



Systematic Review The Efficacy of *Panax ginseng* for the Treatment of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Preclinical Studies

Keungmo Yang ^{1,†}, Hee-Hoon Kim ^{2,†}, Young-Ri Shim ² and Myeong Jun Song ^{1,*}

- ¹ Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, College of Medicine, The Catholic University of Korea, Seoul 06591, Republic of Korea
- ² Life Science Research Institute, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon 34141, Republic of Korea
- Correspondence: mjsong95@catholic.ac.kr
- + These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract: Although tremendous research has reported the protective effects of natural compounds in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), there is still no approved drug. This study aimed to examine the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD in preclinical studies. A total of 41 studies were identified by searching the PubMed, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases. The methodological quality was assessed by the risk of bias tool from the Systematic Review Center for Laboratory Animal Experimentation. The standardized mean difference (SMD) with a 95% confidence interval was calculated, and the random effects model was used to examine overall efficacy or heterogeneity. The publication bias was analyzed by Egger's test. The results showed that *Panax ginseng* treatment significantly reduced the systemic levels of alanine aminotransferase (SMD: -2.15 IU/L; p < 0.0001), aspartate aminotransferase (SMD: -2.86 IU/L; p < 0.0001), total cholesterol (SMD: -1.69 mg/dL; p < 0.0001), low-density lipoprotein (SMD: -1.45 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) while increasing high-density lipoprotein (SMD: 1.22 mg/dL; p = 0.0002) in NAFLD regardless of animal models or species. These findings may suggest that *Panax ginseng* is a promising therapeutic agent for NAFLD treatment.

Keywords: meta-analysis; *Panax ginseng*; nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; liver injury; dyslipidemia; glucose tolerance

1. Introduction

Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), the most prevalent chronic liver disease worldwide, develops into a continuous spectrum of hepatic dysfunction ranging from nonalcoholic fatty liver (NAFL) to nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), leading to fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) [1]. In 1988, Day and James proposed a "two-hit" theory to describe the pathogenesis of NASH [2]. In this theory, intrahepatic triglyceride accumulation is regarded as a "first hit" that makes the liver more vulnerable to injury induced by "second hits", including inflammation, oxidative stress, and mitochondrial dysfunction. Unlike this "two-hit" theory, recent studies have emphasized the multifaceted features of NAFLD pathogenesis, providing a more accurate description. This "multiple hit" hypothesis suggests that multiple insults, such as insulin resistance, adipokines, and genetic factors, act together to induce NAFLD [3]. In line with this, the development of NAFLD is strongly associated with metabolic syndrome, including obesity, insulin resistance, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and dyslipidemia [4]. Although the recent obesity epidemic and increased sedentary behaviors caused by the COVID-19 pandemic have accelerated the incidence rate of NAFLD worldwide [4,5], there is still no approved drug for the disease,



Citation: Yang, K.; Kim, H.-H.; Shim, Y.-R.; Song, M.J. The Efficacy of *Panax ginseng* for the Treatment of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Preclinical Studies. *Nutrients* 2023, *15*, 721. https:// doi.org/10.3390/nu15030721

Academic Editor: Naoki Tanaka

Received: 5 January 2023 Revised: 20 January 2023 Accepted: 30 January 2023 Published: 31 January 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). and the first line of therapy is a lifestyle intervention [6]. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a new drug that can cover the various pathogenic mechanisms of NAFLD.

Panax ginseng (C. A. Meyer) is an ancient and famous botanical medicine in eastern countries [7]. Currently, approximately 300 substances have been identified in *Panax ginseng*, including ginsenosides, polysaccharides, polyacetylenes, amino acids, and peptides [8]. The previous reports have demonstrated the protective roles of *Panax ginseng* in animal models of liver diseases, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes mellitus, and neurological diseases with its anti-oxidative, anti-inflammatory, and anti-microbial effects [9,10]. In addition, the oral administration of *Panax ginseng* to healthy individuals or Sprague Dawley rats is well-tolerated for 24 weeks or 12 months, respectively [11,12]. Based on the above findings and the support of systematic reviews and meta-analyses, more than 100 clinical trials with *Panax ginseng* that target metabolic syndrome, neurological diseases, and cardiovascular diseases have been registered in the World Health Organization international clinical trials registry platform [13–16]. However, to date, there is still a lack of clinical trials to study the effects of *Panax ginseng* in patients with NAFLD. In this aspect, a rigorous review based on animal studies may offer solid evidence for future clinical trials.

Here, the present study reports a systematic review and meta-analysis of data obtained from animal models of NAFLD that examined the efficacy of various doses and treatment durations of *Panax ginseng*. In particular, this study focused on the changes in alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), triglyceride (TG), total cholesterol (TC), high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, and fasting blood glucose levels by *Panax ginseng* treatment. In addition, the current study explored, through subgroup analysis, whether these outcomes differed to the experimental models or animal species used.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Search Strategy

The present meta-analysis was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines by two independent researchers [17]. The study protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) (registration number: CRD42023381574). From inception to February 2023, PubMed, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library databases were utilized to search the reliable literature on the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* for the treatment of NAFLD. "Ginseng" and "Fatty liver" were used as the main keywords. The detailed search strategy for the literature was described in Table 1.

Table 1. Literature searching strategy.

PubMed

"ginsengs" (All Fields) OR "panax" (MeSH Terms) OR "panax" (All Fields) OR "ginseng" (All Fields) OR "ginsengs" (All Fields)) AND ("fatty liver" (MeSH Terms) OR ("fatty" (All Fields)) AND "liver" (All Fields)) OR "fatty liver" (All Fields)

Web of Science

1. (ginseng) OR (panax)

- 2. (fatty liver) OR (non-alcoholic fatty liver disease)
- 3. #1 AND #2

Cochrane Library

- 1. (ginseng) OR (panax)
- 2. (fatty liver) OR (non-alcoholic fatty liver disease)
- 3. #1 AND #2

"#" means number.

2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for the present study were as follows: (1) The participants were animal models of NAFLD; (2) NAFLD-induced animals were divided into the experiment (with *Panax ginseng* treatment) and control (without *Panax ginseng* treatment) groups; (3) studies included at least one serological marker (ALT, AST, TG, TC, HDL, LDL, or fasting blood glucose) reflecting the severity of NAFLD; (4) studies were published in English; (5) all animal experiments should be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

Studies containing the following criteria were excluded from the final analysis: (1) Duplicated literature identified from the different searching databases; (2) studies that were not related to the therapeutic efficacy of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD; (3) studies that used natural products other than *Panax ginseng*; (4) studies without animal experiments; (5) review articles or clinical trials; (6) insufficient data for the primary outcomes; (7) in vitro experiments; and (8) conference abstracts, books, or theses.

2.3. Data Extraction

The extraction of the elementary data from included studies was conducted by two independent reviewers as follows: (1) the first author's name and publication year; (2) the authors' country; (3) sample size in each group; (4) animal species; (5) diet model of NAFLD and feeding period; (6) components of *Panax ginseng*; (7) treatment dose, route, and times. Digitizing software was utilized to extract the data presented in graphs. If there were discrepancies in the data extraction by the two reviewers, they were resolved after the discussion with the third reviewer.

2.4. Quality Assessment

The methodological quality of the included studies was assessed according to the risk of bias tool from the Systematic Review Centre for Laboratory Animal Experimentation (SYRCLE) for animal studies [18]. Categories for the investigation of quality were as follows: (1) Sequence generation; (2) baseline characteristics; (3) allocation concealment; (4) random housing; (5) blinding for the performance bias; (6) random outcome assessment; (7) blinding for the detection bias; (8) incomplete outcome data; (9) selective outcome data; and (10) other sources of bias. Assessment of each category was divided into high, low, or unclear risk of bias.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

The present meta-analysis was performed with ReviewManager (RevMan 5.4; London, UK) and R software (version 4.2.1; R foundation, Inc. (Indiana, IN, USA); http://cran.r-project.org (accessed on 1 December 2022). The standardized mean difference (SMD) with a 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated to investigate the efficacy of *Panax ginseng*. The heterogeneity among included studies was evaluated by the I^2 statistic and Cochrane's Q-square test. A fixed- or random-effects model was conducted for minor ($I^2 \leq 50\%$ or $p \geq 0.1$) or major heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$ or p < 0.1), respectively. Publication bias was analyzed by Egger's linear regression test. A p value < 0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Study Identification and Selection

This study selected reliable literature for meta-analysis according to the flow described in Figure 1. A total of 280 records were initially screened from the PubMed, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases, and 128 duplicates were removed. According to the prescribed exclusion criteria, 90 studies that were not related to the present study, review articles, or clinical trials were additionally removed based on the contents of their titles and abstracts. After a careful review of 62 full-text articles, a total of 41 studies were included in the final analysis (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Flow diagram of the systematic literature search. NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease.

3.2. Study Characteristics

All of the included articles (41 studies) were published between 2009 and 2023, and the nationality of the authors was mainly Chinese (53.7%) or Korean (41.5%). The animal species used in the experiments were mice (73.2%) or rats (26.8%). In 24 out of 30 studies that used mice as experimental models, C57BL/6J or C57BL/6N mice were utilized. Other studies used Kunming mice, db/db mice, or institute of cancer research (ICR) mice. For rat studies, 9 out of 11 studies incorporated Sprague-Dawley rats, and Otsuka Long-Evans Tokushima fatty (OLETF) rats were used in the remaining 2 studies. To induce NAFLD, various animal models, including high-fat diet (HFD), methionine-choline deficient (MCD) diet, high-fat high-sugar (HFHS) diet, or db/db mice, were used. Treatment agents ranged from a single component, including ginsenosides Rb1, Rg1, or Rh1, to Panax ginseng itself. The route of drug administration was mainly oral gavage, and in four studies, drugs were intraperitoneally injected. The administered doses of *Panax ginseng* varied greatly, ranging from 0.4 mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹ to 1000 mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹. In addition, the treatment period was also diverse, ranging from 3 days to 16 weeks. For the analyses of the outcomes, 30 studies (ALT), 26 studies (AST), 32 studies (TG), 29 studies (TC), 18 studies (HDL), 19 studies (LDL), and 14 studies (fasting blood glucose) were involved. The overall experimental characteristics of the involved studies were summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Overall characteristics of included literature.

Study	Country	Animal (Sex)	NAFLD Model	Component	Dose	Route and Times
2009 Lim [19]	Republic of Korea	OLETF rat (male)	32 weeks	Ginsam (a vinegar extract from <i>Panax</i> ginseng)	$300 \mathrm{~mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)
2010 Kwak [20]	Republic of Korea	Sprague- Dawley rat (male)	Triton WR1339 (i.v., 150 mg kg ⁻¹)	Korean red ginseng	100, 500, or 1000 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (for 3 days before Triton)
2010 Liu [21]	China	Kunming mouse (female) HFD (8 weel		Protopanaxdiol	0.02% or 0.05% in the diet	p.o., daily
2012 Quan [22]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6J mouse HFD (6 weeks) C (undefined)		Ginsenoside Re	5, 10, or 20 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 3 weeks)
2013 Hong [23]	Republic of Korea	OLETF rat (male)	12 months	Korean red ginseng	200 mg kg^{-1} in the diet	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)

Study	Country	Animal (Sex)	NAFLD Model	Component	Dose	Route and Times		
2014 Lee [24]	Republic of Korea	<i>db/db</i> mouse (female)	13 weeks	Total ginsenosides	5% of the diet	p.o., daily		
2014 Li [25]	United States	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (15 weeks)	Chinese ginseng	$500 { m mg kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily		
2015 Lee [26]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	HFD (10 weeks)	Ginseng cambial meristematic cells	75, 150, or 300 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily		
2016 Kho [27]	Republic of Korea	Sprague- Dawley rat (male)	High-fructose diet (8 weeks)	Red ginseng and <i>Polygoni</i> <i>Multiflori</i> Radix (1:1 ratio)	100 or 300 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 6 weeks)		
				Chinese ginseng saponins	$50~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$			
2017 Chen [28]	China	Sprague- Dawley rat	HFD (11 weeks)	Ginsenoside Compound K	$3 \mathrm{mg}\mathrm{kg}^{-1}$	i.p., daily (last 10 weeks)		
		(male)		Ginsenoside Rh1	$3 \mathrm{mg}\mathrm{kg}^{-1}$	(last 10 weeks)		
				Compound K + Rh1	$3 \mathrm{mg}\mathrm{kg}^{-1}$			
2017 Huang [29]	China	<i>db/db</i> mouse (male)	10 weeks	Ginsenoside Rb2	$10~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	i.p., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2017 Tion [20]	China	Sprague-	HFD (12 weeks)	Ginsenoside	25 or 50 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2017 Han [50]	China	(male)	HFD (16 weeks)	Rg1	25 or 50 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		
2018 Jeong [31]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	MCD diet (13 weeks)	Korean red ginseng	100, 200, or 400 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily		
2018 Kim [32]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6J mouse (undefined)	HFD (12 weeks)	Ginseng seed oil	250 or 500 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily		
2010 1 : [22]	Republic of	C57BL/6	LIED (1(susselies)	Fermented ginseng root	Not indicated,	n o doilte		
2018 Li [33]	Korea	mouse (male)	HFD (16 weeks)	Fermented ginseng berry	with a diet	p.o., dany		
2018 Shin [34]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	HFD (8 weeks)	Ginseng extract	5% in the diet	p.o., daily		
2018 Xu [35]	China	C57BL/6 mouse (female)	HFD (20 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg1	$20 \text{ or} \\ 40 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2019 Choi (1) [36]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	Western diet (12 weeks)	GBCK25	10, 20, 100, 200, or 400 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily		
2019 Choi (2) [37]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6N mouse (male)	Fast-food diet (14 weeks)	Fermented Korean red ginseng	100 or 300 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		

Table 2. Cont.

6 of 20

Table 2. Cont.

Study	Country	Animal (Sex)	NAFLD Model	Component	Dose	Route and Times		
2019 Fan [38]	China	Sprague Dawley rats (undefined)	HFHS diet (16 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg1	10, 25, or 50 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
	Republic of	C57BL/6		Korean red ginseng	$0.4~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$			
2019 Kim [39]	Korea	mouse (male)	HFD (6 weeks)	Korean red ginseng and probiotics	$0.4 \text{ mg kg}^{-1} + 0.03 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$	p.o., daily		
2020 Cheng [40]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (undefined)	HFD (16 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg2	$10~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	i.p., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2020 Hou [41]	China	Sprague Dawley rats	HFHS diet	Ginsenoside	30 or	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
	China	(undefined)	(14 weeks)	Rg1	60 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		
2020 Jeong [42]	Republic of Korea	<i>db/db</i> mouse (male)	10 weeks	Black ginseng	100 or 900 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 5 weeks)		
2020 Lee [43]	Republic of Korea	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	MCD diet (6 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg3	15 or 30 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 3 weeks)		
2020 Park [44]	Republic of Korea	ICR mouse (male)	High-fat high-fructose diet (17 weeks)	Black ginseng	0.5%, 1%, or 2% in the diet	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		
2020 Qi [45]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	Intraperitoneal D-galactose (120 mg kg ⁻¹ day ⁻¹) injection (6 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg1	$40 \mathrm{~mg~kg^{-1}}$	i.p., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2020 Song [46]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (24 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rb1	$10~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		
2020 Yao [47]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (12 weeks)	Panax ginseng root extract	$120~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2021 Gu [48]	China	Sprague Dawley rats (male)	HFHS diet (26 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rg1	$100~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily (last 8 weeks)		
2021 Jiang (1) [49]	Pakistan	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	HFD (6 weeks)	Black ginseng extract	$100~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily		
2021 Jiang (2) [50]	China	<i>db/db</i> mouse (male)	8 weeks	Ginsenoside Re	$30~{ m mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily		
2021 Liang [7]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (12 weeks)	Panax ginseng	100 or 200 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily		
2021 Zhao [51]	China	Sprague Dawley rats (male)	HFD (8 weeks)	Fermented Panax ginseng	200 or 400 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily		
2021 Zhou [52]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (8 weeks)	Ginsenoside F2	50 or 100 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)		
2022 Li [53]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (14 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rb1	10 mg kg^{-1}	i.p., daily (last 2 weeks)		

Study	Country	Animal (Sex)	NAFLD Model	Component	Dose	Route and Times
2022 Wei (1) [54]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	MCD diet (6 weeks)	Black ginseng extracts	300, 600, or 900 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 3 weeks)
2022 Wei (2) [55]	China	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	Western diet and sugar water and carbon tetrachloride (2 mL kg ⁻¹ , once a week) (12 weeks)	Black ginseng extracts	300, 600, or 900 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)
2022 Zhang [56]	China	C57BL/6 mouse (male)	30% fructose in water (4 weeks)	Ginsenoside Compound K	30 or 60 mg kg^{-1}	p.o., daily
2022 Zou [57]	China	C57BL/6J mouse (male)	HFD (12 weeks)	Ginsenoside Rb1	$120~\mathrm{mg~kg^{-1}}$	p.o., daily (last 4 weeks)
2023 Ren [58]	China	Sprague Dawley rats (male)	High-glucose high-fat diet (8 weeks) and streptozotocin (35 mg kg ⁻¹)	Rg1-enriched polysaccharide	100 or 300 mg kg ⁻¹	p.o., daily

Table 2. Cont.

HFD, high-fat diet; HFHS, high-fat high-sucrose; ICR, institute of cancer research; i.p., intraperitoneal injection; MCD, methionine-choline deficient diet; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver; OLETF, Otsuka Long-Evans Tokushima; p.o., per os.

3.3. Quality Assessment

In quality assessment, only one study conducted random sequence generation. In addition, about 50% (17 of 41) of studies were analyzed with the same baseline characteristics among experimental groups, and two studies had an allocation with concealment. Among the referred studies, random housing of animals was performed in 30 studies. Due to the characteristics of animal experiments, it was difficult to evaluate blinding bias in most studies. The attrition bias was low in 18 studies that had complete outcome data, and they also showed a low risk of reporting bias. Although the overall quality of the referred articles was not satisfactory, no literature was excluded from this process. Detailed information about the quality assessment of the included studies is presented in Figure 2.

3.4. Primary Outcomes

3.4.1. Markers for Liver Injury

Persistent overload of nutrients and inflammatory cues instigate liver injury, one of the cardinal features of NAFLD [1]. Therefore, the effects of *Panax ginseng* on the systemic levels of liver injury markers (ALT and AST) in animal models of NAFLD were examined. In the analysis of ALT, a total of 30 studies with 1358 animals were analyzed (Figure 3A). Since the results showed a high degree of heterogeneity between the experimental and control groups ($I^2 = 81\%$, p < 0.01), the random-effects model was selected for further investigation (Figure 3A). Interestingly, a notable decrease in ALT levels by the *Panax ginseng* treatment was found in NAFLD-induced animals (SMD: -2.15 IU/L; 95% CI: -2.50 to -1.79 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 3A). Next, to explore the effects of *Panax ginseng* on AST levels, 26 studies with 1166 animals that reported AST levels were analyzed with strong heterogeneity ($I^2 = 90\%$, p < 0.01) (Figure 3B). Similar to the results from ALT, *Panax ginseng* administration significantly reduced AST levels in NAFLD-induced animals (SMD: -2.86 IU/L; 95% CI: -3.70 to -2.02 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 3B). These results may suggest that *Panax ginseng* could attenuate NAFLD-induced liver injury in a preclinical model.



Figure 2. Quality assessment of included studies based on the SYRCLE's risk of bias tool. (**A**) A graph of the risk in the bias of included studies. (**B**) A summary of the risk of bias in the included studies [7,19–58].

SMD 95%-CI	 0.9 1.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1
Standardised Mean Difference	
Control otal Mean SD	8 98.3 40.0 8 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 40.0 88 98.3 80.0 88 98.3 80.0 200 318.9 36.9 201 32.3 36.9 201 48.7 152.3 88 192.5 185.7 88 192.5 185.7 88 192.5 185.7 88 100 653.5 88 100 535.5 88 100 535.5 88 120.3 12.8 10 185.5 50.0 10 185.5 50.0 10 175.6 24.4 10 175.6 23.3 <td< td=""></td<>
Experimental Total Mean SD T	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
B) study	2009 Lim 2003 Hong 2016 Kho 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2017 Tan 2018 Jeong 2018 Jeong 2018 Jeong 2018 Kim 2018 Kim 2019 Kim 2019 Kim 2019 Kim 2019 Kim 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 2020 Hou 2020 Hou 2020 Hou 2020 Hou 2021 Jiang (1) 2021 Jiang (2) 2022 Viei (1) 2022 Viei (1) 2022 Viei (1) 2022 Viei (1) 2022 Viei (1) 2022 Thang 2022 Shang 2022 Shang 2023 Shang 20
SMD 95%-CI	 4.1. 5.1. 5.1. 5.1. 5.2. 5.1. 5.2. 5.1. 5.2. 5.1. 5.2. 5.2. 5.2. 5.3. 5.4. 5.4. 5.5. 5.5.
Standardised Mean Difference	* ************************************
Control otal Mean SD	8 71.3 22.6 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 10.5 10.5 10 20.5 19.3 10 20.5 19.3 20 92.5 19.3 20 92.5 19.3 20 92.5 19.3 20 10.3 32.1 20 13.3 6.5 20 13.3 6.5 20 13.3 6.5 20 13.3 6.5 20 13.3 6.5 20 32.1 4.4 10 32.1
Experimental Total Mean SD To	$ \begin{array}{c} 8 & 42.3 & 0.4 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 10.5 & 0.5 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.3 & 1.4 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.5 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.5 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.2 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.2 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.2 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 1.2 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.5 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.5 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.5 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.4 & 2.4 \\ 10 & 25.5 & 2.4 \\ 10 & $
A) ^{study}	2010 Kwak 2010 Kwak 2010 Kwak 2010 Kwak 2015 Lee 2015 Lee 2015 Lee 2015 Lee 2015 Lee 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 2017 Tian 2017 Tian 2017 Tian 2017 Tian 2017 Tian 2017 Tian 2018 Kin 2018 Kin 2018 Kin 2018 Kin 2018 Kin 2018 Kin 2019 Choi (1) 2019 Choi (1) 2020 Heu 2021 Liang 2022 Lee 2022 Viei (2) 2022 Viei (2) 2022 Viei (2) 2022 Viei (2) 2023 Ren

Figure 3. The effect of *Panax ginseng* on the levels of liver injury markers in NAFLD-induced animals. Forest plots for comparison: (**A**) Alanine aminotransferase (ALT) levels [7,19,20,23,24,27–32,35–41,43–45,47–50,52,54–56,58]. (**B**) Aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels [19,23,27–32,35–41,44,45,47–50,52, 54–56,58]. SD, standard deviation.

3.4.2. Markers for Hepatic Lipid Metabolism

In the development of NAFLD, dysregulation of hepatic lipid metabolism is a characterized phenotypic change, accompanying an abnormal increase in the systemic TG, TC, and LDL levels, while HDL levels are decreased [1]. Therefore, studies that involved changes in TG, TC, LDL, or HDL levels by Panax ginseng treatment in NAFLD-induced animals were investigated. A total of 32 studies with 1246 animals or 29 studies with 1259 animals were analyzed for the efficacy of Panax ginseng on TG or TC levels, respectively. Of note, the Panax ginseng treatment significantly lowered TG (SMD: -2.86 mg/dL; 95% CI: -3.70 to -2.02 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) and TC (SMD: -1.69 mg/dL; 95% CI: -1.99 to -1.40 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) levels in NAFLD-induced animals with high heterogeneity (TG: $I^2 = 84\%$, p < 0.01; TC: $I^2 = 74\%$, p < 0.01) (Figure 4A,B). To explore the effects of *Panax ginseng* on hepatic cholesterol metabolism in detail, changes in HDL and LDL levels in NAFLD-induced animals were evaluated. A total of 18 studies and 702 animals measured HDL levels, which were significantly elevated by Panax ginseng treatment (SMD: 1.22 mg/dL; 95% CI: 0.59 to 1.85 mg/dL; p = 0.0002) with strong heterogeneity ($I^2 = 88\%$, p < 0.01) (Figure 4C). Contrary to the results of HDL levels, LDL levels were remarkably decreased by Panax ginseng treatment in NAFLD-induced animals (SMD: -1.46 mg/dL; 95% CI: -1.89 to -1.03 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 4D). These data suggest that *Panax ginseng* may improve hyperlipidemia by regulating hepatic lipid metabolism in NAFLD-induced animals.

3.5. Subgroup Analysis

3.5.1. Subgroup Analysis in HFD-Induced NAFLD

According to the information in the included studies, various animal models were used to induce NAFLD, such as HFD, MCD, the HFHS diet, or db/db mice. Depending on the method and duration of the experimental model, the severity and mechanisms by which NAFLD is induced may differ. Since chronic HFD feeding is widely used to study NAFLD and is well matched with the pathophysiology of human NAFLD patients [59], subgroup analysis was conducted with studies using the HFD-induced NAFLD model. A total of 16 studies with 850 animals reported systemic ALT levels with high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 82\%$, p < 0.01), and the *Panax ginseng* treatment significantly reduced ALT levels in the HFD-induced NAFLD animal model (SMD: -2.33 mg/dL; 95% CI: -2.82 to -1.85 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 5A). In addition, AST levels were also notably decreased by *Panax ginseng* treatment (SMD: -3.16 mg/dL; 95% CI: -4.43 to -1.90 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 5B), implying possible involvement of *Panax ginseng* in hepatoprotective effects in HFD-induced NAFLD.

Changes in serum TG and TC levels of HFD-fed animals were investigated in terms of hepatic lipid metabolism. In line with the results from Figure 4, the subgroup analysis of HFD-induced NAFLD animal models also showed prominently mitigated dyslipidemia by *Panax ginseng* treatment (TG: SMD -2.13 mg/dL, 95% CI -2.75 to -1.51 mg/dL, p < 0.0001; TC: SMD -1.61 mg/dL, 95% CI -1.96 to -1.27 mg/dL, p < 0.0001) with significant heterogeneity (TG: $I^2 = 82\%$, p < 0.01; TC: $I^2 = 74\%$, p < 0.01) (Figure 6A,B). In addition, HDL levels were notably elevated (SMD: 1.24 mg/dL; 95% CI: -2.32 to -1.08 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) by *Panax ginseng* treatment in the subgroup analysis of HFD-induced NAFLD (Figure 6C,D). Based on these results, it might be conceivable that the safeguarding roles of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD are not limited to a certain experimental model.

	SMD 95%-CI	-1.3 [-2.4; -0.2]	-1.4 [-2.5; -0.3] -1.0 [-1.9: -0.1]	-3.4 [-4.9; -1.9]	-4.7 [-6.6; -2.9]	-2.0 [-3.3; -0.0] -2.8 [-4.3; -1.3]	-1.4 [-2.4; -0.4]	-4.3 [-6.0; -2.6]	-2.2 [-3.3; -1.0] -3.9 [-5.5: -2.3]	-2.7 [-4.0; -1.4]	-2.4 [-3.6; -1.2]	-4.3 [-6.0; -2.5]	0.1 [-0.3; 0.7] -1.3 [-2.0: -0.6]	-0.6 [-1.1; -0.1]	-1.1 [-1.7; -0.4]	-4.8 [-6.6; -2.9] -0.8 [-1.4· -0.2]	-2.0 [-2.7; -1.2]	-0.8 [-1.4; -0.1]	-1.6 [-2.3; -0.9]	-0.5 [-1.6: 0.4]	-2.6 [-4.3; -0.9]	-0.7 [-1.9; 0.5]	-2.4 [-3.8; -1.0] -0.8 [-1.8: 0.2]	-0.9 [-1.9; 0.2]	-1.8 [-2.8; -0.7]	-2.1 [-3.2; -0.9] -2.6 [-3.8: -1.3]	0.6 [-0.5; 1.7]	-0.1 [-1.1; 1.0]	-1.8 [-3.2; -0.3] -1.3 [-2.3; -0.3]	-2.7 [-3.9; -1.4]	-3.4 [-4.8; -1.9] -3.7 [-5.3: -2.2]	-3.7 [-3.3, -2.2] -1.3 [-2.5; -0.1]	-2.7 [-4.3; -1.1]	-2.1 [-3.5; -0.7] -1.6 [-2.7: -0.4]	-1.4 [-2.9; 0.0]	-1.3 [-2.2; -0.3]	-0.3 [-1.3, 0.7] -1.8 [-3.0; -0.6]	-2.2 [-3.5; -0.9]	-0.7 [-1.8; 0.4] -1.7 [-3.0; -0.4]	-3.2 [-4.7; -1.6]	-2.1 [-3.3; -0.8]	-0.7 [-1.6; 0.2] -4.1 [-5.7: -2.4]	-0.6 [-1.9; 0.6]	-0.7 [-1.7; U.2]	-0.4 [-1.3, 0.0]	-1.7 [-2.0; -1.4]				
	Standardised Mean Difference	IIII	.								-		₽ ₩	1	III III			+							+ -	ŧ∵‡		#	¥.#	L				* -*						•••••		<u>+</u>		Į,	1		6 -4 -2 0 2 4 6) 4 2 1		
	Control Fotal Mean SD	8 111.7 12.1	8 111./ 12.1 10 148 1 7 5	10 148.1 7.5	10 148.1 7.5 -	8 182.0 17.5	10 301.3 37.3	10 199.2 10.4	10 1/3.2 9.8 10 173 2 9.8	10 173.2 9.8	10 85.0 8.9	10 85.0 8.9	20 203.1 89.0	105 203.1 89.0	20 203.1 89.0	10 107.2 5.4 - 20 534 1 38 7	20 534.1 38.7	20 530.2 61.9	20 530.2 61.9	8 212.5 25.6	6 136.3 9.0	6 136.3 9.0	8 170.2 22.7 8 154 8 23 5	8 154.8 23.5	10 280.2 34.8	10 280.2 34.8 10 280 2 34.8	7 136.5 15.3	7 136.5 15.3	6 197.5 19.5 10 316.8 31.2	10 316.8 31.2	10 377.2 23.2	7 121.1 15.9	7 121.1 15.9	8 162.5 18.3	5 193.5 25.1	10 205.9 11.2 • 166 4 20 4	8 193.6 17.9	8 193.6 17.9	7 119.2 15.1	8 174.2 10.9	8 174.2 10.9	10 143.6 8.5 10 143.6 8.5	5 316.8 29.6	10 254.2 68.2 10 254 2 68 2	10 204.2 00.2	672				
	Experimental Total Mean SD 1	8 98.4 6.7	8 93.0 12.9 10 138.5 10 7	10 121.5 7.5	10 108.9 8.4	8 140.5 9.5	10 257.8 21.8	10 155.1 9.2	10 156.2 4.3	10 150.0 6.2	10 66.3 5.9	10 54.5 3.9	20 96.8 65.0	20 149.8 57.0	20 121.9 58.1	70 400 2.2 2.2	20 460.5 34.8	20 487.6 42.6	20 441.2 46.4 • 205 1 20 2	0 203.1 20.2 8 198.2 18.5	6 113.3 7.2	6 128.2 11.6	8 121.5 14.9 8 139.5 10.5	8 136.7 14.2	10 218.8 31.4	10 210.1 29.9 10 195 7 27 4	7 145.6 12.4	7 135.0 13.8	6 167.9 10.3 10 274.5 30.5	10 234.5 27.8	10 291.6 25.5 10 248 8 40 2	7 102.5 9.8	7 82.5 10.3	8 135.5 14.1	5 145.6 34.1	10 189.2 13.9 0 164 E 21 1	8 158.4 19.2	8 145.2 23.1	7 90.9 15.5	8 142.8 7.6	8 152.7 8.8	10 135.6 12.2 10 105.2 9.6	5 295.2 31.2	10 211.2 38.4 10 228 8 54 0	6.4C 0.077 01	587	^c = 0.9519, <i>p</i> < 0.01			
	Study	2009 Lim	2010 Lim 2010 Kwak	2010 Kwak	2010 Kwak	2010 Liu 2010 Liu	2013 Hong	2014 Li	2015 Lee 2015 Lee	2015 Lee	2016 Kho	2016 Kho	2017 Chen	2017 Chen	2017 Chen	2017 Huang	2017 Tian	2017 Tian	2017 Tian	2018 Kim	2018 Li	2018 Li	2018 Shin 2018 XII	2018 Xu	2019 Fan	2019 Fan 2019 Fan	2019 Kim	2019 Kim	2020 Cheng 2020 Hou	2020 Hou	2020 Hou	2020 Park	2020 Park	2020 Sond	2020 Yao	2021 Jiang (1)	2021 Liang (2)	2021 Liang	2021 Zhao 2021 Zhao	2021 Zhou	2021 Zhou	2022 Zhang 2022 Zhang	2022 Zou	2023 Ren 2023 Ben		Random effects model	Heterogeneity: l^{ϵ} = 74%, τ^{*}			
(B)	SMD 95%-CI	0.0 [-0.9; 1.0]	-0.7 [-1.7; 0.3] -1.2 [-2.2: -0.2]	-2.2 [-3.3; -1.0]	-4.1 [-5.7; -2.4]	-5.4 [-7.8; -3.1]	-0.4 [-1.6; 0.7]	-1.1 [-2.4; 0.1]	-3.3 [-3.3, -1.4] -1.8 [-2.9: -0.7]	-1.8 [-3.0; -0.6]	-0.4 [-1.3; 0.5]	-6.4 [-8.7; -4.0] -8.0 [-12.0] - 5.7]	-0.3 [-12.0, -3.1] -5.1 [-7.0; -3.1]	-3.1 [-4.5; -1.7]	-1.1 [-2.1; -0.2]	-0.0 [-0.0; 0.0] -3.9 [-5.0: -2.8]	-2.4 [-3.2; -1.5]	-2.1 [-2.9; -1.3]	-1.3 [-2.3; -0.3] -0.0 [-1.5: -0.2]	-0.3 [-1.3, -0.2] -1.7 [-2.4; -1.0]	-0.7 [-1.4; -0.1]	-4.8 [-6.0; -3.5]	-1.1 [-2.2; -0.0] -1.4 [-2.5; -0.3]	0.1 [-1.0; 1.2]	0.2 [-1.0; 1.3] -2.3 [-3.6: 0.0]	-2.3 [-3.0; -0.9] -3.8 [-5.6: -2.0]	-2.7 [-4.1; -1.2]	-0.3 [-1.1; 0.6]	-1.4 [-2.4; -0.4] -2.7 [-4.0; -1.4]	-0.5 [-1.6; 0.6]	4.9 [2.5; 7.2] -5.0 [-7.6: -2.3]	-0.8 [-1.7; 0.1]	-1.5 [-2.5; -0.5] F P C P O: 2 EI	-3.0 [-0.0, -3.0] -6.7 [-9.1; -4.2]	-0.1 [-1.1; 0.9]	-0.9 [-2.0; 0.2] -16 [-2 0: -04]	-1.3 [-2.4; -0.2]	-7.0 [-11.0; -2.9]	-1.0 [-2.0; -0.0] -3.2 [-4.6; -1.8]	-0.2 [-1.2; 0.8]	-1.1 [-2.2; -0.1]	-2.0 [-3.3; -0.0] 0.2 [-0.9; 1.2]	-0.5 [-1.6; 0.5]	-0./ [-1.8; 0.3] -1.6 [-2.7: -0.4]	-2.7 [-4.0; -1.4]	-3.4 [-4.9; -1.9]	-1.9 [-3.5; -0.3] -4.9 [-6.7; -3.0]	-4.0 [-5.7; -2.4]	-2.0 [-2.4; -1.5]	
	ndardised Mean Difference	*1					1	ŧ			141-			ŧ	- II				+		÷		ŧ., ŧ		ŧ	•		+	ŧ.		+		¥		-18-7	ŧ.,			ŧ	-11411-	ŧ.,		1	ŧ., "ŧ			<u>ا</u>			5 0 5 10
	Control Sta tal Mean SD	8 149.5 80.7	0 149.5 00.7	10 579.5 35.1	10 579.5 35.1 - 8 485 8 55 6	8 485.8 55.6	6 77.9 8.2	6 77.9 8.2 6 77.0 8.2	0 //.9 0.2 10 527.7 153.3	8 302.8 40.9	10 99.8 4.4	10 111.2 5.3	10 111.2 5.3	10 240.8 69.8	10 240.8 69.8	20 126.0 17.5	20 126.0 17.5	20 126.0 17.5	10 264.0 58.1 20 70.4 22.8	20 70.4 22.8	20 79.2 3.5	20 79.2 3.5 + 8 475 5 5 5	8 125.5 35.5	6 55.0 12.1	6 55.0 12.1 8 168 5 25 6	8 172.2 10.5	8 172.2 10.5	10 122.5 15.7	10 122.5 15.7 10 122.5 15.7	7 60.0 17.3	7 60.0 17.3 6 289 9 15 2	10 196.5 19.5	10 196.5 19.5	10 281.6 22.3	7 95.3 5.9	7 95.3 5.9 7 95.3 5.9	8 79.2 8.3	5 123.2 10.5	10 510.4 33.4	8 352.0 105.6	8 140.8 15.3 8 140.8 15.3	7 109.1 17.6	7 109.1 17.6	8 158.4 52.6 8 158.4 52.8	10 334.4 26.4	10 334.4 26.4	5 211.2 31./ 10 387.2 29.9	10 387.2 29.9	23	- 10 -
	Experimental Total Mean SD Tot	8 151.9 57.4	0 101.0 39.7	10 481.3 50.6	10 398.1 49.3 8 375 6 16 0	8 253.4 13.4	6 74.1 7.8	6 69.1 6.1	10 302.0 70.4	8 212.5 52.6	10 98.1 3.5	10 75.2 5.5	10 82.6 5.5	10 76.8 16.6	10 181.8 7.7	20 65 1 12 3 3	20 77.0 22.8	20 77.8 26.3	10 204.0 21.1 20 563 18 3	20 40.5 8.8	20 63.4 29.9	20 35.2 12.3	8 87.5 7.5 8 87.5 7.5	6 56.7 18.3	6 56.5 2.6 8 120 2 12 5	0 120.2 12.5 8 114.4 17.6	8 134.2 15.9	10 118.5 14.5	10 101.1 13.9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	7 28.4 84.4	7 147.7 16.5 6 218.7 10 9	10 181.5 15.9	10 170.9 11.7	10 148.5 15.4	7 94.5 8.9	7 88.7 7.5	8 67.9 8.1	5 45.8 9.5	10 342.2 63.4	8 333.4 70.4	8 123.2 13.8 0 105 6 17 5	7 112.6 17.6	7 100.3 12.3	0 123.2 30.4 8 88.6 28.5	10 260.5 25.8	10 245.9 23.3	5 150.6 25.5 10 228.8 32.5	10 264.4 28.4	al 623 67	τ ² = 2.8801, <i>p</i> < 0.01
(A)	Study	2009 Lim	2010 Kwak	2010 Kwak	2010 Kwak	2010 Liu	2012 Quan	2012 Quan	2013 Hond	2014 Lee	2014 Li	2015 Lee	2015 Lee	2016 Kho	2016 Kho	2017 Chen	2017 Chen	2017 Chen	2017 Huang	2017 Tian	2017 Tian	2017 Tian	2018 Kim	2018 Li	2018 Li 2018 Chin	2018 Xu	2018 Xu	2019 Fan	2019 Fan 2019 Fan	2019 Kim	2019 Kim 2020 Chend	2020 Hou	2020 Hou	2020 Hou	2020 Park	2020 Park 2020 Park	2020 Song	2020 Yao	2021 Jiana (1)	2021 Jiang (2)	2021 Liang	2021 Zhao 2021 Zhao	2021 Zhao	2021 Zhou 2021 Zhou	2022 Zhang	2022 Zhang	2022 Zou 2023 Ren	2023 Ren	Random effects mode	Heterogeneity: I ^L = 84%,

(C) Experimental Contro Standardised Mean Difference SD Study Total Mean SD SMD 95%-C Total ean 2009 Lim 31.0 31.0 $\begin{array}{rrrr} \textbf{-1.4} & [-2.6; -0.3] \\ \textbf{-1.7} & [-2.9; -0.5] \\ \textbf{0.5} & [-0.5; 1.6] \\ \textbf{0.9} & [-0.1; 2.0] \\ \textbf{1.3} & [0.3; 2.3] \\ \textbf{4.4} & [2.6; 6.1] \\ \textbf{4.8} & [2.9; 6.6] \\ \textbf{0.3} & [-0.3; 0.9] \\ \textbf{3.4} & [2.4; 4.4] \\ \textbf{3.3} & [2.2; 4.0] \\ \textbf{3.4} & [2.4; 4.4] \\ \textbf{3.3} & [2.2; 4.3] \\ \textbf{3.4} & [2.2; 4.0] \\ \textbf{3.6} & [2.2; 5.6] \\ \textbf{4.3} & [2.4; 5.6] \\ \textbf{4.3} & [2.4; 5.6] \\ \textbf{1.5} & [-2.8; 6.5] \\ \textbf{-1.5} & [-2.8; 6.5] \\ \textbf{-1.5} & [-2.8; 6.5] \\ \textbf{-1.6} & [-4.7; -1.3] \\ \textbf{3.0} & [4.7; -1.3] \\ \textbf{3.0} & [4.7;$ 2.4 2.4 8 27.6 2 26.0 55.2 8 8 3.0 2009 Lim 8 2010 Liu 4.5 8 8 49.8 12.4 2010 Liu 2013 Hong 49.8 52.9 12.4 18.9 8 59.0 3.9 10 86.6 29.2 10 24.8 24.8 11.9 11.9 11.9 11.9 0.8 0.8 5.0 5.0
 34.5
 2.9

 38.5
 3.8

 15.5
 15.1

 33.7
 7.3
 2016 Kho 10 10 20 20 20 20 10 10 20 2016 Kho 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 20 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 37.9 29.0 20 20 5.0 5.0 9.7 5.8 29.0 101.5 103.4 47.8 49.2 84.3 110.1 5.6 78.5 2018 Kim 5.9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 5.6 4.9 5.3 4.9 7.5 10.1 2018 Kim 2018 Xu 78.5 52.8 5.9 7.9 7.9 8.4 8.4 52.8 52.8 75.1 75.1 97.6 97.6 2018 Xu 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 10 10 10 10 10 110.1 10.1 10 118.9 9.6 7 87.5 6.7 7 80.4 5.1 7 101.5 12.3 7 99.4 15.9 7 105.8 10.6 8 54.7 10.2 10 7 7 8.4 5.6 5.6 2019 Fan 2019 Kim 2019 Kim . -3.0 [-4.7; -1.3] 1.0 [-0.1; 2.2] 0.8 [-0.3; 1.9] 1.4 [0.2; 2.6] -0.4 [-1.4; 0.6] 4.7 [2.9; 6.6] -0.2 [-1.2; 0.7] -0.2 [-1.2; 0.8] 0.5 [-0.5; 1.5] 0.5 [-0.5; 1.5] 0.9 [-0.2 2.1] 2020 Park 85.6 15.9 7 7 7 2020 Park 2020 Park 85.6 15.9 85.6 15.9 6.8 8.1 2020 Song 8 58.1 2021 Jiang 10 146.3 11.6 138.5 15.5 80.5 11.9 10 96.8 8.1 143.2 20.5 2021 Jiang (2) 8 8 8 8 82.7 12.3 2021 Liang 12.3 12.3 5.4 5.4 7.6 7.6 2021 Liang 2021 Zhao 89.5 22.1 12.8 82.7 19.7 8 7 8 7 22.1 2.8 24.4 3.9 78.5 5.9 72.5 4.8 56.1 6.6 62.2 5.1 158.4 32.1 0.5 [-0.5; 1.6] 0.9 [-0.2; 2.1] 0.2 [-0.8; 1.1] -0.7 [-1.8; 0.3] 1.2 [0.2; 2.2] 2.6 [1.3; 3.8] 1.9 [0.8; 3.0] 2021 Zhao 7 8 8 7 8 19.7 2021 Zhou 2021 Zhou 77.4 77.4 8 10 4.9 4.9 2022 Zhano 10 48.7 2022 Zhang 10 10 10 48.7 2023 Ren 10 105.6 18.2 2023 Ren 10 134 6 23 6 10 105.6 18.2 1.3 [0.3: 2.3] **Random effects model 351** Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 88\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.3694$, p < 0.011.2 [0.6; 1.9] 351 2 -6 -4 -2 0 4 6 (D) Standardised Mean Experimental Control Study Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Difference SMD 95%-CI 40.5 9.1 46.7 8.5 102.6 17.5 2009 L im 8 8 50.8 12.2 -0.9 -1.9: 0.1 2009 Lim 2009 Lim 2010 Liu 50.8 12.2 138.7 17.5 -0.3 -0.4 -1.9 [-1.4; 0.6] [-3.2; -0.7] 8 8 8 8 8 97.0 12.6 148.5 9.2 151.0 28.0 -2.6 -4.2 -4.9 [-4.0; -1.2] [-5.8; -2.5] [-6.8; -3.0] 2010 Liu 8 138.7 17.5 10 185.1 10 253.0 10 253.0 2014 Li 2016 Kho 7.6 10 10 -4.9 [-6.8; -3.0] -8.6 [-11.7; -5.5] 0.5 [-0.2; 1.1] -1.0 [-1.7; -0.3] -0.7 [-1.3; -0.1] -0.6 [-1.2; 0.0] -1.3 [-2.0; -0.6] 162.0 14.0 80.8 28.6 35.6 31.7 2016 Kho 10 3.0 2017 Chen 2017 Chen 66.9 30.1 66.9 30.1 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2017 Chen 38.7 46.8 20 20 66.9 30.1 66.9 30.1 -0.7 -0.6 -1.3 -1.8 -0.6 -1.8 -2.0 -3.2 -0.4 2017 Chen 2017 Tian 38.5 58.1 69.7 11.6 20 100.6 30.9 69.7 11.6 58.0 11.6 85.1 23.2 54.2 19.4 90.5 10.5 81.2 7.7 112.5 19.5 100.6 30.9 104.5 34.7 [-2.5; -1.0] [-1.3; -0.0] 2017 Tian 20 20 2017 Tian 20 104.5 34.7 [-2.5; -1.0] 2017 Tian [-2.5; -1.0] [-3.2; -0.7] [-4.8; -1.6] [-1.4; 0.6] [-1.2; 0.7] [-1.5; 0.3] [-2.0; -0.1] 2018 Kim 8 8 8 8 112.2 10.5 112.2 10.5 2018 Kim 2018 Xu 8 8 121.5 24.2 2018 Xu 2019 Fan 2019 Fan 116.9 9.3 140.7 19.5 135.9 15.9 121.5 24.2 121.5 24.2 151.5 11.9 151.5 11.9 8 8 -0.2 -0.6 -1.1 -1.8 0.7 -0.0 10 10 10 10 129.8 10.8 118.0 13.0 110.0 10.0 151.5 11.9 151.5 11.9 110.3 5.0 110.3 5.0 [-2.9; -0.8] [-0.4; 1.8] [-1.1; 1.0] 10 7 7 10 7 7 2019 Fan 2019 Kim 2019 Kim 8 87.1 8.8 10 74.6 16.4 8 205.6 32.7 8 70.4 9.6 8 66.9 8.6 7 450 7 7 7 7 2020 Song 2021 Jiang (1) 2021 Jiang (2) -0.9 -1.0 -0.1 [-2.0; 0.1] [-2.0; -0.1] [-1.1; 0.8] [-7.2; -2.8] 8 96.8 10.9 92.4 17.0 10 10 8 211.2 42.8 70.4 9.6 66.9 8.6 158.7 27.1 2021 Liang 8 8 123.2 10.5 123.2 10.5 2021 Liang [-7.9; -3.1] 2021 Zhad 7 7 165.6 23.3 [-1.3; 0.8] 2021 Zhao



-10

-5

Figure 4. The effect of *Panax ginseng* on hepatic lipid metabolism in NAFLD-induced animals. Forest plots for comparison: (**A**) Triglyceride (TG) levels [7,19–30,32–35,38–41,44,46–52,56,58]. (**B**) Total cholesterol (TC) levels [7,19–21,23,25–30,32–35,38–41,44,46,47,49–52,56–58]. (**C**) High-density lipoprotein (HDL) levels [7,19,21,23,27,28,32,35,38,39,44,46,49–52,56,58]. (**D**) Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) levels [7,19,21,25,27,28,30,32,35,38,39,44,46,49–52,56–58]. SD, standard deviation.

0 5 10

(

(A)				(В)				
Study	Experimental Total Mean SD	Control Total Mean SD	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD 95%-CI	Study	Experimenta Total Mean SI	al Control D Total Mean SD	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD 95%-CI
2015 Lee	10 40.2 7.0	10 45.5 6.4		-0.8 [-1.7; 0.2]	2016 Kho	10 100.5 9.	8 10 54.5 6.9	=	5.2 [3.2; 7.2]
2015 Lee	10 35.8 5.5	10 45.5 6.4		-1.6 [-2.6; -0.5]	2016 Kho	10 91.5 1.	9 10 54.5 6.9	1 -	7.0 [4.4; 9.6]
2015 Lee	10 29.0 4.7	10 45.5 6.4		-2.8 [-4.1; -1.5]	2017 Chen	20 182.3 62.	7 20 318.9 36.9	_ 1	-2.6 [-3.5; -1.7]
2016 Kho	10 25.3 1.4	10 30.0 3.0		-1.9 [-3.0; -0.8]	2017 Chen	20 86.1 16.	9 20 318.9 36.9	*	-8.0 [-9.9; -6.0]
2016 Kno 2017 Chop	10 27.6 1.3	10 30.0 3.0		-0.9 [-1.8; 0.0]	2017 Chen	20 93.4 9.	1 20 318.9 36.9	言目	-8.2 [-10.2; -6.2]
2017 Chen	20 72.9 35.4	20 92.5 19.3		-0.7 [-1.3; -0.0]	2017 Chen	20 101.1 17.	0 20 318.9 36.9	- <u>-</u>	-7.4 [-9.2; -5.6]
2017 Chen	20 52.8 8.7	20 92.5 19.5	1	-2.0 [-3.5, -1.7]	2017 Tian 2017 Tian	20 116.2 14.4	4 20 146.3 0.0	- 1	-2.0 [-3.5, -1.0]
2017 Chen	20 01.9 18.9	20 92.5 19.5		-1.0 [-2.3, -0.9]	2017 Tian 2017 Tian	20 95.9 4.	0 20 140.3 0.0		-9.3 [-11.0, -7.1]
2017 Tian	20 43.0 5.1	20 133.5 8.2		-2.3 [-3.1: -1.5]	2017 Tian	20 107.3 12.	6 20 150.3 4.7		-4.3 [-3.3, -3.2]
2017 Tian	20 94.2 6.3	20 133 5 8 2		-5.3 [-6.6: -3.9]	2018 Kim	8 212 3 58	1 8 295 2 48 4		-1.5 [-2.6; -0.3]
2017 Tian	20 110.2 8.1	20 134.2 6.2		-3.3 [-4.2; -2.3]	2018 Kim	8 198.2 18	2 8 295.2 48.4		-2.5 [-3.9: -1.1]
2017 Tian	20 89.1 6.5	20 134.2 6.2 -		-7.0 [-8.7; -5.2]	2018 Xu	8 161.5 6.4	4 8 192.5 18.5	100	-2.1 [-3.4: -0.8]
2018 Kim	8 123.5 12.5	8 148.5 25.9		-1.2 [-2.2; -0.1]	2018 Xu	8 158.9 4.	9 8 192.5 18.5		-2.3 [-3.7; -1.0]
2018 Kim	8 120.4 7.1	8 148.5 25.9	-	-1.4 [-2.5; -0.3]	2019 Choi (1)	9 489.9 75.	2 10 623.5 152.5		-1.0 [-2.0; -0.1]
2018 Xu	8 42.2 5.3	8 61.2 8.5		-2.5 [-3.9; -1.1]	2019 Choi (1)	10 495.5 104.	5 10 623.5 152.5	+	-0.9 [-1.9; -0.0]
2018 Xu	8 45.5 6.8	8 61.2 8.5		-1.9 [-3.2; -0.7]	2019 Choi (1)	9 510.2 106.	6 10 623.5 152.5	+	-0.8 [-1.8; 0.1]
2019 Choi (1)	9 154.5 32.5	10 321.1 44.4		-4.1 [-5.8; -2.4]	2019 Choi (1)	12 460.4 85.	3 10 623.5 152.5		-1.3 [-2.2; -0.4]
2019 Choi (1)	10 162.3 31.2	10 321.1 44.4		-4.0 [-5.6; -2.3]	2019 Choi (1)	10 471.8 90.	7 10 623.5 152.5		-1.2 [-2.1; -0.2]
2019 Choi (1)	9 189.2 45.5	10 321.1 44.4		-2.8 [-4.1; -1.5]	2019 Choi (2)	8 152.3 48.	9 8 148.3 34.5		0.1 [-0.9; 1.1]
2019 Choi (1)	12 172.9 19.8	10 321.1 44.4		-4.3 [-5.9; -2.7]	2019 Choi (2)	8 114.7 14.	1 8 148.3 34.5		-1.2 [-2.3; -0.1]
2019 Choi (1)	10 178.2 22.2	10 321.1 44.4	<u> </u>	-3.9 [-5.5; -2.3]	2019 Kim	7 68.5 13.	5 7 154.5 5.0		-7.9 [-11.5; -4.3]
2019 Choi (2)	8 135.2 68.5	8 205.1 95.5		-0.8 [-1.8; 0.2]	2019 Kim	7 72.0 10.	1 7 154.5 5.0	- -	-9.7 [-14.0; -5.4]
2019 Choi (2)	8 120.4 31.8	8 205.1 95.5		-1.1 [-2.2; -0.0]	2020 Cheng	6 167.8 7.4	4 6 181.4 10.3		-1.4 [-2.7; -0.1]
2019 Kim	7 63.3 13.4	7 88.5 16.8		-1.6 [-2.8; -0.3]	2020 Hou	10 158.5 9.4	4 10 185.5 6.9	_ =	-3.1 [-4.5; -1.7]
2019 Kim	7 44.5 12.3	7 88.5 16.8	<u> </u>	-2.8 [-4.4; -1.2]	2020 Hou	10 139.9 4.	9 10 185.5 6.9		-7.3 [-10.0; -4.6]
2020 Cheng	6 67.3 6.0	6 84.6 6.8		-2.5 [-4.1; -0.8]	2020 Hou	10 170.5 11.	1 10 210.3 12.8		-3.2 [-4.6; -1.8]
2020 Hou	10 49.5 6.5	10 65.1 6.9		-2.2 [-3.4; -1.1]	2020 Hou	10 148.6 9.	2 10 210.3 12.8	_ =	-5.3 [-7.3; -3.3]
2020 Hou	10 50.1 5.7	10 00.1 0.9		-4.1 [-5.7, -2.4]	2020 140	5 120.5 4.	9 5 224.5 5.6 -		-10.5 [-25.7, -7.5]
2020 Hou	10 30.4 7.5	10 70.2 5.1		-2.9 [-4.2, -1.3]	2021 Gu	10 192.2 10.	9 10 246.5 15.1	1	-3.2 [-4.5, -1.0]
2020 100	5 422 132	5 112 5 28 9		-4.0 [-5.6, -2.4]	2021 Jiang (1)	0 102 0 10	0 9 120 2 22 2		-0.0 [-1.0; 0.1]
2020 140	10 63 2 6 9	10 79 5 7 2		-2.0 [-4.0, -0.0]	2021 Liang	8 99 8 21	5 0 120.2 23.3 1 8 120 2 23 3		-0.0 [-1.0, 0.3]
2021 Jiang (1)	10 34 0 36	10 488 35		-2.2 [-3.4, -1.1]	2021 Liang 2021 Zhou	8 125 3 8	6 8 138 2 12 5		-0.9 [-1.9, 0.2]
2021 Liang	8 25 2 6 5	8 32 5 5 6	-	-1.1 [-2.2:-0.1]	2021 Zhou	8 75 6 9	2 8 138 2 12.5	-	-5.4 [-2.2, -0.1]
2021 Liang	8 24.8 4.8	8 32.5 5.6		-1.4 [-2.5: -0.3]	20212100	0 75.0 9.	2 0 100.2 12.0		-3.4 [-7.7, -3.0]
2021 Zhou	8 44.8 4.9	8 29.5 7.8		2.2 [0.9: 3.5]	Random effects mo	del 395	395		-32 [-4419]
2021 Zhou	8 22.3 5.7	8 29.5 7.8	-	-1.0 [-2.1: 0.1]	Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 92^{\circ}$	$% \tau^2 = 13.5120 \ p < 0.0$	1		on [, -1.0]
	2 3810 011		_		notorogonoky, r = oz.	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-20 -10 0 10 20	0
Random effects mode	425	425	\$	-2.3 [-2.8; -1.8]					
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 82\%$,	$\tau^2 = 1.9066, p < 0.01$								
- /	.,		-5 0 5						

Figure 5. Effects of *Panax ginseng* on liver injury markers in the subgroup analysis of HFD-induced NAFLD. Forest plots for comparison: (**A**) ALT levels [7,26–28,30,32,35–37,39–41,47–49,52]. (**B**) AST levels [7,27,28,30,32,35–37,39–41,47–49,52]. SD, standard deviation.

3.5.2. Subgroup Analysis According to the Animal Species

In the present meta-analysis, the animal species used for the study is another variable. Among the total of 41 animal studies, mice or rats were used in 30 (73.2%) or 11 studies (26.8%), respectively. To find out whether the effect of *Panax ginseng* differs depending on the animal species, a meta-regression test was performed by dividing groups of mice and rats. As a result, all factors related to liver injury (ALT and AST) or lipid metabolism (TG, TC, HDL, and LDL) did not show significant linear associations according to animal species (*p* in ALT = 0.184; *p* in AST = 0.069; *p* in TG = 0.867; *p* in TC = 0.909; *p* in HDL = 0.051; *p* in LDL = 0.361) (Figure 7A–F). These data may indicate that the animal species used in the meta-analysis could be a factor in increasing heterogeneity, but did not affect the overall protective effects of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD-induced animals.

3.6. Fasting Blood Glucose

Impaired glucose tolerance and insulin resistance are considered crucial hepatic manifestations in the progression of NAFLD [1]. Therefore, studies reporting fasting blood glucose levels were subjected to analysis. A total of 14 studies with 394 animals with high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 74\%$, p < 0.01) were analyzed to investigate the overall effect of *Panax ginseng* on fasting blood glucose levels (Figure 8A). As expected, a random-effects model demonstrated that *Panax ginseng* treatment significantly reduced fasting blood glucose levels compared to the control groups (SMD: -1.45 mg/dL; 95% CI: -1.99 to -0.92 mg/dL; p < 0.0001) (Figure 8A). In addition, the subgroup analysis with the HFD-induced NAFLD model also presented diminished fasting blood glucose levels by *Panax ginseng* treatment (SMD: -0.99 mg/dL; 95% CI: -1.60 to -0.38 mg/dL; p = 0.0014) (Figure 8B). Moreover, there was no difference in the hypoglycemic effect of *Panax ginseng* according to animal species (p in fasting blood glucose = 0.599) (Figure 8C).



Figure 6. Effects of *Panax ginseng* on markers for hepatic lipid metabolism in the subgroup analysis of HFD-induced NAFLD. Forest plots for comparison: (**A**) TG levels [7,21,22,25–28,30,32–35,39–41,46–49,51,52,57]. (**B**) TC levels [7,21,25–28,30,32–35,39–41,46,47,49,51,52,57]. (**C**) HDL levels [7,21,27,28,32, 35,39,46,49,51,52]. (**D**) LDL levels [7,21,25,27,28,30,32,35,39,46,49,51,52,57]. SD, standard deviation.

3.7. Publication Bias

Notably, substantial publication bias (p < 0.05) was detected in all measured outcomes by the Egger's bias test of included studies (Supplementary Figure S1). Therefore, although the current study discovered beneficial effects of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD-induced liver injury, dyslipidemia, and glucose intolerance, these results should be interpreted with caution.

(B)



Figure 7. Effects of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD according to animal species. Bubble plots with the fitted meta-regression lines for comparison: (**A**) ALT levels [7,19,20,23,27–32,35–41,43–45,47–50,52,54–56,58]. (**B**) AST levels [19,23,27–32,35–41,44,45,47–50,52,54–56,58]. (**C**) TG levels [7,19–30,32–35,38–41,44,46–52,56,58]. (**D**) TC levels [7,19–21,23,25–30,32–35,38–41,44,46,47,49–52,56–58]. (**E**) HDL levels [7,19,21,23, 27,28,32,35,38,39,44,46,49–52,56–58]. (**F**) LDL levels [7,19,21,25,27,28,30,32,35,38,39,46,49–52,56–58]. SD, standard deviation. Each circle indicates each study.

	(A)			.		
	Study	Experimental Total Mean SD	Control Total Mean SD	Standardised Mean Difference	SMD	95%-CI
	Study 2009 Lim 2009 Lim 2012 Quan 2012 Quan 2012 Quan 2012 Quan 2014 Lee 2016 Kho 2017 Huang 2018 Kim 2018 Kim 2019 Fan 2020 Jeong 2020 Jeong 2022 Zhang Random effects mod Heterogeneity: /² = 74%	Experimental Total Mean SD 8<118.0	Control SD 8 179.0 88.7 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 123.5 5.5 10 156.5 34.0 10 366.9 46.1 8 227.3 77.5 6 121.5 18.5 10 216.0 45.0 10 216.0 45.0 10 216.0 45.0 10 216.0 18. 7 193.0 21.8 7 193.0 21.8 7 147.6 30.5 <	Difference	-0.9 -0.9 -0.0 -0.6 -3.6 -0.3 -0.4 -1.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.1 -1.4 -2.6 -0.1 -1.4 -2.6 -0.1 -0.7 -2.1 -0.7 -2.1 -0.7 -2.1 -0.7 -1.8 -5.3 -5.0 -1.8	95%-C1 [-2.0; 0.1] [-1.9; 0.2] [-1.1; 1.1] [-1.7; 0.6] [-7.2; -2.2] [-2.8; 0.4] [-5.1; -2.1] [-1.2; 0.6] [-1.3; 0.5] [-2.0; -0.1] [-1.6; 0.4] [-1.6; 0.4] [-1.6; 0.4] [-1.6; 0.4] [-1.6; 0.4] [-3.0; -0.2] [-1.3; 1.0] [-2.4; -0.4] [-3.6; -1.2] [-3.6; -1.1] [-3.1; -0.5] [-7.4; -3.3] [-6.9; -3.1]
Study 2012 Quan 2012 Quan 2012 Quan 2014 Li 2016 Kho 2016 Kho	Experimental Total Mean SD 6 171.0 7.2 6 167.4 3.6 6 138.6 5.4 10 101.1 6.5 10 148.8 4.4 10 146.8 1.5	Control Total Mean SD 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 6 171.0 7.2 — 10 123.5 5.5 10 156.5 34.0 10 156.5 34.0	Standardised Mear Difference	SMD 95%-Cl 0.0 [-1.1; 1.1] -0.6 [-1.7; 0.6] -4.7 [-7.2; -2.2] -3.6 [-5.1; -2.1] -0.3 [-1.2; 0.6] -0.4 [-1.3; 0.5]	(C)	Glucose
2018 Kim 2018 Kim 2018 Li 2018 Li 2019 Kim 2019 Kim 2020 Song 2022 Li	8 190.5 30.8 8 188.5 35.4 6 96.5 8.8 6 118.5 23.5 7 191.7 18.2 7 195.1 22.4 8 99.0 14.5 7 93.6 25.4	8 227.3 77.5 8 227.3 77.5 6 121.5 18.5 6 121.5 18.5 7 193.0 21.8 7 193.0 21.8 8 136.0 12.8 7 147.6 30.5	*****	-0.6 [-1.6; 0.4] -0.6 [-1.6; 0.4] -1.6 [-3.0; -0.2] -0.1 [-1.3; 1.0] 0.1 [-1.1; 1.0] 0.1 [-1.0; 1.1] -2.6 [-4.0; -1.1] -1.8 [-3.1; -0.5]		Mouse Rat
Random effects Heterogeneity: I ²	s model 105 = 69%, τ^2 = 0.9649, $p < 0.01$	105		-1.0 [-1.6; -0.4]		



NAFLD subgroup analysis [22,25,27,32,33,39,46,53]. (C) A bubble plot with the fitted meta-regression line for the subgroup analysis according to animal species [19,22,24,25,27,29,32,33,38,39,42,46,53,56]. Each circle indicates each study. SD, standard deviation.

4. Discussion

Recent "multiple hit" theories of NAFLD pathogenesis have suggested that both intrahepatic (e.g., inflammation, oxidative stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, and endoplasmic reticulum (ER) stress) and extrahepatic (e.g., gut microbiome or adipokines) mechanisms cooperatively contribute to NAFLD development [3]. Because of the heterogeneous nature of NAFLD pathogenesis, there is still no approved drug for NAFLD, even though numerous clinical trials are ongoing. *Panax ginseng* is a traditional herbal medicine in eastern countries that exerts anti-oxidative, anti-inflammatory, and anti-microbial effects. Due to these beneficial functions of *Panax ginseng*, the preclinical study with *Panax ginseng* has been performed on various diseases, such as liver diseases, metabolic disorders, cardiovascular diseases, and neurological diseases, in which oxidative stress and inflammatory responses play important roles [9,10]. However, although many publications were investigating the role of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD, to the best of our knowledge, there is no systematic review and meta-analysis related to this topic. Due to this limited information on the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* for NAFLD, only a small-scale clinical study has been conducted with *Panax ginseng* in patients with NAFLD [60].

In the systematic review and meta-analysis of a preclinical study, it is important to carefully set the primary outcomes so that the results can be applied to the clinic. Although a reliable endpoint that can effectively predict the outcome of patients is still lacking, most of the ongoing NAFLD clinical trials set the markers for liver injury (ALT and AST), lipid metabolism (TG, TC, HDL, and LDL), and hyperglycemia (fasting blood glucose) as primary outcomes. In line with this clinical setting, the present study concisely analyzed the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD-related liver injury, dyslipidemia, and glucose tolerance in the preclinical studies using the above parameters as primary outcomes.

As a result, Panax ginseng treatment significantly diminished NAFLD-induced systemic ALT, AST, TG, TC, LDL, and fasting blood glucose levels while elevating HDL levels in animals. These results are partially consistent with a previous clinical trial in which blood ALT, gamma-glutamyl transferase, and TG levels of patients with NAFLD were significantly reduced by 30 days of 2 g day $^{-1}$ treatment with Korean red ginseng compared to placebo controls [60]. In this study, TC levels were significantly reduced compared to the baseline in NAFLD patients treated with Korean red ginseng, but there was no difference when compared to the placebo controls. In addition, AST and fasting glucose levels were not changed by the Korean red ginseng treatment. However, since the participants in the above clinical trial were also administered milk thistle extracts (450 mg d^{-1} ; Legalon[®]), further clinical trials are needed to demonstrate the protective effects of Panax ginseng in patients with NAFLD. Interestingly, the current meta-analysis acquired promising results from highly heterogeneous studies on the dose (0.4 mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹ to 1000 mg kg⁻¹ day⁻¹), duration (3 days to 16 weeks), and route of *Panax ginseng* treatment. It may imply that Panax ginseng has multiple downstream targets in NAFLD. Although the underlying mechanisms could not be delineated by this study, included articles have suggested several protective mechanisms mediated by Panax ginseng treatment against NAFLD. First, in hepatocytes, Panax ginseng treatment suppressed NAFLD-induced cellular stress responses, such as oxidative stress [23,50], ER stress [35,47], and mitochondrial dysfunction [26]. In addition, the administration of *Panax ginseng* has beneficial effects on hepatic energy metabolism by activating AMP-activated protein kinase [22,29,56,58] but inhibiting the mammalian target of rapamycin complex 1 [37], resulting in the normalization of hepatic glucose [30] and lipid metabolism [32–34,41] in NAFLD. In the hepatic microenvironment, Panax ginseng reduced inflammatory responses by preventing activation of the NLR family pyrin domain containing 3 (NLRP3) inflammasome and nuclear factor kappa-light-chainenhancer of activated B cells (NF-κB), thereby suppressing gene and protein expression levels of interleukin (IL)-1β, IL-6, and tumor necrosis factor- α [35,36,38,49,55]. In the extrahepatic milieu, *Panax ginseng* rebounded adiponectin production by adipocytes [53] and restricted the expansion of adipose tissue by inhibiting angiogenesis [24]. In addition, recent studies have suggested that the beneficial roles of *Panax ginseng* on hepatic lipid metabolism may be derived from the modulation of the gut microbiome [51,57,58].

As such, the various protective mechanisms of *Panax ginseng* may suggest that it could help treat NAFLD patients with high heterogeneity in their pathophysiology. Indeed, in the subgroup analyses of the current study, the therapeutic effects of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLDinduced animals were not dependent on the experimental models or animal species used. However, although the beneficial effects of *Panax ginseng* treatment were found in NAFLDinduced animals, there was a publication bias in all outcomes in Egger's test. Publication bias is the phenomenon in which the results of experiments determine the likelihood of publication, often overinterpreting positive results. Despite the significant publication bias of the present study, multiple lines of evidence support the protective effect of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD. Furthermore, in the case of animal experiments to investigate the efficacy of *Panax ginseng*, publication might be difficult if the effect of treatment was unsatisfactory. Therefore, although the present study demonstrated the protective effects of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD-induced animals, all results of the primary outcomes should be interpreted with caution, and more well-designed preclinical and clinical studies are required.

Despite the present meta-analysis providing rigorous information on the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD, there are several limitations. First of all, the most critical limitation of this study is that the efficacy of *Panax ginseng* was evaluated only in preclinical animal models. Although the various NAFLD models used in the included literature can mimic the pathobiology of human NAFLD patients in part, there are significant discrepancies in the pathogenesis and effects of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD between animals and patients. In addition, due to the nature of animal experiments, included studies had greater heterogeneity with various experimental conditions compared to patients. Another limitation is that the current study could not clarify the efficient components, doses, durations, and routes of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD in detail. As this study detected constant favorable outcomes, including liver injury, from all included studies, *Panax ginseng* may have therapeutic potential in NAFLD. However, a future study that directly compares the components-, dose-, duration-, and route-dependent efficacy of *Panax ginseng* in NAFLD will be necessary for its therapeutic application.

5. Conclusions

The present study demonstrated that the treatment of *Panax ginseng* significantly ameliorated liver injury and disturbances of lipid and glucose metabolism in NAFLD-induced animals, regardless of the experimental model. Although the protective mechanisms of *Panax ginseng* on NAFLD remain unknown, this meta-analysis suggested that *Panax ginseng* has both intra- and extrahepatic beneficial effects. Because there was considerable heterogeneity and publication bias in the included studies, the results should be interpreted with caution.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at: https://www.mdpi.com/article/10.3390/nu15030721/s1, Figure S1: Funnel plots of the measured outcomes reflect publication bias.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; methodology, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; software, K.Y.; validation, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; formal analysis, K.Y.; investigation, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; writing—original draft preparation, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; writing—review and editing, Y.-R.S. and M.J.S.; visualization, K.Y. and H.-H.K.; supervision, M.J.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

18 of 20

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Published systematic review and PROSPERO (CRD42023381574).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Friedman, S.L.; Neuschwander-Tetri, B.A.; Rinella, M.; Sanyal, A.J. Mechanisms of NAFLD development and therapeutic strategies. *Nat. Med.* 2018, 24, 908–922. [CrossRef]
- 2. Day, C.P.; James, O.F. Steatohepatitis: A tale of two "hits"? Gastroenterology 1998, 114, 842–845. [CrossRef]
- Buzzetti, E.; Pinzani, M.; Tsochatzis, E.A. The multiple-hit pathogenesis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). *Metabolism* 2016, 65, 1038–1048. [CrossRef]
- Arab, J.P.; Arrese, M.; Trauner, M. Recent Insights into the Pathogenesis of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Annu. Rev. Pathol.* 2018, 13, 321–350. [CrossRef]
- Stockwell, S.; Trott, M.; Tully, M.; Shin, J.; Barnett, Y.; Butler, L.; McDermott, D.; Schuch, F.; Smith, L. Changes in physical activity and sedentary behaviours from before to during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown: A systematic review. *BMJ. Open. Sport. Exerc. Med.* 2021, 7, e000960. [CrossRef]
- 6. Hannah, W.N., Jr.; Harrison, S.A. Lifestyle and Dietary Interventions in the Management of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Dig. Dis. Sci.* **2016**, *61*, 1365–1374. [CrossRef]
- Liang, W.; Zhou, K.; Jian, P.; Chang, Z.; Zhang, Q.; Liu, Y.; Xiao, S.; Zhang, L. Ginsenosides Improve Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease via Integrated Regulation of Gut Microbiota, Inflammation and Energy Homeostasis. *Front. Pharmacol.* 2021, 12, 622841. [CrossRef]
- 8. Kim, D.H. Chemical Diversity of Panax ginseng, Panax quinquifolium, and Panax notoginseng. J. Ginseng. Res. 2012, 36, 1–15. [CrossRef]
- Ratan, Z.A.; Haidere, M.F.; Hong, Y.H.; Park, S.H.; Lee, J.O.; Lee, J.; Cho, J.Y. Pharmacological potential of ginseng and its major component ginsenosides. J. Ginseng. Res. 2021, 45, 199–210. [CrossRef]
- 10. Huu Tung, N.; Uto, T.; Morinaga, O.; Kim, Y.H.; Shoyama, Y. Pharmacological effects of ginseng on liver functions and diseases: A minireview. *Evid. Based. Complement. Alternat. Med.* **2012**, 2012, 173297. [CrossRef]
- Song, S.W.; Kim, H.N.; Shim, J.Y.; Yoo, B.Y.; Kim, D.H.; Lee, S.H.; Park, J.S.; Kim, M.J.; Yoo, J.H.; Cho, B.; et al. Safety and tolerability of Korean Red Ginseng in healthy adults: A multicenter, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J. Ginseng. Res.* 2018, 42, 571–576. [CrossRef]
- 12. Park, S.K.; Kim, S.W.; Seo, H.W.; Hyun, S.H.; Kyung, J.S.; Youn, S.H.; So, S.H.; In, G.; Park, C.K.; Yi, E.C.; et al. Long-term evaluation of safety and biological effects of Korean Red Ginseng (Panax Ginseng): A long-term in vivo study. *BMC Complement. Med. Ther.* **2022**, *22*, 284. [CrossRef]
- 13. He, Y.; Yang, J.; Lv, Y.; Chen, J.; Yin, F.; Huang, J.; Zheng, Q. A Review of Ginseng Clinical Trials Registered in the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform. *Biomed. Res. Int.* **2018**, 2018, 1843142. [CrossRef]
- 14. Naseri, K.; Saadati, S.; Sadeghi, A.; Asbaghi, O.; Ghaemi, F.; Zafarani, F.; Li, H.B.; Gan, R.Y. The Efficacy of Ginseng (Panax) on Human Prediabetes and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients* **2022**, *14*, 2401. [CrossRef]
- 15. Wang, Y.; Yang, G.; Gong, J.; Lu, F.; Diao, Q.; Sun, J.; Zhang, K.; Tian, J.; Liu, J. Ginseng for Alzheimer's Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Curr. Top. Med. Chem.* **2016**, *16*, 529–536. [CrossRef]
- Komishon, A.M.; Shishtar, E.; Ha, V.; Sievenpiper, J.L.; de Souza, R.J.; Jovanovski, E.; Ho, H.V.; Duvnjak, L.S.; Vuksan, V. The effect of ginseng (genus *Panax*) on blood pressure: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled clinical trials. *J. Hum. Hypertens.* 2016, 30, 619–626. [CrossRef]
- 17. Moher, D.; Liberati, A.; Tetzlaff, J.; Altman, D.G.; Group, P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* **2009**, *6*, e1000097. [CrossRef]
- 18. Hooijmans, C.R.; Rovers, M.M.; de Vries, R.B.; Leenaars, M.; Ritskes-Hoitinga, M.; Langendam, M.W. SYRCLE's risk of bias tool for animal studies. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **2014**, *14*, 43. [CrossRef]
- Lim, S.; Yoon, J.W.; Choi, S.H.; Cho, B.J.; Kim, J.T.; Chang, H.S.; Park, H.S.; Park, K.S.; Lee, H.K.; Kim, Y.B.; et al. Effect of ginsam, a vinegar extract from Panax ginseng, on body weight and glucose homeostasis in an obese insulin-resistant rat model. *Metabolism* 2009, *58*, 8–15. [CrossRef]
- Kwak, Y.S.; Kyung, J.S.; Kim, J.S.; Cho, J.Y.; Rhee, M.H. Anti-hyperlipidemic effects of red ginseng acidic polysaccharide from Korean red ginseng. *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* 2010, 33, 468–472. [CrossRef]
- Liu, R.; Zhang, J.; Liu, W.; Kimura, Y.; Zheng, Y. Anti-Obesity effects of protopanaxdiol types of Ginsenosides isolated from the leaves of American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius* L.) in mice fed with a high-fat diet. *Fitoterapia* 2010, 81, 1079–1087. [CrossRef]
- 22. Quan, H.Y.; Yuan, H.D.; Jung, M.S.; Ko, S.K.; Park, Y.G.; Chung, S.H. Ginsenoside Re lowers blood glucose and lipid levels via activation of AMP-activated protein kinase in HepG2 cells and high-fat diet fed mice. *Int. J. Mol. Med.* 2012, 29, 73–80. [CrossRef]
- Hong, S.H.; Suk, K.T.; Choi, S.H.; Lee, J.W.; Sung, H.T.; Kim, C.H.; Kim, E.J.; Kim, M.J.; Han, S.H.; Kim, M.Y.; et al. Anti-oxidant and natural killer cell activity of Korean red ginseng (*Panax ginseng*) and urushiol (*Rhus vernicifera* Stokes) on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease of rat. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 2013, 55, 586–591. [CrossRef]

- 24. Lee, H.; Kim, M.; Shin, S.S.; Yoon, M. Ginseng treatment reverses obesity and related disorders by inhibiting angiogenesis in female db/db mice. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* **2014**, 155, 1342–1352. [CrossRef]
- Li, X.; Luo, J.; Anandh Babu, P.V.; Zhang, W.; Gilbert, E.; Cline, M.; McMillan, R.; Hulver, M.; Alkhalidy, H.; Zhen, W.; et al. Dietary supplementation of chinese ginseng prevents obesity and metabolic syndrome in high-fat diet-fed mice. *J. Med. Food.* 2014, 17, 1287–1297. [CrossRef]
- Lee, S.B.; Cho, H.I.; Jin, Y.W.; Lee, E.K.; Ahn, J.Y.; Lee, S.M. Wild ginseng cambial meristematic cells ameliorate hepatic steatosis and mitochondrial dysfunction in high-fat diet-fed mice. J. Pharm. Pharmacol. 2016, 68, 119–127. [CrossRef]
- Kho, M.C.; Lee, Y.J.; Park, J.H.; Cha, J.D.; Choi, K.M.; Kang, D.G.; Lee, H.S. Combination with Red ginseng and *Polygoni Multiflori* ameliorates highfructose diet induced metabolic syndrome. *BMC Complement. Altern. Med.* 2016, 16, 98. [CrossRef]
- 28. Chen, X.J.; Liu, W.J.; Wen, M.L.; Liang, H.; Wu, S.M.; Zhu, Y.Z.; Zhao, J.Y.; Dong, X.Q.; Li, M.G.; Bian, L.; et al. Ameliorative effects of Compound K and ginsenoside Rh1 on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in rats. *Sci. Rep.* **2017**, *7*, 41144. [CrossRef]
- Huang, Q.; Wang, T.; Yang, L.; Wang, H.Y. Ginsenoside Rb2 Alleviates Hepatic Lipid Accumulation by Restoring Autophagy via Induction of Sirt1 and Activation of AMPK. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2017, 18, 1063. [CrossRef]
- Tian, W.; Chen, L.; Zhang, L.; Wang, B.; Li, X.B.; Fan, K.R.; Ai, C.H.; Xia, X.; Li, S.D.; Li, Y. Effects of ginsenoside Rg1 on glucose metabolism and liver injury in streptozotocin-induced type 2 diabetic rats. *Genet. Mol. Res.* 2017, 16, gmr16019463. [CrossRef]
- 31. Jeong, H.; Kim, J.W.; Yang, M.S.; Park, C.; Kim, J.H.; Lim, C.W.; Kim, B. Beneficial Effects of Korean Red Ginseng in the Progression of Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis via FABP4 Modulation. *Am. J. Chin. Med.* **2018**, *46*, 1581–1607. [CrossRef]
- Kim, G.W.; Jo, H.K.; Chung, S.H. Ginseng seed oil ameliorates hepatic lipid accumulation in vitro and in vivo. *J. Ginseng. Res.* 2018, 42, 419–428. [CrossRef]
- 33. Li, Z.; Kim, H.J.; Park, M.S.; Ji, G.E. Effects of fermented ginseng root and ginseng berry on obesity and lipid metabolism in mice fed a high-fat diet. *J. Ginseng. Res.* 2018, 42, 312–319. [CrossRef]
- Shin, S.S.; Yoon, M. Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng) inhibits obesity and improves lipid metabolism in high fat diet-fed castrated mice. J. Ethnopharmacol. 2018, 210, 80–87. [CrossRef]
- Xu, Y.; Yang, C.; Zhang, S.; Li, J.; Xiao, Q.; Huang, W. Ginsenoside Rg1 Protects against Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease by Ameliorating Lipid Peroxidation, Endoplasmic Reticulum Stress, and Inflammasome Activation. *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* 2018, 41, 1638–1644. [CrossRef]
- Choi, N.; Kim, J.W.; Jeong, H.; Shin, D.G.; Seo, J.H.; Kim, J.H.; Lim, C.W.; Han, K.M.; Kim, B. Fermented ginseng, GBCK25, ameliorates steatosis and inflammation in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis model. J. Ginseng. Res. 2019, 43, 196–208. [CrossRef]
- Choi, S.Y.; Park, J.S.; Shon, C.H.; Lee, C.Y.; Ryu, J.M.; Son, D.J.; Hwang, B.Y.; Yoo, H.S.; Cho, Y.C.; Lee, J.; et al. Fermented Korean Red Ginseng Extract Enriched in Rd and Rg3 Protects against Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease through Regulation of mTORC1. *Nutrients* 2019, *11*, 2963. [CrossRef]
- Fan, X.; Zhang, C.; Niu, S.; Fan, B.; Gu, D.; Jiang, K.; Li, R.; Li, S. Ginsenoside Rg1 attenuates hepatic insulin resistance induced by high-fat and high-sugar by inhibiting inflammation. *Eur. J. Pharmacol.* 2019, 854, 247–255. [CrossRef]
- Kim, J.C.; Jeon, J.Y.; Yang, W.S.; Kim, C.H.; Eom, D.W. Combined Amelioration of Ginsenoside (Rg1, Rb1, and Rg3)-enriched Korean Red Ginseng and Probiotic Lactobacillus on Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Curr. Pharm. Biotechnol.* 2019, 20, 222–231. [CrossRef]
- 40. Cheng, B.; Gao, W.; Wu, X.; Zheng, M.; Yu, Y.; Song, C.; Miao, W.; Yang, Z.; He, Y.; Liu, C.; et al. Ginsenoside Rg2 Ameliorates High-Fat Diet-Induced Metabolic Disease through SIRT1. J. Agric. Food Chem. **2020**, 68, 4215–4226. [CrossRef]
- 41. Hou, Y.; Gu, D.; Peng, J.; Jiang, K.; Li, Z.; Shi, J.; Yang, S.; Li, S.; Fan, X. Ginsenoside Rg1 Regulates Liver Lipid Factor Metabolism in NAFLD Model Rats. *ACS Omega* 2020, *5*, 10878–10890. [CrossRef]
- Jeong, Y.J.; Hwang, M.J.; Hong, C.O.; Yoo, D.S.; Kim, J.S.; Kim, D.Y.; Lee, K.W. Anti-hyperglycemic and hypolipidemic effects of black ginseng extract containing increased Rh4, Rg5, and Rk1 content in muscle and liver of type 2 diabetic db/db mice. *Food Sci. Biotechnol.* 2020, 29, 1101–1112. [CrossRef]
- Lee, J.H.; Oh, J.Y.; Kim, S.H.; Oh, I.J.; Lee, Y.H.; Lee, K.W.; Lee, W.H.; Kim, J.H. Pharmaceutical Efficacy of Gypenoside LXXV on Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis (NASH). *Biomolecules* 2020, 10, 1426. [CrossRef]
- 44. Park, M.; Yoo, J.H.; Lee, Y.S.; Park, E.J.; Lee, H.J. Ameliorative effects of black ginseng on nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in free fatty acid-induced HepG2 cells and high-fat/high-fructose diet-fed mice. J. Ginseng. Res. 2020, 44, 350–361. [CrossRef]
- 45. Qi, R.; Jiang, R.; Xiao, H.; Wang, Z.; He, S.; Wang, L.; Wang, Y. Ginsenoside Rg1 protects against d-galactose induced fatty liver disease in a mouse model via FOXO1 transcriptional factor. *Life Sci.* **2020**, 254, 117776. [CrossRef]
- 46. Song, B.; Sun, Y.; Chu, Y.; Wang, J.; Zheng, H.; Liu, L.; Cai, W.; Zhang, H. Ginsenoside Rb1 Alleviated High-Fat-Diet-Induced Hepatocytic Apoptosis via Peroxisome Proliferator-Activated Receptor gamma. *Biomed. Res. Int.* **2020**, 2020, 2315230. [CrossRef]
- 47. Yao, Y. Ginsenosides reduce body weight and ameliorate hepatic steatosis in high fat diet-induced obese mice via endoplasmic reticulum stress and p-STAT3/STAT3 signaling. *Mol. Med. Rep.* **2020**, *21*, 1059–1070. [CrossRef]
- Gu, D.; Yi, H.; Jiang, K.; Fakhar, S.H.; Shi, J.; He, Y.; Liu, B.; Guo, Y.; Fan, X.; Li, S. Transcriptome analysis reveals the efficacy of ginsenoside-Rg1 in the treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Life Sci.* 2021, 267, 118986. [CrossRef]
- 49. Jiang, G.; Ramachandraiah, K.; Murtaza, M.A.; Wang, L.; Li, S.; Ameer, K. Synergistic effects of black ginseng and aged garlic extracts for the amelioration of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) in mice. *Food Sci. Nutr.* **2021**, *9*, 3091–3099. [CrossRef]

- Jiang, Y.; Sui, D.; Li, M.; Xu, H.; Yu, X.; Liu, J.; Yu, Q. Ginsenoside Re Improves Inflammation and Fibrosis in Hepatic Tissue by Upregulating PPARgamma Expression and Inhibiting Oxidative Stress in db/db Mice. *Evid. Based Complement. Alternat. Med.* 2021, 2021, 9003603. [CrossRef]
- 51. Zhao, C.; Qu, Q.; Yang, F.; Li, Z.; Yang, P.; Han, L.; Shi, X. Monascus ruber fermented Panax ginseng ameliorates lipid metabolism disorders and modulate gut microbiota in rats fed a high-fat diet. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* **2021**, *278*, 114300. [CrossRef]
- 52. Zhou, J.; Zhang, J.; Li, J.; Guan, Y.; Shen, T.; Li, F.; Li, X.; Yang, X.; Hu, W. Ginsenoside F2 Suppresses Adipogenesis in 3T3-L1 Cells and Obesity in Mice via the AMPK Pathway. J. Agric. Food Chem. 2021, 69, 9299–9312. [CrossRef]
- Li, Y.; Zhang, S.; Zhu, Z.; Zhou, R.; Xu, P.; Zhou, L.; Kan, Y.; Li, J.; Zhao, J.; Fang, P.; et al. Upregulation of adiponectin by Ginsenoside Rb1 contributes to amelioration of hepatic steatosis induced by high fat diet. *J. Ginseng. Res.* 2022, 46, 561–571. [CrossRef]
- Wei, W.; Liu, L.; Liu, X.; Tao, Y.; Zhao, X.; Gong, J.; Wang, Y.; Liu, S. Exploring the Therapeutic Effects of Black Ginseng on Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease by Using Network Pharmacology and Molecular Docking. *Chem. Biodivers.* 2022, 19, e202200719. [CrossRef]
- Wei, W.; Liu, L.; Liu, X.; Tao, Y.; Gong, J.; Wang, Y.; Liu, S. Black ginseng protects against Western diet-induced nonalcoholic steatohepatitis by modulating the TLR4/NF-kappaB signaling pathway in mice. J. Food. Biochem. 2022, 46, e14432. [CrossRef]
- Zhang, J.; Ma, X.; Fan, D. Ginsenoside CK ameliorates hepatic lipid accumulation via activating the LKB1/AMPK pathway in vitro and in vivo. *Food Funct.* 2022, 13, 1153–1167. [CrossRef]
- Zou, H.; Zhang, M.; Zhu, X.; Zhu, L.; Chen, S.; Luo, M.; Xie, Q.; Chen, Y.; Zhang, K.; Bu, Q.; et al. Ginsenoside Rb1 Improves Metabolic Disorder in High-Fat Diet-Induced Obese Mice Associated With Modulation of Gut Microbiota. *Front. Microbiol.* 2022, 13, 826487. [CrossRef]
- Ren, T.; Liu, F.; Wang, D.; Li, B.; Jiang, P.; Li, J.; Li, H.; Chen, C.; Wu, W.; Jiao, L. Rhamnogalacturonan-I enriched pectin from steamed ginseng ameliorates lipid metabolism in type 2 diabetic rats via gut microbiota and AMPK pathway. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 2023, 301, 115862. [CrossRef]
- Van Herck, M.A.; Vonghia, L.; Francque, S.M. Animal Models of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease-A Starter's Guide. *Nutrients* 2017, 9, 1072. [CrossRef]
- Hong, J.T.; Lee, M.J.; Yoon, S.J.; Shin, S.P.; Bang, C.S.; Baik, G.H.; Kim, D.J.; Youn, G.S.; Shin, M.J.; Ham, Y.L.; et al. Effect of Korea red ginseng on nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: An association of gut microbiota with liver function. *J. Ginseng. Res.* 2021, 45, 316–324. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.