Open Access Full Text Article

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Clinical efficacy and safety of autologous stem cell transplantation for patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction

Rong Li^{1,*} Xiao-Ming Li^{2,*} Jun-Rong Chen³

¹Department of Intensive Care Unit, The People's Hospital of Baoji City, ²Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, ³Department of Function, Baoji Central Hospital, Baoji, Shaanxi, People's Republic of China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: Rong Li Department of Intensive Care Unit, The People's Hospital of Baoji City, No 24 Xinhua Lane, Jinger Road, Baoji City, Shaanxi Province 721000, People's Republic of China Tel/fax +86 91 7327 2307 Email dr_lirong@163.com



Purpose: The purpose of this study is to evaluate the therapeutic efficacy and safety of stem cells for the treatment of patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI). **Materials and methods:** We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of relevant published clinical studies. A computerized search was conducted for randomized controlled trials of stem cell therapy for STEMI.

Results: Twenty-eight randomized controlled trials with a total of 1,938 STEMI patients were included in the present meta-analysis. Stem cell therapy resulted in an improvement in long-term (12 months) left ventricular ejection fraction of 3.15% (95% confidence interval 1.01–5.29, P<0.01). The 3-month to 4-month, 6-month, and 12-month left ventricular end-systolic volume showed favorable results in the stem cell therapy group compared with the control group (P≤0.05). Significant decrease was also observed in left ventricular end-diastolic volume after 3-month to 4-month and 12-month follow-up compared with controls (P<0.05). Wall mean score index was reduced significantly in stem cell therapy group when compared with the control group at 6-month and 12-month follow-up (P=0.01). Moreover, our analysis showed a significant change of 12-month infarct size decrease in STEMI patients treated with stem cells compared with controls (P<0.01). In addition, no significant difference was found between treatment group and control in adverse reactions (P>0.05).

Conclusion: Overall, stem cell therapy is efficacious in the treatment of patients with STEMI, with low rates of adverse events compared with control group patients.

Keywords: ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction, bone marrow mononuclear cells, hematopoietic stem cells, endothelial progenitor cells, mesenchymal stem cells, meta-analysis

Introduction

Acute myocardial infarction (AMI) remains the leading cause of disability and mortality throughout the world, despite substantial advances in therapeutic approaches, including pharmacotherapy, percutaneous coronary intervention, device-based therapies, and cardiac transplantation.^{1–4} Usually, heart failure is largely caused by ischemic heart disease.⁵ AMI leads to regional ischemia and subsequent myocardial tissue necrosis. AMI is generally caused by the formation of a blockage in the coronary arteries supplying blood to the heart, which is primarily due to the unstable buildup of cholesterol, leukocytes, and fat.^{6,7} AMI is further divided into two subclasses, ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) and non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI). STEMI accounted for roughly 25%–40% of AMI and is known as a combination of symptoms including a typical ischemic chest pain that persists for >20 minutes and elevated serum myocardial necrosis marker

Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management 2016:12 1171-1189

1171

Commercial use of this work is published and licensed by Dove Medical Press Limited. The full terms of this license are available at https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php
 and incorporate the Cracity Commons Attribution — Non Commercial (unported, v3.0) License (http://cracityecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0). By accessing the work you
 hereby accept the Terms. Non-commercial use of the work are permitted without any further permission from Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. For permission
 for commercial use of this work, please see paragraphs 4.2 and 5 of our Terms (https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php).

concentrations, as well as a typical class of ST-segment elevation on the electrocardiogram.^{8–10} Currently, more effective treatments are strongly required to be explored, due to the high mortality and disability rate in STEMI patients. Application of stem cell therapy has opened a new chapter for ischemic heart disease treatment. Various methods of stem cells have been used to treat STEMI patients in recent years, including clinical setting, cell type, the route, and timing of cell delivery.^{11–14} Stem cell therapy is confirmed to be safe, although the efficacy remains controversial.

Stem cells used in clinical trials can be roughly divided into four categories: bone marrow mononuclear cells (BM-MNCs), hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs), endothelial progenitor cells (EPCs), and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs).¹¹⁻¹⁵ ClinicalTrials.gov lists 25 registered trials on STEMI with the keywords of "stem cells" and "STEMI" until January 4, 2016: one in Phase I, 15 in Phase II, eight in Phase III, and one in Phase IV (https://www.ClinicalTrials.gov),16 14 trials among them have been completed. Recently, the most trending type of stem cells used for STEMI are bone marrowderived cells (BMCs).^{11–15} BMCs contain multiple cluster of stem cells, including HSCs, EPCs, and MSCs. In July 2011, Hearticellgram-AMI (FCB-Pharmicell, Seongnam, South Korea) was approved by the Korean Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of AMI, and MSCs were the main ingredient of this drug.

In this study, we performed a systematic review and metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to assess the efficacy and safety of stem cell therapy in the treatment of patients with STEMI. The aim was to evaluate the clinical response to stem cell therapy by assessing left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), left ventricular end-systolic volume (LVESV) and left ventricular end-systolic volume index (LVESVI), left ventricular end-diastolic volume (LVEDV) and left ventricular end-diastolic volume index (LVEDVI), wall mean score index (WMSI), infarct size (IS), and adverse events (AEs).

Materials and methods Search strategy, study design, and eligibility criteria

Randomized controlled clinical trials were identified by searching PubMed, EMBASE, the Cochrane Center Register of Controlled Trials, the Central medical literature, the Wangfang Database and China Journal Net, and the China Science and Technology Periodical Database from 1966 to February 2016. The search strategy included the keywords ("bone marrow mononuclear cells" OR "mesenchymal stem cells" OR "haemopoietic stem cells" OR "endothelial progenitor cells" OR "stem cells") AND ("ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction" OR "STEMI") AND "randomized controlled trial" without language limitation. The registered trials with publication citations were displayed at the bottom of the "full-text view" tab of a study record, under the "more information" heading. All retrieved articles were checked by the relevant review papers, previously published trials, and postgraduate articles. We also searched <u>ClinicalTrials.gov</u> website for the information of ongoing trials. The studies on animals and cell lines, case reports, investigating multiple types of AMI, no details of patients, and not RCTs were excluded.

Data selection criteria and quality assessment

Study selection and data extraction were performed independently by two reviewers (Rong Li and Xiao-Ming Li) using a standardized approach and according to the quality of reporting of meta-analyses (QUOROM) recommendations. Studies were eligible for inclusion if 1) they published, prospective, RCTs in human BM-MNCs or MSCs or HSCs or EPC transplantation therapy for STEMI patients, 2) the data of LVEF were reported both prior to therapy and at the end of the study, 3) they enrolled six or more patients in each group, and 4) the dose of BM-MNCs is between 10^7 and 10^8 ; the dose of MSCs, HSCs, and EPCs should be $>10^6$. The exclusion criteria were 1) studies with inadequate key background data of patients and 2) ongoing or unpublished studies and duplicate reports. Study features extracted included the first author's name, country and year of publication, the phase of clinical trial, trial identifier, number of patients, sample size per arm, mean patient age, time from STEMI to cell delivery, the kinds of stem cells, cell dose and route of administration, and myocardial function measurement. Any data that could not be directly obtained from the articles were calculated from the graphed data using Adobe Illustrator and Photoshop.

Definition of outcome measures

LVEF improvement was defined as the mean change in the LVEF from baseline. LVESV, LVESVI, LVEDV, and LVEDVI reduction were defined as the mean changes in the LVESV, LVESVI, LVEDV, and LVEDVI from baseline, respectively. WMSI and IS reduction were defined as the mean changes in the WMSI and IS from baseline, respectively. The primary end points were absolute change in global LVEF, LVESV, and LVESVI from baseline. Secondary end points included changes in LVEDV, LVEDVI, WMSI, IS, and AEs. Short-term (3–4 months and 6 months) and long-term (12 months) data were separately analyzed for each group.

Statistical analysis

In this meta-analysis, we compared the stem cell treatment groups from the trials with their respective control groups using Review Manager (Version 5.0, Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark). The stem cell treatment effects were reflected by the weighted mean differences (WMDs) and odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Fixed- and randomeffect models were used to estimate stem cell treatment effects. Heterogeneity among the trials was assessed with the χ^2 -based Q-test and the I^2 statistic, and $I^2 > 50\%$ was considered to indicate a high level of heterogeneity. A random-effect model was used when statistical heterogeneity was confirmed; otherwise, a fixed-effect model was used. $P \le 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant in all analysis, and all reported P-values resulted from two-sided version tests of the respective tests. To assess the possibility of publication bias, Egger's test and Begg's test were used (Stata Version 12.0; Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA).

Results Trial selection

The data search yielded 101 references, 51 of which were excluded for various reasons (21 review articles, seven full texts were not available, four animal models or in vitro experiments, six case reports, and 13 due to multiple publication). An additional 50 studies were excluded because they were published in other languages, did not provide detailed-enough clinical data, or were not RCTs. Finally, 28 trials met the specified inclusion criteria.^{17–44} Figure 1 provides a flowchart illustrating the search results and mechanisms of exclusion for certain studies. The funnel plots for the analyses regarding AEs were largely symmetrical (Figure S1). Both Begg's test and Egger's test showed no clear evidence of publication bias (P>0.05). Thus, publication bias did not seem to be present in our study.

Baseline patient characteristics

The baseline characteristics of the patients in the 28 selected publications are listed in Table 1. The trials involved a total of 1,938 patients with STEMI. All of the 28 papers were fully published over the period from 2006 to 2015. Sample size ranged from a minimum of 12 to a maximum



Figure I Flow diagram showing the study identification, screening, and inclusion process. Abbreviation: RCT, randomized controlled trial.

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		trial phase	identifier	(male): control	control	to cell delivery (days)	arm injection	dose	measurement
$ \begin{array}{c} \label{constraints} \mbox{i} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$									
Care at length UK 10 (B): 10 (B): 10 (B) 58.35 1 BH-MMGG (B) 33.6 (D) 346 (D) Repaire at Clammy/ ¹¹ I NCT0023455 30 (D): 30 (2) 35.5 57 43 BH-MMGG (B) 33.6 (D) 346 (D) Repaire at Clammy/ ¹¹ I NCT0023455 30 (D): 30 (2) 35.5 57 43 BH-MMG (B) 34.6 (D) 34.6 (D)<	Lunde et al (Norway) ¹⁷	_	NCT00199823	50 (42); 50 (42)	58.1; 56.7	6	BM-MNCs (ii)	6.8×10′	SPECT, echo, and MRI
Meyer Extending Ex	Ge et al (People's	N	UK	10 (8); 10 (10)	58; 59	_	BM-MNCs (ii)	3.8×10 ⁷	SPECT and echo
Schedingere al. I NCT0023435 30.02); 30.20 33.4 32.4 34.4 MPMNGs (i) 24.46(10) MB Schedingere al. II NCT0023435 30.02); 30.23 33.4 34.5 34.5 34.5 34.6 1 36.5 1 10.5 1	Republic of China) ¹⁸								
III NCT0027915 IOI (3); IOI (3); IOI (4) 55, 37 4.3 BMMNGs (1) 2.36/10 Edu Generhoger etal II NCT0027915 IOI (3); IOI (4) 55, 37 4.3 DeMMNG (7) 2.36/10 Edu Generhoger flepable UK UK II (7); 20 (13) 58.4 6.16 1 BMMNG (7) 2.46/10* 2.4/10* 2.4/10	Meyer et al (Germany) ¹⁹	_	NCT00224536	30 (20); 30 (22)	53.4; 59.2	4.8	BM-MNCs (ii)	2.46×10 ⁸	MRI
Gio (Propies Republic Composition Lit Bit Lit Lit <t< td=""><td>Schächinger et al</td><td>≡</td><td>NCT00279175</td><td>101 (83); 103 (84)</td><td>55; 57</td><td>4.3</td><td>BM-MNCs (ii)</td><td>2.36×10⁸</td><td>Echo and MRI</td></t<>	Schächinger et al	≡	NCT00279175	101 (83); 103 (84)	55; 57	4.3	BM-MNCs (ii)	2.36×10 ⁸	Echo and MRI
Guo (Preside Republic UK 11 (9): 10 (8) S4:61.6 1 BH-HNCs (8) 353:00 Edv Pencia eral (Carch) ² 1 NCT00395545 14:10 59 (mean age of the evolution of China) ¹ 1 NCT00395545 14:10 59 (mean age of the evolution of particular of China) ¹ 2 <	(Germany) ²⁰								
of Chend ³ i NCT0038545 14:10 S9 (mean age of the envice call (Czech) ³ 14:10 S9 (mean age of the envice call (Czech) ³ 11 BM-MMCs (n) 2.64×10* S75 Republic of Chend ³ UK UK 20 243.55.4 1 1 BM-MMCs (n) 12×10* S76 Methor act al (Presolts) UK UK 20 243.55.4 1 1 BM-MMCs (n) 12×10* S76 Methor act al (Presolts) UK UK UK 237.51.2 2.35.54 BM-MMCs (n) 24%10* S76 Stare al (Presolts) UK UK UK 21.0%1.27.12 57.57.54 B2 BM-MMCs (n) 24%10* S76 Stare al (Presolts) UK UK UK UK UK UK 24.57.55 55.53 55.53 55.54 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 57.69 <	Guo (People's Republic	ЛК	UK	11 (9); 10 (8)	58.4; 61.6	_	BM-MNCs (ii)	3.63×10 ⁷	Echo
Perioda ca d (Czeh) ²³ I NCT0038545 14;10 59 (mean age of the the angle ca d (Czeh) ³³ 1 NCT0038545 14;10 59 (mean age of the the angle ca d (Czeh) ³³ 1 NCT0038545 14;10 59 (mean age of the the angle ca d (Czeh) ³³ 1 NCT0038534 4;10 59 (mean age of the the angle ca d (Czeh) ³³ 1 NCT0038334 4;03(h;40(13) 54,55 55 8 PhMNCs (1) 12,107 57 Meaning rea d (Czeh) ³³ UK UK 20 (h); 20 (h) 54,55 55 8 8 44 40,54 (d) 56 55 55 8	of China) ²¹								
Hung et al (Feople's Republic of China) ³ UK $20 (17; 20 (18))$ S48.55.4 1 BM-MNCs (t) 12×10^6 See Republic of China) ³ UK UK UK UK UK 12×10^6 See Molutine of China) ³ UK	Penicka et al (Czech) ²²	=	NCT00389545	14; 10	59 (mean age of the	4-11	BM-MNCs (ii)	2.64×10 ⁸	SPECT and echo
Hung era (People's UK 20 (1); 20 (b) 548,554 1 BM-MNGs (i) 1.2.10 ⁶ See Repulsi of Cham ³ II NCT0033334 40 (36; 40 (3) 54,55 53 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See Repulsi of Cham ³ UK UK UK 37,54 (3) 54,55 57,94 (4) 82 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See She acal (Remay) ²¹ II NCT0024316 37,54 (2) 55,53 57,94 (4) 82 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See She acal (Repolis) ²¹ UK UK 12 (0); 12 (1) 52,153 57,54 82 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See Cace ral (Repolis) ²¹ UK UK 12 (0); 12 (1) 52,153 4,35 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See Cace ral (Repolis) ²¹ UK UK UK 12 (0); 12 (1) 52,153 4,45 BM-MNGs (ii) 1.2.10 ⁶ See Cace ral (Repolis) ²¹ UK UK UK 12 (0); 12 (1) 52,153 4,45 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>two groups of patients)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					two groups of patients)				
Republic of China) ² NCT00353324 40 (35); 0 (3) 6.3 2.9 BN-MNCs (i) 4.02×(0° EFH Melazine et al (Franch) ² UK UK UK UK UK 0.55 55, 55 55 BN-MNCs (i) 3.40×(0° 5FE Silve et al (Franzh) ² UK UK UK UK UK 0.55, 57, 54 82 BN-MNCs (i) 3.43×(0° 5FE Silve et al (Franzh) ² UK UK UK UK 12 (1); 12 (1) 52.1; 52.7 43 BN-MNCs (i) 3.45×(0° 5FF Case et al (Franzh) ² UK UK UK 12 (1); 12 (1) 52.1; 52.7 43 BN-MNCs (i) 3.45×(0° 5FF Case et al (Franzh) ² UK UK UK UK 13 (27); 41 (12) 52.1; 52.7 43 55 6 BN-MNCs (i) 3.40° 5FF 6FF BN-MNCs (i) 3.40° 6FF 6 BN-MNCs (i) 3.70° 6F 6 BN-MNCs (i) 3.70° 6F 6 BN-MNCs (i) <td>Huang et al (People's</td> <td>NK</td> <td>UK</td> <td>20 (17); 20 (18)</td> <td>54.8; 55.4</td> <td>_</td> <td>BM-MNCs (ii)</td> <td>1.2×10⁸</td> <td>SPECT and echo</td>	Huang et al (People's	NK	UK	20 (17); 20 (18)	54.8; 55.4	_	BM-MNCs (ii)	1.2×10 ⁸	SPECT and echo
Hukuri er al (Fning)* II NCT00343324 40 (38); 40 (3) 60; 39 52, 53 58 BM-MNGs (1) 402×(0) 52×(Republic of China) ²³								
Mearin et al (Czech) ³ UK Discretion Set al (Czech) ³ Discretion Discretion <thdiscretion< th=""> Discretion</thdiscretion<>	Huikuri et al (Finland) ²⁴	=	NCT00363324	40 (36): 40 (34)	60: 59	2.9	BM-MNCs (ii)	4.02×10^{8}	Echo
Silve and [Ream])* UK UK <td>Maluzín at al (Czech)²⁵</td> <td>IK N</td> <td>IIK</td> <td></td> <td>54.55</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>RM-MNC (ii)</td> <td>I×10⁸</td> <td>SPECT acho and MRI</td>	Maluzín at al (Czech) ²⁵	IK N	IIK		54.55	8.4	RM-MNC (ii)	I×10 ⁸	SPECT acho and MRI
Dilla et al (Germany) ² II NCT0029115 77(3) 57:57.5 55:54 IS BPH-MNG (i) VK EAN De atter al (activation) ² II NCT0024316 37(27):34(28) 55:56 IS BPH-MNG (i) VK EAN De atter al (activation) ² II NCT0024316 37(27):34(28) 55:56 IS BPH-MNG (i) VK EAN De atter al (activation) ² II NCT0024316 37(27):34(28) 55:56 IS BPH-MNG (i) 19×10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (DSA) ² II NCT00264316 37(27):41(12) 521:5217 4.3 BPH-MNG (i) 19×10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT00264316 37(27):41(12) 41(2) 495:505 4.45 BPH-MNG (i) 19×10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT0026077 37(25):41(4(2) 495:555 6 F BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT0020077 27(25):41(4(2) 55:55 6 F F BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT0020077 27(25):41(4(2) 55:55 6 F F BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT0020077 27(25):41(4(2) 55:55 6 F F P BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ² II NCT0020077 27(25):41(4) 61.2.60.6 6 BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁷ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT00301318 65(56); 65(56); 65(55) 55; 55 6 F F P BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁷ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 65(56) 55; 55 5 5 5 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 2.94:10 ⁷ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 5 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 5 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 2 2 4 5 6 6 7 7 7 8 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 2 7 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 7 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 7 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 7 7 7 9 BPH-MNG (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse et al (USA) ³ II NCT0031318 80(56); 40(30) 55; 55 7 7 7 9 BPH-MI (i) 1.97(9 ⁶ SFIC EAN Traverse		Ξ.	Ď			0.0 T			
Dill et al (Germany) ³ III NCT002391/5 37,54/6 82 BPHMNG (i) UK Eth Hencos et al (Begium) ¹¹ I NCT002431/5 37,54/5 15,55,58 1 1 BPHMCG (i) 4,75×10 ⁶ Eth Expublic of Cinna) ¹⁰ UK UK 12(10);15(11) 521;527 4,3 BPHMCG (i) 4,75×10 ⁶ Eth C. ao et al (People's UK UK 12(10);12(11) 521;527 4,3 BPHMCG (i) 2,34×10 ⁷ SFE Republic of Cinna) ¹⁰ UK UK 12(10);12(11) 521;527 4,3 BPHMCG (i) 2,34×10 ⁷ SFE For et al (People's UK UK 12(10);12(11) 521;527 4,3 BPHMCG (i) 2,34×10 ⁷ SFE For et al (People's UK UK 0, 0) 55:55 7 7 9 BPHMCG (i) 2,34×10 ⁷ SFE For et al (People's UK UK 0, 0) 56;55 55 5 7 7 9 BPHMCG (i) 2,34×10 ⁷ SFE Hirsch et al UK 0, 0 K 0, 0,00007 20(2);12(3) 5,555 6 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,94×10 ⁷ SFE Hirsch et al UK 0,00007 20(2);12(3) 5,555 6 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,95×10 ⁹ Eth Amsterdam) ¹⁴ I NCT0028017 20(2);12(3) 5,555 6 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,95×10 ⁹ Eth Amsterdam) ¹⁴ I NCT0028118 6(5(5) 5,555 6 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,95×10 ⁹ Eth Amsterdam) ¹⁴ I NCT0028118 6(5(5) 5,555 6 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,95×10 ⁹ Eth Amsterdam) ¹⁵ I NCT00284118 11(9);14(9) 6(12,606 6 BPHMCG (i) 2,95×10 ⁹ SFE BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 6(12,606 6 BPHMCG (i) 1,39×10 ⁹ SFE BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 6(12,606 6 BPHMCG (i) 1,30×10 ⁹ SFE BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 6(12,606 6 BPHMCG (i) 1,30×10 ⁹ SFE BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHMCG (i) 1,20×10 ⁹ SEE FOC (i) 2,91×10 ⁹ SEE FOC (i) 2,91×10 ⁹ SFE BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHMCG (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 5 12 12 BPHMCG (Chna) ¹⁷ Tendera et al (Casch) ¹⁶ I I NCT0028418 11(9);14(9) 5,55 3 32 14 BPHCG (Casch) ¹⁶	Silva et al (Brazil)**	YD YD	N	14 (/); 0 (4)	7.16;1.46	0.0		2.43×10°	SPECI, ecno, and MRI
Herbots et al (Regula) II NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55, 58 I BM-MMCs (i) 27 / 78 MM Cs (i) 57 (0° 57 m Cs (i) 57 (0° 57 m Cs (i) 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 57 (0° 58 (0° 56 (0° 56 (0° 56 (0° 57 (0° 5	Dill et al (Germany) ²⁷	=	NCT00279175	27 (24); 27 (25)	57.9; 54.6	8.2	BM-MNCs (ii)	З	Echo and MRI
Cao et al (People's UK UK 1 (39); 45 (42) 50.7; 51.0 7 BM-MNCs (i) 5×10° SFE Republic of China) ³ UK UK UK 12 (10); 12 (11) 521; 52.7 4.3 BM-MNCs (i) 13×10° SFE Republic of China) ³ UK UK UK 12 (10); 12 (11) 521; 52.7 4.3 BM-MNCs (i) 13×10° SFE Traverse at al (USA) ³ UK UK UK 31 (27); 14 (12) 499; 50; 4-6 BM-MNCs (i) 13×10° SFE Forestat UK UK UK UK 11 NCT00268307 32 (25); 65 (55) 55; 55 6 BM-MNCs (i) 33×10° SFE Forestat UK UK UK NCT00208307 56; 55 55; 55 7-10 BM-MNCs (i) 13×10° SFE Forestat I NCT002035186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (i) 13/9°10° SFE Safe et al I NCT002035186 65 (56); 67 (56)	Herbots et al (Belgium) ²⁸	=	NCT00264316	33 (27); 34 (28)	55; 58	_	BM-MNCs (ii)	4.76×10 ⁸	Echo and MRI
Republic of Chima ¹² Republic of Chima ¹² Republic of Chima ¹² BM-MMCs (i) 13×10 ⁶ 5FE Yao et al (Polandy ¹¹) UK UK 12(1) 521:52.7 4.3 BM-MMCs (i) 13×10 ⁶ 5FE Republic of Chima ¹⁰ UK UK UK 12(2); 14(12) 521:52.7 4.3 BM-MMCs (i) 12×10 ⁶ 5FE Traverse et al (Dshard) ¹¹ UK UK UK 12(2); 14(12) 52:55 4.75 BM-MMCs (i) 12/10 ⁶ Ech Traverse et al (Dshard) ¹¹ UK UK 23(5); 6(6) 52:55 7.10 BM-MMCs (i) 12/0 ⁶ 5FE Anstretan UK UK NCT00268307 30 (25); 0 (6) 55:55 7.10 BM-MMCs (i) 12/0 ⁶ 5FE Anstretan UK UK NCT00284316 6 (56); 67 (56) 55: 55 2.4 BM-MMCs (i) 12/0 ⁶ 5FE Anstretan UK NCT00384178 30 (25); 67 (56) 55: 55 2.4 BM-MMCs (i) 12/0 ⁶ 5FE	Cao et al (People's	N	NK	41 (39); 45 (42)	50.7; 51.0	7	BM-MNCs (ii)	5×10 ⁸	SPECT and echo
Yao et al (People's) UK UK 12 (10); 12 (11) 52.1; 52.7 4.3 BM-MNCs (i) 1.9×10* SPE Rapublic of China) ¹⁰ UK UK 11 (27); 14 (12) 49.9; 50; 4-6 BM-MNCs (i) 1.9×10* SPE Rapublic of China) ¹⁰ UK UK 11 (27); 14 (12) 49.9; 50; 5.5 4.75 BM-MNCs (i) 2.34×10* SPE Roncall et al (France) ¹⁰ UK UK 9(39); 65 (55) 5.5, 55 6 BM-MNCs (i) 2.98×10* FR Amsteadm) ⁴¹ UK UK 9(39); 65 (55) 55, 55 6 BM-MNCs (i) 2.98×10* FR Amsteadm) ⁴¹ UK UK 0(29); 12(29) 56, 55 56, 55 56 55 56	Republic of China) ²⁹								
Republic of China) ¹⁶ <	Yao et al (People's	NK	UK	12 (10): 12 (11)	52.1:52.7	4.3	BM-MNCs (ii)	1.9×10 ⁸	SPECT. echo. and MRI
Graphend UK 31 (27); 14 (12) 493; 503 4-6 BPH-MNCs (i) 2.33+(10° 5FE Traverse et al (USA) ¹³ 1 NCT00268307 30<(25); 10<(6)	Renthlic of China) ³⁰								
Constraction Cartor C		2		(01/ 11 .(20/ 10	40 0. EV 0	2 4		0177CC	CDECT 2562 224 MDI
Traverse et al (USA) ⁴ I NCT00208307 30 (23); 10 (6) 5.25; 57.5 4.75 BM-MNCs (ii) 11 (10) ⁶ Ech Hirsch et al (France) ¹³ UK VK 69 (58); 65 (56) 56; 55 5 5 5 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 11 (10) ⁶ Ech Hirsch et al UK VK 69 (58); 65 (56) 56; 55 5 5 5 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1130×10 ⁶ Ech Sürder et al UK VK 69 (58); 65 (56) 55; 55 5 5 8 BM-MNCs (ii) 133×10 ⁶ Ech BM-MNCs (ii) 133×10 ⁶ Ech 133×10 ⁶ Ech Ech Ech Ech Ech Ech 133×10 ⁶ Ech 1430 12:40 133×10 ⁶ Ech Ech 133×10 ⁶ Ech 133×10 ⁶ Ech 133×10 ⁶ Ech		20.		01 (2/); 14 (12) 00 00 10 10	47.7, 30.7	0-1		2.24×10	
Roncalli et al (France) ¹³ II NCT00200707 52 (42); 49 (44) 56; 55 7-10 BH-MNCs (ii) 933×107 594 Hirsch et al UK UK 05 (56); 67 (56) 56; 55 5 5 5 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 296×10 ⁶ Ech (Amsterdam) ¹⁴ I NCT00355186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 5 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁶ Ech (Amsterdam) ¹⁵ I NCT00355186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁶ Ech San Roman et al (Spain) ¹⁵ I NCT00385188 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁶ Ech Republic of China) ¹⁷ NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 55 7.9 BM-MNCs (ii) 17/0 ⁶ Ech Republic of China) ¹⁷ II NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 17/0 ⁶ Ech Republic of China) ¹⁷ UK UK 11(1) 10 (30) 55;	Traverse et al (USA) ³²		NCT00268307	30 (25); 10 (6)	52.5; 57.5	4.75	BM-MNCs (ii)	I×10 ⁸	Echo and MRI
Hirsch et al UK UK G (58); 65 (56) 56; 55 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 296×10 ⁹ Ech (Amsterdam) ³⁴ (Amsterdam) ³⁴ (Amsterdam) ³⁴ 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 295×10 ⁹ MRI (Amsterdam) ³⁴ (Svitzerlad) ³⁵ 6 55; 55 55; 55 55 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁹ Surder et al NCT0035186 65 (55); 67 (56) 65; 55 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁹ San Roman et al (Spain) ¹⁴ I NCT0034178 30 (29); 31 (29) 54; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 139×10 ⁹ SF Hu et al (People's I NCT00134181 11 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 178×10 ⁹ SF Hu et al (People's I NCT00134181 11 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 170 ⁹ SF Republic of China ³⁷ NCT00134181 11 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 170 ⁹ SF Republic of China ³⁷ NK UK </td <td>Roncalli et al (France)³³</td> <td>=</td> <td>NCT00200707</td> <td>52 (42); 49 (44)</td> <td>56; 55</td> <td>7–10</td> <td>BM-MNCs (ii)</td> <td>9.83×10⁷</td> <td>SPECT, echo, and MRI</td>	Roncalli et al (France) ³³	=	NCT00200707	52 (42); 49 (44)	56; 55	7–10	BM-MNCs (ii)	9.83×10 ⁷	SPECT, echo, and MRI
(Amsterdam) ⁴⁴ (Amsterdam) ⁴⁴ (Amsterdam) ⁴⁴ (Amsterdam) ⁴⁴ (Amsterdam) ⁴⁵ (BM-MNCs (ii) 1.59×10 ⁴ MRI Sürder et al 1 NCT00355186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ BF Swizerland) ¹³ (Swizerland) ¹³ 1 NCT0035186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ BF San Roman et al (Spain) ³⁴ 1 NCT00384178 30 (29); 31 (28) 54; 57 7,9 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ BF Hu et al (People's 1 NCT01234181 11 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.30 ⁹ 2.9×10 ⁹ BF Tendera et al (USA) ¹⁴ 1 NCT01234181 11 (19); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.30 ⁹ 2.9×10 ⁹ Ech Republic of China) ⁷⁷ 1 NCT00234318 80 (55); 40 (30) 55; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 1.9×10 ⁹ Ech Bystron et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK UK 10	Hirsch et al	Х	ЛК	69 (58); 65 (56)	56; 55	6	BM-MNCs (ii)	2.96×10 ⁸	Echo and MRI
Strider et al I NCT00355186 65 (56); 67 (56) 55; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.59×10 ⁹ MRI (Switzerland) ¹⁵ (Switzerland) ¹⁵ I NCT00355186 65 (56); 67 (56) 62; 55 24 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ SPE (Switzerland) ¹⁵ I NCT0038178 30 (29); 31 (28) 54; 57 7.9 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ SPE Hu et al (People's I NCT01234181 I (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.39×10 ⁹ SPE Republic of China) ¹⁷ NCT01234181 I (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.210 ⁹ SPE Republic of China) ¹⁷ II NCT00316381 80 (55); 40 (30) 55; 53 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.20 ⁹ Ech Maki et al (Finland) ¹⁹ UK UK UK 11 (1); 8(8) 56; 55 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.20 ⁹ FE Maki et al (Finland) ¹⁹ UK UK UK BM-MNCs (ii) 1.20 ⁹ 56; 55 1	(Amsterdam) ³⁴								
Surgerland ¹³ Start (Spain) ¹⁶ NCT00084178 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT00084178 Start (Spin) ¹⁶ NCT0084178 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT0084118 NCT0084118 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT0084118 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT0084118 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT0084118 NCT0084118 Start (Spin) ¹⁷ NCT008418	Siirder et al	_	NCT00355186	45 /54)· 47 /54)	קק. קא	v	RM-MNCs (ii)	1 59×10 ⁸	MRI
Concentratory- San Roman et al (Spain) ¹⁶ NCT00098178 30 (29); 31 (28) 54; 57 7.9 BM-MNCs (ii) 8.3×10' SPE Hu et al (Repole's Hu et al (People's Fundera et al (USA) ³⁸ II NCT0038178 30 (29); 31 (28) 54; 57 7.9 BM-MNCs (ii) 8.3×10' SPE Hu et al (People's Hu et al (DSA) ³⁸ II NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Tendera et al (USA) ³⁸ III NCT00316381 80 (51); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK UK 11 (11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCS (ii) 2.9×10 ⁶ SPE Bystroñ et al (Czech) ⁴¹ UK UK UK UK UK UK UK Ech BMSCS (ii) 1.5×10 ⁶ Ech Bystroñ et al (Czech) ⁴¹ UK UK SS 55 3.2 UK ECS (ii) 1.5×10 ⁶ Ech Massens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ UK UK UK <td< td=""><td></td><td>=</td><td></td><td>()), (), ()) () (5), (5), (5)</td><td>20, 20 20, EE</td><td></td><td></td><td>801~001</td><td></td></td<>		=		()), (), ()) () (5), (5), (5)	20, 20 20, EE			801~001	
San Roman et al (Spain)** II NCT00984178 30 (29); 31 (28) 54, 57 7.9 BM-MNCs (i) 8.3×10* SPE Hu et al (People's I NCT01234181 11 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 8.3×10* SPE Republic of China)** I NCT002316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10* SPE Republic of China)** II NCT00316381 80 (51); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10* SPE Republic of China)** UK UK II NCT00316381 80 (51); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.210* SPE Republic of China)** UK UK UK II II (11); 8 (8) 55; 55 3.2 II BMSCs (ii) 2.9×10* SPE Bystroň et al (Czech)** UK UK UK EF BMSCs (ii) 3.2×10* SPE SPE <td></td> <td>:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td></td> <td>21×70.1</td> <td></td>		:				12		21×70.1	
Hu et al (People's II NCT01234181 I1 (9); 14 (9) 61.2; 60.6 6 BM-MNCs (ii) 1×10 ⁸ SPE Republic of China) ³⁷ Tendera et al (USA) ³⁸ III NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁹ Ech Republic of China) ³⁷ UK UK UK II NCT00316381 80 (55); 40 (30) 58; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁹ Ech Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK UK UK II 1.95, 19 56; 55 3.2 UK Ech (ii) 1.9×10 ⁹ Ech Bystroñ et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK UK S6; 55 3.2 UK UK UK Ech (ii) 1.9×10 ⁹ Ech Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ II NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55.8; 57.9 7 BMSCs (ii) 0.1 Ech (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech (ii) 0.1 Ech (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech (ii) 2.9×10 ⁹ Ech (ii) 0.1 Ech (iii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech (ii) 2.9×10 ⁹ Ech (ii) 0.1 0.1 0.1	San Roman et al (Spain) ³ °	_	NCT00984178	30 (29); 31 (28)	54; 57	7.9	BM-MNCs (ii)	8.3×10′	SPECT, echo, and MRI
Republic of China) ³⁷ Republic of China) ³⁷ BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Tendera et al (USA) ³⁸ III NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 HSCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK II (11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 2.9×10 ⁶ SPE Bystroň et al (Zzech) ⁴⁰ UK UK II (11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 2.9×10 ⁶ SPE Bystroň et al (Zzech) ⁴⁰ UK UK UK S6; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Janssens et al (Zzech) ⁴¹ UK UK S6; 55 55.3; 57.9 7 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Xue (People's Republic UK UK S7, 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK S6, 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Plewka et al (People's UK UK S6, 56 3–11 BMSCs (i	Hu et al (People's	_	NCT01234181	11 (9); 14 (9)	61.2; 60.6	6	BM-MNCs (ii)	I×10 ⁸	SPECT, echo, and MRI
Tendera et al (USA) ³⁶ III NCT00316381 80 (56); 40 (30) 55; 59 7 BM-MNCs (ii) 1.78×10 ⁸ Ech Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK UK II (11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 1.9×10 ⁶ SPE Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK UK EPCs (ii) UK EPCs (ii) UK Ech Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ I NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 57; 57 UK EPCs (ii) UK Ech Xue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCS (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 55; 56 3–11 BMSCS (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Reublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCS (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ 57 Reublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCS (ii) 1.44×10 ⁸ Ech Reublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6	Republic of China) ³⁷								
Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK 11.9×10 ⁶ Bystroň et al (Finland) ³⁹ UK UK UK 11.(11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 2.9×10 ⁶ SPE Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK UK EPCs (ii) UK EC Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ II NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 57; 57 UK EPCs (ii) UK Ech Xue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 21/2; 157.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁹ Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SPE Renublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SPE	Tendera et al (USA) ³⁸	≡	NCT00316381	80 (56); 40 (30)	55; 59	7	BM-MNCs (ii)	1.78×10 ⁸	Echo and MRI
Mäki et al (Finland) ^{3*} UK UK UK II (11); 8 (8) 56; 55 3.2 HSCs (ii) 2.9×10* SPE Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK 50 (39); 50 (38) 57; 57 UK EPCs (ii) UK Ech Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴¹ I NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55.8; 57.9 V EPCs (ii) UK Ech Vue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10* Ech Vue (People's Republic UK UK 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10* Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 55, 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10* Ech Roublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10* SPE				80 (51); 40 (30)	58; 59	7	HSCs (ii)	1.9×10 ⁶	
Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴⁰ UK UK EPCs (ii) UK Etch Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ I NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55.8; 57.9 7 BMSCs (ii) 3.2×10' Ech Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ I NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55.8; 57.9 7 BMSCs (ii) 3.2×10' Ech Xue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10 ⁶ Ech of China) ⁴² UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 56; 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10 ⁸ Ech Roublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SFI	Mäki et al (Finland) ³⁹	UK	UK	11 (11); 8 (8)	56; 55	3.2	HSCs (ii)	2.9×10 ⁶	SPECT, echo, and MRI
Janssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹ I NCT00264316 33 (27); 34 (28) 55.8; 57.9 7 BMSCs (ii) 3.2×10' Ech Xue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10° Ech of China) ⁴² UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10° Ech Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 56; 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10° Ech Gao et al (People's UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10° SPE Reublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10° SPE	Bystroň et al (Czech) ⁴⁰	Х	NK	50 (39): 50 (38)	57: 57	UK	EPCs (ii)	Х	Echo
Xue (People's Republic UK UK 6 (5); 6 (4) 57.7; 57.5 12–14 BMSCs (ii) 1.5×10° Ech of China) ⁴² of China) ⁴² UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 56; 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10° Ech Gao et al (Poople's UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10° SPE Reublic of China) ⁴⁴ UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10° SPE	lanssens et al (Czech) ⁴¹	_	NCT00264316	33 (27): 34 (28)	55.8: 57.9	7	BMSCs (ii)	3.2×10 ⁷	Echo and MRI
of China) ⁴² of China) ⁴³ UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 56; 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10 ⁸ Ech Gao et al (People's UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SPE Reublic of China) ⁴⁴	Xiie (People's Republic	1.IK	IIK	6 (5): 6 (4)	577.575	12-14	BMSCs (ii)	1.5×10^{8}	Echo
Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³ UK UK 38 (26); 18 (14) 56; 56 3–11 BMSCs (ii) 1.44×10 ⁸ Ech Gao et al (People's UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SPE Reublic of Chinal ⁴⁴	of China) ⁴²								
Gao et al (People's UK UK 21 (21); 22 (19) 55.0; 58.6 17.1 BMSCs (ii) 3.08×10 ⁶ SPE Renublic of China) ⁴⁴	Plewka et al (Poland) ⁴³	LIK	1.1K	38 (26): 18 (14)	56: 56	3-11	BMSCs (ii)	1.44×10^{8}	Echo
Gaule tai (reoptes on $\Delta r = \frac{1}{2} (x_1), x_2 (r_2) = 33.0, 39.0 r.1.1$					EE O. EO Z	171		2 00~106	CDECT orbo and MDI
Kepublic of China)**		20	20	ZI (ZI); ZZ (IZ)	0.00, 00.0	1.7.1		-01×00.0	
	Republic of China)**								

of 204 patients. The percentage of male study participants ranged from 55% to 93%. Time from STEMI to cell delivery ranged from 1 day to 24 days. The average ages of enrolled patients were between 50.7 years and 62 years. In all of the trials, stem cell therapy was evaluated in STEMI patients with BM-MNCs in 22 studies,^{17–38} HSCs in two studies,^{38,39} EPCs in one study,⁴⁰ and bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells (BMSCs) in four studies.^{41–44} The number of stem cells injected ranged from 2.9×10^6 to 5×10^8 . The routes of stem cells injection used were all intracoronary injection, which is the most promising way of transplantation.

Left ventricular ejection fraction Three to 4 months LVEF

Information on the 3-month to 4-month LVEF improvementbased SPECT was available from seven trials.^{22,25,26,28,31,33,34} These seven trials contained a total of 423 patients, of whom 230 patients received stem cell treatment, and 193 control patients did not receive stem cell therapy. The WMD of changes in LVEF (%) of patients receiving stem cell treatment was a no-significant increase of -0.11% (95% CI -2.03-1.82, P>0.05, P=70%) compared with that of the controls (Figure 2A). In five studies that reported 3-month to 4-month LVEF-based echocardiography (echo), the WMD of changes in LVEF was 2.76% (95% CI 0.90–4.62, P<0.01). And the corresponding P was 67% (Figure 2B). In two studies^{20,35} that reported 3-month to 4-month LVEF-based magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), the WMD of changes in LVEF was 2.02% (95% CI 0.71–3.32, P=0.002, P=0%; Figure 2C).

Six-month LVEF

Information on the 6-month LVEF improvement-based SPECT was available from seven trials,^{17,25,26,30,31,37,39} including a total of 273 patients (149 of whom received stem cell treatment; Figure 2). The WMD of changes in LVEF (%) of patients receiving stem cell treatment was a no-significant increase of 2.91% (95% CI –0.15–5.96, P>0.05, I^2 =80%) compared with that of the control group. In nine studies that reported 6-month LVEF-based echo, the WMD of changes



Figure 2 (Continued)

В	Study or subgroup	Stem o Mean	cells SD	Total	Contro Mean	ol SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, random, 95% CI	Mean c randon	liffere n, 95%	nce IV, 6 CI	
	LVEF mean change	s from	baseliı	ne to 3-	-4-mont	th follo	w-up wi	th echo					
	Cao et al ²⁹	5.9	1.9	41	4.9	2.22	45	9.7	1.00 (0.13, 1.87)		÷		
	Dill et al ²⁷	4.9	6.3	27	-0.3	6.1	27	3.6	5.20 (1.89, 8.51)		-		
	Janssens et al41	3.4	6.9	30	2.2	7.3	30	3.2	1.20 (-2.39, 4.79)		+-		
	Schächinger et al ²⁰	5.5	7.3	95	3	6.5	92	6.4	2.50 (0.52, 4.48)		-		
		11	3.04	6	4.83	3.98	6	2.7	6.17 (2.16, 10.18)				
	Subtotal (95% CI)			199			200	25.6	2.76 (0.90, 4.62)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2$. Test for overall effect	69; χ²=1 : Z=2.90	12.21, d 0 (<i>P</i> =0	df=4 (P .004)	=0.02);	l²=67%							
	LVEF mean change	s from	baseliı	ne to 6-	month	follow-u	up with	echo					
	Cao et al ²⁹	9.4	2.1	41	7.1	2.34	45	9.5	2.30 (1.36, 3.24)		•		
	Gao et al44	4.2	0.8	19	3.1	0.8	20	10.6	1.10 (0.60, 1.60)				
	Ge et al ¹⁸	4.8	6.07	10	-1.9	5.15	10	2.0	6.70 (1.77, 11.63)				
	Guo ²¹	6.8	4.4	11	0.8	5.3	10	2.6	6.00 (1.81, 10.19)				
	Huang et al ²³	7.1	3	20	2.9	2.6	20	7.0	4.20 (2.46, 5.94)		-		
	Huikuri et al ²⁴	4	11.3	39	-1.4	10.1	38	2.1	5.40 (0.62, 10.18)				
	Lunde et al ¹⁷	3.1	7.9	50	2.1	9.2	50	3.5	1.00 (–2.36, 4.36)		+		
	Plewka et al43	5	4.43	38	9	6.32	18	3.7	-4.00 (-7.24, -0.76)		-		
	Tendera et al ³⁸	3	10.1	80	-1	4.1	40	5.0	4.00 (1.45, 6.55)		-		
	Tendera et al ³⁸	2	9.8	80	-1	4.1	40	5.1	3.00 (0.50, 5.50)		- <u>-</u>		
	Subtotal (95% CI)			388			291	51.0	2.58 (1.27, 3.90)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2$. Test for overall effect	61; χ²=4 : Z=3.8	41.42, d 5 (<i>P=</i> 0	df=9 (P .0001)	<0.0000	01); <i>I</i> ² =7	8%						
	LVEF mean change	s from	baseliı	ne to 12	2-month	n follow	-up with	1 echo					
	Cao et al ²⁹	9.2	2.69	41	6	2.62	45	9.0	3.20 (2.08, 4.32)				
	Dill et al ²⁷	6.2	5.6	27	-0.4	6.4	27	3.7	6.60 (3.39, 9.81)		-		
	Gao et al44	4.5	0.7	19	3.2	0.7	20	10.7	1.30 (0.86, 1.74)		- H		
	Subtotal (95% CI)			87			92	23.4	3.15 (1.01, 5.29)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2$. Test for overall effect	85; χ²=1 t: Z=2.89	18.88, d 9 (<i>P=</i> 0	df=2 (P .004)	<0.0001); <i>I</i> ²=89	%						
	Total (95% CI)			674			583	100	2.59 (1.83, 3.35)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=1$.	36; χ ² =7	72.52, 0	df=17 (F	><0.000	001); /²=	77%			+	_ <u> </u>		-+-
	Test for overall effect	: Z=6.6	5 (P<0	.00001)		,,				-50 -25	0	25	50
			- (,						Stem cells		Control	
С	Study or subgroup	Stem Mean	cells SD	Total	Contr Mean	ol SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, random, 95% CI	Mean c randor	liffere n, 95%	nce IV, 6 CI	
	LVEF mean change	s from	Daseili	ne to 3-	-4-mon		w-up wi						
	Schächinger et al ²⁰	5.5	7.3	95	3	6.5	92	21.3	2.50 (0.52, 4.48)		-		
	Sürder et al ³⁵	1.4	6.4	58	-0.4	7.21	60	19.5	1.80 (–0.66, 4.26)		-		
	Sürder et al ³⁵	1.1	5.84	49	-0.4	7.21	60	19.6	1.50 (–0.95, 3.95)		<u>.</u>		
	Subtotal (95% CI)			202			212	60.4	2.02 (0.71, 3.32)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$. Test for overall effect	00; χ²=0 t: Z=3.03).43, <i>di</i> 3 (<i>P</i> =0	f=2 (<i>P</i> = .002)	0.81); <i>I</i> ²	=0%							
	LVEF mean change	s from	baseliı	ne to 6-	month	follow-i	up with	MRI					
	Lunde et al17	1.2	7.5	45	4.3	7.1	44	17.4	-3.10 (-6.13, -0.07)		-		
	Mever et al ¹⁹	6.7	6.5	30	0.7	8.1	30	15.0	6.00 (2.28, 9.72)		- 		
	Traverse et al ³²	6.2	9.8	30	9.4	10	10	7.2	-3.20 (-10.32, 3.92)	-			
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0.2	0.0	105	0		84	39.6	0.11 (-6.58, 6.80)		\bullet		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=29$	9.19; χ²=	=14.78,	df=2 (I	P=0.000	06); <i>I</i> ²=8	6%				Ť		
	lest for overall effect	t: Z=0.03	3 (P=0	.97)									
	Total (95% CI)			307			296	100	1.31 (–0.94, 3.56)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=5$.	16; $\chi^2 = 1$	17.17, (df=5 (P	=0.004)	; <i>I</i> ²=71%	, 0				<u> </u>		<u>_</u>
	Test for overall effect	t: Z=1.14	4 (<i>P</i> =0	.25)						-50 -25	U	25	50
										Stem cells		Control	

Figure 2 Forest plots of weighted mean difference, with 95% Cl in LVEF in patients undergoing stem cell therapy and controls.

Notes: (A) LVEF-based SPECT, (B) LVEF-based echo, and (C) LVEF-based MRI. Random-effect models (Mantel-Haenszel method) were used. Each trial is represented by a square, and the size of the square is proportional to the information in that trial. The ends of the horizontal bars denote 95% CIs. Black diamond gives the overall results of all trials.

Abbreviations: Cl, confidence interval; echo, echocardiography; IV, inverse variance; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; SPECT, single-photon-emission computed tomography.

in LVEF was 2.58% (95% CI 1.27–3.90, P < 0.01, P=78%). Three studies^{17,19,32} measured LVEF with MRI at 6 months. Pooled analysis of these data did not show a significant improvement in STEMI patients receiving stem cell therapy (WMD 0.11, 95% CI –6.58–6.80, P>0.05, P=86%).

Twelve-month LVEF

Information on the 12-month LVEF improvement-based SPECT was available from five trials,^{25,30,31,36,37} which contained a total of 184 patients (100 of whom received stem cell treatment; Figure 2). Stem cell therapy led to 12-month

1

LVEF of 4.51% improvement (95% CI 2.36–6.66, P<0.01, P=67%) in STEMI patients. Three studies^{27,29,44} measured LVEF with echo at 12 months. Pooled analysis of these data showed a significant improvement in STEMI patients receiving stem cell therapy (WMD 3.15, 95% CI 1.01–5.29, P<0.01, P=89%; Figure 2).

Left ventricular end-systolic volume and left ventricular end-systolic volume index

WMD of changes in LVESV and LVESVI at 3–4 months was -6.42 mL (95% CI –11.34 to –1.49, *P*=0.01, *P*=80%) and –1.70 mL (95% CI –5.18–1.78, *P*>0.05, *P*=0%). In nine trials that reported 6-month outcomes, the WMD of changes in LVESV was –3.78 mL (95% CI –7.50 to –0.07, *P*=0.05, *P*=92%).^{24,25,29–32,37,38,44 In two studies that reported}

6-month outcomes, the WMD of changes in LVESVI was –2.56 mL (95% CI –8.58–3.46, P>0.05, I^2 =0%).^{19,39} Information on the 12-month LVESV was available form eight trials.^{25,27,29–31,36,37,44} These eight trials contained a total of 363 patients (187 of whom received stem cell treatment and 176 controls who did not receive). The WMD of changes in LVESV was –8.50 mL (95% CI –13.30 to –3.70, P<0.01, I^2 =91%; Figure 3).

Left ventricular end-diastolic volume and left ventricular end-diastolic volume index

WMD of changes in LVEDV and LVEDVI at 3–4 months was -6.61 mL (95% CI –12.54 to –0.69, *P*=0.03, *P*=76%) and –2.03 mL (95% CI –6.03–1.96, *P*>0.05, *P*=0%).

UVESV mean changes from baseline to 3-4-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁶ -8.1 5.04 41 -5.9 5.1 45 5.3 -2.20 (-4.34, -0.06) Dil et al ²⁷ 0.4 2.3.4 27 9.1 22.9 22 3.3 -8.70 (-21.05, 3.65) Grajek et al ¹³ 3.5 13.01 31 12.24 24.86 14 2.0 -8.74 (-22.54, 5.06) Herbots et al ²⁶ -9 4 20 6 7 20 -1.10.0 (-18.53, -11.47) Penicka et al ²⁶ -0 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 -6.20 (-12.0, -0.30) Surder et al ³⁶ 7 30.97 56 18 27.86 60 2.9 -11.00 (-20.78, -1.20) Subtotal (95% CI) 367 362 29.4 -6.42 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: r ² =36.82; z ³ =40.47, dF8 (P<0.00001); P=80% Test for overall effect: Z=-255 (P=0.01) Test for overall effect: Z=-255 (P=0.01) Test for overall effect: Z=-255 (P=0.01) Test for 0.033, 36 -2.7 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) -2.60 (-12.6, 7.24) -2.60 (-13.4, 0.24) Test for 0.03, 2.53) Test for 0.03, 36	Study or subgroup	Stem Mean	cells SD	Total	Contro Mean	ol SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, random, 95% CI	Mean difference IV, random, 95% Cl
Cao et al ¹⁶ 0.4 23.4 27 9.1 22.9 27 2.3 -8.70 (-21.05, 3.65) Grajek et al ¹⁷ 3.5 13.01 31 12.24 24.86 14 2.0 -8.74 (-22.54, 5.06) Herbots et al ¹⁸ 4 19 32 7 17 34 3.2 -3.00 (-11.72, 57.2) Herbots et al ¹⁸ 4 19 32 7 17 34 3.2 -3.00 (-11.74, 57.2) Penicka et al ²⁹ -9 4 20 6 7 20 5.0 -15.00 (-18.53, -11.47) Penicka et al ²⁹ -9 4 20 6 7 20 5.0 -15.00 (-18.63, -11.40) Schächinger et al ²⁰ -0.6 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 -6.20 (-12.10, -0.30) Subtotel (95% cl) 367 362 29.4 -1.00 (-20.78, -1.22) Subtotel (95% cl) 367 362 29.4 -6.42 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: r ¹ =36.82; $r^{3}=40.47$, $df=8$ (P<0.00001); $P=80\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.55 (P=0.01) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ¹⁹ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Tavarese et al ³⁰ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 25.3) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hukusin et al ²⁴ -01 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 17.9) Helvelzin et al ¹⁹ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-18.04, -8.96) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁹ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotel (95% cl) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: r ² =27.00; $r^{2}=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $P=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ¹⁹ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -2.36 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ¹¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ¹⁹ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -2.30 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ¹⁰¹ -0.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ¹⁰² -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -2.360 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ¹⁰¹ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ¹⁰¹ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.41, -0.44) Subtotal (95% Cl) 17 7 20 4.9 -2.00.0(-2.87, 7, -16.23) Foto ders ¹⁰⁵ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.41, -3.49) Heterogeneity: r	LVESV mean chan	aes fro	m basel	line to 3	3–4-moi	nth follo	au-wa			
Dill et al ²⁷ 0.4 23.4 27 9.1 22.9 27 2.3 -8.70 (-21.05, 365) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.5 13.01 31 12.24 24.86 14 2.0 -8.74 (-22.54, 5.06) Herbots et al ²³ 4 19 32 7 17 34 3.2 -3.00 (-11.72, 5.72) Meluzin et al ²³ 4.1 7 14 2 16.8 10 2.0 1.10 (-12.60, 14.80) Schächinger et al ²³ 1.1 7 14 2 16.8 10 2.0 1.10 (-12.60, 14.80) Schächinger et al ²³ 1.7 30.97 58 18 27.86 60 2.7 -1.00 (-11.64, 9.64) Surder et al ²⁵ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.7 -1.00 (-20.78, -1.22) Subtoal (95% C) 367 362 29.4 -6.42 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=36.82$; $r^{2}=40.47$, df=8 ($P<0.00001$); $P=80\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.55$ ($P=0.01$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁶ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Test for overall effect: $Z=2.55$ ($P=0.01$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁶ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Test for overall effect: $Z=2.55$ ($P=0.01$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁶ -1.3 2, 5.2 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ²⁷ -1.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 19 -2.170 (-36.12, -7.28) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Traverse et al ²⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ²⁹ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-26.50, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $r^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $P=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁶ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) The det al ²⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ²¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.42, 2.66) Hu et al ²⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ²¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.42, 2.66) Hu et al ²⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.3	Cao et al ²⁹	-8.1	5.04	41	-5.9	5.1	45	5.3	-2.20 (-4.34, -0.06)	-
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Grapk et al}^{11} & 3.5 & 13.01 & 31 & 12.24 & 24.86 & 14 & 2.0 & -8.74 (-22.54, 5.06) \\ \mbox{Herbos et al}^{118} & 4 & 19 & 32 & 7 & 17 & 34 & 3.2 & -3.00 (-11.72, 5.72) \\ \mbox{Herbos et al}^{118} & -9 & 4 & 20 & 6 & 7 & 20 & 5.0 & -15.00 (-18.53, -11.47) \\ \mbox{Penicka et al}^{12} & -3.1 & 17 & 14 & 2 & 16.8 & 10 & 2.0 & 1.10 (-12.60, 14.80) \\ \mbox{Surder et al}^{118} & 17 & 30.97 & 58 & 18 & 27.86 & 60 & 2.7 & -1.00 (-11.64, 9.64) \\ \mbox{Surder et al}^{118} & 17 & 30.97 & 58 & 18 & 27.86 & 60 & 2.9 & -11.00 (-20.78, -1.22) \\ \mbox{Surder et al}^{118} & 17 & 30.97 & 58 & 18 & 27.86 & 60 & 2.9 & -11.00 (-20.78, -1.22) \\ \mbox{Surder et al}^{118} & 7 & 24.19 & 49 & 18 & 27.86 & 60 & 2.9 & -11.00 (-20.78, -1.22) \\ \mbox{Surder et al}^{118} & 12 & 4.52 & 41 & -7.8 & 5.15 & 45 & 5.3 & -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) \\ \mbox{Test for overall effect: Z=2.55 (P=0.01) \\ \mbox{LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up \\ \mbox{Cao et al}^{12} & -13.2 & 4.52 & 41 & -7.8 & 5.15 & 45 & 5.3 & -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) \\ \mbox{Hu et al}^{12} & -11.1 & 20.8 & 11 & 10.6 & 14.4 & 14 & 1.9 & -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) \\ \mbox{Hu et al}^{12} & -11.1 & 20.8 & 11 & 10.6 & 14.4 & 14 & 1.9 & -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) \\ \mbox{Hu lux in et al}^{12} & -10 & 30.3 & 36 & -1.2 & 11.5 & 36 & 2.7 & -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) \\ \mbox{Hu lux in et al}^{12} & -10 & 30.3 & 36 & -1.2 & 11.5 & 36 & 2.7 & -8.80 (-13.9, 1.79) \\ \mbox{Hu lux in et al}^{12} & -7 & 3.3 & 30 & -2 & 8.4 & 10 & 4.4 & -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -7 & 3.3 & 30 & -2 & 8.4 & 10 & 4.4 & -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -3.5 & 1.95 & 12 & -2.5 & 2.16 & 12 & 5.4 & -1.60 (-2.6, 0.2, 0.90) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -3.8 & 4.55 & 41 & -7.1 & 5.31 & 45 & 5.3 & -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -3.8 & 4.55 & 41 & -7.1 & 5.31 & 45 & 5.3 & -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -3.8 & 4.55 & 41 & -7.1 & 5.31 & 45 & 5.3 & -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) \\ \mbox{Traverse et al}^{12} & -3.8 & 4.55 & 41 & -7.1 & 5.31 & 45$	Dill et al ²⁷	0.4	23.4	27	9.1	22.9	27	2.3	-8.70 (-21.05, 3.65)	
Herbots et al ²⁸ 4 19 32 7 17 34 3.2 $-3.00(-11.72, 5.72)$ Heluzin et al ²⁹ -9 4 20 6 7 20 5.0 $-15.00(-18.5, -11.47)$ Penicka et al ²² 3.1 17 14 2 16.8 10 2.0 $1.10(-12.60, 14.80)$ Schächinger et al ²⁹ -0.6 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 $-6.20(-12.0, -0.30)$ Schächinger et al ²⁹ -0.6 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 $-6.20(-12.0, -3.0)$ Surder et al ³⁵ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 $-11.00(-12.60, 14.80)$ Surder et al ³⁵ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 $-11.00(-20.78, -1.22)$ Subtotal (95% CI) 367 362 29.4 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 $-5.40(-7.44, -3.36)$ Sao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Gao et al ⁴⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 124.19 14 2.0 $-12.81(-26.43, 0.81)$ 1U et al ²⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 $-21.70(-36.12, -7.28)Hukuri et al35 -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00(-13.40, -9.96)Traverse et al32 -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00(-12.4, 7.24)Fendera et al36 4 11 80 -3 5 40 4.7 -3.00(-12.4, 7.24)Fradera et al36 4 11 80 -3 5 40 4.7 -3.00(-12.4, 7.24)Fraderas et al32 -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00(-12.4, 0.34)Traverse et al32 -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00(-12.40, 0.34)Traverse et al32 -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00(-10.26.50, 0.65)Subtotal (95% CI) -360 251 41.7 -3.78(-7.50, -0.07)Heterogeneity: t^{-2}27.0t, t^{2}=10.57, df=9(P<0.0001); P=92\%East for overall effect: 2=2.00 (P=0.05)LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-upCao et al59 -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70(-8.78, -4.62) -7.40Heterogeneity: t^{-2}2.22t, t^{-2}=9.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); P=92\%East for overall effect: 2=2.00 (F=0.05)LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-upCao et al59 -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70(-8.78, -4.62) -7.40Heterogeneity: t^{-2}=2.22t, t^{-2}=9.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); P=92\%East for overall effect: Z=2.00 (F=0.05)LOTESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-upCao et al59 -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.4 -1.60(-3.34, 0.14) -1.28, -1.200(-2.$	Graiek et al ³¹	3.5	13.01	31	12.24	24.86	14	2.0	-8.74 (-22.54, 5.06)	
	Herbots et al ²⁸	4	19	32	7	17	34	3.2	-3.00 (-11.72, 5.72)	_ _
Penicka et al^{12} 3.1 17 14 2 16.8 10 2.0 1.10 (-12.60, 14.80) Schachniger et al^{10} -0.6 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 -6.20 (-12.10, -0.30) Subtract et al^{15} 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 -11.00 (-20.78, -1.22) Subtract et al^{15} 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 -11.00 (-20.78, -1.22) Subtract et al^{15} 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 -4.2 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: $r^{2}=36.82; \chi^{2}=40.47, df=8 (P<0.00001); l^{2}=80% Test for overall effect: Z=2.55 (P=0.01) VESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al^{15} -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36)Sao et al^{4} -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53)Gao et al^{4} -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53)Graigk et al^{13} 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81)ut et al^{17} -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 19 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28)Unikuri et al^{24} -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79)Weluzin et al^{24} -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.40, -9.96)Findera et al^{18} 0 18 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87)Fraverse et al^{12} -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.24, 7.24)Findera et al^{18} 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87)Fraverse et al^{12} -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.24, 0.04)Subtract (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07)Heterogeneity: r^{2}=27.00; r^{2}=109.57, df=9 (P<0.00001); l^{2}=92\%Feast for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05)VESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-upCao et al^{16} -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62)Dill et al^{17} -5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.60, 0.2.90)Sao et al^{44} -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14)Gao et al^{16} -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14)Gao et al^{16} -6.8 13.7 11 1.68 26.7 14 1.6 -23.80 (-3.97, 6, -7.44)Weluzin et al^{12} -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23)San Roman et al^{16} -3.8 (2.7 44 1.05 2.00 5.4 -5.00 (-13.60, -3.70)Heterogeneity: r^{2}=22.21; \chi^{2}=9.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l^{2}=93\%Feator ove$	Meluzín et al ²⁵	-9	4	20	6	7	20	5.0	-15.00 (-18.53, -11.47)	-
Schächinger et al ¹⁰ -0.6 19 95 5.6 22 92 4.2 -6.20 (-12.10, -0.30) Surder et al ¹³ 17 30.97 58 18 27.86 60 2.7 -1.00 (-1.164.9.64) Surder et al ¹³ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 -1.00 (-20.78, -1.22) Subtotal (95% CI) 367 362 29.4 -6.42 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2-36.82; r^2=40.47, df=8 (P<0.00001); l^2=80\%$ Test for overall effect: $z=2.55 (P=0.01)$ LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ¹³ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ¹⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.33, 2.53) Gao et al ¹⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.33, 2.53) Grapk et al ¹³ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ¹⁶ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Hukuri et al ²⁶ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.6) Tendera et al ¹⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ¹⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ¹² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -4.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ¹⁰ -5.1 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-26.50, 0.55) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00; r^2=109.57, df=9 (P<0.00001); l^2=92%$ Test for overall effect: $z=2.00 (P=0.05)$ LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ¹² -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 2.67 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ¹⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-28.77, -16.23) Gao et al ¹⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 2.06 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grapk et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ¹⁷ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.36, 0.80) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.21; r^2=99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $z=3.47 (P=0.0005)$ Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22; r^2=27.761, df=26 (P<0.00001); l^2=91\%$	Penicka et al22	3.1	17	14	2	16.8	10	2.0	1.10 (-12.60, 14.80)	
Sürder et al ³⁵ 17 30.97 58 18 27.86 60 2.7 $-1.00(-11.64, 9.64)$ Sürder et al ³⁶ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 $-11.00(-20.78, -1.22)$ Well tetrogeneity: $r^2=36.82$; $r^{2}=40.47$, $df=8$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=80\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.55 (P=0.01) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ³⁷ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Grajek et al ³³ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-2643, 0.81) Hu et al ³⁷ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.100 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ⁵⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $r^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ⁴⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Cao et al ⁴⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Tendera et al ³⁸ 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.20$; $r^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ⁴⁹ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ⁴⁹ -3 5 20 217 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Ta al 45\% CI) 817 7 72 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Subtotal (95% CI) 817 7 72 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Ta al 916 -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22$; $r^2=277.61$, $df=26$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Schächinger et al20	-0.6	19	95	5.6	22	92	4.2	-6.20 (-12.10, -0.30)	
Sürder et al ³⁵ 7 24.19 49 18 27.86 60 2.9 $-11.00(-20.78, -1.22)$ Subtotal (95% CI) 367 362 29.4 $-6.42(-11.34, -1.49)$ Heterogeneity: $r^2=36.82$; $r^{2=4}0.47$, $df=8$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^{2=80\%}$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.55$ ($P=0.01$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ²³ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.32, 2.53) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Huikuri et al ²⁵ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-13.99, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-13.99, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Traverse et al ²⁹ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁶ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 -7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ²⁹ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -0.0 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.03$; $r^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.11 2.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -32.80 (-3.976, -7.44) Meluzin et al ³⁶ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -32.60 (-3.96, 0.77, -6.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 17 7 17 20.4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Traverse et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.21; r^2=99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l^2=91\%$	Sürder et al35	17	30.97	58	18	27.86	60	2.7	-1.00 (-11.64, 9.64)	
Subtotal (95% CI) 367 362 29.4 -6.42 (-11.34, -1.49) Heterogeneity: r^2 =36.82; χ^2 =40.47, dr =8 (P<0.00001); I^2 =80% Test for overall effect: Z =2.55 (P=0.01) LVESV mean changes from baselline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ⁴² -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ³⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Traverse et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³⁸ -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: r^2 =27.00; χ^2 =109.57, dr =9 (P<0.00001); I^2 =92% Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baselline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ⁴⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) - Dill et al ⁹⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.60, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 2.0 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ⁹⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-9.3.76, -7.44) Huet al ⁹⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.9.76, -7.44) Huet al ⁹⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 17 7 20 4.9 -2.000 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ⁴⁶ -3 5 20 17 7 7 20 4.9 -2.000 (-23.77, -16.23) Total (95% CI) 187 T7 27 61, dr =26 (P<0.00001); I^2 =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: r^2 =22.22; χ^2 =227.61, dr =26 (P<0.00001); I^2 =93%	Sürder et al35	7	24.19	49	18	27.86	60	2.9	-11.00 (-20.78, -1.22)	
Heterogeneity: $r^2=36.82$; $\chi^2=40.47$, $dr=8$ ($P<0.00001$); $I^2=80\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.55$ ($P=0.01$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ¹²⁹ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ¹⁴¹ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Grajek et al ³¹¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ²⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁸ -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $dr=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $I^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁰ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -22.80 (-3.9.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ³⁶ -3 2.6 2.6 2 2.4 24 2.0 -5.00 (0.29.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 T7 ($P=0.00001$); $I^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.21$; $\chi^2=27.61$, $dr=26$ ($P<0.00001$); $I^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.22$; $\chi=27.77$ 61, $dr=26$ ($P<0.00001$); $I^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=3.47$ ($P=0.0005$)	Subtotal (95% CI)			367			362	29.4	-6.42 (-11.34, -1.49)	•
LVESV mean changes from baseline to 6-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 $(-7.44, -3.36)$ Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 $(-9.32, 2.5)$ 36 Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 $-72.64.3, 0.81$) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 $(-19.39, 1.79)$ Meluzin et al ²⁸ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 $(-18.04, -9.96)$ -7 Traverse et al ³⁹ -3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 $(-10.34, 0.34)$ -7 Traverse et al ³⁹² -7 3.3 30 -2 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 $(-265, 0.65)$ -7 7 35.3 7 18 -7.00 7 $3.$	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=3$ Test for overall effect	86.82; χ ² ct: Z=2.5	=40.47, 55 (<i>P</i> =0.	<i>df</i> =8 (/ 01)	₽<0.000	01); /²=8	80%			
Cao et al ²⁹ -13.2 4.52 41 -7.8 5.15 45 5.3 -5.40 (-7.44, -3.36) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ³⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁸ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tradera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 $3.00 (-1.24, 7.24)$ Tendera et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 4.7 $3.00 (-1.24, 7.24)$ Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.6 $(-5.401.00 (-2.65, 0.65))$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9 (P<0.00001)$; $l^2=92\%$ Tea et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Traverse et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.42, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.42, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.36, -7.44) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.36, -7.44) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.36, -7.44) Hu et al ³⁶ -3 2.6 2.6 2 2.4 2.4 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Ya oet al ³⁶ -3 1.2 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 T76 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7 (P<0.00001)$; $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 ($P=0.0005$) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	LVESV mean chan	ges fro	m basel	line to	6-month	n follow	-up			
Gao et al ⁴⁴ -3.9 2.5 19 -4.7 3 20 5.4 0.80 (-0.93, 2.53) Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ³⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁶ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁶ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% Cl) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) - Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ⁵⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-2.3.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ⁹⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 20 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=3.47$ ($P=0.0005$) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22$; $\chi^2=277.61$, $df=26$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=91\%$	Cao et al ²⁹	-13.2	4.52	41	-7.8	5.15	45	5.3	-5.40 (-7.44, -3.36)	+
Grajek et al ³¹ 3.2 14.15 31 16.01 24.19 14 2.0 -12.81 (-26.43, 0.81) Hu et al ³⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% Cl) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) - Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) - Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) - San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ⁶⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, -0.04) Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.22$; $\chi^2=27.7.61$, $df=26$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=91\%$	Gao et al44	-3.9	2.5	19	-4.7	3	20	5.4	0.80 (-0.93, 2.53)	t
Hu et al ³⁷ -11.1 20.8 11 10.6 14.4 14 1.9 -21.70 (-36.12, -7.28) Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Huikuri et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $r^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Gao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Gao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 7.7 7 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ⁶⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.13, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21$; $r^2=99.48$, $df=7$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 ($P=0.0005$) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22$; $r^2=277.61$, $df=26$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=91\%$	Grajek et al ³¹	3.2	14.15	31	16.01	24.19	14	2.0	–12.81 (–26.43, 0.81)	
Huikuri et al ²⁴ -10 30.3 36 -1.2 11.5 36 2.7 -8.80 (-19.39, 1.79) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 3.00 (-1.24, 7.24) Tendera et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% Cl) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00; \chi^2=109.57, df=9 (P<0.00001); l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Total (95% Cl) -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³² -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-33.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21; \chi^2=99.48, df=7$ (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22; \chi^2=277.61, df=26$ (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Hu et al ³⁷	-11.1	20.8	11	10.6	14.4	14	1.9	–21.70 (–36.12, –7.28)	
Meluzín et al ²⁵ -5 6 20 9 7 20 4.8 -14.00 (-18.04, -9.96) Tendera et al ³⁸ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 $3.00 (-1.24, 7.24)$ Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00; \chi^2=109.57, df=9 (P<0.00001); l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00 (P=0.05)$ LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁵ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.976, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21; \chi^2=99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.22; \chi^2=277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l^2=91\%$	Huikuri et al ²⁴	-10	30.3	36	-1.2	11.5	36	2.7	-8.80 (-19.39, 1.79)	
Tendera et al ³³ 0 18 80 -3 5 40 4.7 $3.00(-1.24, 7.24)$ Tendera et al ³³ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ⁵⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.00; χ^2 =109.57, df=9 (P<0.00001); l ² =92% Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Meluzín et al ²⁵	-5	6	20	9	7	20	4.8	-14.00 (-18.04, -9.96)	
Tendera et al ³⁸ 4 11 80 -3 5 40 5.1 7.00 (4.13, 9.87) Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $r^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Bubtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $r^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=3.47$ ($P=0.0005$) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Φ	Tendera et al38	0	18	80	-3	5	40	4.7	3.00 (–1.24, 7.24)	
Traverse et al ³² -7 3.3 30 -2 8.4 10 4.4 -5.00 (-10.34, 0.34) Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ ($P=0.05$) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ ($P<0.00001$); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=3.47$ ($P=0.0005$) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) + 000 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Tendera et al ³⁸	4	11	80	-3	5	40	5.1	7.00 (4.13, 9.87)	-
Yao et al ³⁰ -3.5 1.95 12 -2.5 2.16 12 5.4 -1.00 (-2.65, 0.65) Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Traverse et al ³²	-7	3.3	30	-2	8.4	10	4.4	-5.00 (-10.34, 0.34)	
Subtotal (95% CI) 360 251 41.7 -3.78 (-7.50, -0.07) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=2.00 (P=0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) - Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-3.97,6, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) - San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 20 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Yao et al ³⁰	-3.5	1.95	12	-2.5	2.16	12	5.4	–1.00 (–2.65, 0.65)	.*
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.00$; $\chi^2=109.57$, $df=9$ (<i>P</i> <0.00001); $l^2=92\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=2.00$ (<i>P</i> =0.05) LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) - Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzin et al ²⁶ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) - San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7$ (<i>P</i> <0.00001); $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=3.47$ (<i>P</i> =0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Subtotal (95% CI)			360			251	41.7	–3.78 (–7.50, –0.07)	•
LVESV mean changes from baseline to 12-month follow-up Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); I ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2$ Test for overall effective	27.00; χ^2 ct: Z=2.0	² =109.57 00 (<i>P</i> =0.	7, <i>df</i> =9 .05)	(<i>P</i> <0.00	001); <i>I</i> ²:	=92%			
Cao et al ²⁹ -13.8 4.55 41 -7.1 5.31 45 5.3 -6.70 (-8.78, -4.62) Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 -12.00 (-26.90, 2.90) Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	LVESV mean chan	ges fro	m basel	line to	12-mont	th follow	w-up			
Dill et al ²⁷ 5.8 17.7 27 17.8 35.3 27 1.8 $-12.00(-26.90, 2.90)$ Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 $-1.60(-3.34, 0.14)$ Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 $-8.89(-20.44, 2.66)$ Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 $-23.60(-39.76, -7.44)$ Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 $-20.00(-23.77, -16.23)$ San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 $-5.00(-18.86, 8.86)$ Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 $-1.60(-3.16, -0.04)$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 $-8.50(-13.30, -3.70)$ Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90(-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Cao et al ²⁹	-13.8	4.55	41	-7.1	5.31	45	5.3	-6.70 (-8.78, -4.62)	÷
Gao et al ⁴⁴ -5.6 3 19 -4 2.5 20 5.4 -1.60 (-3.34, 0.14) Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 -8.89 (-20.44, 2.66) Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Dill et al ²⁷	5.8	17.7	27	17.8	35.3	27	1.8	–12.00 (–26.90, 2.90)	
Grajek et al ³¹ 10.12 12.83 31 19.01 20.29 14 2.4 $-8.89 (-20.44, 2.66)$ Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 $-23.60 (-39.76, -7.44)$ Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 $-20.00 (-23.77, -16.23)$ San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 $-5.00 (-18.86, 8.86)$ Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 $-1.60 (-3.16, -0.04)$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 $-8.50 (-13.30, -3.70)$ Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=32.21$; $\chi^2=99.48$, $df=7 (P<0.00001)$; $l^2=93\%$ Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 $-5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)$	Gao et al44	-5.6	3	19	-4	2.5	20	5.4	–1.60 (–3.34, 0.14)	-
Hu et al ³⁷ -6.8 13.7 11 16.8 26.7 14 1.6 -23.60 (-39.76, -7.44) Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% Cl) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% Cl) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Grajek et al ³¹	10.12	12.83	31	19.01	20.29	14	2.4	-8.89 (-20.44, 2.66)	+
Meluzín et al ²⁵ -3 5 20 17 7 20 4.9 -20.00 (-23.77, -16.23) San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df =7 (P <0.00001); l^2 =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P =0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df =26 (P <0.00001); l^2 =91%	Hu et al ³⁷	-6.8	13.7	11	16.8	26.7	14	1.6	-23.60 (-39.76, -7.44)	<u> </u>
San Roman et al ³⁶ -3 26 26 2 24 24 2.0 -5.00 (-18.86, 8.86) Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	Meluzín et al ²⁵	-3	5	20	17	7	20	4.9	-20.00 (-23.77, -16.23)	
Yao et al ³⁰ -6.1 1.83 12 -4.5 2.06 12 5.4 -1.60 (-3.16, -0.04) Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df=7 (P<0.00001); l ² =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df=26 (P<0.00001); l ² =91%	San Roman et al ³⁶	-3	26	26	2	24	24	2.0	-5.00 (-18.86, 8.86)	
Subtotal (95% CI) 187 176 28.8 -8.50 (-13.30, -3.70) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df =7 (P<0.00001); l^2 =93% Test for overall effect: Z=3.47 (P=0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df =26 (P<0.00001); l^2 =91%	Yao et al ³⁰	-6.1	1.83	12	-4.5	2.06	12	5.4	-1.60 (-3.16, -0.04)	
Heterogeneity: τ^2 =32.21; χ^2 =99.48, df =7 (P <0.00001); I^2 =93% Test for overall effect: Z =3.47 (P =0.0005) Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, df =26 (P <0.00001); I^2 =91%	Subtotal (95% CI)			187			176	28.8	-8.50 (-13.30, -3.70)	◆
Total (95% CI) 914 789 100 -5.90 (-8.31, -3.49) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=27.22$; $\chi^2=277.61$, $df=26$ (P<0.00001); $l^2=91\%$	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=3$ Test for overall effect	82.21; χ ² ct: <i>Ζ</i> =3.4	=99.48, 7 (<i>P</i> =0.	<i>df</i> =7 (<i>l</i> 0005)	P<0.000	01); /²=9	93%			
Heterogeneity: τ^2 =27.22; χ^2 =277.61, <i>df</i> =26 (<i>P</i> <0.00001); <i>l</i> ² =91%	Total (95% CI)			914			789	100	-5.90 (-8.31, -3.49)	•
-30 -23 0	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2$	27.22; χ^2	=277.61	1, <i>df=</i> 26	6 (<i>P</i> <0.0	0001); <i>I</i>	² =91%			-50 -25 0 25
		JI. ∠-4.0	ы (r <0.	00001)						Stom collo Control

Figure 3 (Continued)

В	Study or	Stem o	cells	Total	Contro	bl	Total	Weight	Mean difference IV,		Mean	differe	nce IV,	
	subgroup	wear	30	Total	wean	3D	Total	(%)	lixed, 95% CI		nxea,	95% C		
	LVESVI mean chan	iges fro	m base	line to	3–4-mo	nth foll	ow-up							
	Hirsch et al34	-0.5	13.4	67	1.2	11.7	60	47.7	-1.70 (-6.07, 2.67)			-		
	Janssens et al41	-1.1	11.2	30	0.6	11.6	30	27.3	-1.70 (-7.47, 4.07)					
	Subtotal (95% CI)			97			90	74.9	-1.70 (-5.18, 1.78)			•		
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=0$ Test for overall effect	.00, <i>df=</i> :t: <i>Z</i> =0.9	1 (P=1) 6 (P=0)	00); /²= 34)	0%									
	LVESVI mean char	iges fro	m base	line to	6-mont	h follov	v-up							
	Meyer et al19	-0.6	14.9	30	2	11.1	30	20.5	-2.60 (-9.25, 4.05)					
	Mäki et al39	11.5	11.6	11	13.9	17.9	8	4.5	-2.40 (-16.57, 11.77)		_		-	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			41			38	25.1	-2.56 (-8.58, 3.46)			\bullet		
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=0$ Test for overall effect	.00, <i>df=</i> :t: <i>Z</i> =0.8	1 (P=0) 3 (P=0)	.98); /²= 40)	0%									
	Total (95% CI)			138			128	100	-1.92 (-4.93, 1.10)					
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=0$ Test for overall effect	.06, <i>df=</i> :t: <i>Z</i> =1.2	3 (P=1) 5 (P=0)	00); /²= 21)	0%					↓ 50	-25	0	25	 50
	Test for subgroup di	fference	es: χ²=0	.06, <i>df</i> =	1 (P=0.	81); <i>I</i> ² =	0%			s	tem cells		Control	

Figure 3 Forest plots of WMD with 95% Cl in patients undergoing stem cell therapy and controls in LVESV (A) and LVESVI (B). Note: Random- and fixed-effect models were used.

Abbreviations: WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; LVESV, left ventricular end-systolic volume; LVESVI, left ventricular end-systolic volume Index.

In ten trials that reported 6-month outcomes, the WMD of changes in LVEDV was -2.75 mL (95% CI -6.58-1.08, P>0.05, $I^2=86\%$).^{17,24,25,29-32,37,38,44} In two studies that reported 6-month outcomes, the WMD of changes in LVEDVI was 2.71 mL (95% CI -5.18-10.59, P>0.05, $I^2=43\%$).^{19,39} Information on the 12-month LVEDV was available form nine trials.^{17,25,27,29-31,36,37,44} These trials included a total of 452 patients (232 of whom received stem cell treatment and 220 controls who did not receive). The WMD of changes in LVEDV was -5.39 mL (95% CI -9.71 to -1.06, P=0.01, $I^2=79\%$; Figure 4).

Wall mean score index

Pooled analysis of three trials with measurement of 3-month to 4-month WMSI did not show statistic significance with stem cell treatment patients compared with the controls, and the WMD of WMSI changes was -0.02 (95% CI -0.14-0.10, P>0.05, $l^2=71\%$). Pooled analysis was also performed on six trials at 6 months.^{29,31,37,39,43,44} The WMD of WMSI changes was statistically significant, which was -0.03 (95% CI -0.05to -0.01, P=0.01, $l^2=12\%$). Information on the 12-month WMSI improvement was available from five studies,^{29,31,36,37,44} which included a total of 245 patients (128 of whom received stem cell treatment; Figure 5). And the WMD of WMSI changes was statistically significant, which was -0.04 (95% CI -0.06 to -0.01, P=0.01, $l^2=24\%$).

Infarct size

Pooled analysis of three trials with measurement of 3-month to 4-month IS did not show statistical significance with stem cell treatment patients compared with controls, and the WMD of IS changes was -0.03 (95% CI -0.24-0.19, P > 0.05, P=0%). Pooled analysis was performed on four trials at 6 months. The WMD of IS changes was not statistically significant, which was -0.56 (95% CI -2.88-1.77, P > 0.05, P=72%). Information on the 12-month IS improvement was available from three trials,^{29,30,36} which included a total of 160 patients (79 of whom received stem cell treatment). And the WMD of IS changes was statistically significant, which was -2.22 (95% CI -3.28 to -1.15, P < 0.01, P=0%; Figure 6).

Toxicity and adverse reactions

The AEs of patients were summarized in Table 2, including death,^{20,32–38} cardiac death,^{33,40} reinfarction,^{20,32–36,38,40} rehospitalization for heart failure (HF),^{20,32–37} target-vessel revascularization,^{20,32,35,37} stent thrombosis,^{20,33,37,40} stroke,^{34,37,38} and artythmia.^{20,33,36} Because some side effects occurred less frequently, we analyzed only the common adverse effects in this meta-analysis. No significant differences were found in the rates of AEs between stem cell treatment and control groups (Table 2 and Figure S2).

Discussion

Each year, ~17 million people die from cardiovascular diseases worldwide, more than half of which are due to AMI.^{1,3,45} Traditional revascularization and drug treatment are used currently to prevent the deterioration of cardiac function that emerged after AMI, while the effects were limited. Hence, how to make the damaged myocardium cell regeneration becomes the urgent problem to be

Α	Study or subgroup	Stem Mean	cells SD	Total	Contro Mean	ol SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, random, 95% Cl		Mean diffe random, 9	rence IV, 5% CI	
	LVEDV mean change	ges fror	n basel	ine to 3	–4-mon	th follo	w-up						
	Cao et al ²⁹	-1.7	7.77	41	-0.2	7.02	45	5.6	-1.50 (-4.64, 1.64)		-		
	Dill et al27	8.5	28.6	27	13.9	28.1	27	2.0	-5.40 (-20.52, 9.72)			_	
	Grajek et al ³¹	9.19	19.1	31	15.72	30.97	14	1.6	-6.53 (-24.09, 11.03)			n	
	Herbots et al ²⁸	20	27	32	26	28	34	2.3	-6.00 (-19.27, 7.27)			_	
	Meluzín et al ²⁵	0	6	20	16	8	20	5.2	-16.00 (-20.38, -11.62)				
	Penicka et al ²²	5.5	20.59	14	7.4	18.68	10	1.8	–1.90 (–17.72, 13.92)				
	Schächinger et al ²⁰	12	31	95	14	33	92	3.4	–2.00 (–11.18, 7.18)			_	
	Sürder et al ³⁵	27	33.14	58	27	31.41	60	2.7	0.00 (–11.66, 11.66)				
	Sürder et al ³⁵	10	27.02	49	27	31.41	60	2.9	-17.00 (-27.97, -6.03)				
	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: τ^2 =5 Test for overall effec	1.10; χ ^{2:} t: <i>Ζ</i> =2.1	=33.72, 9 (<i>P</i> =0.0	367 df=8 (F 03)	°<0.000 1); /²=76	362 %	27.5	-6.61 (-12.54, -0.69)		•		
	LVEDV mean chang	ges fror	n basel	ine to 6	6-month	follow-	up						
	Cao et al ²⁹	-3.2	6.95	41	1.5	7.1	45	5.6	-4.70 (-7.67, -1.73)		-		
	Gao et al44	4.3	3.9	19	-1.5	5.6	20	5.6	5.80 (2.78, 8.82)			-	
	Grajek et al31	2.54	20.47	31	13.65	28.36	14	1.7	-11.11 (-27.62, 5.40)			_	
	Hu et al ³⁷	-16.2	31.6	11	9.1	17.3	14	1.2	-25.30 (-46.06, -4.54)				
	Huikuri et al ²⁴	5.4	37.1	36	8.2	34.3	36	1.7	-2.80 (-19.30, 13.70)				
	Lunde et al17	-11.2	36	50	-1.8	17.6	50	2.9	-9.40 (-20.51, 1.71)				
	Meluzín et al ²⁵	8	8	20	13	9	20	4.8	-5.00 (-10.28, 0.28)				
	Tendera et al ³⁸	8	17	80	6	3	40	5.4	2.00 (-1.84, 5.84)		4	-	
	Tendera et al ³⁸	12	13	80	6	3	40	5.6	6.00 (3.00, 9.00)				
	Traverse et al ³²	-4	22	30	17	11	10	3.1	-21.00 (-31.41, -10.59)				
	Yao et al ³⁰	-2	2.92	12	-1.5	1.83	12	5.9	-0.50 (-2.45, 1.45)		4		
	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2^{-1}$	7.06; χ^{2}	=69.64,	410 <i>df</i> =10 (P<0.000	001); /²=	301 86%	43.5	-2.75 (-6.58, 1.08)		•		
		t: Z=1.4	1 (<i>P</i> =0.1	10)	0								
	LVEDV mean chang	ges fror	n basei	Ine to 1	2-mont		/-up	5.0	F F0 (0 00 0 00)				
	Cao et al ²⁹	-5.1	6.89	41	0.4	7.89	45	5.6	-5.50 (-8.62, -2.38)		-		
	Dill et al ²⁷	17.9	20.3	27	31.7	44.2	27	1.5	-13.80 (-32.15, 4.55)			-	
	Gao et al	0.8	5	19	1.2	4.7	20	5.6	-0.40 (-3.45, 2.65)		1		
	Grajek et al	18.56	29.44	31	19.52	41.56	14	1.0	-0.96 (-25.07, 23.15)				
	Hu et al ³⁷	6.9	22.62	11	17.8	43.5	14	0.8	-10.90 (-37.32, 15.52)	-			
	Lunde et al"	-0.9	34.3	45	-2.8	20	44	2.7	-4.10 (-15.73, 7.53)			_	
	Meluzin et al ²³	1	1	20	23	9	20	4.9	-16.00(-21.00, -11.00)				
	San Roman et al.	12	51	20	12	32	24	1.0	0.00(-23.41, 23.41)				
		-3.5	2.88	12	-2.6	1.87	12	5.9	-0.90 (-2.84, 1.04)				
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=2^{-1}$ Test for overall effect	1.77; χ²: t: Ζ=2 .4	=37.54, 4 (<i>P</i> =0.0	<i>df</i> =8 (<i>F</i> 01)	°<0.0000	1); <i>I</i> ²=7	9%	29.0	-5.39 (-9.71, -1.06)		•		
	Total (95% CI)	0 50:2	-171 00	1,009	(D <0.00	001). /2	883	100	-4.67 (-7.25, -2.09)		•		
	Test for overall effect	t: Z=3.5	5 (<i>P</i> =0.0	, <i>01=</i> 28 0004)	(P<0.00	1001), 7-	-04%			-50	-25 0	25 Control	50
D								M	N	30	eni cens	Control	
D	study or S subgroup N	tem cel lean	is SD 1	otal	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	fixed, 95% Cl		fixed, 95%	CI	
	LVEDVI mean chan	ges fro	m base	line to	3–4-mor	th follo	w-up						
	Hirsch et al ³⁴ 5	.4 ′	13.4 6	67	8.2	13.5	60	57.8	-2.80 (-7.49, 1.89)		-		
	Janssens et al ⁴¹ 2	.8.	15.2 3	80	2.8	15	30	21.7	0.00 (-7.64, 7.64)		-+		
	Subtotal (95% CI)		9	7			90	79.6	-2.03 (-6.03, 1.96)		•		
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=0$. Test for overall effect	.37, <i>df=</i> t: <i>Z</i> =1.0	1 (P=0.9 0 (P=0.3	54); /²=(32)	0%								
	LVEDVI mean chan	ges fro	m base	line to	6-month	follow	-up						
	Meyer et al ¹⁹ 7	.6 2	20 3	80	3.4	11.1	30	19.0	4.20 (-3.99, 12.39)		+	-	
	Mäki et al ³⁹ 1	2	20.1 1	1	17.4	38.6	8	1.5	-16.40 (-45.67, 12.87)				
	Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=1$. Test for overall effect	.77, <i>df=</i> t: <i>Z</i> =0.6	4 1 (P=0.1 7 (P=0.5	1 1 18); /²=4 50)	43%		38	20.4	2.71 (–5.18, 10.59)				
	Total (95% CI)		. 1	38			128	100	-1 07 (-4 63 2 50)				
	Heterogeneity: $v^2=3$	25 df=	3 (P=0 1	36) /2=	8%		. 20	100					
	Test for overall effec	t: Z=0.5	9 (P=0.5	56)	- / -				-	-50	-25 0	25	50
	Test for subgroup dif	ference	s: χ²=1.	11, <i>df=</i>	1 (<i>P</i> =0.2	9); <i>I</i> ²=9	5%			St	em cells	Control	

Figure 4 Forest plots of WMD with 95% CI in patients undergoing with stem cell therapy and controls in LVEDV (A) and LVEDVI (B).

Note: Random- and fixed-effect models were used.

Abbreviations: WMD, weighted mean difference; Cl, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; LVEDV, left ventricular end-diastolic volume; LVEDVI, left ventricular end-diastolic volume index.



Figure 5 Effect of stem cell treatment on WMSI.

Note: Random-effect models were used.

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; WMSI, wall mean score index.

solved recently. Stem cell-based therapies seem to be one of the most promising solutions. If the transplanted stem cells could successfully differentiate into myocardial cells and had the contractility of cardiac muscle fibers, which then could improve the heart function for AMI patients.^{45–47} Transplanted stem cells secrete various cytokines, growth factors and vascular endothelial growth factors, thereby promoting the proliferation of cells and the regeneration of vascular.^{48,49} In addition, the expression of heat shock protein 32 and heat shock protein 70 is also increased by the transplanted stem cells, which could promote the recovery of cardiac muscle cell function.50 Our systemic review assessed the efficacy and safety of the stem cell treatment application in STEMI patients in multicountry based on the analysis of LVEF, LVESV, LVESVI, LVEDV, LVEDVI, WMSI, IS, and AEs. In this study, data indicate the significant improvement in LVEF, LVESV, LVEDV, WMSI, and IS after stem cell treatment, whereas there was no significant improvement in LVESVI and LVEDVI after stem cell transplantation compared with the controls.

Several important findings were revealed in this metaanalysis. We first demonstrated that stem cell therapy could significantly increase the 12-month LVEF (based SPECT); the 3-month to 4-month, 6-month, and 12-month LVEF (based echo); and the 3-month to 4-month LVEF (based MRI) in STEMI patients compared with the control group (P < 0.01; Figure 2). No significant increase was found in 6-month LVEF (based MRI; P=0.97). Only the positive trend was proved to be existed. Currently, the use of MRI to detect LVEF is considered as the gold standard.^{51,52} In this analysis, 46.4% of all trials use echo, while only 17.9% of all trials use MRI. Our logistic regression results showed that stem cell therapy could significantly increase long-term (12 months) LVEF (>3.15%) in STEMI patients. The effects of stem cell therapy on short-term (3 months to 4 months and 6 months) LVEF still need to be incorporated into larger number of patients.

Second, the 3-month to 4-month, 6-month, and 12-month LVESV showed favorable results in the stem cell therapy group compared with the control group ($P \le 0.05$, Figure 3).

Study or subgroup	Stem o Mean	cells SD	Total	Contro Mean	SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, random, 95% CI	Mean difference IV, random, 95% CI
Infarct size mean o	changes	from ba	aseline	to 3–4-m	onth fo	llow-up			
Cao et al ²⁹	-10.1	3.37	41	-10.4	2.54	45	11.3	0.30 (-0.97, 1.57)	+
Penicka et al22	26.3	11.08	14	25.7	12.49	10	0.4	0.60 (-9.08, 10.28)	
Roncalli et al33	-1.3	8.52	52	-0.7	6.84	49	3.3	-0.60 (-3.61, 2.41)	+
Sürder et al35	0.6	0.76	58	0.5	0.9	67	22.9	0.10 (-0.19, 0.39)	+
Sürder et al35	0.3	0.84	49	0.5	0.9	60	22.5	-0.20 (-0.53, 0.13)	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			214			231	60.4	-0.03 (-0.24, 0.19)	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$	0.00; $\chi^2 = 2$	2.21, df=	=4 (P=0.	70); / ² =0	%				
Test for overall effect	ct: Z=0.2	3 (<i>P</i> =0.8	31)						
Infarct size mean o	changes	from ba	aseline	to 6-mor	nth follo	w-up			
Cao et al ²⁹	-11.8	2.82	41	-11.6	2.58	45	12.6	-0.20 (-1.35, 0.95)	+
Lunde et al17	-11	12.7	50	-7.8	8.7	50	1.8	-3.20 (-7.47, 1.07)	
Mäki et al39	0.4	3.6	11	-5.3	6.7	8	1.2	5.70 (0.59, 10.81)	
Yao et al ³⁰	-4	2.33	12	-1.8	2.16	12	7.4	-2.20 (-4.00, -0.40)	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			114			115	23.0	-0.56 (-2.88, 1.77)	♦
Heterogeneity: τ^2 =3 Test for overall effect	5.48; χ ² = ct: Z=0.4	10.76, di 7 (<i>P</i> =0.6	f=3 (P=0 64)	0.01); <i>I</i> ²=	72%				
Infarct size mean o	changes	from ba	aseline	to 12-mc	onth foll	ow-up			
Cao et al ²⁹	-14.7	2.82	41	-12.5	2.63	45	12.5	-2.20 (-3.36, -1.04)	-
San Roman et al ³⁶	12	9	26	12	8	24	1.5	0.00 (-4.71, 4.71)	+
Yao et al ³⁰	-6.2	3.8	12	-2.7	4.6	12	2.7	-3.50 (-6.88, -0.12)	
Subtotal (95% CI)			79			81	16.6	-2.22 (-3.28, -1.15)	*
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$ Test for overall effect	0.00; χ^{2} = ct: Z=4.0	1.41, <i>df</i> = 8 (<i>P</i> <0.0	=2 (<i>P</i> =0. 0001)	50); /²=0	%				
Total (95% CI)			407			427	100	-0.55 (-1.13, 0.04)	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$.37; χ²=3	31.38, <i>d</i> i	f=11 (<i>P</i> =	=0.0010);	I2=65%			-	+ + + +
Test for overall effect	ct: Z=1.8	3 (<i>P</i> =0.0	07)					-	-50 -25 0 25 5
									Stem cells Control

Figure 6 Effect of stem cell treatment on IS. Note: Random-effect models were used.

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; IV, inverse variance; IS, infarct size.

Table	2	Pooled	adverse	outcome	data
I able	2	Pooled	adverse	outcome	data

Outcome	Studies	Events stem	Events	Odds ratio	95% CI	P-value
	reporting	cell treatment	control			
Death						
3–6 months	9	9/556	6/455	1.25	0.49-3.14	0.64
12–18 months	3	2/142	7/148	0.33	0.08-1.40	0.13
Cardiac death						
3–6 months	2	4/102	3/99	1.30	0.28-5.95	0.74
Reinfarction						
3–6 months	9	11/595	15/491	0.61	0.30-1.25	0.17
12–18 months	2	2/131	5/134	0.68	0.01-39.75	0.85
HF hospitalization						
3–6 months	7	6/396	9/375	0.69	0.27-1.79	0.45
12–18 months	3	6/142	6/148	1.15	0.14-9.29	0.90
Target-vessel revascul	arization					
3–6 months	5	20/275	27/261	0.69	0.38-1.28	0.24
12–18 months	2	16/112	24/117	0.62	0.31-1.25	0.18
Stent thrombosis						
3–6 months	4	5/214	5/216	0.98	0.29-3.26	0.97
12–18 months	2	1/112	3/117	0.33	0.03-3.26	0.34
Stroke						
3–6 months	4	0/240	0/159	-	-	_
Arrhythmia						
3–6 months	2	6/153	6/152	0.99	0.31-3.15	0.99
12–18 months	2	11/131	11/134	1.03	0.42-2.53	0.95

Abbreviations: Cl, confidence interval; HF, rehospitalization for heart failure.

LVEDV also significantly decreased at 3-month to 4-month and 12-month follow-up compared with the controls ($P \le 0.05$, Figure 4). LVESV and LVEDV are two surrogate markers for left ventricular adverse remodeling. No significant increase was found in LVESVI and LVEDVI (P > 0.05), and only the positive trend was proved to be existed. Mechanistically, ventricular enlargement is mainly due to the suddenly increased loading conditions after AMI, which leads to a series of reparative changes including the expansion of ventricle after programmed cell death, the formation of discrete collagen scars, and the myocardial hypertrophy in noninfarct area.²⁹ Therefore, logistic regression helps us to conclude that stem cell treatment significantly limits LVESV increase and averts progressive LVEDV expansion in STEMI patients.

Furthermore, as one of the secondary end points, our analysis showed significant reduction in 6-month WMSI and 12-month WMSI in STEMI patients treated with stem cells compared with controls. WMSI serves as a well-characteristic indicator for the local systolic function of the heart. Tao et al reported that MSC could significantly decrease the WMSI in animals 10 weeks after AMI.53 Santoso et al54 also reported that the 3-month WMSI was decreased significantly from 1.57 at baseline to 1.37 after peripheral blood stem cell treatment. Stem cell therapy did not significantly decrease 3-month to 4-month WMSI in our meta-analysis (P > 0.05). This result might be due to the sparse number of patients counted in this study. Thereby, we have concluded based on logistic regression that stem cell therapy has a significant effect on WMSI (both long term and short term) in patients with STEMI.

In addition, our analysis showed a significant change in 12-month IS, which decreased in STEMI patients with the treatment of stem cells compared with controls. Changes in IS are commonly used to quantify the left ventricular function. Recently, research by Chen et al⁵⁵ on EPCs transplantation in AMI reported that after AMI, the expression of endothelial nitric oxide synthases was beneficial to deterioration prevention, infarcted size reduction, and the improvement in heart function by promoting the formation of blood vessels. In another trial, the decrease of IS in repeated BM-MNCs administration group was more significant than in single BM-MNCs administration control group. This finding suggests that the number and frequency of cell transplantation may play a key role in therapeutic efficacy to AMI patients.³⁰ In the trial of Cao et al,²⁹ the BM-MNC therapy did not further improve the myocardial viability of the infarcted area as assessed by SPECT 4 years after transplantation. Thus, the effects of stem cell therapy on IS still need to be incorporated into larger number of patients and longer follow-up.

Although great results were received in both AMI animal models and clinical studies using stem cell transplantation treatment, there are still some problems that need to be explored and settled in the future. First, what kinds of cell types are suitable for cell transplantation? At present, bone marrow-derived stem cell usage, which took up to 80% of the total stem cell therapy trials for AMI patients. Bone marrowderived stem cell is a group of hybrid cells, mainly including BM-MNCs, HSCs, BMSCs, etc. BM-MNCs have their own advantages, such as large reserves and simple separation process; however, the inflammatory reaction aggravation of myocardium by mixing a large number of white blood cells limits its performance. We believe that the higher purity of stem cells, the better treatment effect will be achieved.56,57 Second, the "NICH" that guarantee stem cells differentiate into cardiomyocytes? Microenvironment (named "NICH") is believed to affect stem cell differentiation, but the regulation mechanism of stem cell differentiation into cardiomyocytes remains unclear. Furthermore, the best timing for stem cell transplantation is also a critical point to be taken into account. The period of heart inflammation peaks 1–3 days after AMI, which might reduce the survival of the transplanted stem cells. The vessel wall in the infarct area forms ~20 days later after AMI, preventing the migration of transplanted stem cells. The secretion of growth factors such as vascular endothelial growth factor reaches its highest level on the seventh day after AMI. Hence, the best time point for stem cell transplantation is ~1 week after AMI.17,25-27,33

In summary, our meta-analysis demonstrates that stem cell therapy post-STEMI results in significant improvements in LVEF, LVESV, LVEDV, WMSI, and IS for STEMI patients with low rates of side effects.

Limitations

Although this meta-analysis showed that stem cells therapy is effective for STEMI patients, it also has certain contraindications. The 28 clinical trials in this systemic review were conducted in 13 countries, and not all trials were multicenter clinical research, so the results could not be extended to all STEMI patients around the world. Other factors might affect the outcome of this analysis, such as the total sample size, the follow-up time, and the process of stem cells transplantation. Second, some good efficacy clinical trials were excluded because they were not RCTs or for other reasons. So the effectiveness of the stem cells therapy might be underestimated. In addition, it should be stressed the conclusions of this meta-analysis are confirmed only to BM-MNCs, HSCs, EPCs, and BMSCs transfer after STEMI. The effectiveness of other stem cell types remains to be studied. Thus, future better design randomized multicenter clinical trials are required to develop and maximize the clinical potential of stem cell therapy.

Future perspectives

In the near future, stem cell therapy could potentially offer substantial benefits for STEMI patients. But before that, there are still many issues regarding the methodology of transplanting cells, treatment mechanism, and safety, which need to be solved. First, we need to definitively address the precise molecules and pathways, including microenvironment improvement and cell homing. Furthermore, we still need to identify the best cell types, explore the best cell culture condition and number, choose the best cell infusion method, and select the most appropriate outcome measures for stem cell therapy. In addition, we also need to select the ideal target patients. At last, with the continuous progress that is being made in biotechnology, the future stem cell therapy for heart disease patients will move toward individualized treatment.

Conclusion

Taken together, the results suggest that stem cell therapy has great potential as an efficacious clinical therapy for the treatment of STEMI patients after percutaneous coronary intervention. The results of these clinical trials are very promising and additional studies have to be performed with a more rigorous, larger sample size validation before stem cell therapy could be used in clinical practice.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the authors of the original clinical trials. Rong Li and Xiao-Ming Li are co-first authors of this work.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

- Carville SF, Henderson R, Gray H. The acute management of STsegment-elevation myocardial infarction. *Clin Med (Lond)*. 2015; 15(4):362–367.
- Yee J, Rajpurohit N, Khan MA, Stys A. Review of acute coronary syndromes: diagnosis and management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction. S D Med. 2015;68(8):357–361.
- Guimarães PO, Tricoci P. Ticagrelor, prasugrel, or clopidogrel in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: which one to choose? *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. 2015;16(13):1983–1995.

- Afzal MR, Samanta A, Shah ZI, et al. Adult bone marrow cell therapy for ischemic heart disease: evidence and insights from randomized controlled trials. *Circ Res.* 2015;117(6):558–575.
- Menendez ME, Memtsoudis SG, Opperer M, Boettner F, Gonzalez Della Valle A. A nationwide analysis of risk factors for in-hospital myocardial infarction after total joint arthroplasty. *Int Orthop.* 2015;39(4): 777–786.
- Moran AE, Tzong KY, Forouzanfar MH, et al. Variations in ischemic heart disease burden by age, country, and income: the Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors 2010 study. *Glob Heart*. 2014;9(1): 91–99.
- Moran AE, Forouzanfar MH, Roth GA, et al. The global burden of ischemic heart disease in 1990 and 2010: the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. *Circulation*. 2014;129(14):1493–1501.
- 8. Lavall MC, Bagatini MD, Thomé GR, et al. Extracellular hydrolysis of adenine nucleotides and nucleoside adenosine is higher in patients with ST elevation than Non-ST elevation in acute myocardial infarction. *Clin Lab.* 2015;61(7):761–767.
- Kook HY, Jeong MH, Oh S, et al. Current trend of acute myocardial infarction in Korea (from the Korea Acute Myocardial Infarction Registry from 2006 to 2013). *Am J Cardiol.* 2014;114(12):1817–1822.
- Gnavi R, Rusciani R, Dalmasso M, et al. Gender, socioeconomic position, revascularization procedures and mortality in patients presenting with STEMI and NSTEMI in the era of primary PCI. Differences or inequities? *Int J Cardiol.* 2014;176(3):724–730.
- Sun D, Narsinh K, Wang H, et al. Effect of autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells transplantation in diabetic patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;167(2):537–547.
- Yu CW, Choi SC, Hong SJ, et al. Cardiovascular event rates in patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction were lower with early increases in mobilization of Oct4(high)Nanog(high) stem cells into the peripheral circulation during a 4-year follow-up. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013; 168(3):2533–2539.
- 13. Porto I, De Maria GL, Leone AM, et al. Endothelial progenitor cells, microvascular obstruction, and left ventricular remodeling in patients with ST elevation myocardial infarction undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention. *Am J Cardiol.* 2013;112(6):782–791.
- Miettinen JA, Salonen RJ, Ylitalo K, et al. The effect of bone marrow microenvironment on the functional properties of the therapeutic bone marrow-derived cells in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *J Transl Med.* 2012;10:66.
- Zimmet H, Porapakkham P, Porapakkham P, et al. Short- and longterm outcomes of intracoronary and endogenously mobilized bone marrow stem cells in the treatment of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis of randomized control trials. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2012;14(1):91–105.
- https://www.clinicaltrials.gov [homepage on the Internet]. ClinicalTrials. gov. Available from: https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/. Accessed June 21, 2016.
- Lunde K, Solheim S, Aakhus S, et al. Intracoronary injection of mononuclear bone marrow cells in acute myocardial infarction. *NEngl J Med.* 2006;355(12):1199–1209.
- Ge J, Li Y, Qian J, et al. Efficacy of emergent transcatheter transplantation of stem cells for treatment of acute myocardial infarction (TCT-STAMI). *Heart*. 2006;92(12):1764–1767.
- Meyer GP, Wollert KC, Lotz J, et al. Intracoronary bone marrow cell transfer after myocardial infarction: 5-year follow-up from the randomized-controlled BOOST trial. *Eur Heart J*. 2009;30(24): 2978–2984.
- Schächinger V, Erbs S, Elsässer A, et al. Intracoronary bone marrowderived progenitor cells in acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355(12):1210–1221.
- 21. Guo SZ [webpage on the Internet]. Assessing therapeutic efficacy of autologous mononuclear bone marrow cells transplantation with RT-MCE in AMI patients, Thesis, The University of Fudan, 2006. Available: http://epub.cnki.net/kns/brief/result.aspx?dbprefix=scdb& action=scdbsearch&db_opt=SCDB. Accessed May 25, 2016.

- 22. Penicka M, Horak J, Kobylka P, et al. Intracoronary injection of autologous bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells in patients with large anterior acute myocardial infarction: a prematurely terminated randomized study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2007;49(24):2373–2374.
- Huang RC, Yao K, Qian JY, et al. Evaluation of myocardial viability with 201Tl/18F-FDG DISA-SPECT technique in patients with acute myocardial infarction after emergent intracoronary autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells transplantation. *Zhong hua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi*. 2007;35(6):500–503.
- Huikuri HV, Kervinen K, Niemelä M, et al. Effects of intracoronary injection of mononuclear bone marrow cells on left ventricular function, arrhythmia risk profile, and restenosis after thrombolytic therapy of acute myocardial infarction. *Eur Heart J.* 2008;29(22): 2723–2732.
- Meluzín J, Janousek S, Mayer J, et al. Three-, 6-, and 12-month results of autologous transplantation of mononuclear bone marrow cells in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol.* 2008; 128(2):185–192.
- Silva SA, Sousa AL, Haddad AF, et al. Autologous bone-marrow mononuclear cell transplantation after acute myocardial infarction: comparison of two delivery techniques. *Cell Transplant*. 2009;18(3): 343–352.
- 27. Dill T, Schächinger V, Rolf A, et al. Intracoronary administration of bone marrow-derived progenitor cells improves left ventricular function in patients at risk for adverse remodeling after acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: results of the Reinfusion of Enriched Progenitor cells And Infarct Remodeling in Acute Myocardial Infarction study (REPAIR-AMI) cardiac magnetic resonance imaging substudy. *Am Heart J.* 2009;157(3):541–547.
- Herbots L, D'hooge J, Eroglu E, et al. Improved regional function after autologous bone marrow-derived stem cell transfer in patients with acute myocardial infarction: a randomized, double-blind strain rate imaging study. *Eur Heart J*. 2009;30(6):662–670.
- Cao F, Sun D, Li C, et al. Long-term myocardial functional improvement after autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells transplantation in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: 4 years follow-up. *Eur Heart J.* 2009;30(16):1986–1994.
- Yao K, Huang R, Sun A, et al. Repeated autologous bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in patients with large myocardial infarction. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2009;11(7):691–698.
- 31. Grajek S, Popiel M, Gil L, et al. Influence of bone marrow stem cells on left ventricle perfusion and ejection fraction in patients with acute myocardial infarction of anterior wall: randomized clinical trial: impact of bone marrow stem cell intracoronary infusion on improvement of microcirculation. *Eur Heart J.* 2010;31(6):691–702.
- 32. Traverse JH, McKenna DH, Harvey K, et al. Results of a phase I, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of bone marrow mononuclear stem cell administration in patients following ST-elevation myocardial infarction. *Am Heart J.* 2010;160(3):428–434.
- Roncalli J, Mouquet F, Piot C, et al. Intracoronary autologous mononucleated bone marrow cell infusion for acute myocardial infarction: results of the randomized multicenter BONAMI trial. *Eur Heart J*. 2011; 32(14):1748–1757.
- 34. Hirsch A, Nijveldt R, van der Vleuten PA, et al. Intracoronary infusion of mononuclear cells from bone marrow or peripheral blood compared with standard therapy in patients after acute myocardial infarction treated by primary percutaneous coronary intervention: results of the randomized controlled HEBE trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2011;32(14):1736–1747.
- Sürder D, Manka R, Lo Cicero V, et al. Intracoronary injection of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells early or late after acute myocardial infarction: effects on global left ventricular function. *Circulation*. 2013;127(19):1968–1979.
- 36. San Roman JA, Sánchez PL, Villa A, et al. Comparison of different bone marrow-derived stem cell approaches in reperfused STEMI. A Multicenter, Prospective, Randomized, Open-Labeled TECAM Trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2015;65(22):2372–2382.

- 37. Hu X, Huang X, Yang Q, et al. Safety and efficacy of intracoronary hypoxia-preconditioned bone marrow mononuclear cell administration for acute myocardial infarction patients: the CHINA-AMI randomized controlled trial. *Int J Cardiol*. 2015;184:446–451.
- Tendera M, Wojakowski W, Ruzyłło W, et al. Intracoronary infusion of bone marrow-derived selected CD34+CXCR4+ cells and non-selected mononuclear cells in patients with acute STEMI and reduced left ventricular ejection fraction: results of randomized, multicentre Myocardial Regeneration by Intracoronary Infusion of Selected Population of Stem Cells in Acute Myocardial Infarction (REGENT) Trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2009;30(11):1313–1321.
- 39. Mäki MT, Koskenvuo JW, Ukkonen H, et al. Cardiac function, perfusion, metabolism, and innervation following autologous stem cell therapy for acute ST-elevation myocardial infarction. A FINCELL-INSIGHT sub-study with PET and MRI. *Front Physiol*. 2012;3:6.
- Bystroň M, Cervinka P, Spaček R, et al. Randomized comparison of endothelial progenitor cells capture stent versus cobalt-chromium stent for treatment of ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Six-month clinical, angiographic, and IVUS follow-up. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2010;76(5):627–631.
- Janssens S, Dubois C, Bogaert J, et al. Autologous bone marrowderived stem-cell transfer in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: double-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2006;367(9505):113–121.
- 42. Xue Z [webpage on the Internet]. The clinical research on treatment for Acute Myocardial infarction with autologous bone marrow stem cell, Thesis, The University of Hebei medical, 2007. Available: http:// epub.cnki.net/kns/brief/result.aspx?dbprefix=scdb&action=scdbsearch &db_opt=SCDB. Accessed May 25, 2016.
- Plewka M, Krzemińska-Pakuła M, Lipiec P, et al. Effect of intracoronary injection of mononuclear bone marrow stem cells on left ventricular function in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Cardiol.* 2009; 104(10):1336–1342.
- 44. Gao LR, Pei XT, Ding QA, et al. A critical challenge: dosage-related efficacy and acute complication intracoronary injection of autologous bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells in acute myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;168(4):3191–3199.
- Santhakumar R, Vidyasekar P, Verma RS. Cardiogel: a nano-matrix scaffold with potential application in cardiac regeneration using mesenchymal stem cells. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(12):e114697.
- Makino S, Fukuda K, Miyoshi S, et al. Cardiomyocytes can be generated from marrow stromal cells in vitro. J Clin Invest. 1999;103(5):697–705.
- Wei H, Tan G, Manasi. One-step derivation of cardiomyocytes and mesenchymal stem cells from human pluripotent stem cells. *Stem Cell Res.* 2012;9(2):87–100.
- Suzuki E, Fujita D, Takahashi M, Oba S, Nishimatsu H. Adipose tissuederived stem cells as a therapeutic tool for cardiovascular disease. *World J Cardiol.* 2015;7(8):454–465.
- Wang Y, Zhang G, Hou Y, et al. Transplantation of microencapsulated Schwann cells and mesenchymal stem cells augment angiogenesis and improve heart function. *Mol Cell Biochem*. 2012;366(1–2): 139–147.
- Zhang S, Guo J, Zhang P, et al. Transplantation of bone marrow cells up-regulated the expressions of HSP32 and HSP70 in the acute ischemic myocardium. *Beijing Da Xue Xue Bao*. 2003;35(5):476–480.
- Springeling T, Uitterdijk A, Rossi A, et al. Evolution of reperfusion post-infarction ventricular remodeling: new MRI insights. *Int J Cardiol.* 2013;169(5):354–358.
- Springeling T, Kirschbaum SW, Rossi A, et al. Late cardiac remodeling after primary percutaneous coronary intervention-five-year cardiac magnetic resonance imaging follow-up. *Circ J.* 2013;77(1):81–88.
- 53. Tao B, Cui M, Wang C, et al. Percutaneous intramyocardial delivery of mesenchymal stem cells induces superior improvement in regional left ventricular function compared with bone marrow mononuclear cells in porcine myocardial infarcted heart. *Theranostics*. 2015;5(2): 196–205.

- 54. Santoso T, Irawan C, Alwi I, et al. Safety and feasibility of combined granulocyte colony stimulating factor and erythropoetin based-stem cell therapy using intracoronary infusion of peripheral blood stem cells in patients with recent anterior myocardial infarction: one-year follow-up of a phase 1 study. *Acta Med Indones*. 2011;43(2):112–121.
- 55. Chen X, Gu M, Zhao X, Zheng X, Qin Y, You X. Deterioration of cardiac function after acute myocardial infarction is prevented by transplantation of modified endothelial progenitor cells overexpressing endothelial NO synthases. *Cell Physiol Biochem.* 2013;31(2–3): 355–365.
- 56. Sheu JJ, Lee FY, Yuen CM, et al. Combined therapy with shock wave and autologous bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells alleviates left ventricular dysfunction and remodeling through inhibiting inflammatory stimuli, oxidative stress & enhancing angiogenesis in a swine myocardial infarction model. *Int J Cardiol.* 2015;193:69–83.
- 57. Ter Horst EN, Naaijkens BA, Krijnen PA, Van Der Laan AM, Piek JJ, Niessen HW. Induction of a monocyte/macrophage phenotype switch by mesenchymal stem cells might contribute to improved infarct healing postacute myocardial infarction. *Minerva Cardioangiol*. 2013; 61(6):617–625.

Supplementary materials



Figure S1 A funnel plot of AEs generated by Review Manager Version 5.0. Note: (A) 3–6 months, (B) 12–18 months.

Abbreviations: AE, adverse effect; SE, standard error; OR, odds ratio; HF, rehospitalization for heart failure.

subgroup	Stem ce Events	lls Total	Control Events	Total	Weight (%)	Odds ratio M–H, fixed, 95% Cl	Odds ratio M–H, fixed, 95% C
Death							
Hirsch et al ¹	0	69	0	65		Not estimable	
Hu X et al-	0	11	2	14	2.8	0.22 (0.01, 5.02)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Roncalli et al ³	1	52	0	49	0.7	2.88 (0.11, 72.48)	
Schachinger et al*	2	101	2	103	2.6	1.02 (0.14, 7.39)	
Surder et als	3	65	0	67	0.6	7.56 (0.38, 149.30)	
Surder et als	1	63	0	67	0.6	3.24 (0.13, 81.01)	
lendera et al	1	80	1	40	1.7	0.49 (0.03, 8.10)	
Tendera et al ⁶	1	80	1	40	1.7	0.49 (0.03, 8.10)	
Traverse et al ⁷	0	30	0	10		Not estimable	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	1	551		455	10.8	1.26 (0.50, 3.17)	
Total events	9		6				
Heterogeneity: χ^2 = Test for overall effe	=4.08, <i>df</i> =6 ect: Z=0.49	(P=0.67 (P=0.63); /²=0%)				
Cardiac death	0	50		50	1.0	0.04 (0.40, 00.07)	
Bystron et al	2	50	1	50	1.3	2.04 (0.18, 23.27)	
Roncalli et al ³	2	52	2	49	2.6	0.94 (0.13, 6.95)	
Subtotal (95% CI))	102		99	3.9	1.30 (0.28, 5.95)	
Total events Heterogeneity: χ^2 = Test for overall effe	4 =0.23, <i>df</i> =1 (ect: <i>Z</i> =0.34	(<i>P</i> =0.63 (<i>P</i> =0.74	3); /²=0%)				
Reinfarction	1	50	0	50	0.6	2.06 (0.12, 76.05)	
bystron et al	1	50	0	00	0.0	3.00 (U.12, /0.95)	
Hirsch et al	0	69	1	65	2.0	0.31 (0.01, 7.73)	
Roncalli et al ³	6	52	2	49	2.4	3.07 (0.59, 15.98)	+
Schächinger et al4	0	101	5	103	7.2	0.09 (0.00, 1.62)	← +
Sürder et al⁵	0	63	1	67	1.9	0.35 (0.01, 8.73)	
Sürder et al⁵	1	65	1	67	1.3	1.03 (0.06, 16.84)	
Tendera et al6	1	80	2	40	3.5	0.24 (0.02, 2.74)	
Tendera et al6	2	80	2	40	3.4	0.49 (0.07, 3.59)	
Traverse et al7	0	30	1	10	2.9	0.10 (0.00, 2.77)	←
Subtotal (95% CI))	590		491	25.2	0.61 (0.30, 1.25)	-
Total events	11		15			(, , , ,	•
Heterogeneity: χ^2 = Test for overall effe	=8.48, <i>df</i> =8 (ect: Z=1.34	(P=0.39 (P=0.18); /²=6%				
HF hospitalizatio	n	(,				
Hirsch et al1	0	69	1	65	2.0	0.31 (0.01, 7.73)	
Hu X et al ²	0	11	0	14		Not estimable	
Roncalli et al3	4	52	2	49	2.5	1.96 (0.34, 11.21)	
Schächinger et al4	0	101	2	103	3.3	0.20 (0.01, 4.22)	•
Sürder et al ⁵	2	65	2	67	2.5	1 03 (0 14 7 55)	
Sürder et al ⁵	2	63	2	67	2.5	1 07 (0 15, 7 80)	
Traverse et al ⁷	0	30	0	10	2.0	Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	8	391	9	375	12.8	0.89 (0.36, 2.24)	+
Heterogeneity: χ^2 = Test for overall effe	=2.17, <i>df</i> =4 (ect: Z=0.24	(P=0.70 (P=0.81); /²=0%)				
Target-vessel rev	ascularizat	ion					
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ²	ascularizat	ion 11	0	14		Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴	ascularizat 0 15	ion 11 101	0 20	14 103	22.3	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵	ascularizat 0 15 2	ion 11 101 63	0 20 3	14 103 67	22.3 3.7	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵	ascularizat 0 15 2 3	ion 11 101 63 65	0 20 3 3	14 103 67 67	22.3 3.7 3.7	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0	ion 11 101 63 65 30	0 20 3 3 1	14 103 67 67 10	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI)	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270	0 20 3 3 1	14 103 67 67 10 261	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270	0 20 3 3 1 27	14 103 67 67 10 261	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effet	rascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 =1.52, df=3 ect: Z=1.14	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26)	0 20 3 1 27); <i>I</i> ² =0%	14 103 67 67 10 261	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effet	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 -ect: Z=1.14	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26)	0 20 3 1 27); / ² =0%	14 103 67 67 10 261	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Stent thrombosis Bystron et al ⁸	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 sect: Z=1.14	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26) 50	0 20 3 1 27 ; /²=0%	14 103 67 67 10 261	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effe Stent thrombosis Byströn et al ⁸ Hu X et al ²	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 :1.52, df=3 ect: Z=1.14 1 0	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 	0 20 3 1 27); /²=0%	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroń et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Roncalli et al ³	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 :1.52, df=3 ict: Z=1.14 1 0 3	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 50	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>i</i> ² =0%)	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtoal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 1.52, df=3 sct: Z=1.14 1 0 3 1	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26) 50 11 52 101 52	0 20 3 1 27); <i>I</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49 103	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Roncalli et al ³ Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI)	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 1.52, df=3 ect: Z=1.14 1 0 3 1	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214	0 20 3 1 27 27 27 27 0 0 0 2 3	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroň et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Roncalli et al ³ Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 =1.52, df=3 ict z=1.14 1 0 3 1 5 5	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214	0 20 3 3 1 27 7 27); /2=0%) 0 0 2 3 3 5 5	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effor Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effor	rascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.52, df=3 -1.51, df=2 -5 -1.51, df=2 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -2	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>I</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 3 5); <i>I</i> ² =0%	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtoal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroň et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtoal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Subtoal (95% CI)	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 21.52, df=3 (cct: Z=1.14 1 0 3 1 5 5 1.51, df=2 exct: Z=0.03	ion 11 101 63 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97)	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>i</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>i</i> ² =0%)	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (55% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effor Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effor Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effor Stroke Hirsch et al ¹	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.51, df=2 -5 -1.51, df=2 -2 -0 -2 -0 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26) 50 11 52 101 214 P=0.47 (P=0.97) 69	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>I</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 3 5); <i>I</i> ² =0%) 0	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26)	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Roncalli et al ³ Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{2z} Test for overall effet Stroke Hirsch et al ¹ Hu X et al ²	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 =1.52, df=3 0 ect: Z=1.14 5 :1.51, df=2 ect: Z=0.03 0 0	ion 11 101 63 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97 69 11	0 20 3 3 1 27 (?=0%)) 0 0 2 3 5); ?=0%) 0 0 0 0	14 103 67 67 10 261 50 14 9 103 216 65 14	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtoal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroň et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtoal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Stroke Hirsch et al ¹⁵ Hu X et al ² Roncall effet	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 1.52, df=3 (ect: Z=1.14 3 1 0 3 1 5 5 -1.51, df=2 (ect: Z=0.03 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97 69 11 80	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>i</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>i</i> ² =0%) 0 0 0 2 3 5); <i>i</i> ² =0%	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216 65 14 40	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Stroke Hirsch et al ¹ Hu X et al ² Tendera et al ⁶	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.51, df=2 -5 -1.51, df=2 -2 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ion 11 101 63 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97 69 11 80 80	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>I²=0%</i>) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>I²=0%</i>) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216 65 14 40	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Roncalli et al ³ Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: $\chi^{2=}$ Test for overall effet Stroke Hirsch et al ⁷ Hu X et al ² Tendera et al ⁶ Tendera et al ⁶	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 =1.52, df=3 (ion 11 101 63 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.97 (P=0.97 69 11 80 80 80 80	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>I</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>I</i> ² =0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216 65 14 40 40 40	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Sürder et al ⁵ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Stent thrombosis Bystroň et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effet Stroke Hirsch et al ¹⁵ Hu X et al ² Rendera et al ⁸ Subtotal (95% CI)	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 =1.52, df=3 (ect: Z=1.14 5 1 0 3 1 5 =1.51, df=2 (oct: Z=0.03 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ion 11 101 63 65 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97 69 11 80 80 240	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>i</i> ² =0%) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>i</i> ² =0%) 0 0 0 0 2 3 5); <i>i</i> ² =0%	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216 65 14 40 40 159	22.3 3.7 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	
Target-vessel rev Hu X et al ² Schächinger et al ⁴ Sürder et al ⁵ Traverse et al ⁷ Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Stent thrombosis Bystroñ et al ⁸ Hu X et al ² Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: χ^{22} Test for overall effor Stroke Hirsch et al ¹ Hu X et al ² Tendera et al ⁶ Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events	ascularizat 0 15 2 3 0 20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -1.52, df=3 -20 -2.52, df=3 -2.51, df=2 -2.51, df=2 -2.51, df=2 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -3.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -2.52, df=3 -3.52, df=3 -	ion 11 101 63 30 270 (P=0.68 (P=0.26 50 11 52 101 214 (P=0.47 (P=0.97 69 11 80 80 240	0 20 3 3 1 27); <i>I²=0%</i>) 0 0 2 3 5); <i>I²=0%</i>) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14 103 67 10 261 50 14 49 103 216 65 14 40 159	22.3 3.7 2.9 32.6 0.6 2.6 3.9 7.1	Not estimable 0.72 (0.35, 1.51) 0.70 (0.11, 4.33) 1.03 (0.20, 5.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.77) 0.70 (0.38, 1.29) 3.06 (0.12, 76.95) Not estimable 1.44 (0.23, 9.00) 0.33 (0.03, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) 0.98 (0.29, 3.26) Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	

Figure S2 (Continued)

	Study or subgroup	Stem ce Events	ells Total	Control Events	Total	Weight (%)	Odds ratio M–H, fixed, 95% Cl	Odds ratio M–H, fixed, 95% Cl
	Arrhythmia							
	Roncalli et al ³	4	101	4	103	5.0	1.02 (0.25, 4.20)	
	Schächinger et al4	2	52	2	49	2.6	0.94 (0.13, 6.95)	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		153		152	7.6	0.99 (0.31, 3.15)	-
	Total events	6		6				T
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=0$ Test for overall effect	0.00, <i>df</i> =1 ct: Z=0.01	(P=0.9 (P=0.9	5); /²=0% 9)				
	Total (95% CI) Total events	63	2,511	71	2,208	100	0.83 (0.59, 1.16)	•
	Heterogeneity: $\chi^2=1$ Test for overall effective	9.40, <i>df=</i> ct: Z=1.11	31 (P=0 (P=0.2	1.95); /²=0' 7)	%			0.01 0.1 0 10 100 Stem cells Control
В	Study or subgroup	Stem ce Events	lls Total	Control Events	Total	Weight (%)	Odds ratio M–H, random, 95% C	Odds ratio Cl M–H, random, 95% Cl
	Death							
	Hu X et al ²	0	11	0	14		Not estimable	
	San Roman et al ⁹	0	30	1	31	23		
	Schächinger et al4	2	101	6	103	87	0.33 (0.06, 1.66)	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	2	142	0	148	11 0	0.33 (0.08, 1.40)	
	Total events	2	174	7	140	11.0	0.00 (0.00, 11.0)	
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$ Test for overall effect	.00; χ²=0. ct: Z=1.50	00, <i>df=</i> (<i>P</i> =0.1	1 (<i>P</i> =0.99 3)); <i>I</i> ²=0%			
	Son Domon of all	2	20	0	21	2 5	E E2 (0 2E 120 0E)	
	Sohächinger et el4	2	101	5	102	2.0	5.55(0.25, 120.05)	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0	131	5	134	2.0 5 A	0.09 (0.00, 1.02)	
	Total events	2	131	5	134	0.4	0.00 (0.01, 00.70)	
	Heterogeneity: τ^2 =6 Test for overall effect	5.31; χ²=3. ct: Z=0.19	70, df= (P=0.8	1 (P=0.05 5)); <i>I</i> ²=739	%		
	HF hospitalization	2	44	0	44	2.5	11 04 (0 FE 000 00)	
	Fight A et al	3	20	2	14	2.5	11.94 (0.33, 200.20)	
	Schächinger et al ⁴	0	101	3	103	0.2	1.04(0.19, 3.39) 0.14(0.01, 2.77)	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	0	142	3	103	13.4	1 15 (0 14 9 29)	
	Total events	6	172	6	140	10.4	1.10 (0.14, 0.20)	
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=1$ Test for overall effect	.78; χ²=4. ct: Z=0.13	13, df=: (P=0.9	2 (<i>P</i> =0.13 0)); <i>I</i> ²=529	%		
	Target-vessel reva	sculariza	tion					
	Hu X et al ²	16	101	24	103	37.9	0.62 (0.31, 1.25)	_ _
	Schächinger et al4	0	11	0	14		Not estimable	-
	Subtotal (95% CI)		112		117	37.9	0.62 (0.31, 1.25)	•
	Total events	16		24				•
	Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	applicable ct: Z=1.33	(<i>P</i> =0.1	8)				
	Stent thrombosis							
	Hu X et al ²	0	11	0	14		Not estimable	
	Schächinger et al ⁴	1	101	3	103	4.6	0.33 (0.03, 3.26)	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		112		117	4.6	0.33 (0.03, 3.26)	
	Total events	1		3				
	Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	applicable ct: Z=0.94	(<i>P</i> =0.3	4)				
	Arrhythmia							
	San Roman et al9	6	30	6	31	14.0	1.04 (0.29, 3.68)	_
	Schächinger et al4	5	101	5	103	13.8	1.02 (0.29, 3.64)	_
	Subtotal (95% CI)		131		134	27.8	1.03 (0.42, 2.53)	•
	Total events	11		11				
	Heterogeneity: $\tau^2=0$ Test for overall effect	$\chi^{2}=0.00; \chi^{2}=0.07$	00, df= (P=0.9	1 (<i>P</i> =0.98 5)); <i>I</i> ²=0%			
	Total (95% CI)		770		798	100	0.70 (0.43. 1.14)	
	Total events	38		56				•
	Heterogeneity: r ² =0	$.04; \chi^2 = 10$).55, df	=10 (<i>P</i> =0.	39); /²=5	5%		
	Test for overall effect	ct: Z=1.42	(P=0.1	5)				0.01 0.1 0 10 100 Stem cells Control

Figure S2 Effect of stem cell treatment on AEs.

Notes: Fixed-effect and random-effect models were used. (A) 3–6 months, (B) 12–18 months. Abbreviations: AE, adverse effect; CI, confidence interval; HF, rehospitalization for heart failure; M–H, Mantel–Haenszel test.

References

- 1. Hirsch A, Nijveldt R, van der Vleuten PA, et al. Intracoronary infusion of mononuclear cells from bone marrow or peripheral blood compared with standard therapy in patients after acute myocardial infarction treated by primary percutaneous coronary intervention: results of the randomized controlled HEBE trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2011;32(14): 1736–1747.
- 2. Hu X, Huang X, Yang Q, et al. Safety and efficacy of intracoronary hypoxia-preconditioned bone marrow mononuclear cell administration for acute myocardial infarction patients: The CHINA-AMI randomized controlled trial. *Int J Cardiol.* 2015;184:446–451.
- 3. Roncalli J, Mouquet F, Piot C, et al. Intracoronary autologous mononucleated bone marrow cell infusion for acute myocardial infarction: results of the randomized multicenter BONAMI trial. *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32(14):1748–1757.
- Schächinger V, Erbs S, Elsässer A, et al. Intracoronary bone marrowderived progenitor cells in acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355(12):1210–1221.
- Sürder D, Manka R, Lo Cicero V, et al. Intracoronary injection of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells early or late after acute myocardial infarction: effects on global left ventricular function. *Circulation*. 2013;127(19):1968–1979.

- Tendera M, Wojakowski W, Ruzyłło W, et al. Intracoronary infusion of bone marrow-derived selected CD34+CXCR4+ cells and non-selected mononuclear cells in patients with acute STEMI and reduced left ventricular ejection fraction: results of randomized, multicentre Myocardial Regeneration by Intracoronary Infusion of Selected Population of Stem Cells in Acute Myocardial Infarction (REGENT) Trial. *Eur Heart J.* 2009;30(11):1313–1321.
- Traverse JH, McKenna DH, Harvey K, et al. Results of a phase I, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of bone marrow mononuclear stem cell administration in patients following ST-elevation myocardial infarction. *Am Heart J.* 2010;160(3):428–434.
- Bystroň M, Cervinka P, Spaček R, et al. Randomized comparison of endothelial progenitor cells capture stent versus cobalt-chromium stent for treatment of ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Six-month clinical, angiographic, and IVUS follow-up. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;76(5):627–631.
- San Roman JA, Sánchez PL, Villa A, et al. Comparison of different bone marrow-derived stem cell approaches in reperfused STEMI. A Multicenter, Prospective, Randomized, Open-Labeled TECAM Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2015;65(22):2372–2382.

Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management

Publish your work in this journal

Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management is an international, peerreviewed journal of clinical therapeutics and risk management, focusing on concise rapid reporting of clinical studies in all therapeutic areas, outcomes, safety, and programs for the effective, safe, and sustained use of medicines. This journal is indexed on PubMed Central, CAS, EMBase, Scopus and the Elsevier Bibliographic databases. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: http://www.dovepress.com/therapeutics-and-clinical-risk-management-journal

Dovepress