Efficacy and Safety of Atorvastatin as Adjunctive Treatment 1

in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Systematic 2

Review and Meta-Analysis 3

4	Ke Chen ¹⁴⁵ , <u>chenke111718@163.com</u>										
5	Bowen Xu ¹⁴⁵ , <u>1304520495@qq.com</u>										
6	Lu Zhang ²⁴⁵ ,18715028922@163.com										
7	Li Fang ^{145,} fangli0825@163.com										
8	Di <u>Wu³⁴⁵</u> , <u>1293603638@qq.com</u>										
9	Huanzhang Ding ¹⁴⁵ ,598620653@qq.com										
10	Zegeng <u>Li¹²⁴⁵, 15056765167@163.com</u>										
11	¹ The First Clinical Medical College of Anhui University of Chinese										
12	Medicine,Hefei,230031,China										
13	² Anhui University of Chinese Medicine, Hefei, 230012, China										
14	³ Anhui Provincial Chinese Medicine Hospital, Hefei, 230031, China										
15	⁴ Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine for Respiratory Disease Prevention and										
16	Treatment, Anhui Academy of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Hefei, 230031										
17	⁵ Anhui Provincial Key Laboratory of Translational Medicine for Prevention and										
18	Treatment of Major Respiratory Diseases with Traditional Chinese Medicine, Hefei,										
19	230031										
20	Corresponding Author : Zegeng Li email: 15056765167@163.com										
21	Affiliation: Anhui Provincial Chinese Medicine Hospital										

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Background:Accumulating evidence suggests that atorvastatin, a widely used lipid-lowering agent, may provide additional benefits for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) patients, including anti-inflammatory effects and improved lung function. However, inconsistent findings across studies warrant a systematic evaluation to clarify its clinical role.

Objective: To systematically evaluate the efficacy and safety of atorvastatin as an
adjunctive treatment for COPD and inform clinical decision-making.

Methods: A comprehensive search of PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, CNKI, WanFang, CBM, and VIP databases identified randomized controlled trials (RCTs) up to May 20, 2024. Meta-analysis using RevMan 5.3 and R software was performed to estimate pooled effects with mean differences or standardized mean differences (95% CI). Subgroup analyses explored variations by treatment duration and dosage.

Results:Twenty-four RCTs involving 2,534 patients demonstrated significant benefits 36 of atorvastatin for stable COPD and acute exacerbations (AECOPD):Lung function: 37 FEV1%pred increased by 5.36% (95% CI: 4.57–6.14), FEV1/FVC by 6.30% (95% CI: 38 4.46-8.14), and FEV1 by 0.21 L (95% CI: 0.15-0.27). Inflammatory markers: CRP 39 decreased by 1.87 mg/L (95% CI: 1.45-2.29), with reductions in hs-CRP and 40 IL-6.Quality of life: CAT scores improved by 3.5 points (95% CI: 2.8-4.2).Exercise 41 capacity: The 6-minute walk distance increased by 25.4 meters (95% CI: 18.1-42 32.7). Stronger evidence emerged with 3-month treatments ($I^2 < 30\%$) and consistent 43 benefits at 20 mg doses. Adverse events were mild and self-limiting. 44

45 Conclusion: Atorvastatin (20 mg) significantly improves lung function, reduces
46 inflammation, and enhances quality of life in COPD patients, with a favorable safety
47 profile. Although not currently recommended in COPD guidelines, these findings
48 support further trials to validate its potential role in COPD management.

49 Key words: Atorvastatin, chronic obstructive pulmonary, Meta-analysis, RCT

50 **1. Introduction**

51 Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) is a prevalent global public health concern characterized by airflow limitation and chronic airway inflammation[1]. 52 53 According to data from the World Health Organization, COPD is among the leading causes of mortality globally. Epidemiological studies indicate that the global 54 prevalence of COPD among adults aged 40 and above is approximately $9\% \sim 10\%$ [2]. 55 COPD detrimentally affects patients' quality of life and imposes a substantial 56 57 economic burden on healthcare systems[3;4] Although bronchodilators and corticosteroids are commonly utilized in COPD management, their efficacy remains 58 suboptimal in certain patient populations[5]. Recent years have seen the emergence of 59 60 statins, particularly atorvastatin and simvastatin, as promising agents in the treatment of COPD. Research suggests that atorvastatin may enhance lung function, inhibit 61 inflammatory responses, and reduce oxidative stress in COPD patients while also 62 exhibiting favorable safety profiles[6;7]. Consequently, this study systematically 63 assesses the efficacy and safety of atorvastatin as an adjunctive treatment for COPD. 64 aiming to furnish clinicians with enhanced evidence-based support. Furthermore, it 65 conducts subgroup analyses stratified by dosage, treatment duration, and disease 66 severity, with the goal of providing robust data to inform clinical decision-making. 67

68 **2.Methods**

69 **2.1. Protocol and Registration**

70 This meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items

for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines(see
Supplementary Document 1). The protocol for this study was registered in the
International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) under
registration number CRD42024531466.

75 2.2 Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

76 A comprehensive search of relevant studies was conducted across eight major databases: PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, CNKI, WanFang 77 Data, CBM, and VIP. The search spanned from the inception of each database to May 78 20, 2024. To ensure the search captured all relevant studies, we used a combination of 79 Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms, such as "Chronic Obstructive 80 Pulmonary Disease," "atorvastatin," "inflammation," and "lung function." Boolean 81 operators (AND, OR) were applied, and search terms were tailored to each database. 82 We also conducted supplementary searches, including reference lists of relevant 83 articles and systematic reviews, to identify additional eligible studies. 84

Studies were eligible for inclusion if they were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) 85 evaluating atorvastatin as an adjunctive treatment in patients diagnosed with chronic 86 obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) based on established criteria, such as the 87 Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) guidelines[8]. To 88 ensure clinical relevance, included studies needed to report at least one of the 89 90 following outcomes: (1) primary outcomes—lung function parameters (e.g., FEV1%pred, FEV1/FVC) and systemic inflammatory markers (e.g., CRP, hs-CRP, 91 92 IL-6); or (2) secondary outcomes—exercise capacity (e.g., 6-minute walk distance),

quality of life (e.g., COPD Assessment Test [CAT]), or adverse events.Interventions
were considered eligible if atorvastatin was compared to placebo or standard COPD
treatment.

96 Studies were excluded if they were non-randomized trials, observational studies, case 97 reports, or reviews. Additionally, we excluded studies with insufficient data for 98 analysis, animal models, or those involving atorvastatin doses outside the clinical 99 guidelines. Full-text articles not available in English or Chinese were also excluded to 100 ensure accurate data interpretation.

101 **2.3.Data Extraction and Quality Assessment**

Data extraction was independently conducted by two reviewers, Ke Chen and Bowen 102 Xu, using a standardized data extraction form to ensure consistency and accuracy. The 103 information extracted included study characteristics, such as author names, 104 publication year, country, and sample size, as well as participant demographics, 105 106 including age, sex, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) severity, and comorbidities. Details of the interventions, including atorvastatin dosage, treatment 107 duration, and comparator interventions, were also collected. The primary outcomes of 108 interest were lung function parameters, specifically the Forced Expiratory Volume in 109 the first second as a percentage of the predicted value (FEV1%pred) and the Forced 110 Expiratory Volume in the first second to Forced Vital Capacity ratio (FEV1/FVC). 111 112 Additionally, inflammatory markers, such as C-reactive protein (CRP), high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP), and interleukin-6 (IL-6), were included 113 as primary outcomes. Secondary outcomes encompassed exercise capacity, measured 114

by the six-minute walk distance (6MWD), quality of life, assessed using the COPD Assessment Test (CAT), and adverse events, including elevated alanine aminotransferase (ALT) levels and myopathy. Any disagreements arising during the data extraction process were resolved through discussion or, when necessary, consultation with a third reviewer, Huanzhang Ding, to ensure the reliability of the extracted data.

The quality of included studies was assessed using the Cochrane RoB 2 tool[9], 121 which evaluates five domains: randomization process, deviations from intended 122 123 interventions, missing outcome data, measurement of outcomes, and selection of reported results. Each domain was rated as "low risk," "some concerns," or "high 124 risk," and overall bias for each study was determined. Two reviewers conducted the 125 126 risk of bias assessment independently, with discrepancies resolved by consensus. This systematic approach ensured the reliability and validity of the included studies for 127 subsequent meta-analysis. 128

129 2.4.Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using RevMan 5.3 and R (v3.6.1). Continuous outcomes (e.g., lung function parameters, inflammatory markers, and quality of life scores) were summarized as mean differences (MD) or standardized mean differences (SMD) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI). Dichotomous outcomes (e.g., adverse events) were analyzed using risk ratios (RR) with 95% CI. The pooled effect size for each outcome was calculated using either a fixed-effect model or a random-effects model, depending on the degree of heterogeneity observed.

Heterogeneity was assessed using the I² statistic and τ^2 values. An I² > 50% was 137 considered indicative of substantial heterogeneity, prompting the use of a 138 139 random-effects model to account for variability among studies. For outcomes with low heterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$), a fixed-effect model was employed. Additionally, the 140 Cochran Q test (p < 0.10) was used to further evaluate statistical heterogeneity. 141 Sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the robustness of the pooled results by 142 excluding high-risk studies (e.g., those rated as "Some Concerns" or "High Risk" in 143 the Cochrane RoB 2 tool) and by re-analyzing data using alternative statistical 144 145 models.

Subgroup analyses were pre-specified to explore potential sources of
heterogeneity. Stratifications were performed based on atorvastatin dosage (20 mg vs.
40 mg), treatment duration (<6 months vs. ≥6 months), and patient condition (stable
COPD vs. acute exacerbation of COPD [AECOPD]).

Publication bias was evaluated using funnel plots and Egger's regression test, provided that the number of included studies exceeded 10, as smaller samples may yield unreliable assessments. Visual inspection of funnel plot symmetry was used to detect potential small-study effects. In cases where asymmetry was observed, additional analyses were conducted to explore its impact on the overall meta-analytic results. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05 for all analyses, except where otherwise specified.

157 **3.Results**

158 **3.1.Literature Screening Process and Results**

A total of 1,100 articles were initially identified. After sequential screening, 24 randomized controlled trials (RCTs)[10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33],were finally included, involving 2,534 patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). The literature screening process and results are shown in **Figure 1**.

164 **3.2.Basic Characteristics of Included Studies**

This meta-analysis included 24 randomized controlled trials (RCTs)¹⁰⁻³⁴published between 2011 and 2024, involving diverse study designs and patient populations. All studies evaluated the efficacy and safety of atorvastatin as an adjunctive treatment for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). The sample sizes ranged from 30 to 200 participants per study, with treatment durations varying between 3 to 12 months. The included studies reported key outcomes such as lung function parameters, inflammatory markers, quality of life, and exercise capacity.

172 **3.3.Risk of Bias Assessment**

The risk of bias for the included studies was evaluated using the Cochrane Risk of 173 Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool. The results are summarized as follows:(1)Randomization 174 **Process**: Among the 24 included studies, 20 (83.3%) were evaluated as having a low 175 risk of bias, and 4 (16.7%) had some concerns. None of the studies were assessed as 176 high risk in this domain.(2)Deviations from Intended Interventions: A total of 18 177 studies (75%) were assessed as having a low risk of bias, and 6 studies (25%) had 178 some concerns. No studies fell into the high-risk category.(3)Missing Outcome Data: 179 In this domain, 15 studies (62.5%) were categorized as low risk, while 9 studies 180

(37.5%)Again, 181 had some concerns. no high-risk assessments were noted.(4)Measurement of the Outcome: For this domain, 12 studies (50%) were 182 rated as low risk, while the remaining 12 studies (50%) had some concerns. None of 183 the studies were deemed high risk.(5)Selection of the Reported Result: A total of 24 184 studies (100%) had some concerns in this domain. No studies were classified as low 185 or high risk.(6)Overall Bias:Out of the 24 studies, 24 (100%) were categorized as 186 having some concerns overall. There were no studies classified as low or high risk. 187

188 3.4. Results: Meta-Analysis Results

189 **3.4.1. FEV1%pred**

A total of 8 RCTs[10; 11; 12; 15; 20; 21; 24; 29; 31] involving 695 patients were 190 included. The results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that 191 192 adjunctive therapy with 20 mg of atorvastatin could improve FEV1%pred. Subgroup analysis based on the treatment duration revealed that the therapy was effective at 193 both 3 months [MD = 5.04, 95% CI (3.92, 6.16), P < 0.00001] and 6 months [MD = 194 6.53, 95% CI (3.56, 9.51), P < 0.00001]. Subgroup analysis based on different disease 195 states showed that atorvastatin improved FEV1%pred in both AECOPD patients [MD 196 = 5.59, 95% CI (3.95, 7.23), P < 0.00001] and stable patients [MD = 5.47, 95% CI 197 (3.74, 7.19), P < 0.00001].(Figure 3a)198

199 **3.4.2. FEV1/FVC**

A total of 9 RCTs⁻[10; 11; 12; 15; 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 31] involving 882 patients were included. The results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that adjunctive therapy with 20 mg of atorvastatin could improve FEV1/FVC. Subgroup

203	analysis based on the treatment duration indicated that the therapy was effective at
204	both 3 months [MD = 6.19, 95% CI (0.9, 11.48), P < 0.00001] and 6 months [MD =
205	5.08, 95% CI (2.91, 7.26), $P < 0.00001$]. Subgroup analysis based on different disease
206	states showed that atorvastatin was effective in improving FEV1/FVC in both acute
207	exacerbation patients [MD = 3.63, 95% CI (2.52, 4.74), $P < 0.00001$] and stable
208	patients [MD = 7.89, 95% CI (1.79, 13.99), P < 0.00001].(Figure 3b)

209 **3.4.3. FEV1**

A total of 9 RCTs[10; 11; 12; 15; 19; 20; 21; 24; 29; 31]nvolving 816 patients were 210 included. The results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that 211 adjunctive therapy with 20 mg of atorvastatin could improve FEV1. Subgroup 212 analysis based on the treatment duration indicated that the therapy was effective at 3 213 214 months [MD = 5.04, 95% CI (3.92, 6.16), P < 0.00001] and also effective at 6 months [MD = 6.53, 95% CI (3.56, 9.51), P < 0.00001]. Subgroup analysis based on different 215 disease states showed that atorvastatin was effective in improving FEV1 in both acute 216 exacerbation and remission stages of COPD patients. Subgroup analysis based on 217 different dosages revealed that only the 20 mg dose of atorvastatin was effective in 218 improving FEV1 in COPD patients.(Figure 3c) 219

220 **3.4.4.** CRP

A total of 4 RCTs[16;18,25,32]involving 334 patients were included. CRP Levels Subgroup analysis demonstrated that atorvastatin significantly reduced CRP levels across different doses and treatment durations. A 20 mg dose resulted in an average reduction of 1.87 mg/L (95% CI: 1.45–2.29), while a 40 mg dose further reduced CRP

by 2.10 mg/L (95% CI: 1.60–2.60). For every 10 mg increase in dosage, CRP levels
decreased by approximately 0.12 mg/L. Regarding treatment duration, significant
reductions were observed over both 3 months (-1.50 mg/L, 95% CI: -1.10 to -1.90)
and 6 months (-2.30 mg/L, 95% CI: -1.80 to -2.80), with longer durations showing
enhanced anti-inflammatory effects. (Figure 4a)

230 **3.4.5. hs-CRP**

A total of 4 RCTs[15; 21; 26; 27] i involving 269 patients were included. The results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that adjunctive therapy with atorvastatin could reduce hs-CRP levels. Subgroup analysis based on different dosages revealed that only the 20 mg dose of atorvastatin was effective in improving hs-CRP levels in COPD patients. Subgroup analysis based on different disease states indicated that atorvastatin improved hs-CRP levels in both AECOPD and COPD patients.(**Figure 4b**)

238 **3.4.6. IL-6**

A total of 5 RCTs[10; 13;27;25,32;] involving 359 patients were included. The 239 results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that adjunctive 240 therapy with atorvastatin could reduce IL-6 levels. Subgroup analysis based on 241 different treatment durations indicated that atorvastatin was effective in patients with 242 a treatment duration of up to 6 months but was ineffective in those with a treatment 243 duration of 6 to 12 months. Subgroup analysis based on different dosages revealed 244 245 that a 20 mg dose of atorvastatin was effective in improving IL-6 levels in COPD patients. (Figure 4c) 246

247 **3.4.7. CAT Score**

A total of 7 RCTs[10; 14; 22; 25; 26; 32; 33] involving 639 patients were included. 248 249 The results of the meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that adjunctive therapy with atorvastatin could improve CAT scores in COPD patients. Subgroup 250 analysis based on different dosages revealed that both 20 mg and 40 mg doses of 251 atorvastatin could improve CAT scores in COPD patients. Subgroup analysis based 252 on different treatment durations (3, 6, and 12 months) indicated that atorvastatin was 253 effective across short, medium, and long treatment periods. (Figure 5a) 254 255 3.4.8. 6MW A total of 6 RCTs[14;19;17; 26;28, 32]involving 715 COPD patients were included. 256 Atorvastatin significantly improved exercise capacity as measured by 6MWD, with 257 258 subgroup analyses indicating differences based on dosage and treatment duration. Patients treated with a 20 mg dose experienced an average improvement of 25.4 m 259 (95% CI: 18.1-32.7), whereas those receiving a 40 mg dose showed a smaller 260 improvement of 18.0 m (95% CI: 10.0-26.0), possibly reflecting diminished 261 tolerability or adverse effects at higher doses. Treatment duration also played a crucial 262 role, with 6-month treatments yielding a larger improvement of 30.2 m (95% CI: 263

264 25.0–35.4) compared to 3-month treatments (18.5 m, 95% CI: 10.2–26.8). These 265 findings emphasize the importance of sustained treatment and optimal dosing for 266 enhancing physical function in COPD patients.(**Figure 5b**)

267 **3.4.9.ADR events**

Among the 24 included studies, 3 RCTs [30, 31, 33] reported adverse reactions,

accounting for 7.9% of the total study population. The reported adverse events were primarily mild and included symptoms such as dry mouth, gastrointestinal discomfort, dizziness, and palpitations. One study noted mild elevations in ALT levels, which normalized following the administration of liver-protective medications without the need to discontinue atorvastatin therapy.

Due to variations in adverse reaction criteria across studies and the limited number of reported events, only descriptive analyses were performed. Statistical significance between groups could not be established. For detailed data, including incidence rates and patient numbers, please refer to the Supplementary Material TableS2.

Notably, while adverse events were generally mild and self-limiting, a higher incidence of gastrointestinal symptoms and liver enzyme elevations was observed with the 40 mg dose compared to the 20 mg dose. This suggests a potential dose-dependent relationship in atorvastatin-related adverse events. However, further studies with larger sample sizes and standardized reporting criteria are needed to confirm these findings and better evaluate the safety profile of atorvastatin in COPD patients.

286 4. Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity analysis (**Figure S1**) confirmed the robustness of the pooled results, as the overall estimates remained within the confidence intervals (CI) of the main analysis after excluding each study. However, certain studies, including Zhengwei (2013)[10], Zhang Rongchang (2015)[25], and Hassan Ghobadi (2014)[26], showed

notable contributions to heterogeneity. Excluding Zhengwei (2013)[10] significantly 291 altered the pooled estimate for FEV1%pred (from 5.36% [95% CI: 4.57-6.14] to 292 293 4.78% [95% CI: 3.96–5.60]), likely due to the shorter treatment duration (6 months) and inclusion of AECOPD patients, whose inflammatory responses may differ from 294 those of stable COPD patients. Similarly, Zhang Rongchang (2015)[25], a 12-month 295 study, caused a narrowing of the CI when removed (from 4.57–6.14 to 5.01–5.71), 296 suggesting that treatment duration is a key source of variability. Hassan Ghobadi 297 (2014)[26], with a higher atorvastatin dose (40 mg), contributed to heterogeneity due 298 299 to differences in dosing regimens and potential pharmacokinetic variations in different populations. 300

These findings highlight the importance of patient characteristics (e.g., AECOPD vs. stable COPD), treatment duration (<6 months vs. \geq 6 months), and dosing regimens (20 mg vs. 40 mg) in influencing the pooled results. Future meta-analyses should consider stratified analyses based on these factors to better elucidate their impact on treatment outcomes and heterogeneity.

306 5.Heterogeneity and Inconsistency Assessment

In this meta-analysis, heterogeneity was assessed using I² and τ^2 statistics, alongside p-values from the Cochran Q test. Several outcomes exhibited moderate heterogeneity, including CAT Score (I² = 52.4%) and 6MW (I² = 51.3%), likely attributable to differences in study populations, intervention durations, and measurement methods. For outcomes such as FEV1/FVC (I² = 34.5%) and CRP (I² = 41.5%), heterogeneity was moderate, and results remained consistent between

fixed-effect and random-effects models, underscoring the robustness of the pooledestimates.

The τ^2 values, reflecting between-study variance, were relatively low for most outcomes, further supporting the reliability of the results. Notably, hs-CRP (I² = 48.2%) and IL-6 (I² = 46.3%) exhibited slightly higher heterogeneity, potentially reflecting variability in baseline inflammation levels or comorbid conditions among study participants. Detailed heterogeneity metrics are provided in Supplementary Table S3.

Subgroup analyses revealed that treatment duration (<6 months vs. \geq 6 months) and patient condition (AECOPD vs. stable COPD) contributed to the observed heterogeneity in hs-CRP and IL-6, suggesting that these factors may influence baseline inflammation levels and treatment efficacy.

325 **6.Discussion**

The management of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) remains a 326 significant challenge due to the lack of therapeutic agents that can reverse key 327 pathological features, such as airway remodeling, emphysema, and vascular 328 abnormalities. This highlights the urgent need for novel therapeutic targets and 329 pharmacological interventions[34-36]. Statins, initially developed as lipid-lowering 330 agents, have demonstrated significant anti-inflammatory and antioxidant effects. 331 Specifically, atorvastatin modulates the guanosine triphosphatase and nuclear factor 332 κB (NF- κB) pathways, inhibiting the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines such 333 as TNF- α , IL-6, and IL-8. These effects alleviate lung inflammation and reduce 334

neutrophil infiltration into the lungs[37-39].

336 Dose-Effect Analysis: 40 mg vs. 20 mg Atorvastatin

Figures 4b and 5b show that the therapeutic contribution of the 40 mg dose is smaller than that of the 20 mg dose, potentially due to smaller sample sizes or differences in study design. However, this difference did not significantly affect the overall effect estimates in the primary analysis, indicating that the current evidence is insufficient to conclude the 40 mg dose is ineffective.

The superior efficacy of the 20 mg dose may result from its ability to achieve an 342 343 optimal balance between anti-inflammatory effects and pulmonary function improvement. Higher doses could lead to suboptimal outcomes due to excessive drug 344 concentrations, which may reduce lung-specific bioavailability. Additionally, 345 346 atorvastatin's pharmacokinetics may limit its targeted delivery at higher doses[40-41]. Ethnic differences might also contribute to variations in the observed 347 effects. For instance, studies involving the 40 mg dose were predominantly conducted 348 in Caucasian populations, whereas evidence suggests that Asian populations are more 349 sensitive to stating due to genetic polymorphisms affecting CYP2D6, CYP2C, and 350 OATP1B1, resulting in higher systemic drug concentrations and enhanced therapeutic 351 sensitivity[42]. Future studies should validate the efficacy of the 40 mg dose in 352 large-scale randomized controlled trials and conduct subgroup analyses to clarify its 353 mechanisms and identify suitable populations. 354

355 Heterogeneity Between COPD and AECOPD Populations

Figure 4b indicates that atorvastatin demonstrated therapeutic benefits in both stable

COPD and AECOPD populations, suggesting its efficacy in both chronic and acute 357 disease states. However, the intensity of therapeutic responses likely differs. In 358 359 AECOPD patients, atorvastatin appears to exert pronounced short-term effects by suppressing acute inflammatory responses. Conversely, in stable COPD patients, the 360 benefits may be more associated with long-term inflammation reduction and 361 improvements in pulmonary vascular function. Future studies should conduct stratified 362 analyses to further explore the differential responses of COPD and AECOPD 363 populations to interventions. This approach will help optimize atorvastatin use based 364 365 on individual patient characteristics and disease phases, improving clinical practice.

366 Safety and Adverse Effects

The safety profile of atorvastatin in this study was favorable, with only a few mild adverse reactions reported, including gastrointestinal symptoms, dizziness, headache, palpitations, insomnia, and transient elevations in transaminases. These adverse effects were either self-limiting or resolved after discontinuation of the drug. This aligns with previous studies, emphasizing atorvastatin's good tolerability in COPD treatment[6; 37-45].

To ensure safe application in clinical practice, liver function monitoring is recommended, particularly for patients receiving higher doses or with pre-existing hepatic conditions. Further research should explore strategies to mitigate adverse effects, such as the combination of atorvastatin with hepatoprotective agents.

377 Comparison with Previous Studies

The findings of this study align with those of Lu et al. (2019)[43], whose network

meta-analysis demonstrated significant reductions in inflammatory markers (e.g., CRP and IL-6) and pulmonary hypertension in COPD patients, with cumulative probabilities of 68% and 75.4%, respectively. Similarly, He et al. (2023)[44]reported that atorvastatin attenuated pulmonary vascular remodeling and inflammation in a COPD rat model by regulating HDAC2 and VEGF expression. These studies, along with our findings, reinforce the anti-inflammatory and anti-remodeling potential of atorvastatin in COPD management.

386 Study Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, variability in treatment durations across the 387 included studies limited the ability to conduct time-based subgroup analyses for some 388 outcomes, potentially introducing heterogeneity. Second, many studies lacked 389 390 detailed information on randomization, allocation concealment, or blinding, increasing the risk of selection and measurement bias. Finally, the limited range of 391 outcome indicators precluded an evaluation of atorvastatin's effects on immune 392 function and the frequency of acute exacerbations. Future studies should address these 393 gaps to provide more robust evidence. 394

395 7.Conclusions

In summary, atorvastatin at a 20 mg dose demonstrated significant efficacy in improving lung function, reducing inflammatory markers, and enhancing quality of life in COPD patients, with a favorable safety profile. Although atorvastatin is not currently included in the GOLD guidelines for routine COPD treatment, emerging evidence—including this study—suggests that statins may reduce lung-related and

- all-cause mortality in COPD patients[6;37;45]. These findings warrant further 401 validation through high-quality, long-term studies.
- 403 8. Conflict of Interest

402

- This manuscript has no potential conflict of interest to disclose. 404
- 9. AuthorsContributions 405
- CK introduced the concept and design of the study. Data extraction: XBW, CK; Data 406
- analysis: CK, XBW, and ZL. Interpretation results: CK and FL; Manuscript writing: 407
- CK and XBW. All authors contributed to the completion of this study and approved 408
- 409 the submitted version of the paper.

10.Data Availability Statement 410

The data used in this study are sourced from publicly available databases. All original 411 412 data can be provided upon reasonable request. There are no access restrictions on the data, and researchers can obtain the relevant data by contacting the corresponding 413 author. 414

415 **11.Funding**

- 416 This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
- (82374399) and the Major Breakthrough Project of the Anhui Institute of New An 417
- Medicine and Modernization of Traditional Chinese Medicine, under the Hefei 418
- National Comprehensive Science Center for Big Health Research ("Revealing the List 419
- and Taking Command" Program) (2023CXMMTCM005) for COPD. 420

12.Ethics 421

This study is not clinical and therefore does not require ethical approval. 422

13.References 423

- [1] A.K. Agarwal, A. Raja, and B.D. Brown, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, 424 StatPearls, StatPearls Publishing 425
- Copyright © 2024, StatPearls Publishing LLC., Treasure Island (FL), 2024. 426
- 427 [2] H. Wang, X. Ye, Y. Zhang, and S. Ling, Global, regional, and national burden of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease from 1990 to 2019. Front Physiol 13 428 (2022) 925132. 429
- [3] M.S. Ahmed, A. Nevaz, and A.N. Aslami, Health-related quality of life of chronic 430 obstructive pulmonary disease patients: Results from a community based 431 432 cross-sectional study in Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India. Lung India 33 (2016) 148-53. 433
- [4] M. Miravitlles, and A. Ribera, Understanding the impact of symptoms on the 434 burden of COPD. Respir Res 18 (2017) 67. 435
- [5] J.A. Falk, O.A. Minai, and Z. Mosenifar, Inhaled and systemic corticosteroids in 436 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Proc Am Thorac Soc 5 (2008) 506-12. 437
- [6] X. Chen, F. Hu, F. Chai, and X. Chen, Effect of statins on pulmonary function in 438 439 patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Thorac Dis 15 (2023) 440 3944-3952. 441
- [7] A.S. Tulbah, The potential of Atorvastatin for chronic lung diseases therapy. Saudi 442 Pharm J 28 (2020) 1353-1363. 443
- [8] A. Agusti, and C.F. Vogelmeier, GOLD 2024: a brief overview of key changes. J 444 Bras Pneumol 49 (2023) e20230369. 445
- [9] M. Cumpston, T. Li, M.J. Page, J. Chandler, V.A. Welch, J.P. Higgins, and J. 446 Thomas, Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of 447 448 the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 10 (2019) Ed000142. 449
- [10] Z. Wei, and W. Jiangping, The Study on the Influence of Atorvastatin on 450 Inflammatory Factors, Pulmonary Function, and Quality of Life in Patients 451 with COPD. . Clinical Pulmonary Medicine 18 (2013) 870-872. 452
- [11] J. Honghui, H. Hua, and L. Chunjin, The Influence of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary 453 Function and Induced Sputum VEGF Levels in Patients with Acute 454 Exacerbation of COPD. Hainan Medical Journal (2018). 455
- [12] L. Wenhui, The Impact of Atorvastatin on Airway Remodeling in Patients with 456 Stable Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Southwest Defense Medical 457 Journal 029 (2019) 441-443. 458
- [13] Y. Yong, Z. Minhua, and T. Qiang, The Influence of Atorvastatin on Plasma 459 Inflammatory Cytokines in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary 460 Disease and Observation of Therapeutic Efficacy. Journal of 461 Pharmacoepidemiology (2013) 3. 462
- [14] X. Junping, L. Shumei, and L. Yaman, The Impact of Atorvastatin on CAT 463 Scores, mMRC Scores, and BODE Index in Patients with Stable Chronic 464

465	Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Laboratory Medicine and Clinical Medicine
466	13 (2016) 4.
467	[15] Z. Weishi, L. Zhaowen, and H. Yingxin, Observation of the Efficacy of
468	Atorvastatin in Improving Pulmonary Function in Elderly Patients with Acute
469	Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Hainan Medical
470	Journal (2017) 1332-1333.
471	[16] G. Sujuan, N. Lina, N. Lixin, and X. Shengxia, The Effect of Atorvastatin
472	Calcium on Serum IL-13, TNF-a, and CRP in Patients with Chronic
473	Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Clinical Pulmonary Medicine 20 (2015) 3.
474	[17] He Yan, D. Yajie, and H. Yingli, Observation of the Therapeutic Effect of
475	Atorvastatin Calcium Tablets in the Treatment of Chronic Obstructive
476	Pulmonary Disease. Shenzhen Journal of Integrated Traditional Chinese and
477	Western Medicine (2016) 2.
478	[18] L. Jianyi, The Role of Atorvastatin Calcium in Reducing Serum IL-13, TNF-α,
479	and CRP in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Strait
480	Pharmaceutical Journal 30 (2018) 2.
481	[19] L. Zheng, Clinical Efficacy Study of Atorvastatin Calcium in Treating Stable
482	Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Chinese Contemporary Medicine 24
483	(2017) 3.
484	[20] W. Haoling, and L. Chengyi, Discussion on the Therapeutic Role of Atorvastatin
485	in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Journal of Clinical Rational Use
486	of Medicines 4 (2011) 2.
487	[21] F. Jun, D. Shuping, H. Yong, L. Junchuan, and X. Zangling, Research on the Use
488	of Atorvastatin in the Treatment of Acute Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive
489	Pulmonary Disease Chinese Journal of Disability and Medical Treatment. 22
490	(2014) 2.
491	[22] C. Hong, The Application and Effectiveness of Atorvastatin in the Treatment of
492	Stable Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Journal of Chronic Diseases
493	(2018) 3.
494	[23] C.F. Peng Yufeng, Xing Konglang, Chen Xiaojun, Huang Hui, Chen Qi Jing,
495	Clinical Study on the Treatment of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
496	Patients with Atorvastatin. Chinese Journal of Clinical Pharmacology 39
497	(2023) 155-159.
498	[24] C. Liqiao, Research on the Impact of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary Function and
499	Quality of Life in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
500	Medical Information (2013) 286-287.
501	[25] Z. Rongchang, Z. Shuai, and L. Yuxiong, The Impact of Atorvastatin Calcium
502	Tablets on Serum C-Reactive Protein, Interleukin-6, and Pulmonary Function
503	in Patients with Stable Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Journal of
504	Translational Medicine (2015) 30-32.
505	[26] H. Ghobadi, S.M. Lari, F. Pourfarzi, A. Mahmoudpour, and M. Ghanei, The
506	effects of atorvastatin on mustard-gas-exposed patients with chronic
507	obstructive pulmonary disease: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of
508	research in medical sciences 19 (2014) 99-105.

- [27] A. Arian, S.G. Mortazavi Moghadam, T. Kazemi, M. Zardast, and A. Zarban,
 Trial of Atorvastatin on Serum Interleukin-6, Total Antioxidant Capacity,
 C-Reactive Protein, and Alpha-1 Antitrypsin in Patients with Chronic
 Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. J Res Pharm Pract 7 (2018) 141-146.
- 513 [28] C. Shoubin, and O. Zongxing, Observation of the Effects of Atorvastatin in
 514 Patients with Severe Stable Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
 515 Shandong Medical Journal (2015) 2.
- 516 [29] H. Yufen, Research on the Impact of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary Function and
 517 Quality of Life in Patients with Acute Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive
 518 Pulmonary Disease (AECOPD). Celebrity Doctor (2019) 1.
- [30] Z. Xiuli, L. Han, and Q. Huijuan., Clinical Efficacy of Atorvastatin Calcium
 Tablets Combined with Budesonide/Formoterol Inhalation Powder for the
 Treatment of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and the Impact on
 Blood Gas Analysis Indicators in Patients. Chinese Journal of Rational Use of
 Medicines 21 (2024) 76-82.
- [31] L.F. Zhang Guifeng, Pei Hailin, The Impact of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary
 Function Indices in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease.
 Systematic Medicine 9 (2024) 84-86+90.
- 527 [32] Y. Weilong, Efficacy of Atorvastatin Calcium Combined with Tiotropium in
 528 Patients with Severe Stable Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Henan
 529 Medical Research 29 (2020) 6838-6840.
- [33] L. Meicen, X. Hua, and S. Di, Observation of the Therapeutic Efficacy of
 Atorvastatin Combined with Tiotropium in the Treatment of Severe Stable
 Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD). Southwest Defense
 Medicine 27 (2017) 1197-1199.
- [34] P.J. Barnes, and R.A. Stockley, COPD: current therapeutic interventions and
 future approaches. Eur Respir J 25 (2005) 1084-106.
- [35] K.F. Rabe, S. Rennard, F.J. Martinez, B.R. Celli, D. Singh, A. Papi, M. Bafadhel,
 J. Heble, A. Radwan, X. Soler, J.A. Jacob Nara, Y. Deniz, and P.J. Rowe,
 Targeting Type 2 Inflammation and Epithelial Alarmins in Chronic
 Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Biologics Outlook. Am J Respir Crit Care
 Med 208 (2023) 395-405.
- 541 [36] G.B. Bolger, Therapeutic Targets and Precision Medicine in COPD:
 542 Inflammation, Ion Channels, Both, or Neither? Int J Mol Sci 24 (2023).
- [37] J.H. Kim, H.G. Choi, M.J. Kwon, J.H. Kim, J.Y. Park, Y.I. Hwang, S.H. Jang,
 and K.S. Jung, The Influence of Prior Statin Use on the Prevalence and
 Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in an Adult
 Population. Front Med (Lausanne) 9 (2022) 842948.
- [38] Y.Y. Chen, T.C. Li, C.I. Li, S.P. Lin, and P.K. Fu, Statins Associated with Better
 Long-Term Outcomes in Aged Hospitalized Patients with COPD: A
 Real-World Experience from Pay-for-Performance Program. J Pers Med 12
 (2022).
- [39] C.M. Lin, T.M. Yang, Y.H. Yang, Y.H. Tsai, C.P. Lee, P.C. Chen, W.C. Chen,
 and M.J. Hsieh, Statin Use and the Risk of Subsequent Hospitalized

- It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .
- 553 Exacerbations in COPD Patients with Frequent Exacerbations. Int J Chron 554 Obstruct Pulmon Dis 15 (2020) 289-299.
- [40] A.M. Noyes, and P.D. Thompson, The effects of statins on exercise and physical
 activity. J Clin Lipidol 11 (2017) 1134-1144.
- [41] A. Muraki, K. Miyashita, M. Mitsuishi, M. Tamaki, K. Tanaka, and H. Itoh,
 Coenzyme Q10 reverses mitochondrial dysfunction in atorvastatin-treated
 mice and increases exercise endurance. J Appl Physiol (1985) 113 (2012)
 479-86.
- [42] H.Y. Yow, S. Hamzah, N. Abdul Rahim, and V. Suppiah, Pharmacogenomics of
 response to statin treatment and susceptibility to statin-induced adverse drug
 reactions in Asians: a scoping review. Asian Biomed (Res Rev News) 17
 (2023) 95-114.
- 565 [43] Y. Lu, R. Chang, J. Yao, X. Xu, Y. Teng, and N. Cheng, Effectiveness of
 566 long-term using statins in COPD a network meta-analysis. Respir Res 20
 567 (2019) 17.
- [44] Y. He, S. Wang, Y. Li, J. Deng, and L. Huang, Effects of atorvastatin in
 suppressing pulmonary vascular remodeling in rats with chronic obstructive
 pulmonary disease. Clinics (Sao Paulo) 78 (2023) 100252.
- [45] V. Søyseth, P.H. Brekke, P. Smith, and T. Omland, Statin use is associated with
 reduced mortality in COPD. Eur Respir J 29 (2007) 279-83.
- 573
- 574 Figure1:Literature screening process and results
- 575 Table1: Summary characteristics of included RCTs
- 576 Figure 2 (a and b). Risk of bias of the included RCTs.
- 577 a. Risk of bias graph
- 578 b. Risk of bias summary; Green circles represent low risk, yellow circles represent
- unclear risk, and red circles represent high risk.

Figure 3: Forest Plots of the Effects of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary Function Parameters

- This figure demonstrates the pooled effects of atorvastatin (20 mg daily) on key pulmonary function parameters in COPD patients, calculated using a random-effects model. Positive effect sizes indicate improvement in lung function. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.
- **3a: Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1 (L)** This forest plot shows the effect of atorvastatin on FEV1 (forced expiratory volume in the first second), measured in liters. Positive values indicate enhanced pulmonary function, reflecting an increase in airflow during exhalation. All included studies utilized a 20 mg dose of atorvastatin.
- 3b: Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1/FVC Ratio (%) This forest plot illustrates the
- 591 impact of atorvastatin on the FEV1/FVC ratio, expressed as a percentage. A higher

ratio suggests improved airway obstruction and better pulmonary function. All 592 included studies consistently administered atorvastatin at a dose of 20 mg per day. 593

- 3c:Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1%pred (% Predicted). This forest plot 594 highlights the effect of atorvastatin on FEV1%pred (percentage of predicted forced 595 expiratory volume in the first second), an important measure of lung function relative 596 597 to normal values. Positive results signify improved pulmonary capacity. All included studies applied a daily dose of 20 mg of atorvastatin. 598

Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention. Positive values represent 599 improvement in pulmonary function (FEV1, FEV1/FVC ratio, and FEV1%pred). 600

Figure 4: Forest Plots of the Effects of Atorvastatin on Inflammatory Markers 601

This figure presents the pooled effects of atorvastatin (20 mg daily) on key 602 inflammatory markers in patients with COPD, analyzed using a random-effects 603 model. Negative effect sizes indicate reductions in inflammatory markers, reflecting 604 improved systemic inflammation. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. 605

4a: Effect of atorvastatin on CRP levels (mg/L). This forest plot illustrates the effect 606 of atorvastatin on C-reactive protein (CRP) levels. A total of 4 randomized controlled 607 trials (RCTs) involving 334 patients demonstrated significant reductions in CRP 608 levels during both 3-month and 6-month treatment periods. The results suggest that 609 atorvastatin effectively reduces systemic inflammation in COPD patients over these 610 durations. 611

4b: Effect of atorvastatin on hs-CRP levels (mg/L). This forest plot highlights the 612 impact of atorvastatin on high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) levels. Based 613 on 4 RCTs involving 269 patients, the 20 mg dose consistently reduced hs-CRP levels 614 across different patient populations, including both stable COPD and AECOPD (acute 615 exacerbations of COPD). Improvements were observed regardless of the disease state, 616 indicating the broad anti-inflammatory benefits of atorvastatin. 617

4c: Effect of atorvastatin on IL-6 levels (pg/mL). This forest plot demonstrates the 618 effects of atorvastatin on interleukin-6 (IL-6) levels. Data from 5 RCTs involving 359 619 patients showed significant reductions in IL-6 levels with a 20 mg dose within the 620 first 6 months of treatment. However, no significant effects were observed in studies 621 with treatment durations of 6-12 months, suggesting a time-dependent response to 622 atorvastatin's anti-inflammatory effects. 623

Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention (negative values represent 624

625 reductions in inflammatory markers).

Figure 5: Effects of Atorvastatin on CAT Scores and 6-Minute Walk Distance(6MWD)

This figure highlights the effects of atorvastatin on COPD-related quality of life and exercise capacity, analyzed using a random-effects model. Negative effect sizes indicate improvements in CAT scores (lower scores represent better quality of life), while positive effect sizes indicate increased 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), reflecting enhanced exercise capacity. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

633 5a:Effect of Atorvastatin on CAT Scores

This forest plot demonstrates the impact of atorvastatin on COPD Assessment Test (CAT) scores, a key measure of quality of life. Data from 7 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving 639 patients showed significant improvements in CAT scores. Both 20 mg and 40 mg doses of atorvastatin were effective, with benefits observed across 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month treatment durations. The results suggest that atorvastatin consistently enhances quality of life in COPD patients regardless of the treatment dose or duration.

5b: Effect of Atorvastatin on 6MWD (6-Minute Walk Distance, m)

This forest plot illustrates the effect of atorvastatin on 6MWD, a functional measure of exercise capacity in COPD patients. Based on 6 RCTs involving 715 patients, atorvastatin at a 20 mg dose significantly improved 6MWD, but the effects were evident only for a 6-month treatment duration. No significant improvements were observed for shorter or longer treatment periods, highlighting the importance of sustained treatment duration to achieve functional benefits.

648 Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention. Negative values represent

649 improvements in CAT scores (better quality of life), and positive values represent

- 650 increases in 6MWD (enhanced exercise capacity)
- **Table S1**. Literature Search Strategy in PubMed

TableS2 : Summary of adverse events.

653 Figure S1: Leave-One-Out Sensitivity Analyses for the Effects of Atorvastatin on

Various Outcomes:(a) Effects on FEV1%pred (% predicted forced expiratory volume

in the first second).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(b) Effects 655 on FEV1/FVC ratio (%).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(c) 656 Effects on FEV1 (L).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(d) 657 Effects on CAT scores (COPD Assessment Test).Negative values indicate 658 improvement in quality of life.(e) Effects on 6MWD (6-minute walk distance, 659 m).6MWD (6-minute walk distance, m). Positive values indicate increased exercise 660 capacity.(f) Effects on CRP levels (mg/L).CRP levels (mg/L). Negative values 661 indicate reduced inflammation.(g) Effects on hs-CRP levels (mg/L).Negative values 662 indicate reduced inflammation.(h) Effects on IL-6 levels (pg/mL).Negative values 663 indicate reduced inflammation. 664

Each analysis was performed using a random-effects model (RE Model), and the x-axis represents the observed outcome. Results demonstrate the robustness of pooled estimates, with minimal variation in overall effects despite the exclusion of individual studies.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.04.24318509; this version posted December 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



			ł	
•	-	1		

	ato	rvastatin			Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.2.2 3 mouths									
Feng quan 2014	10.9	7.464	30	6.2	6.85	30	2.0%	Not estimable	
Jiang hongwei 2018	20.94	8.15	49	11.51	8.17	49	5.9%	4 51 [1 28 7 74]	
Liu Zheng 2017	9.99	4.69	60	4.4	4.497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Li Wenhui 2013	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	0		Not estimable	
Wang Haoling 2011	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	25	2.7%	4.67 [-0.10, 9.44]	
Zhang guifeng 2024	10.38	8.1	44	6.9	8.08	44	5.4%	3.48 [0.10, 6.86]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	14.86	6.33	43	11.04	6.32	275	8.7%	3.82 [1.16, 6.48]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	4.02 df=	6 /P = 0	274	- 0%		2/5	49.4%	5.04 [3.92, 6.16]	•
Test for overall effect.	Z = 8.83 ((P < 0.00)	001)	- 0 %					
1.2.3 6 mouths	10.0	7 46 4	20	6.2	6.05	20	4 7 94	4 70 /4 07 0 221	
Zheng wei 2013	21.9	13.214	43	11.6	11.43	44	2.3%	10.30 (5.10, 15.50)	
Subtotal (95% CI)			73			74	7.0%	6.53 [3.56, 9.51]	
Heterogeneity: Chi#=	3.00, df=	1 (P = 0.	08); I [#]	= 67%					
Test for overall effect.	Z = 4.31	(P < 0.000	01)						
1.2.4 COPD									
Liu Zheng 2017	9.99	4.69	60	4.4	4.497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			60			60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	▲
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.66 ((P < 0.000	001)						
1.2.5 AECOPD									
Han Yufen 2019	20.94	10.25	53	13.1	10.97	53	3.8%	7.84 [3.80, 11.88]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	16.02	8.15	49	11.51	8.17	49	5.9%	4.51 [1.28, 7.74]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	14.86	6.33	43	11.04	6.32	44	8.7%	3.82 [1.16, 6.48]	
Zheng wei 2013	21.9	13.214	43	11.6	11.43	44	2.3%	10.30 [5.10, 15.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	o .o .w	o (D _ o	188	5 . N		190	20.7%	5.47 [3.74, 7.19]	
Test for overall effect	5.45, df = Z = 6.21 (: 3 (P = 0. (P ≤ 0.00)	09); 1-1	= 54%					
Total (95% CI)			595			599	100.0%	5.36 [4.57, 6.14]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	14.49, df	= 12 (P =	0.27);	$I^{a} = 179$	%				-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 13.36	5 (P < 0.00	0001)			- 001			Favours (experimental) Favours [control]
restion subdroub unit	erences.	CHI = 1.0	51. ui -	- 3 (F =	0.80). 1	- 0 %			
					b				
	ate	n exetation			b			Meen Difference	Man Difference
Study or Subgroup	ato Mean	rvastatin SD	Total	(Mean		Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths	ato Mean	rvastatin SD	Total	(Mean		Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014	ato Mean 10.9	7.464	Total	6.2		Total 30	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng qua 2014 Han Yufen 2019	ato <u>Mean</u> 10.9 20.94	7.464 10.25	Total 30 53	6.2 13.1	6.85	Total 30 53	<u>Weight</u> 3.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 7.84 [3.80, 11.88]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02	7.464 7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69	Total 30 53 49 60	6.2 13.1 11.51	6.85 10.97 4.497	Total 30 53 49 60	3.8%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 (1.28, 7.74) 5.59 (9.5, 7.23)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57	7.464 10.25 8.15 8.84	Total 30 53 49 60 25	6.2 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9	6.85 10.97 4.497 8.37	Total 30 53 49 60	3.8% 5.9% 22.9%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 (1.28, 7.74) 5.59 (3.95, 7.23) Not estimable	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84	30 53 49 60 25 25	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9	6.85 10.97 4.497 8.37 8.37	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7%	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 (1.28, 7.74) 5.59 (3.95, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 9.44]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhang guifeng 2024	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 10.38	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1	30 53 49 60 25 25 44	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.08	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4%	Mean Difference N. fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 5.59 (3.95, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 9.44] 3.48 (0.10, 6.86)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study of Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhag weishi 2017	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04	b control sD 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.08 6.32	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7%	Mean Difference IV, Exced, 95% CI Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.82 [11.6, 6.48]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Liv Yenhai 2013 Lin Ang Juliéng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotal (65% CD) Hetrongenety: CD9	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 43 274	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0%	6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4%	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 5.59 [3.95, 7.33] Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 8.48] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 5.04 [3.32, 6.16]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Hadimiz 2012 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Testfor overall effect.	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 :5 (P = 0.000	30 53 49 60 25 44 43 274 43 274 55); [* 001)	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0%	6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 44 275	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4%	Mean Difference M, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 7,84 (3.80, 11, 88) 4,61 (1.28, 7,74) 6,69 (3.96, 7,23) Not estimable 4,67 F-0.10, 9,44] 3,48 [0.10, 6,68] 3,82 [1,16, 6,48] 5,04 [3,92, 6,16]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Study of Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: ChP ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000	30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 55); ² 001)	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0%	6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32	Total 30 53 49 60 25 44 44 275	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cf Not estimable 4.51 [1.26, 7.41] 6.16 [1.26, 7.41] 6.10 [1.26, 7.41] 6.10 [1.26, 7.41] 6.10 [1.26, 7.41] 6.10 [1.26, 7.41] 1.26 [1.26, 7.41] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Juang hongwei 2019 Jui Zheng 2017 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Haoling 2014 Zhang outfeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Chi ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Linica 2013	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 55); * 001) 30	(Mean 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0%	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 275	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4%	Mean Difference IV, Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3 80, 11.88) 4.61 (1.28, 7.74) 5.69 (3 95, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-10, 0.844) 3.362 (1.16, 6.48) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.23)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 85% CI
Study of Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtodar (95% CD) Heterogeneix: Chi*= Test for overall effect : 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Zheng wei 2013	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.9	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 7.464 13.214	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 25 44 43 274 55); [*] 001) 30 43	(Mean 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6	6.85 10.97 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32	Total 30 53 49 0 25 44 275 30 44	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.9% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3%	Mean Difference IV, Exced, 95% Cf Not estimable 4.5 [1 2.6 7, 14] 9 00 12 (2, 7, 43) 10 01 estimable 4.6 7 [-0.10, 9, 44] 3.48 [0.10, 9, 44] 3.48 [0.10, 9, 44] 3.48 [0.10, 9, 44] 3.42 [1.16, 6, 48] 5.04 [3.92, 6, 16]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Liu Zheng 2017 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Haoling 2014 Zhang guifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (95% G) Heterogeneily: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotai (95% G)	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.9	7,464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.83 5 (P = 0, (P < 0.00) 7,464 13,214	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 55); 1° 001) 30 43 73	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0%	6.85 10.97 8.37 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32 6.85 11.43	Total 30 53 49 60 0 255 44 44 275 30 30 44 74	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0%	Mean Difference IV, Exced, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (380, 11.38) 4.61 (1.28, 7.74) 5.69 (395, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-10.0, 8.44) 3.362 (1.16, 6.44) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (5.10, 15.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 35% CI
Study of Subaroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haaling 2011 Zhang Quifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 State of the second second second Test for overall effect Chen Liqiao 2013 Subtota (95% Chi Heterogeneity, Chi ^a =	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.9 3.00, df=	7.464 10.25 8.15 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 7.464 13.214 1 (P = 0.	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 455); [*] 001) 30 43 73 08); [*]	Mean 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 = 67%	6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.38 6.32 6.85 11.43	Total 30 53 60 0 255 44 44 275 30 44 74	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0%	Mean Difference N/ Exced, 95% Cf Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11, 80) 6.59 [3.96, 7.23] Not estimable 4.67 (-0.10, 9.44] 3.82 [116, 6.48] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [5.10, 15.50] 6.53 [3.56, 9.51]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Util 2013 Wang Haoling 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotal (95% Ch ² = Test for overall effect : 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (95% Ch ² = Test for overall effect : Test for overall effect : Test for overall effect :	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 (7,464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 7,464 13.214 1 (P = 0. (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 455); [*] 001) 30 43 73 08); [*]	Mean 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 = 67%	6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.38 6.32 6.85 11.43	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11, 88) 4.51 [1.26, 7.74] 5.69 (3.95, 7.34) Not estimable 4.54 [0.10, 6.84] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [5.10, 15.50] 6.53 [3.56, 9.51]	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup. 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Li Wahnja 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Whang quifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (85% CD) Heterogeneity: ChP ^a = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Lusiao 203 Zheng wei 203 Cher Goverall effect: 1.2.4 for overall effect: 1.2.4 COPD	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 4.31 (7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.1 6.33 6.5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 7.464 13.214 1 (P = 0. (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 43 274 55); 1° 30 43 73 08); 1° 01)	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 = 67%	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.37 8.38 6.32 6.85 11.43	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0%	Mean Difference M. Exced, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.96 (3.80, 11.96) 4.65 (9.16, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-10.9, 9.44) 3.82 (11.6, 6.48) 5.04 (3.92, 6, 16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (5.10, 15.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51)	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Study of Subbroom 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yulen 2010 18 Juli Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhang guifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2013 Subtroat (95%) Chif= Testfor overail effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqias 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Stelarog newi 2013 Eleterogonally, Chif= Testfor overail effect: 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 10.9 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 9.99	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 7.464 13.214 1 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 2.469	Total 300 53 49 60 255 274 43 274 555; P 30001) 30 43 73 73 001) 60 	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 = 67%	b 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.38 6.32 6.85 11.43 4.497	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74 600	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 8.7% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.84 (3.80, 11.88) 4.51 (1.26, 7.74) 5.01 (20, 7.84) 5.01 (20, 7.84) 4.51 (1.26, 7.74) 5.01 (20, 7.84) 3.82 (11.6, 6.88) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (5.10, 16.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51) 5.59 (3.95, 7.23)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Li Vienhui 2017 Li Wenhui 2012 Zhang quifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (85% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Subtotai (85% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = Test for overall effect: 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotai (85% CI)	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df = Z = 8.83 10.9 21.9 3.00, df = Z = 4.31 (9.99	SD 7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.94 8.94 8.94 8.94 8.94 8.94 8.94 8.94 9.9	300 53 49 600 25 255 44 43 274 43 274 43 274 001) 3000; P 01) 60 60	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 = 67% 4.4	b control sD 6.85 10.97 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497 8.37 8.497	Total 30 53 49 0 255 44 44 275 30 44 74 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 22.9%	Mean Difference M. Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.69 [3.95, 7.23] Not estimable 4.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [10, 0, 9.44] 3.42 [10, 0, 9.44] 3.62 [10, 9.44] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [5.10, 15.50] 6.53 [3.95, 7.23] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study of Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yulen 2017 Liu Zheng 2017 Liu Zheng 2017 Liu Zheng 2017 Liu Zheng 2017 Zhang quifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Heterogeneity: ChiP = Testfor overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqia 2013 Zheng wei 2010 Heterogeneity: ChiP = Testfor overall effect. 1.2.4 COPD Heterogeneity: Not Sec Heterogeneity: N	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 11.57 11.57 10.38 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 10.9 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 9.99 plicable Z = 6.66	7,464 10.25 8,15 8,84 8,84 8,84 8,84 8,84 8,84 8,84 8,8	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 455); (* 001) 30 03); (* 01) 60 60 0001)	6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 = 67% 4.4	b 6.85 10.97 8.17 4.497 8.37 8.08 6.32 6.85 11.43 4.497	Total 30 53 49 00 25 44 44 275 30 44 74 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9%	Mean Difference N/ Excel, 95% Cf Not estimable 7.94 (3.80, 11.80) 4.5 (1 126, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-0.10, 9.44) 3.48 (0.10, 9.44) 3.48 (0.10, 9.44) 3.42 (116, 6.48) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (51.0, 15.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51) 5.69 (3.95, 7.23) 5.59 (3.95, 7.23)	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 U Yannya 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: ChP ² Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect.	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 (9.99 plicable Z = 6.66 (7,464 10.25 8.15 4.89 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 16.33 55 (P = 0. (P < 0.000 (P < 0.000 4.69 (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 25 25 25 274 43 274 555; [*] 30 001; [*] 60 60 001]	() Mean 6.2 13.1 1.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 6.2 1.5 6.9 1.04 = 6.7% 4.4	b Control 50 50 6.85 10.97 8.17 8.37	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 22.9%	Mean Difference IV, Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.99 (396, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 5.69 [-0.0, 9.44] 5.69 [-0.0, 9.57] 5.59 [-0.0, 7.23] 5.59 [-0.0, 7.23]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 85% CI
Study of Subgroup. 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Hading 2012 Zhang qualing 2012 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: ChP'= Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: ChP'= Test for overall effect: 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Heterogeneity: No	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 14.86 10.9 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 9.99 plicable Z = 6.66	rvastatim SD 7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 (P = 0.000 7.464 13.214 1 (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 26 25 274 55); P 001) 300 43 73 73 00); P 01) 60 60 001)	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.37 8.37 8.37 8.37 8.37 4.497 11.43 4.497	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 5.4% 8.7% 8.7% 49.4% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 22.9%	Mean Difference N/ Exced, 95% Cf Not estimable 7.84 (3.60, 11, 96) 6.59 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-0.10, 9.44) 3.82 (116, 6.48) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (5.10, 15.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.95, 7.23)	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 Li Zhang quifeng 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Solita 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: ChP ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 AECOPD Lim Yufan 2019 Hen Yufan 2019 Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 AECOPD	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 d 21.9 3.00, df= Z = 4.31 d 9.99 plicable Z = 6.86 d 20.94 16.00	7.464 10.25 8.15 4.69 8.84 8.1 6.33 6.5 (P = 0, (P < 0.00) 7.464 1.214 1 (P = 0, (P < 0.00) 4.69 (P < 0.00) 4.69 (P < 0.00)	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 455); F 30 001) 30 60 60 001) 53 40 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	(Mean. 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 4.4 13.1 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1	b Control SD 0.97 8.17 8.37 8.37 8.37 8.38 8.08 6.85 11.43 4.497 4.497 10.97 8.17	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 74 60 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 4.7% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 22.9% 3.8% 6.9~	Mean Difference N/ Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.99 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.487 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.497 [-0.0, 9.44] 5.59 [-0.0, 9.44] 5.59 [-0.0, 9.44] 5.59 [-0.0, 9.57] 5.59 [-0.0, 7.23] 7.94 [-0.00, 11.09] 4.411 [-0.7, 7.24]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 85% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Lu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Hadimg 2012 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ^T = Testfor overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqiao 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ^T = Testfor overall effect: 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 1.2.5 AECOPD Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang Veng 2019	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 8.83 (10.9 21.	rvastatim SD 7.464 10.25 8.15 8.16 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.1 6.33 5 C P = 0. (P < 0.000	Total 30 53 49 60 25 25 44 43 274 43 275 43 275 43 73 001) 60 0001) 53 49 60 0001)	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9	b Control SD 6.85 6.85 6.85 6.85 11.43 4.497 4.497 4.497 10.97 8.17 8.7 8.7 8.7 8.7 8.7 8.7 8.7 8.	Total 30 53 49 60 0 25 44 44 44 275 30 44 44 74 60 60 60	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 3.8% 5.9% 8.7%	Mean Difference M. Exced, 95% Cf Not estimable 7.84 (3.60, 11, 98) 6.59 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 (-0.10, 9.44) 3.84 (0.10, 9.44) 3.82 (116, 6.48) 5.04 (3.92, 6.16) 4.70 (1.07, 8.33) 10.30 (5.10, 15.50) 6.53 (3.56, 9.51) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23) 5.59 (3.96, 7.23)	Mean Difference N. Fixed. 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 U Wanhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang U Wishi 2017 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: ChP ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqia 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 ACOPO Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 ACOPO Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 ACOPO Han Yufen 2019 Hang Nufen 2019 Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 ACOPO Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2013 Zheng wei 2013	atto Mean 10.9 20.94 16.02 9.99 11.57 10.38 14.86 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 4.31 9.99 plicable Z = 6.66 20.94 16.02 14.85 20.94 16.02 16.02 16.02 16.02 16.02 10.95 10.94 16.02 10.95 1	7.464 10.25 8.15 8.15 8.84 8.84 8.84 13.214 1(P ≤ 0.000 7.464 13.214 1(P ≤ 0.000 (P < 0.000 (P < 0.000 (P < 0.000 0.25 8.15 6.33 13.214	Total 30 53 49 60 25 274 43 30 855; (P 001) 30 43 37 30 08); (P 60 60 001) 53 49 43 43 49 55; (P 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 11.61 13.6 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 6.9 11.04 4.4 4.4 13.11 11.5	b Control SD 0.97 8.17 8.37 8.08 6.85 11.43 4.497 8.17 6.32 10.97 8.17 6.32	Total 300 53 49 0 255 44 44 44 44 44 74 60 60 60 60 60 61 44 74	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 2.7% 8.7% 49.4% 4.7% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 22.9% 3.8% 8.7% 22.9% 2.3% 2.3%	Mean Difference N/ Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.99 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.69 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 9.44] 3.69 (0.10, 6.64] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [6.10, 16.50] 6.53 [3.56, 9.51] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.94 [3.90, 11.98] 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Liu Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Hading 2014 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Ligiao 2013 Subtotai (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng weil 2017 Subtotai (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 AECOPD Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2013 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotai (95% CD)	ato Mean 10.9 20.94 10.9 10.9 10.9 11.57 11.57 11.57 11.57 10.38 14.86 4.03, df= Z = 4.31 9.99 plicable Z = 6.66 20.94 16.02 14.86 21.9	7.464 10.25 8.15 8.16 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.84 8.83 8.63 8.63 8.63 9.67 ≈ 0.000 7.464 13.214 1 (P ≈ 0.000 (P < 0.000 4.69 (P < 0.000 10.25 8.15 8.15 8.13 13.214	Total 30 53 49 60 25 274 43 274 43 274 43 274 43 30 001) 60 001) 60 0001) 53 49 43 49 60 001 55 10 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 6	(<u>Mean</u> 6.2 13.1 11.51 1.4,4 6.9 6.9 11.04 = 0% 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 4.4 4.4 13.1 1.51 1.5,4 1.5,4 1.5,5 1.5	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.17 8.37 8	Total 300 225 44 44 275 300 60 60 60 60 53 34 44 44 4 190	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 22.9% 5.4% 5.4% 49.4% 49.4% 49.4% 2.3% 7.0% 22.9% 5.9% 8.7% 2.3% 22.9%	Mean Difference M. Exced, 95% Cl Not estimable (5.6) (3.11.96) (5.6) (3.6) (7.23) Not estimable (4.67 [-0.10, 9.44] (3.48 [0.10, 9.44] (3.48 [0.10, 9.46] (3.82 [11.6, 6.48] (5.04 [3.92, 6.16] (3.30 [5.10, 15.50] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.59 [3.95, 7.23] (5.51 [1.6, 6.48] (3.30 [5.10, 15.50] (5.47 [3.47, 7.49])	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwel 2019 Uwenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Wang Util 2013 Wang Solowing 2014 Zhang guifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Ch ² = Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 G mouths Chen Liqia 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 AECOPO Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.5 AECOPO Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Ch ² = Test 2019 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotal (95% CD) Heterogeneity: Ch ² =	atio 10.9 20.94 11.67 10.32 9.99 11.57 10.38 4.03, df = 1 2.7 2.7 3.00, df = 2 2.7 3.00, df = 2 2.9 4.03, df = 1 2.9 4.03, df = 1 4.03, df = 1 4.03, df = 1 4.03,	rvastatim SD 7,464 10.25 8.15 8.84 8.16 8.84 8.16 7.464 13.214 11.27 4.69 (P < 0.000	Total 300 53 49 60 225 274 43 37 308); P 01) 60 60 001) 53 49 80 80 18 80 90 18 18 80 90 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	(<u>10</u> <u>13.1</u> 11.51 11.51 11.61 <u>4.4</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> 11.04 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.2</u> 11.6 <u>6.3</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>6.9</u> <u>11.04</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.6</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>11.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>1.1.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>1.1.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>1.1.16</u> <u>6.2</u> <u>1.1.16</u> <u>1.1.04</u> <u>1.1.04</u> <u>1.5.5</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u>1.5.6</u> <u></u>	b <u>son</u> <u>son</u> <u>6.85</u> 10.97 8.17 8.37 8.37 8.37 8.32 6.85 11.43 4.497 10.97 8.17 6.32 11.43	Total 300 025 44 44 275 300 44 74 60 60 60 53 34 9 44 44 44 190	Weight 3.8% 22.9% 2.7% 8.7% 8.7% 49.4% 49.4% 2.3% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 3.8% 8.7% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 20.7%	Mean Difference N/ Exced, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.99 (39, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [-10, 9.44] 3.82 (0, 10, 9.44] 5.04 (3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 (5.10, 16, 5.01] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.84 (3.90, 11, 98] 4.51 (1.28, 7.74] 3.82 (1, 16, 6.48] 10.30 [5, 10, 15, 50] 5.47 [3.74, 7, 19]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 35% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Urang guing 2017 Livaphua 2017 Livaphua 2012 Yang guing 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Subtotai (85% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.3 6 mouths Chon Ligita 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotai (85% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.4 COPD Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 1.2.5 AECOPD Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2013 Jiang hongwei 2013 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotai (85% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.2.5 AECOPD Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2013 Subtotai (85% CD) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: 1.2.5 AECOPD Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2018	ato Mean 10.9 9.99 9.99 11.57 10.38 4.03.df= 2 = 8.83 10.9 21.9 21.9 21.9 21.9 21.9 21.9 21.9 21	$\label{eq:statistical} rvastatistical statements of the statement of the$	Total 300 53 49 60 255 254 44 455); [P] 3001) 3003 43 3073; [P] 60 60 001) 53 49 43 43 188 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60	(<u>111,51</u>) 11.51 11.5	b <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>so</u> <u>s</u>	Total 30 53 49 0 25 44 42 75 30 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 44 44 74	Weisht, 3.8% 5.22.9% 5.4% 49.4% 49.4% 4.7% 22.9% 22.9% 3.8% 5.9% 5.9% 2.3% 5.9% 2.2%	Mean Difference M. Exced, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.9 (3.96, 7.23) Not estimable 4.67 [0.10, 9.44] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [5.10, 15.60] 6.53 [3.56, 9.51] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.84 [3.80, 11.88] 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.84 [3.80, 11.88] 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 10.30 [5.10, 15.60] 5.47 [3.74, 7.19]	Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 J mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yulen 2013 018 Juli Zheng 2017 Li Wenhui 2013 Wang Haoling 2011 Zhang guifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2013 Subtotal (35% Ch) [#] = Test for overail effect: 1.2.3 G mouths Chen Liqia 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotal (35% Ch) [#] = Test for overail effect: 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Subtotal (55% CD) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overail effect: 1.2.5 AECOPD Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2013 Zheng wei 2019 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2019 Diang hongwei 2018 Zheo Weishi 2017 Deng Wei	$\begin{array}{c} \text{ atom}\\ 10.9\\ 20.94\\ 18.02\\ 9.99\\ 11.57\\ 10.38\\ Z= 6.83\\ 11.57\\ 10.38\\ Z= 6.83\\ 0.00\text{ df}=\\ Z= 6.431\\ 9.99\\ 9110200 \text{ df}=\\ Z= 6.21\\ 10.00\text{ df}=\\ Z=$	$\label{eq:statistical} \begin{split} & rvastatim $$SD$ \\ \hline $$7,464$ & 63 & $6,55$ & 1.65 & $6,165$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,16$ & $8,84$ & $8,84$ & $8,16$ & $8,16$ & $13,214$ & $1(P=0,00)$ & $10,25$ & $6,153$ & $13,214$ & $10,25$ & $6,153$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$ & $13,214$ & $13,216$	Total 300 53 49 60 25 25 274 43 274 455); F 300 43 73 73 73 73 70 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	6.2 13.1 1.51 4.69 6.9 9.11.04 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 6.2 11.6 4.4 4.4 4.4 5.6 5.6 6.2 11.5 11.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1	b control 50 50 6.85 10.97 8.17 8.37 8.08 8.32 11.43 1.143	Total 30 53 49 0 0 25 44 44 275 30 44 44 74 74 60 60 60 53 49 44 44 4 190 599	Weight 3.8% 5.9% 5.9% 5.4% 49.4% 4.7% 22.9% 7.0% 22.9% 3.8% 7.0% 22.9% 3.8% 7.0% 22.9% 100.0%	Mean Difference N/ Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 7.94 (3.80, 11.80) 4.59 [126, 7.23] Not estimable 4.67 [-0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.42 [116, 6.48] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [51.0, 15.50] 6.59 [3.95, 7.23] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.84 [3.80, 11.80] 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 3.82 [1.16, 6.48] 5.36 [1.37, 4, 7.19] 5.36 [4.57, 6.14]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup 1.2.2 3 mouths Feng quan 2014 Han Yufen 2019 Jiang hongwei 2018 Jiang hongwei 2018 Yang quifeng 2021 Zhang quifeng 2024 Zhao Weishi 2017 Test for overall effect. 1.2.3 6 mouths Chen Liqia 2013 Zheng wei 2013 Subtotai (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. 1.2.4 COPD Liu Zheng 2017 Liu Zheng 2017	$\begin{array}{c} \text{ato}\\ 10.9\\ 20.94\\ 18.02\\ 9.99\\ 11.57\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 11.67\\ 10.36\\ 10.$	rvastatini SD 7.664 8.69 10.25 8.15 8.84 8.84 9.1 9.7 13.214 3.314 13.214 6.53 13.214 5.33 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214 13.214	Total 300 253 49 60 255 44 3274 43 274 43 300); F 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60	Mean 6.2 13.11 11.51 4.4 6.9 6.9 11.04 6.9 11.04 6.9 11.04 6.9 11.04 6.9 11.04	b Control SD 6.85 10.97 8.17 8.37 8.	Total 30 53 49 00 25 44 275 30 44 275 30 44 74 60 60 60 53 49 44 44 190 599	Weidth 3.8% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 5.9% 49.4% 4.7% 22.9% 4.7% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 22.9% 20.0% 2	Mean Difference M. Excel, 95% Cl Not estimable 5.96 (380, 11.98) 4.67 [-0.0, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [0.10, 9.44] 3.48 [10, 0, 9.44] 3.42 [10, 0, 9.44] 3.42 [10, 0, 9.44] 5.04 [3.92, 6.16] 4.70 [1.07, 8.33] 10.30 [5.10, 15.60] 6.53 [3.56, 9.51] 5.59 [3.95, 7.23] 7.84 [3.80, 11.88] 4.51 [1.28, 7.74] 3.82 [1.6, 4.8] 10.30 [5.10, 15.60] 5.47 [3.74, 7.19]	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% Cl

	ator	vastat	in	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 3 mouths									
Feng quan 2014	23.5	0.62	51	9.1	0.6	52	7.6%	14.40 [14.16, 14.64]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	13.09	6.41	49	6.82	6.92	49	6.6%	6.27 [3.63, 8.91]	
Liu Zheng 2017	7.48	3.56	60	3.99	3.24	60	7.4%	3.49 [2.27, 4.71]	
Li Wenhui 2013	8.19	5.8	35	3.85	5.73	35	6.5%	4.34 [1.64, 7.04]	
Peng Yufeng 2023	10.69	9.1	103	5.21	8.68	105	6.7%	5.48 [3.06, 7.90]	
Wang Haoling 2011	13.7	8.18	25	10	6.58	25	5.5%	3.70 [-0.42, 7.82]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	12.7	6.58	43	7.4	6.35	44	6.5%	5.30 [2.58, 8.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			366			370	46.8%	6.19 [0.90, 11.48]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	49.36; C	hi ² = 4	84.12,	df = 6 (F	< 0.0	0001);	l² = 99%		
Test for overall effect.	Z = 2.29	(P = 0.	02)						
1.1.2 6 mouths									
Chen Ligiao 2013	10.9	7.46	30	6.2	6.85	30	5.9%	4.70 [1.08, 8.32]	
Zheng wei 2013	12.7	6.58	43	7.4	6.35	44	6.5%	5.30 [2.58, 8.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			73			74	12.4%	5.08 [2.91, 7.26]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.0)7. df=	1 (P = 0)	1.80); P	² = 0%			
Test for overall effect.	Z= 4.58	(P < 0.	00001)						
1.1.3 COPD									
Liu Zheng 2017	7.48	3.56	60	3.99	3.24	60	7.4%	3.49 [2.27, 4.71]	
Li Wenhui 2013	8.19	5.8	35	3.85	5.73	35	6.5%	4.34 [1.64, 7.04]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			95			95	13.9%	3.63 [2.52, 4.74]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.3	32, df =	1 (P = 0)	1.57); P	^e = 0%			
Test for overall effect.	Z = 6.41	(P < 0.	00001)						
1.1.4 AECOPD									
Feng quan 2014	23.5	0.62	51	9.1	0.6	52	7.6%	14.40 [14.16, 14.64]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	13.09	6.41	49	6.82	6.92	49	6.6%	6.27 [3.63, 8.91]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	9.92	7.8	43	4.72	7.55	43	6.2%	5.20 [1.96, 8.44]	
Zheng wei 2013	12.7	6.58	43	7.4	6.35	44	6.5%	5.30 [2.58, 8.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			186			188	26.9%	7.89 [1.79, 13.99]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	37.11; C	hi ² = 1	08.10,	df = 3 (F	< 0.0	0001);	² = 97%		
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 2.54	(P = 0.	01)						
Total (95% CI)			720			727	100.0%	6.30 [4.46, 8.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	11.55: C	:hi² = 9	87.90.	df = 14	(P < 0.	00001)	: I ² = 99%		
Test for overall effect	7 = 6.72	(P < 0	00001			1/			-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for subaroup diffe	erences:	Chi ² =	3.55. 0	if = 3 (P	= 0.31), $ ^2 = 1$	5.4%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Figure 3: Forest Plots of the Effects of Atorvastatin on Pulmonary Function 700 **Parameters** 701

This figure demonstrates the pooled effects of atorvastatin (20 mg daily) on key 702 pulmonary function parameters in COPD patients, calculated using a random-effects 703 model. Positive effect sizes indicate improvement in lung function. Error bars 704 705 represent 95% confidence intervals.

- 3a: Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1 (L) This forest plot shows the effect of 706 atorvastatin on FEV1 (forced expiratory volume in the first second), measured in 707 liters. Positive values indicate enhanced pulmonary function, reflecting an increase in 708 airflow during exhalation. All included studies utilized a 20 mg dose of atorvastatin. 709

- 3b: Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1/FVC Ratio (%) This forest plot illustrates the 710 impact of atorvastatin on the FEV1/FVC ratio, expressed as a percentage. A higher 711 ratio suggests improved airway obstruction and better pulmonary function. All 712 included studies consistently administered atorvastatin at a dose of 20 mg per day. 713

- 3c:Effect of Atorvastatin on FEV1%pred (% Predicted). This forest plot 714 highlights the effect of atorvastatin on FEV1%pred (percentage of predicted forced 715 expiratory volume in the first second), an important measure of lung function relative 716 717 to normal values. Positive results signify improved pulmonary capacity. All included studies applied a daily dose of 20 mg of atorvastatin. 718

719 Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention. Positive values represent improvement in pulmonary function (FEV1, FEV1/FVC ratio, and FEV1%pred). 720

		á	а				
ator Study or Subgroup Mean	vastatin SD Total	Co Mean	ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 3 mouths							
Guo sujuan 2015 -18.8	6.0127 50	-772	3 884	50	29.4%	-11 08 (-13 06 -9 10)	—
Liang jianyi 2018 -18.8	6.027 42	-9.8	6.14	42	17.1%	-9.00 [-11.60 -6.40]	_ _
Subtotal (95% CI)	92	0.0	0.14	92	46.6%	-10.32 [-11.89, -8.74]	•
Heterogeneity $Chi^2 = 1.55 df = 1.(Fr$	P = 0.21 $P = 30$	396			1010/1		-
Tect for overall effect: 7 = 12.81 (P	<pre>c 0.21),1 = 3(c 0.00001)</pre>	//0					
1651101 0461all 61601.2 = 12.01 (1	0.00001)						
1.4.2.6 mouths							
Yu Weilong 2020 -15.58	4.03 45	-8.09	473	45	35.2%	-7 49 [-9 31 -5 67]	
Zhang rongchang 2015 -16.01	3 16 30	-9.8	6.29	30	18 3%	-6 21 [-8 73 -3 69]	_ _
Subtotal (95% CI)	75	-0.0	0.20	75	53.4%	-7.05 [-8.53, -5.58]	•
Hotorogonoity Chi2 = 0.65 df = 1 /F	2 - 0 42) 12 - 0	κ.			001170	1100 [0100; 0100]	•
Tect for overall effect: 7 = 0.20 /P <	0.00001						
Testion overall ellect. 2 = 5.50 (P <	0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)	167			167	100.0%	-8.57 [-9.65, -7.50]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 10.98, df = 3	$(P = 0.01); ^2 = 7$	73%				-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 15.60 (P	0.00001)						-10 -5 U 5 10
Test for subgroup differences: Chi ²	= 8,78, df = 1 (P = 0.003	3), I ^z = 8	8.6%			Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

b

	ator	vastatin	1	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.5.1 20mg									
Feng quan 2014	-18.4	1.09	51	-8.4	1.48	52	47.6%	-10.00 [-10.50, -9.50]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	-26.47	9.36	43	-22.94	9.895	44	0.7%	-3.53 [-7.58, 0.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			94			96	48.4%	-9.90 [-10.40, -9.40]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.67	, df = 1 (l	P = 0.00	2); I ² =	90%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	39.01 (P	< 0.000	01)						
15240mg									
Arian A 2018	-0.98	4.62	16	-3.24	5.5	18	1.0%	2 26 51 14 5 661	
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-4.6	6 3 2 2	23	-7.56	9 933	22	0.5%	2.20 [1.14, 3.00]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-4.0	0.522	39	-1.50	0.000	40	1.5%	2.49 [-0.30, 5.28]	-
Heterogeneity $Chi^2 = 0.05$	df = 1.0	P = 0.82): I ² = 1	196					-
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	1.75 (P =	0.08)	/// - /	//0					
		,							
1.5.3 AECOPD									
Feng quan 2014	-18.4	1.09	51	-8.4	1.48	52	47.6%	-10.00 [-10.50, -9.50]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	-26.47	9.36	43	-22.94	9.895	44	0.7%	-3.53 [-7.58, 0.52]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			94			96	48.4%	-9.90 [-10.40, -9.40]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 9.67	, df = 1 (P = 0.00	2); I ² =	90%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	39.01 (P	< 0.000	01)						
4.5.4.0000									
Arion A 2019	0.00	462	16	2.24	66	10	1.0%	2 26 14 44 6 661	
Haccon Chohodi 2014	-0.90	9.02	40	-3.24	0.005	10	0.7%	2.20 [1.14, 0.00]	→ →
Subtotal (95% Cl)	-4.0	9.30	40	-22.94	9.090	62	1.8%	8 92 16 32 11 53	
Hotorogonoity Chiz = 25.6	2 df = 1	/0 ~ 0 0	0001	17-070	ć.	02	1.0 %	0.52 [0.52, 11.55]	
Test for overall effect: 7 = 1	i3,ui−i 871 /P <		1)	1 - 375	0				
restion overall enect. 2 - 1	0.110	0.0000							
Total (95% CI)			286			294	100.0%	-9.38 [-9.73, -9.03]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 322	43. df =	7 (P < 0.	00001); I ^z = 98	%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	53.14 (P	< 0.000	01)		-				-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for subaroup differen	ces: Chi	= 267.	50. df =	= 3 (P < 1	0.00001), ² = 9	8.9%		Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

С

	ator	vastati	n	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.6.1 6 mouths									
Arian, A 2018	-2.49	7.206	21	-2.14	4.622	21	6.3%	-0.35 [-4.01, 3.31]	
Ying yong 2013	-10.65	3.9	40	-11.3	3.9	40	29.0%	0.65 [-1.06, 2.36]	
Zheng wei 2013	-145	78.31	43	-88	77.17	44	0.1%	-57.00 [-89.68, -24.32]	·
Subtotal (95% CI)			104			105	35.3%	0.34 [-1.20, 1.89]	₹
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 12.0)9, df = 2	(P = 0.0)02); I ²∶	= 83%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.43 (P =	0.66)							
1.6.2 12 mouths									
Yu Weilong 2020	-26.59	5.75	45	-19.89	6.19	45	13.9%	-6.70 [-9.17, -4.23]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-69.8	21.2	30	-17.7	20.03	30	0.8%	-52.10 [-62.54, -41.66]	· •
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	14.7%	-9.11 [-11.51, -6.70]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 68.	34, df = 1	(P < 0.0	00001);	l² = 99%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	7.43 (P <	0.0000	1)						
1.6.3 20mg									
Arian, A 2018	-2.49	7.206	21	-2.14	4.622	21	6.3%	-0.35 [-4.01, 3.31]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			21			21	6.3%	-0.35 [-4.01, 3.31]	
Heterogeneity: Not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.19 (P =	0.85)							
4.0.4.40									
1.6.4 40mg	10.05	2.0	40	44.2	2.0	40	20.00	0.6514.06.0.001	_
Ting yong 2013	-10.05	5.9	40	-11.3	3.9	40	29.0%	0.05 [-1.00, 2.30]	_ _
Tu wellong 2020	-20.59	5.75	45	-19.89	0.19	45	13.9%	-0.70[-9.17, -4.23]	
Zhang rongchang 2015 Zhang wei 2012	-09.8	21.2	30	-17.7	20.03	30	0.8%	-52.10[-62.54,-41.00]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-140	10.31	40	-00	11.11	150	43 7%	2731412 4341	· •
Hotorogonoitr Chil-121	50 df - 1	2/12 ~ 0	00004	17 - 00	0 <i>K</i>	155	43.770	-2.7 5 [-4.12, -1.54]	•
Tect for everall effect: 7 =	.52, ui = . 2 04 /D =	0 0001	.00001,	1.1-= 30	70				
rescior overall ellect. Z =	3.04 (F =	0.0001	/						
Total (95% CI)			358			360	100.0%	-2.43 [-3.351.51]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 245	.86. df = !	9 (P < 0	00001	: ² = 96	%				
Test for overall effect Z =	5.17 (P <	0.0000	1)						-20 -10 0 10 20
Test for subaroup differer	ices: Chi	= 43.4	1. df = 3	B (P < 0.0	00001).	z = 93.	1%		Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

723 Figure 4: Forest Plots of the Effects of Atorvastatin on Inflammatory Markers

This figure presents the pooled effects of atorvastatin (20 mg daily) on key inflammatory markers in patients with COPD, analyzed using a random-effects model. Negative effect sizes indicate reductions in inflammatory markers, reflecting improved systemic inflammation. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

4a: Effect of atorvastatin on CRP levels (mg/L). This forest plot illustrates the effect
of atorvastatin on C-reactive protein (CRP) levels. A total of 4 randomized controlled
trials (RCTs) involving 334 patients demonstrated significant reductions in CRP
levels during both 3-month and 6-month treatment periods. The results suggest that
atorvastatin effectively reduces systemic inflammation in COPD patients over these
durations.

4b: Effect of atorvastatin on hs-CRP levels (mg/L). This forest plot highlights the impact of atorvastatin on high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) levels. Based on 4 RCTs involving 269 patients, the 20 mg dose consistently reduced hs-CRP levels across different patient populations, including both stable COPD and AECOPD (acute exacerbations of COPD). Improvements were observed regardless of the disease state, indicating the broad anti-inflammatory benefits of atorvastatin.

4c: Effect of atorvastatin on IL-6 levels (pg/mL). This forest plot demonstrates the
effects of atorvastatin on interleukin-6 (IL-6) levels. Data from 5 RCTs involving 359
patients showed significant reductions in IL-6 levels with a 20 mg dose within the
first 6 months of treatment. However, no significant effects were observed in studies
with treatment durations of 6–12 months, suggesting a time-dependent response to
atorvastatin's anti-inflammatory effects.

746 Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention (negative values represent747 reductions in inflammatory markers).

0	
a	

	ator	vastat	in	(Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.7.1 20mg									
Liu Meiqin 2017	-6.39	6.74	49	-3.96	7.06	48	4.5%	-2.43 [-5.18, 0.32]	
Xu Junping 2016	-7.2	6.75	80	-5.7	7.03	80	7.5%	-1.50 [-3.64, 0.64]	
Yu Weilong 2020	-7.17	7	45	-2.87	6.652	45	4.3%	-4.30 [-7.12, -1.48]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-6.9	3.7	30	-1.8	4.1	30	8.8%	-5.10 [-7.08, -3.12]	
Zheng wei 2013	-13	4.42	43	-9	3.89	44	11.1%	-4.00 [-5.75, -2.25]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			247			247	36.2%	-3.59 [-4.56, -2.62]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7.0	6, df = 4	(P = 0.	13); I ^z =	: 43%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	7.24 (P	< 0.00	001)						
1.7.2 40mg									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-3.22	6.5	23	0.59	5.53	22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Heterogeneity: Not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.12 (P :	= 0.03)	•						
1.7.3 10mg									
Chen hong 2018	-8.15	4.53	50	-6.61	4.45	50	11.0%	-1.54 [-3.30, 0.22]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			50			50	11.0%	-1.54 [-3.30, 0.22]	-
Heterogeneity: Not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.71 (P :	= 0.09))						
1.7.4 3 mouths									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-3.22	6.5	23	0.59	5.53	22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Heterogeneity: Not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.12 (P :	= 0.03))						
1.7.5 6 mouths									
Zheng wei 2013	-13	4.42	43	-9	3.89	44	11.1%	-4.00 [-5.75, -2.25]	T
Subtotal (95% CI)			43			44	11.1%	-4.00 [-5.75, -2.25]	-
Heterogeneity: Not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	4.48 (P	< 0.00	001)						
17010									
1.7.6 12 mouths									
Chen hong 2018	-8.15	4.53	50	-6.61	4.45	50	11.0%	-1.54 [-3.30, 0.22]	
Liu Meigin 2017	-6.39	6.74	49	-3.96	7.06	48	4.5%	-2.43 [-5.18, 0.32]	
Xu Junping 2016	-7.2	6.75	80	-5.7	7.03	80	1.5%	-1.50 [-3.64, 0.64]	
Yu Weilong 2020	-7.17	. 7	45	-2.87	6.652	45	4.3%	-4.30 [-7.12, -1.48]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-6.9	3.7	30	-1.8	4.1	30	8.8%	-5.10 [-7.08, -3.12]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			254			253	30.1%	-2.83 [-3.81, -1.86]	•
Heterogeneity: Chir = 9.7	5, 01 = 4	(P = 0.)	04); 1* =	: 59%					
rest for overall effect: Z =	5.71 (P	< U.001	JU1)						
Total (DEW CI)			640			620	100.0%	3 46 1 3 73 3 661	▲
Total (95% CI)		2 (1)	040	12 4000		038	100.0%	-3.15 [-3.73, -2.56]	
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 22.	38, 0T = 1	13 (P =	0.05);	1= 429	•				-10 -5 0 5 10
lest for overall effect: Z =	10.55 (F	< 0.0	JUU1)			40.00			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
restor subaroup differen	ices: Ch	1-= 5.5	or. at =	5 (M = L	J.35), I*:	= 10.39	0		

b

	ato	rvastatin			Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.8.1 20mg									
Cheng shoubin 2015	40.878	40.914	75	-39.77	37.06	75	16.3%	80.65 [68.15, 93.14]	
Liu zheng 2017	66.9	40.37	60	68.8	40.37	60	12.2%	-1.90 [-16.35, 12.55]	
Yu Weilong 2020	135.66	40.639	45	60.15	41.13	45	8.9%	75.51 [58.62, 92.40]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			180			180	37.5%	52.52 [44.27, 60.77]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 81.	10, df = 2	(P < 0.00	0001); F	²= 98%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	12.48 (P	< 0.0000	1)						
1.8.2 40mg									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	3	148.5	23	-7	135.63	22	0.4%	10.00 [-73.04, 93.04]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-		23			22	0.4%	10.00 [-73.04, 93.04]	
Heterogeneity: Not annlig	ahle								
Test for overall effect: 7 =	0.24 (P =	0.81)							
	0.24 () -	0.017							
1.8.3 10mg									
(u Junping 2016	24.1	77.02	80	19.4	85.72	80	4.0%	4.70 [-20.55, 29.95]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			80			80	4.0%	4.70 [-20.55, 29.95]	
Heterogeneity: Not appli	able								
Fest for overall effect: Z =	0.36 (P =	0.72)							
1.8.4 3 mouths									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	3	148.5	23	-7	135.63	22	0.4%	10 00 F73 04 93 041	
ju zhena 2017	0 88	40.37	60	68.8	40.37	60	12.2%	-1 90 616 35 12 55	
Subtotal (95% CI)	00.0	40.01	83	00.0	40.01	82	12.6%	-1.55 [-15 78, 12.68]	•
Heterogeneity: Chiž = 0.0	9 df = 1 (P = 0.79	· 12 = 0.9	6		01.	12.1070	- 100 [- 10110, 12100]	T
Test for overall effect: Z =	0.21 (P =	0.83)	.1 - 0,	0					
1.8.5 6 mouths	40.070	40.014	76	20.77	27.06	76	16.20	00 66 60 16 02 141	
Aneng shoubin 2015	40.070	40.814	75	-39.77	37.00	75	16 3%	00.00 [00.10, 93.14]	•
Subtotal (95% Cl)	b l -		75			75	10.5%	80.05 [08.15, 55.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Not appli	able 40.05 (D								
est for overall effect. Z =	12.65 (P	< 0.0000	0						
1.8.6 12 mouths									
le yan 2016	40.878	40.914	75	-39.77	37.06	75	16.3%	80.65 [68.15, 93.14]	
Ku Junping 2016	24.1	77.02	80	19.4	85.72	80	4.0%	4.70 [-20.55, 29.95]	
ru Weilong 2020	135.66	40.639	45	60.15	41.13	45	8.9%	75.51 [58.62, 92.40]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			200			200	29.3%	68.70 [59.37, 78.04]	•
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 28.	81, df = 2	(P < 0.00)001); F	²= 93%					
Fest for overall effect: Z =	14.43 (P	< 0.0000	1)						
otal (95% CI)			641			639	100.0%	52.98 [47.93, 58 02]	•
Hoterogeneity Chiz-24	1 21 df-	10 /P = 0	00004	18 - 05	96	033	.00.070	02100 [41100, 00:02]	
fection everall offert 7-	20.67/0	~ 0.0000	4)	, r = 95	70				-100 -50 0 50 100
rearior overall ellect Z =	20.57 (P	~ 0.0000	U						Eavours (experimental) Eavours (control)

Test for subaroup differences: Chi² = 101.22. df = 5 (P < 0.00001). l² = 95.1%

Figure 5: Effects of Atorvastatin on CAT Scores and 6-Minute Walk Distance(6MWD)

This figure highlights the effects of atorvastatin on COPD-related quality of life and exercise capacity, analyzed using a random-effects model. Negative effect sizes indicate improvements in CAT scores (lower scores represent better quality of life), while positive effect sizes indicate increased 6-minute walk distance (6MWD), reflecting enhanced exercise capacity. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

757 **5a:Effect of Atorvastatin on CAT Scores**

This forest plot demonstrates the impact of atorvastatin on COPD Assessment Test (CAT) scores, a key measure of quality of life. Data from 7 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving 639 patients showed significant improvements in CAT scores. Both 20 mg and 40 mg doses of atorvastatin were effective, with benefits observed across 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month treatment durations. The results suggest that atorvastatin consistently enhances quality of life in COPD patients regardless of the treatment dose or duration.

765 **5b: Effect of Atorvastatin on 6MWD (6-Minute Walk Distance, m)**

This forest plot illustrates the effect of atorvastatin on 6MWD, a functional measure of exercise capacity in COPD patients. Based on 6 RCTs involving 715 patients, atorvastatin at a 20 mg dose significantly improved 6MWD, but the effects were evident only for a 6-month treatment duration. No significant improvements were observed for shorter or longer treatment periods, highlighting the importance of sustained treatment duration to achieve functional benefits.

Bottom Label: Treatment effect favors intervention. Negative values represent
improvements in CAT scores (better quality of life), and positive values represent
increases in 6MWD (enhanced exercise capacity)

Table1:Summary characteristics of included RCTs 776

		Number		Ye	ears		Control	Course	Outcom	
Study	Country	Т	С	Туре	Т	С	Treament Group	Group	(months)	es
Zheng 2013	China	43	44	AECOPD	63.8	3±7.6	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	6	123 67
Jiang2018	China	49	49	AECOPD	68.9±14.2		Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	0.5	123
Li 2019	China	35	35	COPD	<65 years 22, and age 65 years 13	<65 years 23, and age 65 years 12	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	123
Ying2013	China	40	40	AECOPD	68.7±6.1	69.1±5.9	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	1	6
Xu 2016	China	80	80	COPD	55.6±12. 6	57.4±7.7	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin10mg	Convention al therapy	12	7
Zhao 2017	China	43	43	AECOPD	73.8±9.4	72.9±8.5	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	0.5	123 5
Guo 2015	China	50	50	NA	56.27±10 .33	57.42±10 .19	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	3	4
He 2016	China	75	75	NA	57.4±7.6	57.6±7.8	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	8
Liang 2018	China	42	42	NA	57.3±9.2	58.3±9.4	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	3	4
Liu2017	China	60	60	COPD	67.7±5.5	68.5±5.9	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	0.5	123 8
Wang 2011	China	25	25	NA	NA	NA	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	1	123
Feng2014	China	51	52	AECOPD	69.8	71.3	Conventional therapy	Convention al therapy	NA	123 5

+atorvastatin20mg

Chen2018	China	50	50	COPD	60.21±5. 52	60.32±5. 24	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	79
Peng2023	China	105	103	NA	65.71±8. 95	63.93±9. 23	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	1	29
Chen2013	China	30	30	NA	70.1	±9.6	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	6	123
Zhang2015	China	30	30	COPD	N	A	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	467
H·G2014	Iran	23	22	NA	50.2±8.2	47.3±7.5	Atorvastatin40mg	placebo	NA	57
Zhang2024	China	44	44	NA	66.87±4. 89	66.93±4. 71	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	2	13
Arian,A 2018	Iran	21	21	NA	65.8±11. 5	63.7±7.6	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin40mg	Convention al therapy	NA	(5)6)
Cheng 2015	China	75	75	COPD	66.8	±7.5	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	(8)
Han2019	China	53	53	AECOPD	N	A	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	0.5	13
Yu 2020	China	45	45	COPD	66.42±6. 19	65.97±6. 85	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	467
Zhang 2024	China	60	60	NA	48.58±5. 98)	47.64±5. 75	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	1	9
Liu 017	China	49	48	COPD	64.7	² ±9.6	Conventional therapy +atorvastatin20mg	Convention al therapy	12	$\overline{\mathcal{T}}$
777										
778 779		Note:	U FE	VI%pred (2) CATors	9 FEV1/F de 8 6M	VC ③ FE W ⑨ adv	VI (4) CRP (5) I	1s-crp © IL-	6 (7)	
115				Unigia						

Efficacy and Safety of Atorvastatin as Adjunctive Treatment 781

in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Systematic 782

Review and Meta-Analysis

784	Ke Chen, Bowen Xu,Lu Zhang,Li Fang,Di Wu,Huanzhang Ding,Zegeng Li*
785	
786	
787	
788	
789	
790	Supplementary Appendix
791	

792 Contents

- 793 **Supplementary Document 1**:PRISMA Checklist
- 794 **Table S1**. Literature Search Strategy in PubMed
- 795 **TableS2 :** Summary of adverse events.
- **Figure S1**: Sensitivity analyses for the effects of atorvastatin on various outcomes.
- 797 Table S3. Summary of Meta-Analysis Results for Outcomes Using Fixed-Effect and
- 798 Random-Effects Models
- 799

800		Supplementary Document 1: PRISMA Checklist	
Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page1
ABSTRACT	•	·	
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page2-3
INTRODUCTION		·	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page3-4
METHODS	·	·	
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page4
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page5
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Page5-6
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page6
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page6
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page7
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page7
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page7

Supplementary Document 1 PRISMA Checklist

Section and Location where item Item # Checklist item Topic is reported Effect measures 12 Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean Page7 difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. Synthesis 13a Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for Page7 each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and methods comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5). 13b Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or Page7 synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of Page7 13c individual studies and syntheses. 13d Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale Page7 for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. 13e Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity Page7 among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). 13f Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the Page7 synthesized results. Reporting bias 14 Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results Page7 assessment in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). Certainty 15 Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the Page7 assessment body of evidence for an outcome. RESULTS Study selection 16a Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number Page8 and Figure 1 of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. 16b Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which Figure1 were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. Study 17 Cite each included study and present its characteristics. Page9 characteristics Risk of bias in 18 Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. Figure2 studies Results of 19 For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each Page10-14 individual group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision studies (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. Results of 20a For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias Page10-14 syntheses among contributing studies.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Page10-14
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Page10-14
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Page10-14
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Page 14-15
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Page14-15
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Page16-19
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page19
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Page19
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page19
OTHER INFORMA			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Page4
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Page 19
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	-
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page19
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page19
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Page19

802	Table S1. Literat	ture Search Strategy in PubMed	
Search number	Query	Search Details	Results
13	((#11) OR #12)) AND (#10)	<pre>("atorvastatin"[MeSH Terms] OR "atorvastatin"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive"[MeSH Terms] OR "chronic obstructive pulmonary disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic obstructive lung disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic obstructive airway disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic airway obstruction"[Title/Abstract] OR "emphysema"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic bronchitis"[Title/Abstract] OR "lung diseases obstructive"[Title/Abstract] OR "COPD"[Title/Abstract]] OR</pre>	32
12	atorvastatin[Title/Abstract]	"atorvastatin"[Title/Abstract]	10,632
11	atorvastatin[MeSH Terms]	"atorvastatin"[MeSH Terms]	7,622
10	((((((((#1) OR (#2)) OR (#3)) OR (#4)) OR (#5)) OR (#6)) OR (#7)) OR (#8)) OR (#9)	"pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive"[MeSH Terms] OR "chronic obstructive pulmonary disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic obstructive lung disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic obstructive airway disease"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic airway obstruction"[Title/Abstract] OR "emphysema"[Title/Abstract] OR "chronic bronchitis"[Title/Abstract] OR "lung diseases obstructive"[Title/Abstract] OR "COPD"[Title/Abstract]	129,202
9	COPD[Title/Abstract]	"COPD"[Title/Abstract]	62,582
8	obstructive[Title/Abstract]	"lung diseases obstructive"[Title/Abstract]	28
7	chronic bronchitis[Title/Abstract]	"chronic bronchitis"[Title/Abstract]	10,596
6	emphysema[Title/Abstract]	"emphysema"[Title/Abstract]	28,711
5	chronic airway obstruction[Title/Abstract]	"chronic airway obstruction"[Title/Abstract]	372
4	chronic obstructive airway disease[Title/Abstract]	"chronic obstructive airway disease"[Title/Abstract]	337
3	chronic obstructive lung disease[Title/Abstract]	"chronic obstructive lung disease"[Title/Abstract]	4,807
2	chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[Title/Abstract]	"chronic obstructive pulmonary disease"[Title/Abstract]	65,443
1	pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive[MeSH Terms]	"pulmonary disease, chronic obstructive"[MeSH Terms]	69,843

804	TableS2 : Sumi	mary of adverse events.	
Study	Group	Adverse Reactions	Statistical Significance
			(P-value)
Liu Meicen et al.	Tiotropium Bromide	3 cases of dry mouth, 1 case of	P > 0.05
(2017)		constipation	
Liu Meicen et al.	Atorvastatin + Tiotropium	2 cases of dry mouth, 2 cases of	P > 0.05
(2017)	Bromide	nausea, 1 case of mild abdominal	
		discomfort	
Zhang Xiuli et al.	Budesonide-Formoterol	2 cases of gastrointestinal discomfort,	P > 0.05
(2024)		1 case of dizziness (Total: 5.00%)	
Zhang Xiuli et al.	Atorvastatin+	2 cases of gastrointestinal discomfort,	P > 0.05
(2024)	Budesonide-Formoterol	1 case of dizziness, 1 case of	
		palpitations (Total: 6.67%)	
Zhang Guifeng et	Not Reported	Confirmed atorvastatin safety, no	Not Applicable
al. (2024)		significant increase in adverse	
		reactions	

Tables? . S ofod

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.04.24318509; this version posted December 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



806

Figure S1: Leave-One-Out Sensitivity Analyses for the Effects of Atorvastatin on 807 Various Outcomes:(a) Effects on FEV1%pred (% predicted forced expiratory volume 808 in the first second).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(b) Effects 809 on FEV1/FVC ratio (%).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(c) 810 811 Effects on FEV1 (L).Positive values indicate improvement in lung function.(d) Effects on CAT scores (COPD Assessment Test).Negative values indicate 812 improvement in quality of life.(e) Effects on 6MWD (6-minute walk distance, 813 m).6MWD (6-minute walk distance, m). Positive values indicate increased exercise 814 capacity.(f) Effects on CRP levels (mg/L).CRP levels (mg/L). Negative values 815 indicate reduced inflammation.(g) Effects on hs-CRP levels (mg/L).Negative values 816 indicate reduced inflammation.(h) Effects on IL-6 levels (pg/mL).Negative values 817

- 818 indicate reduced inflammation.
- Each analysis was performed using a random-effects model (RE Model), and the
- 820 x-axis represents the observed outcome. Results demonstrate the robustness of pooled
- 821 estimates, with minimal variation in overall effects despite the exclusion of individual
- 822 studies.
- 823

Table S3. Summary of Meta-Analysis Results for Outcomes Using Fixed-Effect and Random-Effects Models

Outcome	Model	SMD	95% CI	I² (%)	τ^2	p-value (Heterogeneity)
FEV1%pred	Fixed Effect Model	0.7119	0.5578-	27.1	0.0185	0.2126
	Random Effects Model	0.7064	0.8659 0.5249– 0.8879	27.1	0.0185	0.2126
FEV1/FVC	Fixed Effect Model	1.12	[1.02, 1.45]	34.5	0.045	0.085
	Random Effects Model	1.15	[0.92, 1.38]	34.5	0.050	0.085
FEV1	Fixed Effect Model	1.23	[1.02, 1.45]	42.1	0.062	0.067
	Random Effects Model	1.19	[0.91, 1.47]	42.1	0.066	0.067
CRP	Fixed Effect Model	-1.85	[-2.17, -1.53]	41.5	0.056	0.072
	Random Effects Model	-1.88	[-2.30, -1.47]	41.5	0.060	0.072
hs-CRP	Fixed Effect Model	-2.35	[-2.68, -2.01]	48.2	0.072	0.061
	Random Effects Model	-2.40	[-2.89, -1.91]	48.2	0.081	0.061
IL-6	Fixed Effect Model	-1.75	[-2.01, -1.49]	46.3	0.068	0.055
	Random Effects Model	-1.78	[-2.21, -1.36]	46.3	0.072	0.055
CAT Score	Fixed Effect Model	-1.48	[-1.72, -1.24]	52.4	0.089	0.045
	Random Effects Model	-1.52	[-1.89, -1.16]	52.4	0.096	0.045
6MW	Fixed Effect Model	0.98	[0.76, 1.20]	51.3	0.095	0.048
	Random Effects Model	1.02	[0.78, 1.26]	51.3	0.100	0.048



As percentage (intention-to-treat)



Figure2a



	ator	rvastatir		0	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Total	Weight	N, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
1.2.2 3 mouths									
Feng guan 2014	10.9	7.464	30	6.2	6.95	30		Not estimable	
Han Yufen 2019	20.94	10.25	53	13.1	10.97	53	3.8%	7.84 [3.80, 11.88]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	16.02	8.15	49	11.51	8.17	49	5.9%	4.51 [1.28, 7.74]	
Liu Zheng 2017	9.99	4.69	60	4.4	4.497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Li Wenhui 2013	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	0		Not estimable	
Wang Haoling 2011	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	25	2.7%	4.67 [-0.10, 9.44]	
Zhang guifeng 2024	10.38	8.1	44	6.9	8.08	44	5.4%	3.48 [0.10, 6.86]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	14.86	6.33	43	11.04	6.32	44	8.7%	3.82 [1.16, 6.48]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			274			275	49,4%	5.04 [3.92, 6.16]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 4	4.03, df=	5 (P = 0.	55); P	= 0%					
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 8.83 (P < 0.00	001)						
1.2.3 6 mouths									
Chen Ligiao 2013	10.9	7.464	30	6.2	6.85	30	4,7%	4.70 [1.07, 8.33]	
Zheng wei 2013	21.9	13.214	43	11.6	11.43	44	2.3%	10.30 [5.10, 15.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			73			74	7.0%	6.53 [3.56, 9.51]	-
Heterogeneity: Chi# = :	3.00, df=	1 (P = 0.	08); I*:	= 67%					
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 4.31 (P ≤ 0.00	01)						
1310000									
1.2.4 COPD									
Liu Zheng 2017	8.99	4.69	60	4.4	4.497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			60			60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	-
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable								
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 6.66 (P < 0.00	001)						
1.2.5 AECOPD									
Han Yufen 2019	20.94	10.25	53	13.1	10.97	53	3.8%	7 84 13 80 11 881	
Jiang hongwei 2018	16.02	8.15	49	11.61	817	49	5.9%	4 51 11 28 7 741	
Zhao Meishi 2017	14.06	6.22	43	11.04	6.32	44	0.7%	3 02 11 16 6 401	
Zhena wei 2013	21.9	13 214	43	11.6	11.43		2.3%	10 30 15 10 15 501	
Subtotal (95% CD		10.214	188	11.0	11.49	190	20.7%	5.47 [3.74, 7.19]	•
Heterogeneity Chi? = I	6.46 ef=	3/P = 0	090:121	64%			2.011 1.0	out four directly	-
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 6.21 0	P = 0.00	001)						
			-						
Total (95% CI)			595			599	100.0%	5.36 [4.57, 6.14]	
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 1	14.49, df:	= 12 (P =	0.27);	P = 179	6				-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect 2	Z = 13.36	(P < 0.0	0001)						Eavours lexperimental Eavours Icontroll
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: (Ch/# = 1.1	01. df=	3 (P = 1	0.80). 🏴	= 0%			canonia ferbraumentaria Lanonia feorinoid

	ato	rvastati	n	0	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	50	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.2.2 3 mouths									
Feng guan 2014	10.9	7.464	30	6.2	6.85	30		Not estimable	
Han Yufen 2019	20.94	10.25	53	13.1	10.97	53	3.8%	7.84 [3.80, 11.88]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	16.02	8.15	49	11.51	8.17	49	5.9%	4.51 [1.28, 7.74]	
Liu Zheng 2017	9.99	4.69	60	4.4	4,497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Li Wenhui 2013	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	0		Not estimable	
Wang Haoling 2011	11.57	8.84	25	6.9	8.37	25	2.7%	4.67 [-0.10, 9.44]	
Zhang guifeng 2024	10.38	8.1	44	6.9	8.08	44	5.4%	3.48 (0.10, 6.86)	
Zhao Weishi 2017	14.86	6.33	43	11.04	6.32	44	8.7%	3.82[1.16, 6.48]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			274			275	49.4%	5.04 [3.92, 6.16]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# =	4.03, df=	5 (P = 0	55); P	= 0%					
Test for overall effect.	Z = 8.83 (P < 0.00	001)						
1.2.3 6 mouths									
Chen Ligiao 2013	10.9	7.464	30	6.2	6.85	30	4.7%	4.70 [1.07, 8.33]	
Zheng wei 2013	21.9	13.214	43	11.6	11.43	44	2.3%	10.30 [5.10, 15.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			73			74	7.0%	6.53 [3.56, 9.51]	-
Heterogeneity: Chi#=	3.00, df=	1 OP = 0	08); P	67%					
Test for overall effect.	Z = 4.31 (P = 0.00	01)						
1.2.4 COPD									
Liu Zheng 2017	9.99	4.69	60	4.4	4.497	60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			60			60	22.9%	5.59 [3.95, 7.23]	•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect.	Z = 6.66 (P = 0.00	001)						
1.2.5 AECOPD									
Han Yufen 2019	20.94	10.25	53	13.1	10.97	53	3.8%	7.84 [3.80, 11.88]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	16.02	8.15	49	11.51	0.17	49	5.9%	4.51 [1.28, 7.74]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	14.85	6.33	43	11.04	6.32	44	8.7%	3.82 [1.16, 6.48]	
Zheng wei 2013	21.9	13.214	43	11.6	11.43	44	2.3%	10.30 [5.10, 15.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			100			190	20.7%	5.47 [3.74, 7.19]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ^a =	6.46, df=	3 (P = 0	.09); P	= 54%					
Test for overall effect.	Z = 6.21 (P < 0.00	001)						
Total (95% CI)			595			599	100.0%	5.36 [4.57, 6.14]	
Heterogeneity: Chi# =	14.49, df	= 12 (P i	0.27);	I* = 179	6				10 5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect.	Z = 13.36	(P < 0.0	0001)						Favours levnerimental Favours (control)
Test for subproup diff.		ChiP = 1	01 46-	-2.02 = 1	0.000 P	- 0%			cancers forthermanical a success from and

	1	•
	L	٠
		-

	ator	vastat	in	0	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 3 mouths									
Feng guan 2014	23.5	0.62	51	9.1	0.6	52	7.6%	14.40 [14.16, 14.64]	
Jiang hongwei 2018	13.09	6.41	49	6.82	6.92	49	6.6%	6.27 [3.63, 8.91]	
Liu Zheng 2017	7.48	3.56	60	3.99	3.24	60	7.4%	3.49 [2.27, 4.71]	
Li Wenhui 2013	8.19	5.8	35	3.85	5.73	- 35	6.5%	4.34 [1.64, 7.04]	
Peng Yufeng 2023	10.69	9.1	103	5.21	8.68	105	6.7%	5.48 [3.06, 7.90]	
Wang Haoling 2011	13.7	8.18	25	10	6.58	25	5.5%	3.70 [-0.42, 7.82]	
Zhao Weishi 2017	12.7	6.58	43	7.4	6.35	44	6.5%	5.30 [2.58, 8.02]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			366			370	46.8%	6.19 [0.90, 11.48]	



	ato	rvastatin		(Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C1	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 3 mouths									
Guo sujuan 2015	-18.8	6.0127	50	-7.72	3.884	50	29.4%	-11.08 [-13.06, -9.10]	
Liang jianyi 2018	-18.8	6.027	42	-9.8	6.14	42	17.1%	-9.00 [-11.60, -6.40]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			92			92	46.6%	-10.32 [-11.89, -8.74]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = 1.55	df = 1 (P = 0.21)	P = 36	96					
Test for overall effect Z = 1	12.81 (P	< 0.0000	1)						
1.4.2 6 mouths									
Yu Weilong 2020	-15.58	4.03	45	-8.09	4.73	45	35.2%	-7.49 [-9.31, -5.67]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-16.01	3.16	30	-9.8	6.29	30	18.3%	-6.21 [-8.73, -3.69]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	53.4%	-7.05 [-8.53, -5.58]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 0.65	df = 1 (P = 0.42)	I [#] = 09	6					
Test for overall effect Z = 5	9.38 (P <	0.00001)						
Total (95% CI)			167			167	100.0%	-8.57 [-9.65, -7.50]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 10.9	8, df = 3	(P = 0.01); I ^a = 7	3%					
Test for overall effect Z = 1	15.60 (P	< 0.0000	1)						-10 -5 U 5 10
Tool for outpareup differen	ener Chil	- 0 70	1. 1 1	0 - 0.00	20 R - 1	0.00			Playours lexhelimetriail - Javoniz (counoi)

Test for subgroup differences: Chi# = 8.78, df = 1 (P = 0.003), I# = 88.6%

b

а

		atory	astatir	n	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
_	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
	1.5.1 20mg									
	Feng quan 2014	-18.4	1.09	51	-8.4	1.48	52	47.6%	-10.00 [-10.50, -9.50]	•
	Zhao Weishi 2017	-26.47	9.36	43	-22.94	9.895	44	0.7%	-3.53 [-7.58, 0.52]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			94			96	48.4%	-9.90 [-10.40, -9.40]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.87	, df = 1 (P	= 0.00	02); I ^a =	90%					
	Test for overall effect Z = 3	39.01 (P +	0.000	01)						
medf	Rxiv preprint doi: https://doi	i.org/10.1 ified by p	101/20 eer re	24.12.0 view) is	04.24318 s the aut	8509; thi hor/func	s versi ler. wh	on poste o has gra	d December 6, 2024. Th anted medRxiv a license	e copyright holder for this to display the preprint in
p r	Arian A 2018	-0.98	4.62	16	-3.24	perpetui	ty. 18	1.0%	2.26 [-1.14, 5.66]	
	Hassan Ghobadi 2014	It is	made	availat	ole unde	r a <mark>CC-E</mark>	3Y 4,0	Internatio	onal license .	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			39			40	1.5%	2,49 [-0,30, 5,28]	-
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.05	5. df = 1 (P	= 0.82	2): P = 0	196					
	Test for overall effect Z =	1.75 (P =	0.08)							
			,							
	1.5.3 AECOPD									
	Feng guan 2014	-18.4	1.09	51	-8.4	1.48	52	47.6%	-10.00 [-10.50, -9.50]	
	Zhao Weishi 2017	-26.47	9.36	43	-22.94	9.895	44	0.7%	-3.53 [-7.58, 0.52]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			94			96	48.4%	-9.90 [-10.40, -9.40]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi# = 9.67	, df = 1 (P	= 0.00	02); I [#] =	90%					
	Test for overall effect Z = 3	39.01 (P +	0.000	01)						
	1.5.4 COPD									
	Arian, A 2018	-0.98	4.62	16	-3.24	5.5	18	1.0%	2.26 [-1.14, 5.66]	
	Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-4.6	9.36	43	-22.94	9.895	44	0.7%	18.34 [14.29, 22.39]	-
	Subtotal (95% CI)			59			62	1.8%	8.92 [6.32, 11.53]	-
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 35.5	53, df = 1 (P < 0.0	00001);	I ² = 979	6				
	Test for overall effect Z =	6.71 (P <	0.0000	1)						
	Total (95% CI)			286			294	100.0%	-9.38 [-9.73, -9.03]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi# = 322	43, df = 7	(P < 0	.00001); I ^a = 98	195				10 6 0 6 10
	Test for overall effect Z =	53.14 (P +	0.000	01)						Favoure (control)
	Test for subaroup differen	ices: Chi#	= 267.	50. df=	: 3 (P < (0.00001), P = 9	8.9%		ravous (experimental) ravous (condo)

С

	ator	vastati	n	c	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Differenc
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% 0
1.6.1 6 mouths									
Arian, A 2018	-2.49	7.206	21	-2.14	4.622	21	6.3%	-0.35 [-4.01, 3.31]	
Ying yong 2013	-10.65	3.9	40	-11.3	3.9	40	29.0%	0.65 [-1.06, 2.36]	-
Zheng wei 2013	-145	78.31	43	-88	77.17	44	0.1%	-57.00 [-89.68, -24.32]	•
Subtotal (95% CI)			104			105	35.3%	0.34 [-1.20, 1.89]	+
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 12.	09, df = 2	(P = 0.0)	002); P	= 83%					
Test for overall effect Z =	0.43 (P=	0.66)							
1.6.2 12 mouths									
Yu Weilong 2020	-26.59	5.75	45	-19.89	6.19	45	13.9%	-6.70 [-9.17, -4.23]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-69.8	21.2	30	-17.7	20.03	30	0.8%	-52.10 [-62.54, -41.66]	•
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	14.7%	-9.11[-11.51, -6.70]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 68.	84, df = 1	(P < 0.0	00001);	I ^a = 99%					
Test for overall effect Z =	7.43 (P <	0.0000	1)						

7.43 (P < 0.00001) ≡ enect ∠ =



а

	ator	vastat	in	0	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.7.1 20mg									
Liu Meigin 2017	-6.39	6.74	49	-3.96	7.06	48	4.5%	-2.43 [-5.18, 0.32]	
Xu Junping 2016	-7.2	6.75	80	-5.7	7.03	80	7.5%	-1.50 [-3.64, 0.64]	
Yu Weilong 2020	-7.17	7	45	-2.87	6.652	45	4.3%	-4.30 [-7.12, -1.48]	
Zhang rongchang 2015	-6.9	3.7	30	-1.8	4.1	30	8.8%	-5.10 [-7.08, -3.12]	
Zheng wei 2013	-13	4.42	43	-9	3.89	44	11.1%	-4.00 [-5.75, -2.25]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			247			247	36.2%	-3.59 [-4.56, -2.62]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 7.08	s, df = 4 ((P = 0.1)	13); P=	43%					
Test for overall effect Z =	7.24 (P -	< 0.000	001)						
1.7.2 40mg									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-3.22	6.5	23	0.59	5.53	22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Heterogeneity: Not applica	able								
Test for overall effect Z = :	2.12 (P =	= 0.03)							
17310000									
Chap hong 2019	0.16	160	60	0.01	1.15	60	11.0%	1 641 2 20 0 221	
Crien nong 2018 Subtotal (05% Cf)	+8.15	4.53	50	+0.01	4.40	50	11.0%	-1.54 [-3.30, 0.22]	•
Hotorononoity Not anniis	abla		50			30	11.07.0	- 1.34 [-3.30, 0.22]	-
Test for overall effect 7 = :	4 74 /D -	0.003							
Learnor overall ellect T =	1.71 (P)	0.09)							
1.7.4 3 mouths									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	-3.22	6.5	23	0.59	5.53	22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			22	2.8%	-3.81 [-7.33, -0.29]	
Heterogeneity: Not applica	able								
Test for overall effect Z = :	2.12 (P =	= 0.03)							
1756 mouths									
Thoma wai 2012	10	112	10		2.00		11.10	4 00 1 5 75 - 2 251	
Energi wei 2013 Subtotal (05% Cf)	-13	4.42	43	-9	3.69	44	44.4%	4.00[-0.70, -2.20]	•
Jataronanajiki Matanniiki	abla		43				11.170	-real (ours) -creal	•
reterogeneity, Not applica	aute								

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.04.24318509; this version posted December 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a 6C-BY 4.0 International license



Test for subaroup differences: Chi^p = 5.57, df = 5 (P = 0.35), I^p = 10.3%

b

	ato	rvastatin		(Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
1.8.1 20mg									
Cheng shoubin 2015	40.878	40.914	75	-39.77	37.06	75	16.3%	80.65 [68.15, 93.14]	
Liu zheng 2017	66.9	40.37	60	68.8	40.37	60	12.2%	-1.90 [-16.35, 12.55]	_
Yu Weilong 2020	135.66	40.639	45	60.15	41.13	45	8.9%	75.51 [58.62, 92.40]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			180			180	37.5%	52.52 [44.27, 60.77]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 81	.10, df = 2	(P < 0.00	0001); P	*= 98%					
Test for overall effect Z =	: 12.48 (P	< 0.0000	1)						
1.8.2 40mg									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	3	148.5	23	-7	135.63	22	0.4%	10.00 [-73.04, 93.04]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			22	0.4%	10.00 [-73.04, 93.04]	
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable								
Test for overall effect Z =	: 0.24 (P =	0.81)							
1.8.3 10mg									
Xu Junping 2016	24.1	77.02	80	19.4	85.72	80	4.0%	4.70 [-20.55, 29.95]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			80			80	4.0%	4.70 [-20.55, 29.95]	-
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable								
Test for overall effect Z =	= 0.36 (P =	0.72)							
1.8.4 3 mouths									
Hassan Ghobadi 2014	3	148.5	23	-7	135.63	22	0.4%	10.00 [-73.04, 93.04]	
Liu zheng 2017	66.9	40.37	60	68.8	40.37	60	12.2%	-1.90 [-16.35, 12.55]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			83			82	12.6%	-1.55 [-15.78, 12.68]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi# = 0.0)8, df = 1 (P = 0.78)	; I ^a = 09	6					
Test for overall effect Z =	: 0.21 (P =	0.83)							
1.8.5 6 mouths									
Cheng shoubin 2015	40.878	40.914	75	-39.77	37.06	75	16.3%	80.65 [68.15, 93.14]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	16.3%	80.65 [68.15, 93.14]	•



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.04.24318509; this version posted December 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .





а

Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis

Guo sujuan	,	_	•		-11.0	8 [-1	3.06	. 9.1	[0]
Zhang rongchang				_	-6.	24-(-8.73	-3.6	19]
Liang jianyi				_	-9.0	0 [-1	1.60	-6.4	0]
Yu Weilong			+	•	-7,	49 [9.31	5.6	7]
RE Model			_	_	-8.4	9 [-1	0.57	-6.4	1]
		-	-	-	-	-			
	-14		-10		-6	-4	-2		
		Ot	serve	d C	outco	me			



Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis

b



e

Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis

Xu Juping			-		-0.22	2 [-2.3	5, 1.92]			
Zhang rongcl	hang		-	1 [-3.21	8, 0.67]					
Chen hong			-	•	-0.34	-0.34 [-2.10, 1.42] -0.63 [-4.15, 2.89]				
Hassan Ghol	badi	-		•	-0.63					
Liu meigin				+	-0.85	5 [-3.10	0, 2.40]			
Yu weilong		-		•	-0.63	1-3.4	5, 2.19]			
Zheng wei			-	+	-0.96	8 [-2.7	1, 0.79]			
RE Model			-	-	-0.67	7 [-1.5	0, 0.15]			
	_	-	-	+	-	_				
	-6	-4	-2	0	2	4				
		Obr	ierved	Outo	ome					

g

Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis



h

Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis

Li wenhui Wasa baoling				5	0	36 [0.14,	0.58]
Hassan Ghobadi		_			-0	18-1-1	12.36	12.001
Cheng shoubin					0	0.07 [0.04.	0.10]
Liu zheng					0	.45	0.25,	0.65]
Han yufen					1	.14	1.01,	1.27]
Yu weilong				٠	ç).11 [0.05,	0.17]
Liu meigin				٠	¢	0.07 [0.02,	0.12]
RE Model					0	.37 [0.06,	0.67]
	_	-	-	+	-	-		
	-15		-5	0	5	10		
		Ob	servi	ed O	utco	me		

с

Forest Plot with Leave-One-Out Analysis

		Obse	rved Out	come							
00	-80	-60	-40	-20	0	20					
_	-	1	-	1	_						
RE	Model					6 [-45.08,	3.35				
Yu	weilong				 -6.7 	0[-9.17,	-4.23				
Aria	an, A				-8-0.3	\$5[-4.01,	3.31				
Zha	ang rong	chang-			-52.10	[-62.54, -	41.66				
Yin	gyong				0.65 [-1.06, 2.3						
Zhe	engwei			-	-57.00	[-89.68, -	24.32				

f

Figure S1