REVIEW OPEN ACCESS



The Effectiveness of Curcumin, Resveratrol, and Silymarin on MASLD: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Qian Huang^{1,2} | Ziming An¹ | Xin Xin¹ | Xiaojun Gou³ | Xiaoting Tian⁴ | Yiyang Hu¹ | Zubing Mei⁵ | Qin Feng^{1,6,7,8} 💿

¹Institute of Liver Diseases, Shuguang Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China | ²School of Basic Medicine, Shaanxi University of Chinese Medicine, Xianyang, Shaanxi, China | ³Central Laboratory, Baoshan District Hospital of Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine of Shanghai, Shanghai, China | ⁴Shanghai Institute of Materia Medica, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai, China | ⁵Institute of Anorectal Diseases, Shuguang Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China | ⁶Shanghai Key Laboratory of Traditional Chinese Clinical Medicine, Shanghai, China | ⁷Key Laboratory of Liver and Kidney Diseases, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China | ⁸Central Laboratory, Shuguang Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai University of Chinese Traditional Medicine, Shanghai, China

Correspondence: Zubing Mei (herrmayor@shutcm.edu.cn) | Qin Feng (fengqin@shutcm.edu.cn)

Received: 2 October 2023 | Revised: 25 September 2024 | Accepted: 25 October 2024

Funding: This work was supported by the Shanghai Shenkang 3-year action plan (SHDC2020CR4051 to Q.F.), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82174040 to Q.F., 81973456 to X.T.T.), the District level Medical and Health Key Project of Shanghai Baoshan District Science (21-E-63 to X.J.G.), and the excellent doctoral projects in key fields of Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (2-082 to Q.H.).

Keywords: curcumin | meta-analysis | metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease | resveratrol | silymarin

ABSTRACT

Polyphenols, known for their potent antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties, have emerged as promising, natural, and safe complementary treatment options for metabolic-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD). Among these, curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin are the most extensively studied; however, their differential effects on MASLD outcomes remain inconclusive. This systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs aimed to evaluate the efficacy of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin in patients with MASLD. A comprehensive search of seven databases was conducted up to September 2024. Odds ratios (OR), mean differences (MD), and standardized MD (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to assess treatment effects. Primary outcomes included improvement in hepatic steatosis and ALT activity, while secondary outcomes included changes in AST activity, blood lipids, glucose, BMI, blood pressure, and TNF- α . Twenty-seven studies involving 1691 participants were included. Curcumin significantly improved hepatic steatosis compared to placebo (OR: 4.39, 95% CI: 1.45 to 13.27, p = 0.009), followed by resveratrol (OR: 3.18, 95% CI: 1.20 to 8.42, p = 0.02). Silymarin exhibited the strongest effect in reducing ALT levels (MD: -6.44 U/L, 95% CI: -10.03 to -2.85, p=0.0004), with curcumin (MD: -5.88 U/L, 95% CI: -9.05 to -2.72, p=0.0003) also showing significant reductions. A marked reduction in AST was observed with silymarin (MD: -6.99U/L, 95% CI: -8.56 to -5.42, p < 0.00001), followed by curcumin (MD: -3.36 U/L, 95% CI: -5.35 to -1.36, p = 0.001). Furthermore, curcumin intake significantly improved metabolic indicators (TG, FBG, HOMA-IR, and BMI). Resveratrol reduced FBG and DBP. Curcumin had the strongest effect on hepatic steatosis and improved both transaminase levels and metabolic markers. Silymarin demonstrated the greatest reduction in transaminase levels, while resveratrol showed modest benefits in steatosis and metabolic improvements. The three polyphenols appear as promising therapeutics for the treatment of MASLD.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Author(s). Food Science & Nutrition published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

1 | Introduction

With the global rise in type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) and obesity, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), now referred to as metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD) (Rinella et al. 2023), has emerged as the leading cause of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) (Talamantes et al. 2023). MASLD represents a spectrum of disease that ranges from simple steatosis to metabolic dysfunction-associated steatohepatitis (MASH), previously known as non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), and may ultimately progress to fibrosis (Calzadilla Bertot and Adams 2016). Despite the increasing prevalence and severity of this condition, only one drug has been approved by the FDA for the treatment of NASH in the past 40 years, which is insufficient to address the substantial clinical need (Harrison et al. 2024). Consequently, there is an urgent need for the development of safe and effective therapeutic strategies to manage MASLD.

Polyphenols are a group of phytochemicals that share a common phenolic structure (Alberdi et al. 2013), such as curcumin and resveratrol, and have a long history of being used as functional foods, nutraceuticals, and pharmaceutical products. Enormous studies indicated that polyphenols are safe to be used in a variety of populations. A review summarized that they could alleviate oxidative stress, promote fatty acid beta-oxidation, and modulate insulin resistance (Larussa et al. 2019; Williamson and Sheedy 2020). Furthermore, polyphenols can also protect liver (Khan and Mukhtar 2018). In animal studies, they improved liver steatogenesis, oxidative stress, and inflammation (Rodriguez-Ramiro, Vauzour, and Minihane 2016; Van De Wier et al. 2017). Several clinical trials have evaluated several polyphenolic active ingredients that can affect MASLD (Jalali et al. 2020; Zeraattalab-Motlagh, Jayedi, and Shab-Bidar 2021).

In the current study, curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin were the most investigated polyphenolic compounds for the treatment of MASLD. However, the studies were limited by relatively small sample sizes and inconsistent outcomes (Asghari et al. 2018; Panahi et al. 2017). Moreover, the efficacy of these three compounds has not been directly compared, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about their relative effectiveness.

Given the gaps in the current evidence, particularly the lack of comprehensive evaluation of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin in treating MASLD, a systematic review and metaanalysis are warranted. Such an analysis would provide a more robust and evidence-based understanding of their therapeutic potential in MASLD management.

2 | Materials and Methods

We systematically identified relevant articles published before Sep. 2024 by searching PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, China Biology Medicine, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Internet, and Wanfang databases. Search terms included the keywords: ("NAFLD," "non-alcoholic fatty liver disease," "non-alcoholic steatohepatitis," and "NASH") and ("active ingredient," "bioactive ingredients," "active compounds," "active components," "natural compounds," and "natural products"). To identify additional articles, we also manually looked for the references of reviews and relevant original studies.

This meta-analysis was conducted using a random/fixedeffect model, and the quality of articles was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0. The manuscript was written according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) harm checklist. This study was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42022335681).

2.1 | Selection Criteria

Population: individuals diagnosed with MASLD according to liver biopsy or noninvasive imaging modalities (Fibroscan or B-ultrasound). Inclusion criteria included hepatic histology, B-ultrasound, and Fibroscan. They are as follows: (1) Biopsy-verified MASLD with a steatosis score ≥ 1, (2) B-ultrasound indicated steatosis, and (3) controlled attenuation parameter (CAP) value > 263 dB/m (Petroff et al. 2021; Siddiqui et al. 2019).

The grades of hepatic steatosis are according to B-ultrasound and biopsy: (i) based on B-ultrasound: hepatic steatosis was graded as 0 (lack of fat accumulation), 1 (mild fat deposits), 2 (moderate fat deposits), and 3 (severe fat deposits) (Saadeh et al. 2002), (ii) based on liver biopsy: the distribution of steatosis for stages 0, 1, 2, and 3 was < 5%, 5%–33%, 33%–67%, and > 67%, respectively (Faghihzadeh et al. 2014).

All MASLD patients were \geq 18 years old and had no primary systemic diseases or primary malignant tumors.

- 2. *Intervention*: Curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin were administered at any form and dosage, with an intervention duration of ≥4 weeks.
- 3. Comparison: placebo.
- 4. Outcomes: (i) Primary outcomes were liver parameters: hepatic steatosis, alanine transaminase (ALT) activity. (ii) Secondary outcomes were aspartate aminotransferase (AST) activity, blood lipid indices [total cholesterol (TC), total glyceride (TG), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), blood glucose indicators [fasting plasma glucose (FPG), homeostasis model assessment-insulin resistance (HOMA-IR)], body mass index (BMI), blood pressure [systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP)], and inflammatory factor [tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α)].

Among studies that assessed change in hepatic steatosis by ultrasound grading and categorization (0/1/2/3; none/mild/moderate/severe), the number of patients with mild/moderate/severe steatosis (1/2/3), at baseline who experienced improvement by ≥ 1 grade at the end of the trial was analyzed.

3 | Study: Randomized Controlled Clinical Trials

3.1 | Exclusion Criteria

1. The type of study was not specified.

- 2. Experiments conducted on animals or cells.
- 3. No valid outcome data could be extracted from the article.

3.2 | Quality Assessment

Each included study was evaluated for random sequence generation, allocation hiding, blinded participants and studies, blinded outcome evaluation, incomplete outcome indicators, selective reporting, and other possible biases and classified as low risk, unclear risk, or high risk according to the Cochrane tools (Higgins 2011). Quality assessment was performed independently by Q.H. and Z.M.A., and inconsistencies were resolved through discussion by Q.F.

3.3 | Data Extraction and Statistical Analysis

For all included outcomes, the combined effect size was expressed as odds ratio (OR), standardized mean difference (SMD), mean difference (MD), and 95% confidence interval (CI). When the measurement methods and units were identical, WMD was preferred to combine statistics. Instead, chose SMD. The classification variables were selected as risk differences and 95% CI for analysis. Data represented in medians and quartiles were converted to mean and standard deviation, which was recommended by Hozo et al. For studies that did not show changes before and after the treatment, Mean_{Change} and SD_{Change} were calculated by the method provided in the Cochrane Handbook Chapter 6.5.2 (Higgins, Li, and Deeks 2021). A correlation coefficient (Corr) of 0.5 was used in our calculations. The formula used to calculate the $Mean_{Change}$ and SD_{Change} of the observed indicators before and after the intervention is as follows:

$$Mean_{Change} = Mean_{Final} - Mean_{Baseline}.$$
 (1)

SDChange

$$= \sqrt{\text{SDFinal}^2 + \text{SDBaseline}^2 - 2 \times \text{Corr} \times \text{SDFinal} \times \text{SDBaseline.}}$$
(2)

Cochrane Q and I^2 tests were used to evaluate the heterogeneity. The fixed-effects model was chosen if $I^2 < 50\%$ or p > 0.1; if not, the random-effects model was selected. Subgroup analysis was conducted to explore the sources of heterogeneity, with $I^2 > 50\%$. A sensitivity analysis was used to verify the stability of the results. Subgroup analyses were performed based on different polyphenols (curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin) and different intervention durations (<12 and ≥ 12 weeks). A sensitivity analysis was performed using the "one-studyremoved" strategy to investigate the influence of each study on the effect size. The software for the meta-analysis is Revman 5.3. A two-tailed p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

4 | Results

4.1 | Characteristics of Included Studies and Quality Assessment

The RCTs included in this study involved three polyphenols: curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin. Twenty seven eligible studies met the inclusion and exclusion criteria and were included in the study (Anushiravani et al. 2019; Beheshti Namdar et al. 2023; Chachay et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2015; Cicero et al. 2020; Faghihzadeh et al. 2014; Farzin et al. 2020; Hashemi, Eskandar, and Sardabi 2009; Ghaffari et al. 2019; He et al. 2024; Heeboll et al. 2016; Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021; Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019; Kalhori et al. 2022; Kantartzis et al. 2018; Loguercio et al. 2012; Masoodi, Panahian, and Vojdanian 2013; Mirhafez, Azimi-Nezhad, et al. 2021; Mirhafez, Dehabeh, et al. 2021; Moradi Kelardeh et al. 2020; Navarro et al. 2019; Navekar et al. 2017; Panahi et al. 2017; Panahi et al. 2019; Rahmani et al. 2016; Saadati et al. 2019; Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020; Safari et al. 2023; Solhi et al. 2014; Wah Kheong, Nik Mustapha, and Mahadeva 2017). Some records are merged because they belong to the same RCTs. The study characteristics are listed in Table 1. The flow diagram of these studies' selection process is shown in Figure 1. There were 27 RCTs, detailed bias results are shown in Figure S1. The funnel plot generated for the reported outcomes is symmetrical. Publication bias was assessed using Egger's regression test and funnel plots when there were ≥ 10 data points (Sterne, Gavaghan, and Egger 2000).

4.2 | Effect of Polyphenols on Primary Outcomes

4.2.1 | Hepatic Steatosis

The effect of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on improvement in hepatic steatosis, as graded by liver ultrasound or histology, was examined across 11 studies involving a total of 819 participants (408 in the polyphenol group and 411 in the placebo group). The combined effect of three specific polyphenols-curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin-on hepatic steatosis improvement was statistically significant (OR: 4.52, 95% CI: 2.03 to 10.06, p = 0.0002, $I^2 = 61\%$). Subgroup analysis revealed that curcumin exhibited the most pronounced effect in enhancing the odds of improvement from mild, moderate, or severe hepatic steatosis compared to placebo (OR: 4.39, 95% CI: 1.45 to 13.27, p = 0.009) followed by resveratrol (OR: 3.18, 95% CI: 1.20 to 8.42, p = 0.02) (Figure 2). Further analysis indicated that polyphenols were particularly effective in improving hepatic steatosis when the intervention period was less than 12 weeks (OR: 7.94, 95% CI: 3.48 to 18.10, p < 0.00001) (Figure S2A). Sensitivity analysis confirmed the robustness of the overall effect size.

4.2.2 | Alanine Aminotransferase Activity (ALT)

A total of 23 studies, involving 1537 participants (768 in the polyphenol group and 769 in the placebo group), were included to evaluate the impact of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on ALT, and heterogeneity tests (p < 0.01, $I^2 = 79\%$) suggested statistical

TABLE 1Characteristics of the included studies.

			Simple size	Mean	age	NAFLD			
Polyphenols	Study	Country	(experimental/ placebo)	Experimental	Placebo	diagnosis method	Duration (weeks)	Daily dosage (mg/day)	Outcome
Curcumin	Cicero et al. (2020)	Iran	40/40	54±3	53±5	Ultrasound	∞	200	1.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 2.FBG, HOMA-IR 3.BMI 4.SBP, DBP
	Kalhori et al. (2022)	Iran	21/21	40.38 ±9.26	42.09 ± 7.23	Ultrasound	12	3000	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG, HOMA-IR 5.BMI 6.SBP, DBP
	Mirhafez, Azimi- Nezhad, et al. (2021)	Iran	35/37	45.0±11.1	43.1 ± 11.6	Ultrasound	∞	250	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG 5.BMI
	Moradi Kelardeh et al. (2020)	Iran	22/23	66.72 ± 3.03	64.36±2.97	Ultrasound	12	80	BMI
	Panahi et al. (2017)	Iran	44/43	44.98±12.59	47.21 ± 10.29	Ultrasound	×	1000	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4, HOMA-IR 5.BMI 6.SBP, DBP
	Panahi et al. (2019)	Iran	35/35	46.63 ± 2.21	47.51 ± 2.45	Ultrasound	12	500	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C
	Rahmani et al. (2016)	Iran	37/40	46.37 ±11.57	48.95±9.78	Ultrasound	∞	500	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG 5.BMI
	Saberi-Karimian et al. (2020)	Iran	27/28	18-,	70	Ultrasound	∞	500	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG 5.BMI 6.SBP, DBP
	Saadati et al. (2019)	Iran	27/23	46.19 ± 11.5	45.13 ± 10.9	Ultrasound/ fibroscan	12	1500	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3.FBG, HOMA-IR 4.BMI 5.TNF-α
	Jarhahzadeh et al. (2021)	Iran	32/32	44.12 ± 8.35	38.56 ± 10.43	Ultrasound	12	2000	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG
J	azayeri-Tehrani et al. (2019)	Iran	42/42	41.8 ± 5.6	42.5 ± 6.2	Ultrasound	12	80	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3.FBG, HOMA-IR 4.BMI 5.SBP, DBP 6.TNF-α
	Beheshti Namdar et al. (2023)	Iran	27/29	15-(60	Ultrasound	∞	160	ALT, AST
	Safari et al. (2023)	Iran	28/28	43.92 ± 8.74	50.35 ± 9.44	Ultrasound	12	250	1.ALT, AST 2. TC, TG, HDL- C, LDL-C 3. FBG 4.BMI
	He et al. (2024)	China	40/40	42 ±10.0	40 ± 9.8	Fibro-Touch	24	500	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3.FBG, HOMA-IR 4.BMI 5.SBP, DBP

(Continues)

 TABLE 1
 (Continued)

			Simple size	Mear	1 age	NAFLD			
Polyphenols	Study	Country	(experimental/ placebo)	Experimental	Placebo	diagnosis method	Duration (weeks)	Dally dosage (mg/day)	Outcome
Resveratrol	Chen et al. (2015)	China	30/30	45.2±10.0	43.5 ±11.0	Ultrasound	∞	300	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG, HOMA-IR 5.BMI 6.SBP, DBP 7.TNF-α
	Chachay et al. (2014)	Australia	10/10	48.8±12.2	47.5 ± 11.2	MRI	×	3000	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3.FBG, HOMA-IR 4.BMI 5.SBP, DBP 6.TNF-α
	Farzin et al. (2020)	Iran	25/25	39.78±8.09	38.71 ± 5.76	Ultrasound	12	600	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.FBG, HOMA-IR 4.BMI
	Faghihzadeh et al. (2014)	Iran	25/25	44.04 ± 10.10	46.28 ±9.52	Ultrasound	12	500	1.Grade of hepatic steatosis 2.ALT, AST 3.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 4.FBG, HOMA-IR 5.BMI 6.SBP, DBP 7.TNF-α
	Heeboll et al. (2016)	Denmark	13/13	18-	70	Biopsy	24	1500	1.ALT, AST 2.TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3. HOMA-IR 4.BMI 5.SBP, DBP 6.TNF-α
	Kantartzis et al. (2018)	Denmark	53/52	18-	-70	MRI	12	150	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3. HOMA-IR 4.SBP, DBP
Silymarin	Anushiravani et al. (2019)	Iran	30/30	47.0 -	± 9.1	Ultrasound	12	140	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL- C, LDL-C 3.FBG 4.BMI
	Hashemi, Eskandar, and Sardabi (2009)	Iran	50/50	39.28 ± 11.12	39.0 ± 10.70	Ultrasound	24	280	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL- C, LDL-C 3.FBG 4.BMI
	Loguercio et al. (2012)	Italy	100/100	40.8 ± 10.3	44.2±9.5	Biopsy	48	94	Grade of hepatic steatosis
	Masoodi, Panahian, and Vojdanian (2013)	Iran	50/50	48.42±6.75	48.32±5.45	Ultrasound	12	280	1.ALT, AST 2.BMI
	Navarro et al. (2019)	Italy	27/25	48.2 ± 11.4	49.5 ± 10.9	Biopsy	48	700	Grade of hepatic steatosis
	Solhi et al. (2014)	Iran	33/31	43.6 ± 8.3	39.36 ± 10.5	Ultrasound	8	210	ALT, AST
	Wah Kheong, Nik Mustapha, and Mahadeva (2017)	Malaysia	49/50	49.6 ±12.7	50.1 ± 10.2	Biopsy	48	2100	1.ALT, AST 2.TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C 3.FBG, HOMA-IR
Abbreviations: A	LT, alanine aminotransferase; .	AST, aspartate	aminotransferase; BN	4I, body mass index; I	DBP, diastolic blood	pressure; FPG, fasti	ng plasma gluco	se; HDL-C, high-d	ensity lipoprotein cholesterol; HOMA-IR, homeo;

LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; NR, not reported; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TC, total cholesterol; TG, total glyceride; TNF-a, tumor necrosis factor-a.



FIGURE 1 | Flow diagram of the literature research.

heterogeneity among studies. The findings demonstrated that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin notably reduced ALT levels (MD: -5.61 U/L, 95% CI: -7.93, -3.29, p < 0.00001), as analyzed using a random-effects model (Figure 3A). Subgroup analysis indicated that silymarin had the most substantial effect in lowering ALT levels (MD: -6.44 U/L, 95% CI: -10.03 to -2.85, p = 0.0004) followed by curcumin (MD: -5.88 U/L, 95% CI: -9.05 to -2.72, p = 0.0003) (Figure 3A). Additionally, subgroup analyses revealed that polyphenols significantly reduced liver enzyme levels whether the treatment duration exceeded 12 weeks or not (Figure S2B). Sensitivity analysis confirmed that the overall effect size remained largely consistent.

4.3 | Effect of Polyphenols on Secondary Outcomes

4.3.1 | Aspartate Aminotransferase Activity (AST)

The same 23 studies as ALT, evaluated the impact of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on AST levels, revealing considerable inter-study heterogeneity (p < 0.01, $I^2 = 90\%$). Our analysis, using a random-effects model, demonstrated that polyphenols significantly lowered AST levels (MD: -3.84 U/L, 95% CI: -5.49 to -2.20, p < 0.00001) (Figure 3B). Subgroup analyses further indicated a marked reduction in AST with silymarin (MD: -6.99 U/L, 95% CI: -8.56 to -5.42, p < 0.00001), followed by curcumin (MD: -3.36 U/L, 95% CI: -5.35 to -1.36, p < 0.00001). In contrast, resveratrol did not show a statistically significant effect (MD: -2.14 U/L, 95% CI: -5.63 to 1.34, p = 0.23) (Figure 3B). Furthermore, the results suggested significant differences in the magnitude of AST reduction across varying intervention durations (Figure S2C). Sensitivity analysis confirmed the stability of the overall effect size.

4.3.2 | Blood Lipid Indices (TC, TG, HDL-C, and LDL-C)

A total of 20 studies, encompassing 1371 participants (685 receiving polyphenols and 686 on placebo), examined the effects of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on TC in individuals with MASLD. The analysis indicated that polyphenol intake had no significant impact on TC levels (SMD: -0.13, 95% CI: -0.43 to -0.17) (p = 0.40, $I^2 = 86\%$) (Figure 4A). Another subgroup analysis showed that polyphenols significantly reduced TC when the intervention period was less than 12 weeks (SMD: -0.57, 95% CI: -1.00 to -0.14, p = 0.009) (Figure S2D). Moreover, sensitivity analysis demonstrated that excluding any individual study had minimal impact on the overall heterogeneity.



(**G**) Other bias



Twenty studies, including 1342 participants (671 polyphenols users and 671 placebo users), reported the effects of three polyphenols (curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin) on TG. Subgroup analysis indicated that curcumin supplementation significantly reduced TG levels (SMD: -0.51, 95% CI: -0.92 to $-0.10, p = 0.01, I^2 = 87\%$) based on the random-effects model (Figure 4B). Furthermore, the significant differences were observed in TG level changes while intervention durations less than 12weeks (Figure S2E). Sensitivity analysis showed that excluding any reference had little effect on overall heterogeneity (Figure S4).

A total of 21 studies, involving 1397 participants (698 in the polyphenol group and 699 in the placebo group), provided data on HDL-C levels. The analysis showed that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin did not result in significant improvements in HDL-C (SMD: 0.15, 95% CI: -0.04 to 0.35, p=0.12) according to the random-effects model (p < 0.01, $I^2 = 70\%$) (Figure 4C). The effect of different polyphenols and intervention durations on HDL-C levels in MASLD patients was similarly insignificant (Figure S2F). Sensitivity analysis revealed that the effect of silymarin on HDL-C levels in MASLD patients became significant (SMD: 0.28, 95% CI: 0.00 to 0.56, p=0.05) after excluding the study by (Anushiravani et al. 2019).

Similarly, in the same population as the HDL-C analysis, it was found that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin had no significant effect on LDL-C levels (SMD: -0.15, 95% CI: -0.51 to 0.21, p = 0.41) using the random-effects model (p < 0.01, $I^2 = 90\%$) (Figure 4D). However, subgroup analysis indicated that polyphenols significantly reduced LDL-C levels when the intervention period was less than 12 weeks (Figure S2G). Sensitivity analysis further demonstrated that, upon removing the study by Panahi et al. curcumin significantly lowered LDL-C levels in MASLD patients (SMD: -0.50, 95% CI: -0.92 to -0.07, p = 0.02).

4.3.3 | Blood Glucose Indicators (FBG and HOMA-IR)

Based on the analysis of 18 effect sizes from studies involving 1214 participants (606 in the polyphenol group and 608 in the placebo group), changes in fasting blood glucose (FBG) were assessed using a fixed-effects model, in accordance with the results of the heterogeneity test (p < 0.01, $I^2 = 75\%$). The findings indicated that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin significantly reduced FBG levels in patients with MASLD (SMD: -0.31, 95% CI: -0.43 to -0.20, p < 0.0001) (Figure 5A). Subgroup

Δ		Exp	eriment	al	c	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
~	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% C	IV, Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
	Curcumin										2288888
	Jarnanzaden et al. 2021 Jazaveri-Tehrani et al. 2019	30.51	12.61	32	39.5	21.15	32	4.1%	-8.99 [-17.52, -0.46]	+	
	Kalhori et al. 2017	22.95	10.85	21	27.09	11.91	21	5.0%	-4.14 [-11.03, 2.75]		
	Mirhafez et al. 2021	-6.12	26.6	35	1.22	15.96	37	3.3%	-7.34 [-17.54, 2.86]		
	Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2019	-10.61	15.49	44	4.51	7.4 6 10	43	6.3% 8.1%	-15.12 [-20.20, -10.04]		
	Rahmani et al. 2016	-12.03	47.38	37	-1.62	12.3	40	1.7%	-1.37 [-17.11, 14.37]	-	??
	Saadati et al. 2019	-5.63	14.5	27	-6.82	15.83	23	4.1%	1.19 [-7.28, 9.66]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \circ \bullet \bullet$
	Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	-0.18	12.75	27	-4.72	10.74	28	5.5%	4.54 [-1.70, 10.78]		
	Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023	42.62	23.76	27	48.44	27.32	29	2.3%	-5.82 [-19.21, 7.57]		
	Safari et al. 2023	-5.67	3.52	28	-4.33	2.3	28	8.7%	-1.34 [-2.90, 0.22]		
	Subtotal (95% CI)			395			398	65.0%	-5.88 [-9.05, -2.72]	•	
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.24; (Test for overall effect: Z = 3.64	Chi² = 88. 4 (P = 0.0	25, df = 003)	11 (P <	< 0.0000	1); I ² = 1	88%				
	Resveratrol										
	Faghihzadeh et al. 2014	-24.45	34.08	25	-11.16	19.6	25	1.8%	-13.29 [-28.70, 2.12]		??
	Chen et al. 2016	-6.82	6.62	30	-0.96	9.73	30	6.9%	-5.86 [-10.07, -1.65]		
	Chachav et al. 2014	68.17	22.36	10	63.15	50.74	10	0.3%	5.02 [-29.35, 39.39]	<u> </u>	
	Farzin et al. 2020	46.2	25.19	30	40.94	28.81	30	2.2%	5.26 [-8.43, 18.95]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
	Kantartzis et al. 2018	4.01	6.14	53	0.95	23.49	52	5.2%	3.06 [-3.54, 9.66]	1	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18 08: (Chi ² = 8 3	0 df = 5	161 (P = 0	14). 12 =	= 40%	160	16.9%	-2.22 [-8.10, 3.66]	T	
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.74$	4 (P = 0.4	6)	(F = 0	. 14), 1 -	- 40 /8					
	Silymarin		54.00			10.77	50	4.000	4 00 / 47 00 40 001		
	vvan-kneong et al. 2017 Anushiravani et al. 2019	-20	51.69 15.91	49	-21	43.77	50	1.3% 4.5%	1.00 [-17.89, 19.89] -8 70 [-16 43 -0.971		
	Hashemi et al. 2009	73.14	62.44	50	89.92	41.83	50	1.1%	-16.78 [-37.61, 4.05]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet ? \bullet \bullet$
	Masoodi et al. 2013	68.54	5.54	50	73.32	5.58	50	8.3%	-4.78 [-6.96, -2.60]	•	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
	Solhi et al. 2014	38.4	11.8	33	52.3	29.9	31	2.9%	-13.90 [-25.17, -2.63]		•••••
	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 3.76$; C Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.5$	hi² = 4.78 1 (P = 0.0	, df = 4 (004)	P = 0.3	81); l² =	16%	211	10.1%	-0.44 [-10.03, -2.85]	•	
		. (700			760	400.0%	E 64 [7 02 0 00]		
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 15.54: (Chi ² = 104	1.74. df =	: 22 (P	< 0.000	01): l ² =	: 79%	100.0%	-5.01 [-7.95, -5.29]	·····	
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.74	4 (P < 0.0	0001)	(- 0.000	,, .	1070			-100 -50 0 50	100
	Test for subgroup differences:	Chi ² = 1.	51, df =	2 (P =	0.47), l²	= 0%				experimental control	
	Risk of bias legend										
	(A) Random sequence genera (B) Allocation concealment (se	ation (sele	ction dia	s)							
	(C) Blinding of participants and	d personn	el (perfo	rmanc	e bias)						
	(D) Blinding of outcome asses	sment (de	etection	bias)							
	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((E) Collective assesting (constitution)	sment (de	etection ias)	bias)							
	 (D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias 	sment (de (attrition b ng bias)	etection ias)	bias)							
_	 (D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporting (G) Other bias 	sment (de (attrition b ng bias)	etection ias)	bias)							
В	 (D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias 	esment (de (attrition b ng bias) Exp	etection ias) eriment	al		Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias	sment (de (attrition b ng bias) Exp <u>Mean</u>	eriment	al Total	C Mean	control SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Study or Subgroup Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016	esment (de (attrition b ng bias) Exp <u>Mean</u> -5.04	eriment SD 6.49	al Total 37	C <u>Mean</u> 2.02	Control SD 11.79	<u>Total</u> 40	Weight 4.7%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 (-11.27, -2.85)	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D F F G
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Study or Subgroup Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al.2017	Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95	eriment SD 6.49 7.47	al Total 37 44	0 <u>Mean</u> 2.02 3.79	control SD 11.79 6.43	<u>Total</u> 40 43	<u>Weight</u> 4.7% 5.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias ABCDEFG 979€€?
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data (F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Study or Subgroup Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019	sment (de (attrition b ng bias) Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68	al Total 37 44 27	2.02 3.79 -3.46	5.43	Total 40 43 23	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -0.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39]	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bias <u>A B C D E F G</u> ? ? ● ● ? ● ● ● ● ● ● ? ● ●
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al.2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	sment (da (attrition b ng bias) Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24 14	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8 9	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 42 21	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04	introl SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4	Total 40 43 23 42 21	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 5.7% 4.6%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-6.35 4.55]	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 7 9 1 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 7 9 1 7 7 9 9 9 7 9 1 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017	Exp (attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 42 21 35	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68	control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9
В	(D) Blinding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumın Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	sment (de (attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 42 21 35 27	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08	5.43 5.43 5.43 5.43 5.43 5.43 5.43	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-7.34, -7.781] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.66 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021	sment (de (attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44	control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -1.074 [-7.367, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 7 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al.2016 Panahi et al.2016 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al.2017 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	sment (d((attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 27 35 27	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.59	5.43 5.43 5.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6% 5.0% 2.8%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.47, -7.81] 0.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.07 [-7.95, -0.19] 0.131, 74 17 671	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Sabari-Karimian et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Benashi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 He et al. 2024	sment (d((attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 32 27 40	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.29 5	11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6% 5.0% 2.8% 6.6%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -5.82 [-7.11, -4.53]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumın Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Sadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Babari-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 He et al. 2024	sment (d((attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.05 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82 -2.6	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 32 27 35 32 27 40 28	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67	11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 28 37 229 40 28	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6% 5.4% 6.6% 6.7%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-7.34, -7.781] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.66 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18]	Mean Difference N. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * ? * * ? ? * * ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (65% CI)	sment (d((attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.07 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82 -2.6	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 40 28 395 32 27 40 28	2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67	5.43 5.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 28 398 398	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6% 5.4% 6.6% 6.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -1.074 [-7.347, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.82] -4.07 [-7.95, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.33 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3	Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 -0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82 -2.6 chP = 75.5 0 (P = 0.0	erimenti SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17, df = 1 010)	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 32 27 35 32 27 40 28 395 1 (P <	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 24.04 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67	Sontrol SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.25 5.4 3.35 5.19 9.66 11.15 4.06 11.15 4.06 1.05 2 = 8	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 4 398 398 55%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 5.4% 5.4% 6.6% 6.6% 6.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, 1-91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.47 [-7.55, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36]	Mean Difference V. Random. 95% CI 	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 He et al. 2024 Safari et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3,31	Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82 -2.6 bhP = 75.5 0 (P = 0.0	eriment SD 6.49 6.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 7, df = 1 010)	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 32 27 35 32 27 40 28 395 1 (P <	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65 1.65	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 28 398 398 5%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 5.4% 5.4% 5.4% 6.6% 6.6% 6.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-7.36, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.50] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36]	Mean Difference N. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al.2016 Panahi et al.2016 Panahi et al.2017 Sadati et al.2017 Sadati et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Baberi-Karimian et al.2020 Mirhafez et al.2021 Jarhahzadeh et al.2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al.2023 Beheshti-Namdar et al.2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall GEC: Z = 3.30 Resveratrol	sment (dr (attrition b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 31.72 -0.82 -2.6 (P = 0.0 -10.66	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 7.df = 1 010)	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 42 21 35 32 27 36 32 27 48 395 1 (P <	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001	control SD 11.79 6.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 7.4 7.43 7.2 7.4 7.43 7.43 7.2 7.4 7.43 7.43 7.5 7.4 7.43 7.43 7.43 7.43 7.43 7.43 7.43	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 08 398 398 5%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 6.3% 5.4% 3.6% 5.0% 2.8% 6.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.07 [-7.95, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.33 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-9.80, 2.84]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (65% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.9 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chen et al. 2014	sment (d(attrition b) (attrition b) (attriti	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17,010	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 227 35 32 27 40 0 8 395 1 (P < 25 30 21	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95	control SD 11.79 6.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 1.65 1.11.15 4.06 1.65 8.24 5.25 4.52 2.54 5.24 5.24 5.24 5.24 5	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 29 40 25 398 398 5%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 5.4% 5.9% 5.0% 2.8% 6.6% 6.6% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -5.82 [-7.11, -4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al.2017 Saadaii et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al.2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.31 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chen et al. 2016 Heeball et al. 2016	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.72 -2.73 -2.73 -2.73 -2.73 -2.73 -2.73 -2.73 -2.74 -2.75	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 16.86 0.87 2.51 16.86 0.87 2.51 16.86 0.87 15.5 4.67 55.09 15.5 10.10 10.1	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 35 32 27 40 0 8 395 32 27 40 0 8 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 38	control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.22 5.4 3.35 5.19 9.66 11.15 4.06 11.15 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.65 1.	Total 40 43 42 21 35 28 37 32 28 398 398 5% 25 30 13 10	Weight 4.7% 5.1% 6.3% 6.3% 5.0% 6.3% 6.6% 6.2.1% 3.7% 5.9% 0.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.47 [-7.55, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.26 [-60.05, 5.33]	Mean Difference V. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshi-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghinzadeh et al. 2016 Chen et al. 2016 Heeboli et al. 2021	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -22.03 -24.14 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.42 -2.6 -0.82 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.72 -2.6 -0.95 -2.72 -2.74 -4 -2.75 -2.74 -2.74 -2.74 -2.75 -2.75 -2.74 -2.74 -2.74 -2.75 -2	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 4.45 5.9 4.45 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17.df = 1 010) 12.35 4.67 55.09 15 11.19	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 32 27 40 28 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 10 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 4.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 34.27	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.59 5.4 3.59 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65); ² = 8 8.24 5.25 24.59 21.06	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 35 28 398 398 55% 25 30 13 10 030	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 5.4% 3.6% 2.8% 2.8% 6.6% 62.1% 3.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-7.367, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] 3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -0.33 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.28 [-60.05, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * ? * * ? ? * * ? * * ? ? * * ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Babeshti-Namdar et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.31 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2018	sment (dk aftrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.02 24.14 -9.44 0.13 -2 21.19 -0.82 21.19 -0.62 -2.6.6 -6.95 -2.72 22.19 -0.10 -0	erimenti SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 16.80 0.87 2.51 10010)	al Total Total 37 44 27 42 25 32 27 40 8 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 35 30 13	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 38 34.27 1.74	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 1.65 4.06 1.65 2.25 2.4.59 15 2.21.06 1.08	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 28 398 398 5%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 6.3% 6.6.3% 6.6.3% 6.6.7% 62.1% 3.7% 62.1%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.74 [-2.94, 4.39] -3.76 [-5.64, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, -4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.27 26 [-60.5, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumın Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% C1)	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.23 -2.23 -2.2 -2.23 -2.2 -2.23 -2.2 -2.2	erimenti SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 1010) 12.35 5.09 15 11.19 0.69	al Total Total 37 44 27 42 27 35 27 30 32 27 40 0 28 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 33 161 10 (P = 0)	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 38 34.27 1.74	control SD 11.79 6.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.19 11.15 4.06 11.15 4.06 11.15 4.06 5.25 5.25 24.59 15 21.06 8.24 5.25 24.59 15 21.08 8.24 5.25 21.08 1.0	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 29 40 28 398 398 55% 25 300 13 10 0 32 160	Weight 4,7% 5,6% 5,1% 5,7% 5,4% 4,6% 5,4% 6,3% 5,4% 6,2,4% 6,2,1% 3,7% 5,9% 6,2,1% 3,7% 5,2% 2,4% 6,2,4%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.06 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantarziz et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C	$\label{eq:second} \begin{split} & \text{sment} (d, karrial array of the second $	erimenti SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 5.67 16.86 0.87 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 7.df = 1 0.00 12.35 5.69 10.100	al Total Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 32 277 42 21 35 32 277 43 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 30 305 13 10 30 10 30 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	C C Mean 2.02 2.5.2 2.3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 34.27 1.74 0.002); I ²	control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.19 11.15 5.19 11.15 4.06 1.65 5.25 24.59 5.25 24.59 5.21.06 1.08 = = 74%	Total 40 43 23 42 28 37 32 29 40 08 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 39	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 5.4% 5.0% 6.6% 6.6% 6.2.1% 3.7% 6.2.1% 3.7% 6.2.4% 6.2.4%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.66 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.74 [-2.94, 4.39] -3.76 [-5.64, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.47, 7.67] 0.13 [-7.47, 7.67] 0.13 [-7.47, 7.67] 0.33 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, 2.543] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? @ ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumın Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Babesht-Narimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarn	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -2.20 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.23 -2.22 -2.23 -2.24 -2.24 -2.24 -0.82 -2.26 -0.82 -2.25 -2.55 -2.25 -2.55	erimenti SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 4.45 5.9 8.9 4.45 5.67 16.86 0.87 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 7.010 12.35 5.09 15.50 9 15.50 9 15.90 10.10 10.69 10.55 10.69 10.69 10.69 10.69 10.69 10.69 10.59 10.69 10.	al Total 37 44 27 35 32 27 40 25 32 27 40 25 30 10 10 30 53 161 (P = 0	C C Mean 2.02 2.5.2 2.5.2 3.79 -3.46 25.63 2.4.4 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 34.27 -0.95 -5.84 34.27 1.74	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.22 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 1.65 1.11.15 4.06 1.65 2.10 8.24 5.25 2.1.06 1.08 2.24.59 1.5 2.1.06 1.08 2.24.59 1.5 2.1.09 1.1.79 1.1.79 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.69 9.66 3.5.19 1.1.65 1	Total 40 43 23 42 28 37 32 29 40 08 398 398 55% 25 30 13 10 00 52 160	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 5.4% 5.2.8% 6.3% 5.4% 6.2.8% 6.7% 62.1% 3.7% 5.9% 0.2.4% 2.4% 2.4%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.72 [-[60.5, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * ? * * * ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.2 Sitymarin Wah-Kheong et al. 2017	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) Expp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -0.82 -2.2 -2.2 -2.2 -0.82 -2.6 -0.45 -0.72 -2.72 -2.73 -2.75 -2.72 -2.73 -2.75 -2.72 -2.73 -2.75 -2.7	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17, df = 1 0.10 12.35 4.67 55.09 15 11.19 0.69 5.3() 38.46	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 35 32 27 40 25 30 10 395 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 0 33 161 (P = 0 49 27 27 40 25 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 -5.68 -1.07 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 38 34.27 1.74 -6.67	control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.22 5.4 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 1.65 24.59 15 21.06 1.08 24.59 15 21.06 1.08 2.45 2.459 15 2.1000 2.10000 2.10000 2.10000 2.10000000000	Total 40 43 32 21 35 28 392 29 40 28 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 300 21 0 25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 2	Weight 4,7% 5,6% 5,1% 4,6% 5,7% 4,6% 5,7% 5,7% 6,2% 6,7% 6,2% 6,7% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,3% 6,2% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4% 7,4	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.26 [-60.05, 5.53] -0.12 [-0.71, 0.23] -0.12 [-0.71, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * * * ? ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Sabari-Karimian et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2020 Kantarizis et al. 2016 Chechay et al. 2016 Chechay et al. 2016 Chechay et al. 2016 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarn Vah-Kheong et al. 2017 Anushiravani et al. 2019	sment (d/ attrition b ng bias) Exp 4.635 2.72 2.203 2.4.14 5.24 2.2.2 2.2.3 2.4.14 2.2 2.2.3 2.4.14 2.2 2.2.3 2.4.14 2.2 2.2.3 2.4.14 2.2 2.2.3 2.4.14 2.2 2.2.10 0 (P = 0.2 13 8.44 4.5 5.2.52 13 8.44 4.5 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 2.7 2	erimenti sp 6.49 7.47 7.68 8.9 4.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17.0f = 1 0.69 15. 11.19 0.69 15. 33. 4.67 7.88 1.97 1	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 42 27 42 21 15 32 27 42 21 15 32 27 42 21 15 32 27 42 21 15 32 27 42 21 15 32 27 10 28 395 1 (P < 25) 30 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	C Mean 2.02 25.63 24.04 -5.68 24.4 25.26 31.59 -1.67 -7.68 34.27 -7.68 34.27 1.74 .0002); P -6 -0.95 5.54 -0.95 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.95 -5.58 -0.95 -0.	Control SD 11.79 6.43 3.54 5.43 3.35 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65 2.4.59 21.06 1.08 = 74% 26.23 10.74	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 99 90 40 28 398 55% 255 300 13 310 300 55%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 6.3% 4.6% 2.8% 2.8% 2.8% 6.6% 62.1% 3.7% 6.2% 0.2% 0.2% 0.2% 1.3% 6.8% 2.4% 6.8%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 47.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-7.367, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.47 [-7.55, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, -4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.26 [-60.05, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73]	Mean Difference N. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Sabari-Karimian et al. 2019 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chen et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantarziz et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantarziz et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantarziz et al. 2017 Mashcay et al. 2017 Anushiravani et al. 2017 Mashcay et al. 2017 Mascodi et al. 2017	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -2.20 -2.22 -2.22 -2.2 -2.2 -2.2 -2.2	eriment SD 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 8.45 7.09 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 11.99 0.69 5.11.19 0.69 38.46 7.47 5.57 11.19 0.69 5.33 38.46 5.51 33.46 5.51 33.46 5.51	al Total 37 44 27 42 27 35 32 27 40 285 322 27 40 285 322 27 40 285 327 40 285 30 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 -5.68 2.44 4.568 2.44 4.55.26 3.159 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 38 -0.95 -0.95 -0.95 -0.95 -0.92 ().174 -0.02); I ² -6 -0.9 66.16	<pre>control sp 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 3.35 5.19 9.66 1.1.65 24.59 15 21.06 8.24 5.25 24.59 15 21.06 = 74% 26.23 1.08 = 74%</pre>	Total 40 43 42 23 42 29 40 28 83 7 32 29 40 28 39 8 39 8 39 8 39 8 39 8 39 8 39 8 3	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 5.0% 5.2.8% 6.3% 6.6% 6.2.1% 3.7% 6.2.1% 3.7% 6.2.1% 1.3% 2.2.4% 6.8% 2.0.4%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% C1 -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.66 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, 2.54] -7.22 [-6.06, 5.53] -7.26 [-6.76, 5.53] -7.26 [-6.76, 2.54] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-22.47, -2.73] -6.86 [-8.86, 5.57]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.9 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Ghanter et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarin Wah-Kheong et al. 2017 Masheri et al. 2019 Masocoi et al. 2013 Solhi et al. 2014	sment (dk attrilion b ng bias) Expp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 -2.22 -2.22 -2.22 -2.2 -2.2 -2.2 -2.2 -10.66 -3.3 -10.66 -3.3 -10.66 -3.3 -2.7 -2	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 8.9 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 10.10 12.35 4.67 55.09 15 10.10 10.9 5, df = 1 10.9 5, df = 5 3, df = 5 5, df = 5 3, df = 5 3, df = 5 5, df = 5 3, df = 5 3, df = 5 3, df = 5 5, df = 5 3, df = 5 3, df = 5 5, df = 5 5,	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 322 277 40 28 395 322 277 40 28 395 322 1 (P < 1 (P < (P = 0) 49 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 25.63 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 38 34.27 1.74 -6.6 -0.95 -5.68 34.27 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -0	Control SD 6.43 5.43 5.43 5.5 5.19 11.65 11.15 9.66 9.66 1.0.65 12.25 24.59 15 21.06 1.08 22.45 21.06 1.08 21.07 4 27.44 3.39 26.23 3.107 4 27.44 3.39 26.23 3.107 4 27.44 3.39 26.23 3.25 21.07	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 29 40 02 25 30 0 13 10 30 55% 25 30 0 30 50 50 30 50 50 30 31	Weight 4,7% 5,6% 5,1% 5,5% 5,0% 6,3% 5,0% 6,2.8% 6,2.8% 6,2.8% 6,2.1% 3,7% 5,9% 6,2.1% 3,7% 5,9% 6,2.1% 4,4% 2,0.4% 4,4% 1,3% 4,4% 4,1% 4,4% 4,1% 4,4% 4,1% 4,4% 4,4	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, 0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.00 [-61.5, 2.0.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73] -6.50 [-28.45, -4.55] -6.86 [-8.65, 5.07]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G 7 7 9 9 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 7 9
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayen-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2017 Aushiravani et al. 2019 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarn Wah-Kheong et al. 2017 Anushiravani et al. 2019 Masocoi et al. 2013 Solhi et al. 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	sment (dk attrilion b ng blas) Expp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -1.82 -2.73 -1.82 -2.73 -1.82 -2.73 -3.73 -3.74 -4.95 -5.74 -4.95 -5.74 -7.33 -7.73 -7.33 -7.3 -7.33 -	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 7.49 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 17.df = 1 0.69 5.3 38.46 7.88 3.326 5.51 8.20 3.26 5.51 8.20 3.26 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 8.20 5.51 5.52 5.51 5.52 5.51 5.52 5.	al <u>Total</u> 37 44 27 35 37 35 32 27 35 32 27 40 8 395 11 (P < 25 30 27 40 0 8 395 11 (P < 25 30 10 30 10 30 31 10 30 30 31 212 212	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 -5.68 -1.08 2.44 -5.68 -1.08 2.5.26 -1.57 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 -0.95 -5.84 38 34.27 1.74 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -0.95 -5.68 -0.95 -0.9	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.55 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65 21.06 1.08 = 74% 26.23 10.74 3.39 12.4 3.39 12.4	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 38 338 338 338 338 338 338 338 338 3	Weight 4,7% 5,6% 5,1% 5,1% 6,3% 4,6% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3% 6,3	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.07 [-7.56, -1.91] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.60, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.26 [-60.05, 5.33] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73] -6.50 [-2.84, 4.55] -6.86 [-8.65, -5.07] -5.70 [-10.88, -6.52]	Mean Difference V. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Curcumin Rahmani et al.2016 Panahi et al.2017 Saadati et al.2017 Saadati et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Panahi et al.2017 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhabzadeh et al.2021 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.30 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2020 Kantarizis et al.2020 Kantarizis et al.2021 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Sitymarn Wah-Kheong et al.2017 Anushiravani et al.2019 Hasponi et al.2017 Anushiravani et al.2019 Hasponi et al.2017 Solhi et al.2014 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Sitymarn Wah-Kheong et al.2017 Anushiravani et al.2019 Hasponi et al.2017 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall alf effect: Z = 0.00; C Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00; C Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C	sment (d/attrilion b ng bias) Exp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -2.03 -2.2 -2.03 -2.2 -2.03 -2.2 -2.03 -2.2 -2.03 -2.2 -2.13 -2.2 -2.13 -2.2 -3.4 -3.2 -2.2 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.94 4 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.95 -0.94 -0.82 -0.85 -	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 11.39 12.35 4.55 11.19 10.69 15.50 11.19 10.69 15.50 11.19 10.69 15.50 11.19 10.69 15.50 11.19 10.69 15.50 11.19 10.6	al Total 37 44 27 44 27 44 27 35 27 40 08 395 1 (P < 25 30 30 13 10 (P = 0 49 30 50 30 212 P = 0.6 P = 0.6	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 25.63 31.59 5 -1.67 -7.68 34.27 -7.68 34.27 1.74 .0022); I ² -6.156 36.2 30); I ² =	Sontrol SD 11.79 6.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 6.43 11.69 9.66 4.06 1.65 2.1.06 1.08 2.1.06 1.08 2.1.06 1.08 2.1.06 3.0.74 2.7.44 3.39 12.4 0%	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 28 37 32 28 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 398 39	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 4.6% 5.4% 5.0% 6.3% 5.0% 6.2.1% 6.6% 6.2.1% 3.7% 6.2.1% 4.4% 2.0.4% 4.1.5% 6.8% 4.4% 1.1.5% 4.1% 1.7.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C1 -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.66 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -3.36 [-5.1, -1.91] -5.82 [-7.11, -4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.272 [e]-60.5, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-22.7, -2.73] -6.86 [-8.65, 5.07] -5.70 [-10.88, -0.52] -6.99 [-8.56, -5.42]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @<
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumın Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Baberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Beheshti-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 9.15; C Test for overall effect: Z = 3.3 Resveratrol Faghihzadeh et al. 2014 Chachay et al. 2014 Farzin et al. 2020 Kantartzis et al. 2016 Chachay et al. 2017 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarın Wah-Kheong et al. 2017 Anushiravan et al. 2017 Masocoi et al. 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Solhi et al. 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; C	sment (d/ attrilion b ng bias) Expp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.72 -2.03 -2.72 -2.04 -0.62 -6.95 -0.62 -0.73 -0.75 -0.73 -0.75	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 8.9 8.9 14.33 5.67 7.68 5.9 14.33 5.67 7.68 5.9 14.33 5.67 7.68 5.9 14.33 5.67 15.9 10.00 15 10.00 15 5.9 5.9 38.46 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 15 10.00 15 5.9 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 15 10.00 10.69 10.	al Total 37 44 27 42 21 35 27 40 28 395 1 (P < 25 30 27 40 28 395 1 (P < 41 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 40 27 27 40 28 395 305 305 305 305 305 305 305 30	C Mean 2.02 3.79 25.63 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 34.27 1.74 .002); I ² =	Sontrol SP 11.79 6.43 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.43 7.2 5.19 11.15 8.24 5.25 24.59 15 21.06 1.08 = 74% 26.23 10.74 27.44 3.39 12.4 0%	Total 40 43 23 24 21 37 32 28 83 37 32 29 40 28 398 398 398 55% 255 300 10 30 30 52 160 50 30 30 31 211	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.7% 4.6% 5.4% 5.4% 6.3% 6.2.8% 6.7% 62.1% 3.7% 5.9% 62.1% 3.7% 5.9% 62.1% 4.8% 2.4% 5.9% 2.4% 5.9% 5.2.4% 5.1% 5.2.4% 5.3% 6.2.1% 5.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-6.42, -0.78] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, -2.54] -7.22 [-60.5, 5.53] 7.00 [-6.15, 20.15] -1.75 [-10.28, 6.78] -0.12 [-0.47, 0.23] -2.14 [-5.63, 1.34] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73] -6.56 [-2.86, 5, 57] -5.70 [-10.88, -0.52] -6.89 [-8.56, -5.42]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias Curcumin Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Panahi et al. 2017 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021 Jarhahzadeh et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.45; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Silymarin Wah-Kheong et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Soliti et al. 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Soliti et al. 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	$\label{eq:simeric} \begin{split} & \text{simeric} (d, kirred) \\ & \text{Expp} \\ & \text{Mean} \\ & -5.04 \\ & -6.95 \\ & -2.72 \\ & 22.03 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -2.22 \\ & -1.05 \\ & -1.05 \\ & -2.22 \\ & $	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 5.9 8.9 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 16.86 0.87 2.51 11.19 15.04 = 1 0.69 15.5, df = 5 3.3) 38.46 5.5, df = 5 3.3) 38.46 5.5, df = 5 3.3)	al Total 70tal 37 44 27 35 27 32 27 32 27 70 28 395 50 1 (P < 25 30 13 10 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 25.63 24.04 25.26 31.59 5 -1.67 0.00001 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 -0.95 -5.84 -0.95 34.27 1.74 -6.61 61.56 61.56 61.56 61.56 (5.62) -0.9 -	Sontrol SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 5.43 7.2 5.4 9 11.15 11.15 11.15 24.59 15 21.06 1.074 26.23 10.74 27.44 3.39 12.4 0%	Total 40 43 23 42 21 37 32 28 37 32 29 40 28 398 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5% 5%	Weight 4.7% 5.6% 5.1% 5.5% 5.4% 5.0% 6.2.8% 6.2.8% 6.2.1% 3.7% 5.9% 0.2% 4.4% 1.3% 2.4% 6.3% 4.4% 1.5% 6.3% 4.4% 1.5% 6.3% 1.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-13.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, 0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.05 [-7.56, 2.24] -5.05 [-7.56, 2.24] -5.05 [-7.56, 2.24] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, 2.73] -6.50 [-8.45, -4.55] -6.86 [-8.65, 5.07] -5.70 [-10.8, 0.52] -6.99 [-8.56, -5.42] -3.84 [-5.49, -2.20]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? * * * * * ? ? * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
В	(D) Binding of outcome asses (E) Incomplete outcome data ((F) Selective reporting (reporti (G) Other bias <u>Curcumin</u> Rahmani et al. 2016 Panahi et al. 2017 Saadati et al. 2019 Sabari-Karimian et al. 2019 Kalhori et al. 2019 Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020 Mirhafez et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Jarhabradeh et al. 2021 Beheshi-Namdar et al. 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.15; CI Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Kantzzis et al. 2020 Kantzzis et al. 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.09; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C Test for overall effect: Z = 1.20 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	sment (dk attrilion b ng blas) Expp Mean -5.04 -6.95 -2.72 22.03 24.14 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -9.44 -0.82 -2.6 -0.72 -2.6 -0.72 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.82 -0.92 -0.82 -0.92 -0.	eriment <u>SD</u> 6.49 7.47 7.68 6.9 7.47 7.68 6.59 8.9 14.33 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 12.35 5.67 16.86 0.87 2.51 11.19 0.69 5.3 38.46 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 33.26 5.51 8.29 5.51 8.29 5.51 5.51 8.29 5.51	al Total Total 37 44 27 44 27 35 32 27 70 28 395 30 25 30 31 1 (P < 25 30 31 1 (P = 0 49 30 53 212 P = 0.6 768 8 22 77 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	C Mean 2.02 3.79 -3.46 -5.68 -1.08 2.4.04 -5.68 -1.08 2.5.26 -1.07 -7.68 -0.95 -5.84 -0.95 -5.84 38.32 -7.68 -0.95 -5.88 34.27 1.74 -0.95 -5.88 34.27 -0.95 -5.88 34.27 -0.95 -5.88 -1.67 -0.95 -5.88 -1.67 -0.95 -5.88 -1.67 -0.95 -5.88 -1.67 -0.95 -5.88 -1.67 -0.95 -5.88 -0.95 -0.95 -5.88 -0.95 -	Control SD 11.79 6.43 5.43 3.55 5.19 11.69 9.66 11.15 4.06 1.65 21.06 1.08 = 74% 26.23 10.74 3.39 12.4 0% 001); ² = 8	Total 40 43 23 42 21 35 53 22 29 40 28 398 55% 25 30 13 13 13 10 30 55% 55% 55% 25 30 13 13 10 30 55% 50 30 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Weight 4,7% 5,6% 5,1% 6,3% 4,6% 6,3% 6,3% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2% 6,2	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -7.06 [-11.27, -2.85] -10.74 [-3.67, -7.81] 0.74 [-2.91, 4.39] -3.60 [-64.2, -0.78] 0.10 [-4.35, 4.55] -3.76 [-5.61, -1.91] 1.21 [-2.08, 4.50] -4.44 [-10.50, 1.62] -4.47 [-7.55, -0.19] 0.13 [-7.41, 7.67] -5.82 [-7.11, 4.53] -0.93 [-2.04, 0.18] -3.36 [-5.35, -1.36] -2.98 [-8.80, 2.84] -5.08 [-7.56, -2.54] -27.26 [-60.05, 5.53] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73] -7.00 [-19.99, 5.99] -7.50 [-12.27, -2.73] -7.70 [-18, -0.52] -6.86 [-8.66, -5.42] -3.84 [-5.49, -2.20]	Mean Difference W. Random. 95% Cl	Risk of Bias A B C D E F G ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ ? ? @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? ? @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ @ @ @ @ ? @ @ @ <t< td=""></t<>

- $$\label{eq:constraint} \begin{split} & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 10.29; Chi^2 = 219.96, df = 22 \ (P < 0.00001); l^2 = 90\% \\ & \text{Test for overall effect: } Z = 4.57 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ & \text{Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 11.23, df = 2 \ (P = 0.004), l^2 = 82.2\% } \end{split}$$
 Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 11.23, df = 2 (P = 0.004) <u>Risk of bias legend</u> (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias) (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias) (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

FIGURE 3 | Forest plots of the effect of polyphenols on transaminase activity, including (A) ALT and (B) AST. ALT, alanine transaminase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase.

	/	١			
I			١	1	

	Expe	erimenta	al	c	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Saadati et al. 2019	-13.4	22.64	27	-5.23	27.79	23	4.9%	-0.32 [-0.88, 0.24]		
Mirhafez et al. 2021	-9.09	27.79	35	4.12	26.65	37	5.2%	-0.48 [-0.95, -0.01]		
Cicero et al. 2020	185	13	40	189	19	40	5.2%	-0.24 [-0.68, 0.20]	-+	
Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	186.5	36.49	32	182.62	29.36	32	5.1%	0.12 [-0.37, 0.61]	<u> </u>	? ?
Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	195.2	19.8	42	205	20.5	42	5.3%	-0.48 [-0.92, -0.05]		
Kalhori et al. 2017	204	39.1	21	217	32.1	21	4.7%	-0.36 [-0.97, 0.25]		
Panahi et al.2017	-41.28	28.42	44	15.3	46.01	43	5.1%	-1.47 [-1.95, -0.99]		? ?
Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	-10.95	24.77	27	-4.48	26.77	28	5.0%	-0.25 [-0.78, 0.28]		
Panahi et al.2019	-23.86	9.32	35	-19.21	8.71	35	5.1%	-0.51 [-0.99, -0.03]		
Rahmani et al. 2016	-24.22	38.1	37	9.05	24.98	40	5.1%	-1.03 [-1.51, -0.55]		? ? + + ? + +
He et al. 2024	0.01	0.11	40	0.07	0.12	40	5.2%	-0.52 [-0.96, -0.07]		
Safari et al. 2023	-3.5	4.83	28	-27.03	8.31	28	4.0%	3.41 [2.57, 4.25]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			408			409	60.1%	-0.23 [-0.69, 0.24]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.59; Ch	ni² = 111.	.32, df =	11 (P	< 0.0000	1); ² = !	90%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.96	i (P = 0.3	4)								
Resveratrol										
Chen et al. 2016	-0.67	0.5	30	-0.15	0.77	30	5.0%	-0.79 [-1.32, -0.26]		
Chachay et al. 2014	5.1	1.1	10	4.3	1.2	10	3.8%	0.67 [-0.24, 1.57]		
Faghihzadeh et al. 2014	-2.27	37.08	25	-8.31	31.7	25	4.9%	0.17 [-0.38, 0.73]		770000
Farzin et al. 2020	217.56	40.4	30	211.39	34.48	30	5.1%	0.16 [-0.34, 0.67]	<u>—</u>	
Kantartzis et al. 2018	200	41	53	198	41	52	5.4%	0.05 [-0.33, 0.43]	T I	
Subtotal (95% CI)			148			147	24.2%	-0.00 [-0.41, 0.41]	—	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; Ch	$hi^2 = 11.4$	9, df = 4	+ (P = 0).02); l² =	65%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00) (P = 1.0	<i>i</i> 0)								
Columnation										
Silymann	0.00	4.00	40	0.00	0.00	50	E 404	0.001.0.01.0.101		
Anuchizeusei et al. 2017	-0.33	1.29	49	-0.09	0.00	20	5.4%	-0.22 [-0.01, 0.18]		
Anushiravani et al. 2019	-1.4	43.4	30	-/	52.06	30	5.1%	0.12 [-0.39, 0.62]	<u> </u>	
Subtotal (95% CI)	230.42	59.94	120	220.02	53.79	130	15 8%	0.01 [-0.09, 0.70]		
Hotorogonoity Tours = 0.02; Ch		df = 2	(D = 0	10). 12 -	400/	150	15.078	0.00 [-0.20, 0.33]	Ť	
Test for overall effect: 7 = 0.39	$1^{-} = 3.42$, ui = 2 ((P = 0.	10); 1	4270					
	(F = 0.7	0)								
Total (95% CI)			685			686	100.0%	-0.13 [-0.43, 0.17]	+	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.40$: Ch	$n^2 = 140$	12 df =	19 (P	< 0 0000	1)· l ² = 1	86%				
Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.84$	(P = 0.4)	(12, ui =	13 (1	- 0.0000	1), 1 -	00 /0			-2 -1 0 1 2	
Test for subgroup differences:	$Chi^2 = 1$	03 df =	2 (P =	0.60) 12	= 0%				experimental control	
Pick of bias logond	0111 - 1.	00, 01 -	- () -	0.00), 1	- 070					
(A) Random sequence general	tion (sele	ection bis	ae)							
(R) Allocation concealment (se	lection b	iccion bio	a5)							
(C) Blinding of participants and	looreonr	nal (norfe	ormano	o hige)						
(D) Blinding of outcome assess	mont (d	atection	hige)	10 blub)						
(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition h	nias)	bius)							
(E) Selective reporting (reporting	na hias)	nasy								
(G) Other bias	ig blub)									
D										
Б										
	Exper	imental		Co	ntrol		s	td. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD 7	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Cicero et al. 2020	151	16	40	157	19	40	5.3%	-0.34 [-0.78, 0.10]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$

В										
	Exp	erimenta	d l	c	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Cicero et al. 2020	151	16	40	157	19	40	5.3%	-0.34 [-0.78, 0.10]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	141.78	65.57	32	155.62	85.35	32	5.1%	-0.18 [-0.67, 0.31]	-+	?? ♥♥♥♥♥
Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	142.5	49.9	42	175.3	62.5	42	5.3%	-0.57 [-1.01, -0.14]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kalhori et al. 2017	202	80.2	21	248	106	21	4.6%	-0.48 [-1.09, 0.13]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Mirhafez et al. 2021	-0.09	41.6	35	1.34	38.97	37	5.2%	-0.04 [-0.50, 0.43]	-	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ ? \bullet \bullet$
Panahi et al.2017	-26.09	29.81	44	5.61	24.31	43	5.3%	-1.15 [-1.61, -0.70]		? ?
Panahi et al.2019	-10.59	15.18	35	19.44	18.67	35	4.9%	-1.75 [-2.30, -1.19]		
Rahmani et al. 2016	-26.24	80.61	37	-6.62	49.07	40	5.3%	-0.29 [-0.74, 0.16]	-1	? ? • • ? • •
Saadati et al. 2019	-18.59	79.45	27	16.52	47.18	23	4.8%	-0.52 [-1.08, 0.05]		
He et al. 2024	-0.1	0.05	40	0.11	0.21	40	5.1%	-1.36 [-1.85, -0.87]		
Safari et al. 2023	-13.03	16.52	28	-27.03	8.31	28	4.8%	1.06 [0.49, 1.62]	▲ <u> </u>	
Subtotal (95% CI)	2222 PO10228		381		303 1003003	381	55.9%	-0.51 [-0.92, -0.10]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.42; C	hi ² = 75.5	8, df = 10) (P < ().00001);	l ² = 87%	D				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.45	5 (P = 0.0	1)								
Paswaratrol										
Chap at al. 2016	0.20	0.40	20	0.22	0.62	20	E 10/	0.29 [0.70 0.22]	-+	
Chen et al. 2016	-0.38	0.49	12	-0.22	1.00	30	5.1%	-0.28 [-0.79, 0.23]		2244244
Chachay at al. 2016	1 52	0.05	10	1.45	0.96	10	4.0%	-0.46 [-1.26, 0.31]		
Englishing of all 2014	26.99	97.25	25	22.2	04.30	25	4 0%	0.00 [-0.73, 0.30]		2244444
Faginizaden et al. 2014	179 16	111 38	30	171.46	94.39	30	4.5%	0.07[-0.71, 0.40]	+	
Kantartzis et al. 2018	153	94	53	132	64	52	5.5%	0.26 [-0.13, 0.64]	÷	
Subtotal (95% CI)	100	01	161	102	01	160	28.1%	-0.01 [-0.23, 0.21]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C	hi² = 4.77	. df = 5 (F	P = 0.4	4): $ ^2 = 0^4$	%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.10	0 (P = 0.9)	2)		.,						
		,								
Silymarin										
Wah-Kheong et al. 2017	-0.2	0.52	49	0.04	0.44	50	5.5%	-0.49 [-0.90, -0.09]		••••
Anushiravani et al. 2019	-4.7	57.09	30	-6.5	49.19	30	5.1%	0.03 [-0.47, 0.54]	+	
Hashemi et al. 2009	260.16	102.18	50	268.52	102.68	50	5.5%	-0.08 [-0.47, 0.31]	1	
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			130	16.0%	-0.20 [-0.52, 0.12]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; C	hi² = 3.25	, df = 2 (F	P = 0.2	0); l ² = 3	3%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.24	4 (P = 0.2	:1)								
			674			674	100.0%	0.241.0 50 0.091	▲	
Total (95% CI)			0/1		13 - 040	6/1	100.0%	-0.34 [-0.59, -0.08]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	_
Heterogeneity: Tau- = 0.27; C	nr = 98.8	9, 01 = 15	9(P<(J.00001);	1- = 01%	D			-4 -2 0 2 4	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.55	9(P = 0.0)	(10)	0 /0 - (10) 12 -	EC 70/				experimental control	
Test for subgroup differences.	GHF = 4.	62, ui = 2	2 (12 - 1	J. 10), I [_] =	50.7%					
Kisk of blas legend	Non (onla	ation bio	-)							
(A) Random sequence general	aloction bi	iccion bias	5)							
(B) Allocation concealment (se	d porconn	ids)		hine)						
(D) Blinding of outcome asses	emont (d	etection b	mance	bias)						
(E) Incomplete outcome data	attrition b	iae)	nd5)							
(E) Selective reporting (reporting	na hias)	nasj								
(G) Other bias	ng 0.03)									
(=) = and bidd										



•										
	Exp	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Panahi et al.2019	0.45	2.58	35	2.97	2.66	35	4.9%	-0.95 [-1.45, -0.46]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Rahmani et al. 2016	2.42	5.4	37	4.1	14.39	40	5.1%	-0.15 [-0.60, 0.30]	+	?? € € ? € €
Saadati et al. 2019	-2.57	9.56	27	-0.15	0.37	23	4.5%	-0.34 [-0.90, 0.22]	-+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \circ \bullet$
Mirhafez et al. 2021	0.49	7.93	35	-3.98	5.76	37	5.0%	0.64 [0.17, 1.12]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \circ \bullet$
Cicero et al. 2020	44	4	40	42	3	40	5.1%	0.56 [0.11, 1.01]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	42.34	4.13	32	44.59	7.17	32	4.9%	-0.38 [-0.87, 0.11]		?? €€€€€
Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	51.4	6.6	42	43.8	5.4	42	5.0%	1.25 [0.78, 1.72]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kalhori et al. 2017	44.7	7.19	21	40.8	7.67	21	4.2%	0.51 [-0.10, 1.13]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Panahi et al.2017	-1.73	4.62	44	-0.88	5.22	43	5.3%	-0.17 [-0.59, 0.25]	-+	?? €€€€€
Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	1.36	4.96	27	1.48	5.24	28	4.7%	-0.02 [-0.55, 0.51]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
He et al. 2024	0.05	0.23	40	-0.01	0.03	40	5.2%	0.36 [-0.08, 0.80]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Safari et al. 2023	2.89	2.67	28	1.57	1.91	28	4.6%	0.56 [0.03, 1.10]	<u>t</u> -	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Subtotal (95% CI)			408			409	58.4%	0.16 [-0.18, 0.50]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.29; C	hi² = 63.	52, df =	11 (P	< 0.000	01); I ² =	83%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.9	1 (P = 0.	36)								
Resveratrol										
Chen et al. 2016	0.04	0.36	30	-0.02	0.41	30	4.8%	0.15 [-0.35, 0.66]	+	\bullet $? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Heebøll et al. 2016	-0.03	0.31	13	-0.02	0.3	13	3.4%	-0.03 [-0.80, 0.74]	+	?? ♥ ♥ ? ♥ ♥
Chachay et al. 2014	1	0.71	10	0.9	0.34	10	2.9%	0.17 [-0.71, 1.05]	+-	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Faghihzadeh et al. 2014	-6.47	8.64	25	-7.88	8.72	25	4.5%	0.16 [-0.40, 0.72]	+	? ?
Farzin et al. 2020	37.12	11.28	30	37.69	8.55	30	4.8%	-0.06 [-0.56, 0.45]	+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kantartzis et al. 2018	51	13	53	48	9	52	5.5%	0.27 [-0.12, 0.65]	t	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Subtotal (95% CI)			161			160	25.9%	0.14 [-0.08, 0.36]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C	hi² = 1.1	9, df = 5	5 (P = 0).95); l ²	= 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.23	3 (P = 0.	22)								
Silymarin										
Wah-Kheong et al. 2017	0.07	0.16	49	0.02	0.18	50	5.5%	0.29 [-0.10, 0.69]	r-	••••
Anushiravani et al. 2019	0.1	11.45	30	-0.3	7.71	30	4.8%	0.04 [-0.47, 0.55]	+	
Hashemi et al. 2009	40.9	5.75	50	39.4	5.33	50	5.5%	0.27 [-0.13, 0.66]	t	$\mathbf{e} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}$
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			130	15.7%	0.22 [-0.02, 0.47]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; C	hi ² = 0.6	6, df = 2	2 (P = 0).72); l ²	= 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.79	9 (P = 0.	07)								
Total (95% CI)			698			699	100.0%	0.15 [-0.04, 0.35]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14; C	hi² = 65.	66, df =	20 (P	< 0.000	01); I² =	70%		-	-4 -2 0 2 4	_
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.5	5 (P = 0.	12)							experimental control	
Test for subgroup differences:	: Chi ² = 0).27, df	= 2 (P :	= 0.87),	$ ^2 = 0\%$					
Rick of hige legend										

 Risk of bias legend

 (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

 (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

 (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

 (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

 (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

 (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

 (G) Other bias

D

	Expe	eriment	al	С	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Cicero et al. 2020	111	8	40	116	14	40	4.9%	-0.43 [-0.88, 0.01]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	108.4	26.83	32	104.6	22.99	32	4.9%	0.15 [-0.34, 0.64]	- 	??
Jazaveri-Tehrani et al. 2019	114.6	20.5	42	125.7	22.2	42	5.0%	-0.51 [-0.95, -0.08]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kalhori et al. 2017	119	31.8	21	128	28.3	21	4.6%	-0.29 [-0.90, 0.32]	-+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Mirhafez et al. 2021	-7.41	27.91	35	11.02	20.38	37	4.9%	-0.75 [-1.23, -0.27]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \bullet \bullet$
Panahi et al 2017	-30.25	21.27	44	21.01	29.36	43	4.8%	-1.99 [-2.50, -1.47]		??
Panahi et al 2019	-18 96	7.5	35	-31 12	6.45	35	4.7%	1 72 [1 17 2 27]		
Rahmani et al. 2016	-11 46	24 18	37	943	23.5	40	4.9%	-0.87 [-1.34 -0.40]		? ? ? . .
Sandati et al. 2019	-7 11	20.91	27	-8 30	27.01	23	4.0%	0.05 [-0.50, 0.61]		AAAAAAA
Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	1 22	19 75	27	-3.72	20.06	28	4.9%	0.10[-0.34, 0.72]		AAAAAA
He et al. 2024	0.17	0.11	40	0.07	0.11	40	4.0%	0.00 [0.44, 1.36]	——	ĂĂĂĂĂĂĂĂ
Safari at al. 2023	-1 77	4.41	28	0.07	4.58	28	4.070	-2 47 [-3 17 -1 76]		ĂĂĂĂĂĂĂĂ
Subtotal (95% CI)	-1.77	4.41	408	9.47	4.00	400	4.4 %	-2.47 [-3.17, -1.70]	•	
Hotorogonoity: Tau2 = 0.99: Ct	ni2 - 172	57 df -	11 (D	< 0.0000	1)-12-0	100	01.070	-0.00 [-0.00, 0.20]	-	
Test for everall effect: 7 = 1 19	$1^{-} = 1/2$.57, 01 =	11 (P	< 0.0000	1); 1- = :	94 70				
Test for overall effect: 2 = 1.16	P = 0.2	(4)								
Resveratrol										
Chashey at al. 2014	25	0.0	10	27	0.0	10	2.0%	0.95 (0.07 4 79)	<u> </u>	
Charles at al. 2014	3.5	0.9	20	2.7	0.9	20	3.9%	0.05 [-0.07, 1.76]		
Chen et al. 2016	-0.41	0.35	30	12.04	0.71	30	4.0%	-0.00 [-1.39, -0.33]		2266666
Fagninzaden et al. 2014	0.3	20.21	25	-13.21	25.01	25	4.770	0.79 [0.22, 1.37]	<u> </u>	
Farzin et al. 2020	144.0	35.23	30	139.41	32.12	30	4.8%	0.15 [-0.35, 0.66]		2266266
Heedøll et al. 2016	0.13	1.34	13	-0.11	1.52	13	4.3%	0.16[-0.61, 0.93]		
Kantartzis et al. 2018	112	33	164	115	31	160	5.0%	-0.09 [-0.48, 0.29]		
			101			160	27.0%	0.12 [-0.36, 0.61]	T	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.27; Cr	hi* = 21.3	s9, df = t	P = 0	.0007); I	* = 77%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.49$	P = 0.6	53)								
Silvmarin										
Silymann	0.04	4.00		0.47	0.70	50	E 00/	0 4 4 4 0 50 0 000		
wan-Kneong et al. 2017	-0.31	1.23	49	-0.17	0.78	50	5.0%	-0.14 [-0.53, 0.26]		
Anushiravani et al. 2019	-0.9	38.8	30	-0.6	44.19	30	4.8%	-0.01 [-0.51, 0.50]		
Hashemi et al. 2009	160.42	48.47	50	142.96	47.75	50	5.0%	0.36 [-0.04, 0.76]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			130	14.9%	0.08 [-0.23, 0.39]	Ť	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch	hi ² = 3.19	9, df = 2	(P = 0.:	20); l² = :	37%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.51	(P = 0.6	51)								
T-1-1/050/ ON							100.00/			
Total (95% CI)			698			699	100.0%	-0.15 [-0.51, 0.21]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.62; Ch	$hi^2 = 207$.06, df =	20 (P	< 0.0000	1); $I^2 = 9$	90%			-2 -1 0 1 2	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.82	? (P = 0.4	1)							experimental control	
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi ² = 1.	.86, df =	2 (P =	0.39), l²	= 0%					
Risk of bias legend										
(A) Random sequence general	tion (sele	ection bia	as)							
(B) Allocation concealment (se	lection b	ias)								
(C) Blinding of participants and	personr	nel (perfe	ormand	e bias)						
(D) Blinding of outcome assess	sment (d	etection	bias)							
(E) Incomplete outcome data (a	attrition b	oias)								
(F) Selective reporting (reportin	ng bias)	1								
(G) Other bias	- /									

FIGURE 4 | (Continued)

	Expe	eriment	al	c	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin							-			
Cicero et al. 2020	101	6	40	105	8	40	6.6%	-0.56 [-1.01, -0.11]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Jarhahzadeh et al. 2021	101.08	10.51	32	97	10.94	32	5.4%	0.38 [-0.12, 0.87]	<u>+</u>	??+++++
Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	86.3	5.2	42	88.2	5.5	42	7.1%	-0.35 [-0.78, 0.08]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kalhori et al. 2017	85.23	13.44	21	86.28	9.34	21	3.6%	-0.09 [-0.69, 0.52]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Mirhafez et al. 2021	-8.83	48.41	35	1.81	10.66	37	6.1%	-0.30 [-0.77, 0.16]	+	++++?++
Rahmani et al. 2016	-4.08	19.42	37	1.27	13.31	40	6.5%	-0.32 [-0.77, 0.13]		??++?++
Saadati et al. 2019	4.59	7.63	27	4.1	14.25	23	4.3%	0.04 [-0.51, 0.60]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \circ \bullet \bullet$
Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	-5.27	22.38	27	-1.2	9.68	28	4.7%	-0.23 [-0.76, 0.30]	-+	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
He et al. 2024	-0.03	0.02	40	0.03	0.03	40	4.0%	-2.33 [-2.90, -1.76]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Safari et al. 2023	0.01	0.02	28	0.02	0.01	28	4.6%	-0.62 [-1.16, -0.09]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Subtotal (95% CI)			329			331	53.0%	-0.41 [-0.57, -0.25]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 58.25, d	lf = 9 (P <	< 0.0000	1); l ² =	85%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.05	5 (P < 0.0	00001)								
Resveratrol										
Chachay et al. 2014	5.4	0.5	10	5.6	0.5	10	1.7%	-0.38 [-1.27, 0.50]		
Chen et al. 2016	-0.64	0.31	30	-0.1	0.82	30	4.7%	-0.86 [-1.39, -0.33]		\bullet ? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet
Faghihzadeh et al. 2014	-1.72	10.75	25	1.5	15.66	25	4.3%	-0.24 [-0.79, 0.32]	-+	$\mathbf{0} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{$
Farzin et al. 2020	91.24	7.21	30	91	7.15	30	5.2%	0.03 [-0.47, 0.54]		
Kantartzis et al. 2018	5.4	0.61	53	5.51	0.64	52	9.0%	-0.17 [-0.56, 0.21]	1	
Subtotal (95% CI)			148			147	24.8%	-0.29 [-0.52, -0.06]	◆	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.42, df	= 4 (P =	0.17); l ²	= 38%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.43	3 (P = 0.0)2)								
Silvmarin										
Wab-Kheong et al. 2017	03	1 67	49	07	2 13	50	8 5%	-0.21 [-0.60, 0.19]	-+	++++2++
Hashemi et al. 2009	108 34	53 12	50	107	45 18	50	8.6%	0.03 [-0.37 0.42]	+	
Anushiravani et al. 2003	_11 9	14 46	30	-6.8	26.68	30	5.1%	-0.23 [-0.74, 0.27]	-+	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-11.5	14.40	129	-0.0	20.00	130	22.2%	-0.12 [-0.37, 0.12]		
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.92$ df	= 2 (P =	0 63)· I²	= 0%							
Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.99$	P = 0.3	(2)	070							
	0.0	,_)								
Total (95% CI)			606			608	100.0%	-0.31 [-0.43, -0.20]	♦	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 69.36. d	lf = 17 (P	< 0.000	01); l ²	= 75%					+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.3	5 (P < 0.0	00001)							-4 -2 0 2 4	
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi ² = 3.	76, df =	2 (P =	0.15). I	² = 46.8	%			experimental control	
Risk of bias legend				- // -						

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(A) Kandom sequence generation (selection bias)
 (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
 (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
 (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
 (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

В

	Expe	erimen	ital	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	RISK OF BIAS
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Cicero et al. 2020	3.8	1.1	40	4.7	1.4	40	8.7%	-0.90 [-1.45, -0.35]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Jazayeri-Tehrani et al. 2019	1.39	0.21	42	1.65	0.18	42	9.2%	-0.26 [-0.34, -0.18]	-	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Kalhori et al. 2017	2.48	0.89	21	3.08	1.17	21	8.5%	-0.60 [-1.23, 0.03]		$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Panahi et al.2017	-0.58	2.05	44	-0.27	0.97	43	8.5%	-0.31 [-0.98, 0.36]		??+++++
Saadati et al. 2019	-0.67	0.77	27	-0.97	1.21	23	8.6%	0.30 [-0.27, 0.87]	+	$\mathbf{+}$ $\mathbf{+}$ $\mathbf{+}$ $\mathbf{+}$ $\mathbf{?}$ $\mathbf{+}$ $\mathbf{+}$
He et al. 2024	-2.34	1.23	40	3.64	2.1	40	8.3%	-5.98 [-6.73, -5.23]	•	$\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$
Subtotal (95% CI)			214			209	51.8%	-1.27 [-2.53, -0.01]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.38; C	hi² = 227	7.72, d	f = 5 (P	< 0.000	001); l ²	² = 98%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.98	B (P = 0.	05)								
Barrantast										
Resveratroi							0 101			
Chachay et al. 2014	3.7	1.26	10	3.08	0.48	10	8.1%	0.62 [-0.22, 1.46]		
Chen et al. 2016	-0.6	1.15	30	0.09	1.37	30	8.5%	-0.69 [-1.33, -0.05]		
Faghinzaden et al. 2014	-0.26	1.48	25	-0.74	1.23	25	8.3%	0.48 [-0.27, 1.23]		
Farzin et al. 2020	1.84	2.03	30	2.79	3.53	30	6.6%	-0.95 [-2.41, 0.51]		
Heebøll et al. 2016	-0.08	0.77	13	-0.09	1.21	13	8.2%	0.01 [-0.77, 0.79]		
Kantartzis et al. 2018	3.83	1.49	53	4.45	2.13	52	8.4%	-0.62 [-1.32, 0.08]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			161			160	48.2%	-0.15 [-0.65, 0.36]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.22; C	hi² = 11.	69, df	= 5 (P =	= 0.04);	l² = 57	%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.58	B (P = 0.	56)								
Total (95% CI)			375			369	100.0%	-0.73 [-1.44, -0.02]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.43; C	hi² = 240).38, d	f = 11 (P < 0.00	0001);	l ² = 959	%			+
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.02	2 (P = 0.	04)							-4 -2 0 2	4
Test for subgroup differences:	Chi ² = 2	2.63, d	f = 1 (P	= 0.11)	, l² = 6	1.9%			experimental control	
Risk of bias legend										
(A) Random sequence genera	ation (sel	ection	bias)							
(B) Allocation concealment (se	election	bias)	,							
(C) Blinding of participants and	d person	nel (pe	erforma	nce bia	s)					
(D) Blinding of outcome asses	sment (detecti	on bias)	-					
(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition	bias)		-						
(F) Selective reporting (reporti	ng bias)									
(G) Other bias										



analyses revealed that curcumin had the most pronounced effect on lowering FBG (WMD: -0.41, 95% CI: -0.57 to -0.25, p < 0.001), followed by resveratrol (WMD: -0.29, 95% CI: -0.52 to -0.06, p = 0.02), while silymarin did not demonstrate a significant effect (WMD: -0.12, 95% CI: -0.37 to 0.12, p = 0.32) (Figure 5A). Moreover, polyphenols were particularly effective in reducing FBG levels when the intervention period exceeded 12weeks (Figure S2H). Sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of the results, as no significant changes were observed upon the exclusion of any individual study.

Twelve studies, encompassing 744 participants (375 polyphenol users and 369 placebo users), reported on changes in HOMA-IR before and after treatment. Analysis of 12 effect sizes indicated a significant impact of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on HOMA-IR in patients with MASLD (MD: -0.73, 95% CI: -1.44 to -0.02, p = 0.04, $I^2 = 95\%$) (Figure 5B). Subgroup analysis revealed that curcumin had a significant effect on reducing HOMA-IR (MD: -1.27, 95% CI: -2.53 to -0.01, p=0.05), while resveratrol did not show significant differences between the treatment and control groups (MD: -0.15, 95% CI: -0.65 to 0.36, p=0.56) (Figure 5B). The intervention duration had little effect on blood pressure (Figure S2I). Silymarin was involved in only one study, so it was not subjected to subgroup analysis. Sensitivity analysis confirmed that the overall effect size remained consistent, with no significant changes observed upon the exclusion of any individual study.

4.3.4 | Body Mass Index (BMI)

Based on a random-effects model (p < 0.001, $I^2 = 71\%$), an analysis of 19 studies involving 1170 participants (587 in the polyphenol group and 583 in the placebo group) demonstrated that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin significantly reduced BMI (MD: -0.36, 95% CI: -0.58 to -0.14, p = 0.002) (Figure 6). Subgroup analysis revealed that curcumin contributed to a significant reduction in BMI (MD: -0.35, 95% CI: -0.65 to -0.04, p = 0.02) (Figure 6), particularly in studies with an intervention period exceeding 12 weeks (Figure S2J). Sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of these findings, as no significant changes occurred upon the exclusion of any single study.

4.3.5 | Blood Pressure (SBP and DBP)

Ten studies, comprising 609 participants (305 in the polyphenol group and 304 in the placebo group), evaluated the effects of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin on blood pressure. The analysis indicated that polyphenol intake did not significantly affect systolic blood pressure (SBP), with a weighted mean difference (WMD) of -0.41 mmHg (95% CI: -1.04 to 0.23, p = 0.21), according to the random-effects model ($p < 0.01, I^2 = 71\%$) (Figure 7A). However, sensitivity analysis revealed that upon excluding the study by (Faghihzadeh et al. 2014), heterogeneity decreased to 38%, and resveratrol was found to significantly reduce SBP (MD: -5.78 mmHg, 95% CI: -9.67 to -1.90, p = 0.004). Additionally, resveratrol intake was associated with a significant reduction in DBP (MD:

-2.97 mmHg, 95% CI: -5.70 to -0.24, p = 0.03) (Figure 7B). A significant improvement in SBP was observed in interventions lasting longer than 12 weeks (Figure S2K,L). Sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of the results, with no significant changes detected after excluding any individual study. Notably, no studies assessed the impact of silymarin on blood pressure in this context.

4.3.6 | Inflammatory Factor (TNF-α)

Six studies included290 participants (147 polyphenols users and 143 placebo users). We found that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin significantly reduced TNF- α (MD: -1.57 pg/mL, 95% CI: -2.70, -0.44, p = 0.007) (Figure 8) based on the random-effects model while the intervention duration more than 12 weeks (Figure S2M). However, there was no significant difference in individual subgroup (Figure 8). The overall effect size remained unchanged after performing sensitivity analysis. No study assessed the impact of resveratrol in this regard.

4.4 | Publication Bias

To identify the publication bias among the eligible studies, the Egger test was utilized. Publication bias analysis did not highlight any differences between the observed and estimated values (p > 0.05) (Figure S3).

5 | Discussion

5.1 | Principal Findings

In this meta-analysis, we systematically evaluated the effects of the three polyphenols (curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin) on hepatic steatosis, transaminase levels, blood lipids, and other related indicators in patients with MASLD. The results demonstrated that these polyphenols were associated with improvements in hepatic steatosis, glycemic control, lipid metabolism, and inflammation. Subgroup analysis revealed that curcumin had the most pronounced effect in reducing hepatic steatosis, along with significant improvements in transaminase levels and various metabolic markers. Silymarin showed the strongest effect in lowering transaminase levels. While not the strongest in any specific outcomes, resveratrol still was associated with significant improvements in hepatic steatosis and metabolic parameters.

5.2 | Potential Mechanisms

Polyphenols have a common anti-MASLD mechanism, ranging from lipogenesis regulation to modulation of insulin resistance, oxidative stress modification, and inflammation control (Prochazkova, Bousova, and Wilhelmova 2011); (Rafiei, Omidian, and Bandy 2017), (Figure 9). In terms of specific molecular mechanisms, (Kang et al. 2013). found that curcumin activates AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK) and inhibits sterol regulatory element-binding protein (SREBP-1c)



(G) Other bias

FIGURE 6 | Forest plots of the effect of polyphenols on BMI. BMI, body mass index.

and fatty acid synthase expression in hepatocytes, leading to reduced hepatic lipogenesis. Another study found that the inhibitory effect of curcumin on HSC activation depends on blocking of NF-kB and ERK signaling (Chen and Zheng 2008) and inducing of PPAR- γ (Lin et al. 2012). Several studies have shown that resveratrol can also activate AMPK and regulate SIRT1 to improve hepatic lipid metabolism (Baur et al. 2006; Lagouge et al. 2006). At the same time, it can treat experimental NASH by inhibiting fat synthesis [down-regulating SREBP-1, fatty acid synthase (FAS), and acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC)], promoting fat acid oxidation (up-regulation of CPT-1 and ACO) (Alberdi et al. 2013; Gomez-Zorita et al. 2012), and regulating intestinal microflora (Heeboll et al. 2015; Lagouge et al. 2006; Shang et al. 2008); (Salamone et al. 2012) and (Zhang et al. 2013) confirmed that silymarin can inhibit the activity of nuclear factor-kB (NF-kB) and regulate IRS-1/PI3K/AKT pathway to alleviate IR. Different polyphenols, such as resveratrol and curcumin, exert their effects through similar molecular targets acting on the AMPK pathway, suggesting that these compounds may share the same molecular pathway in lipid metabolism (Cheng et al. 2020). In addition, curcumin and silymarin both act on the NF-κB

pathway to relieve inflammation, indicating that they may share the same molecular mechanism in the inflammatory response. We summarized 16 RCT studies of polyphenolic compounds in the treatment of MASLD through systematic review and meta-analysis to provide the latest clinical evidence for clinicians and patients in the future.

5.3 | Comparison With Other Studies

Previous studies reviewed the effects of polyphenols on MASLD, with curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin being the most examined compounds (Bayram, Majoo, and Ozturkcan 2021). In line with these findings, we conducted a meta-analysis that utilized more objective data and employed rigorous methodologies to further validate the therapeutic effects of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin.

In addition, Yang et al. conducted a meta-analysis evaluating the effects of polyphenols on MASLD but did not exclude studies involving combination therapies, nor did they compare the efficacy of different polyphenols (Yang et al. 2022). To address

A										
	Exp	eriment	tal	C	ontrol	_		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEFG
Curcumin										
Cicero et al. 2020	126	6	40	127	9	40	3.2%	-1.00 [-4.35, 2.35]	_	
Jazayeri-Tenrani et al. 201	9 118.2	4.4	42	0.17	4.9	42	7.0%	-1.40 [-3.39, 0.59]		
Rainori et al. 2017	-0.43	0.73	21	-0.17	0.8	21	20.4%	-0.26 [-0.72, 0.20]	I	
Sabari Karimian at al. 2020	0.07	0.59	44	-0.00	0.90	43	20.3%	0.15[-0.19, 0.49]	I I	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.1	0.54	174	-0.25	0.52	174	94.4%	0.03 [-0.21, 0.28]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01 Test for overall effect: Z = 0	; Chi² = 4.9 0.28 (P = 0.	95, df = 4 .78)	4 (P = 0).29); l²	= 19%		0-1170			
Resveratrol										
Chachay et al. 2014	128	11	10	124	7	10	0.6%	4 00 [-4 08 12 08]	+	$\bullet \bullet $
Chen et al. 2016	1.27	14.4	30	1.73	16	30	0.7%	-0.46 [-8.16. 7.24]		
Faghihzadeh et al. 2014	-11.6	8.14	25	-2.78	5.5	25	2.5%	-8.82 [-12.67, -4.97]		??
Heebøll et al. 2016	-5	15.52	13	4	14.11	13	0.3%	-9.00 [-20.40, 2.40]	+	??++?++
Kantartzis et al. 2018	135	11	53	139	15	52	1.5%	-4.00 [-9.04, 1.04]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			131			130	5.6%	-3.92 [-8.64, 0.80]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.6	5; Chi ² = 10	0.47, df	= 4 (P =	= 0.03);	l² = 629	6				
Test for overall effect: $Z = T$	1.63 (P = 0.	.10)								
Total (95% CI)			305			304	100.0%	-0.41 [-1.04, 0.23]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.34	; Chi ² = 31.	14, df =	9 (P =	0.0003	; l ² = 7'	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.26 (P = 0.	21)							-20 -10 0 10 20	
Test for subgroup difference	ces: Chi ² = 2	2.69, df	= 1 (P :	= 0.10),	l² = 62.	8%			experimental control	
Risk of bias legend										
(A) Random sequence gen	neration (sel	lection b	oias)							
(B) Allocation concealment	t (selection	bias)								
(C) Blinding of participants	and person	nnel (per	formar	nce bias)					
(D) Blinding of outcome as	sessment (detection	n bias)							
(E) Incomplete outcome da	ta (attrition	bias)								
(F) Selective reporting (rep	orting bias)									
(G) Other bias										
	-								N. D.W.	
C Study or Subgroup	Expe	eriment	al Totol	Moon	ntrol	otol V	Voight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	wean	50	Total	wean	<u>50 I</u>	otal v	veight	IV, Random, 95% CI		ABCDEFG
Curcumin	0.4	7	40	04	~	40	0 40/	0.00 10 44 5 001		
Cicero el al. 2020	04	20	40	70.7	24	40	3.4%	3.00 [0.14, 5.66]	-	
Jazayeri-Tenrani et al. 201	9 11.9	2.9	42	/8./	3.4	42	11.2%	-0.80 [-2.15, 0.55]	1	
Kainori et al. 2017	-0.5	1.21	21	-0.24	0.72	21	23.4%	-0.26 [-0.86, 0.34]	I	2200000
Panani et al.2017	0.07	0.59	44	-0.12	1.05	43	30.0%	0.19 [-0.07, 0.45]	I	
Saberi-Karimian et al. 2020	J 0.02	0.73	174	0.17	1.05	28	20.0%	-0.15 [-0.63, 0.33]	T	
	0.062-0.2			001.12	- 500/	1/4	54.0 /0	-0.03 [-0.43, 0.36]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10	1; Cnr = 8.3	9, at = 4	F (P = 0).08); I*	= 52%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$	0.15 (P = 0.	.00)								
Resveratrol Chachay et al. 2014	80	Q	10	81	5	10	0.9%	1 00 [-4 85 6 85]	<u> </u>	
Chen et al 2016	_1 2	12	30	690	10.8	30	0.9%	-1 83 [-7 61 3 05]	_ _	
	9.44	9.07	25	2.95	7.01	25	1 49/	-1.03 [-7.01, 3.95]		2244444
	-0.44	0.97	12	-3.05	9.54	12	0.7%	-4.09 [-9.20, 0.10]		2244244
Hashall at al. 2016	4	0 17			0.04	13	0.7%	-9.00 [-15.61, -2.19]	-	
Heebøll et al. 2018 Kentortzig et al. 2018	-4	9.17	FO	00	0	52	2 20/	'J 111 6 6 4 4 6 4		the second second second second second second
Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI)	-4 86	9.17 10	53 131	88	9	52 130	2.2%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64]	•	
Heebøll et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI)	-4 86	9.17 10	53 131	88	9	52 130	2.2% 6.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24]	•	
Heebøll et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0.	9.17 10 6, df = 4 .03)	53 131 I (P = 0	88).23); l²	9 = 29%	52 130	2.2% 6.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24]	•	
Haghinzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl)	-4 86 ; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0.	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03)	53 131 I (P = 0 305	88).23); l²	9 = 29%	52 130 304 1	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76. 0.36]	•	
Hagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0.	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df =	53 131 4 (P = 0 305 9 (P =	88 0.23); l² 0.01): ¹⁷	9 = 29% ² = 56%	52 130 304 1	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	• - + + + + + +	_
Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Tost for overall effect: Z = 4 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 4	-4 86 2.14 (P = 0. 2.14 (P = 0. 2.14 (P = 0. 2.14 (P = 0.	9.17 10 66, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48)	53 131 I (P = 0 305 9 (P =	88).23); l² 0.01); l [;]	9 = 29% ² = 56%	52 130 304 1	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20	_
Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0	-4 86 3; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 3; Chi ² = 20. 0.71 (P = 0.	9.17 10 66, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48)	53 131 4 (P = 0 305 9 (P =	88 0.23); l² 0.01); l ²	9 = 29% ² = 56% 1 ² = 77	52 130 304 1	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	-
Heebøll et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 0 Disk for subgroup difference	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 3; Chi ² = 20. 0.71 (P = 0. 2:es: Chi ² = 4	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df	53 131 I (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P =	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); I ² = 0.04),	9 = 29% ² = 56% I ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	-
Headminization et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.26 Test for subgroup difference Risk of bias leggend	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 5; Chi ² = 20. 0.71 (P = 0. ces: Chi ² = 4	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df	53 131 I (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P =	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); F = 0.04),	9 = 29% ² = 56% I ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	-
 Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for subgroup difference Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (D) Allegeting sequence 	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 0.71 (P = 0. 0.71 (P = 0. 0.85: Chi ² = 4 0.95: Chi ² = 4	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df lection b	53 131 I (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P =	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); F = 0.04),	9 = 29% ² = 56% ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	_
 Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25 Test for subgroup difference Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gene (B) Allocation concealment (C) Rinding of earlies of the subgroup difference 	-4 86 2:14 (P = 0. 2:14 (P = 0. 2:14 (P = 0. 0:71 (P = 0. 0:71 (P = 0. 0:25 Chi ² = 4 0:25 Chi ² = 20 0:27 (P = 0. 0:27 (P = 0.) 0:27 (P = 0.)	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df lection b bias)	53 131 I (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P =	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); F = 0.04),	9 = 29% ² = 56% I ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0% 00.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	_
 Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for subgroup difference Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gene (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of participants 	-4 86 8; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 0.71 (P = 0. 0.71 (P = 0. 0.75; Chi ² = 4 bereation (sel t (selection) and person	9.17 10 66, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df = lection b bias) anel (per	53 131 4 (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P = bias)	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); I ² = 0.04), nce bias	9 = 29% ² = 56% I ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	-
 Fagninzaden et al. 2014 Heebøll et al. 2016 Kantartzis et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2.83 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.26 Test for subgroup difference Risk of bias legend (A) Random sequence gen (B) Allocation concealment (C) Blinding of participants (D) Blinding of outcome as 	-4 86 ; Chi ² = 5.6 2.14 (P = 0. 0.71 (P = 0.71 (P = 0.	9.17 10 6, df = 4 03) 64, df = 48) 4.36, df = lection b bias) anel (per detection bias)	53 131 4 (P = 0 305 9 (P = = 1 (P = bias)	88 0.23); I ² 0.01); I ² = 0.04), nce bias	9 = 29% ² = 56% I ² = 77.	52 130 304 1 1%	2.2% 6.0%	-2.00 [-5.64, 1.64] -2.97 [-5.70, -0.24] -0.20 [-0.76, 0.36]	-20 -10 0 10 20 experimental control	-

(G) Other bias

FIGURE 7 | Forest plots of the effect of polyphenols on blood pressure, including (A) SBP and (B) DBP. SBP: systolic blood pressure. DBP, diastolic blood pressure.

these limitations, our meta-analysis adopted a more stringent approach by focusing exclusively on placebo-controlled studies where polyphenols were used as the sole intervention. Additionally, we conducted subgroup analyses to directly compare the therapeutic efficacy of curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin. This careful selection allowed us to provide more definitive and reliable evidence on the efficacy of polyphenols in the management of MASLD.

Hepatic steatosis is a hallmark of MASLD (Younossi et al. 2018). Previous studies suggested that polyphenolic compounds may reduce hepatic fat accumulation (Bayram, Majoo, and

20487177, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/fsn3.4595 by Universita/Degli Studi Di Mila, Wiley Online Library on [18/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://online

elibrary.wiley.com/term

and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License



FIGURE 8 | Forest plots of the effect of polyphenols on inflammatory factor (TNF- α). TNF- α , tumor necrosis factor- α .

Ozturkcan 2021; Peng et al. 2020). However, to our best knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis of published randomized controlled trials to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of polyphenolic compounds on hepatic steatosis in MASLD patients. The eleven RCTs included in our analysis showed that the overall effect of the three polyphenols—curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin—significantly increased the odds of improvement from mild, moderate, or severe hepatic steatosis. Curcumin supplementation improved MASLD severity as assessed by liver ultrasonography findings, which is consistent with recent meta-analyses of curcumin's effect on MASLD (Ngu et al. 2022). Different from other meta-analyses, we further found that curcumin had the most pronounced effect on improving hepatic steatosis, followed by resveratrol based on the subgroup results.

The decision to use ALT and AST levels as primary outcomes was because these are main markers of hepatocellular injury, which is more pronounced in patients with MASLD (Giannini, Testa, and Savarino 2005). The effects of some polyphenolic compounds on liver enzymes appear to be inconsistent. Our study indicated that curcumin supplementation reduced AST and ALT levels, which is consistent with recent reports (Ebrahimzadeh et al. 2024; Molani-Gol, Dehghani, and Rafraf 2024). In the meta-analysis conducted by Zhang et al. resveratrol was demonstrated not to affect the activity of liver enzymes (Zhang et al. 2016). In turn, a study focusing on patients with MASLD showed that a six-month therapy with resveratrol supplementation contributed to decreasing the levels of hepatic enzymes (Jakubczyk et al. 2020; Wei and Yu 2021). In the present study, it was demonstrated that the decline in ALT following resveratrol treatment in MASLD patients was not statistically significant. These discrepancies may be attributed to differences in resveratrol dosage, treatment duration, and patient characteristics across studies. The previous study found that silymarin has anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory,

antifibrotic, antioxidant, and liver regeneration properties in the treatment of MASLD (Abenavoli et al. 2018; Salvoza et al. 2022). Our results showed that silymarin had the strongest effect on decreasing ALT and AST followed by curcumin.

Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) are the leading cause of death in patients with MASLD (Targher, Byrne, and Tilg 2020). One reason for the development of CVDs is atherogenic dyslipidemia, characterized by low HDL-C and high LDL-C, TC, and TG levels. Our subgroup analysis found that curcumin significantly reduced TG compared with placebo, whereas resveratrol and silymarin did not show significant effects. This finding is consistent with previous studies suggesting that curcumin has lipid-lowering effects (Sahebkar et al. 2016).

In terms of glucose metabolism, our results showed that resveratrol and curcumin reduced fasting blood glucose (FBG) levels; additionally, curcumin had a significant effect on HOMA-IR. These findings are consistent with previous meta-analyses (Jakubczyk et al. 2020; Molani-Gol, Dehghani, and Rafraf 2024). The hypoglycemic effects of curcumin may be attributed to its ability to enhance insulin sensitivity and modulate inflammatory pathways. This meta-analysis found that curcumin significantly reduced BMI. This is similar to previously published studies showing that polyphenols have anti-obesity properties that can increase energy expenditure and lipolysis (Boccellino and D'Angelo 2020).

5.4 | Strengths and Limitations

Our study has several notable strengths. First, a key strength lies in the direct comparison of the effects of polyphenolic compounds in patients with MASLD, providing a clear assessment of their efficacy. Second, we exclusively included



FIGURE 9 | Molecular effects of polyphenols on MASLD. (1) In the hepatocytes, polyphenols inhibit lipogenesis and promote FA oxidation and stimulate insulin (IRS/PI3K/AKT) and AMPK signaling; (2) Inhibition of the activation of HSC, reduce the production of ROS and fibrogenic cytokines; (3) Inhibition of ROS and inflammatory cytokines production in Kupfer cells. MASLD: Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, FA: fatty acid, IRS/PI3K/AKT: Insulin receptor substrate 1/phosphatidylinositol-3-kinase/protein kinase B. AMPK, AMP-activated protein kinase; HSC, hepatic stellate cells; ROS, reactive oxygen species.

randomized controlled trials (RCTs), which are considered the gold standard for evaluating intervention effectiveness. The use of randomization minimizes selection bias, enhancing the reliability of the pooled results (Ijaz et al. 2014). Third, the literature search was comprehensive, making the conclusions credible.

Our study is not without limitations. First, although no statistical publication bias was found, regional and publication biases remain a concern, as most studies were conducted in Iran, and potential unpublished studies may limit generalizability. Additionally, bias detection methods have limitations (Loomba and Sanyal 2013), underscoring the need for larger, more diverse studies to confirm these findings across different populations. Second, the sensitivity analysis revealed both variability in study quality and significant heterogeneity in some outcomes, which could affect the robustness of our conclusions. Third, only a limited number of studies provided data from sequential liver biopsies conducted before and after treatment, restricting our ability to fully assess treatment efficacy over time. Despite these shortcomings, we believe that our results support the consideration of well-designed and larger studies to assess polyphenols as a treatment option for MASLD.

5.5 | Clinical Implications

This study has implications for future clinical practice. Hepatic steatosis, with elevated transaminase levels, is the most common clinical manifestation of MASLD. Though most studies used ALT, AST, and B-ultrasound not liver biopsy to evaluate the efficacy of drugs, this meta-analysis showed that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin can effectively improve liver steatosis, reduce serum transaminase activity, and inhibit inflammation. The finding will push for the creation of new trials whose solid

endpoints are the histological improvement. And these results suggest polyphenol may be a promising complementary and alternative therapy for MASLD.

5.6 | Conclusion

The current meta-analysis suggests that curcumin, resveratrol, and silymarin offer some benefits in treating MASLD. Among the polyphenols studied, curcumin shows the most promise in reducing hepatic steatosis, silymarin has the strongest effect on lowering transaminase levels. While not the strongest in any specific outcomes, resveratrol still was associated with significant improvements in steatosis and metabolic parameters. However, due to the potential biases and limitations in the included studies, further high-quality research, particularly with larger cohorts of biopsy-proven MASLD patients, is needed to confirm these findings.

Author Contributions

Qian Huang: data curation (equal), formal analysis (equal), investigation (equal), writing – original draft (lead). Ziming An: investigation (equal). Xin Xin: investigation (equal). Xiaojun Gou: funding acquisition (equal). Xiaoting Tian: writing – review and editing (equal). Yiyang Hu: writing – review and editing (equal). Zubing Mei: methodology (equal). Qin Feng: funding acquisition (equal), methodology (equal), writing – review and editing (equal).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Data can be available upon request.

References

Abenavoli, L., A. A. Izzo, N. Milic, C. Cicala, A. Santini, and R. Capasso. 2018. "Milk Thistle (*Silybum marianum*): A Concise Overview on Its Chemistry, Pharmacological, and Nutraceutical Uses in Liver Diseases." *Phytotherapy Research* 32, no. 11: 2202–2213. https://doi.org/10.1002/ ptr.6171.

Alberdi, G., V. M. Rodriguez, M. T. Macarulla, J. Miranda, I. Churruca, and M. P. Portillo. 2013. "Hepatic Lipid Metabolic Pathways Modified by Resveratrol in Rats Fed an Obesogenic Diet." *Nutrition* 29, no. 3: 562–567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2012.09.011.

Anushiravani, A., N. Haddadi, M. Pourfarmanbar, and V. Mohammadkarimi. 2019. "Treatment Options for Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Double-Blinded Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial." *European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 31, no. 5: 613–617. https://doi.org/10.1097/MEG.00000000001369.

Asghari, S., M. Asghari-Jafarabadi, M. H. Somi, S. M. Ghavami, and M. Rafraf. 2018. "Comparison of Calorie-Restricted Diet and Resveratrol Supplementation on Anthropometric Indices, Metabolic Parameters, and Serum Sirtuin-1 Levels in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial." *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* 37, no. 3: 223–233. https://doi.org/10. 1080/07315724.2017.1392264.

Baur, J. A., K. J. Pearson, N. L. Price, et al. 2006. "Resveratrol Improves Health and Survival of Mice on a High-Calorie Diet." *Nature* 444, no. 7117: 337–342. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05354. Bayram, H. M., F. M. Majoo, and A. Ozturkcan. 2021. "Polyphenols in the Prevention and Treatment of Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: An Update of Preclinical and Clinical Studies." *Clinical Nutrition ESPEN* 44: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2021.06.026.

Beheshti Namdar, A., M. Ahadi, S. M. Hoseini, et al. 2023. "Effect of Nano-Micelle Curcumin on Hepatic Enzymes: A New Treatment Approach for Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD)." *Avicenna Journal of Phytomedicine* 13, no. 6: 615–625. https://doi.org/10.22038/AJP.2023.21919.

Boccellino, M., and S. D'Angelo. 2020. "Anti-Obesity Effects of Polyphenol Intake: Current Status and Future Possibilities." *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 21, no. 16: 42. https://doi. org/10.3390/ijms21165642.

Calzadilla Bertot, L., and L. A. Adams. 2016. "The Natural Course of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 17, no. 5: 74. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms17050774.

Chachay, V. S., G. A. Macdonald, J. H. Martin, et al. 2014. "Resveratrol Does Not Benefit Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 12, no. 12: e2091–e2096. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2014.02.024.

Chen, A., and S. Zheng. 2008. "Curcumin Inhibits Connective Tissue Growth Factor Gene Expression in Activated Hepatic Stellate Cells In Vitro by Blocking NF-kappaB and ERK Signalling." *British Journal of Pharmacology* 153, no. 3: 557–567. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjp.0707542.

Chen, S., X. Zhao, L. Ran, et al. 2015. "Resveratrol Improves Insulin Resistance, Glucose and Lipid Metabolism in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Digestive and Liver Disease* 47, no. 3: 226–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2014.11.015.

Cheng, C., Z. Li, X. Zhao, et al. 2020. "Natural Alkaloid and Polyphenol Compounds Targeting Lipid Metabolism: Treatment Implications in Metabolic Diseases." *European Journal of Pharmacology* 870: 172922. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejphar.2020.172922.

Cicero, A. F. G., A. Sahebkar, F. Fogacci, M. Bove, M. Giovannini, and C. Borghi. 2020. "Effects of Phytosomal Curcumin on Anthropometric Parameters, Insulin Resistance, Cortisolemia and Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Indices: A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial." *European Journal of Nutrition* 59, no. 2: 477–483. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s00394-019-01916-7.

Ebrahimzadeh, A., S. Mohseni, M. Safargar, et al. 2024. "Curcumin Effects on Glycaemic Indices, Lipid Profile, Blood Pressure, Inflammatory Markers and Anthropometric Measurements of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials." *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 80: 103025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2024.103025.

Faghihzadeh, F., P. Adibi, R. Rafiei, and A. Hekmatdoost. 2014. "Resveratrol Supplementation Improves Inflammatory Biomarkers in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Nutrition Research* 34, no. 10: 837–843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2014.09.005.

Farzin, L., S. Asghari, M. Rafraf, M. Asghari-Jafarabadi, and M. Shirmohammadi. 2020. "No Beneficial Effects of Resveratrol Supplementation on Atherogenic Risk Factors in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *International Journal for Vitamin and Nutrition Research* 90, no. 3–4: 279–289. https://doi.org/10.1024/0300-9831/a000528.

Ghaffari, A., M. Rafraf, R. Navekar, B. Sepehri, M. Asghari-Jafarabadi, and S. M. Ghavami. 2019. "Turmeric and Chicory Seed Have Beneficial Effects on Obesity Markers and Lipid Profile in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD)." *International Journal for Vitamin and Nutrition Research* 89, no. 5-6: 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1024/0300-9831/a000568.

Giannini, E. G., R. Testa, and V. Savarino. 2005. "Liver Enzyme Alteration: A Guide for Clinicians." *CMAJ* 172, no. 3: 367–379. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.1040752.

Gomez-Zorita, S., A. Fernandez-Quintela, M. T. Macarulla, et al. 2012. "Resveratrol Attenuates Steatosis in Obese Zucker Rats by Decreasing Fatty Acid Availability and Reducing Oxidative Stress." *British Journal of Nutrition* 107, no. 2: 202–210. https://doi.org/10.1017/S000711451 1002753.

Harrison, S. A., P. Bedossa, C. D. Guy, et al. 2024. "A Phase 3, Randomized, Controlled Trial of Resmetirom in NASH With Liver Fibrosis." *New England Journal of Medicine* 390, no. 6: 497–509. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2309000.

Hashemi, S., H. Eskandar, and E. Sardabi. 2009. "A Placebo-Controlled Trial of Silymarin in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Hepatitis Monthly* 9, no. 4: 265–270. https://doi.org/10.1136/gut.2008. 174516corr1.

He, Y., X. Chen, Y. Li, et al. 2024. "Curcumin Supplementation Alleviates Hepatic Fat Content Associated With Modulation of Gut Microbiota-Dependent Bile Acid Metabolism in Patients With Nonalcoholic Simple Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 120, no. 1: 66–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut. 2024.05.017.

Heeboll, S., M. Kreuzfeldt, S. Hamilton-Dutoit, et al. 2016. "Placebo-Controlled, Randomised Clinical Trial: High-Dose Resveratrol Treatment for Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology* 51, no. 4: 456–464. https://doi.org/10.3109/ 00365521.2015.1107620.

Heeboll, S., K. L. Thomsen, A. Clouston, et al. 2015. "Effect of Resveratrol on Experimental Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis." *Pharmacological Research* 95-96: 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2015.03.005.

Higgins, J. P. T., and S. E. Green. 2011. "Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration 2011." http://handbook.cochrane.

Higgins, J. P. T., T. Li, and J. J. Deeks. 2021. "Choosing Effect Measures and Computing Estimates of Effect. In Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 6.2." https://training. cochrane.org/handbook/archive/v6.2.

Ijaz, S., J. H. Verbeek, C. Mischke, and J. Ruotsalainen. 2014. "Inclusion of Nonrandomized Studies in Cochrane Systematic Reviews Was Found to Be in Need of Improvement." *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 67, no. 6: 645–653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.01.001.

Jakubczyk, K., K. Skonieczna-Zydecka, J. Kaldunska, E. Stachowska, I. Gutowska, and K. Janda. 2020. "Effects of Resveratrol Supplementation in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease—A Meta-Analysis." *Nutrients* 12, no. 8: 435. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12082435.

Jalali, M., M. Mahmoodi, Z. Mosallanezhad, R. Jalali, M. H. Imanieh, and S. P. Moosavian. 2020. "The Effects of Curcumin Supplementation on Liver Function, Metabolic Profile and Body Composition in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials." *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 48: 102283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2019. 102283.

Jarhahzadeh, M., P. Alavinejad, F. Farsi, D. Husain, and A. Rezazadeh. 2021. "The Effect of Turmeric on Lipid Profile, Malondialdehyde, Liver Echogenicity and Enzymes Among Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Double Blind Clinical Trial." *Diabetology and Metabolic Syndrome* 13, no. 1: 112. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-021-00731-7.

Jazayeri-Tehrani, S. A., S. M. Rezayat, S. Mansouri, et al. 2019. "Nano-Curcumin Improves Glucose Indices, Lipids, Inflammation, and Nesfatin in Overweight and Obese Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD): A Double-Blind Randomized Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial." *Nutrition & Metabolism (London)* 16: 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12986-019-0331-1.

Kalhori, A., M. Rafraf, R. Navekar, A. Ghaffari, and M. A. Jafarabadi. 2022. "Effect of Turmeric Supplementation on Blood Pressure and

Serum Levels of Sirtuin 1 and Adiponectin in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial." *Prev Nutr Food Sci* 27, no. 1: 37–44. https://doi.org/10.3746/pnf. 2022.27.1.37.

Kang, O. H., S. B. Kim, Y. S. Seo, et al. 2013. "Curcumin Decreases Oleic Acid-Induced Lipid Accumulation via AMPK Phosphorylation in Hepatocarcinoma Cells." *European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences* 17, no. 19: 2578–2586.

Kantartzis, K., L. Fritsche, M. Bombrich, et al. 2018. "Effects of Resveratrol Supplementation on Liver Fat Content in Overweight and Insulin-Resistant Subjects: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial." *Diabetes, Obesity & Metabolism* 20, no. 7: 1793–1797. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.13268.

Khan, N., and H. Mukhtar. 2018. "Tea Polyphenols in Promotion of Human Health." *Nutrients* 11, no. 1: 39. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu110 10039.

Lagouge, M., C. Argmann, Z. Gerhart-Hines, et al. 2006. "Resveratrol Improves Mitochondrial Function and Protects Against Metabolic Disease by Activating SIRT1 and PGC-1alpha." *Cell* 127, no. 6: 1109–1122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2006.11.013.

Larussa, T., E. Suraci, R. Marasco, M. Imeneo, L. Abenavoli, and F. Luzza. 2019. "Self-Prescribed Dietary Restrictions Are Common in Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients and Are Associated With Low Bone Mineralization." *Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania)* 55, no. 8: 7. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina55080507.

Lin, J., Y. Tang, Q. Kang, Y. Feng, and A. Chen. 2012. "Curcumin Inhibits Gene Expression of Receptor for Advanced Glycation End-Products (RAGE) in Hepatic Stellate Cells In Vitro by Elevating PPARgamma Activity and Attenuating Oxidative Stress." *British Journal of Pharmacology* 166, no. 8: 2212–2227. https://doi.org/10. 1111/j.1476-5381.2012.01910.x.

Loguercio, C., P. Andreone, C. Brisc, et al. 2012. "Silybin Combined With Phosphatidylcholine and Vitamin E in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Free Radical Biology & Medicine* 52, no. 9: 1658–1665. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freer adbiomed.2012.02.008.

Loomba, R., and A. J. Sanyal. 2013. "The Global NAFLD Epidemic." *Nature Reviews. Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 10, no. 11: 686–690. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2013.171.

Masoodi, M. R., M. Panahian, and M. Vojdanian. 2013. "Effects of Silymarin on Reducing Liver Aminotransferases in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Diseases." *Govaresh* 18: 181–185.

Mirhafez, S. R., M. Azimi-Nezhad, M. Dehabeh, et al. 2021. "The Effect of Curcumin Phytosome on the Treatment of Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial." *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology* 1308: 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64872-5_3.

Mirhafez, S. R., M. Dehabeh, M. Hariri, et al. 2021. "Curcumin and Piperine Combination for the Treatment of Patients With Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Double-Blind Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial." *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology* 1328: 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73234-9_2.

Molani-Gol, R., A. Dehghani, and M. Rafraf. 2024. "Effects of Curcumin/Turmeric Supplementation on the Liver Enzymes, Lipid Profiles, Glycemic Index, and Anthropometric Indices in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Patients: An Umbrella Meta-Analysis." *Phytotherapy Research* 38, no. 2: 539–555. https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.8051.

Moradi Kelardeh, B., S. Rahmati-Ahmadabad, P. Farzanegi, M. Helalizadeh, and M. A. Azarbayjani. 2020. "Effects of Non-Linear Resistance Training and Curcumin Supplementation on the Liver Biochemical Markers Levels and Structure in Older Women With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies* 24, no. 3: 154–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbmt.2020.02.021.

Navarro, V. J., S. H. Belle, M. D'Amato, et al. 2019. "Silymarin in Non-Cirrhotics With Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo Controlled Trial." *PLoS One* 14, no. 9: e0221683. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221683.

Navekar, R., M. Rafraf, A. Ghaffari, et al. 2017. "Turmeric Supplementation Improves Serum Glucose Indices and Leptin Levels in Patients with Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Diseases." *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* 36, no. 4: 261–267. https://doi.org/10. 1080/07315724.2016.1267597.

Ngu, M. H., M. N. Norhayati, Z. Rosnani, and M. M. Zulkifli. 2022. "Curcumin as Adjuvant Treatment in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver (NAFLD) Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 68: 102843. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.ctim.2022.102843.

Panahi, Y., P. Kianpour, R. Mohtashami, R. Jafari, L. E. Simental-Mendia, and A. Sahebkar. 2017. "Efficacy and Safety of Phytosomal Curcumin in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Drug Res (Stuttg)* 67, no. 4: 244–251. https://doi.org/ 10.1055/s-0043-100019.

Panahi, Y., G. Valizadegan, N. Ahamdi, S. Ganjali, M. Majeed, and A. Sahebkar. 2019. "Curcuminoids Plus Piperine Improve Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Clinical Trial." *Journal of Cellular Biochemistry* 120, no. 9: 15989–15996. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcb.28877.

Peng, C., A. G. Stewart, O. L. Woodman, R. H. Ritchie, and C. X. Qin. 2020. "Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Review of Its Mechanism, Models and Medical Treatments." *Frontiers in Pharmacology* 11: 603926. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.603926.

Petroff, D., V. Blank, P. N. Newsome, et al. 2021. "Assessment of Hepatic Steatosis by Controlled Attenuation Parameter Using the M and XL Probes: An Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis." *Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 6, no. 3: 185–198. https://doi.org/10. 1016/S2468-1253(20)30357-5.

Prochazkova, D., I. Bousova, and N. Wilhelmova. 2011. "Antioxidant and Prooxidant Properties of Flavonoids." *Fitoterapia* 82, no. 4: 513–523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fitote.2011.01.018.

Rafiei, H., K. Omidian, and B. Bandy. 2017. "Comparison of Dietary Polyphenols for Protection Against Molecular Mechanisms Underlying Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in a Cell Model of Steatosis." *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research* 61, no. 9: 81. https://doi.org/10.1002/mnfr. 201600781.

Rahmani, S., S. Asgary, G. Askari, et al. 2016. "Treatment of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease With Curcumin: A Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial." *Phytotherapy Research* 30, no. 9: 1540–1548. https:// doi.org/10.1002/ptr.5659.

Rinella, M. E., J. V. Lazarus, V. Ratziu, et al. 2023. "A Multi-Society Delphi Consensus Statement on New Fatty Liver Disease Nomenclature." *Hepatology* 78: 1966–1986. https://doi.org/10.1097/HEP.000000000 000520.

Rodriguez-Ramiro, I., D. Vauzour, and A. M. Minihane. 2016. "Polyphenols and Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: Impact and Mechanisms." *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 75, no. 1: 47–60. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665115004218.

Saadati, S., B. Hatami, Z. Yari, et al. 2019. "The Effects of Curcumin Supplementation on Liver Enzymes, Lipid Profile, Glucose Homeostasis, and Hepatic Steatosis and Fibrosis in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 73, no. 3: 441–449. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41430-018-0382-9.

Saadeh, S., Z. M. Younossi, E. M. Remer, et al. 2002. "The Utility of Radiological Imaging in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Gastroenterology* 123, no. 3: 745–750. https://doi.org/10.1053/gast.2002. 35354.

Saberi-Karimian, M., M. Keshvari, M. Ghayour-Mobarhan, et al. 2020. "Effects of Curcuminoids on Inflammatory Status in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 49: 102322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2020.102322.

Safari, Z., M. Bagherniya, Z. Khoram, et al. 2023. "The Effect of Curcumin on Anthropometric Indices, Blood Pressure, Lipid Profiles, Fasting Blood Glucose, Liver Enzymes, Fibrosis, and Steatosis in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Livers." *Frontiers in Nutrition* 10: 1163950. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2023.1163950.

Sahebkar, A., A. F. G. Cicero, L. E. Simental-Mendia, B. B. Aggarwal, and S. C. Gupta. 2016. "Curcumin Downregulates Human Tumor Necrosis Factor-Alpha Levels: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Ofrandomized Controlled Trials." *Pharmacological Research* 107: 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2016.03.026.

Salamone, F., F. Galvano, F. Cappello, A. Mangiameli, I. Barbagallo, and G. Li Volti. 2012. "Silibinin Modulates Lipid Homeostasis and Inhibits Nuclear Factor Kappa B Activation in Experimental Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis." *Translational Research* 159, no. 6: 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trsl.2011.12.003.

Salvoza, N., P. J. Giraudi, C. Tiribelli, and N. Rosso. 2022. "Natural Compounds for Counteracting Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD): Advantages and Limitations of the Suggested Candidates." *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 23, no. 5: 64. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23052764.

Shang, J., L. L. Chen, F. X. Xiao, H. Sun, H. C. Ding, and H. Xiao. 2008. "Resveratrol Improves Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease by Activating AMP-Activated Protein Kinase." *Acta Pharmacologica Sinica* 29, no. 6: 698–706. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7254.2008.00807.x.

Siddiqui, M. S., R. Vuppalanchi, M. L. Van Natta, et al. 2019. "Vibration-Controlled Transient Elastography to Assess Fibrosis and Steatosis in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 17, no. 1: 156–163 e152. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.cgh.2018.04.043.

Solhi, H., R. Ghahremani, A. M. Kazemifar, and Z. Hoseini Yazdi. 2014. "Silymarin in Treatment of Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Randomized Clinical Trial." *Caspian Journal of Internal Medicine* 5, no. 1: 9–12.

Sterne, J. A., D. Gavaghan, and M. Egger. 2000. "Publication and Related Bias in Meta-Analysis: Power of Statistical Tests and Prevalence in the Literature." *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 53, no. 11: 1119–1129. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00242-0.

Talamantes, S., M. Lisjak, E. H. Gilglioni, C. J. Llamoza-Torres, B. Ramos-Molina, and E. N. Gurzov. 2023. "Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Diabetes Mellitus as Growing Aetiologies of Hepatocellular Carcinoma." *JHEP Rep* 5, no. 9: 100811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhepr. 2023.100811.

Targher, G., C. D. Byrne, and H. Tilg. 2020. "NAFLD and Increased Risk of Cardiovascular Disease: Clinical Associations, Pathophysiological Mechanisms and Pharmacological Implications." *Gut* 69, no. 9: 1691–1705. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2020-320622.

Van De Wier, B., G. H. Koek, A. Bast, and G. R. Haenen. 2017. "The Potential of Flavonoids in the Treatment of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease." *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 57, no. 4: 834–855. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2014.952399.

Wah Kheong, C., N. R. Nik Mustapha, and S. Mahadeva. 2017. "A Randomized Trial of Silymarin for the Treatment of Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis." *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 15, no. 12: 1940–1949 e1948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2017.04.016.

Wei, S., and X. Yu. 2021. "Efficacy of Resveratrol Supplementation on Liver Enzymes in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 57: 102635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2020.102635.

Williamson, G., and K. Sheedy. 2020. "Effects of Polyphenols on Insulin Resistance." *Nutrients* 12, no. 10: 35. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu121 03135.

Yang, K., J. Chen, T. Zhang, et al. 2022. "Efficacy and Safety of Dietary Polyphenol Supplementation in the Treatment of Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Frontiers in Immunology* 13: 949746. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.949746.

Younossi, Z., Q. M. Anstee, M. Marietti, et al. 2018. "Global Burden of NAFLD and NASH: Trends, Predictions, Risk Factors and Prevention." *Nature Reviews. Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 15, no. 1: 11–20. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2017.109.

Zeraattalab-Motlagh, S., A. Jayedi, and S. Shab-Bidar. 2021. "The Effects of Resveratrol Supplementation in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome, and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: An Umbrella Review of Meta-Analyses of Randomized Controlled Trials." *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 114, no. 5: 1675–1685. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab250.

Zhang, C., W. Yuan, J. Fang, et al. 2016. "Efficacy of Resveratrol Supplementation Against Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Meta-Analysis of Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trials." *PLoS One* 11, no. 8: e0161792. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161792.

Zhang, Y., J. Hai, M. Cao, et al. 2013. "Silibinin Ameliorates Steatosis and Insulin Resistance During Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Development Partly Through Targeting IRS-1/PI3K/Akt Pathway." *International Immunopharmacology* 17, no. 3: 714–720. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.intimp.2013.08.019.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section.