

(A)

**Review Manager 5.4.1**  
File Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help

Shugan Jiyeu Capsules for Insomnia

**Data and analyses**  
1 Shugan Jiyeu Capsules for Insomnia

**New Study Data Wizard**  
Which studies do you want to add data for?

Included Studies:  
Huang Wei 2018  
Li Xiaobo 2019  
Lu Feng 2021  
Lv Xin 2016  
Xu Xiquan 2021  
Already used studies:  
Bao Shaohua 2020  
Chen Jia 2017  
Gao Chao 2018  
Guo Caohong 2020

Filter by:  
Year range: to  
Outcome text:  
Bias:

Tip: hold down Ctrl/Command or Shift to select multiple items

Outcome or Subgroup	Events	Total	Weight	Effect Estimate
1.1 Total clinical efficiency	4	192		Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)
1.2 Adverse reactions	8	677		Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)
1.3 PSQI overall score	8	717		Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)
1.4 Sleep time	8	734		Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)
1.5 Sleep duration				
1.6 Night awakening				
1.7 Nightmares with excess				
1.8 Daytime sleepiness				
1.9 Low energy				
1.10 Sleep quality				
1.11 Adverse reactions				
1.12 Adverse reactions				
1.13 PSQI overall score				

Status: No connection, Version: No connection

(B)

**Review Manager 5.4.1**  
File Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help

Shugan Jiyeu Capsules for Insomnia

Comparison: 1 Shugan Jiyeu Capsules for Insomnia, Outcome: 1.1 Total clinical efficiency

Study or Subgroup	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	M-H, F
Bao Shaohua 2020	55	60	46	60	22.1%	3.1
Chen Jia 2017	48	50	38	50	8.7%	7.5
Gao Chao 2018	57	60	38	60	10.9%	11.0
Guo Caohong 2020	51	52	44	52	4.9%	9.2

**Forest plot**

Study or Subgroup	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Bao Shaohua 2020	55	60	46	60	22.1%	3.35 [1.12, 9.99]	
Chen Jia 2017	48	50	38	50	8.7%	7.58 [1.80, 35.93]	
Gao Chao 2018	57	60	38	60	10.9%	11.80 [0.08, 39.33]	
Guo Caohong 2020	51	52	44	52	4.9%	9.27 [1.12, 77.07]	
Wang Jing 2015	28	36	14	36	17.9%	5.50 [1.98, 15.45]	
Wen King 2020	50	51	40	51	4.5%	13.75 [1.70, 111.08]	
Xiao Jun 2017	49	50	40	50	4.6%	12.25 [1.50, 99.98]	
Xie Na 2017	41	45	33	45	16.9%	3.73 [1.10, 12.64]	
Zhang Meixia 2016	27	29	24	29	9.5%	2.81 [0.50, 15.88]	
Total (95% CI)		433	433	100.0%		6.12 [3.85, 9.73]	
Total events	406		317				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.85, df = 8 (P = 0.79), I <sup>2</sup> = 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.85 (P < 0.00001)							

0.002 0.1 1 10 500  
Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Status: No connection, Version: No connection

