- Title: The diagnostic value of plasma phosphorylated tau 181 in Alzheimer's disease 1
- within the Chinese population: A systematic review and meta-analysis 2

Authors: Keqiang Yan^{1,2,3}, Shuxin He^{1,2}, Xiaodong Jia^{1,2}, Haiyan Li^{1,2}, Dequan 3 Liu^{1,2*+}, Jianchun Chen^{1,2*+} 4

5

Affiliations: 6

- 7 ¹Tianjin Kingmed Diagnostics Laboratory Co.Ltd, Tianjin, China.
- ²Tianjin Key Laboratory of Multi-omics Precision Diagnosis Technology for 8
- Neurological Diseases, Tianjin, China. 9
- ³Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China 10
- 11
- ⁺Contributed equally 12
- 13 *Corresponding author
- Email: tianj-liudequan@kingmed.com.cn 14
- Address: Building B, Building 3, Sanwu Internet Technology Park, Binhai High-tech 15
- 16 Zone, Tianjin
- 17

18 Abstract

Among all related biomarkers, plasma phosphorylated tau (p-tau181) has 19 demonstrated strong diagnostic performance in the very early stages of Alzheimer's 20 disease (AD), showing significant differences between AD patients and healthy 21 controls. The aim of our present systematic review and meta-analysis was to roundly 22 23 evaluate the clinical diagnostic value of plasma p-tau181 based on the Simoa platform in Chinese populations. We systematically searched five databases (Embase, PubMed, 24 Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, and Web of Science) from inception to May 11th, 2024, 25 as well as the references of retrieved relevant articles. We included prospective cohort 26 studies and retrospective case-control studies in our analysis. Out of 1165 identified 27 28 articles, 10 met the inclusion criteria for meta-analysis. Our quantitative analysis 29 showed that plasma p-tau181 levels were significantly increased in patients with AD and mild cognitive impairment (MCI) compared to healthy controls (standard mean 30 difference [SMD]: 1.45 [1.25 - 1.65], p<0.00001; SMD: 0.55 [0.31 - 0.78], 31 p<0.00001) and were lower in MCI patients compared to AD patients (SMD: -0.88 32 33 [-0.93 - -0.82], p<0.00001). The reference values for plasma p-tau181 were 4.48 [95% confidence interval (CI): 4.01 - 5.00] for AD patients, 2.86 [95% CI: 2.45 -34 3.34] for MCI patients, and 2.09 [95% CI: 1.90 - 2.30] for healthy controls. The 35 meta-analysis confirmed that plasma p-tau181 significantly increases from healthy 36 controls to mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and then to AD in the Chinese 37 population. We also provide reliable reference values for plasma p-tau181, which 38 contribute to the early diagnosis of AD in Chinese clinical settings. 39

40 **Keywords:** meta-analysis, p-tau181, Alzheimer's disease

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

42 Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the most prevalent neurodegenerative disorder and a 43 leading cause of dementia worldwide^[1]. First identified by Dr. Alois Alzheimer in 44 1901, AD has since posed significant challenges to the medical community, with no 45 46 definitive cure currently available^[2]. The 2011 National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association (NIA-AA) Diagnostic Criteria conceptualize AD as a 47 continuum encompassing three stages: an asymptomatic phase (preclinical AD), a 48 predementia phase (mild cognitive impairment due to AD), and a dementia phase 49 (dementia due to AD)^[3-5]. Pathophysiological changes in AD can commence 15 to 20 50 years prior to the manifestation of clinical symptoms, underscoring the critical 51 52 importance of early diagnosis and timely intervention to potentially slow disease progression^[6]. 53

Recent studies have focused on the early detection of AD through the use of fluid 54 biomarkers^[7]. Tau proteins, which are microtubule-binding proteins, play an essential 55 role in maintaining neuronal stability and morphology under normal conditions. The 56 regional progression of brain atrophy in AD is closely associated with the 57 accumulation of Tau proteins^[8]. Hyperphosphorylated Tau (p-tau), in its full-length or 58 truncated forms, represents a key pathological hallmark of AD, exhibiting over 70 59 post-translational modifications, including more than 40 phosphorylation sites. 60 Various forms of p-tau can be measured in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and plasma^[9]. 61 Among these, p-tau181 is significantly elevated in the CSF of AD patients and is 62 considered a critical biomarker for the disease^[10]. The ability of p-tau181 to 63 differentiate AD from other neurodegenerative conditions, such as frontotemporal 64 lobar degeneration (FTLD-TDP) and chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE), is 65 crucial for the accurate diagnosis of AD^[11]. Furthermore, p-tau181 levels correlate 66 with AD severity and predict disease progression, providing valuable insights for 67 evaluating therapeutic efficacy and guiding treatment strategies. Recent findings 68 indicate that p-tau181 have excellent discriminative performance in plasma, paving 69 the way for non-invasive monitoring of AD^[12-15]. 70

Advancements in technology, such as the Single-molecule Array (Simoa), have 71 enabled the detection of plasma p-tau181 at low concentrations^[16]. The US FDA has 72 granted breakthrough medical device clearance to this technology, recognizing it as a 73 valuable tool for diagnosing AD through the detection of p-tau181 biomarkers in 74 blood^[17-18]. Currently, this technique is also widely used in the clinical diagnosis of 75 AD in China. Despite the proven diagnostic value of plasma p-tau181, a large amount 76 of literature with inconsistent conclusions has confused our understanding of this 77 field^[19-24]. There is a notable lack of accurate clinical reference values that can 78 distinguish AD from healthy elderly individuals. Previous studies, including one by 79 Ding et al., have attempted to address this by comparing the range of p-tau181 80 between AD patients and healthy individuals through meta-analysis^[25]. However, 81 these studies predominantly collected data from European and American populations, 82 which may not be applicable to other populations due to quantitative differences in 83

p-tau181 levels among different races and ethnicities. Howell et al. found that older
African Americans had lower CSF levels of p-tau181 compared to older Caucasians,
even after adjusting for demographic variables, genetic factors, and cognitive
function^[26]. This suggests that there may be race-associated differences in CSF
p-tau181 marker, which also exist in plasma.

To address this gap, the primary objective of the present study is to conduct an extensive and comprehensive meta-analysis to determine the distribution of plasma p-tau181 levels in both healthy individuals and patients with AD and other neurodegenerative diseases within the Chinese population. Our aim is to provide more precise and reliable cut-off thresholds for clinical use, thereby improving the accuracy of AD and other neurodegenerative disease diagnoses and facilitating early screening in Chinese clinical settings.

96

97 Methods

98 Search strategy and study selection

99 This meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items
100 for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines. The analysis
101 questions were designed according to the PICOS framework:

- 102 •Participants: clinically diagnosed AD patients;
- 103 •Intervention: evaluation of plasma p-tau181levels;
- Comparison: patients clinically diagnosed with non-AD dementia and
 cognitively unimpaired participants;

Outcome: normal range of plasma p-tau181 levels in healthy Chinese
populations and the efficacy of plasma p-tau181 in differentiating AD from
cognitively unimpaired participants or non-AD dementia patients, based on plasma
p-tau181 level discrepancies;

•Study design: original, observational cross-sectional and prospective studies.

A literature search was conducted across five databases (Embase, PubMed, Cochrane 111 Library, MEDLINE and Web of Science) on the date of May 11th, 2024, using the 112 following search terms: plasma phosphorylated tau, Alzheimer disease, AD, Chinese 113 114 and Simoa. Candidate studies were included or excluded based on the following criteria: (1) full text publications written in English; (2) plasma p-tau181 levels 115 measured using Simoa; (3) Study population consisting of Chinese individuals; (4) 116 AD diagnosed according to the 2011 and 2018 NIA-AA criteria^[27] or the 1984 117 NINCDS-ADRDA criteria^[28]. Studies were excluded if non-quantitative methods 118 were employed to assess biomarker levels in the samples. 119

120

121 Data extraction and quality assessment

Data of interest were independently extracted by two authors (Shuxin He and Keqiang Yan). Study quality was evaluated using the modified version of the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS)^[29]. A maximum of eight points per study was given according to the quality of population selection, group comparability and exposure assessment. Disagreements regarding study selection or data extraction were resolved

127 by additional reviewers (Xiaodong Jia or Haiyan Li).

128

129 Statistical analysis

A random-effects model meta-analysis was employed to calculate the pooled effect 130 size across multiple studies^[31]. The normal range of plasma p-tau181 and standardized 131 132 mean difference (SMD) between dementia interest groups were represented in forest plots with 95% confidence intervals (CI)^[31]. Tau² was used to estimate of the 133 between-study variance in a random-effects meta-analysis. Statistical heterogeneity 134 across studies was assessed using chi-squared statistic (Chi[^]2) and the I[^]2 index. 135 According to the Cochrane handbook, I² values of 25%, 50%, and 75% represented 136 low, moderate, and substantial inter-study variability, respectively^[32]. The Wan et al. 137 138 method was employed to estimate the mean and standard deviation (SD) when studies provided median and interquartile range (IQR)^[33]. All calculations were conducted 139 using R statistical software (version 4.3.0). 140

141 **Results**

142 Study inclusions and quality assessment

The search syntax yielded 1165 publications, of which 275 were duplicates and 878 143 were excluded following abstract screening. Of the 22 entries that were eligible for 144 full-text assessment, 12 studies were excluded for not complying with the eligibility 145 criteria: Two studies were not based on a Chinese population; five did not provide 146 specific diagnostic data for p-tau181; one did not use Simoa assays for measurement; 147 148 and four had duplicated published data for the same baseline cohort. Consequently, 10 149 studies were included in this meta analysis. The detailed selection process is illustrated by the PRISMA flow diagram in Figure 1. The modified NOS criteria for 150 quality assessment of the studies indicated that the majority of them were of 151 high-quality (Table 1). One study scored low on the quality assessment since it only 152 contained healthy cohort and lacked biomarker diagnosis for inclusion criteria. The 153 characteristics of the 10 studies, including the number of subjects, average age, 154 155 female percentage, and plasma p-tau181 level are presented in Table 2. From the included studies, 7 studies compared blood biomarkers between AD and healthy 156 controls (783 AD patients and 508 controls), while four of them also focused on mild 157 cognitive impairment (MCI) comparing 368 MCI patients and 321 controls. Six 158 studies paid extra attention to the performance of plasma p-tau181 between 649 AD 159 patients and 413 non-AD dementia patients (non-ADD), including patients with 160 cognitive disorders other than AD, such as frontotemporal dementia, vascular 161 dementia, Lewy body disease, and Parkinson's disease dementia. 162

163 [Figure 1 here]

164 Plasma p-tau181 levels in healthy cohorts

A summary of plasma p-tau181 levels in Chinese healthy cohorts was presented.Subgroup analysis was performed according to age and sex ratio. The retrieved data

were stratified by mean age into two cohors: young (< 65 years) and old (\geq 65 years). 167 The sex ratio was defined as medium (40-60% female) and high (more than 60% 168 female). Following the removal of one study (Chen J, et al 2023) with high 169 heterogeneity $I^2 = 95\%$, seven studies were included, suggesting that the average 170 plasma p-tau181 level in Chinese healthy populations was 2.09 pg/ml (95% CI 171 172 1.90-2.30, $I^2 = 77\%$, P< 0.01) (Figure 2a). The mean plasma p-tau181 levels in young and old groups were 2.23 pg/ml (95% CI 1.66-3.00) and 2.03 pg/ml (95% CI 173 1.85-2.30), respectively, with no significant differences observed (p = 0.54) (Figure 174 2b). Nevertheless, there were significant differences (p = 0.04) in the subgroup 175 analyses by sex ratio. As illustrated in Figure 2c, the mean plasma p-tau181 176 concerntration was 1.87 pg/ml (95% CI 1.74-2.01) in the subgroup with more than 177 178 60% female participants, in comparison with 2.14 pg/ml (95% CI 1.92-2.37) in the 179 other subgroup.

[Figure 2 here]

Plasma p-tau181 levels in AD patients 181

180

182 A total of nine studies with 11 cohorts were conducted to evaluate p-tau181 plasma levels in 1131 AD patients. The results indicated a mean value of 4.48 pg/ml (95% CI 183 4.01-5.00, $I^2 = 93\%$, P < 0.01) (Figure 3a). The heterogeneity of observed in the data 184 was influenced by a number of factors, including age and sex composition, 185 geographic location of the study, time period and the severity of disease. Most of the 186 studies included in the current analysis employed clinical diagnostic guidelines, 187 including various iterations of international guidelines, rather than the gold standard 188 189 of autopsy-confirmed AD, which may have contributed to the observed heterogeneity. There was significantly difference of plasma p-tau181 levels between young and old 190 groups of AD patients (P < 0.05), with 4.94 pg/ml (95% CI 4.42–5.53) and 4.12 pg/ml 191 192 (95% CI 3.66-4.63) in young and old groups, respectively (Figure 3b). While no significant differences (P = 0.7) in subgroup analysis by sex ratio (Figure 3c). 193 Subsequently, plasma p-tau181 levels were compared between AD patients and 194 healthy cohorts. The meta-analysis based on seven studies including 783 AD patients 195 and 508 control participants, demonstrated that p-tau181 was significantly higher in 196 AD in comparison to control (p < 0.01), providing a SMD of 1.45 (95% CI: 1.25, 197 1.65), with low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 33\%$) (Figure 3d). In the aspect of differentiating 198 AD patients from normal controls, three studies demonstrated the diagnostic accuracy 199 of plasma biomarkers, as indicated by ROC curves. Chen et al. reported as AUC 200 (Area Under the Curve) of 0.882 (95%CI: 0.79, 0.97) for p-tau181, which was higher 201 than A β 40, A β 42 and GAFP, but was lower than A β 42/A β 40 (AUC = 0.998, 95%CI: 202 0.99-1.00). Sun et al. combined plasma markers including AB42/AB40, p-tau181 and 203 neurofilament light protein (NfL), suggesting the best discriminative performance 204 (AUC = 0.902) among of all single plasma biomarkers (p-tau181 AUC=0.773), with a 205 sensitivity and specificity of 0.867 and 0.886, respectively. Wu et al. found that 206 p-tau181 performed well in both early-onset AD (EOAD) and late-onset AD (LOAD) 207 patients (AUC = 0.925 and 0.842, respectively) for the AD/control comparison. Three 208 additional studies focused on the ability of p-tau181 plasma levels in AB PET 209

scanning status prediction, with AUC values of 0.813 (Xiao Z, et al., 2023), 0.916 210 (Guo Y, et al., 2023) and 0.839 (Gao F, et al., 2023 - CANDI cohort). Gao et al. 211 constructed a logistic regression (LR) model, which combined APOE-E4, plasma 212 p-tau181, and serum glial fibrillary acidic protein (GFAP), resulting in an 213 improvement in the AUC for distinguishing AB-PET status from 0.839 to 0.915. 214 215 Subsequently, the efficacy of this LR model was demonstrated in both the CANDI and multi-center cohorts, showing superior performance compared to any of the blood 216 biomarkers. Guo et al. found other plasma biomarkers including AB40, AB42, 217 AB42/AB40 and Nfl, had relatively lower discriminative accuracy than p-tau181. 218 Furthermore, the study reported that once the CSF AB42/AB40 ratio was positive, 219 plasma p-tau181 began to increase significantly and continued to increase throughout 220 221 the course of preclinical AD.

222 [Figure 3 here]

223 Plasma p-tau181 in MCI patients

224 Four studies evaluated plasma p-tau181 levels in 368 patients with MCI, suggesting that the mean value was 2.86 pg/ml (95% CI 2.45–3.34, $I^2 = 82\%$, P < 0.01) (Figure 225 4a). Our further meta-analysis revealed that p-tau181 levels were significantly higher 226 in MCI patients compared with controls (SMD = 0.55, 95% CI: 0.31, 0.78, P < 0.01), 227 while exhibiting a lower concentration than that in AD patients (SMD = -0.88, 95%) 228 CI: -0.93, -0.82, P < 0.01) (Figure 4b, 4c). One study (Wu X, et al. 2021) 229 230 demonstrated that p-tau181 exhibited a larger AUC than plasma t-tau, Aβ40, Aβ42 and Nfl, achieving an AUC of 0.702 (95% CI: 0.64, 0.764) for the amnestic MCI/Ctrl 231 comparison and 0.719 (95% CI: 0.661, 0.776) for the amnestic MCI/AD comparison. 232 The AUC of the amnestic MCI/Ctrl comparison was then improved to 0.789 (95%CI: 233 0.737, 0.841) through the application of a model comparising t-tau, A β 40, A β 42, 234 p-tau181, and NfL, in conjunction age, sex, and education years. 235

236

[Figure 4 here]

237 Plasma p-tau181 between AD patients and non-AD dementia patients

Five studies with seven cohorts focused on the performance of plasma p-tau181 in 238 distinguishing AD patients from non-AD dementia patients, demonstrating p-tau181 239 level was significantly higher in AD. Studies with small sample sizes were not 240 included in the meta-analysis. Based on the meta-analysis results we proved that the 241 average p-tau181 level in AD patients was significantly higher than in those non-ADD 242 patients, providing a SMD of 1.12 (95% CI: 0.53,1.71, p<0.01) (Figure 5). Two 243 studies reported that p-tau181 had a better performance in discriminating AD from 244 245 non-ADD than A\u006742, A\u00e742/40, GFAP and NfL, providing the AUC of 0.892 and 0.805 respectively^[36-37]. Besides, the AUC was improved to 0.945 when combined 246 with other plasma biomarker index (AB42/ AB40, NfL, GFAP) in Chen Y, et al. 247 research. 248

250 **Discussion**

The current investigation examined the conflicting results of studies on plasma 251 p-tau181 linked to AD or MCI in the Chinese population, aiming to develop a 252 non-invasive diagnostic biomarker for the early phases of AD. Plasma p-tau181 levels 253 254 may serve as one of the most promising fluid biomarkers for validating AD or MCI diagnoses. The current findings show that AD is associated with higher blood levels 255 of p-tau181 compared to MCI and controls. Based on the current literature, we 256 established the average plasma p-tau181 levels for AD, MCI, and controls in the 257 Chinese population, providing reference values for future clinical diagnosis. 258

Many meta-analysis studies have demonstrated that plasma p-tau181 can precisely 259 260 differentiate AD from MCI and healthy controls. However, most of the studies were based on Western populations. It is validated that race and ethnicity have impact on 261 the level of p-tau181 in many studies. Howell et al. found that African Americans 262 showed lower p-tau181 levels in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) than Caucasians, which 263 may lead to underdiagnosis of AD in African Americans^[26]. Schindler et al. Further 264 validated that diagnosis performance of plasma p-tau181 in AD is inconsistent 265 between African (AA) and non-Hispanic White (NHW), which could result in 266 disproportionate misdiagnosis of AA individuals^[38]. In the Canadian population, the 267 reference range for plasma p-tau181 is 0.9-4 pg/ml for individuals aged 60-80. In a 268 Japanese population study, the interquartile range (IOR) for plasma p-tau181 was 269 2.58-4.31 pg/ml in PET-positive cohorts, and 1.32-2.33 pg/ml in PET-negative 270 individuals. Additionally, a meta-analysis by Ding et al. showed that the average 271 plasma p-tau181 level in the general population is 11.18 pg/ml^[25]. This is significantly 272 273 different from the meta-analysis results for the Chinese population, which reported an average level of 2.09 pg/ml.This study was conducted among Chinese populations, 274 which further add to the evidence of plasma p-tau181 as reliable prognostic 275 candidates for AD and highlight their promising roles in future clinical practice and 276 research. Cooper et al. found in addition to population, p-tau181 levels are also 277 affected by other factors such as hypertension, myocardial infarction (MI) and 278 stroke^[39]. More comprehensive studies are needed to determine the impact of these 279 factors on p-tau181 levels. 280

To improve diagnosis accuracy, the p-tau181 was combined with APOE genotyping, 281 where the presence of an $\varepsilon 4$ allele (encoding the E4 isoform of the apoplipoprotein E 282 protein) is associated with higher probability of AD. Snellman et al. indicates that 283 plasma p-tau181 levels are significantly higher in APOE4/4 carriers compared to 284 non-carriers and heterozygous APOE3/4 carriers^[40]. Elevated levels of plasma 285 p-tau181 are already observed in cognitively unimpaired high-risk individuals with 286 homozygous APOE4/4. Cooper et al suggests a strong correlation between p-tau181 287 levels and APOE £4 carrier status in cognitively healthy individuals over 85 years 288 old^[39]. Although p-tau181 levels are elevated in elderly APOE ɛ4 carriers, their 289 cognitive abilities remain intact. Combining APOE and p-tau181 markers and 290 conducting joint analyses may provide more comprehensive predictive information 291 292 for clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease.

293 Compared to p-tau181, p-tau217 which is tightly associated with Ab plaque formation 294 within the brain, suggested a higher specificity to AD. Nervertheless, meta-analysis of 295 this biomarker could not be done due to too few studies, especially in Chines 296 population. Integration of diverse P-tau formed proteins such as p-tau181, p-tau217

and p-tau231 may significantly improved diagnosis power of AD^[41].

298

299 Limitations

Some limitations should be addressed in this meta-analysis. Firstly, misdiagnosis 300 could have occurred in some of the studies included in this systematic review, as 301 diagnosis was reached mostly on clinical grounds rather than gold-standard 302 autopsy-confirmend AD. Secondly, only 10 studies were used for meta-analysis, this 303 304 small studies can be more heterogeneous than large studies. These findings will be verified in future large and multicenter cohort studies for subsequent diagnosis for 305 MCI and AD. Lastly, it is likely that the level of plasma p-tau181 is correlated with 306 APOE status. However, due to lacking of these data, we can't explore the impact of 307 APOE to levels of p-tau181 in different groups. 308

309

310 Conclusion

In summary, our meta-analysis revealed significant relationships of plasma p-tau181 with Alzheimer's patients compared with cognitively normal control subjects and mild cognitive impairment. The results presented provide preliminary reference value of plasma p-tau181 for AD and MCI, which may facilitate clinical diagnosis of neurological diseases for Chinese population.

Funding All authors acknowledge funding from Tianjin Science and Technology
Leading Cultivation Enterprise Project (22YDPYSY0020).

318 Authors' contributions

KQ Yan conceptualised this systematic review. SX He searched the literature and screened the titles and abstracts. KQ Yan and SX He reviewed all full-text articles and extraced data. HY Li and XD Jia formally analysed, visualised and validated the data. DQ Liu and JC Chen supervised the systematic review. All authors were responsible for the methodology and review and editing of the manuscript. All authors had final responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

References 326

- 327 [1]. Prince, M., et al., World Alzheimer Report 2015. The Global Impact of Dementia: An analysis of prevalence, incidence, cost and trends.. 2015, Alzheimer's Disease International. 328
- 329 [2]. Tagarelli, A., et al., Alois Alzheimer: a hundred years after the discovery of the eponymous 330 disorder. International journal of biomedical science: IJBS, 2006. 2(2): p. 196.
- 331 [3]. McKhann, G.M., et al., The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations
- 332 from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for
- 333 Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's & dementia, 2011. 7(3): p. 263-269.
- 334 [4]. Albert, M.S., et al., The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease:
- 335 recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on 336 diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Focus, 2013. 11(1): p. 96-106.
- 337 [5]. Sperling, R.A., et al., Toward defining the preclinical stages of Alzheimer's disease: 338 Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on 339 diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's & dementia, 2011. 7(3): p. 280-292.
- 340 [6]. Braak, H. and E. Braak, Neuropathological stageing of Alzheimer-related changes. Acta 341 neuropathologica, 1991. 82(4): p. 239-259.
- 342 [7]. Chatterjee, P., et al., Diagnostic and prognostic plasma biomarkers for preclinical Alzheimer's 343 disease. Alzheimer's & Dementia, 2022. 18(6): p. 1141-1154.
- 344 [8]. Hansson, O., Biomarkers for neurodegenerative diseases. Nature medicine, 2021. 27(6): p. 345 954-963.
- 346 [9]. Mi, K. and G.V. Johnson, The role of tau phosphorylation in the pathogenesis of Alzheimer's 347 disease. Current Alzheimer Research, 2006. 3(5): p. 449-463.
- 348 [10]. Karikari, T.K., et al., Blood phosphorylated tau 181 as a biomarker for Alzheimer's disease: a
- 349 diagnostic performance and prediction modelling study using data from four prospective cohorts. The 350 Lancet Neurology, 2020. 19(5): p. 422-433.
- 351 [11]. Thijssen, E.H., et al., Association of Plasma P-tau217 and P-tau181 with clinical phenotype,
- 352 neuropathology, and imaging markers in Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal lobar degeneration: a 353 retrospective diagnostic performance study. The Lancet. Neurology, 2021. 20(9): p. 739.
- 354 [12]. Thomas, A.J., et al., A longitudinal study of plasma pTau181 in mild cognitive impairment with
- 355 Lewy bodies and Alzheimer's disease. Movement Disorders, 2022. 37(7): p. 1495-1504.
- 356 [13]. Tissot, C., et al., Plasma pTau181 predicts cortical brain atrophy in aging and Alzheimer's disease. 357 Alzheimer's Research & Therapy, 2021. 13: p. 1-11.
- 358 [14]. Doecke, J.D., et al., Plasma pTau181 and biomarker combinations to identify Alzheimer's disease
- 359 at any stage along the AD continuum compared with both controls and non - AD dementia. 360 Alzheimer's & Dementia, 2023. 19: p. e077504.
- [15]. Coomans, E.M., et al., A head-to-head comparison between plasma ptau181 and tau pet along the 361
- 362 Alzheimer' s disease continuum. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2023. 64(3): p. 437-443.
- 363 [16]. Rissin, D.M., et al., Single-molecule enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay detects serum proteins
- 364 at subfemtomolar concentrations. Nature biotechnology, 2010. 28(6): p. 595-599.
- 365 [17]. Janelidze, S., et al., Plasma P-tau181 in Alzheimer's disease: relationship to other biomarkers,
- 366 differential diagnosis, neuropathology and longitudinal progression to Alzheimer' s dementia. Nature
- 367 medicine, 2020. 26(3): p. 379-386.
- 368 [18]. Karikari, T.K., et al., Diagnostic performance and prediction of clinical progression of plasma

- 369 phospho-tau181 in the Alzheimer' s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. Molecular psychiatry, 2021. 370 26(2): p. 429-442.
- 371 [19]. Chen, J., et al., Reference intervals for plasma amyloid- β , total tau, and phosphorylated tau181 in
- 372 healthy elderly Chinese individuals without cognitive impairment. Alzheimer's Research & Therapy,

2023. 15(1): p. 100. 373

- 374 [20]. Guo, Y., et al., The dynamics of plasma biomarkers across the Alzheimer' s continuum. 375 Alzheimer's Research & Therapy, 2023. 15(1): p. 31.
- 376 [21]. Sun, Q., et al., Plasma β -amyloid, tau, neurodegeneration biomarkers and inflammatory factors
- 377 of probable Alzheimer's disease dementia in Chinese individuals. Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience, 378 2022. 14: p. 963845.
- 379 [22]. Cai, H., et al., Plasma biomarkers predict Alzheimer's disease before clinical onset in Chinese 380 cohorts. Nature Communications, 2023. 14(1): p. 6747.
- 381 [23]. Wu, X., et al., Development of a plasma biomarker diagnostic model incorporating ultrasensitive
- 382 digital immunoassay as a screening strategy for Alzheimer disease in a Chinese population. Clinical 383 Chemistry, 2021. 67(12): p. 1628-1639.
- 384 [24]. Gao, F., et al., Blood-based biomarkers for Alzheimer' s disease: a multicenter-based 385 cross-sectional and longitudinal study in China. Science Bulletin, 2023. 68(16): p. 1800-1808.
- 386 [25]. Ding, X., et al., Ultrasensitive assays for detection of plasma tau and phosphorylated tau 181 in
- 387 Alzheimer's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Translational neurodegeneration, 2021. 10: 388 p. 1-14.
- 389 [26]. Howell, J.C., et al., Race modifies the relationship between cognition and Alzheimer's disease 390 cerebrospinal fluid biomarkers. Alzheimer's research & therapy, 2017. 9: p. 1-10.
- 391 [27]. Jack Jr, C.R., et al., NIA-AA research framework: toward a biological definition of Alzheimer's 392 disease. Alzheimer's & dementia, 2018. 14(4): p. 535-562.
- 393 [28]. McKhann, G., et al., Clinical diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease: Report of the NINCDS - ADRDA
- 394 Work Group* under the auspices of Department of Health and Human Services Task Force on 395 Alzheimer's Disease. Neurology, 1984. 34(7): p. 939-939.
- 396 [29]. Wells, G.A., et al., The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of 397 nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2000.
- 398 [30]. Van Houwelingen, H.C., L.R. Arends and T. Stijnen, Advanced methods in meta - analysis: 399 multivariate approach and meta - regression. Statistics in medicine, 2002. 21(4): p. 589-624.
- 400 [31]. Friedrich, J.O., N.K. Adhikari and J. Beyene, The ratio of means method as an alternative to mean 401 differences for analyzing continuous outcome variables in meta-analysis: a simulation study. BMC 402 Medical Research Methodology, 2008. 8: p. 1-15.
- 403 [32]. Higgins, J.P., et al., Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Bmj, 2003. 327(7414): p. 557-560.
- 404 [33]. Wan, X., et al., Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, 405 range and/or interquartile range. BMC medical research methodology, 2014. 14: p. 1-13.
- 406 [34]. Chen, Y., et al., Diagnostic value of isolated plasma biomarkers and its combination in
- 407 neurodegenerative dementias: A multicenter cohort study. Clinica Chimica Acta, 2024. 558: p. 118784.
- 408 [35]. Huang, L., et al., Neuropsychiatric symptoms in Alzheimer's continuum and their association with 409 plasma biomarkers. Journal of Affective Disorders, 2024. 348: p. 200-206.
- 410 [36]. Shang, L., et al., Association of APOE ϵ 4/ ϵ 4 with fluid biomarkers in patients from the
- 411 PUMCH dementia cohort. Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience, 2023. 15: p. 1119070.
- 412 [37]. Xiao, Z., et al., Plasma p - tau217, p - tau181, and NfL as early indicators of dementia risk in a

- 413 community cohort: The Shanghai Aging Study. Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment &
- 414 Disease Monitoring, 2023. 15(4): p. e12514.
- 415 [38]. Schindler, S.E., et al., Effect of race on prediction of brain amyloidosis by plasma A β 42/A β 40,
- 416 phosphorylated tau, and neurofilament light. Neurology, 2022. 99(3): p. e245-e257.
- 417 [39]. Mielke, M.M., et al., Performance of plasma phosphorylated tau 181 and 217 in the community.
- 418 Nature medicine, 2022. 28(7): p. 1398-1405.
- 419 [40]. Cooper, J.G., et al., APOE ϵ 4 carrier status modifies plasma p - tau181 concentrations in
- 420 cognitively healthy super - seniors. Alzheimer's & Dementia, 2024.
- [41]. Qu, Y., et al., Blood biomarkers for the diagnosis of amnestic mild cognitive impairment and 421
- 422 Alzheimer's disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews,
- 423 2021. 128: p. 479-486.
- 424
- 425

427 Table 1. Quality assessment of included studies in the meta-analysis using NEWCASTLE -428 OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE (NOS)

	Selection				Comparability	Exposure			
	Is the case definition Representativeness Selection of Definition of adequate? of the cases Controls Controls		Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis	Ascertainment of exposure	Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls	Non-Response rate			
Chen J, et al. 2023	NA	NA			NA	*	NA		
Guo Y, et al. 2023	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	
Sun Q, et al. 2022	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Cai H, et al. 2023	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Wu X, et al. 2021	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Gao F, et al. 2023	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Chen Y, et al. 2024	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Huang L, et al. 2024	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	
Shang L, et al. 2023	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Xiao Z, et al. 2023	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	

429

430

431 Table 2. Basic characteristics of included studies for plasma p-tau181 analysis

Study	Subjects (n)	Female (%)	Age (years)	P-tau181 (pg/ml)
Chen J, et al. 2023 ^[19]	CN (193)	49.7	$\boldsymbol{67.3 \pm 9.8}$	1.19 (0.88, 1.76)
	CN (43)	58.82	57.02 ± 6.76	1.92 ± 0.78
G V · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	MCI (36)	58.33	66.72 ± 9.82	2.88 ± 1.70
Guo Y, et al. 2023^{120}	AD (93)	59.14	59.48 ± 8.28	4.60 ± 1.82
	Non-AD dementia (68)	41.18	62.41 ± 8.70	2.08 ± 1.16
	CN (44)	50	71.86 ± 7.76	2.27 (1.78, 3.18)
$Sun Q, et al. 2022^{[21]}$	AD (30)	40	75.27 ± 7.67	3.94 (3.02, 5.39)
G . H. (1.0000 ^[22]	CN (123)	50.4	70.0 ± 7.1	1.9 (1.51, 2.67)
Cai H, et al. $2023^{(22)}$	AD (126)	50	69.0 ± 6.3	3.97 ± 1.39
	CN (121)	62.8	69.3 ± 7.1	1.8 (1.4, 2.4)
Wu X, et al. 2021 ^[23]	MCI (148)	54.1	69.7 ± 8.8	4.3 (3.0, 5.6)
	AD (159)	57.2	66.9 ± 9.9	2.6 (1.7, 3.9)
	CN (104)	52.9	59.1 ± 8.6	2.6 ± 1.8
Gao F, et al. 2023 - CANDI	MCI (110)	62.7	63.3 ± 9.3	3.5 ± 2.3
cohort ^[24]	AD (208)	63.9	63.0 ± 8.1	5.8 ± 2.8
	Non-AD dementia (55)	49.1	61.9 ± 8.1	3.5 ± 2.8
Con E at al 2022 WCU ash art ^[24]	AD (47)	57.4	76.8 ± 6.0	5.8 ± 3.0
Gao F, et al. 2023 - WCH conort	Non-AD dementia (81)	58.0	60.9 ± 7.4	2.9 ± 1.0
Gao F, et al. 2023 - SAHZU	AD (36)	66.7	61.9 ± 9.6	4.1 ± 1.6
cohort ^[24]	Non-AD dementia (19)	31.6	60.4 ± 9.8	3.5 ± 1.9
	CN (20)	50	65.7 ± 9.1	1.8 (1.4, 2.8)
Chan V. at al. 2024[34]	AD (64)	48.44	$\boldsymbol{62.8 \pm 10.7}$	5.2 (3.8, 7.1)
Chen 1, et al. 2024^{10}	FTD (16)	62.5	64.3 ± 9.0	2.9 (2.2, 5.0)
	PSP (12)	58.33	71.8 ± 5.9	2.9 (1.5, 3.2)
	CN (53)	45.28	65.13 ± 6.96	1.93 ± 0.90
Huang L, et al. 2024 ^[35]	MCI (74)	48.65	65.72 ± 6.60	2.43 ± 1.44
	AD (103)	59.22	66.03 ± 8.21	3.95 ± 1.94

Study	Subjects (n)	Female (%)	Age (years)	P-tau181 (pg/ml)
Sharra L. et al. 2022[36]	AD (120)	55.8	60.8 ± 7.9	4.9 ± 1.9
Snang L, et al. 2023^{100}	Non-AD dementia (128)	46.9	61.7 ± 9.1	2.7 ± 1.4
V: 7 (1 2022 ^[37]	AD (145)	62.1	79.1 ± 6.1	3.12 ± 2.30
X1ao Z, et al. $2023^{(3)}$	Non-AD dementia (62)	71	77.8 ± 5.9	2.22 ± 0.80

435 Figures

436

437 Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection process

438



439

440 Figure 2. Forest plot of random effects meta-analysis of plasma p-tau181 levels in

441 healthy controls (A), age subgroups (B) and sex ratio subgroups (C).

Study	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Mean IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean IV, Random, 95% CI
Gao E et al 2023 (CANDI	2 60	1 8000	104	13.9%	2 60 [2 28 2 97]	
W/u X et al 2021	1.87	0 7502	121	17.6%	1 87 [1 74 2 01]	
	2.02	0.7502	121	17.0%	2.02 [1.04, 2.01]	
Cal H, et al. 2023	2.03	0.0090	123	17.4%	2.03 [1.00, 2.19]	
Sun Q, et al. 2022	2.41	1.0/12	44	14.0%	2.41 [2.11, 2.75]	
Guo Y, et al. 2023	1.92	0.7800	43	14.6%	1.92 [1.70, 2.17]	
Chen Y, et al. 2024	2.00	1.1111	20	8.1%	2.00 [1.57, 2.55]	
Huang L, et al. 2024	1.93	0.9000	53	14.3%	1.93 [1.70, 2.19]	
Total (95% CI)			508	100.0%	2.08 [1.90, 2.28]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01;	$Chi^2 = 26$	6.57, df =	6 (P <	0.01); $I^2 =$	77%	
						1.6 1.8 2 2.2 2.4 2.6 2
Study or					Mean	Mean
Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Participants Age = < 65 yea	rs					
Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI)	2.60	1.8000	104	13.9%	2.60 [2.28, 2.97]	
Guo Y, et al. 2023	1.92	0.7800	43	14.6%	1.92 [1.70, 2.17]	<u> </u>
Total (95% CI)	-		147	28.5%	2.23 [1.66, 3.00]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04; Chi Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P	² = 10.88, = NA)	df = 1 (P	< 0.01);	l ² = 91%		
Participants Age = = 65 yea	rs					
Wu X, et al. 2021	1.87	0.7502	121	17.6%	1.87 [1.74, 2.01]	
Cai H, et al. 2023	2.03	0.8696	123	17.4%	2.03 [1.88, 2.19]	
Sun Q, et al. 2022	2.41	1.0712	44	14.0%	2.41 [2.11, 2.75]	
Chen Y, et al. 2024	2.00	1.1111	20	8.1%	2.00 [1.57, 2.55]	
Huang L, et al. 2024	1.93	0.9000	53	14.3%	1.93 [1.70, 2.19]	— <mark>— </mark> —
Total (95% CI)			361	71.5%	2.03 [1.86, 2.20]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = < 0.01; C Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P	hi ² = 11.6 = NA)	9, df = 4 (P = 0.02	2); I ² = 66%		
Total (95% CI)			508	100.0%	2.08 [1.90, 2.28]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi	$^{2} = 26.57$	df = 6 (P)	< 0.01);	$1^2 = 77\%$		
Test for subgroup differences: C	hi ² = 0.38	, df = 1 (P	9 = 0.54)			1.6 1.8 2 2.2 2.4 2.6 2
Study or					Mean	Mean
Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Proportion of Female Partic	ipants =	40% ~ 6	60%			
Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI)	2.60	1.8000	104	13.9%	2.60 [2.28, 2.97]	
Cai H, et al. 2023	2.03	0.8696	123	17.4%	2.03 [1.88, 2.19]	
Sun Q, et al. 2022	2.41	1.0712	44	14.0%	2.41 [2.11, 2.75]	
Guo Y, et al. 2023	1.92	0.7800	43	14.6%	1.92 [1.70, 2.17]	
Chen Y, et al. 2024	2.00	1.1111	20	8.1%	2.00 [1.57, 2.55]	
Huang L. et al. 2024	1.93	0.9000	53	14.3%	1.93 [1.70, 2.19]	
				/ v		

1.87 [1.74, 2.01]

2.08 [1.90, 2.28]

1.6 1.8 2 2.2 2.4 2.6 2.8

442

Figure 3. Forest plot of random effects meta-analysis of plasma p-tau181 levels in AD 443

121 17.6%

- 444 patients (A), age subgroups (B) and sex ratio subgroups (C). Meta-analysis of studies
- comparing p-tau181 levels between AD and healthy controls (D). 445

 Total (95% Cl)
 387
 82.4%

 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 18.93, df = 5 (P < 0.01); I² = 74%
 74%

 Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)
 NA
 NA

 Solution
 Solution
 100.0%

 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 26.57, df = 6 (P < 0.01); l² = 77%
 Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 4.56, df = 1 (P = 0.03)

 Proportion of Female Participants => 60%

 Wu X, et al. 2021
 1.87
 0.7502

Gas F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.60 2.600 2.00 208 9.6% 5.80 (5.40, 6.19) Gas F et al. 2023 (SAPL) 4.10 1.600 36 8.7% 4.10 [5.61, 6.63] Gas F et al. 2023 (SAPL) 5.80 1.947 159 9.6% 3.90 (1.6, 61) Cat H, et al. 2023 (SAPL) 4.10 1.600 36 8.7% 4.10 [5.61, 4.63] Cat H, et al. 2023 (SAPL) 4.00 1.820 03 9.4% 4.60 [4.24, 4.90] Chen Y, et al. 2024 (SAPL) 5.1900 103 9.5% 5.95 (S.5, 9.4.34) Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (SAPL) 3.12 [2.77, 5.52] 5.80 (5.50, 8.34) Viang L, et al. 2024 (SAPL) 5.80 (1.600 - 0.20), 17 = 9.3% 5.80 (5.50, 8.34) Study or Mean 5.0< 7.600 2.00 9.6% 4.50 (1.82, 4.69) Gas F et al. 2023 (SAPL) Mean 5.0< 7.600 2.00 9.6% 4.50 (1.82, 4.69) Study or Mean 5.0< 7.600 2.00 9.6% 4.60 (1.82, 4.69) Mean Study or Mean 5.0< 7.600 2.00 9.6% 4.60 (1.82, 4.59) Mean Study or Mean 5.0< 7.600 2.00 9.6% 4.60 (1.82, 4.59) Mean Gas F et al. 2023 (MCH) 5.80 0.000 47	Study	Mean	SE	Total	Weight	Mean IV, Random,	95% CI	IV,	Random	n, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Gao} F, \text{et al}. 2023 (W-FU) & 5.80 3.0000 47 & 8.3\% & 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] \\ \text{Gao} F, \text{et al}. 2023 (SAH2U) & 4.10 1.6000 36 6.7\% & 4.10 [5.61, 4.66] \\ \text{Vu} X, \text{et al}. 2023 & 4.21 2.18344 30 & 8.1\% & 4.12 [5.51, 4.83] \\ \text{Gau} Y, \text{et al}. 2023 & 4.22 1.8344 30 & 8.1\% & 4.12 [5.51, 4.83] \\ \text{Chen Y, et al}. 2023 & 4.22 1.8344 30 & 8.1\% & 4.12 [5.51, 4.83] \\ \text{Chen Y, et al}. 2023 & 4.50 1.8200 & 63 & 8.9\% & 5.37 [F, 73, 5.22] \\ \text{Hung L, et al}. 2023 & 4.50 1.9000 120 & 9.6\% & 4.60 [6.57, 5.25] \\ \text{Hung L, et al}. 2023 & 3.50 1.9000 120 & 9.6\% & 4.60 [6.57, 5.25] \\ \text{Hung L, et al}. 2023 & 3.50 1.9000 120 & 9.6\% & 4.60 [6.57, 5.25] \\ \text{Hung L, et al}. 2023 & 3.50 1.9000 120 & 9.6\% & 4.60 [6.4, 4.97] \\ \text{Hetrogeneity. Tau2 = 0.03; Ch2 = 147.60, dt = 10 (P < 0.01); P = 53\% \\ \text{Study or } & \text{Moan} & \text{SD} & \text{Total} & \text{Weight} V, \text{Random, 59% CI } \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Study or } & \textbf{Moan} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Weight} V, \textbf{Random, 59\% CI } \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Study or } & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Study or } & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Study or } & \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} & \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} [5.43, 6.19] \\ \textbf{Hetrogeneity. Tau2 = 0.02; (Ch2 = 3.43, dt = 4.0 < 0.01); P = 53\% \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} [5.00, 6.72] \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} & \textbf{Mean} \\ \textbf{Mean}$	Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80	2.8000	208	9.6%	5.80 [5.43,	6.19]			-	
Gao F, et al. 2023 (SAP42) 4.10 1.6000 36 8.7% 4.10 (3.61, 4.65) VAX x et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 9.6% 4.30 (4.01, 4.61) Gai H, et al. 2022 4.12 1.8344 4.00 18.1% 4.12 (3.51, 4.83) Guo Y, et al. 2022 4.12 1.8344 4.00 18.1% 4.12 (3.51, 4.83) Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 (4.57, 5.55) Hung L, et al. 2023 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 (2.77, 3.82) Total (95% C) Farticipants Age = <6 Sysens Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 5.20 (5.30, 4.34) Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 5.20 (5.30, 4.34) Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 5.20 (5.30, 4.34) Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.99) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.99) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.99) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.49) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.49) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 2.4000 36 9.7% 4.40 (142, 4.49) Chen Y, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.50 3.0000 120 9.6% 4.90 (4.57, 5.55) Total (95% C) (C) (C) C ² = 3.31, df = 4 (7 < 0.01); F = 85% Test for ownall effect. 2 = NA (7 + NA) Participants Age = <6 Sysens Gao F, et al. 2023 (SANDI) 5.50 3.0000 120 9.6% 4.30 (4.01, 4.61) CaH, et al. 2023 (3.12 2.3000 143 0.8.7% 4.10 (124, 14.61) CaH, et al. 2023 (3.12 2.3000 147 0.8.7% 5.13 (124, 6.52) Total (95% C) (C) (C) Ch ² = 4.22, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for ownall effect. 2 = NA (P = NA) Participants Age = = 65 (yane Gao F, et al. 2023 (SANDI) 5.50 3.0000 4.7 8.3% 5.80 (500, 6.72] WAX, et al. 2024 (3.22, 2.2000 143 8.8.7% 4.10 (124, 14.61) CaH, et al. 2023 (3.317 2.2.200 145 8.8% 3.12 (2.77, 3.52) Total (95% C) (C) (C) Ch ² = 4.22, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for ownall effect. 2 = NA (P = NA) Participants Age = = 60.0; Ch ² = 4.70, 0.01; F = 67% Test for ownall effect. 2 = NA (P = NA) Total (95% C) (C) (C) (C) = 4.72, 0.01; F = 67% Test for ownall effect. 2 = NA (P = NA) Total (95% C) (C) (C) (C) = 4.70, 0.01;	Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH)	5.80	3.0000	47	8.3%	5.80 [5.00,	6.72]		_	-	
VUX X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 1.59 9.6% 4.30 4.12 1.8.1 Sun Q, et al. 2023 4.07 1.30 1.947 1.59 9.6% 4.30 4.14 4.51 Sun Q, et al. 2023 4.60 1.20 8.17 5.300 6.4% 4.60 4.24 4.93 Chen Y, et al. 2024 3.96 1.900 103 9.6% 5.57 4.50 6.28 3.96 5.43 4.50 6.27 Hung L, et al. 2024 3.96 1.900 103 9.6% 5.80 5.60 5.64 5.80 5.00 5.64 5.97 5.90 5.80 5	Gao F, et al. 2023 (SAHZU	J) 4.10	1.6000	36	8.7%	4.10 [3.61,	4.66]	-			
Call H, et al. 2023 3:97 1:390 126 9.7% 3.97 [3:73, 4.22] Sun O, et al. 2022 4:12 1:834 4:00 18.1% 4:12 [3:51, 4.32] Guo Y, et al. 2022 4:52 1:834 30 1:900 120 9.6% 4:50 (4.24, 4.59) Chen Y, et al. 2024 5:37 2:500 145 8:8% 3:12 [2:77, 3:2] Total (95% C) Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Participants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:0, 6:72] Shudy or Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Participants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:0, 6:72] Shudy or Subgroup A Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Participants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Farticipants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 2:800 2:08 9.5% 4:50 (5:40, 6:19] Farticipants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:50 3:0000 1:20 9.6% 4:30 (4:57, 5:53) Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 3.3; df = 4(P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P = NA) Participants Age = <6 Syars Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:80 3:0000 4:7 8.3% 5:80 (5:00, 6:72] WUX, x et al. 2024 3:3:1 2:2:000 1:48 8:8% 3:12 (2:77, 3:52] Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 4.23, df = 4(P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P = NA) Participants Age = = 65 (Sars) Gao F, et al. 2023 (SNDI) 5:80 3:0000 4:7 8:3% 5:80 (5:00, 6:72] WUX, x et al. 2024 3:3:1 2:2:3000 1:48 8:8% 3:12 (2:77, 3:52] Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 4.23, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 65% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P = NA) Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 4.27, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 65% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P = NA) Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 4.27, df = 10(P < 0.01); F = 65% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P = NA) Total (95% C) 1:Ch ² = 4.27, df = 10(P < 0.01); F = 65% Test for ownall entic 2 = NA(P =	Wu X, et al. 2021	4.30	1.9447	159	9.6%	4.30 [4.01,	4.61]		-		
Suff Que Y et al. 2023 (a) Que Y et al. 2023 (b) Que Y et al. 2023 (c) Y et al. 2024 (c) Y et al. 2024	Cai H, et al. 2023	3.97	1.3900	126	9.7%	3.97 [3.73,	4.22]		.		
Cub P, retail: 2024 4.60 1.600 93 93 94.79 4.50 1.4.4.99 Shang L, et al: 2024 4.90 1.900 120 9.6% 4.90 1.97 1.71 1.93 Values L, et al: 2023 3.95 1.900 120 9.6% 4.90 4.90 4.90 4.90 Values L, et al: 2023 3.91 2.900 125 8.36% 3.12 2.700 3.64 4.84 [4.0.4, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); P = 93%	Sun Q, et al. 2022	4.12	1.8344	4 30	8.1%	4.12 [3.51,	4.83]	_			
Chart 1, Et al. 2024 Shing L, et al. 2023 Shing L, et al. 2024 Shing L, et al. 2024	Guo Y, et al. 2023	4.00	1.8200	93	9.4%	4.60 [4.24,	4.99]				
$\begin{aligned} \begin{aligned} \text{Drimp}_{1} \ rel at 2024 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{1} \ rel at 2024 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{1} \ rel at 2024 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{1} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{2} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{2} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{1} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{2} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{3} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text{Xiao Z}_{4} \ rel at 2023 \\ \text$	Shang L et al 2022	5.37	2.5000	120	0.9%	5.37 [4.79,	5.251				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Huang L et al 2024	3.05	1.9000	103	9.0%	3 05 13 50	4 341				
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); P ² = 93% Study or Study or Study or Study or Mean SD Total Weight W, Random, 95% CI Participants Age = <6 years Gao F, et al 2023 (CAN2U) Salo 2 2000 Gao F, et al 2023 (CAN2U) Salo 2 2000 Salo 2 200 Salo 2 2000 Salo 2 200 Salo 2 200 Salo 2 2000 Salo 2 200 Salo 2 200	Xiao Z. et al. 2023	3.12	2.3000) 145	8.8%	3.12 [2.77.	3.521 -	-	.		
Total (95% CI)											
Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.03; Ch" = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); P = 93%	Total (95% CI)	2		1131	100.0%	4.48 [4.04,	4.97]		-	-	
Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight Mean	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; ($Chi^2 = 14$	7.60, df	= 10 (P	< 0.01); I	= 93%		3	4	5 6	
Study or Subgroup Non SD Total Weight V, Random, 95% Cl Participants Age = < 65 years Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 209 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 209 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Participants Age = = 65 years Gao F et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 126 9.7% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] CaH, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 WCH) 5.80 3.0000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Heat cogenetry: Tau ² = 0.02; Chu ² = 4.2.8, df = 10 (P < 0.01); f ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl Proportion of Female Participants = > 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 128 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 4.30 1.9447 159 9.6% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 2.20 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.30 [4.01, 6.2	1201 N					10001	,	5	4	5 0	
Participants Age = < 65 years Gap F et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gap F et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 2.8000 9.8% 4.10 [3.61, 4.66] Gup C et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] 5.87 [5.7, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2024 4.90 [1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95%, C) 7.80 (3.900 47 8.3% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95%, C) 1.9000 126 9.7% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95%, C) 1.904 (5.7, 5.25) 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95%, C) 1.904 (7.9, 3.97) 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] 9.97% 4.90 [4.47, 5.33] Sub C, et al. 2023 (MCH) 5.80 (3.000 47 8.3% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] 1.102 (3.3, 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95%, C) 1131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Mean Mean Mean Nubgroup Mean SD Total Weight N. Random, 95% CI Mean Total (95%, C) 1.22 (2.6, 6.22) Mean N. Random, 95%, CI Mean N. Random, 95%, CI <t< td=""><td>Study or Subgroup</td><td>Mean</td><td>SD</td><td>Total</td><td>Weight</td><td>IV, Random,</td><td>95% CI</td><td></td><td>IV, Rando</td><td>an m, 95% Cl</td></t<>	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random,	95% CI		IV, Rando	an m, 95% Cl	
Gao F et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 4.10 1.6000 93 8.7% 4.10 [3.61, 4.66] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 9.4% 4.00 [4.24, 4.99] Chen Y, et al. 2024 4.50 1.8200 93 9.4% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95% C1) 5.80 2.8000 47 8.3% 4.94 [4.42, 5.53] Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi ² = 3.31, df = 4 (P < 0.01); F = 88% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Participants Age = 65 years Gao F, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun O, et al. 2022 14.21 8.834 430 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.63] Huar L, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun O, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 4.5 8.43, df = 10 (P < 0.01); F = 89% Total (95% C1) 6.10 2.01° = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% C1) 6.10 2.01° = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% C1) 6.10 2.01° = 44.7.80, df = 10 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% C1) 6.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 4.10 1.6000 38 8.7% 4.21 [2.85, 6.22] Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.7.80, df = 10 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Proportion of Female Participants = 60% , 3.89 5.80 [5.06, 6.72] Wi X, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 4.10 1.6000 38 8.7%, $4.21 [2.85, 6.22]$ Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.7.80, df = 2 (P < 0.01); F = 85% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Proportion of Female Participants = 40% , 60% , 3.30% 5.80 [5.06, 6.72] Wi X, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 1.72 (1.97, 3.52] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 1.72 (1.97, 3.52] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 1.72 (1.97, 3.52] Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 1.72 (1.97, 3.52] Total (95% C1) 7.72 (2.71, 4.52) Total (95% C1) 7.72 (2.71, 4.53) Total (95% C1) 7.72 (2.71, 4.72) Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAN2D) 1.75 (2.71, 7.75, 2.53) Total (95% C1) 7.72 (2.71, 7.75, 2.53) Total (95% C1) 7.72 (2.71, 7.75	Participants Age = < 65 yea	irs								_	
Gao F et al. 2023 (VAPL2) 4.10 1.6000 36 8.7% 4.10 [2.61, 4.66] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 64 8.9% 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Total (95% CI) 580 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VACH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VACH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VACH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VACH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VACH) 5.80 3.0000 126 9.7% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] CaH, et al. 2024 3.31 ($f = 4.78$, $d = 5 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 5 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 5 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 5 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 5 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 10 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Total (95% CI) .0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 10 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 4.78, $d = 10 (P < 0.01)$; $F = 89\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = NA ($P = NA$) Total (95% CI) .122 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .122 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .122 2.3000 128 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F et al. 2023 (CAND) 3.50 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Total (95% CI) .122 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 145 8.8% 4.31 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 145 8.8% 4.31 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 145 8.8% 4.31 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 145 8.8% 4.31 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 145 8.8% 4.31 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) .131 2.2.3000 147 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.9000 208 9.6% 4.30 [4.57, 5.25] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15, d ² = 1.67 (d = 2.0 P < 0.01); $F = 87\%$ Test for averall ef	Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI)	5.80	2.8000	208	9.6%	5.80 [5.43,	6.19]			-	
Guo r, et al. 2023 4.00 1.82:00 93 9.4% 4.00 [424, 4.99] Cherry, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.57 (7.19, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.50 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.50 [4.79, 6.02] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Ch ² = 34.31, df = 4 (P < 0.01); l ² = 88% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Participants Age = 65 years Gao F, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 9.7% 4.39 [4.01, 4.61] Cai H, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 9.7% 4.395 [3.59, 4.34] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Ch ² = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95%; Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Ch ² = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95%; Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Ch ² = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95%; Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Ch ² = 44.78, df = 1 (P = 0.03) Study or Study or Study or Study Cli Define Carticipants = > 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.8% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.8% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.8% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.8% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] WLX, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.8% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] WLX, et al. 2023 (WCH) 4.80 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun O, et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.1000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] WLX, et al. 2023 (WCH) 4.80 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.74, 2.2] Sun O, et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.1000 126 9.8% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] Total (95%; Cl) Mon Mean SD Total Weight fV, Random, 95%; Cl Muang L, et al. 2023 (WCH) 4.80 126 9.7% 4.59 [5.41, 8.4, 97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 87.15, df = 2 (P < 0.01); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95%; Cl) Mon Mean SD Total Weight fV, Random, 95%; Cl Muang L, et al. 2023 (WCH) 4.80 126 9.7% 4.59 [5.41, 8.4, 9.7] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 17, 15, df = 2 (P < 0.01); l ²	Gao F, et al. 2023 (SAHZU)	4.10	1.6000	36	8.7%	4.10 [3.61,	4.66]		-		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Guo Y, et al. 2023	4.60	1.8200	93	9.4%	4.60 [4.24,	4.99]		-		
$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \text{cman} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	Chen Y, et al. 2024 Shana L et al. 2023	5.37	2.5000	64	8.9%	5.37 [4.79,	6.02]				
$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \text{Lettergenety: Tau^2 = 0.01; Ch^2 = 34.31, df = 4 (P < 0.01); l^2 = 86\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect: 2 = NA (P = NA) \\ \hline \text{Participants Age = 65 years} \\ \hline \text{Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH) } 5.50 3.0000 47 8.3\% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] \\ \hline \text{Wu X, et al. 2023 (WCH) } 3.97 1.3800 126 9.7\% 3.37 [3.36, 4.34] \\ \hline \text{Large 1, al. 2024 } 3.95 1.3400 103 9.2\% 3.95 [3.59, 4.34] \\ \hline \text{Large 1, al. 2023 } 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8\% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] \\ \hline \text{Harge 2, et al. 2023 } 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8\% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] \\ \hline \text{Harge 2, et al. 2024 } 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8\% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] \\ \hline \text{Harge 2, et al. 2024 } 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8\% \\ \hline \text{Total (95% CI) } \\ \hline \text{Total (2023 (SAPLV) } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline \text{Mean } \\ \hline \text{Subgroup } \\ \hline Subgroup $	Total (95% Ch	4.90	1.9000	524	46 3%	4.90 [4.57,	5.20]				
Test for overall effect: $Z = NA (P = NA)$ Participants Age = 65 years Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.60 30000 47 8.3% Sun Q, et al. 2023 1.947 159 9.6% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] Cai H, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3800 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun Q, et al. 2024 3.955 1.9400 103 9.2% 3.95 [3.59, 4.34] Huarg L, et al. 2024 3.955 1.9400 103 9.2% 3.95 [3.59, 4.34] Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 44.28; df = 5 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 44.28; df = 1 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for subgroup Mean SD Total Weight V, Random, 95% Cl Proportion of Female Participants = > 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] WLX, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.37 [4.70, 5.2] Total (95% Cl) Heterogenety: Tau ² = 0.12; Chi ² = 87.15, df = 2 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Proportion of Female Participants = 40% - 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 3.8000 44 8.87% 4.12 [3.51, 4.83] Guo Y, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 3.8000 120 9.6% 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8220 89.57% [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.4% 4.50 [4.24, 4.99] Total (95% Cl) Tau ² = 0.01; Chi ² = 52.01; df = (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Shang L, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8220 89.577 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8220 89.5 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8220 89.5 5.37 [4	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.01$: Chi	2 = 34.31	df = 4/P	< 0.01)	40.3%	4.54 [4.42,	0.03]				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect: Z = NA (F	= NA)	01-4(1	- 0.01),	1 = 0070						
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Participants Age = = 65 yea	irs									
Wux X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 9.6% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] Cai H, et al. 2023 3.97 1.390 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun O, et al. 2022 4.12 1.8344 30 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.83] Huare L, et al. 2024 3.12 2.3000 145 8.8% 3.12 [2.77, 3.52] Total (95% CI) 610 53.7% 4.12 [3.66, 4.63] Heterogenely: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 44.28, df = 5 (P < 0.01); l ² = 89% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) 5D Total (95% CI) Mean Mean Study or Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Mean Proportion of Female Participants => 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Mean Mean Via 2, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.000 2.86 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Mean Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.000 2.86 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Mean Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 3.12 (2.77, 3.52] Mean Mean Mean Proportion of Female Participants = 40% ~ 60%. 6.80 (5.00, 6.72]	Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH)	5.80	3.0000	47	8.3%	5.80 [5.00,	6.72]			-	
Lai rt, et al. 2022 Sun Q, et al. 2024 Sun Q, et al. 2024 Sub Q, et al. 2025 Sub Q, et al. 2024 Sub Q, et al. 2024 Sub Q, et al. 2025 Sub Q, et al. 2024 Sub Q, et al. 2025 Sub	Wu X, et al. 2021	4.30	1.9447	159	9.6%	4.30 [4.01,	4.61]				
Sun Q, et al. 2022 Huarg L, et al. 2024 A 12 2 1.8344 Xiao Z, et al. 2023 Xiao Z, et al. 2024 Xiao Z, et al.	Cai H, et al. 2023	3.97	1.3900	126	9.7%	3.97 [3.73,	4.22]		-		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Sun Q, et al. 2022	4.12	1.8344	30	8.1%	4.12 [3.51,	4.83]				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Viao 7 et al. 2023	3.95	1.9400	103	9.2%	3.95 [3.59,	4.34				
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Hetrogenely: Tau^2 = 0.02; \ Chl^2 = 44.28, \ df = 5 \ (P < 0.01); \ l^2 = 69\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA)} \\ \hline \text{Total (95% CI)} \\ \hline \text{Hetrogenely: Tau^2 = 0.02; \ Chl^2 = 147.60, \ df = 10 \ (P < 0.01); \ l^2 = 93\% \\ \hline \text{Test for subgroup differences: \ Ch^2 = 4.81, \ df = 1 \ (P = 0.03)} \\ \hline \text{Study or} \\ \hline \text{Study or} \\ \hline \text{Study or} \\ \hline \text{Study or} \\ \hline \text{Study or for formale Participants = > 60\% \\ Gao F, et al. 2023 (GAND) \ 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6\% \\ \hline \text{Stat 223 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ \hline \text{At 10 [361, 4.66] } \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.10 [361, 4.66] \\ \hline \text{Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (GAND42L)} \ 4.10 1 6000 36 8.7\% \\ 4.00 [4.24, 4.89] \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) } \\ \hline Proportion of Formale Participants = 40\% - 60\% \\ Gao F, et al. 2023 \ 4.60 1 18200 33 \ 6.4\% \ 4.60 [4.24, 4.99] \\ \hline \text{Chen Y, et al. 2024} \ 5.37 2.5000 \ 64 \ 8.9\% \ 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] \\ \hline \text{Sharg L, et al. 2023} \ 4.60 1 18200 \ 120 \ 9.6\% \ 4.39 [4.57, 5.25] \\ \hline \text{Haterogenely: Tau^2 = 0.03; \ Chl^2 = 52.01, \ df = 7 (P < 0.01); \ l^2 = 63\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) } \\ \hline \hline \text{Total (95\% CI)} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline \frac{AD}{B} \ Total Weight IV, Random, 95\% CI \\ \hline \ \text{Test for overall effect: C = NA (P = NA) } \\ \hline \hline \text{Total (95\% CI)} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline \text{Std. Mean Difference} \\ \ \text{Std. Mean Difference} \\ \ \text{Std. Mean Difference} \\ \text{Nandom, 95\% CI \\ \hline \ \text{Test for overall effect: C = NA (P = NA) } \\ \hline \hline \ \text{Total (95\% CI)} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline \text{Mean} \ \hline Std. Mean Di$	Total (95% CI)	3.12	2.3000	610	53 7%	4.12 13 66	4 631	-	-		
Test for overall effect: $Z = NA (P = NA)$ Total (95% Cl) 1131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% Test for subgroup differences: Ch ² = 4.81, df = 1 (P = 0.03) Study or Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl V, Random, 95% Cl Proportion of Female Participants = > 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 9.6% 5.80 [5.43, 6.19] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 4.10 1.16000 36 8.7% 4.10 [3.61, 4.66] Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (CAND) 4.10 1.16000 36 8.7% 4.10 [3.61, 4.66] Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (CAND) 4.10 1.16000 36 8.7% 4.10 [3.61, 4.66] Xiao Z, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.0, 6.72] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.12; Ch ² = 87.15, df = 2 (P < 0.01); l ² = 98% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Proportion of Female Participants = 40% ~ 60% Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.0, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 9.6% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] Cal H, et al. 2023 (3.422 4.12 1.8344 30 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.45] Guo Y, et al. 2023 (3.422 4.12 1.8344 30 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.53] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Ch ² = 20, 1, df = 7 (P < 0.01); l ² = 87% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) 120 9.05% 4.90 (4.57, 5.25] Huang L, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 2.80 2.800 2.80 2.800 2.800 2.80 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 4.76, 0, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 87% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) 131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 4.76, 0, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 87% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) 131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch ² = 4.76, 0, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% Test for subgroup differences: Ch ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70) 3 4 5 6	Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.02$ Chi	2 = 44.28	df = 5 (P	< 0.01)	1 ² = 89%	4.12 [0.00,					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect: Z = NA (F	= NA)									
$ \frac{Study or}{Subgroup} \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi Test for subgroup differences: C	² = 147.60 chi ² = 4.81), df = 10 , df = 1 (F	1131 (P < 0.01 P = 0.03)	100.0% I); I ² = 93%	4.48 [4.04,	4.97]	3	4	5 6	
Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight V, Random, 95%, CI IV, Random, 95%, CI Proportion of Female Participants = > 60%, Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80	Study or			_		Mean			Mea	n	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Subgroup	Mean	SD	Iotal	weight	IV, Random, 9	5% CI	IV	, Random	, 95% CI	
Gab F, et al. 2023 (SARLU) 4.10 1.0000 36 8.7% 4.10 1.5001 1.51 1.61 Gab F, et al. 2023 (SARLU) 4.10 1.0000 36 8.7% 4.10 1.51 1.61 Total (B5% CI) 1.01 1.0000 36 8.7% 4.10 1.50 1.61 1.61 Total (B5% CI) 1.01 1.0000 36 8.7% 4.10 1.50 1.62 1.61	Proportion of Female Partic	ipants =	> 60%	208	0.6%	5 80 15 43 6	3 101				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) Gao F et al. 2023 (SAHZU)	4 10	1 6000	200	8.7%	4 10 [3 61 4	1 661			-	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Xiao Z. et al. 2023	3.12	2.3000	145	8.8%	3.12 [2.77. 3	3.521	-			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.12; Ch ² = 87.15, df = 2 (P < 0.01); l ² = 98% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Proportion of Female Participants = 40% ~ 60% Gao F; et al. 2023 (WCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 9.6% 4.30 [4.01, 4.61] Cai H, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun Q, et al. 2022 4.12 1.8344 30 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.83] Chen Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 9.4% 4.60 [4.27, 4.28] Chen Y, et al. 2023 4.50 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Huang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.1000 120 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Huang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.1000 120 9.2% 3.95 [3.59, 4.34] Total (95% Cl) 742 7.2% 4.56 [4.18, 4.57] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 47.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 67% Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) 1131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.97] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 47.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70) Study Mean AD Ctrl Std. Mean Difference Std. 11 [10, 153] Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Dif	Total (95% CI)			389	27.1%	4.21 [2.85, 6	3.22]	_			
Test for overall effect: $Z = NA (P = NA)$ Proportion of Female Participants = 40% ~ 60%, Gao F, et al. 2023 (VCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VCH) 5.80 3.0000 47 8.3% 5.80 [5.00, 6.72] Wu X, et al. 2023 (VCH) 5.80 3.0000 126 9.7% 3.97 [3.73, 4.22] Sun Q, et al. 2023 4.12 18344 30 8.1% 4.12 [3.51, 4.83] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 18.200 93 9.4% 4.60 [4.24, 4.99] Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 8.9% 5.37 [4.79, 6.02] Shang L, et al. 2023 4.90 11000 120 9.6% 4.90 [4.57, 5.25] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 9.2% 3.95 [3.59, 4.34] Total (95% CI) Test for overall effect: $Z = NA (P = NA)$ Total (95% CI) Heterogenety: Inu ² = 0.01; Ch ² = 52.01, df = 7 (P < 0.01); l ² = 67% Test for subgroup differences: Ch ² = 0.15, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 67% Test for subgroup differences: Ch ² = 0.15, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 67% Total (95% CI) Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 2.60 18000 104 20.7% 127 [101, 1.53] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAND) 5.80 2.8000 208 2.60 18000 104 20.7% 127 [101, 1.53] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 18200 93 1.92 0.7000 4.51 11.8% 1.77 [13.81, 196] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 18200 93 1.92 0.7000 4.51 11.4% 1.77 [128, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2023 4.60 18200 93 1.92 0.7000 4.51 11.4% 1.77 [128, 2.11] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.30 1.9407 159 2.07000 4.51 11.4% 1.77 [128, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.30 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.30 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.30 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.30 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.30 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57]	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.12; Chi	2 = 87.15,	df = 2 (P	< 0.01);	$^{2} = 98\%$	•					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P	= NA)									
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Proportion of Female Partic	ipants =	40% ~ 6	0%	0.00/	5 00 IE 00 (701				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Wu X et al 2021	4 30	1 9447	159	9.6%	4 30 [4 01 4	1611		-		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cai H, et al. 2023	3.97	1.3900	126	9.7%	3.97 [3.73.4	1.22]		-		
Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 9.4% 4.60 1.42.4, 4.99 Chen Y, et al. 2024 3.95 3.7 2.5000 64.8 4.90 1.47.9, 6.02 Shang L, et al. 2023 4.90 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 1.47.9, 6.02 Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 9.2% 4.90 1.47.9, 6.02 Houng L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 9.2% 4.90 1.47.6, 6.43 Total (95% Cl) T42 72.2% 4.56 (4.18, 4.37) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% 3 4 5 Test for ovalid fifterences: Chi ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70) 3 4 5 Study Mean SD Total Meight IV, Random, 95% Cl Id. Mean Difference Study Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl Id. Mean Difference Vik, et al. 2023 1.202 2.80 1.8000 1.42 1.97% 1.27 [1.01, 1.53] Gao F, et al. 2023 (CAD) 5.80 2.80 1.900% 1.57 [1.30, 1.84] Cai H, et al 2023 4.03 3.92 1.800 1.42 1.97% 1.27 [1.01, 1.53] <	Sun Q, et al. 2022	4.12	1.8344	30	8.1%	4.12 [3.51, 4	4.83]	-	-		
Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 8.9% 5.37 (4.79, 6.02) Shang L, et al. 2023 3.95 1.9000 120 9.6% 4.90 (4.57, 5.25) Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 9.2% 3.96 (3.59, 4.34) Total (95% Ct) 742 7.25% 4.56 (4.18, 4.57, 5.25) 1.9400 103 9.2% 3.96 (3.59, 4.34) Test for overall effect: Z = NA (P = NA) 742 7.2% 4.56 (4.18, 4.97) 1.96%	Guo Y, et al. 2023	4.60	1.8200	93	9.4%	4.60 [4.24, 4	1.99]		-	1	
	Chen Y, et al. 2024	5.37	2.5000	64	8.9%	5.37 [4.79, 6	5.02]		-	-	
Tutari (g 5% Ci) 742 72.9% 3.95 (5.59, 4.34) Total (g 5% Ci) 742 72.9% 4.56 [4.18, 4.57] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi ² = 52.01, df = 7 (P < 0.01); l ² = 87% 742 72.2% Total (g 5% Ci) 1131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.57] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% 3 4 Total (g 5% Ci) 1131 100.0% 4.48 [4.04, 4.57] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% 3 4 Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70) 3 4 5 Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 2.8000 208 2.800 1000 104 20.7%, 127 [101, 1.53] 58.0 MuX, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 1.57 0.7502 121 19.6%, 1.57 [130, 134] 6 Cair I, et al. 2023 4.01 1.820 93 2.24 1.0712 44 8.5%, 1.57 [130, 134] Gau C, et al. 2023 4.01 1.820 93 1.24 1.082% 1.07 [143, 156] 6 Chern Y, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.33 0.900 05 1.24 1.082% 1.07 [120, 2.01] 6 Guo Y, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.33 0.900 05 1.24 1.085 1.157] 6 Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.33 0.900 05 1.26 1.05 1.12 [126, 2.11] 6	Shang L, et al. 2023	4.90	1.9000	120	9.6%	4.90 [4.57, 5	5.25]		.		
Total (ports or) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01: Chi ² = 52.01, df = 7 (P < 0.01); l ² = 87% Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Test for overall effect Z = NA (P = NA) Total (95% Cl) Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70); l ² = 93% Test for subgroup differences: Chi ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70); l ² = 93% Study Mean Dotal Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) S.80 2.8000 208 2.60 1.8000 104 207% 1.27 [101, 1.53] Wu X, et al. 2021 4.30 194/7 159 1.87 0.7500 2 121 19.6% 1.57 [130, 1.84] Gai N = 0.203 (CANDI) Sun Qu 203 (CANDI) 5.80 0.2800 208 2.60 1.8000 104 2.07% 1.27 [101, 1.53] Wu X, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 1.93 0.7800 Sun Qu 203 (SA 1.0712 4.8 8.5% 1.18 [068, 1.69] Guu Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 1.93 0.9000 6 33 1.40% 1.70 [128, 2.11] Chen	Total (95% Ch	3.95	1.9400	103	72 0%	3.95 [3.59, 4	1 971		-		
test for overtall effect: L = Pix (P ² = NA) Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Ruf = 0.03; Chl ² = 147.60, df = 10 (P < 0.01); l ² = 93% Test for subgroup differences: Chl ² = 0.15, df = 1 (P = 0.70) Study Ctrl Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean <td colspan<="" td=""><td>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi</td><td>2 = 52.01,</td><td>df = 7 (P</td><td>< 0.01); </td><td>2 = 87%</td><td>4.00 [4.16, 4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>53</td></td>	<td>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi</td> <td>2 = 52.01,</td> <td>df = 7 (P</td> <td>< 0.01); </td> <td>2 = 87%</td> <td>4.00 [4.16, 4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>53</td>	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.01; Chi	2 = 52.01,	df = 7 (P	< 0.01);	2 = 87%	4.00 [4.16, 4				53
Study Mean SD Total Mean Ctrl Std. Mean Difference Std. Mea	rest for overall effect: Z = NA (P	- NA)									
AD Ctrl Std. Mean Std. Mean<	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Chi	² = 147.60	, df = 10	1131 (P < 0.01	100.0%); I ² = 93%	4.48 [4.04, 4	4.97]	r	-		
Study AD Neam SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD SD S	Test for subgroup differences: C	hi ² = 0.15,	, df = 1 (P	= 0.70)				3	4	5 6	
Study Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 2.800 208 2.60 1.800 104 20.7% 1.27 [1.01, 1.53] Wu X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 1.87 0.7502 121 1.96% 1.57 [1.30, 1.84] Gai H, et al. 2023 4.97 1.390 1.20 1.28 1.284 30 2.44 1.67 [1.38, 1.96] Sun O, et al. 2023 4.60 1.20 4.85% 1.18 [0.68, 1.69] 4.107 [1.24, 2.11] 4.107 [1.24, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 2.00 1.33 1.40% 1.21 [1.68, 1.57] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.33 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [1.68, 1.57]		AD)		Ctrl	Std. Me	an Difference	es	Std. Mean D	Difference	
Gao F. et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.80 2.8000 2.08 2.60 1.8000 104 20.7% 1.27 [101, 1.53] Wu X, et al. 2021 4.30 1.9447 159 1.67 0.7502 121 19.6% 1.57 [1.30, 1.84] Cai H, et al. 2023 4.97 1.3900 126 2.03 0.8666 123 18.2% 1.67 [1.38, 1.96] Sun O, et al. 2023 4.61 0.8200 9.1 1.9712 44 8.5% 1.18 [0.68, 1.69] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.61 0.8200 9.1 1.90712 43 1.4% 1.70 [1.28, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 2.00 1.1111 20 7.4% 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.39 1.4% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57]		an SE	Total M	lean	SD Total	Weight IV, Ran	dom, 95% Cl		IV, Random	n, 95% CI	
vux A, et al. 2021 4.30 1.944/ 159 1.87 (1.33), 1.84 Cai H, et al. 2023 3.97 1.3900 126 2.30 8.666 Sun O, et al. 2023 4.97 1.3900 1.82 1.82.04 1.87 (1.33), 1.96] Sun O, et al. 2023 4.61 0.8200 9.192 1.82 1.82.04 1.70 (1.28, 1.69] Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 9.192 7.800 43 1.14% 1.70 (1.28, 2.11) Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 2.001.1111 20 7.4% 1.48 [0.85, 1.67] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 1.33 0.9000 53 1.40% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57]	Study Me				104	20.7% 1.27	101 1 531			-	
Sun Q, et al. 2022 412 18544 30 2.41 10712 44 85% 140 [130, 150] Guo Y, et al. 2023 460 1820 93 152 0.7800 45 114% 1.70 [128, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.2500 64 2.00 1111 12 7.74% 146 [030, 2.03] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.33 0.9000 53 140% 1.21 [036, 157]	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5.	80 2.8000	208	2.60 1.8	000 104	40.00/ 4	4 00 4 0 4				
Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.60 1.8200 93 1.92 0.7800 43 11.4% 1.70 [1.28, 2.11] Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 2.00 1.1111 20 7.4% 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.93 0.9000 53 14.0% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57]	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5. Wu X, et al. 2021 4. Cai H et al. 2023 2.	80 2.8000 30 1.9447	208	2.60 1.8	502 121	19.6% 1.57	[1.30, 1.84]				
Chen Y et al 2024 5.37 2.5000 64 2.00 1.1111 20 7.4% 148 [093,2.03] Huang L, et al 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.83 0.9000 53 14.0% 1.21 [0.85,1.57]	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5. Wu X, et al. 2021 4. Cai H, et al. 2023 3. Sun Q. et al. 2022 4.	80 2.8000 30 1.9447 97 1.3900 12 1.8344	208 159 126 30	2.60 1.8 1.87 0.7 2.03 0.8 2.41 1.0	502 121 596 123 712 44	19.6% 1.57 18.2% 1.67 8.5% 1.18	[1.30, 1.84] [1.38, 1.96] [0.68, 1.69]				
Huang L, et al. 2024 3.95 1.9400 103 1.93 0.9000 53 14.0% 1.21 [0.85, 1.57]	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5. Wu X, et al. 2021 4. Cai H, et al. 2023 3. Sun Q, et al. 2022 4. Guo Y, et al. 2023 4.	80 2.8000 30 1.9447 97 1.3900 12 1.8344 60 1.8200	208 7 159 0 126 4 30 0 93	2.60 1.80 1.87 0.79 2.03 0.80 2.41 1.01 1.92 0.70	500 104 502 121 596 123 712 44 800 43	19.6% 1.57 18.2% 1.67 8.5% 1.18 11.4% 1.70	[1.30, 1.84] [1.38, 1.96] [0.68, 1.69] [1.28, 2.11]			-	
	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5. VWu X, et al. 2021 4. Cai H, et al. 2023 3. Sun Q, et al. 2022 4. Guo Y, et al. 2023 4. Chen Y, et al. 2024 5.	80 2.8000 30 1.9447 97 1.3900 12 1.8344 60 1.8200 37 2.5000	208 159 126 30 93 64	2.60 1.80 1.87 0.79 2.03 0.80 2.41 1.00 1.92 0.70 2.00 1.1	500 104 502 121 596 123 712 44 800 43 111 20	19.6% 1.57 18.2% 1.67 8.5% 1.18 11.4% 1.70 7.4% 1.48	[1.30, 1.84] [1.38, 1.96] [0.68, 1.69] [1.28, 2.11] [0.93, 2.03]			-	
	Study Me Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI) 5. Wu X, et al. 2021 4. Cai H, et al. 2022 4. Guo Y, et al. 2022 4. Chen Y, et al. 2023 4. Chen Y, et al. 2023 4. Chen Y, et al. 2024 4. Chen Y, et al. 2024 4.	80 2.8000 30 1.9447 97 1.3900 12 1.8344 60 1.8200 37 2.5000 95 1.9400	208 159 126 30 93 64 103	2.60 1.80 1.87 0.7 2.03 0.80 2.41 1.0 1.92 0.7 2.00 1.1 1.93 0.90	500 104 502 121 696 123 712 44 800 43 111 20 000 53	19.6% 1.57 18.2% 1.67 8.5% 1.18 11.4% 1.70 7.4% 1.48 14.0% 1.21	[1.30, 1.84] [1.38, 1.96] [0.68, 1.69] [1.28, 2.11] [0.93, 2.03] [0.85, 1.57]				

446

Figure 4. Forest plot of random effects meta-analysis of plasma p-tau181 levels in 447 MCI patients (A), age subgroups (B) and sex ratio subgroups (C). 448



Figure 5. Forest plot of random effects meta-analysis of plasma p-tau181 levels in AD 451

- and non-AD patients. 452
- 453

454 455 456

Study	Mean	AD	Total	No Mean	n-ADD SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
Gao F, et al. 2023 (CANDI)	5.80	2.8000	208	3.50	2.8000	55	20.4%	0.82 [0.51, 1.12]	
Gao F, et al. 2023 (WCH)	5.80	3.0000	47	2.90	1.0000	81	18.9%	1.46 [1.05, 1.86]	
Guo Y, et al. 2023	4.60	1.8200	93	2.08	1.1600	68	19.6%	1.59 [1.23, 1.95]	
Shang L, et al. 2023	4.90	1.9000	120	2.70	1.4000	128	20.8%	1.32 [1.05, 1.60]	
Xiao Z, et al. 2023	3.12	2.3000	145	2.22	0.8000	62	20.4%	0.45 [0.15, 0.75]	
Total (95% CI)			613			394	100.0%	1.12 [0.53, 1.71]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; C	$hi^2 = 33$	8.56, df =	4 (P <	0.01); 1	$^{2} = 88\%$				
Test for overall effect: t ₄ = 5.2	5 (P < 0	.01)							-1 0 1