Stem Cell Research & Therapy

Open Access





Hyeongsuk Lee¹, Hyun-Jai Cho², Yeonjung Han¹ and Seon Heui Lee^{1*}

Abstract

Background This comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis investigated the mid- to long-term efficacy and safety of stem cell therapy in patients with acute myocardial infarction (AMI).

Methods The study encompassed 79 randomized controlled trials with 7103 patients, rendering it the most upto-date and extensive analysis in this field. This study specifically focused on the impact of stem cell therapy on left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), major adverse cardiac events (MACE), and infarct size.

Results Stem cell therapy significantly improved LVEF at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months post-transplantation compared to control values, indicating its potential for long-term cardiac function enhancement. A trend toward reduced MACE occurrence was observed in the intervention groups, suggesting the potential of stem cell therapy to lower the risk of cardiovascular death, reinfarction, and stroke. Significant LVEF improvements were associated with long cell culture durations exceeding 1 week, particularly when combined with high injected cell quantities (at least 10⁸ cells). No significant reduction in infarct size was observed.

Conclusions This review highlights the potential of stem cell therapy as a promising therapeutic approach for patients with AMI, offering sustained LVEF improvement and a potential reduction in MACE risk. However, further research is required to optimize cell culture techniques, determine the optimal timing and dosage, and investigate procedural variations to maximize the efficacy and safety of stem cell therapy in this context.

Keywords Cell therapy, Acute myocardial infarction, Systematic review

*Correspondence:

Seon Heui Lee

sunarea87@gachon.ac.kr

¹ College of Nursing, Research Institute of AI and Nursing Science, Gachon University, 191 Hambakmoero, Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 21936, South

Korea

Background

Despite significant prognostic advancements over the past decade, acute myocardial infarction (AMI) remains a significant contributor to global morbidity and mortality [1]. AMI continues to emerge as the primary driver of heart failure (HF), with a substantial impact on the patient's quality of life and healthcare costs [2]. Thus, emphasizing heart function preservation in patients with AMI is crucial, considering its implications for patient survival and the economic burden associated with HF progression [3].

Existing conventional treatments effectively and temporarily control the disease, underscoring the need for



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

² Department of Internal Medicine, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, South Korea

innovative methods aimed at preventing and reversing heart dysfunction. Stem cell therapy has significant regenerative potential in addressing the short-term effects of cardiac damage following AMI [4]. Research on this treatment method is ongoing, and although short-term effects (6 months) on cardiac function have been reported [4, 5], long-term evaluations ranging from 18 months to 3 years have yielded inconsistent data on whether cell transplantation improves cardiac function because of the small number of patients recruited in individual studies [6, 7].

It has been reported that there is an effective improvement in cardiac function as the number of injected stem cells increases [8]. However, the administration of a substantial number of stem cells necessitates a significant harvest from either the patient's blood or bone marrow (BM), a task often fraught with difficulty owing to the challenge of securing an adequate quantity of stem cells. In autologous stem cell transplantation, concerted efforts have been made to increase the quantity of stem cells through in vitro cultivation and proliferation. The duration of isolation and culture, and the timing of subsequent administration are also considered to influence stem cell therapy outcomes in patients with AMI [5, 9]. However, there is a lack of clarity regarding the optimal number of cells. Moreover, the effects of therapy and the appropriate length of time for cell culture to enable the injection of a large number of cells have not yet been discussed.

Administering stem cell therapy before complete myocardial damage may be an effective alternative to current treatment methods [10]. However, injecting stem cells too early can increase the procedural risks. Therefore, questions have been raised regarding the optimal time required from primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) to cell infusion to ensure safe and effective treatment.

Traditionally, the primary outcomes used to evaluate the effectiveness of stem cell infusion include left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), left ventricle end-diastolic volume, and infarct size. However, these indicators often involve subjective interpretations by evaluators, as is the case with echocardiography, which cannot be eliminated in most studies [11]. Therefore, increasing attention has been paid to major adverse cardiac events (MACEs) as the patient outcomes, with a focus on observable events. A MACE is a composite endpoint event that includes cardiovascular death, reinfarction, and stroke [12]. As a critical composite endpoint, MACE has frequently been used to evaluate the safety and efficacy of treatment strategies in patients with acute coronary syndrome [13]. MACE significantly contributes to the morbidity and mortality of patients with AMI [13].

Through this systematic review, we aim to evaluate the mid- to long-term effectiveness of stem cell therapy in patients with AMI. We also intend to determine the appropriate cell quantity and optimal transplantation time to maximize treatment efficacy while ensuring safety.

Methods

The protocol for this review has been prospectively registered in the PROSPERO systematic review database (CRD42023422818). The protocol was prepared according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses protocol checklist. The final report was prepared and submitted according to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.

Search strategy

In this systematic review, searches were performed in the following databases: Ovid-MEDLINE, Ovid-EMBASE, Cochrane Library, KoreaMed, KMBASE, KISS, RISS, and DBpia, up to May 11th, 2023, to find relevant studies. The search terms included Medical Subject Headings in the titles and abstracts. We used the following keywords: "myocardial infarction," "ST elevation myocardial infarction," "non-ST elevated myocardial infarction," "angina pectoris," "myocardial ischemia," coronary artery disease," "coronary occlusion," "coronary stenosis," "acute coronary syndrome," "STEMI," "NSTEMI," "stem cells," "bone marrow cells," "mesenchymal stem cells," "mononuclear cells," "mesenchymal stromal cells," "pluripotent stromal cells," "embryonic stromal cells," and "cardiac progenitor cells." We applied the "removes records about animal" and "RCT" filters and English language limitations. Only peer-reviewed studies were included in this analysis.

Study selection criteria

The intervention groups included patients with AMI who underwent PCI and received stem cell therapy by injection into the coronary arteries, myocardium, or veins. Patients with AMI who underwent PCI intervention but did not receive stem cell therapy comprised the control group.

We included the following study types: (1) randomized controlled trials (RCTs); (2) studies including patients diagnosed with AMI as per the International Classification of Diseases, Eleventh Edition, definition (myocardial infarction specified as acute or with a stated duration of 4 weeks [28 days] or fewer from onset) within the specified timeframe; (3) clinical trials in which allogenic or autologous stem cells were transplanted; and (4) studies in which more than one proper clinical outcome (LVEF, MACE, infarct size, etc.) was reported. Studies were excluded if they were: (1) non-human or pre-clinical studies; (2) non-original articles (systematic reviews, editorials, letters, comments, opinion pieces, reviews, guide-lines, notes, news articles, etc.); (3) non-RCT trials; (4) continuous or duplicate studies; or (5) not available with the complete original text.

Study identification was performed by two independent reviewers (HSL and SHL). Any discrepancies and/or disagreements were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer (YJH). We eliminated duplicate studies and conducted a screening based on titles and abstracts. Subsequently, we identified potentially relevant studies and examined their full text. Finally, 79 RCTs were selected for inclusion in the systematic review. Sixty-nine RCTs were included in the meta-analysis.

Data extraction

Data were collected by two reviewers (HSL and YJH) using standardized forms. Data on publication characteristics (year of publication, journal, country, and corresponding author), study populations (eligibility criteria, age, and sex), intervention details (diagnosis, cell type, cell dose, culture period, injection route, time from the onset of myocardial infarction to the first intervention [cell injection], and number of injected cells), study designs (methods, sample size, and follow-up months), and clinical endpoints (efficacy and safety) were recorded.

Outcome measures

Primary outcomes

The primary outcomes of our study were post-treatment efficacy indices, such as LVEF, infarct size, and MACEs, which are defined as composite outcomes of cardiovascular death, and non-fatal myocardial infarction or stroke [12]. In several studies, cardiac function was measured using more than one modality; however, we included only one modality per study for the analysis of LVEF outcomes. If a single study reported LVEF using multiple modalities, we analyzed the data based on echocardiography, which is the commonly used method in most studies. In the absence of echocardiographic results, we analyzed results from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) followed by single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT). A subgroup meta-analysis was conducted to identify the differences in results based on the methods (echocardiography, MRI, SPECT, angiography) used to measure efficacy.

A subgroup analysis was conducted to analyze the differences in LVEF improvement based on various stem cell characteristics. The following subgroups were defined by baseline characteristics: (1) whether the cells were cultured, (2) length of time the cells had been cultured, and (3) measurement methods. The cut-off points

for the length of time the cells were cultured [14] and the number of injected cells were based on the results of previous cell therapy studies [15, 16].

The secondary outcome was safety, assessed based on the occurrence of adverse events (AEs). We defined procedure-related AEs as complications that occurred during hospitalization in patients receiving stem cell injections. Whereas, non-procedure-related AEs were the events that developed during the follow-up period after hospital discharge for patients receiving stem cell injections. For procedure-related AEs, we analyzed events such as death, obstruction and/or thrombus of the related artery, coronary dissection, coronary spasm, and arrhythmia. We also investigated procedure-related complications associated with BM suppression or granulocyte colony-stimulating factor administration. Safety outcomes during the follow-up period included mortality, rehospitalization, stroke, cancer, and restenosis of the related artery.

Quality assessment

A single reviewer (HSL) assessed the selected studies for quality, and a second reviewer (YJH) confirmed the evaluation using the Cochrane Collaboration tool for assessing the risk of bias in randomized trials. The assessment criteria included random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of the participants and personnel, blinding of the outcome assessments, incomplete outcome data, and selective reporting (Additional file 1).

Statistical analysis

We performed a meta-analysis using Review Manager version 5.4 from the Cochrane Library. Odds ratios (ORs) for dichotomous variables and mean differences and standardized mean differences for continuous variables were computed using a fixed-effects model. Statistical heterogeneity among the selected studies was evaluated using the chi-square test, with a significance level set at p < 0.10, and I² statistics were used to quantify the degree of heterogeneity.

Results

Search and selection of stem cell studies

We identified 14,912 potentially relevant studies and screened them for eligibility, selecting 121 pertinent stem cell therapy studies for full-text review. Of the 121 studies, 42 were excluded because they did not describe AMI (n=9), were not RCTs (n=19), were duplicate reports (n=3), were irrelevant interventions (n=10), or had insufficient outcomes (n=1). Finally, 79 RCTs with 7,103 patients were included in the review [11, 14, 17–93] and 69 RCTs were included in the meta-analysis (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1 Flow diagram of the literature selection process. DB, database, RCT, randomized controlled trial

Study characteristics

Table 1 shows the characteristics of all the included studies. The selected studies were published between 2004 and 2022. The study size ranged from 15 to 375 patients, and the follow-up duration ranged from 1 to 60 months. Of the 79 studies, 49 were conducted in Europe, 9 in China, 7 in the USA, 5 in Korea, 3 in Iran, 2 in India, 2 in Brazil, 2 in Pan-Europe, and 1 in Russia. Among the 7103 patients, 4014 received stem cell therapy, and 3,120 were in the control group. Of the 79 studies, 75 used autologous stem cells and 4 used allogeneic stem cells [17–20].

Of the 75 studies using autologous stem cells, 66 used BM cells (BMCs), 3 used granulocyte colony-stimulating factor-mobilized peripheral blood stem cells (PBSCs) via leukapheresis [87-89], and 4 used both BMCs and PBSCs [90-93]. One study used umbilical cord-derived cells [19] and human cardiac stem cells [17]. Most studies used mononuclear cells (MNCs) (n = 63), and nine studies used mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) cultured from BM aspirates. Two studies used BM-derived cluster of differentiation (CD)133+cells [55, 56], one study used CD34+and C-X-C chemokine receptor (CXCR)4+cells [73], and one used both CD133+and CD34+cells [68]. Two studies used progenitor cells [53, 67]. Twenty-one studies have conducted cell culture, out of which, thirteen employed cell culture duration exceeding seven days.

Most cell injections (n=75) were performed through intra-coronary infusion within 28 days of the primary PCI using the stopped-flow technique. Two studies infused cells intravenously after PCI [18, 20], and two other studies injected cells intramuscularly through the epicardium during coronary artery bypass graft operations [39, 40]. Except for one study [74] where stem cells were infused at 3–7 days and after 3 months, all studies infused a single injection of stem cells. The total numbers of injected cells are listed in Table 1. In 53 studies, cells were injected at quantities equal to or greater than 10^8 . The comparisons included standard treatment (n=40) and placebo (n=30) groups. Seven studies did not report interventions received by the control group.

Left ventricular ejection fraction

Analyses based on a fixed-effects model for differences in LVEF, MACE, and infarct size are shown in Fig. 2. Stem cell therapy for patients with AMI improved LVEF at 6 months (2.91% increase; p < 0.001), 1 year (2.22% increase; p < 0.001), 2 years (2.61% increase; p < 0.001), and 3 years (2.50% increase; p = 0.005) compared with that in the control group (Fig. 2A–D). One study reporting a 5-year follow-up found no significant difference in LVEF between the intervention and control groups (Fig. 2E). In the subgroup analysis based on cell culture, studies with and without cell culture demonstrated a greater improvement in the intervention group than in the control group at 6 and 12 months of observation (Fig. 2F, G). After 24 months of observation, studies with cell culture showed a significant improvement in the intervention group compared to control values (5.11% increase; p < 0.001), whereas those without cell culture showed no significant difference (1.28% decrease; p = 0.23) (Fig. 2H).

This analysis focused on cell culture studies, specifically examining the mean change in LVEF based on the duration of the cell culture. Among the studies with a cell culture period exceeding 1 week, the intervention group showed a significant improvement in LVEF at 6 months (4.32% increase; p < 0.001), 12 months (1.89% increase; p < 0.001), and 24 months (5.23% increase; p < 0.001) (Fig. 2I–K). However, in studies with a cell culture period of 1 week or less, there was a significant improvement only at 6 months (3.38% increase; p < 0.001), with no significant differences between the intervention and control groups at 12 months (1.40% increase; p = 0.46) or 24 months (1.96% increase; p = 0.66).

Cell type-based analyses showed a significant increase in LVEF in the intervention group compared with that of the control group at 6 and 12 months for treatment with MNCs and MSCs (Fig. 2L, M), which were the most commonly used cells. At 6 months, there was a 2.35% (p < 0.001) and a 4.47% (p < 0.001) increase in LVEF during MNC and MSC treatments, respectively. However, at 12 months, we observed a 1.87% (p < 0.001) and a 2.43% (p = 0.001) increase in LVEF during MNC and MSC treatments, respectively. At 24 months, there was no significant difference in LVEF for MNC treatment (p = 0.29), whereas a meta-analysis of two studies using MSCs (5.23% increase; p < 0.001) showed a significant improvement in LVEF in the intervention group compared to that in the control group (Fig. 2N).

Major cardiac adverse events

No significant difference in MACE occurrence was observed between the intervention and control groups at the 6-month observation point (OR 0.78; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.46, 1.31; p=0.34; Fig. 3A). At the 12-month observation point (OR 0.62; 95% CI 0.38, 1.01; p=0.05; Fig. 3B) and between 18 and 36 months (OR 0.63; 95% CI 0.39, 1.02; p=0.06; Fig. 3C), the intervention group showed a tendency toward a lower risk of MACE than that shown by the control group. However, at the 60-month observation point (Fig. 3D), there was no significant difference in MACE occurrence between the intervention and control groups (OR 1.00; 95% CI 0.58, 1.72; p=0.99).

1
5
5
10
21
. <u>Ψ</u>
0
\leq
to
• •
$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$
ā
Ĕ
Ú
ฉัง
÷
Ψ
S
<u>ب</u>
ò
\circ
S
U
· 🗁
5
· <u> </u>
2
Ψ.
5
¥
5
Ē
2
<u> </u>
U
b
<u> </u>
Ψ
<u> </u>
(L)
ň
\cup
_
·
e
<u> </u>

Montonic any res <	Author	Year of	Country	Cell	Type of	Sample size		Mean age		Sex (Male%)		Control	Route of	Cell dose (10^7)	Culture	Injection tir	he Follow-up
Mognerschundt Finders 2018		publication	_	lifilio		Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	רו במחוובות	delivery		auration	(cdpn)	auration
Rimmles Spin Hum CC 33 16 Spin Rection IC 35 Spanopers	Allogeneic (ultured															
Montholia Dist Mod Dist	Fernández et al. [17]	2018	Spain	Hum	an CSC	33	16	56±12	55±8	29 (87.9)	16 (100)	Placebo	Q	3.5	5 passages	5-7	6/12
Qale Chia WMXG: S8 S55±13 S13±13 S1329 S55 Placebo C OG Spansages Heerela 2000 USA BM-MXG: 39 21 303±11 283±14:02 7839 753 Placebo N OG5-153 ⁴ 0 304% 1 AlmoSymone/medi 2011 BMC MSC 21 230±24 585±11 21823 193 Smadad C 014-020 349% <	Chullokanë et al. [18]	2015	India	BMC	MSC	10	10	47.31 ± 12.10	47.79±6.48	10 (100)	8 (80)	Placebo	≥	0.2/kg	passage 1	2	6/24
Humel 200 USA BM-MMC 30 91	Gao et al. [19]	2015	China	SMLW	SCs	58	58	56.7±1.7	57.3 ± 1.3	51 (87.9)	55 (94.8)	Placebo	Q	0.6	6 passages	5-7	12/24
Matogeneticated Autogeneticated Autogeneticated Autogeneticated Autogeneticated Autogeneticate Autoofeneticate Autogeneticate A	Hare et al. [20]	2009	NSA	BM-hi	MSC	39	21	59.0±12.3	55.1±10.2	28 (82.4)	15 (78.9)	Placebo	\geq	0.05-0.5/kg	30 days	1-10	Q
Image 201 China BMC MC XI 21 53.3.46 56.11 2005 195 Sandard IC MU.201 3days red Rimerial 2015 France BMC MSC 14 12 55.3.4.80 73.4.80 14(100) 21000 53.0.4.2.4.40y 20.0.4.2.4.40y 20.0.4.2.4.40y 20.0.4.2.4.40y 20.0.4.4.40y 20.0.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4	Autologous	cultured															
Kum Kum <td>Zhang et al. [14]</td> <td>2021</td> <td>China</td> <td>BMC</td> <td>MSC</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>59.3±9</td> <td>58.6±11</td> <td>20 (95.2)</td> <td>19 (90.5)</td> <td>Standard</td> <td>Q</td> <td>(0.1–0.2)/ ml×2 ml</td> <td>3 days</td> <td>< 30</td> <td>6/12</td>	Zhang et al. [14]	2021	China	BMC	MSC	21	22	59.3±9	58.6±11	20 (95.2)	19 (90.5)	Standard	Q	(0.1–0.2)/ ml×2 ml	3 days	< 30	6/12
Luminality 2017 Fance BMC MMC 52 49 56±12 55±11 42(80) 44 Sandard IC 98±087 14days 29 Manipule 2016 France BMC MNC 33 55 531±123 35(81) 38 (95) Sandard IC 98±087 14days 29 Lueetal. 2014 Kora BMC MNC 30 28 531±103 55(81) 38 (95) Sandard IC 98±087 14days 29 Lueetal. 2014 Kora BMC MNC 30 28 531±103 55(81) 38 (95) Sandard IC 29±087 14days 29 Valuetal China BMC MNC IS 28 541±05 561±93 16(67) 16(79) 16 12 210 12 20 14days 21 20 23 245±07.days 1 12 20 14days 24 24 24 <td>Kim et al. [<mark>2</mark>1]</td> <td>2018</td> <td>Korea</td> <td>BMC</td> <td>MSC</td> <td>14</td> <td>12</td> <td>55.3±8.6</td> <td>57.8±8.9</td> <td>14 (100)</td> <td>12 (100)</td> <td>Standard</td> <td>Q</td> <td>7.2±9</td> <td>25.0 ± 2.4 days</td> <td>28</td> <td>6/12</td>	Kim et al. [<mark>2</mark> 1]	2018	Korea	BMC	MSC	14	12	55.3±8.6	57.8±8.9	14 (100)	12 (100)	Standard	Q	7.2±9	25.0 ± 2.4 days	28	6/12
Manique cal Lij Tance BMC MNC 43 55.1 35.1 36(1) 36(9) Standard IC 92.00 14days 3 Lea Lij 2014 Korea BMC MSC 30 35.1 27/900 35 Standard IC 242-9 7-10 days 3 Lige Lij 2014 Korea BMC MSC 30 35.4 19(679) 55 Standard IC 724-90 7-10 days 2 Wingetal 2013 China BMC MSC 23 54.116 16(67) 16(67) 16 1435 2 146.107 days 1 Ligetal 2013 China BMC MSC 21 22 55.0±16 56.6±5 21(100) 16 14 9 146.50 146.50 146.50 146.50 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <t< td=""><td>Lamirault et al. [22]</td><td>2017</td><td>France</td><td>BMC</td><td>MNC</td><td>52</td><td>49</td><td>56±12</td><td>55±11</td><td>42 (80.8)</td><td>44 (89.8)</td><td>Standard</td><td>Q</td><td>9.8±0.87</td><td>14 days</td><td>9.3±1.7</td><td>12</td></t<>	Lamirault et al. [22]	2017	France	BMC	MNC	52	49	56±12	55±11	42 (80.8)	44 (89.8)	Standard	Q	9.8±0.87	14 days	9.3±1.7	12
Lee et al. 2014 Korea BMC MSC 30 28 542±77 27(90.0) 25 Sandard IC 72±9 7-10 days 7 Mangetal 2014 China BMC MSC 28 583±102 561±93 19(679) 16 72 20 14days 7 Mangetal 2013 China BMC MSC 21 22 550±16 561±93 19(679) 16 23 146±07 days 1 Jazetal 2013 China BMC MSC 16 16 48±248 452.0±316 11(66) 14(90) MA 17 246±84 0 0 2 246±84 0 0 2 246±14 2 2 146±07 days 1 2 <td>Manrique et al. [23]</td> <td>2016</td> <td>France</td> <td>BMC</td> <td>MNC</td> <td>43</td> <td>40</td> <td>55.6±10.5</td> <td>55.1 ± 12.3</td> <td>35 (81)</td> <td>38 (95)</td> <td>Standard</td> <td>Q</td> <td>9.8±0.87</td> <td>14 days</td> <td>9.3±1.7</td> <td>I</td>	Manrique et al. [23]	2016	France	BMC	MNC	43	40	55.6±10.5	55.1 ± 12.3	35 (81)	38 (95)	Standard	Q	9.8±0.87	14 days	9.3±1.7	I
Wangerel 2014 China BMC MSC 28 58±10.2 561±9.8 19(679) 16 Pacebo C 20 14 days 2 Zaj China BMC MSC 21 22 55.0±16 58.6±2.5 21(100) 19,9 55.30±16 14 days 14 20 146±0.7 days 1 Jazetal 2011 USA BMC MSC 15 15 55.0±16 58.6±2.5 21(100) 19 53.3 54.0±0 1< 60.308±5.2 146.0.7 days 3 Jazetal 2011 USA BMC MNC 15 55.0±1.6 58.6±2.5 51.000 19 69.6 14.690 14.690 14.690 3 Davenilit 2011 USA BMC MNC 15 55.4±1 42.8003 34.4 58.0403 14.690 16 14.6905 9 Rondilit 2011 France BMC MNC 15 55.4±1 42.8003 32	Lee et al. [11]	2014	Korea	BMC	MSC	30	28	53.9±10.5	54.2 ± 7.7	27 (90.0)	25 (89.3)	Standard	Ŭ	7.2±9	7–10 days	3.8 ± 1.5 (aspira- tion) + 7-10 culture	Q
Gao et al. 2013 China BMC MSC T_{c} 25 55.0 ± 16 58.6 ± 2.5 $21(100)$ 19 $5tandard$ IC 0.30 ± 5.2 $146\pm0.7 dys$ $136.4)$ 203 ± 5.2 $146\pm0.7 dys$ $146\pm0.7 dys$ 125 Dar' Iran BMC NNC 16 18 45.20 ± 3.16 $11(66)$ $14(90)$ NA IC 246 ± 84 $overnight$ 33 Dar' U US BMC MNC 15 15 $52(median)$ $52(median)$ $14(88)$ $13(87)$ $5randard$ IC $14days$ 8 $Quyyuni U11 US BMC MNC 15 52 56\pm12 55\pm11 42(80) 8(8) 14days 9 14days 14days 14days 14days $	Wang et al. [24]	2014	China	BMC	MSC	28	28	58±10.2	56.1 ± 9.8	19 (67.9)	16 (53.3)	Placebo	Q	20	14 days	25	9
Jazietal2012IanBMCMNC1616 48 ± 2.48 $45\cdot20\pm3.16$ 11(66)14(90)NAIC 246 ± 84 owenight3 201 UJUSABMCMNC151555148513(87)5andardIC114days8 $etal.[27]$ Poncall2011USABMCMNC5249 56 ± 12 55 ± 11 $42(808)$ 44 $5andard$ IC114days8Roncall2011FranceBMCMNC5249 56 ± 12 55 ± 11 $42(808)$ 44 $5andard$ IC11 $42(43)$ 9Roncall2010CzechBMCMNC3736 54 ± 9 56 ± 9 $32(80)$ $32(80)$ IC 100 <t< td=""><td>Gao et al. [<mark>25</mark>]</td><td>2013</td><td>China</td><td>BMC</td><td>MSC</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>55.0±1.6</td><td>58.6±2.5</td><td>21 (100)</td><td>19 (86.4)</td><td>Standard</td><td>Q</td><td>0.308 ± 5.2</td><td>14.6±0.7 days</td><td>17</td><td>6/12/24</td></t<>	Gao et al. [<mark>25</mark>]	2013	China	BMC	MSC	21	22	55.0±1.6	58.6±2.5	21 (100)	19 (86.4)	Standard	Q	0.308 ± 5.2	14.6±0.7 days	17	6/12/24
Quyumi 2011 USA BMC NC 15 52 (median) 54 (48) 13 (87) 5 fandard I 14 days 8 etal.[27] France BMC MNC 52 49 56 ± 12 55 ± 11 42 (80.8) 14 Standard I 14 days 9 Roncalli 2010 France BMC MNC 37 36 54 ± 9 56 ± 9 32 (80) 44 Standard IC 10 overnight 5 Kaminek 2010 Czech BMC MNC 37 36 54 ± 9 56 ± 9 32 (80) 32 (80) 16 10 overnight 5 Grajek 2010 Poland BMC MNC 31 14 499 ± 80.3 27 (87.1) 12 Placebo IC 10 overnight 5 Grajek 2010 Poland BMC MNC 11 19 95 54 ± 12 27 (87.1) 12 Placebo IC	Jazi et al. [26]	2012	lran	BMC	MNC	16	16	48 ± 2.48	45.20±3.16	11 (66)	14 (90)	N/A	Q	246±84	overnight	30	9
Poncali 2011 France BMC NC 52 49 56±12 55±11 42 (80.8) 44 Standard IC 98±087 14 days 9 etal.[28] Etal.[28] Etal.[28] Etal.[29] Etal.[20] Etal.[20] <t< td=""><td>Quyyumi et al. [<mark>27</mark>]</td><td>2011</td><td>USA</td><td>BMC</td><td>MNC</td><td>15</td><td>15</td><td>52 (median)</td><td>52 (median)</td><td>14 (88)</td><td>13 (87)</td><td>Standard</td><td>Q</td><td>-</td><td>14 days</td><td>8.3</td><td>9</td></t<>	Quyyumi et al. [<mark>27</mark>]	2011	USA	BMC	MNC	15	15	52 (median)	52 (median)	14 (88)	13 (87)	Standard	Q	-	14 days	8.3	9
Kaminek 2010 Czech BMC NIC 37 36 54±9 56±9 32 (86) 32 (87) 54ndard IC 10 overnight 5 et al. [29] Folder BMC NIC 31 14 49.9±84 50.9±93 27 (87.1) 12 Placebo IC 234±12 overnight 5 Grajek 2010 Poland BMC NIC 31 14 49.9±84 50.9±93 27 (87.1) 12 Placebo IC 234±12 overnight 5 et al.[30] 2008 Czech BMC NIC 11:20 20 11:19 (95) 18 (90) 5andard IC 11:1 overnight 5 Meluzin 2008 Czech BMC NIC 11:20 20 12:18 (90) 5andard IC 11:1 overnight 5 Kaminek 2008 Czech BMC NIC 31 55±8 54±8 26 (84) 28 (90) 5andard	Roncalli et al. [28]	2011	France	BMC	MNC	52	49	56±12	55±11	42 (80.8)	44 (89.8)	Standard	Ð	9.8±0.87	14 days	9.3±1.7	Q
Grajek 2010 Poland BMC MNC 31 14 49.9±8.4 50.9±9.3 27 (87.1) 12 Placebo IC 234±12 overnight 55 et al. [30] et al. [30] 85.7) 85.7) 12 Placebo IC 234±12 overnight 55 Meluzin 2008 Czech BMC NIC 11:20 20 11:54±2 55±2 11:19 (95) 18 (90) Standard IC 11:1 overnight 5 et al. [31] 2008 Czech BMC MNC 11:20 20 11:54±2 55±2 11:19 (95) 18 (90) Standard IC 11:1 overnight 5 Kaminek 2008 Czech BMC MNC 31 55±8 54±8 26 (84) 28 (90) Standard IC 10 overnight 5 Kaminek 2008 Czech BMC MNC 31 55±8 54±8 26 (84) 28 (90) Standard	Kaminek et al. [29]	2010	Czech	BMC	MNC	37	36	54±9	56±9	32 (86)	32 (89)	Standard	Q	10	overnight	5-9	6/12
Meluzin 2008 Czech BMC INC I1: 20 20 I1: 54±2 55±2 I1: 19 (95) 18 (90) Standard IC I1: 1 overnight 5: et al. [31] 0.08 Czech BMC N/C 11: 20 12: 18 (90) 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 12: 10 0.01 11: 1 1 <td< td=""><td>Grajek et al. [30]</td><td>2010</td><td>Poland</td><td>BMC</td><td>MNC</td><td>31</td><td>14</td><td>49.9±8.4</td><td>50.9±9.3</td><td>27 (87.1)</td><td>12 (85.7)</td><td>Placebo</td><td>Q</td><td>234±12</td><td>overnight</td><td>5-6</td><td>6/12</td></td<>	Grajek et al. [30]	2010	Poland	BMC	MNC	31	14	49.9±8.4	50.9±9.3	27 (87.1)	12 (85.7)	Placebo	Q	234±12	overnight	5-6	6/12
Kaminek 2008 Czech BMC MNC 31 31 55±8 54±8 26(84) 28(90) Standard IC 10 overnight 5 et al. [32]	Meluzín et al. [31]	2008	Czech	BMC	MNC	11: 20 12: 20	20	l1: 54±2 l2: 54±2	55±2	l1: 19 (95) l2: 18 (90)	18 (90)	Standard	Q	11:1 12:10	overnight	59	6/12
	Kaminek et al. [32]	2008	Czech	BMC	MNC	31	31	55±8	54±8	26 (84)	28 (90)	Standard	<u>∪</u>	10	overnight	5-9	Q

Table 1	(continued,															
Author	Year of	Country	Cell	Type of	Sample size		Mean age		Sex (Male%)		Control	Route of	Cell dose (10 ⁷)	Culture	Injection time	Follow-up
	publication		origin		Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	רו במווויבוור	uelivery		auration	(skpn)	auration
Meluzín et al. [33]	2006	Czech	BMC	MNC	11: 22 12: 22	22	1: 55±5 2: 55±5	55±2	11: 22 (100) 12: 19 (86)	20 (91)	Standard	⊔ L	11:1 12:10	overnight	5-9	I
Ge et al. [34]	2006	China	BMC	MNC	10	10	58±11	59±8	8 (80)	10 (100)	Placebo	Ð	4	overnight	24 h	9
Chen et al. [35]	2004	China	BMC	MSC	34	35	58±7	57±5	32 (94.1)	34 (97.1)	Placebo	<u> </u>	(800–1000)/ ml×6 ml	7–10 days	18	Q
Autologous r.	non-cultured															
Mathur et al. [36]	2022	NK	BMC	MNC	46	39	56.6±9.6	56.3±10.0	39 (84.8)	37 (94.9)	Placebo	Ŋ	5.98	I	< 18 h after primary PCI	60
Mathur et al. [<mark>37</mark>]	2020	pan- Euro- pean	BMC	MNC	185	190	59 ± 11	60±11	155 (83.8)	147 (77.4)	Standard	Ŋ	2.5–50 (median 1.4)	I	26	24
Yang et al. [38]	2020	China	BMC	MNC	11: 20 12: 17 13: 20	19	1: 57.0 ± 12.7 2: 50.1 ± 13.0 3: 52.9 ± 13.8	51.7 ± 9.1	11: 18 (90) 12: 15 (88.2) 13: 17 (85.0)	18 (94.7)	Placebo	Q	연급 없 의	I	14–28	12
Laguna et al. [<mark>39</mark>]	2018	Spain	BMC	MNC	œ	6	62.63 ± 8.35	64.78±11.48	7 (87.5)	8 (88.9)	Standard	M	1	I	10–15	12
Naseri et al. [40]	2018	Iran	BMC	MNC	l1: 30 l2: 21	26	11: 51.45±7.49 12: 53.14±8.56	55.50 ± 8.54	l1: 27 (90) l2: 19 (90.5)	23 (88.5)	Placebo	¥	11:56.463 12:0.819	I	30	18/24
Nicolau et al. [41]	2018	Brazil	BMC	MNC	66	55	59.23 ± 9.44	58.72±9.30	53 (80.30)	45 (81.81)	Placebo	<u>∪</u>	10	I	6-9	Q
Traverse et al. [42]	2018	NSA	BMC	MNC	58	27	55.9±11.0	56.4±10.4	51 (87.9)	23 (85.2)	Placebo	Ŋ	15	I	3-7	6/12/24
Quyyumi et al. [43]	2017	NSA	BMC	MNC	78	83	57.1 ± 10.1	56.4±10.1	66 (85)	66 (80)	Placebo	Q	1.49	I	9-10	6/12/24
Choudry et al. [44]	2016	N	BMC	MNC	55	45	56.4±10.4	56.7±10.7	46 (83.6)	41 (91.1)	N/A	Ŋ	5.98	I	< 18 h after primary PCI	12
Surder et al. [45]	2016	Switzer- land	BMC	MNC	l1: 65 l2: 63	55	1: 55±15 2: 62±15	56±14.5	l1: 56 (86.2) l2: 52 (82.5)	46 (83.6)	Standard	Q	5-50	I	11: 5-7 12: 3-4 weeks	6/12
Nair et al. [46]	2015	India	BMC	MNC	125	125	48.07±9.68	48.98 ± 9.76	111 (88.8)	109 (87.2)	Standard	Q	55.8 (median)	I	7–21 (median 15)	9
San Roman et al. [47]	2015	Spain	BMC	MNC	l1: 30 12: 30 13: 29	31	1: 54±11 2: 57±9 3: 56±8	57±11	l1: 29 (97) l2: 25 (83) l3: 25 (86)	28 (90)	Standard	Q	0.5/ml× (3–6) ml	I	4-6	12
Assmus et al. [48]	2014	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	101	103	55±11	57±11	83 (82)	84 (82)	Placebo	Q	0.1	I	4	60
Surder et al. [49]	2013	Switzer- land	BMC	MNC	l1: 65 l2: 63	67	1: 55±15 2: 62±15	56±14.5	l1: 56 (86.2) l2: 52 (82.5)	56 (83.6)	Standard	Q	5-50	I	11: 5–7 12: 3-4 weeks	4
Wöhrle et al. [50]	2013	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	29	13	61.0±8.1	61.1 ±9.3	26(90)	8 (62)	Placebo	Ŋ	32.4	I	7	6/12/24/36

(continued)
-
Ð
Q
Ta

		Counter.	=3	Tunnof	Cample cire		Moon 200				Control	Doutoof		Culture Culture	Injoction time	Collour un
	publication	Country	origin	cell							treatment	delivery		duration	(days)	duration
					Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control						
Skalicka et al. [51]	2012	Czech	BMC	MNC	17	10	61±14	54±10	12 (71)	10 (100)	N/A	2	264	I	4–11 after PCI	6/24
Traverse et al. [52]	2012	NSA	BMC	MNC	79	41	56.9±11.05	57±10.2	69 (87.3)	36 (87.8)	Placebo	Q	15	I	3-7	9
Turan et al. [<mark>53</mark>]	2012	Ger- many	BMC	progeni- tor cell	42	20	61±15	60±11	28 (66.7)	14 (70)	Standard	Ŋ	9.6±3.2/ml× (3−5)ml	I	7	12
Beitnes et al. [54]	2011	Norway	BMC	MNC	48	49	61.2±8.4	59.7 ±9.8	42 (87.5)	42 (85.7)	Standard	9	6.8	I	4-7	I
Colombo et al. [55]	2011	Italy	BMC	MNC (CD133+)	11: 5 12: 5	μ	11: 53.75 ± 3.65 12: 48.75 ± 9.48	53.5 ± 3.93	l1: 5 (100) l2: 4 (80)	5 (100)	Standard	<u> </u>	0.49–1.35	I	10-14	12
Mansour et al. [56]	2011	Iran	BMC	MNC (CD133 +)	20	20	51±5	57±4	18 (95)	16 (87)	Placebo	Q	0.15-3.36	I	3–7 after PCI (11.6 +– 1.4 after the infarction)	12
Miettinen et al. [<mark>57</mark>]	2011	Finland	BMC	MNC	40	40	60±10	59±10	36 (90)	34 (85)	Placebo	Ū	40.2±19.6	I	2–6	I
Plewka et al. [58]	2011	Poland	BMC	MNC	40	20	56±9	56±9	27 (67.5)	15 (75)	Standard	Q	14.4 ± 4.9	I	7 (3–11)	24
Traverse et al. [59]	2011	NSA	BMC	MNC	58	29	57.6±11	54.6 ± 11	46 (79.3)	26 (89.7)	N/A	Q	14.7±1.7	I	2–3 weeks	9
Assmus et al. [60]	2010	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	101	1 03	55±11	57±11	83 (82)	84 (82)	Placebo	Q	0.1	I	4	24
Piepoli et al. [61]	2010	Italy	BMC	MNC	19	19	63.1±2.4	67.0±2.7	13 (68.4)	13 (68.4)	Standard	Q	41.8	I	4-7	12
Schaefer et al. [62]	2010	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	28	28	53±14.8	59.2±13.5	19 (67)	22 (73)	Standard	Q	2500±200	I	4.8	9
Wöhrle et al. [63]	2010	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	29	13	61±8.1	61.1±9.3	26 (89.7)	8 (61.5)	Placebo	Ŋ	38.1±13	I	5-7	Q
Beitnes et al. [64]	2009	Norway	BMC	MNC	50	50	58.1±9.6	56.7 ±9.6	42 (84)	42 (84)	Standard	Q	6.8	I	4-7	6/12/36
Cao et al. [65]	2009	NSA	BMC	MNC	41	45	50.7 ± 1.1	51.0±1.0	39 (95.1)	42 (93.3)	Placebo	Ŋ	12.5 (5±12/ml)	I	7	6/12/48
Dill et al. [66]	2009	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	27	27	57.9±10.7	54.6 ± 11.4	24 (88.9)	25 (92.6)	Placebo	Ū	0.1	I	4	6/12
Herbots et al. [67]	2009	Belgium	BMC	progeni- tor cell	33	84 8	55 ± 11	58±10	27 (81.8)	28 (82.4)	Placebo	Q	30.4 ± 12.8 (nucle ated) + 17.2 ± 7.2 (MNC)	ł	-	Q
Lipiec et al. [68]	2009	Poland	BMC	MNC (CD34+, CD133+)	26	10	57±9	59±9	18 (69.2)	7 (70)	Standard	Q	0.369	I	4-11	9

(continued)	
-	
Ð	
Q	
Ta	

Ab	Veral	1	=3	Turned	Comolo cino		Mass and		Concentry 2007		1000	Dout of		C.14	la incita de la contra de la co	Follow with
	nublication	Country	origin	rype or cell	azis aidiliec		Meall aye				-treatment	deliverv		duration	(davs)	e ronow-up duration
			'n	;	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control					(c (pp)	
Meyer et al. [69]	2009	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	30	30	53±14.8	59.2 ± 13.5	20 (67)	22 (73)	Standard	U.	2500±200	I	4.8	6/24/60
Nogueira et al. [70]	2009	Brazil	BMC	MNC	11: 14 12: 10	9	l1: 59.7 ± 14.3 l2: 53.6 ± 8.3	57.2 ± 10.8	l1: 10 (71) l2: 7 (70)	4 (67)	Standard	Q	10	I	11: 5.5 ± 1.28 12: 6.1 ± 1.37	Q
Plewka et al. [71]	2009	Poland	BMC	MNC	38	18	56±9	56±8	26 (68.4)	14 (77.8)	Standard	Q	14.4±4.9	I	7 (3–11)	9
Schäch- inger et al. [72]	2009	Ger- many	BMC	MNC	95	92	55±12	57±11	77 (81)	78 (85)	Placebo	Ū	0.1	I	4	I
Tendera et al. [73]	2009	Poland	BMC	MNC (CD34 +, CDCR4 +)	l1: 80 12: 80	40	l1: 55 (37–74) l2: 58 (30–75)	59 (37–73)	l1: 56 (70.6) l2: 51 (63.7)	30 (75)	N/A	Ū	17.8	I	7 (3–12)	Q
Yao etal. [74]	2009	China	BMC	MNC	l1: 12 l2: 15	12	11: 52.1 ±6.3 12: 51.3 ±7.4	52.7 ± 7.8	l1: 10 (83.3) l2: 12 (80)	11 (91.7)	Placebo	Q	19±13	I	3–7	6/12
Huikuri et al. [75]	2008	Finland	BMC	MNC	40	40	60±10	59±10	90 (36)	34 (85)	Placebo	Ų	40.2±19.6	I	2–6	Q
Lunde et al. [76]	2007	Norway	BMC	MNC	50	50	58.1 ± 9.6	56.7±9.6	42 (84)	42 (84)	Standard	Q	0.68	I	4-7	I
Suárez et al. [77]	2007	Spain	BMC	MNC	10	10	52±12	55±11	8 (80)	7 (70)	Standard	Q	90±30	I	5-12	Q
Janssens et al. [78]	2006	Belgium	BMC	MNC	33	34	55.8±11	57.9±10	27 (82)	28 (82)	Placebo	Q	17.2 ± 7.2	I	I	9
Lunde et al. [<mark>79</mark>]	2006	Norway	BMC	MNC	50	50	58.1±8.5	56.7 ± 9.6	42 (84)	42 (84)	Standard	Ų	6.8	I	9	9
Meyer et al. [80]	2006	Germany	BMC	MNC	30	30	53 ± 14.8	59.2±13.5	20 (67)	22 (73)	Standard	Ų	2500±200	I	4.8	18/24
Schäch- inger et al. [81]	2006	Germany	BMC	MNC	101	103	55±11	57 ± 11	83 (82)	84 (82	Placebo	<u> </u>	23.6±17.4	I	3–7	9
Schäch- inger et al. [82]	2006	Germany	BMC	MNC	101	103	55 ± 11	57±11	83 (82)	84 (82)	Placebo	Q	0.1	I	4	12
Schaefer et al. [83]	2006	Germany	BMC	MNC	30	29	53 ± 14.8	59±3	20 (67)	21 (71)	Standard	Ų	2500±200	I	4.8	I
Karpov et al. [84]	2005	Russia	BMC	MNC	22	22	55.2±8.6	52.1±9.2	20 (90)	16 (73)	N/A	Ų	8.85 ± 4.92	I	7–21	I
Ruan et al. [85]	2005	China	BMC	MNC	6	11	61 ±8	58±6	8 (88.9)	11 (100)	Placebo	Q	연 山 없 의	I	I	9
Wollert et al. [86]	2004	Germany	BMC	MNC	30	30	53±14.8	59.2±13.5	20 (67)	22 (73)	Standard	Q	2500±200	I	4.8	9

Table 1	(continued)															
Author	Year of	Country	Cell	Type of	Sample size		Mean age		Sex (Male%)		Control	Route of	Cell dose (10 ⁷)	Culture	Injection tim	e Follow-up
	publication		origin	Cell	Intervention (Control	Intervention	Control	Intervention	Control	-treatment	geilvery		guration	(days)	duration
Kang et al. [87]	2012	Korea	PBSC	MNC	57 6	00	57.5±10.9	57.5 ± 11.9	48 (84)	43 (72)	Standard	U U	110±5	1	< 14	6/24
Chang et al. [88]	2008	Korea	PBSC	MNC	20	20	56.6±13.1	57.1 ± 11.9	17 (85)	16 (80)	Standard	IJ	100–200	I	< 14	9
Kang et al. [89]	2006	Korea	PBSC	MNC	50	25	50.6±10.6	59.4 ± 12.3	20 (80)	20 (80)	Standard	Ŋ	140±5	I	< 14	9
Delewi et al. [90]	2015	Nether- lands	BMC, PBSC	MNC	11: 69 12: 66	55	11: 56±9 2: 57±9	55±10	l1: 58 (84) l2: 56 (85)	56 (86)	Standard	IJ	29.6±16.4	I	3-8	6/24
Robbers et al. [91]	2014	Nether- lands	BMC, PBSC	MNC	11: 52 12: 47	45	11: 56±9 2: 56±9	54±10	l1: 44 (85) l2: 47 (85)	40 (89)	N/A	Q	29.6±16.4	I	3-8	I
Hirsch et al. [92]	2011	Nether- lands	BMC, PBSC	MNC	11: 69 12: 66	55	11: 56±9 2: 57±9	55±10	l1: 58 (84) l2: 56 (85)	56 (86)	N/A	Ŋ	29.6 ± 16.4	I	3-8	9
van der Laan et al. [93]	2011	Nether- lands	BMC, PBSC	WNC	11: 23 12: 18	61	11: 55.2 ± 8.8 2: 54.6 ± 11.0	54.2 ± 7.4	l1: 19 (83) l2: 14 (78)	17 (90)	Standard	Q	1:29.1 ±17.3 2:28.8 ±9.1	I	3–8	1

_
6
_Ψ
·=
7
~
8
J
-
~
Ð
ā

Lee et al. Stem Cell Research & Therapy (2024) 15:290 A

	Cel	I ther ap	y	(Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Beitnes 2009	48.8	10.7	50	49	9.5	50	2.5%	-0.20 [-4.17, 3.77]	
Cao 2009	48.4	3.5	41	45.7	3.9	45	15.9%	2.70 [1.14, 4.26]	
Chen 2004	67	3	34	54	5	35	10.3%	13.00 [11.06, 14.94]	
Chullikana 2015	47.8	8.12	10	45.33	8.56	9	0.7%	2.47 [-5.05, 9.99]	
Delewi 2015	46.8	9.61	129	46.4	9.2	60	4.8%	0.40 [-2.46, 3.26]	
Gao 2013	55	7.85	19	54.5	7.6	20	1.7%	0.50 [-4.35, 5.35]	
Ge 2006	58.6	9.9	10	56.3	3.5	10	0.9%	2.30 [-4.21, 8.81]	
Grajek 2010	47.79	10.86	31	44.88	11.25	14	0.8%	2.91 [-4.11, 9.93]	
Hare 2009	56.9	9.641	30	56.1	5.8093	19	2.1%	0.80 [-3.53, 5.13]	
Herbots 2009	59.2	7.9	32	57.8	7.4	34	2.8%	1.40 [-2.30, 5.10]	
Huikuri 2008	60	8	39	56	10	38	2.4%	4.00 [-0.05, 8.05]	
Janssens 2006	51.8	8.8	30	49.1	10.7	30	1.6%	2.70 [-2.26, 7.66]	
Jazi 2012	39.37	9.88	16	31	7.48	16	1.1%	8.37 [2.30, 14.44]	
Kaminek 2008	45.5	8.34	31	44.2	9.1	31	2.1%	1.30 [-3.05, 5.65]	
Kang 2012	53.3	9.3	42	53.7	11.1	29	1.6%	-0.40 [-5.32, 4.52]	
Kim 2018	44.1	5.8	14	42	2.6	12	3.4%	2.10 [-1.28, 5.48]	
Lee 2014	50	8.4	30	50.4	9.4	28	1.8%	-0.40 [-5.00, 4.20]	
Lipiec 2009	44.2	13.7	26	43.8	15.3	10	0.3%	0.40 [-10.45, 11.25]	
Lunde 2006	48.8	10.7	50	49	9.5	50	2.5%	-0.20 [-4.17, 3.77]	
Mever 2009	56.7	12.5	30	52	12.4	30	1.0%	4.70 [-1.60, 11.00]	
Nicolau 2018	44.74	12.95	66	43.5	12.43	55	1.9%	1 24 1-3 29 5 771	<u> </u>
Noqueira 2009	55.1	10.73	24	49.6	17.53	6	0.2%	5.50 [-9.17, 20 17]	
Plewka 2009	44	10	38	33	7	18	1.9%	11.00 (6.46, 15.54)	
Quwumi 2011	50.1	11	11	54.2	11	10	0.4%	-4.10 [-13.52. 5 32]	
Ruan 2005	59.33	12.91	à	50.3	83	11	0.4%	9.03 [-0.73 18 70]	+
Schächinger 2006a	53.9	10.2	95	10.0	13	92	3.5%	3 90 10 54 7 261	
Schoofer 2010	52	10.59	29	43.3	10.59	20	1 296	-1.00 66 54 4 54	
Skalicka 2010	45	10.00	1.4	47	10.50	10	0.62.1	-2.00[.10.24_6.24]	
Okalicka 2012 Ruóroz 2007	4U 50	10.9	19	47	9.0	10	0.0%	40.00 [-10.34, 0.34]	
Sualez 2007 Curder 2016	00 27.7	9	05	40		55	0.730	13.00 [3.34, 20.40]	
Suruer 2010	50.2	9.99	90	4U 54.0	9.9	22	3.070	-2.30 [-5.60, 1.00]	
Traverse 2011	50.3	11.1	55	51.0	7.0	27	1.5%	-1.30 [-0.40, 3.80]	
Traverse 2018	49.2	13	55	48.8	1.8	20	1.9%	0.40 [-4.16, 4.96]	
wang 2014	50.1	3.4	27	49.1	2.3	28	16.4%	1.00 [-0.54, 2.54]	
vvonrie 2013	55.3	9.6	29	61.4	11.2	13	0.8%	-6.10 [-13.12, 0.92]	
Yao 2009	37.7	4.1	12	34.4	2.8	12	4.9%	3.30 [0.49, 6.11]	
T-4-1 (05%) CD			4005			074	400.0%	204/2220 2541	
Total (95% CI)			1205			971	100.0%	2.91 [2.29, 3.54]	
Heterogeneity: Chir=	1/5.40,	at = 34 (P < 0.0	10001);1	1~= 81%				-10 -5 0 5 10
rest for overall effect.	Z= 9.15	(P < 0.0	0001)						Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy]
D									
D	C -1				Control			Mana Difference	Mana Difference
01-1	Cel	r ther ap	y T-4-1		Control	T-4-1	100-1-1-1-4	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	mean	SD	Total	weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, FIXed, 95% CI
Beitnes 2009	48.7	y	50	48.5	8.8	50	5.3%	0.20 [-3.29, 3.69]	
Cao 2009	48.2	4.4	41	44.6	4.3	45	18.9%	3.60 [1.76, 5.44]	
Choudry 2016	52.6	10.5	51	52	9.1	41	4.0%	0.60 [-3.41, 4.61]	
Colombo 2011	46.25	5.55	5	40.25	6.6	5	1.1%	6.00 [-1.56, 13.56]	
Dill 2009	51.5	6.8	27	49.4	6.8	27	4.9%	2.10 [-1.53, 5.73]	
Fernández 2018	44.7	8.7	31	45.6	5.8	16	3.7%	-0.90 [-5.08, 3.28]	
Gao 2013	55.3	7.41	19	54.6	6.71	20	3.3%	0.70 [-3.74, 5.14]	
Gao 2015	58.8	6.04	57	54.5	5.93	55	13.1%	4.30 [2.08, 6.52]	_ _
Grajek 2010	46.95	7.9	27	44.4	11.74	12	1.2%	2.55 [-4.73, 9.83]	
Kaminek 2010	44.1	10.13	37	43.11	8.75	36	3.4%	0.99 [-3.35, 5.33]	
Kim 2018	45	4.2	14	44.5	2.3	12	9.8%	0.50 [-2.06, 3.06]	_
Laguna 2018	56.7	712	8	55 28	7 29	9	1 4 %	1 42 [-5 44 8 28]	
Lamirault 2017	38.5	10.5	46	41.3	9.2	40	3.7%	-2 80 [-6 96 1 36]	
San Roman 2015	55	10	26	51	10	24	21%	4.00 [-1.55 9.55]	
Surder 2016	36.4	117	95	38.1	136	55	3,5%	-1 70 [-6 00 2 60]	
Traverce 2010	10.4	11.0	50	50.1	10.0	27	2.5%	-0.2016.200	
Turan 2012	40.0	7 11.0	40	40	10.0	27	4.070	0.00 [4 27 44 72]	
ruran zul z Wöhrle 2012	504	10 .	42	40 57 0		20	4.0%	0.00 [4.27, 11.73]	
wonne 2013	52.1	10.4	29	57.3	9.6	13	1.5%	-5.20 [-11.65, 1.25]	
rang 2020	45.5	15.44	20	43.6	16.94	19	0.6%	1.90 [-8.29, 12.09]	
Ya0 2009	39.8	3.8	12	35.3	3.5	12	7.5%	4.50 [1.58, 7.42]	
∠nang 2021	62	6.8	18	59.5	5.6	19	4.0%	2.50 [-1.53, 6.53]	
Total (05% CI)			742			EE7	100.0%	2 22 14 42 2 201	
Total (95% CI)	20.05	K- 20 "	713	0.01.17	500	22/	100.0%	2.22 [1.42, 3.02]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	= 39.85, 0	1T = 20 (F	- = U.O	U5); I*=	50%				-10 -5 0 5 10
lest for overall effect	:∠=5.44	F (F < 0.)	UUUU1)	1					Equation (control) - Equation (coll therapy)

Fig. 2 Forest plots of left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) improvement. A–E Forest plots for LVEF at the A 6-, B 12-, C 24-, D 36-, and E 60-month follow-ups. F–H Subgroup comparisons of LVEF between the cultured cell therapy and non-cultured cell therapy groups at the F 6-, G 12-, and H 24-month follow-ups. I–K Subgroup analyses of LVEF based on the length of cell culture time at the I 6-, J 12-, and K 24-month follow-ups. L–N Subgroup comparisons of LVEF between patients treated with mononuclear cells (MNCs) and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) at the L 6-, M 12-, and N 24-month follow-ups

Risk analysis of MACE, according to cell type, showed no significant difference between the intervention group and the control group at 6 months for either MNC (OR 0.58; 95% CI 0.30, 1.13; p=0.11) or MSC (OR 1.23; 95% CI 0.52, 2.91; p=0.63; Fig. 3E) treatment. At 12 months and between 18 and 36 months, the intervention group that received MNCs showed a significantly lower MACE risk than the control group (12 months OR 0.57; 95% CI 0.34, 0.97; p = 0.04) (18 and 36 months OR 0.61; 95% CI 0.37, 0.98; p = 0.04; Fig. 3F); whereas the group that received MSCs showed no significant difference in MACE risk from the control group (12 months OR 1.05; 95% CI 0.25, 4.36; p = 0.95) (18 and 36 months OR 3.15; 95% CI 0.12, 81.74; p = 0.49; Fig. 3G).

The occurrence of AEs related to stem cell injection resulted in one death each in three studies [19, 27, 82];

	Ce	ll therapy	/	0	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Chullikana 2015	46.96	7.56	8	45	10.21	8	2.2%	1.96 [-6.84, 10.76]	
Delewi 2015	47.3	9.36	107	47.7	9.4	52	18.0%	-0.40 [-3.51, 2.71]	
Gao 2013	55.1	7.85	19	54.9	7.16	20	7.8%	0.20 [-4.52, 4.92]	
Gao 2015	60	3.7749	57	54	5.933	55	50.8%	6.00 [4.15, 7.85]	— — —
Kang 2012	53.1	13.6	42	54.5	11.6	29	5.0%	-1.40 [-7.29, 4.49]	
Meyer 2009	55.9	14.7	30	54.4	13	30	3.5%	1.50 [-5.52, 8.52]	
Skalicka 2012	51.2	6.7	14	47.9	14	10	2.0%	3.30 [-6.06, 12.66]	
Traverse 2018	48.7	11.2	58	51.6	11.7	27	6.3%	-2.90 [-8.17, 2.37]	
Wöhrle 2013	51	10.4	29	57.6	9.1	13	4.5%	-6.60 [-12.83, -0.37]	
Fotal (95% CI)			364			244	100.0%	2.61 [1.29, 3.92]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	: 32.02, c	if=8 (P <	0.000	1); l ² = 7	5%				
Test for overall effect	: Z = 3.88	(P = 0.0	001)						-10 -5 U 5 10

-
••
-

	Cell therapy Control			Mean Difference			Mean Difference						
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV, I	ixed, 95% (
Beitnes 2009	47.5	9	48	46.8	8.6	49	25.3%	0.70 [-2.80, 4.20]		-		_	
Cao 2009 (1)	50.5	5	41	46.4	5.2	45	66.9%	4.10 [1.94, 6.26]					
Wöhrle 2013	54	9.9	29	59.4	9.6	13	7.7%	-5.40 [-11.74, 0.94]			-		
Total (95% CI)			118			107	100.0%	2.50 [0.74, 4.27]				•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	leterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.09, df = 2 (P = 0.01); l ² = 78%								-10	-5	6	5	10
restion overall effect.	. 2 - 2.18	(==)	0.000)							Favours (con	trol] Favou	ırs (cell th	ierapy]

<u>Footnotes</u> (1) 48 months f/u

Е

	Cell	thera	py	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Meyer 2009	47.5	16.7	30	48.1	12.9	30	100.0%	-0.60 [-8.15, 6.95]	
Total (95% CI)			30			30	100.0%	-0.60 [-8.15, 6.95]	
Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	plicable Z = 0.16	י 6 (P = נ).88)						-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy)

F

	Cel	l therap	y		Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
3.1.1 LVEF 6 months	cultured	1							
Chen 2004	67	3	34	54	5	35	10.3%	13.00 [11.06, 14.94]	
Chullikana 2015	47.8	8.12	10	45.33	8.56	9	0.7%	2.47 [-5.05, 9.99]	
Gao 2013	55	7.85	19	54.5	7.6	20	1.7%	0.50 [-4.35, 5.35]	
Ge 2006	58.6	9.9	10	56.3	3.5	10	0.9%	2.30 [-4.21, 8.81]	
Graiek 2010	47.79	10.86	31	44.88	11.25	14	0.8%	2.91 [-4.11, 9.93]	
Hare 2009	56.9	9.641	30	56.1	5.8093	19	2.1%	0.80 [-3.53, 5.13]	
Jazi 2012	39.37	9.88	16	31	7.48	16	1.1%	8.37 [2.30, 14, 44]	
Kaminek 2008	45.5	8.34	31	44.2	9.1	31	2.1%	1.30 (-3.05, 5.65)	<u> </u>
Kim 2018	44.1	5.8	14	42	2.6	12	3.4%	2.10 [-1.28, 5,48]	
Lee 2014	50	8.4	30	50.4	9.4	28	1.8%	-0.40 [-5.00, 4.20]	
Qumumi 2011	50.1	11	11	54.2	11	10	0.4%	-4 10 [-13 52 5 32]	
Wang 2014	50.1	3.4	27	49.1	2.3	28	16.4%	1 00 [-0 54 2 54]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			263			232	41.7%	4.21 [3.25, 5,18]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	112 79	df = 11	(P < 0)	100011	1 ² = 90%	LOL			-
Test for overall effect:	7 = 8.55	(P < ∩ (00001	50001),	1 - 30%				
restion overall ellect.	2-0.55	(1 - 0.0	50001)						
3.1.2 LVEF 6 months	non-cult	ured							
Beitnes 2009	48.8	10.7	50	49	9.5	50	2.5%	-0.20 [-4.17] 3.77]	
Can 2009	40.0	3.5	41	45.7	3.0	45	15 0%	2 70 [1 14 4 26]	
Delewi 2015	46.8	9.61	129	46.4	9.2	60	4.8%	0.40 [-2.46, 3.26]	
Herbots 2009	59.2	7 0	32	57.8	7 4	34	2.8%	1 40 [-2:40, 5:20]	
Huikuri 2008	60	1.5	30	56	10	39	2.0.0	4 00 60 05 8 05	
Janecone 2006	51.9	9.9	30	101	10.7	30	1.6%	2 70 [-2 26 7 66]	
Kang 2012	53.3	0.0	42	53.7	11.1	20	1.6%	-0.40 [-5.32, 4.62]	
Linier 2009	44.2	127	26	42.0	15.2	10	0.2%	0.40[-0.52, 4.52]	
Lundo 2006	44.2	10.7	50	40.0	0.5	50	2.5%	-0.20 [.4 17 2.77]	
Mover 2000	40.0	12.5	30	43	12.0	30	2.5%	4 70 61 60 11 00	
Nicolau 2019	44.74	12.5	88	42.5	12.4	55	1 0 %	1 24 1 2 29 6 77	
Noqueire 2000	55 1	10.72	24	40.0	17.52	6	0.2%	5 50 L0 17 20 17	
Plowko 2000	33.1	10.75	24	43.0	7 17.33	10	1 0.2 /0	11 00 16 46 16 64	
Piewka 2003	60 22	12.01	30	60.2	° 2	11	0.4%	0.0210.72.10.70	
Ruan 2005 Roböchinger 2006e	520	10.2	9	40.0	10.3	02	0.4%	2.03 [-0.73, 10.79]	
Schoofor 2010	53.0	10.2	20	43.3	10.50	20	1 204	-1.00 [0.54, 7.20]	
Okalicka 2010	45	10.00	20	47	0.00	10	0.62.1	-1.00[-0.04, 4.04]	
Skalicka 2012 Suóroz 2007	40	10.5	10	47	5.0	10	0.0%	12.00[10.34, 0.34]	
Surder 2016	27.7	0 00	95	40		66	264	-2.20 [.5.60, 1.00]	
Traverce 2011	50.2	111	50	61 G	11.2	27	1 596	-2.30 [-3.00, 1.00]	
Traverse 2011	40.2	12	50	40.0	7.0	26	1.0%	0.40[416.406]	
Wöhrlo 2012	43.2	0.6	20	40.0 61.4	11.2	10	0.006	6 10 [12 12 0 02]	
Voo 2000	33.3	5.0	20	24.4	2.0	13	4.00%	2 20 10 40 6 11	
Fubtotal (05% CI)	51.1	4.1	1002	34.4	2.0	730	4.970	3.30 [0.49, 0.11]	•
Hotorogonoity: Chi?-	60.74 d	f = 22/0	2 - 0.0	0.06\-18-	670	155	50.570	1.50[1.17,2.00]	•
Test for everall effect:	7 - 4 76	/P ~ 0 (0.00	505),1 -	- 37 %				
restion overall effect.	2 - 4.70	(r < 0.0	55001)						
Total (95% CI)			1265			971	100.0%	2.91 [2.29, 3.54]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	175.46,	df= 34	(P < 0.)	00001);	l² = 81%				-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.15	(P < 0.0	00001)						Eavours (control) Eavours (cell therapy)
Test for subaroup diff	rences	: Chi²=	11.93.	df = 1 (F	P = 0.000	6). I²=	91.6%		r arears (control, i around (control up))

Fig. 2 continued

G

	Cell	therap	y	C	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
3.2.1 LVEF 12 months	s culture	d							
Fernández 2018	44.7	8.7	31	45.6	5.8	16	3.7%	-0.90 [-5.08, 3.28]	
Gao 2013	55.3	7.41	19	54.6	6.71	20	3.3%	0.70 [-3.74, 5.14]	
Gao 2015	58.8	6.04	57	54.5	5.93	55	13.1%	4.30 [2.08, 6.52]	
Grajek 2010	46.95	7.9	27	44.4	11.74	12	1.2%	2.55 [-4.73, 9.83]	
Kaminek 2010	44.1	10.13	37	43.11	8.75	36	3.4%	0.99 [-3.35, 5.33]	
Lamirault 2017	38.5	10.5	46	41.3	9.2	40	3.7%	-2.80 [-6.96, 1.36]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			217			179	28.3%	1.81 [0.30, 3.31]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	11.59, d	f= 5 (P	= 0.04)	; I² = 57	%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.36	(P = 0.0	02)						
3.2.2 LVEF 12 months	s non-cu	ltured							
Beitnes 2009	48.7	9	50	48.5	8.8	50	5.3%	0.20 [-3.29, 3.69]	
Cao 2009	48.2	4.4	41	44.6	4.3	45	18.9%	3.60 [1.76, 5.44]	
Choudry 2016	52.6	10.5	51	52	9.1	41	4.0%	0.60 [-3.41, 4.61]	
Colombo 2011	46.25	5.55	5	40.25	6.6	5	1.1%	6.00 [-1.56, 13.56]	
Dill 2009	51.5	6.8	27	49.4	6.8	27	4.9%	2.10 [-1.53, 5.73]	
Kim 2018	45	4.2	14	44.5	2.3	12	9.8%	0.50 [-2.06, 3.06]	
Laguna 2018	56.7	7.12	8	55.28	7.29	9	1.4%	1.42 [-5.44, 8.28]	
San Roman 2015	55	10	26	51	10	24	2.1%	4.00 [-1.55, 9.55]	
Surder 2016	36.4	11.7	95	38.1	13.6	55	3.5%	-1.70 [-6.00, 2.60]	
Traverse 2018	49.8	11.8	58	50	10.8	27	2.5%	-0.20 [-5.28, 4.88]	
Turan 2012	54		42	46		20	4.6%	8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	
Wöhrle 2013	52.1	10.4	29	57.3	9.6	13	1.5%	-5.20 [-11.65, 1.25]	
Yang 2020	45.5	15.44	20	43.6	16.94	19	0.6%	1.90 [-8.29, 12.09]	
Yao 2009	39.8	3.8	12	35.3	3.5	12	1.5%	4.50 [1.58, 7.42]	
Zhang 2021	62	6.8	18	59.5	5.6	19	4.0%	2.50 [-1.53, 6.53]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			490			3/8	/1./%	2.39[1.44, 3.33]	•
Heterogeneity: Uni*=	27.86,0	T= 14 (F	2 = U.U	I); I*= 5	0%				
rest for overall effect.	∠ = 4.95	(P < 0.0	JUUU1)						
Total (95% CI)			713			557	100.0%	2 22 [1 42 3 02]	•
Hotorogonoity Chiz-	20.05 4	f = 20 /f	2-00	- 51 / 20	60%	557	100.0%	2.22 [1.42, 3.02]	
Helefogeneity. Chi =	33.03, u	1 - 20 (1	- 0.0	55), I -	30.20				
Tact for overall effect:	7 - 5 AA	(P < 0)	100043						-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	Z = 5.44	(P < 0.0	00001) 0.41 d	f= 1 (P	- 0.52)	I ² = 0.9	ĸ		-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy)
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 5.44 ferences	(P < 0.0 Chi ² =	00001) 0.41. d	f=1 (P	= 0.52)	. I² = 09	6		-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy)
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 5.44 ferences	(P < 0.0 Chi ² =	00001) 0.41. d	f=1 (P	= 0.52)	. I² = 0%	6		-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 5.44 ferences	(P < 0.0 Chi ² =	00001) 0.41. d	f=1 (P	= 0.52)	. I² = 09	б		-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy)
Test for overall effect: Test for subαroup diff	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell	(P < 0.(: Chi ² = therapy	00001) 0.41. c	f=1 (P C	= 0.52). Control	. I² = 09	6	Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy) Mean Difference
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff H Study or Subgroup	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u>	(P < 0.(: Chi ² = therapy SD	00001) 0.41. d / <u>Total</u>	f=1 (P C <u>Mean</u>	= 0.52) Control	. 1² = 09 Total	% Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff H <u>Study or Subgroup</u> 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u> cultured	(P < 0.(: Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u>	00001) 0.41. c / <u>Total</u>	f=1 (P C <u>Mean</u>	= 0.52) Control	. I ² = 09 <u>Total</u>	% Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff H <u>Study or Subaroup</u> 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u> cultured 46.96	(P < 0.0 : Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u> 1 7.56	00001) 0.41. c / <u>Total</u> 8	f = 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 45	= 0.52) control SD 10.21	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8	% Weight 2.2%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 (-6.84, 10.76)	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u> cultured 46.96 55.1	(P < 0.(Chi ² = therapy SD 1 7.56 7.85	00001) 0.41.c / <u>Total</u> 8 19	f = 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9	= 0.52) control SD 10.21 7.16	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20	% Weight 2.2% 7.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1)	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean cultured 46.96 55.1 60	(P < 0.0 : Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u> 1 7.85 3.7749	00001) 0.41. d / / Total 8 19 57	f = 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. I ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Test for subgroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u> cultured 46.96 55.1 60	(P < 0.0 Chi ² = therapy SD 7.85 3.7749	00001) 0.41. c / Total 8 19 57 84	f = 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83	% Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [415, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Test for subgroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi [#] =	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean scultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df =	(P < 0.(: Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u> 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 : 2 (P = (00001) 0.41. d 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P	f = 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83	% Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Test for suboroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect.	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93	(P < 0.1 : Chi ² = therapy 5D 1 7.85 3.7749 : 2 (P = ((P < 0.0)	00001) 0.41. d 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001)	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect. Test for subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Chi ² = Test for overall effect.	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean scuttured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 ((P < 0.1 : Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u> 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 : 2 (P = ((P < 0.0)	00001) 0.41. d 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001)	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [415, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell therapy) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overall effect Testfor suboroup diff H Study or Subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: ChiP= Testfor overall effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delawa 2015	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 (concutt	(P < 0.0) : Chi ² = therapy SD 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 : 2 (P = 0 (P < 0.0) tured 0.20	00001) 0.41. c 7 7 8 19 57 84 0.06); f 0001)	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54 54 2 = 64%	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overall effect Testfor suboroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% C1) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Testfor overall effect 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell <u>Mean</u> s cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 s s non-cult 47.3 521	(P < 0.1 : Chi ² = therapy 50 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 2 (P = ((P < 0.0) tured 9.36 12 5	00001) 0.41. d 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); i ² 0001)	f = 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83 52 20	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overal effect Testfor subgroup and the subgroup and the subgroup and the subgroup and the subgroup and the subgroup and subgroup and the subgroup and subgroup and the subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and subgroup and	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 concut 47.3 53.1 5.52	(P < 0.(: Chi ² = therapy 50 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 2 (P = ((P < 0.0) tured 9.36 13.6	00001) 0.41. c / Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 20	f = 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6 12	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83 52 29 20 20	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-8.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 4.60 [6.20 e 72]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Testfor overall effect Testfor suboroup diff H Study or Subgroup 3.4.1 UVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2013 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Statistica 2012	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 5.31 55.9 5.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 5.31 55.9	(P < 0.(Chi ² = therapy 50 7.56 7.85 3.7749 2 (P = 0.00 (P < 0.00 tured 9.36 13.6 13.6	00001) 0.41. c 7 7 7 8 8 9 57 8 4 0.06); P 9 0001) 107 42 300	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54 54 54 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.7	= 0.52). control SD 10.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6 13 14	. ² = 09 <u>Total</u> 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 2.90 [-6.8, 4.26]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Testfor overal effect Testfor subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Chi ^e = Testfor overal effect 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2019	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean s cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 s non-cult 47.3 53.1 55.9 51.2 49.7	(P < 0.(: Chi [≈] = therapy 50 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 2 (P = 0.00 tured 9.36 13.6 14.7 6.7 11.2	00001) 0.41. c 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001) 1077 42 300 14	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54 54 54 47.7 54.5 54.5 54.4 47.9 54.5 54.9 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	= 0.52). control <u>SD</u> 10.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6 13 14 117	. ² = 09 Total 8 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27	% 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.2%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [415, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 3.30 [6.06, 12.66] 3.30 [6.06, 12.67]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overall effect Testfor subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2015 (1) Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect . 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2012	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean 500 5551 60 5551 60 5551 60 5551 60 5553, df = Z = 5.93 53,1 53,9 53,1 55,9 51,2 48,7 51	(P < 0.0 : Chi ² = therapy 5D 7.56 7.85 3.7749 2 (P = 0.0 tured 9.36 13.6 14.7 6.7 11.2 10.4	00001) 0.41. c 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 14 58 20	f = 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 = 64% 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6	= 0.52). control <u>SD</u> 10.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.4	. F = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 12	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 4.5%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-5.06, 12.66] -2.90 [-817, 2.37]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overal effect Testfor suboroup diff H 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Testfor overall effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Wöhrle 2013	Z = 5.44 ferences (Mean 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 (mon-cult 47.3 53.1 55.2 48.7 51.2	$(P < 0.1c)^{2} =$ therapy 5D 7.56 7.756 7.757 3.7749 2 $(P = 0.01)^{2}$ tured 9.36 1.3.6 1.4.7 6.7 1.1.2 1.0.4	00001) 0.41. c 7 7 7 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 14 58 29 280	f = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 54 54 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6	9.4 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.1	. ² = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 161	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 6.3% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.82] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-6.06, 1.2.65] 3.30 [-6.06, 1.2.83] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [1.37, 0.87]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overal effect Testfor subgroup A.1 LVEF 24 months Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Testfor overal effect: A.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% C)	Z = 5.44 ferences cell Mean cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df= Z = 5.93 cnon-cult 47.3 53.1 55.9 51.2 48.7 51 500, df=	$(P < 0.1)^2 = \frac{(P < 0.1)^2}{10}$ $\frac{SD}{10}$ 7.56 7.85 7.74 7.72 10.4 7.56 7.12 10.4 7.56 7.5	00001) 0.41. c 7 Total 8 9 7 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 1001) 107 42 30 14 58 29 280 210 142); F	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 4 54.9 54 4 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6 57.6 57.6	9,4 11,6 11,6 11,6 13 14 11,6 13 14 11,7 9,1	. ² = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 13 161	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-8.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-8.06, 12.86] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Testfor overall effect Testfor suboroup diffect H Study or Subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = Testfor overall effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kaing 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Wöhrle 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = Testfor overall effect.	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean cultured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 51.2 47.3 53.1 55.9 51.2 48.7 51.2 48.7 51.2 48.7 51.2 48.7 51.2 48.7 51.2	(P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 (P < 0.1 P	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 7 84 99 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 82 0001) 107 20 20 0.42; P 20	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54.9 54.5 54.4 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6	9.4 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1	. ² = 09 Total 8 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 0 10 27 13 161	6 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.01 [-5.6, 12.66] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Testfor overal effect: Testfor subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Chi ² = Testfor overall effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Traverse 2018 Wöhrle 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Chi ² = Testfor overall effect.	Z = 5.44 ferences Cell Mean cuttured 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = Z = 5.93 concutt 47.3 53.1 55.2 48.7 51.2 48.7 51.2 5.00, df = Z = 1.19	(P < 0.1 : Chi ² = 50 1 7.56 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 8 8 9 57 84 9 57 84 0.06); P 7 84 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 148 29 280 0.42); P 8 3)	f = 1 (P C Mean 45 54.9 54 54 54 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6 57.6 27.6	9.4 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.1	. I [≠] = 09 Total 8 8 20 55 83 55 83 52 29 30 10 7 13 161	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-6.06, 12.66] -2.90 [-817, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overal effect. Test for subgroup 3.4.1 VEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2013 (1) Gao 2013 (1) Gao 2013 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overal effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang	Z = 5,44 (erences Cell Mean culturer 46,96 55,1 60 55,3 df = Z = 5,93 i contruer 47,3 53,1 55,9 61 55,1 55,2 48,7 51 55,1 55,2 55	(P < 0.1) therapy 50 1 7.56 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 7.85 9.36 14.7 1.2 10.4 5 (P = 0.2)	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 8 8 9 9 57 8 4 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 14 58 29 280 0.42); P 3) 364	f= 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6 57.6	9.4 9.4 11.6 13.3 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.1	Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 13 161 244	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [+4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-8.06, 12.68] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.93, 0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.33] 2.61 [12.9, 3.92]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overal effect: Test for subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2013 (19%) Chullikana 2015 Subtotal (9%) Chi ¹² = Test for overal effect. 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2013 Subtotal (9%) Chi ¹² = Test for overal effect. Total (9%) Chi ¹² = Test for overal effect. Total (9%) Chi ¹² = Test for overal effect.	Z = 5.44 (erences Mean cultures	(P < 0.1 : Chi ² = therapy 5D 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 9.36 13.6 14.7 9.36 14.7 9.36 14.7 10.4 5 (P = 0.2 : 10.4 5 (P = 0.2) = 8.(P <	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 8 19 57 8 4 0.06); P 0001) 107 8 4 0.06); P 0001) 107 8 4 0.06); P 0001) 107 8 4 0.06); P 0001) 107 8 8 9 280 0.422; P 33) 364 0.000	f = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 45 54.9 54 54 47.7 54.5 47.9 51.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 57.7 57.6 57.6 57.7 57.8 57.7 57.8 57.7 57.8 5	9.4 10.21 9.4 11.6 13.3 9.4 11.6 13.3 14 11.7 9.1 5%	. 𝑘 = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 13 161 244	Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2% 100.0%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-6.06, 12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83] 2.61 [1.29, 3.92]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overal effect Test for subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect. Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect.	Z = 5.44 (erences Mean 5.53, df = 5.53, df = 2 = 5.93; erences 60 5.53, df = 5.53, df = 5.12 60 5.53, df = 5.12 60 5.53, df = 5.12 60 5.53, df = 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.53, df = 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.13 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 61 2.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 5.12 60 60 61 2.12 60 5.12 61 2.12 60 5.12 61 2.12 61 2.12 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 61 2.2 7.1 5.02 61 2.2 7.12 5.12 7.2 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3	(P < 0.1 : Chi ² = therapy <u>SD</u> 1 7.56 7.85 3.7749 9.36 13.6 14.7 13.6 13.6 14.7 13.6 14.7 13.6 13.6 14.7 13.6 13.6 14.7 13.6 13.6 14.7 13.6 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 14.7 13.6 14.7 13.6 14.7 13.6 14.7 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 14.7 15.6 13.6 14.7 15.6	00001) 0.41.c 7 Total 8 19 57 84 0.006); P 0001) 107 42 29 00014 107 42 200 0.42); P 30 364 0.000	f = 1 (P CC Mean 45 54.9 54.5 54.5 54.4 47.9 51.6 57.6 57.6 57.6 10,12 11,12 12,12 14,12 15,12 16,12 17,12 16,12 1	9.4 9.4 11.21 7.16 5.933 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.1	F = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 100 27 13 161 244	6 Weight 2.2% 7.8% 50.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 4.5% 39.2% 100.0%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% C1 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-6.06, 12.26] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83] 2.61 [1.29, 3.92]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overal effect Test for subgroup 3.4.1 VEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2015 (1) Gao 2013 (1) Gao 2013 (1) Gao 2013 (1) Heterogeneity, Chi ² = Test for overal effect . 3.4.2 LVEF 24 months Delewi 2015 Kang 2012 Meyer 2009 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2018 Skalicka 2012 Traverse 2013 Subtoal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² = Test for overal effect . Heterogeneity, Chi ² = Test for overal effect . Heterogeneity, Chi ² = Test for overal effect . Heterogeneity, Chi ² = Test for overal effect .	Z = 5.44 (erences Mean 40.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = 2 = 5.93 63.1 55.9 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2	(P < 0.: Ch [™] = therapy 5D 1 7.56 7.56 7.785 7.785 7.85	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 8 19 57 84 8 0.06); P 0001) 107 42 30 14 58 29 280 0.42); P 30 0.42); P 33 364 0.0000 001)	f = 1 (P CC Mean 45 54.9 54 54.9 57.6 57	9.4 9.4 10.21 9.4 11.6 13 14 11.7 9.1 5% < 0,000	. [≠] = 0.9 Total 8 200 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 161 244 01). [≠] =	6 Weintt 2.2% 7.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 2.0% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 18.0% 5.0% 19.0% 10.0%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.29, 8.52] 3.00 [-5.06, 12.86] -2.90 [-81, 7, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83] 2.61 [1.29, 3.92]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Testfor overal effect: Testfor suboroup diff H Study or Subgroup 3.4.1 LVEF 24 months Chullikana 2015 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity. Chi ² = Testfor overal effect. Total (95% C) Heterogeneity. Chi ² = Testfor overal effect. Total (95% C)	Z = 5.44 (erences Cell dean culturer 46.96 55.1 60 5.53, df = 55.3 con-cul 47.3 53.1 55.9 con-cul 48.7 51 5.00, df = 2 = 1.19 32.02, df Z = 3.88 ierences:	(P < 0.1 Chi ^P = therapy 5D 7.56 7.75 3.7749 2 (P = (0 (P < 0.0) tured 9.36 13.6 13.6 13.6 14.7 7 11.2 10.4 5 (P = 0.2) = 8 (P < (P = 0.0) Chi ^P = 2 (Chi ^P = 2)	00001) 0.41.c 7 7 8 19 57 84 0.06); P 57 84 0.000; P 0001) 107 42 20 0.001) 0.42); P 30 364 0.000 001) 1.49, c	f = 1 (P CC Mean 45 54.9 54 54.9 54.5 54.4 47.7 54.5 54.4 47.7 51.6 57.6 51.6 51.6 51.6 51.9 51.	9.4 10.21 9.4 11.6 13 14.11.6 13 14.11.7 9.1 5% < 0.000	. F = 09 Total 8 20 55 83 52 29 30 10 27 13 161 244 01), F =	6 Weight 2.2% 50.8% 60.8% 60.8% 18.0% 5.0% 3.5% 2.0% 6.3% 4.5% 39.2% 100.0%	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.96 [-6.84, 10.76] 0.20 [-4.52, 4.92] 6.00 [4.15, 7.85] 5.11 [3.42, 6.80] -0.40 [-3.51, 2.71] -1.40 [-7.29, 4.49] 1.50 [-5.52, 8.52] 3.30 [-6.06, 12.63] -2.90 [-8.17, 2.37] -6.60 [-12.83, -0.37] -1.28 [-3.38, 0.83] 2.61 [1.29, 3.92]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell therapy]

Fig. 2 continued

however, there were either no controls or no significant differences from the control group in AE occurrence. Additionally, cases of coronary artery restenosis, thrombosis, and coronary artery dissection were reported, but all were successfully treated.

Infarct size

Infarct size after stem cell therapy in patients with AMI showed no significant difference between the intervention and control groups at the 6-month (-0.02; 95% CI -0.14, 0.10; p=0.75; Fig. 4A), 1-year (-0.29; 95% CI -0.29, 0.06; p=0.19; Fig. 4B), 2-year (0.12; 95% CI, -0.26, 0.50; p=0.53; Fig. 4C), and 3-4-year observation points (0.01; 95% CI, -0.44, 0.46; p=0.95; Fig. 4D).

Discussion

This systematic review included 79 RCTs that investigated stem cell therapy in patients with AMI. Our work is the most recent and comprehensive systematic review. Additionally, this is the only study that has conducted an analysis based on the duration of cell culture and discusses the adequacy of infused cell counts and the appropriate timing of stem cell injection. The major finding of this study is the enhancement of LVEF in patients undergoing stem cell therapy, as compared to the control group, at 6 and 12 months, and 24 and 36 months durations. Additionally, the intervention groups undergoing stem cell transplantation had a lower MACE risk as compared to the control groups. Moreover, significant



Fig. 2 continued

enhancements in LVEF were observed in studies employing cell culture, especially when the culture duration exceeded 1 week and the cell quantity of at least 10^8 was administered.

Mid- to long-term improvement in LVEF with stem cell therapy

We found that the intervention group showed modest improvements in LVEF at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months compared to the control group. Additionally, these improvements were more pronounced in patients receiving MSC injections. Previous systematic reviews have reported only the short-term (approximately 6 and 12 months) effectiveness of stem cell therapy. The studies evaluating patients from 18 months to 3 years are limited, resulting in inconsistent data on whether cell transplantation improves cardiac function [4, 6]. The current systematic review indicates that the effect of stem cell therapy on LVEF in patients with AMI may last up to 3 years. However, the effects at 5 years remain unclear as a limited number of studies report the follow-up results up to 5 years after stem cell injection.

Μ

Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
2.1.1 LVEF MNC 6 m	nonths								
Beitnes 2009	48.8	10.7	50	49	9.5	50	2.6%	-0.20 [-4.17, 3.77]	
Cao 2009	48.4	3.5	41	45.7	3.9	45	16.5%	2.70 [1.14, 4.26]	
Chullikana 2015	47.8	8.12	10	45.33	8.56	9	0.7%	2.47 [-5.05, 9.99]	
Delewi 2015	46.8	9.61	129	46.4	9.2	60	4.9%	0.40 [-2.46, 3.26]	
Ge 2006	58.6	9.9	10	56.3	3.5	10	1.0%	2.30 [-4.21, 8.81]	
Grajek 2010	47.79	10.86	31	44.88	11.25	14	0.8%	2.91 [-4.11, 9.93]	
Huikuri 2008	60	8	39	56	10	38	2.5%	4.00 [-0.05, 8.05]	
Janssens 2006	51.8	8.8	30	49.1	10.7	30	1.6%	2.70 [-2.26, 7.66]	
Jazi 2012	39.37	9.88	16	31	7.48	16	1.1%	8.37 [2.30, 14.44]	
Kaminek 2008	45.5	8.34	31	44.2	9.1	31	2.1%	1.30 [-3.05, 5.65]	
Kang 2012	53.3	9.3	42	53.7	11.1	29	1.7%	-0.40 [-5.32, 4.52]	
Lipiec 2009	44.2	13.7	26	43.8	15.3	10	0.3%	0 40 [-10 45 11 25]	
Lunde 2006	48.8	10.7	50	49	9.5	50	2.6%	-0 20 64 17 3 771	
Mever 2009	56.7	12.5	30	52	12.4	30	1.0%	4 70 1-1 60 11 001	
Nicolau 2018	44.74	12.0	88	43.5	12.43	55	2.0%	1 24 63 29 5 771	
Noquoiro 2000	66.1	10.72	24	40.6	17.62	6	0.2%	6 60 L0 17 20 17	
Nogueira 2009 Diourko 2000	00.1	10.73	24	49.0	17.55	10	0.270	5.50 [-9.17, 20.17] 11.00 IS 48, 15 541	
Plewka 2009	44	10	38	33		18	2.0%	11.00 [0.40, 15.54]	
Quyyumi 2011	50.1	11	11	54.2	11	10	0.5%	-4.10 [-13.52, 5.32]	
Ruan 2005	59.33	12.91	9	50.3	8.3	11	0.4%	9.03 [-0.73, 18.79]	
Schächinger 2006a	53.8	10.2	95	49.9	13	92	3.6%	3.90 [0.54, 7.26]	
Schaefer 2010	52	10.58	28	53	10.58	28	1.3%	-1.00 [-6.54, 4.54]	
Skalicka 2012	45	10.9	14	47	9.8	10	0.6%	-2.00 [-10.34, 6.34]	
Suárez 2007	58	9	10	45	8	10	0.7%	13.00 [5.54, 20.46]	
Traverse 2011	50.3	11.1	58	51.6	11.2	27	1.6%	-1.30 [-6.40, 3.80]	
Traverse 2018	49.2	13	55	48.8	7.8	26	1.9%	0.40 [-4.16, 4.96]	
Wöhrle 2013	55.3	9.6	29	61.4	11.2	13	0.8%	-6.10 [-13.12. 0.92]	+
Yao 2009	37.7	4.1	12	34.4	2.8	12	5.1%	3.30 [0.49. 6.11]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			984		2.0	740	60.0%	2.35 [1.53, 3,17]	•
Heterogeneity Chiz	= 49 45 4	if = 26 / 4	= 0.0	14): P=	47%			,,,	
Test for overall effor	- 40.40, l + 7 = 5 64	∠0 (F (P ~ 0.0	0.01	247, F. =	+1.70				
, estion overall effec	A. Z = 0.01	Q: 10.0	5001)						
2.1.21 VEE MCC. 8	onthe								
2.1.2 LVCF MSU 0 M	ionuls	~			-		40.70	10.00 //1.00 11.00	
Chen 2004	67	3	34	54	- 5	35	10.7%	13.00 [11.06, 14.94]	
Gao 2013	55	7.85	19	54.5	7.6	20	1.7%	U.5U [-4.35, 5.35]	
Hare 2009	56.9	9.641	30	56.1	5.8093	19	2.2%	0.80 [-3.53, 5.13]	
Kim 2018	44.1	5.8	14	42	2.6	12	3.5%	2.10 [-1.28, 5.48]	+
Lee 2014	50	8.4	30	50.4	9.4	28	1.9%	-0.40 [-5.00, 4.20]	
Wang 2014	50.1	3.4	27	49.1	2.3	28	17.0%	1.00 [-0.54, 2.54]	+- .
Subtotal (95% CI)			154			142	37.1%	4.47 [3.43, 5.52]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 105.37,	df = 5 (P	< 0.0	0001); P	= 95%				
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 8.40) (P < 0.0	0001)						
2.1.3 LVEF BM-prog	jenitor ce	ll 6 mont	hs						
Herbots 2009	59.2	7.9	32	57.8	7.4	34	2.9%	1.40 [-2.30, 5.10]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			32			34	2.9%	1.40 [-2.30, 5.10]	
Heterogeneity: Not a	annlicable								
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² : Test for overall effec Test for overall effec	:t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, :t: Z = 9.59	df= 33 () (P < 0.0	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1 10001) 10.70	00001); df= 2./f	l² = 80%	916	100.0%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneitly: Chi≇ Test for overall effec Test for subαroup di	:t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, :t: Z = 9.59 ifferences	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ^z = 1	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1 10001) 10.70.	00001); df= 2 (f	I [#] = 80% P = 0.005	916 i). I² = 8	100.0 %	3.11 [2.47, 3.74]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi [≠] Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di	t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, t: Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell	df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² = ' therapy	•6) 1 170 (P < 0.1 (0001) 10.70.	00001); df= 2 (f C	² = 80% ? = 0.005 ontrol	916 i). ² = 8	100.0 %	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi [≈] Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di Study or Subgroup	t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, t: Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell Mean	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² = ' therapy SD	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1 10001) 10.70.	00001); df= 2 (f C Mean	I ^z = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD	916 i). ² = 8 Total	100.0% 1.3% Weight	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² . Test for overall effec Test for subgroup d Study or Subgroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n	t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, t: Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ^z = : therapy SD	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1) 10001) 10.70.	00001); df= 2 (F C <u>Mean</u>	I ² = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD	916 i), ² = 8 Total	100.0% 1.3% Weight	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study or Subaroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 m Beitnes 2009	t: Z = 0.74 = 165.51, t: Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² =	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1) 10001) 10.70.	00001); df = 2 (f <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 48.5	i ² = 80% ² = 0.005 ontrol <u>SD</u> 8.8	916 i). I² = 8 <u>Total</u> 50	100.0% 1.3% <u>Weight</u> 5.3%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di <u>Study or Subaroup</u> 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 m Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7 48.2	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² = - therapy <u>SD</u>	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1) (0001) 10.70.	00001); df = 2 (f <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44 6	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 1 8.8 4.3	916). ² = 8 <u>Total </u> 50 45	100.0% 1.3% <u>Weight</u> 5.3% 18.9%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 (1.76, 5.44)	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subgroup 2.2.1 L/VEF MINC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choude 2016	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² =	•6) 1170 (P < 0.1) (0001) 10.70. <u>Fotal</u> 50 41 51	00001); df=2 (f <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 1 8.8 4.3 9.1	916). ² = 8 <u>Total </u> 50 45 41	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 (2.41, 4.61]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di Study or Subgroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 m Beitnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6	df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = 1 therapy <u>SD</u> 9 4.4 10.5	•6) 1170 (0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51	00001); df = 2 (F C Mean 48.5 48.5 44.6 52	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1	916), ² = 8 <u>Total </u> 50 45 41	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² . Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di Study or Subaroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 m Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25	df = 33 (df = 33 (e (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = 1 therapy <u>SD</u> 4.4 10.5 5.55	-6) 1170 (0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 51	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25	P = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6	916), ² = 8 <u>Total</u> 50 45 41 5 27	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 (1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [-1.56, 13.56]	105 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subgroup 2.2.1 LVEF INIC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011 Dill 2009	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.55 ifferences Cell <u>Mean</u> nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5	4 (P = 0.4 df = 33 (9 (P < 0.0 :: Chi ² = ' therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 8	-6) 1170 (P < 0.1) (0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 57 27	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8	916). ² = 8 <u>Total</u> 50 45 41 5 27	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference <u>N. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 15, 44] 0.00 [-1.56, 13, 45] 0.00 [-1.56, 15, 73]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1
Test for reveral effec Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study or Subaroup Cat 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011 Dill 2009 Grajak 2010	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95	4 (P = 0.4 df = 33 (9 (P < 0.0 : Chi² = ' therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9	-6) 1170 (P < 0.1) (0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 527 27 27	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4	P = 80% P = 0.005 00000 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74	916). ² = 8 <u>Total</u> 50 45 41 5 27 12	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.14, 54, 13.66] 2.10 [-1.55, 7.3.66] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [control] Favours [cell thera Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% Ct) Hetlerogeneith, Chi ² Test for subaroup d Study or Subaroup d Study or Subaroup d 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Kaminek 2010	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95 44.1	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = ⁻¹ therapy <u>SD</u> 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13	-6) P < 0.1 0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 51 57 27 37	00001); df = 2 (f <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4 43.11	P = 80% P = 0.005 000000 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75	916). ² = 8 <u>Total </u> 50 45 41 5 27 12 36	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 369] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.45] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.45] 0.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33]	105 0 5 10 Favours (control) Favours (cell thera Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi ⁺ Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study of Subgroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Bettnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011 Dill 2009 Grajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.58 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.95 54.1 56.7	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi [≠] = 1 therapy <u>50</u> 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.5 7.9 10.13 7.12	6) 1170 P < 0,1 10,70, 10,70, 50 41 51 51 57 27 37 8	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29	916). ² = 8 <u>Total </u> 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 3.4% 1.4%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44, 61] 0.60 [-3.14, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.14, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 0.98 [-3.55, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 0.98 [-3.55, 5.73]	Mean Difference V. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneith, Chi ² Test for subaroud af Study or Subaroud af Study or Subaroud af Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Colombo 2011 Dill 2009 Grajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.56 ifferences Cell Mean norths 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.25 51.5 46.95 46.5 51.5 46.95 48.5	df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi [#] = 1 therapy <u>SD</u> 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5	6) 1170 P < 0.(0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 57 27 37 8 46	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 1 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2	916). I ² = 8 Total 1 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 3.4% 3.7%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3,29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1,56, 1.63] 2.10 [-1,53, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28]	Mean Difference
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi ⁺ Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study of Subaroup Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Grajek 2010 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018 Laguna 2018	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.55 ifferences Cell Mean nomths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95 44.1 56.7 38.5 55	df = 33 (df = 33 (0 (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = 1 therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10	6) P < 0.1 10.70. 10.70. 50 41 51 51 57 27 37 8 46 26	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 7 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10	916 (i), ² = 8 50 45 41 5 7 12 36 9 40 24	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 1.4% 3.7% 2.1%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference <u>N. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [7.37, 5.44] 0.00 [-3.61, 4.61] 0.00 [-3.61, 4.61] 0.00 [-3.5, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 0.99 [3.35, 5.33] 0.99 [3.35, 5.35] 0.99 [3.35, 5.95] 0.90 [3.35, 9.55] 0.91 [3.35] 0.91 [3.	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneity, Chi ² Test for subaroud of Study or Subaroud of Study or Subaroud of Study or Subaroud of Choudy 2016 Choudy 20	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.55 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.9 55 56.7 38.5 55 56.4	df = 33 (g (P < 0.0 C C hi ^p = - therapy <u>50</u> 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10 11.7	6) 1170 P < 0. 00001) 10.70. 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 8.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6	916), ² = 8 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.4% 3.4% 1.4% 2.1% 3.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.00 [1.56, 1.45] 0.00 [1.56, 1.45] 0.09 [3.34, 1.45] 0.09 [3.34, 1.45] 0.09 [3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [1.55, 9.55] 1.72 [8.60, 1.36] 4.00 [1.55, 9.55]	Mean Difference
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subarroup d Study of Subgroup Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Cao 2009 Crajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Lamiraul 2018 Lamiraul 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.56 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 46.95 46.25 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 5	df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = ' therapy <u>50</u> 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.7 11.8	6) 1170 P < 0. 100001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95 58	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 48.4 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 38.1 50	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8	916)). * = 8 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 3.4% 3.7% 2.1% 3.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference <u>N. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [-1.65, 13.65] 1.42 [-5.43, 5.73] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.40 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.8, 4.88]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study of Subaroup d Study of Subaroup d Choudy 2016 Calorabo 2011 Dill 2009 Choudy 2016 Calorabo 2011 Dill 2009 Choudy 2016 Carjack 2010 Kaminek 2010 Lagina 2018 Lamiraul 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 54.5 54.1 56.7 38.5 55 36.4 49.8 52.1	df = 33 (df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi [#] = - therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.7 11.7 11.7	6) 1170 P < 0.1 00001) 10.70. 50 51 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95 58 29	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 50 57.3	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6	916)). * = 8 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.2% 3.7% 2.1% 3.5% 2.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [1.56, 1.65] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 1.42 [5.44, 2.83] 0.99 [3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [5.44, 2.83] 0.99 [3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [5.44, 2.84] 4.00 [1.55, 9.55] 1.70 [6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [5.28, 4.88] 2.20 [1.165, 1.25]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d Study of Subaroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 m Beitnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011 DII 2009 Grajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wöhrle 2013 Viano 2020	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.50 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 51.5 56.7 38.5 56.4 49.8 52.1 45.5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 ((P < 0.0 : Chi ² = : therapy 9 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.54	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.70. 10.70. 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95 58 29 20 20	00001); df = 2 (f CC Mean 48.5 44.6 52 44.25 44.24 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 51 38.1 57.3 43.6	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 10.6	916), ² = 8 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 36 21 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.4% 3.5% 2.5% 1.5% 0.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [17.6, 13.65] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.5, 13.673] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] -2.80 [-6.06, 1.36] 1.40 [-1.55, 9.55] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] -0.20 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-12, 00] [-12, 00] 5.20	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneith; Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaround of Study of Subaround 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.59 ifferences Cell Mean norths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 () (P < 0.0 ; ChP = : SD 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.7 10.5 10 10.7 11.7 11.8 10.4 3.8	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.70. 10.70. 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95 58 295 58 295 58 295 20 12 12	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Rean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 44.2 44.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 50 57.3 43.6 57.3 38.1	P = 0.005 sp : sp : 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 9.1 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 16.8 4.3 3.5 15.2 10.005	916 50 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.7% 2.1% 3.5% 1.5% 0.6% 7.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 9329, 369 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [1.56, 1.63] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 0.99 [3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 0.99 [3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 0.90 [5.36, 1.26] 1.70 [6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [5.28, 4.88] 1.30 [5.29, 1.26] 1.30 [5.29, 1	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi [®] Test for verall effec Test for subarous d Study of Subarous 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Colombo 2011 DII 2009 Grajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Wohra 2012 Wohra 2012 Van 2018 Surder 2018 Wohra 2012 Van 2019 Surder 2018 Wohra 2012 Van 2019 Surder 2018 Wohra 2012 Van 2019 Surder 2018 Van 2018 Van 2018 Surder 2018 Van 2018 Van 2018 Van 2018 Surder 2018 Van	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.58 ifferences months 48.7 48.2 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.95 51.5 46.91 56.7 38.5 55 36.4 49.8 52.1 45.5 39.8	(P = 0.4 df = 33 () (P < 0.0 : Chi ² = · therapy 5. 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.13 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.4 11.7 11.8 3.8	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.001) 10.70. Fotal 50 41 5 27 27 37 8 46 26 55 27 37 8 46 25 58 29 20 12 53 2 53 2	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.1 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 38.3	P = 80% SD - 5005 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 8.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 16.94 3.5	916 50 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415 41 41 40 40 40 41 40 41 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 4.9% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 3.4% 3.4% 3.5% 2.5% 0.6% 7.5% 0.6% 7.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-3.5, 3.30] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.25] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.20] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42]	Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference
Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneith; Chi ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di Study of Subgroup 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chagung 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016 Surder 2016 Started (95% CI) Heterospecky; Chi ²	tt Z = 0.74 = 165.51, tt Z = 9.55 ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 46.25 54.95 44.1 56.7 38.5 55 36.4 49.8 52.1 45.8 39.8 52.1 45.8 52.1 45.8 52.8 52.1 55.8 55.	(P = 0.4 df = 33 ((P < 0.0 : Chi ² = : therapy <u>9</u> 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 3.8 (= 14.0 ²)	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 5 27 27 37 8 46 26 58 29 50 12 20 12 532 20 12 20 20 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	C C Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 57.3 51 38.1 57.3 51 38.1 57.3 51 38.1 57.3 51 38.1 57.3 51 38.1 51 57.3 51 38.1 51 57.2 57.2 57.2 57.2 57.2 57.2 57.2 57.2	P = 80% ontrol SD 4.3 9.1 1.74 8.8 4.3 9.1 1.6.6 6.8 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 13.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 14.7 13.6 15.8 1	916 50 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 12 36 9 12 13 19 12 415 19 12 415 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 3.7% 2.1% 3.5% 2.5% 1.5% 0.6% 0.6% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.36] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.20 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.80 [-6.36, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.80 [-6.36, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.80 [-6.36, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.80 [-6.36, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.80 [-6.36, 1.26] -3.20 [-1.55, 1.25] 1.30 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.39 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.39 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.39 [-8.29, 1.20]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for subaroup d 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Colornbo 2011 Dill 2009 Grajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2018 Wohrle 2018 Wohrle 2018 Varies 2019 Sauder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2018 Varies 2019 Sauder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2018 Varies 2019 Sauder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2018 Varies 2019 Sauder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wohrle 2018 Varies 2019 Vac 2009 Subtotal (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for general effect	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.511 if z = 9.55 (ifferences Cell Mean 48.7 48.7 52.6 46.25 51.5 52.6 46.95 44.1 56.7 38.5 55 36.4 49.8 45.21 45.5 30.8 22.44, 0 22.84, 0 45.5 30.84, 0 45.5 45.5 30.84, 0 45.5 4	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 : Chi [#] = ' therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.1 3 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 3.8 (= 14 (P = 0.0	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.0001) 10.70. Total 50 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 57.3 43.6 57.3 43.6 35.3 35.3	P = 80% ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 11.74 8.75 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 16.94 3.5 3%	916 50 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 40 24 55 27 13 40 24 55 40 24 55 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.7% 2.1% 5.5% 0.6% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 13.56] 0.60 [-1.56, 13.56] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.26] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.25] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42]	Mean Difference Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect Test for subaround of Study or Subaround 2.2.1 (UFF INIC 12 m Beitnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chaguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Vichie 2013 Yang 2020 Yao 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] = Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{l} t,t = 0,74\\ = 166,51,1,\\ t,t = 9,56\\ \hline \\ \mbox{ cell} \\ \mbox{ mean} \\ \mbox{ mean} \\ \mbox{ set} \mbox{ set} \\ \mbox{ set} \mbox{ set} \\ \mbox{ set}$	(P = 0.4 df = 33 () (P < 0.0 () (P < 0.0 (6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70. 10.70.	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.24 40.24 40.31 55.28 57.3 41.3 51 38.1 50 57.3 43.6 35.3); ² = 3)	P = 80% P = 0.005 00000 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.6 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.94 3.5 3%	916 50 45 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 1.1% 1.1% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.5% 2.5% 1.5% 0.6% 7.5% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C] 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.50, 1.54] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 0.98 [-3.25, 5.43] 0.98 [-3.25, 5.44] 2.20 [-6.26, 1.25] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] -2.80 [-6.26, 1.25] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] -2.80 [-6.26, 1.25] -2.80 [-6.26, 1.25] 1.90 [-2.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-2.29, 1.20] 1.97 [0.85, 2.90]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi ² Test for subaroup d 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chail 2010 Grajek 2010 Samkona 2015 Samkona 2015 Sankora 2018 Viohnie 2013 Viohnie 2014 Viohnie 201	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $z = 9.54$ (ifferences Celling Mean 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10001000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (P < 0.0 c) (P < 0.0 c) Chi ^p = (therapy 50 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.1 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 3.8 (P = 0.0)	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.001) 10.70. 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 58 29 50 12 532 = 0.07 003)	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 81 55.3 51 38.1 57.3 43.6 35.3 (); ² = 3)	P = 80% ontrol SD 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 13.6 10.8 13.5 13.6 10.8	916 50 50 45 41 5 7 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.5% 2.5% 1.5% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-5, 5.43] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.35] 0.20 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 9.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.42 [-5.28, 4.58] 5.20 [-11.65, 1.25] 5.20 [-11.65, 1.25] 5.20 [-11.65, 1.25] 5.20 [-11.65, 1.25] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42]	Mean Difference V. Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subaround of Study or Subaround 2.2.1 (VFF INIC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Sun Forman 2015 Sunder 2018 Sunder 2018 Sund	tt z = 0,74 = 165,511 tt z = 9,55 (fifterences Cell Mean 48,7 48,2 52,6 44,25 51,5 52,6 44,25 54,4 46,95 44,1 56,7 56,5 53,64 44,98 53,64 49,88 53,64 49,88 53,64 45,53 39,88 52,24,64 45,53 39,88 52,24,64 45,53 39,88 52,24,64 45,53 39,88 52,24,64 45,53 39,88 52,24,64 45,555 39,88 52,24 53,64 55,555	(P = 0.4 df = 33 () (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 c Ch ² = -) 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 3.8 (P = 0.0 7.44	 (6) 1170 (10001) (10.70. (10	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 522 49.4 44.4 40.25 49.4 41.3 55.28 41.3 55.28 41.3 55.28 41.3 55.3 (); J ^a = 3 55.3	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 9.1 1.74 8.75 7.29 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 35 35% 6.74	916 50 50 45 41 527 12 36 9 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.4% 2.5% 0.5% 0.6% 7.5% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C] 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.37, 3.83] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.94 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] -2.80 [-6.69, 1.36] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.29, 4.88] 1.90 [-1.55, 1.25] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Hetlerogeneith; Chi ² Test for subaroud of Study or Subaroud of Study or Subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Crajek 2010 Grajek 2010 Samitok 2010 Samitok 2010 Samitok 2010 Samora 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Vanja 2020 Yao 2009 Subtokal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Chi ² = Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Traverse 2018 Yao 2009 Subtokal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Chi ² = Caso 2019 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Traverse 2018 Yao 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2017 Choudy 201	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $z = 9.54$ (ifferences Cell Mean 48.2 52.66 48.2 51.5 54.4.1 46.25 51.5 54.4.1 46.25 53.64 4.1 45.55 53.64 4.1 45.55 53.64 4.1 45.55 55 36.4 4.1 45.55 55 36.2 4.9.8 55.3 39.8 55.3 39.8 55.3 55.3 55.3 55.3 55.3 55.3 55.3 55	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i) (P < 0.0 : ChP = 0.0 : ChP = - : C	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.70. 10.70. 50 41 51 527 27 37 8 46 26 95 58 29 95 58 29 95 58 29 95 58 29 95 532 = 0.07 003) 19 57	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.3 11 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 57.3 43.6 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 57.4 6 6 6 6 6	P= 80% P= 0.005 sntrol SD 3D 4.3 9.1 6.6 8.8 9.1 6.8 9.1 6.8 9.1 11.74 8.75 9.2 10.8 9.6 13.6 10.8 9.6 13.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 10.8	916 50 50 45 41 57 12 36 9 40 24 55 9 40 24 57 13 19 12 27 13 19 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 2.1% 3.5% 61.6% 3.3% 13.4%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 369] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.57] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.09 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.70 [-6.02, 2.60] -0.20 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.25] 1.80 [-9.29, 12.09] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subaround of Study or Subaround 2.2.1 (VFF INIC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Sun Forman 2015 Sunder 2018 Sunder 2018 Sun	t z = 0.74 = 165.51 t z = 9.55 Cell Mean nonths 48.7 48.2 52.6 52.6 52.6 54.4 46.95 54.4 46.95 54.4 56.7 38.5 36.4 49.8 52.1 56.3 36.4 45.5 39.8 52.2 45.5 30.8 55.3	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0: : Chi ⁼ = 1 therapy SD 3 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 9 4.4 10.1 7.12 10.5 10.1 11.7 11.8 (10.4 15.44 3.8 (P = 0.0) 7.41 6.04	(6) 1170 (0001) 10.70. 50 41 51 527 27 27 37 8 46 26 958 29 20 12 532 = 0.07 003) 19 57 7	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 43.11 55.28 43.13 57.3 38.1 57.3 38.1 57.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3	P = 80% = 0.005 ontrol SD : 8.8 4.3 9.1 11.74 8.8 4.3 9.1 11.74 8.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.94 3.5 3% 6.711 5.93 0.005	916 50 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 25 27 13 12 415 20 55 50 24 27 12 20 55 50 20 24 20 55 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.9% 4.9% 3.4% 1.2% 3.7% 2.5% 1.5% 61.6% 3.3% 13.1%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C] 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.36, 7.83] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.26, 5.24] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.26, 5.25]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroud of Study or Subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chailer 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Traverse 2018 Vander 2018 Traverse 2018 Vander 2018 Traverse 2018 Vander 2018 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2018 Choudry 2018 Cho	t z = 0,74 = 165,51,1 t z = 9,50 (ifferences Cell Mean nonths 48,7 48,2 51,5 55,5 55,	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i) (P < 0.0 : Chi ⁼ = .	.6) 1170 P < 0.1 (00001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 51 52 7 8 46 26 95 58 295 532 20 12 532 50.07 003) 19 57 14 (1) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	D00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 44.311 55.28 41.3 38.1 51 38.1 51 38.1 51 33.5 3 51.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.4 54.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 5	P = 80% P = 0.005 sntrol SD 4.3 9.1 6.6 8.7 10.8 9.2 11.74 8.75 9.2 9.2 13.6 10.8 9.6 16.94 3.5 3% 6.71 5.93 2.33 6.71 5.93 2.5 5.93 5.	916 50 45 41 527 12 366 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 27 13 19 12 27 12 366 9 40 24 55 27 12 27 12 366 9 40 24 55 27 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.1% 4.9% 3.4% 1.4% 2.5% 2.5% 5.5% 61.6% 3.3% 3.3% 5.3%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 1.32, 3.69] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 2.56 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.56 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [-5.28, 4.88] 1.09 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.09 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 0.50 [-2.06] 0.50 [-2.06]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subaround of 2.2.1 LVFF INIC 12 n Betintes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Calombo 2011 Dill 2009 Choudry 2016 Chaudry 2016 Crajek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Lamirault 2017 Sun Forman 2015 Sunder 2018 Wohnte 2013 Viang 2020 Vao 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVFF INSC 12 n Gao 2013 Cao 2015 (1) Kim 2018 Zhang 2021 Chaudry 2018 Chaudry	t z = 0,74 = 165,51,5 t z = 9,55 (fifterences Cell Mean months 48,7 48,2 48,2 52,6 52,6 55,5 55,5 56,4 49,82 44,1 55,5 55,5 56,3 39,8 22,44,60 55,3 58,8 45,55 55,55 56,3 39,8 55,3 56,3 58,8 46,55 56,3 56,3 58,8 46,55 56,3 56,2 56,3	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0: : Chi ^P = · · · · SD · · SD · · 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.5 10 11.7 10.5 10 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 (P = 0.0) 7.41 6.04 4.2 6.8	 (6) 1170 P < 0,1 (100001) 10.70. 50 41 51 52 27 27 27 27 37 8 46 26 27 37 8 46 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 20 21 2532 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 12 232 20 20	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 52 44.6 55.28 49.4 44.4 43.11 38.1 55.28 49.4 43.4 55.28 49.4 43.5 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 (); ² = 3) 54.6 54.5 54.5 59.5	P= 80% = 0.005 ontrol SD 	916 50 50 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415 20 55 512 19 12 415	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 1.1% 4.9% 4.9% 2.1% 3.3% 2.5% 61.6% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3% 3.3%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 154] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.37, 9.33 2.20 [-6.36], 7.43 1.42 [-5.44, 6.32] 1.42 [-5.44, 6.32] 1.42 [-5.44, 6.32] 1.42 [-5.44, 6.32] 1.40 [-1.55, 1.55] 1.50 [-1.60, 1.26] 1.50 [-1.50, 1.25] 1.50 [-2.29, 2.09] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.53, 3.08] 0.50 [-2.08, 5.29] 0.50 [-2.	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroud of Study of Subaroud 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Crajak 2010 Kaminek 2010 Lagina 2018 Lamiraut 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Sudret 2016 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2013 (Gao 2015 (1) Kim 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI)	t z = 0.74 = 165.51, t z = 9.50, (mean 48,7 48,2 52,6 46,25 51,5 54,45,95 46,25 55,5 36,4 49,8 52,1 45,55 36,4 49,8 52,1 49,8 52,1 49,8 52,1 55,51 55,51 55,51 56,51	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0: : Ch ^P = · · · sD · · 9 4.4 10.5 6.85 6.85 6.85 6.85 6.85 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 11.7 11.8 10.4 4.2 (P = 0.0) 7.41 6.04 4.2 6.8	6) 1170 P < 0.1 100001) 10.70. Fotal 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 95 58 29 20 12 29 20 12 29 50 20 12 50 20 10 70 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	000001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 522 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 57.3 43.6 35.3 7); f = 3 54.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5	P = 80% ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 6.8 9.2 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.5 13.6 10.8 9.5 3% 6.71 5.93 2.3 5.6	916). * = 8 50 45 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 22 415 20 55 12 19 106	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 4.9% 1.1% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.2% 5.2% 61.6% 5.3% 0.8% 1.5% 0.8% 1.5% 0.8% 1.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.56, 5.43] 0.09 [-3.31, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.57] 2.10 [-1.52, 9.73] 2.55 [+4.73, 9.33] 0.55 [+4.73, 9.33] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.40 [-5.28, 4.88] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.97 [-5.20, 5.14] 4.50 [1.55, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.56, 5.53] 2.50 [-1.55, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.56, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.56, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.57, 6.53] 3.50 [-1.57, 6.53] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.54] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.54] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.54] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.55] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.54] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.54] 3.51 [-1.57, 6.55] 3.51 [-1.5	Mean Difference Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi ² Test for subaroup d 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chailer 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wohte 2013 Yao 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	t $t = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $t = 9.55$ (ifferences CMEM Mean Mean Mean Mean 48.7 52.6 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 51.5 55.5 5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0: : Chi ^P = · · · 5D · · 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 11.7 11.8 10.4 (P = 0.0 7.41 6.04 4.2 6.3 (P = 0.2 2.5 10.2 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5	.6) 1170 P < 0.1	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 40.25 55.28 41.3 38.1 50.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.4 54.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 59.5 7 = 46%	P = 80% = 0.005 ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 10.6 6.6 8.8 4.3 9.1 10.7 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.6 10.8 9.5 9.3 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.6 5.93 5.95 5.93 5.9	916). * = 8 50 45 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 24 55 12 27 13 19 24 55 12 19 10 50 40 27 13 19 10 27 10 10 27 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.8% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 2.1% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.365] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.23] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.73] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.23] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.23] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -20 [-1.65, 1.25] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -20 [-1.65, 1.25] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -20 [-1.65, 1.25] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.53] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroud of Study or Subground 2.2.1 LVEF INIC 12 n Betnes 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chaguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Check (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Subtod (195% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect	t z = 0,74 = 165,51,1 t z = 9,55 (Mean 48,7 52,6 48,2 52,6 48,2 52,6 48,2 52,6 48,2 52,6 48,2 51,5 54,4 48,2 54,4 48,2 54,4 56,7 38,5 55,3 55,5 55,3 55,5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0; : ChI ^P = : therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.7 11.7 11.7 11.7 11.7 11.7 11.7 11.7	6) 1170 P < 0.1) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 527 27 37 7 7 8 46 26 27 37 7 8 46 26 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	000001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 522 49.4 44.4 44.4 41.3 51 38.1 55.28 49.4 43.4 36.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 54.6 54.5 59.5 F = 46%	P = 80% ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 6.6 8.8 11.74 8.75 6.8 11.74 8.75 9.2 10 13.6 10.8 9.6 13.6 10.94 3.5 5.8 6.71 5.93 6.71 5.93 6.71 5.93 6.71 5.93 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.2 7.29 9.5 7.29 9.5 7.29 9.5 7.29 9.5 7.5 7.29 9.5 7.5 7.29 9.5 7.5 7.29 9.5 7.5 7.5 7.29 9.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7	916 50 10 50 50 50 51 52 52 12 55 12 12 55 12 19 106	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 4.0% 4.9% 1.1% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [M, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 544] 0.60 [3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [1.53, 5.73] 2.26 [4.73, 9.3] 2.280 [-6.96, 1.36] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.36] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.36] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.80 [-6.96, 1.26] -2.90 [-1.56, 1.26] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.209] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.58, 6.52] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroud of Study of Subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Crajak 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamiraul 12017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Kim 2018 Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{l} t \ z = 0 \ , 74 \\ = 165 \ , 51, t \ z = 9.56 \\ \hline mathbf{million} \\ mean \\ months \\ 48, 7 \\ 48, 2 \\ 51, 5 \\ 55, 55, 55, 55, 55, 55, 55, 55, 55$	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (0) (P < 0.0; C h) ⁼ = : therapy SD : 9 4.4 4.4 10.5 5.55 5.68 7.9 10.1 3.7,12 10.5 10.1 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.4 3.8 (P = 0.0 7.41 15.4 4.2 6.8 (P = 0.0 7.41 15.4 4.2 8 (P = 0.0 7.41 15.4 4.2 8 (P = 0.0 7.41 15.4 8 3.3 (P = 0.0 7.41 15.4 8 3.3 7 9 7 9 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5	(6) 1170 P < 0.0 10.70. 50 50 41 51 5 27 27 27 27 27 8 46 6 29 20 12 20 12 20 12 532 20 12 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 12 532 20 10.0	000001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 522 49.4 44.4 41.3 51 38.1 55.28 51.5 50.5 53.5 54.6 554.5 54.5 59.5 ₽ = 46%	P = 80% P = 0.005 SD	916 50 12 50 50 50 50 51 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 12 20 55 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 1.8.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 0.5% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 4.0% 3.3% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 3.49, 3.69] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 2.56 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.56 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.56 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.09 [-3.26, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.40 [-5.28, 4.88] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% CI
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subaround of Study or Subaround 2.2.1 LVFF INIC 12 n Bethess 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Surder 2018 Surder	$\begin{array}{l} \text{ tr} t = 0, 74\\ \text{ = } 165, 51, \text{ tr} z = 9, 55\\ Cell mean means of the second $	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (i (P < 0.0; : Chi ^P = : therapy 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 10.5 10.5 10.1 11.7 11.8 (= 14 (P) (P = 0.0) 7.41 15.44 3.8 (= 14 (P) (P = 0.0) 7.41 15.44 3.8 (= 14 (P) (P = 0.0) 7.41 15.44 3.8 (= 14 (P) (P = 0.0) 7.41 15.44 3.8 (P = 0.0) 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41	.6) 1170 P < 0.11	000001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 49.4 43.11 55.28 44.4 43.11 50 55.4 51.5 57.3 35.3 (); ² = 3) 54.6 54.5	P = 80% ontrol SD 8.8 4.3 9.1 8.7 9.2 10 13.6 6.8 11.74 8.75 10.8 13.6 10.84 3.5 3% 6.71 5.93 5.6 7	916 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	100.0% 1.3% Weight 5.3% 4.0% 4.0% 4.9% 1.2% 1.8% 2.1% 7.5% 61.6% 3.3% 1.3.1% 3.3% 4.0% 3.0% 4.0% 4.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C] 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.37, 3.73] 2.26 [-4.73, 9.73] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.98 [-3.35, 5.33] 0.94 [-3.35, 5.35] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.20 [-5.29, 4.88] 1.42 [-5.44, 4.28] -2.80 [-6.66, 1.36] 1.42 [-5.44, 4.28] -2.80 [-6.66, 1.36] 1.42 [-5.44, 4.28] -2.80 [-6.80, 1.36] 1.42 [-5.44, 4.28] -2.80 [-6.80, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [1.26, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.66] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Crajak 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamiraul 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Gao 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.3 LVEF BM progeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVEF BM progeneity, Chi ² Turan 2012 Subtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{t} t = 0, 74\\ = 165, 51, 1, t = -9, 55\\ \textbf{cent}\\ \textbf{mean}\\ \textbf{months}\\ \textbf{48}, 7\\ \textbf{48}, 2\\ \textbf{51}, 5\\ \textbf{51}, 5\\ \textbf{55}, 5\\ \textbf{55}, 5\\ \textbf{55}, 5\\ \textbf{55}, 5\\ \textbf{56}, 4\\ \textbf{49}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 3\\ \textbf{64}, 4\\ \textbf{49}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 3\\ \textbf{58}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 3\\ \textbf{58}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 3\\ \textbf{58}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 5\\ \textbf{56}, 5\\ \textbf{56}, 1\\ \textbf{61}, T\\ \textbf{56}, 3\\ \textbf{58}, 8\\ \textbf{56}, 5\\ \textbf{56}, 5\\ \textbf{56}, 1\\ \textbf{61}, T\\ \textbf{56}, 1\\ \textbf{56}, 1$	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (0) (P < 0.0; c ch) [#] = : therapy SD : 9 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 5.68 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.13 11.7 11.8 10.4 15.44 (P = 0.0 7.41 6.86 4.2 6.8 (P = 0.0 7.41 6.80 7.41 6.80 7.41 6.80 7.41 7.41 6.80 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41 7.41	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.70. 50 51 50 41 51 5 27 37 8 46 6 27 37 8 46 26 955 58 29 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 540 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	00001);; df = 2 ff C C Mean 48.5 44.6 48.5 44.4 43.11 55.28 44.4 43.11 55.28 44.4 43.3 51.38.1 50.3 57.3 36.3 36.3 36.3 36.3 36.4 54.6 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.6 54.5 54.6 54.5 54	P = 80% P = 0.005 sp = 0.005	916 Total 50 45 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415 20 20 20 20	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 10.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 0.5% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.56] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.09 [-3.55, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 1.09 [-3.26, 1.36] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 1.90 [-8.29, 1.20] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 0.50 [-2.07, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effec Test for subarouo d Study or Subarouo 2.2.1 LVFF INIC 12 n Bethnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Foman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Choudry Chi Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVFF INSC 12 n Gao 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] = Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFE FMH-roper Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] = Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFE FMH-roper Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] = Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFE FMH-roper Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] = Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFE FMH-roper Subtotal (95% C)	t z = 0.74 = 185.51, t z = 9.55 Mean Mean Mean 48.7 48.2 52.6 48.7 48.2 52.6 44.7 38.5 55.3 55	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (0) (P < 0.0; c Ch ² = : therapy SD - : 9 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 5.65 5.65 5.65 5.65 6.8 7.9 10.1 11.8 10.4 3.8 (P = 0.0) 11.7 7.12 6.8 = = 14 (P (P = 0.0) 7.41 6.04 4.2 6.8 = 3 (P = 0.0) 12 mon 7	65) 11700 P < 0.11	00001); df = 2 (f C Mean 48.5 44.6 55.28 44.3 43.4 55.28 44.3 15 5.28 43.1 55.28 43.1 55.28 43.1 55.28 51.3 51.3 51.3 55.3 55.4 56.5 59.5 59.5 59.5 59.5 59.5 59.5 59.5	P = 80% P = 0.005 0	916 1 = 8 1 = 1 1 =	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 3.4% 2.5% 2.1% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 4.0% 4.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [V, Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-3.41, 4.61] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.37, 3.33 2.26 [-4.73, 5.73] 2.26 [-4.73, 5.73] 2.28 [-6.68, 1.36] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] -2.29 [-5.29, 4.88] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] -0.20 [-5.29, 4.88] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] -0.20 [-5.29, 4.88] -1.70 [-6.00, 2.60] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.86, 742] 1.89 [-2.80 [-6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.43 [0.57, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference V. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Sant 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Kim 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MSC 12 n Gao 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVEF BM Creat I Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Turan 2012 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Turan 2012 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Notall Effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Turan 2012 Subtotal (95% C)	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $z = 9.55$ (mferences) Mean nonths 48.7 52.6 48.2 51.5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (3) (P < 0.0; c Ch ² = - therapy SD - y 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 5.55 5.65 5.65 5.10 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.11 11.7 10.5 10 11.17 11.8 10.4 4.2 2 (P = 0.0 7.41 6.04 4.2 2 6.8 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 8 - 9 (P = 0.0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	66) 11700 100001) 10.700. 50 41 51 52 37 8 26 95 20 20 20 21 532 532 532 577 14 108 0.14); 01)	00001); df = 2 (f C Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 49.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 51.3 8.1 55.28 43.6 35.3 35.3 35.3 (); = 3) 54.6 54.5 59.5 59.5	P = 80% P = 0.005 solution 8.8 4.3 9.1 1.6.6 6.8 9.2 10.6 1.8.9 4.3 9.2 10.6 1.8.9 4.3 9.2 10.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 1.5.93 2.3 5.6 7.29 7.23 7.56 7.23 7.57	916 Total 50 45 41 50 45 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 19 12 415 20 20 20 20	100.0% 1.3% Weinht 5.3% 18.8% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 0.6% 7.5% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 4.0% 4.0% 4.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-1.56, 1.65, 1.45] 0.00 [-1.56, 1.57, 33] 2.55 [+4.73, 33] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.33] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 0.90 [-3.55, 1.25] 1.80 [-2.04, 1.56, 1.25] 1.80 [-2.04, 1.56, 1.25] 1.80 [-2.04, 3.05] 2.04 [-1.56, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.56, 1.55] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect Test for subaroup of 2.2.1 LVFF INIC 12 n Betmes 2009 Cao 2010 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Wöhrle 2013 Yang 2020 Yao 2009 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVFF BM Crug Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect 2.2.3 LVFF BM Crug Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFF BM Crug Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect 2.3.1 LVFF BM Crug Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm th} t = 0,74\\ {\rm sh} t = 165,51,\\ {\rm th} t = -9,55\\ {\rm cell} {\rm mean}\\ {\rm mean}\\ {\rm mean}\\ {\rm months}\\ {\rm sh} t = -9,55\\ {\rm sh} t = -9,55\\ {\rm sh} t = -2,55\\ {\rm sh} $	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (0 + 0.0 (P + 0.0 + 2 SD	(6) (F) < 0.1 (00001) (00001) (00001) (00001) (00001) (F) < 0 (00001) (F) < 0 (F)	00001); df = 2 (f C Mean 48.5 54.6 55.28 41.3 51 38.1 36.1 36.3 51.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 44.5 59.5 ^P = 46%	P = 80% P = 0.005 0	916 Total 50 45 57 12 36 9 40 24 40 24 55 27 12 36 9 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 36 9 12 12 12 36 9 12 12 12 36 9 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.3% 1.1% 4.0% 1.1% 4.0% 1.1% 4.0% 1.2% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 4.6%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [-5, 5, 43] 0.60 [-5, 5, 43] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.63] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.63] 0.99 [-3.35, 5.73] 1.42 [-5.44, 9.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] -2.00 [-1.65, 1.55] 5.20 [-1.165, 1.55] 5.20 [-1.165, 1.55] 5.20 [-1.05, 1.26] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect Test for suborou of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chaguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Caguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 Traverse 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF BMS C12 n Gao 2013 Gao 2015 (1) Kim 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.3 LVEF BM-proge Turan 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF AMOCSC-17 Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF AMOCSC-17 Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF AMOCSC-17 Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF AMOCSC-17 Heterogeneity Rotal Heterogeneity Rotal Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF AMOCSC-17 Heterogeneity Rotal Heterogeneity	t z = 0,74 = 165,51, t z = 9,55 (Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 48,7 48,2 52,5 51,5	(P = 0.4) df = 33 ($P = 0.6(P = 0.0)(P = 0.0)(P = 0.0)f = 10.510.415.446.88.388.3810.212$	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.0001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 52 27 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 3	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Rean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 49.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 43.11 55.28 43.11 55.28 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 54.6 55.5 55.5 55.5 55.5 54.6 54.5 55.5 54.6 54.5 55.5 54.6 55.5 55.5	P = 80%	916 0. = = 8 50 45 27 12 36 9 40 24 55 27 13 12 20 55 21 19 106 20 20 20	100.0% 1.3% Weinht 5.3% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.3% 2.1% 3.5% 2.5% 61.6% 13.1% 9.8% 4.0% 4.0% 13.1%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [4.34, 4.61] 0.00 [4.54, 7.83] 2.10 [4.35, 5.73] 1.42 [5.44, 9.28] 2.20 [4.86, 1.36] 4.00 [1.55, 9.55] 2.20 [4.155, 9.55] 2.20 [4.155, 1.25] 1.30 [4.29, 1.20] 1.30 [4.29, 1.20] 1.30 [4.29, 1.20] 0.70 [3.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [5.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [5.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.56, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [5.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.56, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [5.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.56, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.50 [2.06, 3.06] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith, Chi ² Test for subaroud of Study or Subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Cao 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Crajek 2010 Grajek 2010 Grajek 2010 Samitok 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Virona 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Ch ² Test for overall effect Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MDC 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Nch ² Test for overall effect Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MDC 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Nch ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MDC 202 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Nch ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MDC 202 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Nch ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MDC 202 Subtotal (95% CI)	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $z = 9.55$ Cell Mean Mean Mean Monoriths 48,7 49,8 45,5 55	(P = 0.4) df = 33 (0 = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P = 10.0) (P = 10.0) (P = 10.0) (P = 10.0) (P = 10.0) (P = 0.0) (P	(6) P < 0.1 (00001) 10.70. 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 50 41 51 50 50 41 51 50 50 41 51 50 50 41 51 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	00001); df = 2 (f C Mean 48.5 44.6 52 44.2 43.4 43.11 55.28 43.6 57.3 43.6 57.3 38.3 31 38.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 54.5 59.5 7 = 46% 46	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 	916 50 50 41 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 5 27 12 36 9 40 24 5 27 12 12 36 9 20 50 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 4.9% 1.1% 4.9% 1.1% 4.9% 1.2% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 4.8% 4.6% 4.6% 3.7%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 369] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 5.20 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.26] 4.00 [-5.28, 4.88] 5.20 [-1.65, 1.26] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chagkes 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Chagenes 2018 Chagenes 2018 Surder 2018 Chagenes 2018 Surder 2018 Chagenes 2018 Surder 2018 Chagenes 2018 Surder 2018 Chagenes 2018 Surder 2018 Su	t z = 0,74 = 165,51, t z = 9,55 (Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	$\begin{array}{l} (P=0.4\\ df=33.0\\ (P=0.0::Ch^{2}=1)\\ (P=0.0::Ch^{2}=1)\\ spin \\ spi$	6) 1170 P < 0.1 10.0001) 10.70. Total 50 50 51 50 51 50 50 51 50 27 27 37 8 46 52 95 532 20 012 5332 537 537 537 537 537 537 537 537	00001); df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 48.5 44.6 52 49.4 44.4 44.4 55.28 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 35.3 54.6 54.5 55.5 59.5 ² = 48% 46	P = 80%	916 916 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	100.0% 1.3% Weiaht 5.3% 18.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 2.1% 3.3% 0.6% 61.6% 13.1% 9.8% 61.6% 3.3% 4.0% 3.3% 5.3% 3.3% 5.5% 5.5%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 93% C1 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [4.34], 4.61] 6.00 [4.16, 3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [4.16, 3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [4.16, 3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [4.15, 9.55] 2.10 [4.15, 9.55] 2.20 [4.15, 9.55] 1.20 [4.25, 9.55] 2.20 [4.15, 1.25] 1.30 [4.29, 1.20] 0.50 [2.06, 3.66] 2.50 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] -0.90 [5.08, 3.28]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneith; Chi ² Test for subaroud of Study or Subaroud of 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Choudy 2016 Chailer 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2016 Traverse 2018 Yao 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Chi ² = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF MNC 12 n Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.3 LVEF BMSC 12 n Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF MNC 22 n Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF BMSC 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity; Noti = Test for overall effect Difference 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogene	t z = 0.74 = 165.51, t z = 9.55 Cell Mean Mean Monoriths 48,7 49,8 45,5 55,5	$\begin{array}{l} (P=0.4\\ df=33\\ (P=0.0\\ c) \\ (P=0.0\\ c) \\ ch^{2}=1\\ \\ f=1\\ 0\\ f=1\\ 0\\ f=1\\ 0\\ f=1\\ 0\\ f=1\\ 0\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1\\ f=1$	6) 1170 P < 0.1 00001) 10.70. Total 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 41 51 50 50 41 50 50 41 50 50 41 50 50 50 41 50 50 50 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	$\begin{array}{c} \text{D0001};;\\ \text{df}=2 \ (\text{f}\\ \text{Mean}\\ 48.5\\ 49.4\\ 40.26\\ 49.4\\ 43.11\\ 55.28\\ 44.4\\ 43.11\\ 56.28\\ 44.4\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 35.3\\ 55.6\\ 59.5$	P = 80% P = 0.005 ontrol SD 	916 10. P = 8 50 41 51 27 12 36 9 40 27 12 36 9 40 27 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 18.9% 1.1% 4.9% 1.1% 4.9% 1.1% 4.9% 2.7% 5.6% 61.6% 3.3% 4.6% 4.6% 4.6% 3.7% 5.7%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 369] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 2.10 [-1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.20 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.20 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.20 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.20 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.20 [-1.25, 1.25] 1.80 [-0.29, 1.209] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.60 [-2.06, 3.63] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 0.90 [-5.08, 3.28]	Mean Difference Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2ca 1U4F IMIC 12 n Bethes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chaguna 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Chaguna 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Chagan 2018 Surder 2018 Su	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, t $z = 9.55$ Cell Mean Mean Mean 48.7 48.2 52.6 51.5 51.5 52.5 44.1 46.25	(P = 0.4) df = 33 (P = 0.6) (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) f = 10 (P = 0.0) f = 14 (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) ((6) 11700 10,0001) 10,70. 50 50 41 51 57 27 37 8 46 26 58 29 57 27 37 8 46 26 59 55 22 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 22 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 22 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 22 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 20 12 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 20 20 12 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 27 37 8 46 26 95 55 20 20 12 20 31 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.25 40.25 40.25 43.4 44.4 43.11 55.28 41.3 55.28 41.3 55.28 41.3 57.3 43.6 57.3 43.6 57.3 43.6 57.3 43.6 54.6 54.5 59.5 ² = 46% 46 46	P = 80% → = 0.005 sp + 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 5 - 8 	916 10. P = 8 10. J	100.0% 1.3% Weiaht 18.3% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 2.5% 3.4% 2.5% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 4.0% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 3.7% 3.7% 3.7%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% C1 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 5.44] 0.60 [3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [1.56, 1.36] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 2.28 [4.03] 1.25 [5.47, 3.73] 2.280 [4.03] 1.25 [5.47, 3.73] 2.280 [4.04] 1.25 [5.47, 3.73] 2.280 [4.04] 1.20 [2.05, 3.63] 2.280 [4.05, 1.26] 1.30 [2.04, 6.52] 0.50 [2.06, 3.063] 2.43 [0.97, 3.89] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 0.90 [5.08, 3.28] 0.90 [5.08, 3.28]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betnes 2009 Choudy 2016 Cao 2009 Choudy 2016 Cao 2009 Choudy 2016 Cao 2009 Choudy 2016 Chaminek 2010 Kaminek 2010 Kamine	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm th} t = 0,74\\ {\rm end} t = 165,51, {\rm th} t = -9,52\\ {\rm cert} t = -9,52\\ { cert} t = -9,52\\ {\rm cert} t = -9,52\\ { cer$	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (P = 0.6 (P = 0.0 : Ch ² = -) (P = 0.0 : Ch ² = -) (P = 0.1 (P = 0.0 f = 14 (P (P = 0.0 f = 14 (P (P = 0.0 f = 0.	6) 1170 P < 0,1 00001) 10.70. Fotal 50 41 51 5 27 27 37 8 46 26 29 9 55 20 12 55 0.07 003) 19 57 7 14 15 10 20 10 20 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 55 12 12 55 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	$\begin{array}{c} \text{D0001};;\\ \text{df}=2 \ (\text{f}\\ \text{Mean}\\ 48.5\\ 44.6\\ 522\\ 49.4\\ 43.11\\ 55.28\\ 44.4\\ 43.11\\ 55.28\\ 44.3\\ 57.3\\ 35.3\\ 77.3\\ 43.6\\ 35.3\\ 77.3\\ 54.6\\ 59.5\\ 78.4\\ 45.6\\ 46.\\ 45.6\end{array}$	P = 80% P = 0.005 sD sD sD sD sD sD sD sD sD sD	916 10. P = 8 50 50 51 52 52 52 55 52 12 12 55 55 12 12 12 55 12 10 55 12 10 55 12 10 55 12 10 55 12 10 55 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 1.8.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 3.7% 0.6% 7.5% 0.6% 4.6% 4.6% 3.7% 3.7%	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 1.39, 3.69] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-5.44, 8.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.42 [-5.28, 4.88] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.00 [-3.29, 1.20] 1.07 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.06, 5.23] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.06, 5.23] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.53, 6.53] 2.63 [-1.73] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] -0.90 [-5.08, 3.28]	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF INIC 12 n Beitnes 2009 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Calorobo 2011 DIII 2009 Choudry 2016 Calorobo 2011 DIII 2009 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Choudry 2016 Chaudry 2018 Lamirault 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Surder 2018 Choudry 2019 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect 2.2.2 LVEF EMBC 212 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect 2.2.3 LVEF EMBC 2017 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi [®] Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2017 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Test for overall effect 2.2.4 LVEF EMBC 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat Subtotal (95% C) Subtotal (95% C) Subto	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{t} t = 0, 74\\ = 185, 51, 1\\ t = 2, 95, \\ \textbf{cent}\\ \textbf{mean}\\ \textbf{mean}\\ \textbf{mean}\\ \textbf{t} t = 2, 95, \\ \textbf{t} t = 2, 25, $	$\begin{array}{l} (P=0.4\\ df=33.0\\ (P=0.0::Ch^{2}=)\\ (P=0.0::Ch^{2}=)\\ (P=0.0:Thermal equation (P=0.0)\\ (P=0.0$	65) 11700 00001) 00001) 10.70. 50 41 51 52 77 37 8 66 95 532 50003) 19 577 14 18 1008 42 42 0011) 311 31 77 743	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 40.2 40.2 52 40.2 52 40.2 52 40.2 52 44.6 43.1 50 57.3 43.6 38.1 50 57.3 43.6 54.6 54.5 59.5 ° F = 46% 46 46 45.6	P = 80% → = 0.005 sp 	916 0. * = 8 50 50 51 527 12 527 13 12 415 20 557 16 16 16 557	100.0% 1.3% Weight 18.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 1.2% 3.4% 1.5% 0.6% 7.7% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 13.1% 9.8% 4.0% 3.7% 5.3% 13.7% 13.	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference [M, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.20 [3.29, 3.69] 3.60 [1.76, 544] 0.60 [3.41, 4.61] 6.00 [1.53, 5.73] 2.20 [4.62, 4.23] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 1.42 [5.44, 8.28] 2.80 [6.62] 0.70 [5.74, 5.14] 4.50 [1.58, 7.42] 1.87 [0.85, 2.90] 0.70 [5.08, 3.28] 0.90 [5.08, 3.28] 0.90 [5.08, 3.28] 2.22 [1.42, 3.02]	Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Chi ² Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MNC 12 n Betines 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Cao 2009 Choudry 2016 Crajak 2010 Kaminek 2010 Laguna 2018 Lamiraut 2017 San Roman 2015 Surder 2018 Studet 2018 Studet 2018 Choudry 2019 Studet 2013 Studet 2013 Subtotal (95% C)] Heterogeneity, Not al Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MISC 2018 Subtotal (95% C)] Heterogeneity, Not al Test for overall effect 2.2.1 LVEF MISC 2018 Subtotal (95% C)] Heterogeneity, Not al Test for overall effect Choudry 2018 Subtotal (95% C)]	t $z = 0.74$ = 165.51, $z = 9.55$ (mifferences) Cell Mean nonths 48.7 52.6 48.2 52.6 48.2 53.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 55.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 57.5 57.5 56.5 57.5 57.5 56.5 56.5 57.5	(P = 0.4 df = 33 (P = 0.6 (P = 0.0 : Ch ² = -) 9 4.4 10.5 5.55 6.8 7.9 10.13 7.12 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5	65) 11700 100001) 10.0001) 10.70. 50 51 51 52 77 8 46 26 95 200 12 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 532 533 19 57 14 18 101) 31 31 31 31 713	00001); df = 2 (f Mean 48.5 44.6 52 49.4 43.11 50 57.3 41.3 51.3 51.6 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54.5 54	P = 80% P = 0.005 mtrol sD 11.74 8.8 9.1 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.8 9.1 1.74 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.8 9.1 1.74 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.8 9.1 1.74 8.75 9.2 1.3.6 10.8 8.6 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.6 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.6 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.6 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.8 8.6 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.2 10.8 8.75 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.	916 50 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	100.0% 1.3% 5.3% 1.8.9% 4.0% 1.2% 3.4% 2.5% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.3% 61.6% 3.7% 3.3% 3.7% 3.	3.11 [2.47, 3.74] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI 0.20 [-3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 3.29, 3.69] 3.00 [1.76, 3.29, 3.69] 2.10 [1.53, 5.73] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 2.55 [-4.73, 9.83] 1.42 [-54, 4, 8.28] 4.00 [-1.55, 9.55] 1.70 [-6.02, 9.56] 1.70 [-6.02, 9.58] 4.00 [-1.52, 9.48] 1.90 [-8.29, 12.09] 4.50 [1.52, 7.42] 1.90 [-8.29, 12.09] 4.50 [1.52, 7.42] 0.70 [-3.74, 5.14] 4.30 [2.08, 6.52] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 0.50 [-2.06, 3.06] 2.50 [-1.53, 6.53] 8.00 [4.27, 11.73] 0.90 [-5.08, 3.28] 0.90 [-5.08, 3.28] 2.22 [1.42, 3.02]	Mean Difference Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl

Footnotes (1) WJMSCs(Wharton's jelly-derived mesenchymal stem cells)

Fig. 2 continued



Fig. 2 continued

In contrast to the improvement in LVEF, the reduction in infarct size showed no significant difference between the intervention and control groups in the observed 6- to 48-month period, indicating unclear recovery of the infarcted area in AMI with stem cell injection. The improvements in LVEF and lack of improvements in infarct size are consistent with the findings of previous systematic reviews [4]. The observed improvement in infarct-related regional wall motion abnormalities did not correspond to a significant change in infarct size, rendering this discrepancy difficult to explain. Infarct size measurement involves various modalities, such as MRI, echocardiography, and SPECT, leading to limitations owing to the lack of consistency in measurement techniques.

Potential role of stem cell therapy in reducing MACE risk

Our systematic review revealed a trend toward fewer MACEs in the intervention group than in the control group at 12 (p=0.05) and 18-36 months (p=0.06)after stem cell transplantation. In recent years, there has been significant emphasis on reporting MACEs as objective clinical outcomes in patients with heart disease. However, there is a notable scarcity of systematic reviews reporting MACEs as indicators of the efficacy or safety of stem cell transplantation for patients with AMI. Few studies have reported a reduction in MACE incidence after stem cell therapy. This could be attributed to the low incidence of MACEs in intervention groups when compared with that in the well-treated control groups receiving standard therapy that is highly effective. Another possibility is that patients with severe AMI might not have been recruited for stem cell therapy. Considering these points, although not statistically significant, the observed trends in cardiovascular death, non-fatal reinfarction, and non-fatal stroke are noteworthy given the difficulty in demonstrating improvement with cell therapy [7]. Thus, comprehensive analyses that integrate the results from additional studies are necessary to ascertain the true efficacy of cell-based treatments. When analyzed by cell type, the intervention group that received MNCs showed a significant reduction in MACE occurrence compared to the control group at 12 and 18-36 months. However, studies involving MSC injections did not show a significant difference in MACE risk between intervention and control groups. Due to the limited number of studies and MACE occurrences in MSC therapy research, it is difficult to conclude the incidence of MACEs in patients receiving MSC injections based on this metaanalysis. Further research is needed to validate these findings and provide more robust evidence for the effectiveness of stem cell transplantation in reducing MACE risk in patients with AMI.

Although reports of mortality and recurrent myocardial infarction within the hospitalization period exist for patients with AMI who received stem cell injections, no significant difference in frequency was found compared with that in the control group. Moreover, the reported rates of in-hospital mortality after PCI in previous studies ranged from 0.53 to 2.0% [94, 95], and the myocardial infarction recurrence rate was 0.7% [96], which was not significantly higher than control values, indicating relative safety. Most studies analyzed in this systematic review employed intra-coronary stem cell injection. In terms of complications, intra-coronary stem cell injection is generally considered safer than direct cell injection into the myocardium (trans-endocardial or trans-epicardial cell injection) [97].



Fig. 3 Forest plots of major adverse cardiac events (MACEs). A–D Forest plots for MACE occurrence at the 6-, B 12-, C 18-, 24-, 36-, and D 60-month follow-ups. E–G Subgroup analyses of MACE occurrence between patients treated with mononuclear cells (MNCs) and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) at the (E) 6-, F 12-, and G 24-month follow-ups

Role of cell culture in increasing cell numbers and appropriate number of injected stem cells

In this study, a subgroup analysis was conducted by distinguishing studies that did and did not perform cell culture, demonstrating a significant improvement in LVEF during the mid-term period (12–24 months) in patients when cell culture was performed. Furthermore, the analysis of various studies with cell culture periods of less than 1 week and those exceeding 1 week revealed a significant improvement in LVEF during the mid-term period (12–24 months) in studies with a culture period exceeding 1 week. To our knowledge, few studies have analyzed the effects of cell therapy on cardiac function improvement considering whether cell culture was conducted and for how long. The results of this systematic review suggest that enhancing the purity of injected cells has a positive impact on the preservation or recovery of cardiac function. Therefore, we hypothesize that achieving a homogeneous cell population through culture may enhance therapeutic efficacy.

Ensuring an adequate number of selected cells is important to ensure the sufficient recovery of cardiac function. Therefore, recent research on cell therapy for myocardial infarction treatment has also focused on using selected



Fig. 3 continued



Fig. 3 continued

cell products such as MSCs and CD34+cells rather than BM-MNCs [7]. Although it is important to conduct cell processing and isolation effectively, increasing the number of cells may also be necessary. Therefore, in the context of autologous stem cell transplantation, efforts have been made to increase the number of stem cells selected through in vitro cultivation and proliferation.

A systematic review comprising 40 randomized controlled trials reported a significant increase in LVEF when the BMC dosage exceeded 10^8 cells [6]. Another systematic review analyzing 41 RCTs also concluded that the mortality risk was reduced in patients who received > 10^8 to $\leq 10^9$ cells [8], similar to our study findings. Given the hostile environment of AMI, higher doses may be necessary to counteract the initial cell death caused by hypoxia in transplanted cells [98]. MSC doses lower or higher than 10^7 cells did not show differential improvements in LVEF, and using even higher cell doses ($\geq 10^{10}$)

Α

				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Beitnes 2009	0.0987	0.2075	8.4%	0.10 [-0.31, 0.51]	
Chang 2008	0.1225	0.3166	3.6%	0.12 [-0.50, 0.74]	
Chullikana 2015	0.809	0.4825	1.6%	0.81 [-0.14, 1.75]	
Fernández 2018	-0.0086	0.3254	3.4%	-0.01 [-0.65, 0.63]	
Hirsch 2011 (1)	0	0.1563	14.8%	0.00 [-0.31, 0.31]	
Lunde 2006	0.1093	0.2087	8.3%	0.11 [-0.30, 0.52]	
Nicolau 2018	-0.1951	0.183	10.8%	-0.20 [-0.55, 0.16]	
Quyyumi 2011	0.7265	0.4177	2.1%	0.73 [-0.09, 1.55]	
Roncalli 2011	0.0821	0.1992	9.1%	0.08 [-0.31, 0.47]	
Skalicka 2012	-0.2799	0.4164	2.1%	-0.28 [-1.10, 0.54]	
Surder 2016	-0.1564	0.1697	12.6%	-0.16 [-0.49, 0.18]	
Traverse 2011	-0.0445	0.2412	6.2%	-0.04 [-0.52, 0.43]	
Traverse 2018	-0.0981	0.2344	6.6%	-0.10 [-0.56, 0.36]	
Wang 2014	-0.3714	0.2722	4.9%	-0.37 [-0.90, 0.16]	
Wöhrle 2013	0.0095	0.3338	3.3%	0.01 [-0.64, 0.66]	
Yao 2009	-0.1043	0.4086	2.2%	-0.10 [-0.91, 0.70]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	-0.02 [-0.14, 0.10]	+
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	11.13, df = 15 (P = 0.74)	; I² = 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.32 (P = 0.75)				Favours [cell therapy] Favours [control]

B

				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Colombo 2011	1.3328	0.7909	1.3%	1.33 [-0.22, 2.88]	
Dill 2009	-0.4396	0.2757	10.3%	-0.44 [-0.98, 0.10]	
Fernández 2018	-0.2732	0.3177	7.8%	-0.27 [-0.90, 0.35]	
San Roman 2015	0.1032	0.2833	9.8%	0.10 [-0.45, 0.66]	
Surder 2016	0.1014	0.1695	27.3%	0.10 [-0.23, 0.43]	
Traverse 2018	0.0061	0.2343	14.3%	0.01 [-0.45, 0.47]	
Turan 2012	-0.7697	0.2809	9.9%	-0.77 [-1.32, -0.22]	←
Wöhrle 2013	-0.1248	0.3341	7.0%	-0.12 [-0.78, 0.53]	
Yang 2020	-0.0117	0.3204	7.6%	-0.01 [-0.64, 0.62]	
Yao 2009	-0.389	0.4128	4.6%	-0.39 [-1.20, 0.42]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	-0.12 [-0.29, 0.06]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	13.45, df = 9 (P = 0.14);	I ² = 33%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.30 (P = 0.19)				Eavours (cell therapy) Eavours (control)
					Tavou's [centrierapy] Tavou's [control]

С

			S	td. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Std. Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Traverse 2018	0.1735	0.2347	66.9%	0.17 [-0.29, 0.63]	
Wöhrle 2013	0.0123	0.3338	33.1%	0.01 [-0.64, 0.67]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.12 [-0.26, 0.50]	-
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16, df = 1 (P = 0.69); l ² = Z = 0.63 (P = 0.53)	= 0%		-	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [cell therapy] Favours [control]

D Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Std. Mean Difference SE Weight IV, Fixed, 95% Cl IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Beitnes 2009 0.141 0.3152 52.9% 0.14 [-0.48, 0.76] Wöhrle 2013 -0.13 [-0.78, 0.53] -0.1296 0.3341 47.1% Total (95% CI) 100.0% 0.01 [-0.44, 0.46] Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.35$, df = 1 (P = 0.56); $l^2 = 0\%$ -1 -0.5 Ó 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.06 (P = 0.95) Favours [cell therapy] Favours [control]



did not significantly increase LVEF compared with that in the control group [6]. Administering a greater number of injections may pose a risk of myocardial damage, potentially diminishing the effectiveness of therapy and complicating the correlation between cell quantity and clinical benefits [98]. Considering the results of our study, injecting a cell quantity of at least 10⁸ is preferable, whereas cell doses exceeding 10¹⁰ are unlikely to provide additional benefits. Moreover, when performing cell culture for cultivation and proliferation, ensuring a culture period of more than 1 week could be advantageous for increasing cell purity.

Additional research on methods to create purified cell populations is required and should include those employing processes such as cell culture that result in the selection of homogeneous cell populations. Moreover, further studies are required to improve the repair and regeneration functions of the stem cells. The methods for grafting the injected cells into damaged myocardial areas should also be investigated. Most studies included in this review involved autologous stem cells. However, the characteristics of each patient's stem cells were heterogeneous, and the results evaluated at the endpoint also exhibited a heterogeneous tendency. Subsequent studies should be conducted to inject sufficiently standardized allogeneic cells cultured from multiple patients and verify the outcomes.

Appropriate timing of stem cell injection for optimal effectiveness

In addition to cell dosage, the optimal timing of stem cell transplantation to achieve the greatest efficacy in improving cardiac function post-AMI has been investigated. Our study confirmed that ensuring a sufficient number of injected cells would help in the recovery of left ventricular function with an adequate culture period (more than 1 week). Similarly, some studies have suggested that the best transplantation time to secure an adequate culture period is between 7 and 14 days after PCI [14]. This strategy is advantageous because it allows time for the recovery of the damaged myocardium and coronary arteries.

However, contrary to our assertion, previous systematic reviews have suggested that the optimal timing for improving myocardial function is within 3–7 days post-AMI [15]. A systematic review of studies involving MSC transplantation post-AMI reported that, when performed during the first week [99], transplantation shows a higher efficacy in increasing LVEF, thereby improving the left ventricular end-systolic dimension and reducing the incidence of revascularization [100]. If stem cell transplantation is excessively delayed, its effectiveness may decrease due to myocardial cell loss and fibrosis [100]. However, this poses a risk of overlooking the inefficiency of excessively early stem cell transplantation and potential damage to the weakened heart. Immediately after AMI (1–2 days), an increased local apoptosis of transplanted stem cells is observed presumably due to significant myocardial ischemia and inflammation, postreperfusion oxygen burst, and severe peroxidation injury. Therefore, the efficacy of stem cell therapy is poor [6]. The early injection of stem cells may be restricted owing to the risk of arrhythmias when cells are injected into a damaged heart with significant swelling, inflammation, and microvascular blockage, as well as potential coronary embolization and decreased blood flow. Additionally, the administration of heavy antiplatelet and anticoagulant medications can result in bleeding.

In our study, we have addressed crucial aspects of the previously reported optimal timing for stem cell transplantation, which is within 1 week of AMI. Further research is needed to explore the full extent of optimal timing for stem cell transplantation in patients post-AMI. Additionally, investigating potential strategies to mitigate the risks associated with early or delayed transplantation, such as minimizing AEs on coronary circulation, would be beneficial for enhancing the efficacy and safety of stem cell therapy.

In a study on repeated cell injection, when comparing 12 patients who received a single stem cell infusion at 3–7 days with 15 patients who received an initial infusion at 3–7 days followed by a second infusion at 3 months, the latter group showed more pronounced improvements in LVEF and reductions in infarct size, as assessed by MRI at 12 months, than the former group [74]. Further studies with larger patient populations are needed to draw definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of repeated stem cell infusions.

This study has some limitations. The analysis did not thoroughly scrutinize the procedural aspects of the stem cell therapy process, such as the cell collection technique or other preprocessing steps. Thus, further research is required to investigate whether variations in these processes lead to differences in efficacy. Moreover, the incidence of MACEs was too low in both the control and intervention groups to detect any statistically significant differences. Hence, further studies with larger sample sizes are necessary to elucidate the effects of stem cell transplantation on MACE occurrence. Long-term studies extending up to 5 years are warranted to provide a comprehensive understanding of the sustained effects of stem cell therapy on cardiac function post-AMI.

Conclusions

Our findings revealed the sustained enhancement of LVEF for up to 36 months post-transplantation and a trend toward decreased MACE risk in the intervention groups versus the control groups. Notably, significant

LVEF improvements were observed with longer cell culture durations and higher injected cell quantities. Nevertheless, no significant reduction in infarct size was noted, which is consistent with previous reviews. Future research should explore the optimal timing and dosages while addressing procedural variations to enhance the efficacy and safety of stem cell therapy in patients with AMI.

Abbreviations

AMI	Acute myocardial infarction
LVEF	Left ventricular ejection fraction
MACE	Major adverse cardiac event
HF	Heart failure
PCI	Percutaneous coronary intervention
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
SPECT	Single-photon emission computed tomography
AE	Adverse event
OR	Odds ratio
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
BM	Bone marrow
BMC	Bone marrow cell
PBSC	Peripheral blood stem cell
MNC	Mononuclear cell
MSC	Mesenchymal stem cell
CD	Cluster of differentiation

CI Confidence interval

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-024-03891-1.

Additional file 1. Summary of the risk of bias in the included studies. Figures 1 and 2.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Division of Regenerative Medicine Policy for their support.

Author contributions

SHL contributed to the concept and design of the study. HL and YH assisted in statistical analysis and administrative support. The first draft of the manuscript was written by HL, YH, and SHL. HL, HC, and SHL contributed to manuscript writing and preparing the final version of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This study was funded by the Innovative Regenerative Medicine Clinical Research Support Program from the Ministry of Health and Welfare, Republic of Korea.

Availability of data and materials

The data underlying this research will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The protocol of this systematic review and meta-analysis was previously registered in PROSPERO (CRD42023422818). Since this study did not involve human participants, consent to participate was not required.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Received: 16 July 2024 Accepted: 21 August 2024 Published online: 11 September 2024

References

- Reed GW, Rossi JE, Cannon CP. Acute myocardial infarction. Lancet. 2017;389(10065):197–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16) 30677-8.
- Groenewegen A, Rutten FH, Mosterd A, Hoes AW. Epidemiology of heart failure. Eur J Heart Fail. 2020;22(8):1342–56. https://doi.org/10. 1002/ejhf.1858.
- Salari N, Morddarvanjoghi F, Abdolmaleki A, Rasoulpoor S, Khaleghi AA, Hezarkhani LA, et al. The global prevalence of myocardial infarction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2023;23(1):206. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12872-023-03231-w.
- Lee SH, Hong JH, Cho KH, Noh JW, Cho HJ. Discrepancy between short-term and long-term effects of bone marrow-derived cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2016;7(1):153. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13287-016-0415-z.
- Botleroo RA, Bhandari R, Ahmed R, Kareem R, Gyawali M, Venkatesan N, et al. Stem cell therapy for the treatment of myocardial infarction: how far are we now? Cureus. 2021;13(8): e17022. https://doi.org/10.7759/ cureus.17022.
- Xu JY, Cai WY, Tian M, Liu D, Huang RC. Stem cell transplantation dose in patients with acute myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis. Chronic Dis Transl Med. 2016;2(2):92–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cdtm.2016.09. 006.
- Bolli R. Cell therapy for acute myocardial infarction: requiescat in Pace. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(38):3711–4. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ ehaa802.
- Otsuka T, Bär S, Losdat S, Kavaliauskaite R, Ueki Y, Zanchin C, et al. Effect of timing of staged percutaneous coronary intervention on clinical outcomes in patients with acute coronary syndromes. J Am Heart Assoc. 2021;10(23): e023129. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.121.023129.
- Yamada Y, Minatoguchi S, Kanamori H, Mikami A, Okura H, Dezawa M, et al. Stem cell therapy for acute myocardial infarction-focusing on the comparison between Muse cells and mesenchymal stem cells. J Cardiol. 2022;80(1):80–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjcc.2021.10.030.
- Traverse JH, Henry TD, Ellis GG, Pepine CJ, Willerson JT, Zhao DX, et al. Effect of intracoronary delivery of autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells 2 to 3 weeks following acute myocardial infarction on left ventricular function: the late TIME randomized trial. JAMA. 2011;306(19):2110–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama/2011/1670.
- Lee JW, Lee SH, Youn YJ, Ahn MS, Kim JY, Yoo BS, et al. A randomized, open-label, multicenter trial for the safety and efficacy of adult mesenchymal stem cells after acute myocardial infarction. J Korean Med Sci. 2014;29(1):23–31. https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.1.23.
- Bosco E, Hsueh L, McConeghy KW, Gravenstein S, Saade E. Major adverse cardiovascular event definitions used in observational analysis of administrative databases: a systematic review. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2021;21(1):241. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01440-5.
- Duan H, Sun Z, Dong W, Huang Z. Utilizing dynamic treatment information for MACE prediction of acute coronary syndrome. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2019;19(1):5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-018-0730-7.
- Zhang R, Yu J, Zhang N, Li W, Wang J, Cai G, et al. Bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells transfer in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: single-blind, multicenter, randomized controlled trial. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2021;12(1):33. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13287-020-02096-6.
- Delewi R, Hirsch A, Tijssen JG, Schächinger V, Wojakowski W, Roncalli J, et al. Impact of intracoronary bone marrow cell therapy on left ventricular function in the setting of ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: a collaborative meta-analysis. Eur Heart J. 2014;35(15):989– 98. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/eht372.

- Shen T, Xia L, Dong W, Wang J, Su F, Niu S, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis: safety and efficacy of mesenchymal stem cells therapy for heart failure. Curr Stem Cell Res Ther. 2021;16(3):354–65. https://doi. org/10.2174/1574888X15999200820171432.
- Fernández-Avilés F, Sanz-Ruiz R, Bogaert J, Plasencia AC, Gilaberte I, Belmans A, et al. Safety and efficacy of intracoronary infusion of allogeneic human cardiac stem cells in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction and left ventricular dysfunction. Circ Res. 2018;123(5):579–89. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.312823.
- Chullikana A, Majumdar AS, Gottipamula S, Krishnamurthy S, Kumar AS, Prakash VS, et al. Randomized, double-blind, phase I/II study of intravenous allogeneic mesenchymal stromal cells in acute myocardial infarction. Cytotherapy. 2015;17(3):250–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jcyt.2014.10.009.
- Gao LR, Chen Y, Zhang NK, Yang XL, Liu HL, Wang ZG, et al. Intracoronary infusion of Wharton's jelly-derived mesenchymal stem cells in acute myocardial infarction: double-blind, randomized controlled trial. BMC Med. 2015;13:162. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0399-z.
- Hare JM, Traverse JH, Henry TD, Dib N, Strumpf RK, Schulman SP, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, dose-escalation study of intravenous adult human mesenchymal stem cells (prochymal) after acute myocardial infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009;54(24):2277–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2009.06.055.
- Kim SH, Cho JH, Lee YH, Lee JH, Kim SS, Kim MY, et al. Improvement in left ventricular function with intracoronary mesenchymal stem cell therapy in a patient with anterior wall ST-Segment elevation myocardial infarction. Cardiovasc Drugs Ther. 2018;32(4):329–38. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10557-018-6804-z.
- Lamirault G, de Bock E, Sébille V, Delasalle B, Roncalli J, Susen S, et al. Sustained quality of life improvement after intracoronary injection of autologous bone marrow cells in the setting of acute myocardial infarction: results from the BONAMI trial. Qual Life Res. 2017;26(1):121–5. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-016-1366-7.
- Manrique A, Lemarchand P, Delasalle B, Lairez O, Sportouch-Duckan C, Lamirault G, et al. Predictors of ventricular remodelling in patients with reperfused acute myocardial infarction and left ventricular dysfunction candidates for bone marrow cell therapy: insights from the BONAMI trial. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2016;43(4):740–8. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s00259-015-3279-z.
- Wang X, Xi WC, Wang F. The beneficial effects of intracoronary autologous bone marrow stem cell transfer as an adjunct to percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Biotechnol Lett. 2014;36(11):2163–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10529-014-1589-z.
- Gao LR, Pei XT, Ding QA, Chen Y, Zhang NK, Chen HY, 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):3191–9. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2013.04.112.
- Jazi SM, Esfahani MH, Fesharaki M, Moulavi F, Gharipour M. Initial clinical outcomes of intracoronary infusion of autologous progenitor cells in patients with acute myocardial infarction. ARYA Atheroscler. 2012;7(4):162–7.
- Quyyumi AA, Waller EK, Murrow J, Esteves F, Galt J, Oshinski J, et al. CD34(+) cell infusion after ST elevation myocardial infarction is associated with improved perfusion and is dose dependent. Am Heart J. 2011;161(1):98–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2010.09.025.
- Roncalli J, Mouquet F, Piot C, Trochu JN, Corvoisier PL, Neuder Y, 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):1748–57. https://doi.org/10.1093/ eurheartj/ehq455.
- Kaminek M, Meluzin J, Panovský R, Metelkova I, Budikova M, Richter M. Long-term results of intracoronary bone marrow cell transplantation: the potential of gated sestamibi SPECT/FDG PET imaging to select patients with maximum benefit from cell therapy. Clin Nucl Med. 2010;35(10):780–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/RLU.0b013e3181e4d9c5.
- 30. Grajek S, Popiel M, Gil L, Breborowicz P, Lesiak M, Czepczyński R, 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. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp536.

- Meluzín J, Janousek S, Mayer J, Groch L, Hornácek I, Hlinomaz O, 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):185–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ijcard.2007.04.098.
- Kaminek M, Meluzin J, Panovsky R, Janousek S, Mayer J, Prasek J, et al. Individual differences in the effectiveness of intracoronary bone marrow cell transplantation assessed by gated sestamibi SPECT/FDG PET imaging. J Nucl Cardiol. 2008;15(3):392–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. nuclcard.2008.02.016.
- Meluzín J, Mayer J, Groch L, Janousek S, Hornácek I, Hlinomaz O, et al. Autologous transplantation of mononuclear bone marrow cells in patients with acute myocardial infarction: the effect of the dose of transplanted cells on myocardial function. Am Heart J. 2006;152(5):975. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2006.08.004.
- Ge J, Li Y, Qian J, Shi J, Wang Q, Niu Y, et al. Efficacy of emergent transcatheter transplantation of stem cells for treatment of acute myocardial infarction (TCT-STAMI). Heart. 2006;92(12):1764–7. https://doi.org/ 10.1136/hrt.2005.085431.
- Chen SL, Fang WW, Ye F, Liu YH, Qian J, Shan SJ, et al. Effect on left ventricular function of intracoronary transplantation of autologous bone marrow mesenchymal stem cell in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol. 2004;94(1):92–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. amjcard.2004.03.034.
- Mathur A, Sim DS, Choudry F, Veerapen J, Colicchia M, Tyrlejski T, et al. Five-year follow-up of intracoronary autologous cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction: the REGENERATE-AMI trial. ESC Heart Fail. 2022;9(2):1152–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/ehf2.13786.
- Mathur A, Fernández-Avilés F, Bartunek J, Belmans A, Crea F, Dowlut S, et al. The effect of intracoronary infusion of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells on all-cause mortality in acute myocardial infarction: the BAMI trial. Eur Heart J. 2020;41(38):3702–10. https://doi.org/10. 1093/eurheartj/ehaa651.
- Yang YJ, Qian HY, Song L, Geng YJ, Gao RL, Li N, et al. Strengthening effects of bone marrow mononuclear cells with intensive atorvastatin in acute myocardial infarction. Open Heart. 2020;7(1): e001139. https:// doi.org/10.1136/openhrt-2019-001139.
- Laguna G, DI Stefano S, Maroto L, Fulquet E, Echevarría JR, Revilla A, et al. Effect of direct intramyocardial autologous stem cell grafting in the sub-acute phase after myocardial infarction. J Cardiovasc Surg Torino. 2018;59(2):259–67. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0021-9509.17. 10126-6.
- Naseri MH, Madani H, Ahmadi Tafti SH, Farahani MM, Saleh DK, Hosseinnejad H, et al. COMPARE CPM-RMI trial: intramyocardial transplantation of autologous bone marrow-derived CD133+ cells and MNCs during CABG in patients with recent MI: a phase II/III, multicenter, placebocontrolled, randomized, double-blind clinical trial [published correction appears in Cell J. 2018 Oct;20(3):449]. Cell J. 2018;20(2):267–277. https:// doi.org/10.22074/cellj.2018.5197.
- Nicolau JC, Furtado RHM, Silva SA, Rochitte CE, Rassi A, Moraes JBMC, et al. Stem-cell therapy in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction with reduced ejection fraction: a multicenter, double-blind randomized trial. Clin Cardiol. 2018;41(3):392–9. https://doi.org/10.1002/clc.22882.
- 42. Traverse JH, Henry TD, Pepine CJ, Willerson JT, Chugh A, Yang PC, et al. TIME trial: effect of timing of stem cell delivery following ST-elevation myocardial infarction on the recovery of global and regional left ventricular function: final 2-year analysis. Circ Res. 2018;122(3):479–88. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.311466.
- Quyyumi AA, Vasquez A, Kereiakes DJ, Klapholz M, Schaer GL, Abdel-Latif A, et al. PreSERVE-AMI: a randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled clinical trial of intracoronary administration of autologous CD34+ cells in patients with left ventricular dysfunction post STEMI. Circ Res. 2017;120(2):324–31. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.115. 308165.
- 44. Choudry F, Hamshere S, Saunders N, Veerapen J, Bavnbek K, Knight C, et al. A randomized double-blind control study of early intra-coronary autologous bone marrow cell infusion in acute myocardial infarction: the REGENERATE-AMI clinical trial. Eur Heart J. 2016;37(3):256–63. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehv493.

- Sürder D, Manka R, Moccetti T, Cicero VL, Emmert MY, Klersy C, et al. Effect of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cell treatment, early or late after acute myocardial infarction: twelve months CMR and longterm clinical results. Circ Res. 2016;119(3):481–90. https://doi.org/10. 1161/CIRCRESAHA.116.308639.
- Nair V, Madan H, Sofat S, Ganguli P, Jacob MJ, Datta R, et al. Efficacy of stem cell in improvement of left ventricular function in acute myocardial infarction–MI3 trial. Indian J Med Res. 2015;142(2):165–74. https:// doi.org/10.4103/0971-5916.164245.
- San Roman JA, Sánchez PL, Villa A, Sanz-Ruiz R, Fernandez-Santos ME, Gimeno F, 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– 82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2015.03.563.
- Assmus B, Leistner DM, Schächinger V, Erbs S, Elsässer A, Haberbosch W, et al. Long-term clinical outcome after intracoronary application of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells for acute myocardial infarction: migratory capacity of administered cells determines event-free survival. Eur Heart J. 2014;35(19):1275–83. https://doi.org/10.1093/ eurheartj/ehu062.
- Sürder D, Manka R, Lo Cicero V, Moccetti T, Rufibach K, Soncin S, 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):1968–79. https://doi.org/ 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.112.001035.
- Wöhrle J, von Scheidt F, Schauwecker P, Wiesneth M, Markovic S, Schrezenmeier H, et al. Impact of cell number and microvascular obstruction in patients with bone-marrow derived cell therapy: final results from the randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled intracoronary Stem Cell therapy in patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction (SCAMI) trial. Clin Res Cardiol. 2013;102(10):765–70. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s00392-013-0595-9.
- Skalicka H, Horak J, Kobylka P, Palecek T, Linhart A, Aschermann M. Intracoronary injection of autologous bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells in patients with large anterior acute myocardial infarction and left ventricular dysfunction: a 24-month follow up study. Bratisl Lek Listy. 2012;113(4):220–7. https://doi.org/10.4149/bll_2012_051.
- Traverse JH, Henry TD, Pepine CJ, Willerson JT, Zhao DXM, Ellis SG, et al. Effect of the use and timing of bone marrow mononuclear cell delivery on left ventricular function after acute myocardial infarction: the TIME randomized trial [published correction appears in JAMA. 2013 Jan 23;309(4):343] [published correction appears in JAMA. 2015 Jul 7;314(1):86]. JAMA. 2012;308(22):2380–2389. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jama.2012.28726.
- Turan RG, Bozdag-T I, Turan CH, Ortak J, Akin I, Kische S, et al. Enhanced mobilization of the bone marrow-derived circulating progenitor cells by intracoronary freshly isolated bone marrow cells transplantation in patients with acute myocardial infarction. J Cell Mol Med. 2012;16(4):852–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1582-4934.2011.01358.x.
- 54. Beitnes JO, Gjesdal O, Lunde K, Solheim S, Edvardsen T, Arnesen H, et al. Left ventricular systolic and diastolic function improve after acute myocardial infarction treated with acute percutaneous coronary intervention, but are not influenced by intracoronary injection of autologous mononuclear bone marrow cells: a 3 year serial echocardiographic substudy of the randomized-controlled ASTAMI study. Eur J Echocardiogr. 2011;12(2):98–106. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejechocard/jeq116.
- 55. Colombo A, Castellani M, Piccaluga E, Pusineri E, Palatresi S, Longari V, et al. Myocardial blood flow and infarct size after CD133+ cell injection in large myocardial infarction with good recanalization and poor reperfusion: results from a randomized controlled trial. J Cardiovasc Med (Hagerstown). 2011;12(4):239–48. https://doi.org/10.2459/JCM.0b013 e328343d708.
- Mansour S, Roy DC, Bouchard V, Stevens LM, Gobeil F, Rivard A, et al. One-year safety analysis of the COMPARE-AMI trial: comparison of intracoronary injection of CD133 bone marrow stem cells to placebo in patients after acute myocardial infarction and left ventricular dysfunction. Bone Marrow Res. 2011;2011: 385124. https://doi.org/10.1155/ 2011/385124.
- Miettinen JA, Ylitalo K, Hedberg P, Kervinen K, Niemelä M, Säily M, et al. Effects of intracoronary injection of autologous bone marrowderived stem cells on natriuretic peptides and inflammatory markers in

patients with acute ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Clin Res Cardiol. 2011;100(4):317–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00392-010-0246-3.

- Plewka M, Krzemińska-Pakuła M, Peruga JZ, Lipiec P, Kurpesa M, Wierzbowska-Drabik K, et al. The effects of intracoronary delivery of mononuclear bone marrow cells in patients with myocardial infarction: a two year follow-up results. Kardiol Pol. 2011;69(12):1234–40.
- Traverse JH, Henry TD, Ellis SG, Pepine CJ, Willerson JT, Zhao DXM, et al. Effect of intracoronary delivery of autologous bone marrow mononuclear cells 2 to 3 weeks following acute myocardial infarction on left ventricular function: the lateTIME randomized trial. JAMA. 2011;306(19):2110–9.
- Assmus B, Rolf A, Erbs S, Elsässer A, Haberbosch W, Hanbrecht R, et al. Clinical outcome 2 years after intracoronary administration of bone marrow-derived progenitor cells in acute myocardial infarction. Circ Heart Fail. 2010;3(1):89–96. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE. 108.843243.
- Piepoli MF, Vallisa D, Arbasi M, Cavanna L, Cerri L, Mori M, et al. Bone marrow cell transplantation improves cardiac, autonomic, and functional indexes in acute anterior myocardial infarction patients (Cardiac Study). Eur J Heart Fail. 2010;12(2):172–80. https://doi.org/10.1093/ eurjhf/hfp183.
- Schaefer A, Zwadlo C, Fuchs M, Meyer GP, Lippolt P, Wollert KC, et al. Long-term effects of intracoronary bone marrow cell transfer on diastolic function in patients after acute myocardial infarction: 5-year results from the randomized-controlled BOOST trial—an echocardiographic study. Eur J Echocardiogr. 2010;11(2):165–71. https://doi.org/10.1093/ ejechocard/jep191.
- Wöhrle J, Merkle N, Mailänder V, Nusser T, Schauwecker P, von Scheidt F, et al. Results of intracoronary stem cell therapy after acute myocardial infarction. Am J Cardiol. 2010;105(6):804–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. amjcard.2009.10.060.
- Beitnes JO, Hopp E, Lunde K, Solheim S, Arnesen H, Brinchmann JE, et al. Long-term results after intracoronary injection of autologous mononuclear bone marrow cells in acute myocardial infarction: the ASTAMI randomised, controlled study. Heart. 2009;95(24):1983–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/hrt.2009.178913.
- 65. Cao F, Sun D, Li C, Narsinh K, Zhao L, Li X, 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):1986–94. https:// doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp220.
- 66. Dill T, Schächinger V, Rolf A, Möllmann S, Thiele H, Tillmanns H, 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):541–7. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2008.11.011.
- Herbots L, D'hooge J, Eroglu E, Thijs D, Ganame J, Claus P, 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):662–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehn532.
- Lipiec P, Krzemińska-Pakuła M, Plewka M, Kuśmierek J, Płachcińska A, Szumiński R, et al. Impact of intracoronary injection of mononuclear bone marrow cells in acute myocardial infarction on left ventricular perfusion and function: a 6-month follow-up gated 99mTc-MIBI single-photon emission computed tomography study. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009;36(4):587–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00259-008-0988-6.
- Meyer GP, Wollert KC, Lotz J, Pirr J, Rager U, Lippolt P, 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):2978–84. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp374.
- Nogueira FB, Silva SA, Haddad AF, Peixoto CM, de Carvalho RM, Tuche FA, et al. Systolic function of patients with myocardial infarction undergoing autologous bone marrow transplantation. Arg Bras Cardiol. 2009;93(4):374–372. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0066-782x20090010000 10.

- Plewka M, Krzemińska-Pakuła M, Lipiec P, Peruga JZ, Jezewski T, Kidawa M, 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):1336–42. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.amjcard.2009.06.057.
- 72. Schächinger V, Assmus B, Erbs S, Elsässer A, Haberbosch W, Hambrecht R, et al. Intracoronary infusion of bone marrow-derived mononuclear cells abrogates adverse left ventricular remodelling post-acute myocar-dial infarction: insights from the reinfusion of enriched progenitor cells and infarct remodelling in acute myocardial infarction (REPAIR-AMI) trial. Eur J Heart Fail. 2009;11(10):973–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurjhf/hfp113.
- 73. Tendera M, Wojakowski W, Ruzyłło W, Chojnowska L, Kepka C, Tracz 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):1313–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehp073.
- Yao K, Huang R, Sun A, Qian J, Liu X, Ge L, et al. Repeated autologous bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in patients with large myocardial infarction. Eur J Heart Fail. 2009;11(7):691–8. https://doi.org/10. 1093/eurjhf/hfp062.
- Huikuri HV, Kervinen K, Niemelä M, Ylitalo K, Säily M, Koistinen P, 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):2723–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehn436.
- Lunde K, Solheim S, Aakhus S, Arnesen H, Moum T, Abdelnoor M, et al. Exercise capacity and quality of life after intracoronary injection of autologous mononuclear bone marrow cells in acute myocardial infarction: results from the Autologous Stem cell Transplantation in Acute Myocardial Infarction (ASTAMI) randomized controlled trial. Am Heart J. 2007;154(4):710.e1-710.e7108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2007.07.003.
- 77. SuárezdeLezo J, Herrera C, Pan M, Romero M, Pavlovic D, Segura J, et al. Tratamiento regenerativo en pacientes con infarto agudo anterior revascularizado y función ventricular deprimida [Regenerative therapy in patients with a revascularized acute anterior myocardial infarction and depressed ventricular function]. Rev Esp Cardiol. 2007;60(4):357–65.
- Janssens S, Dubois C, Bogaert J, Theunissen K, Deroose C, Desmet W, et al. Autologous bone marrow-derived stem-cell transfer in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: double-blind, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2006;367(9505):113–21. https://doi. org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67861-0.
- Lunde K, Solheim S, Aakhus S, Arnesen H, Abdelnoor M, Egeland T, et al. Intracoronary injection of mononuclear bone marrow cells in acute myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(12):1199–209. https://doi. org/10.1056/NEJMoa055706.
- Meyer GP, Wollert KC, Lotz J, Steffens J, Lippolt P, Fichtner S, et al. Intracoronary bone marrow cell transfer after myocardial infarction: eighteen months' follow-up data from the randomized, controlled BOOST (BOne marrOw transfer to enhance ST-elevation infarct regeneration) trial. Circulation. 2006;113(10):1287–94. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIO NAHA.105.575118.
- Schächinger V, Erbs S, Elsässer A, Haberbosch W, Hambrecht R, Hölschermann H, et al. Intracoronary bone marrow-derived progenitor cells in acute myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(12):1210–21. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa060186.
- Schächinger V, Erbs S, Elsässer A, Haberbosch W, Hambrecht R, Hölschermann H, et al. Improved clinical outcome after intracoronary administration of bone-marrow-derived progenitor cells in acute myocardial infarction: final 1-year results of the REPAIR-AMI trial. Eur Heart J. 2006;27(23):2775–83. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehl388.
- Schaefer A, Meyer GP, Fuchs M, Klein G, Kaplan M, Wollert KC, et al. Impact of intracoronary bone marrow cell transfer on diastolic function in patients after acute myocardial infarction: results from the BOOST trial. Eur Heart J. 2006;27(8):929–35. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ ehi817.
- 84. Karpov RS, Popov SV, Markov VA, Suslova TE, Ryabov VV, Poponina YS, et al. Autologous mononuclear bone marrow cells during reparative

regeneratrion after acute myocardial infarction. Bull Exp Biol Med. 2005;140(5):640–3. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10517-006-0043-1.

- Ruan W, Pan CZ, Huang GQ, Li YL, Ge JB, Shu XH. Assessment of left ventricular segmental function after autologous bone marrow stem cells transplantation in patients with acute myocardial infarction by tissue tracking and strain imaging. Chin Med J (Engl). 2005;118(14):1175–81.
- Wollert KC, Meyer GP, Lotz J, Ringes-Lichtenberg S, Lippolt P, Breidenbach C, et al. Intracoronary autologous bone-marrow cell transfer after myocardial infarction: the BOOST randomised controlled clinical trial. Lancet. 2004;364(9429):141–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04) 16626-9.
- Kang HJ, Kim MK, Lee HY, Park KW, Lee W, Cho YS, et al. Five-year results of intracoronary infusion of the mobilized peripheral blood stem cells by granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in patients with myocardial infarction. Eur Heart J. 2012;33(24):3062–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/ eurheartj/ehs231.
- Chang SA, Kim HK, Lee HY, Choi SY, Koo BK, Kim YJ, et al. Restoration of left ventricular synchronous contraction after acute myocardial infarction by stem cell therapy: new insights into the therapeutic implication of stem cell therapy for acute myocardial infarction. Heart. 2008;94(8):995–1001. https://doi.org/10.1136/hrt.2007.124701.
- Kang HJ, Lee HY, Na SH, Chang SA, Park KW, Kim HK, et al. Differential effect of intracoronary infusion of mobilized peripheral blood stem cells by granulocyte colony-stimulating factor on left ventricular function and remodeling in patients with acute myocardial infarction versus old myocardial infarction: the MAGIC Cell-3-DES randomized, controlled trial. Circulation. 2006;114(1 Suppl):1145–51. https://doi.org/10.1161/ CIRCULATIONAHA.105.001107.
- Delewi R, van der Laan AM, Robbers LF, Hirsch A, Nijveldt R, van der Vleuten PA, et al. Long term outcome after mononuclear bone marrow or peripheral blood cells infusion after myocardial infarction. Heart. 2015;101(5):363–8. https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2014-305892.
- 91. Robbers LF, Nijveldt R, Beek AM, Hirsch A, van der Laan AM, Delewi R, et al. Cell therapy in reperfused acute myocardial infarction does not improve the recovery of perfusion in the infarcted myocardium: a cardiac MR imaging study. Radiology. 2014;272(1):113–22. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.14131121.
- 92. Hirsch A, Nijveldt R, van der Vleuten PA, Tijssen JG, van der Giessen WJ, Tio RA, 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):1736–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/eur/heartj/ehq449.
- 93. van der Laan AM, Hirsch A, Haeck JD, Nijveldt R, Delewi R, Biemond BJ, et al. Recovery of microcirculation after intracoronary infusion of bone marrow mononuclear cells or peripheral blood mononuclear cells in patients treated by primary percutaneous coronary intervention the Doppler substudy of the Hebe trial. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2011;4(8):913–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcin.2011.05.005.
- Al'Aref SJ, Singh G, van Rosendael AR, Kolli KK, Ma X, Maliakal G, et al. Determinants of in-hospital mortality after percutaneous coronary intervention: a machine learning approach. J Am Heart Assoc. 2019;8(5): e011160. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.118.011160.
- Roe MT, Messenger JC, Weintraub WS, Cannon CP, Fonarow GC, Dai D, et al. Treatments, trends, and outcomes of acute myocardial infarction and percutaneous coronary intervention. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2010;56(4):254–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2010.05.008.
- Singh M, Peterson ED, Roe MT, Ou FS, Spertus JA, Rumsfeld JS, et al. Trends in the association between age and in-hospital mortality after percutaneous coronary intervention: national cardiovascular data registry experience. Circ Cardiovasc Interv. 2009;2(1):20–6. https://doi. org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.108.826172.
- 97. Liu C, Han D, Liang P, Li Y, Cao F. The current dilemma and breakthrough of stem cell therapy in ischemic heart disease. Front cell dev biol. 2021;9: 636136. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2021.636136.
- Florea V, Rieger AC, DiFede DL, El-Khorazaty J, Natsumeda M, Banerjee MN, et al. Dose comparison study of allogeneic mesenchymal stem cells in patients with ischemic cardiomyopathy (The TRIDENT Study). Circ Res. 2017;121(11):1279–90. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA. 117.311827.

- Zhang S, Sun A, Xu D, Yao K, Huang Z, Jin H, et al. Impact of timing on efficacy and safetyof intracoronary autologous bone marrow stem cells transplantation in acute myocardial infarction: a pooled subgroup analysis of randomized controlled trials. Clin Cardiol. 2009;32(8):458–66. https://doi.org/10.1002/clc.20575.
- Attar A, Bahmanzadegan Jahromi F, Kavousi S, Monabati A, Kazemi A. Mesenchymal stem cell transplantation after acute myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis of clinical trials. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2021;12(1):600. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-021-02667-1.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.