

**Research** Article

# The Efficacy and Hemorheological Indexes of Ginseng and Its Active Components for Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

# Yawen Xia<sup>1</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Hongkuan Han, <sup>1</sup>Renjun Gu<sup>1</sup>, <sup>2</sup>Ruizhi Tao, <sup>1</sup>Keqin Lu, <sup>1</sup>Zhiguang Sun<sup>1</sup>, <sup>2</sup>Sanbing Shen, <sup>3</sup>Aiyun Wang<sup>1</sup>, <sup>1</sup>and Yin Lu<sup>1</sup>, <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Jiangsu Key Laboratory for Pharmacology and Safety Evaluation of Chinese Materia Medica, School of Pharmacy, Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine, Nanjing 210023, China

<sup>2</sup> Jiangsu Provincial Second Chinese Medicine Hospital, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine, Nanjing 210017, China

<sup>3</sup>Regenerative Medicine Institute, School of Medicine, University of Galway,

Biomedical Science Building BMS-1021, Dangan, Upper Newcastle, Galway, Ireland

<sup>4</sup>Jiangsu Collaborative Innovation Center of Traditional Chinese Medicine Prevention and Treatment of Tumor,

Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine, Nanjing 210023, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Yawen Xia; zhizhi0831@163.com, Aiyun Wang; wangaiyun@njucm.edu.cn, and Yin Lu; luyingreen@njucm.edu.cn

Received 30 January 2022; Revised 22 January 2023; Accepted 24 January 2023; Published 17 February 2023

Academic Editor: Yuan Seng Wu

Copyright © 2023 Yawen Xia et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background. Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is still a slightly less orphan disease after immunotherapy, and routine treatment has low efficiency and adverse events. Ginseng is commonly used in the treatment of NSCLC. The purpose of this study is to assess the efficacy and hemorheological indexes of ginseng and its active components in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Methods. A comprehensive literature search was performed in PubMed, the Cochrane Library, Medline (Ovid), the Web of Science, Embase, CKNI, Wan Fang, VIP, and SinoMed up to July 2021. Only randomized controlled trials evaluating ginseng in combination with chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone in NSCLC patients were included. Primary outcomes included patients' condition after using ginseng or its active components. Secondary outcomes included changes in immune cells, cytokines, and secretions in serum. Data were extracted by two independent individuals, and the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool version 2.0 was applied for the included studies. Systematic review and meta-analysis were performed by RevMan 5.3 software. Results. The results included 1480 cases in 17 studies. The results of the integration of clinical outcomes showed that the treatment of ginseng (or combination of ginseng with chemotherapy) can improve the quality of life for patients with NSCLC. Analysis of immune cell subtypes revealed that ginseng and its active ingredients can upregulate the percentages of antitumor immunocyte subtypes and downregulate the accounts of immunosuppressive cells. In addition, a reduction of the inflammatory level and an increase of antitumor indicators in serum were reported. Meta-analysis showed that Karnofsky score: WMD = 16, 95% CI (9.52, 22.47); quality-of-life score: WMD = 8.55, 95%CI (6.08, 11.03); lesion diameter: WMD = -0.45, 95% CI (-0.75, -0.15); weight: WMD = 4.49, 95% CI (1.18, 7.80); CD3<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 8.46, 95% CI (5.71, 11.20); CD4<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 8.45, 95% CI (6.32, 10.57)+; CD8<sup>+</sup>: WMD = -3.76, 95% CI (-6.34, -1.18); CD4<sup>+</sup>/ CD8<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 0.32, 95% CI (0.10, 0.53); MDSC: WMD = -2.88, 95% CI (-4.59, -1.17); NK: WMD = 3.67, 95% CI (2.63, 4.71); Treg: WMD = -1.42, 95% CI (-2.33, -0.51); CEA: WMD = -4.01, 95% CI (-4.12, -3.90); NSE: WMD = -4.00, 95% CI (-4.14, -3.86); IL-2: WMD = 9.45, 95% CI (8.08, 10.82); IL-4: WMD = -9.61, 95% CI (-11.16, -8.06); IL-5: WMD = -11.95, 95% CI (-13.51, -10.39); IL-6: WMD = -7.65, 95% CI (-8.70, -6.60); IL-2/IL-5: WMD = 0.51, 95% CI (0.47, 0.55); IFN-y: WMD = 15.19, 95% CI (3.16, 27.23); IFN-y/IL-4: WMD = 0.91, 95% CI (0.85, 0.97); VEGF: WMD = -59.29, 95% CI (-72.99, -45.58); TGF-α: WMD = -10.09, 95% CI (-12.24, -7.94); TGFβ: WMD = -135.62, 95% CI (-147.00, -124.24); TGF-β1: WMD = -4.22, 95% CI (-5.04, -3.41); arginase: WMD = -1.81, 95% CI (-3.57, -0.05); IgG: WMD = 1.62, 95% CI (0.18, 3.06); IgM: WMD = -0.45, 95% CI (-0.59, -0.31). All results are statistically significant. No adverse events were reported in the included articles. Conclusion. It is a reasonable choice to use ginseng and its active components as adjuvant therapy for NSCLC. Ginseng is helpful for NSCLC patients' conditions, immune cells, cytokines, and secretions in the serum.

# 1. Introduction

According to the latest data released by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IRAC) in 2020, lung cancer is one of the most common cancers with a high mortality rate. It can be divided into non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) and small cell lung cancer [1]. The former accounts for about 85% [2, 3]. NSCLC is still a slightly less orphan disease after immunotherapy [4]. Platinum-based chemotherapy after surgery is still the standard treatment for patients with resectable, nonmetastatic, non-small cell lung cancer [5]. In recent years, the advent of targeted drugs and immunotherapy has given new hope to NSCLC patients [6–8]. However, low efficiency and high costs of treatment remain huge problems.

Ginseng is a traditional Chinese herb and is the dried root and rhizome of Panax ginseng. It has been used for more than two thousand years as a traditional tonic medicine. Ginseng contains a lot of pharmacologically active ingredients, such as ginsenosides Rb1, Rb2, Rg3, ginseng polysaccharides, etc. [9], which are often used in neurasthenia [10], psychosis, cardiovascular system diseases [11], and diabetes [12]. It also widespread administrated in NSCLC treatment plans [13]. Ginseng shows the highest usage frequency (about 32.5%) among 110 commonly used traditional herbs for lung cancer [14].

It was reported that ginseng and its ingredients have tumor-killing and metastasis-preventing potentials. For example, ginsenoside Rg3 can induce DNA damage by activating the VRK1/P53BP1 pathway to reduce the occurrence of NSCLC [15], and the total extract of ginseng can activate the endoplasmic reticulum stress through the ATF4-CHOP-AKT1-mTOR axis to induce autophagic cell death [16]. In addition, ginseng and its active components are often used to enhance chemotherapy sensitivity and alleviate adverse symptoms [17, 18]. Related mechanisms may be involved in triggering apoptosis in human lung adenocarcinoma cells, promoting macrophages' transformation from type M2 to type M1, and keeping balance between Th1/ Th2 T-helper cells [18–21].

At present, some clinical trials explore the effects of ginseng. However, clinical trials found that a ginsengrelated medicine with navelbine and cisplatin chemotherapy had no significant changes on patients' 1-year survival rates [22]. The function of ginseng in non-small cell lung cancer is still uncertain. Therefore, we will conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the efficacy and hemorheological indexes of ginseng and its active components on patients with non-small cell lung cancer.

# 2. Information and Methods

2.1. Study Protocol. This systematic review and metaanalysis followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) of 2015 guideline [23]. 2.2. Search Strategy. Electronic literature searches were performed in the databases of PubMed, the Cochrane library, the Medline (Ovid), Web of Science, Embase, CKNI, Wan Fang, VIP, and SinoMed up to July 2021. Search strategy of Medline (Ovid) is as follows:

#1. exp panax/.
#2. ginseng.tw.
#3. panax.tw.
#4. or/1-3.
#5. exp small cell lung cancer/.
#6. oat cell.tw.
#7. SCLC.tw.
#8. or/5-7.
#9.4 and 8.

2.3. Inclusion Criteria. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) randomized controlled trials (RCTs); (b) inclusion of people diagnosed with non-small cell lung cancer [24]; (c) interventions using ginseng or its active components as the main treatment. The combination therapy of ginseng or its active components and other interventions compared with the same other interventions alone was also included; and (d) included studies do not have any language limits.

2.4. Exclusion Criteria. Exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) non-clinical studies (experimental and basic studies); (b) observational or retrospective studies; and (c) lack of sufficient information on baseline or primary or secondary outcome data.

2.5. Primary Outcome. Changes in patients' conditions after using ginseng or its active components, such as Karnofsky score, quality-of-life score, lesion diameter, and weight.

2.6. Secondary Outcomes

- Any changes in immune cells, such as CD3<sup>+</sup>, CD4<sup>+</sup>, CD8<sup>+</sup>, CD4<sup>+</sup>/CD8<sup>+</sup>, MDSC, NK, or Treg.
- (2) Any changes in cytokines and secretions in the serum, such as CEA, NSE, IL-2, IL-4, IL-5, IL-6, IL-2/ IL-5, IFN-γ, IFN-γ/IL-4, VEGF, TGF-α, TGF-β, TGF-β1, arginase, IgG, and IgM.

2.7. Patient and Public Involvement. Neither patients nor the public were involved in the design of this study. This systematic review and meta-analysis did not recruit any patients.

2.8. Data Collection. Data were extracted by two independent reviewers (YX; HH). We consulted a third review author (RG) when we had any disagreements. 2.9. Bias Risk Assessment. According to the risk of bias assessment tool from the Cochrane Handbook [25] for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, Version 6.0 (updated July 2019) [26], two authors independently assessed the risk of bias of the included study, and any conflicts were resolved through consensus. Bias risk assessment was evaluated using the following seven items: random sequence generation, assignment concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other biases. These items are described as green, yellow, and red colors and "+," "-," "?." The symbols indicate "low," "high," and "unclear" risk of bias.

2.10. Statistical Analysis. We followed the methods of Gu et al. [27]. The statistical analyses were performed by using Review Manager software (RevMan version 5.3, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). Weighted mean difference (WMD) and 95% CI were used as the effect quantity to merge the continuous variables included in the study.  $I^2$  statistic will be used to test for heterogeneity between trial results. The random effect model was used when  $I^2$ >50% according to the clinical heterogeneity. The statistical calculation process was completed by RevMan5.3 software [28, 29].

# 3. Results

*3.1. Literature Search.* Initial searches generated 923 related studies. According to the inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria, 29 studies were included for full-text consideration. Finally, 17 studies are included for meta-analysis. All studies are non-English studies. (See Figure 1).

*3.2. Characteristics of the Study.* 17 articles were included in the study (see Table 1).

*3.3. Risk of Bias.* The results of the risk of bias assessment of the 17 studies were summarized in Figure 2. All of them did not describe performances bias and detection bias.

#### 3.4. Changes of Patients' Condition

*3.4.1. Karnofsky Score.* Three literature included the Karnofsky Score. The combined effect was WMD = 16, 95% CI (9.52, 22.47), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 3).

3.4.2. *Quality-of-Life Score.* Two literature included the quality-of-life score. The combined effect was WMD = 8.55, 95% CI (6.08, 11.03), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 4).

3.4.3. Lesion Diameter. One literature included the lesion diameter. The combined effect was WMD = -0.45, 95% CI

(-0.75, -0.15), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 5).

3.4.4. Weight. One literature included the weight changes. The combined effect was WMD = 4.49, 95% CI (1.18, 7.80), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 6).

#### 3.5. Numbers of Immune Cells

3.5.1.  $CD3^+$ . Six literature included the numbers of  $CD3^+$  cells. The combined effect was WMD = 8.46, 95% CI (5.71, 11.20), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 7).

3.5.2.  $CD4^+$ . Six literature included the numbers of  $CD4^+$  cells. The combined effect was WMD = 8.45, 95% CI (6.32, 10.57), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 8).

3.5.3.  $CD8^+$ . Five literature included the numbers of  $CD8^+$ Cells. The combined effect was WMD = -3.76, 95% CI (-6.34, -1.18), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 9).

3.5.4.  $CD4^+/CD8^+$ . Seven literature included the ratio of  $CD4^+/CD8^+$ . The combined effect was WMD = 0.32, 95% CI (0.10, 0.53), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 10).

3.5.5. *MDSC*. One literature included the numbers of myeloid-derived suppressor cells. The combined effect was WMD = -2.88, 95% CI (-4.59, -1.17), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 11).

3.5.6. *NK*. Two literature included the numbers of natural killer cells. The combined effect was WMD = 3.67, 95% CI (2.63, 4.71), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 12).

3.5.7. Treg. One literature included the numbers of Treg cells. The combined effect was WMD = -1.42, 95% CI (-2.33, -0.51), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 13).

#### 3.6. Levels of Cytokines and Secretions in Serum

3.6.1. CEA. One literature included the level of CEA. The combined effect was WMD = -4.01, 95% CI (-4.12, -3.90), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 14).

3.6.2. NSE. One literature included the level of NSE. The combined effect was WMD = -4.00, 95% CI (-4.14, -3.86), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 15).



FIGURE 1: Flowchart of study selection.

3.6.3. *IL-2*. One literature included the level of IL-2. The combined effect was WMD = 9.45, 95% CI (8.08, 10.82), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 16).

3.6.4. *IL-4*. One literature included the level of IL-4. The combined effect was WMD = -9.61, 95% CI (-11.16, -8.06), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 17).

3.6.5. *IL-5*. One literature included the level of IL-5. The combined effect was WMD = -11.95, 95% CI (-13.51, -10.39), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 18).

3.6.6. *IL-6*. One literature included the level of IL-6. The combined effect was WMD = -7.65, 95% CI (-8.70, -6.60), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 19).

3.6.7. *IL*-2/*IL*-5. One literature included the ratio of IL-2/IL-5. The combined effect was WMD = 0.51, 95% CI (-0.47, 0.55), 95%, P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 20).

3.6.8. *IFN-* $\gamma$ . Two literature included the level of IFN- $\gamma$ . The combined effect was WMD = 15.19, 95% CI (3.16, 27.23), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 21).

3.6.9. *IFN-* $\gamma$ */IL-4*. One literature included the ratio of IFN- $\gamma$ /IL-4. The combined effect was WMD = 0.91, 95% CI (0.85, 0.97), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 22).

*3.6.10. VEGF.* Six literature included the level of VEGF. The combined effect was WMD = -59.29, 95% CI (-72.99, -45.58), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 23).

				TABLE 1: Chai	racteristics of the study.		
Author (Year)	Experience group average age	Experience group number	Control group average age	Control group number	Experience group method	Control group method	Research designs
Zhang et al. (2004) [30]		34		33	Compound ginseng polysaccharide, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy	Chemotherapy and radiotherapy	RCT
Sun et al. (2006) [31]	59.54	54	57.44	61	Shenyi capsule and NP chemotherapy	NP chemotherapy	RCT
Tu (2008) [32]		20		21	Ginsenoside Rg3, paclitaxel, and cisplatin	Paclitaxel and cisplatin	RCT
Kou et al. (2010) [33]		46		44	Ginsenoside Rg3, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Zhang et al. (2010) [34]		46		44	Ginsenoside Rg3, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Wang et al. (2011) [35]		59		58	Shenyi capsule, gemcitabine, and cisplatin or Shenyi capsule, vinorelbine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin or vinorelbine and cisplatin	RCT
Jin et al. (2011) [36]		20		20	Shenyi capsule, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Luan (2014) [37]		57		43	Shenyi capsule, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Ge et al. (2015) [38]	60.8	67	59.4	75	Ginseng polysaccharide, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Gang (2015) [39]	63.33	35	63.35	35	Ginseng and sodium cantharidinate vitamin B6	30dium cantharidinate vitamin B6	RCT
Wang (2016) [40]	67.49	75	65.67	75	Ginseng polysaccharide, pemetrexed, and cisplatin or ginseng polysaccharide, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Pemetrexed and cisplatin or gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Liang and Han (2016) [41]	67.47	47	66.32	46	Shenyi capsule, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Shi (2018) [42]	69.67	31	68.34	31	Shenyi capsule, paclitaxel, and carboplatin	Paclitaxel and carboplatin	RCT
Zhang et al. (2019) [43]	62.8	32	61.7	31	Ginseng polysaccharide, gemcitabine, and cisplatin or ginseng polysaccharide, docetaxel, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin or docetaxel and cisplatin	RCT
Jiang et al. (2019) [44]		30		30	Ginsenoside Rg3 and osimertinib	Osimertinib	RCT
Zhang et al. (2020) [45]	45.23	40	47.13	40	Shenyi capsule, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT
Liang et al. (2020) [46]	64.1	50	62.5	50	Ginseng polysaccharide, gemcitabine, and cisplatin	Gemcitabine and cisplatin	RCT









Charles and Carles and Carles	Expe	rimental			Control		Weight	Mean Difference			Mean	n Diff	erence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Raı	ndom	95% CI	
Ge, et al 2015	18.4	11.989	65	11.5	11.732	65	36.9	6.90 [2.82, 10.98]	2015					
Jiang, et al 2019	23.07	7.1633	30	13.55	4.9519	30	63.1	9.52 [6.40, 12.64]	2019				-	
Total (95% CI)			95			95	100.0	8.55 [6.08, 11.03]					•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	f = 1 (F	o < 0.32)	; $I^2 = 0\%$					20	10		10	20		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.00, df = 1 ( $P < 0.32$ ); $P = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.77$ ( $P < 0.00001$ )										-20 [e	Favour	s ntal]	Favours [control]	20

FIGURE 4: Forest plot of quality-of-life score.

Study or Subgroup	Exper	imental		С	ontrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Me	an Diffe	rence	
study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Ra	andom,	95% CI	
Luan, et al 2014	-0.99	0.7873	57	-0.54	0.7536	43	100.0	-0.45 [-0.75, -0.15]					
Total (95% CI)			57			43	100.0	-0.45 [-0.75, -0.15]			•		
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								-4	-2	0	2	4
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.90 (P = 0.004)$									[ex	Favours	tal]	Favours [control]	



Steeder on Seek marin	Exper	imental		Cor	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference			Me	an Diff	erence	
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	I Year		IV, Ra	andom	, 95% CI	
Wang, et al 2016	-1.12	10.127	75	-5.61	10.528	75	100.0	4.49 [1.18, 7.80]	2016			-	-	
Total (95% CI)			75			75	100.0	4.49 [1.18, 7.80]					•	
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable									-20	-10	0	10	20
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.66 (P = 0.008)$										Favou	ırs [experin	nental]	Favours [co	ontrol]



Study or Subgroup	Exper	imental		Co	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
Zhang, et al 2004	10.42	9.3275	34	1.6	10.285	33	12.3	8.82 [4.11, 13.53]	2004	
Kou, et al 2010	7.3	5.2307	46	-5.9	5.0478	44	17.2	13.20 [11.08, 15.32]	2010	
Ge, et al 2015	11.4	7.674	65	3.9	7.2187	65	16.5	7.50 [4.94, 10.06]	2015	
Gang, et al 2015	11.7	1.3115	35	1.8	1.5716	35	19.0	9.90 [9.22, 10.58]	2015	-
Shi, et al 2018	6.01	4.8742	31	-1.68	4.3296	31	16.9	7.69 [5.40, 9.98]	2018	
Zhang, et al 2020	-52.08	3.5742	40	-55.86	3.3146	40	18.1	3.78 [2.27, 5.29]	2020	+
Total (95% CI)			251			248	100.0	8.46 [5.71, 11.20]		•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	$^{2}$ = 10.23; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 70.22, df = 5 ( <i>P</i> < 0.00001); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> = 93%									-20 -10 0 10 20
Heterogeneity: $Iau^{2} = 10.23$ ; $Chi^{2} = 70.22$ , $df = 5$ ( $P < 0.00001$ ); $I^{2} = 93\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.04$ ( $P < 0.00001$ )										Favours Favours [experimental] [control]

FIGURE 7: Forest plot of CD3<sup>+</sup> cells.

	Exper	imental		Со	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference			Mea	an Difl	ference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Ra	andom	, 95% CI	
Zhang, et al 2004	9.62	10.379	34	2.16	12.922	33	8.4	7.46 [1.84, 13.08]	2004					-
Kou, et al 2010	10.6	5.3563	46	-3.2	4.7032	44	17.1	13.80 [11.72, 15.88]	2010				-	
Ge, et al 2015	11.7	5.866	65	4	5.6241	65	17.3	7.70 [5.72, 9.68]	2015					
Gang, et al 2015	9.6	1.0536	35	0.3	1.3077	35	20.1	9.30 [8.74, 9.86]	2015					
Shi, et al 2018	7.19	4.0721	31	0.69	2.9526	31	17.9	6.50 [4.73, 8.27]	2018					
Zhang, et al 2020	-31.09	2.7193	40	-36.81	2.6007	40	19.2	5.72 [4.55, 6.89]	2020				-	
Total (95% CI)			251			248	100.0	8.45 [6.32, 10.57]					•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	5.76; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 59.75, a	lf = 5 (	<i>P</i> < 0.00	$(001); I^2 =$	92%			г -2(	)	-10		10	20
Test for overall effect:	< 0.0000	)1)						-20	, [e:	Favours sperimenta	1]	Favou [contro	rs ol]	

FIGURE 8: Forest plot of CD4<sup>+</sup> cells.

3.6.11. TGF- $\alpha$ . One literature included the level of TGF- $\alpha$ . The combined effect was WMD = -10.09, 95% CI (-12.24, -7.94), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 24).

3.6.12. TGF- $\beta$ . One literature included the level of TGF- $\beta$ . The combined effect was WMD = -135.62, 95% CI (-147.00, -124.24), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 25).

Cturder on Sub-susses	Exper	imental		Co	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Me	an Diff	ference	
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, R	andom	, 95% CI	
Zhang, et al 2004	-1.19	10.03	34	0.53	12.084	33	11.8	-1.72 [-7.05, 3.61]	2004	-	-		
Kou, et al 2010	0.1	3.9509	46	8.2	2.8213	44	22.3	-8.10 [-9.51, -6.69]	2010 -				
Ge, et al 2015	-4.5	6.5368	65	-2	6.7639	65	20.1	-2.50 [-4.79, -0.21]	2015				
Gang, et al 2015	-2.5	1.2124	35	-0.2	1.3115	35	23.6	-2.30 [-2.89, -1.71]	2015	-	-		
Shi, et al 2018	-4.46	3.2593	31	-1.27	2.8842	31	22.1	-3.19 [-4.72, -1.66]	2018		-		
Total (95% CI)			211			208	100.0	-3.76 [-6.34, -1.18]					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	7.23; Chi <sup>2</sup> :	= 55.60, a	df = 4 (	<i>P</i> < 0.00	$001); I^2 =$	93%			-10	-5	0	5	10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.86 (P	= 0.004)	)							Favours [experiment	al]	Favours [control]	

Figure	9:	Forest	plot	of	$CD8^+$	cells.
--------	----	--------	------	----	---------	--------

Studer on Sub-moun	Exper	imental		Со	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference			Mea	n Diff	erence	
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Ra	ndom	, 95% C	
Zhang, et al 2004	0.02	0.1015	34	-0.01	0.2022	33	14.7	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]	2004			+		
Kou, et al 2010	0.4	0.2646	46	-0.5	0.2646	44	14.4	0.90 [0.79, 1.01]	2010				-	
Jin, et al 2011	0.1	0.2646	20	0	0.2646	20	13.8	0.10 [-0.06, 0.26]	2011			-	-	
Ge, et al 2015	0.38	0.2427	65	0.1	0.1735	65	14.7	0.28 [0.21, 0.35]	2015				•	
Gang, et al 2015	0.53	0.0985	35	0.01	0.1114	35	14.9	0.52 [0.47, 0.57]	2015					
Shi, et al 2018	0.26	0.3305	31	0.09	0.3799	31	13.6	0.17 [-0.01, 0.35]	2018			ŀ	-	
Zhang, et al 2020	-0.5	0.3132	40	-0.69	0.3593	40	14.0	0.19 [0.04, 0.34]	2020			-	T .	
Total (95% CI)			271			268	100.0	0.32 [0.10, 0.53]				•	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.08; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	227.54,	df = 6	( <i>P</i> < 0.00	0001); I <sup>2</sup> =	= 97%				-2	-1		1	2
Therefore the energy is the energy is the energy of the energy is the e											Favour	s ntal]	Favou [contro	rs ol]

FIGURE 10: Forest plot of the ratio of CD4<sup>+</sup>/CD8<sup>+</sup>.

Ctor have California	Exper	imental		Со	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Me	an Diff	erence		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, R	andom	, 95% CI		
Zhang, et al 2019	-7.32	3.4829	32	-4.44	3.4344	31	100.0	-2.88 [-4.59, -1.17]	2019	-	$-\top$			
Total (95% CI)			32			31	100.0	-2.88 [-4.59, -1.17]		-				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								10				-	10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.30 (P	P = 0.001	0)						-10	-5	0	5	)	10
	rect: $Z = 5.50 \ (P = 0.0010)$								Favours [	experimen	tal]	Favours	[contro	1]

FIGURE 11: Forest plot of the numbers of myeloid-derived suppressor cells.

Studer on Sub moun	Exper	imental		Co	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Me	an Diff	erence	
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, R	andom,	95% CI	
Kou, et al 2010	3.7	2.3896	46	-0.1	2.8513	44	91.2	3.80 [2.71, 4.89]	2010				
Jin, et al 2011	2.1	6.1221	20	-0.2	5.1215	20	8.8	2.30 [-1.20, 5.80]	2011		+	_	
Total (95% CI)			66			64	100.0	3.67 [2.63, 4.71]				•	
Heterogeneity: Tau2 =	= 0.00; Chi2	2 = 0.64, 0	df = 1 (	P = 0.42	); $I^2 = 0\%$	ò				1		1	
Test for overall effect.	Z = 6.91 (F	<pre>       &lt; 0.000       </pre>	01)						-20	-10	0	10	20
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.91 (P < 0.00001)$									Favo	urs [experin	nental]	Favours [c	ontrol]

FIGURE 12: Forest plot of the numbers of natural killer cells.

3.6.13. *TGF*- $\beta$ 1. Two literature included the level of TGF- $\beta$ 1. The combined effect was WMD = -4.22, 95% CI (-5.04, -3.41), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 26).

3.6.14. Arginase. One literature included the level of arginase. The combined effect was WMD = -1.81, 95% CI (-3.57, -0.05), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 27).

Studer on Sub-moun	Exper	imental		Со	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference			Mean D	oifferen	ce	
study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Rando	om, 95%	% CI	
Zhang, et al 2019	-4.13	1.9053	32	-2.71	1.7808	31	100.0	-1.42 [-2.33, -0.51]	2019		-			
Total (95% CI)			32			31	100.0	-1.42 [-2.33, -0.51]			•			
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								r					1
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.06 (1)	P = 0.002	.)						-1	0 -	5	0	5	10
										Favours [e	xperiment	al] I	avours [	control]



Chu day on Culo anoun	Exper	imental		Со	ntrol		Weight	Mean Difference		1	Mean Di	fference	
study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV,	Randor	n, 95% CI	
Luan, et al 2014	-8.01	0.2506	57	-4	0.3143	43	100.0	-4.01 [-4.12, -3.90]					
Total (95% CI)			57			43	100.0	-4.01 [-4.12, -3.90]		+			
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable												
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 68.78 (P	< 0.0000	)1)						-10	-5	0	5	10
									Favour	s [experime	ntal]	Favours [c	ontrol]



Studer on Sub moun	Expe	erimental		(	Control		Weight	Mean Differenc	e	Mean Diff	erence	
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95%	CI	IV, Random	, 95% CI	
Luan, et al 2014	-21	0.3329	57	-17	0.3617	43	100.0	-4.00 [-4.14, -3.8	6]			
Total (95% CI)			57			43	100.0	-4.00 [-4.14, -3.8	6]	. 1		
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 2	plicable Z = 56.6	4 ( <i>P</i> < 0.0	00001)						-10 Favou	-5 ( urs [experimental]	) Favours	5 10 [control]

FIGURE 15: Forest plot of the level of NSE.

	Expe	erimenta	1		Control		Weight	Mean Difference	ce	Mea	ın D	ifference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95%	CI	IV, Ra	ndo	m, 95% C	Ι	
Liang. et al 2020	34.44	3.1104	50	24.99	3.8411	50	100.0	9.45 [8.08, 10.82	2]					
<i>Total (95% CI)</i> Heterogeneity: Not a	oplicable		50			50	100.0	9.45 [8.08, 10.82	2] ⊢			•	• 	
Test for overall effect	Z = 13.5	52 (P < 0.	.00001)	)					-20 Favours	-10	0 1]	1 Favours	0 [contr	20 ol]

FIGURE 16: Forest plot of the level of IL-2.

Study or Subgroup	Expe	rimental		(	Control		Weight	Mean Differenc	e	Mean	Dif	ference	
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95	% CI	IV, Ran	dom	1, 95% CI	
Liang, et al 2020	-17.68	3.9739	50	-8.07	3.9141	50	100.0	-9.61 [-11.16, -8	3.06]				
0.									-				
Total (95% CI)			50			50	100.0	-9.61 [-11.16, -8	3.061	٠			
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable								· · · ·	1			
Test for swanell offerst.		(D < 0.0)	0001)						-20	-10	0	10	20
fest for overall effect:	L = 12.18	(P < 0.0)	0001)						-	· ·	. 11		. 11
									Favoi	ırs [experimen	tal]	Favours [co	ntrol]

FIGURE 17: Forest plot of the level of IL-4.

	Exp	erimenta	ıl		Control	l	Weight	Mean Difference			Mean I	Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	Ι	IV	, Rando	om, 95% C	I
Liang, et al 2020	-21.66	4.1834	50	-9.71	3.7477	50	100.0	-11.95 [-13.51, -10.3	9]				
Total (95% CI)			50			50	100.0	-11.95 [-13.51, -10.3	9]		•		
Heterogeneity. Not ap	plicable												⊢I
	7 150	(D 0)							-50	-25	(	) 25	50
lest for overall effect:	Z = 15.04	(P < 0.0)	)0001)						Favou	rs [exper	imenta	l] Favours	[control]
										- 1		-	

FIGURE 18: Forest plot of the level of IL-5.

Study or Subgroup	Expe	rimental			Control		Weigh	t Mean Difference		Mea	n Differe	ence	
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Tota	1 (%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Ra	ndom, 9	5% CI	
Zhang, et al 2020	0.19	1.8175	40	7.84	2.8515	40	100.0	-7.65 [-8.70, -6.60]	2020				
Total (95% CI)			40			40	100.0	-7.65 [-8.70, -6.60]		•			
Heterogeneity: Not	applical	ole											
Test for overall effe	ct: Z = 1	4.31 (P <	0.000	01)					-20	-10	0	10	20
overall ente		(1		/					Favours	s [experimen	ital] Favo	ours [conti	ol]

FIGURE 19: Forest plot of the level of IL-6.

Studer on Submann	Expe	rimental		(	Control		Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% CI
Liang, et al 2020	1.07	0.1044	50	0.56	0.1136	50	100.0	0.51 [0.47, 0.55]	
Total (95% CI)			50			50	100.0	0.51 [0.47, 0.55]	•
Heterogeneity: Not aj Test for overall effect:	plicabl Z = 23.	e .37 ( <i>P</i> < 0	.00001	)					-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 20: Forest plot of the ratio of IL-2/IL-5.

Study or Subgroup	Expe	rimental		С	ontrol		Weight	Mean Difference		Mean D	ifference	
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% (	CI IV	V, Rando	m, 95% CI	
Liang, et al 2020	41.98	4.8907	50	30.89	5.4303	50	69.1	11.09 [9.06, 13.12]				
Zhang, et al 2019	212.31	37.899	32	187.93	27.143	31	30.9	24.38 [8.14, 40.62]				
Total (95% CI)			82			81	100.0	15.19 [3.16, 27.23]	1		•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect	= 53.45; ( : Z = 2.4	$Chi^2 = 2.5$ 7 ( $P = 0.0$	53, df = 01)	1 (P =	0.11); I <sup>2</sup> =	= 61%			-100 -50 Favours [exper	0 imental]	50 Favours [	100 control]

FIGURE 21: Forest plot of the level of IFN- $\gamma$ .

Chu das on Cuch annaum	Expe	rimental		C	Control		Weigh	t Mean Difference			Mean	Diffe	rence		
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, Rano	dom,	95% C	CI	
Liang, et al 2020	1.83	0.1587	50	0.92	0.1277	50	100.0	0.91 [0.85, 0.97]	2020	)					
Total (95% CI)			50			50	100.0	0.91 [0.85, 0.97]					١		
Heterogeneity: Not a	upplicabl	e								$\rightarrow$					
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 31	.59 (P < 0	0.00001	)						-4	-2	0		2	4
									]	Favours	ental]	Favo	urs [c	ontrol]	

FIGURE	22:	Forest	plot	of the	ratio	of I	$FN-\nu/IL-4$
TIGORE	44.	1 01050	pior	or the	ratio	01 1.	11, 1,11, 1.

Study or Subgroup	Exper	rimental		0	Control		Weigh	t Mean Difference			М	ean Di	fference	
study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year		IV, I	Rando	m, 95% CI	
Tu, et al 2008	-60.43	73.44	21	-33.5	86.253	20	6.1	-26.93 [-76.08, 22.22]	2008					
Zhang, et al 2010	-69.8	75.712	46	-18.8	74.218	44	11.7	-51.00 [-81.98, -20.02]	2010	_		-		
Jin, et al 2011	-19.3	73.818	20	-13.9	75.763	20	6.7	-5.40 [-51.76, 40.96]	2011					
Wang, et al 2011	-106.8	21.108	59	-50.5	26.626	58	26.0	-56.30 [-65.02, -47.58]	2011					
Liang, et al 2016	-110.3	24.635	47	-41.58	21.043	46	25.6	-68.72 [-78.02, -59.42]	2016	-	-			
Shi, et al 2018	-88.9	23.107	31	-8.89	24.896	31	23.8	-80.01 [-91.97, 68.05]	2018	-	-			
Total (95% CI)			224			219	100.0	-59.29 [-72.99, -45.58]			•			
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup>	= 168.15:	$Chi^2 = 1$	9.86. d	f = 5 (P)	= 0.001)	$: I^2 = 75$	%		1					
Test for overall effect	z = 8.48	P < 0.0	0001)	(-	,				-1	00	-50	0	50	100
			,						Fa	vours	[experim	ental]	Favours	[control]

FIGURE 23: Forest plot of the level of VEGF.

Charles and Carles and	Expe	rimenta	al		Control		Weigh	t Mean Difference		Me	an Dif	ference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	Ι	IV, Ra	ndom	, 95% C	Ι
Tu, et al 2008	-12.2	5.203	47	-2.11	5.3785	46	100	-10.09 [-12.24, -7.94	]				
Total (95% CI)			47			46	100	-10.09 [-12.24, -7.94	]	•			
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
Test for overall effect:	- Z = 9.91	(P < 0.0)	)0001)						-20	-10	0	10	20
	(P < 0.0001)  Favours [experimental] Favours [control]												[control]

FIGURE 24: Forest plot of the level of TGF- $\alpha$ .

Study or Subgroup	Experi	Experimental			ontrol	Weight		Mean Differen	Mean Difference		Mean Difference			
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Fixed, 95%	CI	IV, Fix	æd,	95% CI		
Zhang, et al 2019	-156.4	23.298	32	-20.78	22.779	31	100.0	-135.62 [-147.00, -1	24.24]					
Total (95% CI)			32			31	100.0	-135.62 [-147.00, -1	24.24]					
Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effec	applicable t: Z = 23.3	e 36 ( <i>P</i> < 0	.00001	)					-100	-50	0	50	100	
									Favours [e	experimental]		Favours [con	ntrol]	

FIGURE 25: Forest plot of the level of TGF- $\beta$ .

3.6.15. *IgG*. One literature included the level of IgG. The combined effect was WMD = 1.62, 95% CI (0.18, 3.06), P < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 28).

3.6.16. *IgM*. One literature included the level of IgM. The combined effect was WMD = -0.45, 95% CI (-0.59, -0.31), *P* < 0.05. The data were statistically significant (see Figure 29).

## 4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of Main Findings. Ginseng, as the representative of traditional Chinese medicine for tonifying qi, is a complementary and alternative medicine approved by the National Institutes of Health of the United States. The anticancer function of ginseng has been increasingly recognized in clinical practice, and the underlying mechanism could be related to the regulation of body immunity. Nevertheless, the evidence supporting its efficacy and safety is still insufficient. This study includes 1480 cases in 17 RCT studies. All the studies use ginseng in combination with chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone in NSCLC patients. Most of the studies have a low risk of bias, while all of them do not mention performance bias and detection bias. The results of the integration of clinical outcomes showed that the treatment of ginseng (or combination of ginseng with chemotherapy) can improve the quality of life of patients with NSCLC and promote an antitumor response. In addition, a reduction of the inflammatory level and an increase of antitumor indicators in serum were also reported. The meta-analysis result shows the following: Karnofsky score: WMD = 16, 95% CI (9.52, 22.47); quality-of-life score: WMD = 8.55, 95%CI (6.08, 11.03); lesion diameter: WMD = -0.45, 95% CI (-0.75, -0.15); weight: WMD = 4.49, 95% CI (1.18, 7.80); CD3<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 8.46, 95% CI (5.71, 11.20); CD4<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 8.45, 95% CI (6.32, 10.57); CD8<sup>+</sup>: WMD = -3.76, 95% CI (-6.34, -1.18); CD4<sup>+</sup>/CD8<sup>+</sup>: WMD = 0.32, 95% CI (0.10, 0.53); MDSC: WMD = -2.88, 95% CI (-4.59, -1.17); NK: WMD = 3.67, 95% CI (2.63, 4.71); Treg: WMD = -1.42, 95% CI (-2.33, -0.51); CEA: WMD = -4.01, 95% CI (-4.12, -3.90); NSE: WMD = -4.00, 95% CI (-4.14, -3.86); IL-2: WMD = 9.45, 95% CI (8.08, 10.82); IL-4: WMD = -9.61, 95% CI (-11.16, -8.06); IL-5: WMD = -11.95, 95% CI (-13.51, -10.39); IL-6: WMD = -7.65, 95% CI (-8.70, -6.60); IL-2/IL-5: WMD = 0.51, 95% CI (0.47, 0.55); IFN-*y*: WMD15.19, 95% CI (3.16, 27.23); IFN-γ/IL-4: WMD = 0.91, 95% CI (0.85, 0.97); VEGF: WMD = -59.29, 95% CI (-72.99, -45.58); TGF- $\alpha$ : WMD = -10.09, 95% CI (-12.24, -7.94); TGF- $\beta$ : WMD = -135.62, 95% CI (-147.00, -124.24); TGF- $\beta$ 1:

WMD = -4.22, 95% CI (-5.04, -3.41); arginase: WMD = -1.81, 95% CI (-3.57, -0.05); IgG: WMD = 1.62, 95% CI (0.18, 3.06); IgM: WMD = -0.45, 95% CI (-0.59, -0.31). All results are statistically significant. No adverse events were reported in the included articles.

4.2. Applicability of the Current Evidence. Lesion diameter is the most favorable evidence to explain the effect of drug treatment. According to the results, ginseng can remarkably reduce the lesion volume of NSCLC patients, suggesting the feasibility of ginseng as an adjuvant therapy for cancer. The Karnofsky score is a kind of standard to describe the body's function and tolerance to the treatment. A higher score indicates better physical function and higher tolerance. Among the results of our systematic review and metaanalysis, ginseng and its active components significantly improved the Karnofsky score. Additionally, the qualityof-life score and weight, which represent the quality of life of patients, were increased by ginseng. These data revealed the advantages of ginseng compared with chemotherapy drugs.

T cells and NK cells are the main killer immune cells for the body to resist virus infection and tumorigenesis. In a large number of experimental studies, the antitumor immune response of T cells and NK cells is emphasized [47-50]. Myeloid-derived suppressor cells and Treg cells are often associated with immunosuppression. For example, myeloid-derived suppressor cells can secrete arginase to inhibit the antitumor activity of immune cells and secrete TGF- $\beta$  to promote tumor growth [51, 52], as a result, it promotes the development of tumors and leads to the deterioration of patients' tumors. In addition, studies have shown that VEGF, TGF- $\alpha$ , and TGF- $\beta$ 1 play an important role in promoting tumor angiogenesis and tumor growth [53-55]. Although the use of chemotherapeutic drugs has a significant effect on inhibiting tumor growth, it will cause a sharp decrease in the patient's immune cells and affect the patient's immune function. Ginseng has the ability to regulate immunity. Through the above analysis, we find that the combined use of ginseng and chemotherapy increases the number of CD3<sup>+</sup>, CD4<sup>+</sup>T cells, and NK cells in NSCLC patients. It also increases the ratio of CD4<sup>+</sup>/CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells and increases serum immunoglobulin IgG, reduces the number of myeloid-derived inhibitory cells and regulatory T cells, and decreases serum arginase, TGF- $\beta$ , VEGF, TGF- $\alpha$ , and TGF- $\beta$ 1 levels. The increase of CEA and NSE in serum is usually used for the clinical diagnosis of non-small cell lung cancer, and the increase in CEA level is often closely related to the metastasis and infiltration of non-small cell lung cancer [56].



FIGURE 26: Forest plot of the level of TGF- $\beta$ 1.

	Experimental				Control		Weight	Mean Difference	2	Mean	lean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95%	CI	IV, Rando	m, 95% CI		
Zhang, et al 2019	-8.52	3.82	32	-6.73	3.3035	31	100.0	-1.81 [-3.57, -0.05	5]				
<i>Total (95% CI)</i> Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	pplicable :: Z = 2.01	1 (P = 0	<i>32</i> 0.04)			31	100.0	-1.81 [-3.57, -0.05	5] −10 Favours	-5 ( [experimental]	) 5 Favours [co	10 ntrol]	

FIGURE 27: Forest plot of the level of arginase.

	Experimental			(	Control		Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	CI IV, Random, 95% CI
Zhang, et al 2004	1.92	3.0141	34	0.3	2.9818	33	100.0	1.62 [0.18, 3.06]	
<i>Total (95% CI)</i> Heterogeneity: Not a	pplicable		34			33	100.0	1.62 [0.18, 3.06]	
Test for overall effect	: Z = 2.21	(P = 0.0)	3)						-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 28: Forest plot of the level of IgG.

	Expe	rimental		(	Control		Weight	Mean Difference		Mean Difference					
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	I	IV	/, Rano	lom,	95% C	Ι	
Zhang, et al 2004	0.03	0.3381	34	0.48	0.2307	33	100.0	-0.45 [-0.59, -0.31]							
Total (95% CI)			34			33	100.0	-0.45 [-0.59, -0.31]			•				
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.38 (P < 0.0001)$								F	-2 -2 Favours [	2 experi	+ -1 imenta	0 1] Fa	1 vours	2 contro	ol]



In our research, we find that the levels of CEA and NSE in the serum were significantly reduced after using ginseng and its active components. Th1 and Th2, the two types of CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells, have diametrically opposite roles in tumors. The Th1 phenotype can secrete IFN- $\gamma$ , IL-2, and other factors to fight tumors, but IL-4 and IL-5 secreted by the Th2 phenotype have tumorpromoting effects. Therefore, the occurrence of tumors often leads to Th1/Th2 immune imbalance [57-59]. Our analysis shows that after adjuvant chemotherapy with ginseng and its active components, patients' IFN-y and IL-2 are both increasing while IL-4 and IL-5 are decreasing. Using IFN-y/IL-4 and IL2/IL-5 as indicators of Th1/Th2 balance, it is found that the treatment of ginseng and its active components can help restore the Th1/Th2 phenotype. Most literature shows that inflammation tends to promote the progression of cancer [60, 61]. One study has found that IL-6, as a proinflammatory factor, can promote cancer metastasis [62]. We also found that the level of IL-6 decreased after using ginseng and its active components, which indicates that ginseng and its active components are helpful for antitumor treatment. It was recently reported that the underlying mechanism may involve the

inhibition of STAT3/PD-L1 and the activation of miR193a-5p [13]. Therefore, we consider that ginseng and its active components are helpful for NSCLC patients' conditions, immune cells, cytokines, and secretions in serum.

4.3. Limitations of This Review. This study has several limitations. First, the quality of the included RCTs is generally common according to Cochrane's risks of bias tool. Most studies did not mention the performance bias and detection bias. Second, the types of chemotherapy combined with ginseng are different. Due to the lack of relevant literature, subgroup analysis was not carried out. Third, our analysis was based on 17 RCTs, and most of them had a relatively small sample size (n < 100). In addition, ginseng is a traditional Chinese medicine, which is widely used in China. All 17 included trials were written in Chinese, and none of the included trials mentioned adverse events. Last but not least, the follow-up periods of most studies are too short to observe the survival rate. We cannot assess the long-term function of ginseng and its active components. Therefore, well-conducted RCTs are urgently needed to evaluate the efficacy and hemorheological indexes of ginseng and its active components on non-small cell lung cancer.

#### 5. Conclusion

It is a reasonable choice to use ginseng and its active components as adjuvant therapy for NSCLC. Ginseng is helpful for NSCLC patients' conditions, immune cells, cytokines, and secretions in the serum. There is still a need for increasing RCTs about changes in patients' conditions, numbers of immune cells, and levels of cytokines and secretions in serum to address whether ginseng and its active components are effective on NSCLC.

# Abbreviations

NSCLC:	Non-small cell lung cancer
RCTs:	Randomized controlled trials
CD3 <sup>+</sup> :	CD3 <sup>+</sup> pan T cells
CD4+:	CD4 <sup>+</sup> pan T cells
$CD8^+$ :	CD8 <sup>+</sup> pan T cells
MDSC:	Myeloid-derived suppressor cells
NK:	Nature killer cells
Treg:	Regulatory T cells
CEĂ:	Carcinoembryonic antigen
NSE:	Neuron-specific enolase
IL-2:	Interleukin-2
IL-4:	Interleukin-4
IL-5:	Interleukin-5
IL-6:	Interleukin-6
IFN-γ:	Interferon- <i>y</i>
VEGF:	Vascular endothelial growth factor
TGF-α:	Transforming growth factor- $\alpha$
TGF-β:	Transforming growth factor- $\beta$
TGF- $\beta$ 1:	Transforming growth factor- $\beta$ 1
IgG:	Immunoglobulin G
IgM:	Immunoglobulin M.

# **Data Availability**

No primary data in this article.

# **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

# **Authors' Contributions**

Yawen Xia, Yin Lu, and Zhiguang Sun conceived and designed the analysis; Yawen Xia and Hongkuan Han completed the data retrieval; Yawen Xia, Renjun Gu, Hongkuan Han, Aiyun Wang, Ruizhi Tao, and Keqin Lu analyzed the data; Yawen Xia, Renjun Gu, and Hongkuan Han wrote the paper; and Renjun Gu. Aiyun Wang, Sanbing Shen revised the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

# Acknowledgments

This project was supported in part by the Jiangsu Province Traditional Chinese Medicine Leading Talents Program (grant no. SLJ0229), an Open Project of Chinese Materia Medica First-Class Discipline of the Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine (grant no. 2020YLXK20), the Science and Technology Development Foundation of the Nanjing Medical University (grant no. NMUB2019186), and the Jiangsu College Graduate Research and Innovation Projects (grant no. KYCX21\_1747).

## **Supplementary Materials**

PRISMA 2009 Checklist. (Supplementary Materials)

#### References

- J. Ferlay, M. Colombet, I. Soerjomataram et al., "Cancer statistics for the year 2020: an overview," *International Journal* of *Cancer*, vol. 149, no. 4, pp. 778–789, 2021.
- [2] J. R. Molina, P. Yang, S. D. Cassivi, S. E. Schild, and A. A. Adjei, "Non-small cell lung cancer: epidemiology, risk factors, treatment, and survivorship," *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, vol. 83, no. 5, pp. 584–594, 2008.
- [3] T. Sher, G. K. Dy, and A. A. Adjei, "Small cell lung cancer," *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 355–367, 2008.
- [4] J. Remon, M. Aldea, B. Besse et al., "Small cell lung cancer: a slightly less orphan disease after immunotherapy," *Annals of Oncology*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 698–709, 2021.
- [5] J. P. Pignon, H. Tribodet, G. V. Scagliotti et al., "Lung adjuvant cisplatin evaluation: a pooled analysis by the LACE Collaborative Group," *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, vol. 26, no. 21, pp. 3552–3559, 2008.
- [6] M. G. Kris, B. E. Johnson, L. D. Berry et al., "Using multiplexed assays of oncogenic drivers in lung cancers to select targeted drugs," *JAMA*, vol. 311, no. 19, pp. 1998–2006, 2014.
- [7] J. Brahmer, K. L. Reckamp, P. Baas et al., "Nivolumab versus docetaxel in advanced squamous-cell non-small-cell lung cancer," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 373, no. 2, pp. 123–135, 2015.
- [8] H. Borghaei, L. Paz-Ares, L. Horn et al., "Nivolumab versus docetaxel in advanced nonsquamous non-small-cell lung cancer," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 373, no. 17, pp. 1627–1639, 2015.
- [9] J. S. Kim, Y. Kim, S. H. Han et al., "Development and validation of an LC-MS/MS method for determination of compound K in human plasma and clinical application," *Journal of Ginseng Research*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 135–141, 2013.
- [10] Y. Li, W. Liang, C. Guo et al., "Renshen Shouwu extract enhances neurogenesis and angiogenesis via inhibition of TLR4/NF-κB/NLRP3 signaling pathway following ischemic stroke in rats," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, vol. 253, Article ID 112616, 2020.
- [11] J. M. Lü, Q. Yao, and C. Chen, "Ginseng compounds: an update on their molecular mechanisms and medical applications," *Current Vascular Pharmacology*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 293–302, 2009.
- [12] W. Chen, P. Balan, and D. G. Popovich, "Review of ginseng anti-diabetic studies," *Molecules*, vol. 24, no. 24, Article ID 24244501, 2019.
- [13] J. Huang, D. Liu, Y. Wang et al., "Ginseng polysaccharides alter the gut microbiota and kynurenine/tryptophan ratio, potentiating the antitumour effect of antiprogrammed cell death 1/programmed cell death ligand 1 (anti-PD-1/PD-L1) immunotherapy," *Gut*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 734–745, 2022.

- [14] C. Zhao, J. Li, and T. Wu, "Exploring the law of traditional Chinese medicine in the treatment of lung cancer based on data mining," *Journal of Tianjin University of traditional Chinese medicine*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 513–519, 2020.
- [15] T. Liu, L. Zuo, D. Guo et al., "Ginsenoside Rg3 regulates DNA damage in non-small cell lung cancer cells by activating VRK1/P53BP1 pathway," *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, vol. 120, Article ID 109483, 2019.
- [16] M. Zhao, Q. Chen, W. Xu et al., "Total ginsenosides extract induce autophagic cell death in NSCLC cells through activation of endoplasmic reticulum stress," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, vol. 243, Article ID 112093, 2019.
- [17] S. L. Jiang, H. J. Liu, Z. C. Liu et al., "Adjuvant effects of fermented red ginseng extract on advanced non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with chemotherapy," *Chinese Journal of Integrative Medicine*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 331–337, 2017.
- [18] J. Ma, H. Liu, and X. Wang, "Effect of ginseng polysaccharides and dendritic cells on the balance of Th1/Th2 T helper cells in patients with non-small cell lung cancer," *Journal of Traditional Chinese Medicine*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 641–645, 2014.
- [19] H. Li, N. Huang, W. Zhu et al., "Modulation the crosstalk between tumor-associated macrophages and non-small cell lung cancer to inhibit tumor migration and invasion by ginsenoside Rh2," *BMC Cancer*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 579, 2018.
- [20] H. Xiao, Q. Xue, Q. Zhang et al., "How ginsenosides trigger apoptosis in human lung adenocarcinoma cells," *American Journal of Chinese Medicine*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1737–1754, 2019.
- [21] S. Lev-Ari, A. N. Starr, A. Vexler et al., "Rh2-enriched Korean ginseng (Ginseng Rh2+) inhibits tumor growth and development of metastasis of non-small cell lung cancer," *Food & Function*, vol. 12, no. 17, pp. 8068–8077, 2021.
- [22] Y. Z. Chen, Z. D. Li, F. Gao, Y. Zhang, H. Sun, and P. P. Li, "Effects of combined Chinese drugs and chemotherapy in treating advanced non-small cell lung cancer," *Chinese Journal of Integrative Medicine*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 415–419, 2009.
- [23] L Shamseer, D Moher, M Clarke et al., "Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation," *BMJ*, vol. 354, p. 4086, 2016.
- [24] A. A. Thai, B. J. Solomon, L. V. Sequist, J. F. Gainor, and R. S. Heist, "Lung cancer," *Lancet*, vol. 6736, no. 21, pp. 312-313, 2021.
- [25] J. P. T. Higgins, D. G. Altman, P. C. Gøtzsche et al., "The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials," *BMJ*, vol. 343, no. 2, p. 5928, 2011.
- [26] R. Gu, H. Chen, A. Adhikari et al., "Vitamin A for preventing acute lower respiratory tract infections in children up to seven years of age," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, vol. 4, Article ID 14847, 2021.
- [27] R. Gu, Y. Gao, C. Zhang, X. Liu, and Z. Sun, "Effect of tai chi on cognitive function among older adults with cognitive impairment: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Evidence-based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, vol. 2021, Article ID 6679153, 9 pages, 2021.
- [28] G. Renjun, L. Ziyun, Y. Xiwu et al., "Psychological intervention on COVID-19: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis," *Medicine (Baltimore)*, vol. 99, no. 21, Article ID 20335, 2020.
- [29] R. Gu, S. Xu, Z. Li, Y. Gu, and Z. Sun, "The safety and effectiveness of rehabilitation exercises on COVID-19 patients:

a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis," *Medicine* (*Baltimore*), vol. 99, no. 31, Article ID 21373, 2020.

- [30] L. Zhang, X. Liu, J. Chen, and P. He, "Effect of ginseng polysaccharide compound on immunological function and quality of life in elderly patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer," *Chinese Journal of Clinical Rehabilitation*, vol. 5, pp. 916-917, 2004.
- [31] Y. Sun, H. Lin, Y. Zhu et al., "A randomized, prospective, multi-centre clinical trial of NP regimen (vinorelbine + cisplatin) plus Ginseng Rg3 in the treatment of advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer patients," *Chinese Journal of Lung Cancer*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 254–258, 2006.
- [32] H. Tu, Clinical Effect and Influence of Serum Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor on Ginsenoside Rg3 Plus Chemotherapy in Non-small Cell Lung Cancer Patients, Fujian University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Fu Zhou Shi, China, 2008.
- [33] X. Kou, Q. Zhang, X. Li, C. Jin, and X. Zhang, "Influences of ginsenoside Rg3 on immune function and fatigue of the postoperative patients with non-small cell lung cancer," *National Medical Frontiers of China*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 54-55, 2010.
- [34] Q. Zhang, X. Kou, X. Tian, X. Li, C. Jin, and X. Zhang, "Influences and mechanism on ginsenoside Rg3 to prolong survival time of the patients who accepted the operation," *National Medical Frontiers of China*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 42-43, 2010.
- [35] Y. Wang, J. Liu, H. Zhao, M. Yang, L. Xin, and L. Liu, "Clinical efficacy of ginsenoside Rg3 combined with chemotherapy treatment on non-small-cell Lung cancer," *Practical Oncology Journal*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 33–35, 2011.
- [36] C. Jin, X. Kou, and M. Zhanhui, "Observation of ginsenoside Rg3 combined with chemotherapy as adjuvant treatment for elder non-small-cell lung cancer patients," *Journal of Xinxiang Medical College*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 229–232, 2011.
- [37] Z. Luan, Clinical Study on the Efficacy of Ginsenoside Combined with GP Chemotherapy in Treatment of Advanced Nonsmall Cell Lung cancer, Shandong University, Jinan, China, 2014.
- [38] M. Ge, M. Yu, and X. Cao, "Study on the effectiveness and safety of ginseng polysaccharide adjuvant GP chemotherapy in the treatment of non small cell lung cancer," *Chinese Journal of Biochemical Pharmaceutics*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 132–134, 2015.
- [39] X. Gang, Study on Chinese Medicine Granule of Ginseng on post-operative Non-small Cell Lung Cancer (Lung and Spleen Two Deficiency) of T Lymphocyte Subsets of Patients, Changchun University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Changchun, China, 2015.
- [40] B. Wang, "The effect of ginseng polysaccharides on the quality of life and survival time of patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer," *Guide of China Medicine*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 179-180, 2016.
- [41] J. Liang and X. Han, "Effect of ginsenoside Rg3 combined with chemotherapy on serum VEGF, TGF-β1 and TGF-α in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer," *Journal of Clinical Pulmonary Medicine*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 1675–1678, 2016.
- [42] Z. Shi, "The effect of ginsenoside Rg3 capsule on serum TGFβ1, VEGF and immune function in patients with non-small cell lung cancer," *Heilongjiang Medicine and Pharmacy*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 186–189, 2018.
- [43] X. Zhang, S. Yu, and S. Wu, "Effect of ginseng polysaccharide on chemotherapy efficacy and MDSCs, Treg cell and Immune

factors in patients with advanced lung cancer," *Chinese Journal of General Practice*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp. 1308–1311, 2019.

- [44] G. Jiang, Q. Tan, L. Chun et al., "Clinical efficacy and safety of Ginsenoside Rg3 combined with Osimertinib in treatment of the first generation EGFR-TKI-resistant advanced non-small cell lung cancer," *Journal of New Medicine*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 505–509, 2019.
- [45] Y. Zhang, D. Liao, C. Liu, and T. Wen, "Analysis of the effects of Shenyi Capsule on patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer based on gemcitabine combined with cisplatin chemotherapy," *Journal of Basic Chinese Medicine*, vol. 26, no. 11, pp. 1649–1653, 2020.
- [46] G. Liang, S. Qiu, Y. Luo, B. Wang, and G. Zhao, "The effect of ginseng polysaccharide injection on the quality of life and Th1/Th2 of patients with non-small cell lung cancer," *Modern Journal of Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine*, vol. 29, no. 27, pp. 3054–3057, 2020.
- [47] I. Yoshino, T. Yano, M. Murata et al., "Tumor-reactiveT-cells accumulate in lung cancer tissues but fail to respond due to tumor cell-derived factor," *Cancer Research*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 775–781, 1992.
- [48] N. C. Behforouz, J. Cerny, and D. D. Eardley, "Activation of T cells in tumor-bearing mice," *Cellular Immunology*, vol. 79, no. 1, pp. 93–109, 1983.
- [49] J. A. Titus, M. A. Garrido, T. T. Hecht, D. F. Winkler, J. R. Wunderlich, and D. M. Segal, "Human T cells targeted with anti-T3cross-linked to antitumor antibody prevent tumor growth in nude mice," *The Journal of Immunology*, vol. 138, no. 11, pp. 4018–4022, 1987.
- [50] J. E. Talmadge, K. M. Meyers, D. J. Prieur, and J. R. Starkey, "Role of NK cells in tumour growth and metastasis in beige mice," *Nature*, vol. 284, no. 5757, pp. 622–624, 1980.
- [51] D. Wang, G. An, S. Xie, Y. Yao, and G. Feng, "The clinical and prognostic significance of CD14(+)HLA-DR(-/low) myeloidderived suppressor cells in hepatocellular carcinoma patients receiving radiotherapy," *Tumor Biology*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 10427–10433, 2016.
- [52] X. Chen, L. Wang, P. Li et al., "Dual TGF-β and PD-1 blockade synergistically enhances MAGE-A3-specific CD8+ T cell response in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma," *International Journal of Cancer*, vol. 143, no. 10, pp. 2561– 2574, 2018.
- [53] E. C. Connolly, J. Freimuth, and R. J. Akhurst, "Complexities of TGF-β targeted cancer therapy," *International Journal of Biological Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 964–978, 2012.
- [54] K. Krieglstein, K. Miyazono, P. ten Dijke, and K. Unsicker, "TGF-β in aging and disease," *Cell and Tissue Research*, vol. 347, no. 1, pp. 5–9, 2012.
- [55] X. H. Wu, C. Qian, and K. Yuan, "Correlations of hypoxiainduciblefactor-1α/hypoxia-induciblefactor-2α expression with angiogenesis factors expression and prognosis in nonsmall cell lung cancer," *Chinese Medical Journal*, vol. 124, no. 1, pp. 11–18, 2011.
- [56] S. M. Kim, S. Y. Lee, J. S. Cho et al., "Combination of ginsenoside Rg3 with docetaxel enhances the susceptibility of prostate cancer cells via inhibition of NF-κB," *European Journal of Pharmacology*, vol. 631, no. 3, pp. 1–9, 2010.
- [57] J. Gao, R. Cao, and H. Mu, "Long non-coding RNA UCA1 may be a novel diagnostic and predictive biomarker in plasma for early gastric cancer," *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Pathology*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 12936–12942, 2015.
- [58] F. Wang, J. Zhou, X. Xie et al., "Involvement of SRPK1 in cisplatin resistance related to long non-coding RNA UCA1 in

human ovarian cancer cells," Neoplasma, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 432-438, 2015.

- [59] P. Chen, D. Wan, D. Zheng, Q. Zheng, F. Wu, and Q. Zhi, "Long non-coding RNA UCA1 promotes the tumorigenesis in pancreatic cancer," *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, vol. 83, pp. 1220–1226, 2016.
- [60] M. Suarez-Carmona, J. Lesage, D. Cataldo, and C. Gilles, "EMT and inflammation: inseparable actors of cancer progression," *Mol Oncol*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 805–823, 2017.
- [61] J. Liu, P. C. Lin, and B. P. Zhou, "Inflammation fuels tumor progress and metastasis," *Current Pharmaceutical Design*, vol. 21, no. 21, pp. 3032–3040, 2015.
- [62] G. S. Shang, L. Liu, and Y. W. Qin, "IL-6 and TNF-α promote metastasis of lung cancer by inducing epithelial-mesenchymal transition," *Oncology Letters*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 4657–4660, 2017.