

**Original Article**

**Effects of exogenous melatonin supplementation on health outcomes: an umbrella review of meta-analyses based on randomized controlled trials**

Soojin Lim<sup>1†</sup>, Seoyeon Park<sup>1†</sup>, Ai Koyanagi, M.D.<sup>2</sup>, Jae Won Yang, Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>, Louis Jacob, M.D.<sup>4,5</sup>, Dong Keon Yon, M.D.<sup>6</sup>, Seung Won Lee, M.D.<sup>7</sup>, Min Seo Kim, M.D.<sup>8</sup>, Jae Il Shin, M.D.<sup>9\*</sup> and Lee Smith, Ph.D.<sup>10</sup>

1. Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

2. ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, Barcelona, Spain

3. Department of Nephrology, Yonsei University Wonju College of Medicine, Wonju, Republic of Korea

4. Research and Development Unit, Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu, CIBERSAM, Dr. Antoni Pujadas, 42, Sant Boi de Llobregat, Barcelona 08830, Spain

5. Faculty of Medicine, University of Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

6. Department of Pediatrics, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

7. Department of Data Science, Sejong University College of Software Convergence, Seoul, Republic of Korea

8. Genomics and Digital Health, Samsung Advanced Institute for Health Sciences and Technology (SAIHST), Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

9. Department of Pediatrics, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

10. Cambridge Centre for Health, Performance, and Wellbeing, Anglia Ruskin University,  
Cambridge, UK

\* Corresponding Author:

Prof. Jae Il Shin, MD.

Address: 50-1 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, C.P.O. Box 8044, Department of Pediatrics, Yonsei  
University College of Medicine, Seoul 03722, Korea

Tel.: +82-2-2228-2050; Fax: +82-2-393-9118; E-mail: shinji@yuhs.ac

† Soojin Lim and Seoyeon Park contributed equally to this article as co-first authors.

### **Declaration of interest**

All authors state that they have no actual or potential conflict of interest including any  
financial, personal, or other relationships with other people or organization.

### **Funding**

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,  
commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## **Abstract**

Various melatonin supplementations have been developed to improve health outcomes in various clinical conditions. Thus, we sought to evaluate and summarize the effect of melatonin treatments in clinical settings for health outcomes. We searched PubMed/Medline, Embase, and Cochrane Library from inception to 4 February 2021. We included meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials investigating the melatonin intervention for any health outcome. Based on the different effect sizes of each meta-analysis, we calculated random models' standardized mean differences or risk ratios. We observed robust evidence supported by statistical significance with non-considerable heterogeneity between studies for sleep-related problems, cancer, surgical patients, and pregnant women. Patients with sleep disorder, sleep onset latency (SMD 0.33, 95% CI: 0.10 – 0.56,  $P < 0.01$ ) were significantly improved whereas no clear evidence was shown with sleep efficiency (1.10, 95% CI: -0.26 – 2.45). The first analgesic requirement time (SMD 5.81, 95% CI: 2.57 - 9.05,  $P < 0.001$ ) of surgical patients was distinctly improved. Female patients under artificial reproductive technologies had significant increase in the top-quality embryos (SMD 0.53, 95% CI: 0.27 – 0.79,  $P < 0.001$ ), but no statistically clear evidence was found in the live birth rate (SMD 1.20, 95% CI: 0.83 – 1.72). Survival at one year (RR 1.90, 95% CI: 1.28 – 2.83,  $P < 0.005$ ) significantly increased with cancer patients. Research on melatonin interventions to treat clinical symptoms and sleep problems among diverse health conditions was identified and provided considerable evidence. Future well-designed randomized clinical trials of high quality and subgroup quantitative analyses are essential.

## **Keywords**

Melatonin; Umbrella review; Randomized controlled trial; Clinical outcome

63    **Chemical compounds studied in this article**

64    Melatonin (PubChem [CID:896](#)); Inositol (PubChem [CID:892](#)); Clozapine (PubChem  
65    [CID:135398737](#)); Olanzapine (PubChem [CID:135398745](#)); Risperidone (PubChem  
66    [CID:5073](#)); Quetiapine (PubChem [CID:5002](#)); Midazolam (PubChem [CID:4192](#)); Oxazepam  
67    (PubChem [CID:4616](#)); Alprazolam (PubChem [CID:2118](#))

68

## 1. Introduction

Melatonin is an antioxidant, functioning as a hormone in systemic circulation of mammals. It is synthesized in the suprachiasmatic nucleus of the anterior pituitary gland, released into the circulation stimulated by the onset of darkness. [1] The reduction in melatonin production induces insulin resistance, sleep disturbance, and metabolic circadian disorganizations.[2][3] Exogenous melatonin supplementation has been used for many medical and surgical diseases over the last decades,[4] while its clinical importance has been recognized, particularly relating to sleep.[5,6]

It has demonstrated encouraging results for multiple health outcomes from appropriate administration. Low dosage of melatonin also has value as a sleep-promoting agent for children, whereas high doses have shown the hypnotic effects.[7,8] Moreover, evidence also supports the use as an anesthetic agent.[9] It has demonstrated encouraging results in surgical patients' preoperative anxiety score and postoperative pain score.[10] Melatonin has also been observed to favorably affect blood pressure among those with metabolic disorders.[11] Additionally melatonin supplementation has been observed to decrease the 1-year mortality and depressive symptoms of cancer.[12,13]

Melatonin supplement also likely to be safe, only with mild adverse effects, such as dizziness, headache, nausea, and sleepiness.[14] On the other hand, while the stipulation of its prescription or over-the-counter (OTC) availability varies by country,[15] it is widely used as a remedial measure for sleep disorders [16] and is the fourth most popular natural product taken by adults, and the second by children in the United States. Indeed, a significant increase in its use from 0.1% in 2007 to 0.7% in 2012 was reported.[17]

Despite several studies conducted on the effect of exogenous melatonin, considering that a

92 sizable number of nonprofessional individuals can use melatonin autonomously as an OTC  
93 drug, we contemplated the need for comprehensive research about the tendency of effects by  
94 the specific conditions. We extracted available data on the association between a patient's  
95 specific health condition and the effects of exogenous melatonin. An umbrella review of the  
96 existing quantitative analyses is important to provide a comprehensive summary of the  
97 scientific literature,[18] and an overview of the methodology of melatonin supplementation in  
98 a single reference state.

99 Therefore, this study aimed to summarize the meta-analyses to identify the effects of suitable  
100 administration of exogenous melatonin supplements on patients with various health conditions.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Literature search and eligibility criteria

We conducted an umbrella review of meta-analyses based on randomized controlled trials (PROSPERO registration: CRD42021234788).

Inclusion criteria were as follows, established by using the PICOS strategy (Table. S2):

(a) Study type: reviews including meta-analyses of randomized clinical trials (RCTs) only.

(b) Participants: patients who underwent supplementation of melatonin, for any health condition.

(c) Intervention: treatment including melatonin, via any route.

(d) Control: passive controls such as placebo, sedatives, or active controls.

(e) Outcomes: multiple health outcomes according to the condition of the patient.

We systematically searched PubMed/Medline, Embase, and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews from database inception to Feb 4, 2021. Full details of the search strategy, including search terms used, are included in Appendix 1. In addition, we manually searched 11 articles to identify additional primary studies for the systematic search. Two investigators (LSJ and PS) identified eligible themes, independently screening the titles, abstracts, and full texts (Fig. 1). Any disagreements were resolved by consensus with a third reviewer (SJI).

**Fig. 1.** Search strategy: Flow diagram of selection of meta-analyses for the umbrella review

We included systematic reviews including network meta-analyses that provided meta-analyses of interventional studies, only with randomized controlled trials, that pooled any

combination of continuous variables, relative risk, or odds ratio comparing the same exposure with the same health outcome. For example, participants could be healthy, have a preexisting illness, or be pregnant. We included studies published in English only. The present study explored all health outcomes accessible through search inclusions. We excluded reviews that did not include a meta-analysis or did not present sufficient specific data (number of case and control, effect size, and 95% confidence intervals (CI)) for reanalysis, non-human studies, and meta-analyses that had melatonin analogs in the intervention but provided no independent quantitative analysis of melatonin.

If two or more meta-analyses studied a similar topic with the same patients' condition, we selected only one meta-analysis to avoid duplicate estimates. However, when the scope covered by the subject or the control condition in the study was different, it was classified and included. Finally, we included the latest article dealing with the same scope as the subject regardless of the number of RCTs included.

## **2.2 Data extraction**

For each eligible study, two investigators (LSJ and PS) independently extracted the name of the first author, publication year, condition of the patient, number of subjects assigned to the intervention and control groups, or number of event/total each, and the metrics used in the original meta-analyses (e.g., Cohen's *d*, Hedges' *g*, the weighted mean difference [WMD], relative risk [RR] or odds ratio [OR]) along with the corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) and quality of studies included in the meta-analyses, the interpretation under heterogeneity, and the publication bias. The dose of melatonin and comparative treatments was generally provided in mg/day, and we did not modify the original units of the data.

We extracted data from any study comparing melatonin exposure, including subgroup



analysis of high versus low dose responses. If a study presented several meta-analyses for various conditions or outcomes, we considered each of these separately.

Any disagreements between the two researchers (LSJ and PS) in extracted data were resolved by discussion with a third researcher (SJI).

### **2.3 Assessment of methodological quality of included studies**

To assess the methodological quality of the meta-analyses, two investigators (LSJ and PS) independently assessed each eligible study using the AMSTAR 2 (A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews 2), and any disagreements were resolved by discussion.[19]

AMSTAR 2 is a valid instrument to measure the construct validity and reliability of systematic reviews.[19] The assessment of quality scoring consists of 16 items, including critical domains of 7 items. It allows the critical judgment of the methodological of a systematic review. We recorded the total (A2) and the critical domain score (A2-CD) of each article by AMSTAR2. Criteria other than the main perspective of the AMSTAR 2 questionnaire were not included in the scoring.

### **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

We aimed to provide the metrics of estimates from meta-analyses with random-effect models or risk ratio based on random-effect models.

We reanalyzed the data using the extracted individual study estimates using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Software. We continued to use the data's original value correspondingly when standardized mean differences based on random effect models were provided. We converted a mean difference to standardized metrics and estimates of odds ratio to risk ratio, except for one association that provided insufficient data to reanalyze.[20] We calculated the summary effect

estimates and P values of reanalyzed meta-analyses with random effect models.

For continuous variables, we decided to organize consistent directional effect estimates. Regardless of the original direction of the outcomes provided, we decided to set the positive direction of the effect estimate to a beneficial direction. The positive direction of the effect size has converted to the helpful direction. We conserved the numerical estimates from previous studies in the same order if they were in the same direction as our aim. The effect size was converted to a positive value for calculations in the opposite direction to maintain consistent orientation. We evaluated heterogeneity between studies using the  $I^2$  statistics.[21] We also performed Egger's test in order to detect publication bias.[22] Where  $I^2$  exceeded 50% or 75%, heterogeneity was considered substantial or considerable, respectively.[23]

We preserved the original summary data provided by the meta-analysis of the review when the measurement was available but when data in the meta-analysis could not be reanalyzed.

We estimated the confidence interval in 95% prediction. We determined the statistical significance by the boundary of  $P < 0.05$  and further assessed P values below  $10^{-2}$ ,  $10^{-3}$ , and  $10^{-4}$ .

## **2.5 Role of funding source**

There was no funding source for this study. All authors had full access to all studies, and the corresponding authors had final responsibility for submitting for publication.

## **3 Results**

### **3.1 Study selection**

We identified 654 articles and excluded 595 after screening titles and abstracts (including duplicates). Of the 59 remaining articles, we excluded 35 articles after full-text screening for different reasons (Fig. 1). The 24 remaining articles reported data from 111 different meta-analyses. In addition, we included manually searched 11 articles to investigate supplementary studies for the systematic search.

The exclusion of thirty-five articles from systematic search was from the reasons provided. We provided the list of the excluded articles and reasons for exclusion in Appendix 3 and 4.

### **3.2 Study characteristics**

The characteristics of the included studies are presented in Table. S3. These studies were published between 2010 and 2021. All studies were published in English.

After full-text screening, we independently assessed the total and critical domain score of AMSTAR2 (N = 35). The mean total AMSTAR2 score was  $5.5 \pm 1.0$  and the mean critical domain section of AMSTAR2 score was  $13.7 \pm 1.3$ .

Twenty-two studies compared the effect of melatonin against, passive control including placebo, and thirteen studies of these studies used placebo controls alone. All the analyses included 3 to 30 randomized controlled trials, and the range of sample size was from 121 to 2673. Two studies compared with active control of benzodiazepine.<sup>[24,25]</sup> Four studies included children in the population,<sup>[25-28]</sup> and three of these conducted the meta-analyses only on children.<sup>[25,26,28]</sup>

Psychiatric disorder and Alzheimer's disease patients were the studied population in seven studies, sleep disorders in seven studies, surgical patients in five studies, perimenopausal or females of pregnant women in three studies, and metabolic syndrome in two studies. Patients suffering from oxidative stress, cancer, or non-intensive treatment rooms were considered in one study each.

All studies administered melatonin doses in the range of 1 to 20 mg per day for adults and 0.05mg/kg to 9mg for children. Overall, the duration of melatonin administration ranged from 3 to 3.5 years, or preoperative temporarily.[24,25,29] Diagnostic criteria for reported mental illness also varied, using NINCDS-ADRDA, ICD-10, or DSM-IV. [20,30-32]

The most frequently performed subgroup analysis was high versus low dose of melatonin. Six studies conducted such comparisons,[7,25,33-36] and the high-low dose boundary was considered 5 mg for adults and 0.2 mg/kg for children.

### **3.3 Psychiatric disorder, dementia, Alzheimer's disease**

Based on patients with a psychiatric disorder, the health outcomes according to the underlying disorder or the sleep condition were comprehensively summarized. Overall, the analyzed meta-analysis outcomes had non-significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ).

**Table 1** Summary estimates of the associations between psychiatric disorder, dementia, Alzheimer's disease outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus passive control.

AD: Alzheimer's disease, ADAS-cog: Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale cognitive subscale, ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, MMSE: Mini-Mental State

Examination, NA: not available, NR: not recorded, N trials: number of RCT trials included in meta-analysis, N total: number of patients included in meta-analysis, SMD: standardized mean difference

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

**Fig. 2** Summary estimates of the associations between psychiatric disorder, dementia, Alzheimer's disease outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, AD: Alzheimer's disease, ADAS-cog: Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale cognitive subscale, ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, d: day/days, MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination, NA: not available, NR: not recorded, SMD: standardized mean difference, w: week/weeks

Diamond indicates significant difference from control,  $P < 0.05$ ; Circle indicates non-significant effects.

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

As shown in Table 1 and Fig. 2, six reviews were included and meta-analysis of the psychiatric patients. We subdivided psychiatric disorders into specific conditioned of Alzheimer's disease, dementia, and other psychiatric disorders, including neurodevelopmental disorders, such as schizophrenia, autistic spectrum disorder, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

Three studies analyzed the associations between melatonin and the psychiatric patients' improvement of health outcomes. Diastolic blood pressure (SMD = 0.76, 95% [CI]: 0.30 to 1.22,  $P < 0.005$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 80$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) and systolic blood pressure (SMD = 0.42, 95% [CI]: 0.05 to 0.79,  $P < 0.05$ ; 4 trials,  $N = 118$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) decreased favorably in low heterogeneity.[37] The association between melatonin and the variables related to sleep problems was estimated only in children. Specifically, associations were on total sleep time (SMD = 0.33, 95% [CI]: 0.05 to 0.61,  $P < 0.05$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 199$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) and sleep onset latency (SMD = 0.66, 95% [CI]: 0.36 to 0.96,  $P < 0.001$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 183$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) of children with neurological disorders,[26] reaching significant effects at  $P < 10^{-3}$  with non-substantive heterogeneity except for total sleep time of autistic spectrum children (SMD = 1.00, 95% [CI]: 0.28 to 1.73,  $P < 0.01$ ; 4 trials,  $N = 213$ ,  $I^2 = 79.3\%$ ). For patients with schizophrenia, there was no clear evidence of improvement in abnormal involuntary movement scales (SMD = 0.66, 95% [CI]: -1.49 to 2.81,  $P > 0.05$ ; 4 trials,  $N = 130$ ,  $I^2 = 93.2\%$ ).[38]

Two studies including dementia patients, showed either  $P < 0.05$  or  $P > 0.05$  in outcomes related to sleep problems. Daytime/nighttime sleep ratio (SMD = 0.33, 95% [CI]: 0.02 to 0.64,  $P < 0.05$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 184$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), total sleep time duration during 10 days to 10 weeks (SMD = 0.25, 95% [CI]: 0.01 to 0.49,  $P < 0.05$ ; 8 trials,  $N = 491$ ,  $I^2 = 40.2\%$ ), more than 4 weeks (SMD = 0.32, 95% [CI]: 0.05 to 0.60,  $P < 0.05$ ; 6 trials,  $N = 426$ ,  $I^2 = 46.9\%$ ), sleep efficiency during 10 days to 8 weeks (SMD = 0.29, 95% [CI]: 0.04 to 0.53,  $P < 0.05$ ; 4 trials,

N = 375,  $I^2 = 32.0\%$ ) showed significant improvements ( $P < 0.05$ ) with low heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ).[30,31]

No clear evidence was found for improvements in cognitive evaluations in measurements of MMSE (SMD = 0.26, 95% [CI]: -0.28 to 0.80,  $P > 0.05$ ; 3 trials, N = 162,  $I^2 = 52.1\%$ ), ADAS-cog (SMD = 0.19, 95% [CI]: -0.14 to 0.52,  $P > 0.05$ ; 3 trials, N = 162,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), the incidence of adverse events (SMD = 0.25, 95% [CI]: -0.10 to 0.60,  $P > 0.05$ ; 2 trials, N = 151,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), and activities of daily living (SMD = 0.12, 95% [CI]: -0.21 to 0.45,  $P > 0.05$ ; 3 trials, N = 162,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ).[30,31]

Two studies were specifically on Alzheimer's disease patients. Outcomes related to sleep problems showed conflicting results, either  $P < 0.05$  or  $P > 0.05$  and overall low heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ). No clear evidence was shown in terms of improvement of the cognitive evaluations.[31,39]

### 3.4 Sleep disorder

As shown in Table 2 and Fig. 3, we included patients with sleep disorders or patients with other conditions having sleep problems. Seven reviews with sleep problems as the major outcome were identified in the meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials.[26,28,29,32,34,40-43] We analyzed the comprehensive range of patient conditions, including insomnia, shift work sleep disorder, secondary sleep disorder, and delayed sleep phase disorder.

**Table 2** Summary estimates of the associations between sleep disorder outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus passive control.

DSPD: delayed sleep phase disorder, MLT: melatonin

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

**Fig. 3.** Summary estimates of the associations between sleep disorder outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, DSPD: delayed sleep phase disorder, MLT: melatonin, NA: not available, SMD: standardized mean difference

Diamond indicates significant difference from control,  $p < 0.05$ ; Circle indicates non-significant effects.

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

Among children and adolescents with sleep-onset insomnia, sleep onset latency (SMD = 0.92, 95% [CI]: 0.48 to 1.36,  $P < 0.001$ ; 6 trials,  $N = 326$ ,  $I^2 = 70.5\%$ ), total sleep time (SMD = 0.46, 95% [CI]: 0.21 to 0.71,  $P < 0.001$ ; 5 trials,  $N = 262$ ,  $I^2 = 3.4\%$ ), and sleep onset time (SMD = 0.79, 95% [CI]: 0.54 to 1.04,  $P < 0.001$ ; 6 trials,  $N = 323$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) were significantly improved, commonly reaching  $P < 10^{-3}$ . The effect of dim light melatonin onset, wake-up time, and light-off time showed no clear evidence ( $P > 0.05$ ).[28]



In patients with sleep disorders including, shift work, overall data had non-significant heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ). Total sleep time either next day or night and nocturnal sleep time was significantly improved, presenting  $P < 0.05$ . No statistically distinct difference was found between sleep onset latency, sleep quality, and nocturnal awakening frequency assessed subjectively and physiologically.[32,34]

Outcomes of patients with a secondary sleep disorder showed significantly improved sleep onset latency (SMD = 0.33, 95% [CI]: 0.10 to 0.56,  $P < 0.01$ ; 7 trials, N = 304,  $I^2 = 2.9\%$ ) and total sleep time (SMD = 0.54, 95% [CI]: 0.06 to 1.02,  $P < 0.05$ ; 3 trials, N = 142,  $I^2 = 32.6\%$ ) reaching  $P < 0.05$  but there was no clear evidence on sleep efficiency (SMD = 1.10, 95% [CI]: -0.26 to 2.45,  $P > 0.05$ ; 3 trials, N = 142,  $I^2 = 88.3\%$ ).[38]

Outcomes of patients with delayed sleep phase disorder showed substantial or considerable heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$  or  $I^2 > 75\%$ ). Analyses demonstrated distinct improvement on dim light melatonin onset (SMD = 1.66, 95% [CI]: 1.20 to 2.12,  $P < 0.001$ ; 6 trials, N = 238,  $I^2 = 51.3\%$ ), sleep onset latency (SMD = 1.34, 95% [CI]: 0.74 to 1.95,  $P < 0.001$ ; 8 trials, N = 317,  $I^2 = 80.7\%$ ), sleep onset time (SMD = 0.98, 95% [CI]: 0.60 to 1.36,  $P < 0.001$ ; 9 trials, N = 304,  $I^2 = 54.2\%$ ), all  $P < 10^{-3}$ , and wake-up time (SMD = 0.58, 95% [CI]: 0.07 to 1.09,  $P < 0.05$ ; 5 trials, N = 195,  $I^2 = 59.5\%$ ). No clear evidence was shown for total sleep time (SMD = 0.93, 95%CI]: -0.02 to 1.88,  $P > 0.05$ ; 6 trials, N = 235,  $I^2 = 88.6\%$ ).[42]

Children with neurodevelopmental disorders also experienced significantly improved total sleep time (SMD = 0.82, 95% [CI]: 0.37 to 1.24,  $P < 0.001$ ; 9 trials, N = 541,  $I^2 = 80.1\%$ ) and sleep onset latency (SMD = 0.82, 95% [CI]: 0.45 to 1.17,  $P < 0.001$ ; 11 trials, N = 581,  $I^2 = 73.9\%$ ), reaching  $P < 10^{-3}$  both with a high level of heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$ ). No clear evidence was demonstrated for nocturnal awakening frequency (SMD = 0.75, 95% [CI]: -0.38 to 1.89,

P > 0.05; 5 trials, N = 277, I<sup>2</sup> = 91.2%).[26]

### 3.5 Perioperative status

As shown in Table 3 and Fig. 4, we included surgical patients in this subdivision, considering postoperative pain as an outcome of significant interest. Four quantitative reviews presented meta-analyses on randomized controlled trials with postoperative pain, pre-and postoperative anxiety level, and postoperative course as the outcomes.

**Table 3** Summary estimates of the associations between postoperative pain, surgical anxiety, postoperative course outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus passive control.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, h: hour/hours, SMD: standardized mean difference, STAI: state-trait anxiety inventory, VAS: visual analogue scale

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\* P < 0.05, \*\* P < 0.01, \*\*\* P < 0.005

**Fig. 4.** Summary estimates of the associations between postoperative pain, surgical anxiety, postoperative course outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, h: hour/hours, SMD: standardized mean difference, STAI: state-trait anxiety inventory, VAS: visual analogue scale

Diamond indicates significant difference from control, p < 0.05; Circle indicates non-

significant effects.

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

For overall surgical patients, the first analgesic requirement time was distinctly reduced (SMD = 5.81, 95% [CI]: 2.57 to 9.05,  $P < 0.001$ ; 2 trials,  $N = 100$ ,  $I^2 = 92.2\%$ ). Furthermore, post-, intraoperative opioid consumption (SMD = 1.23, 95% [CI]: 0.43 to 2.04,  $P < 0.005$ ; 7 trials,  $N = 517$ ,  $I^2 = 93.9\%$ ) and postoperative chronic pain (SMD = 0.65, 95% [CI]: 0.34 to 0.96,  $P$ : NR(not recorded); 5 trials,  $N = \text{NR}$ ,  $I^2 = 39.4\%$ ) also was significantly reduced.[20,44]

Two tools of measurement, STAI (state-trait anxiety inventory) and VAS (visual analog scale) were used to quantify anxiety. Preoperative (SMD = 0.87, 95% [CI]: 0.56 to 1.19,  $P < 0.001$ ; 18 trials,  $N = 1264$ ,  $I^2 = 85.2\%$ ) and postoperative anxiety (SMD = 0.59, 95% [CI]: 0.08 to 1.09,  $P < 0.05$ ; 7 trials,  $N = 524$ ,  $I^2 = 86.5\%$ ) measured by VAS were distinctly reduced with considerable heterogeneity, while anxiety measured by STAI was also reduced significantly (SMD = 0.70, 95% [CI]: 0.23 to 1.18,  $P < 0.005$ ; 2 trials,  $N = 73$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) with non-substantive heterogeneity.[24]

Postoperative pain had different outcomes depending on the postoperative time. For 1 hour and 3 hours after the surgery, no clear evidence of improvement was observed ( $P > 0.05$ )[29], but 24 hours showed a significant improvement in pain (SMD = 1.94, 95% [CI]: 1.09 to 2.78,  $P < 0.001$ ; 9 trials,  $N = 728$ ,  $I^2 = 96.0\%$ ) with considerable heterogeneity.[20]

We found no clear evidence on postoperative course, including sleepiness after three days, sleep quality, and well-being ( $P > 0.05$ ) with non-substantive heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 25\%$ ).[29]

Data on pain classified according to the type of anesthesia used was also available.[44]

Postoperative pain (SMD = 0.82, 95% [CI]: 0.25 to 1.40, P: NR; 11 trials, N = NR,  $I^2 = 93.0\%$ ) and post-, intraoperative opioid consumption (SMD = 2.76, 95% [CI]: 1.53 to 4.00, P: NR; 7 trials, N = NR,  $I^2 = 96.3\%$ ) with acute pain in general anesthesia were significantly reduced. Opioid consumption for acute procedural pain was also significantly reduced (SMD = 1.44, 95%CI: 0.53 to 3.44, P: NR; 3 trials, N = NR,  $I^2 = 97.5\%$ ), but acute pain in local/epidural anesthesia did not show clear evidence in terms of postoperative pain ( $P > 0.05$ ) with substantial heterogeneity.

In addition, except for drowsiness, quality of sleep, and measurement of well-being, subgroup analysis of surgical patients showed high level of heterogeneity in terms of postoperative course ( $I^2 > 75\%$ ).[29]

### **3.6 Pregnancy, metabolic disease**

Five reviews contained the meta-analyses of in patients under ART (assisted reproductive technology), COS (controlled ovarian stimulation), and patients with metabolic disease (Table 5, Fig. 5).[33,35,45-49] The number of mature oocytes (SMD = 0.56, 95% [CI]: 0.27 to 0.85,  $P < 0.001$ ; 7 trials, N = 738,  $I^2 = 66.0\%$ ) and top-quality embryos (SMD = 0.53, 95% [CI]: 0.27 to 0.79,  $P < 0.001$ ; 3 trials, N = 232,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) was significantly increased ( $P < 10^{-3}$ ) in the population of females under ART.[47] The number of oocytes retrieved was estimated in two types of populations (under COS or ART), both with substantial heterogeneity. Patients under ART showed significant improvements (SMD = 0.34, 95% [CI]: 0.01 to 0.67,  $P < 0.05$ ; 7 trials, N = 738,  $I^2 = 75.0\%$ ),[47] and although patients under COS had similar estimates (SMD = 0.30, 95% [CI]: -0.02 to 0.63,  $P > 0.05$ ; 5 trials, N = 680,  $I^2 = 73.0\%$ ), this did not reach statistical significance.[48]

Two articles analyzed about the insulin level and HOMA-IR (homeostasis model assessment

of insulin resistance)[35,46] (0.56, 95%CI: 0.24 to 0.89,  $P = 0.001$ ;  $I^2=22.0\%$ ) and level of insulin (1.84, 95%CI: 1.13 to 2.56,  $P < 0.001$ ;  $I^2=0.0\%$ ) were also significantly improved in patients with a metabolic syndrome with a low heterogeneity. Quantitative analyses also showed significant improvements in fasting glucose (0.30, 95%CI: 0.04 to 0.55,  $P < 0.05$ ; 2 trials,  $N = 504$ ,  $I^2 = 36.7\%$ ) and QUICKI (quantitative insulin sensitivity check index) (0.46, 95%CI: 0.09 to 0.83,  $P < 0.05$ ; 2 trials,  $N = 114$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), whereas a slight non-significant improvement was observed for hemoglobin A1c estimates (0.27, 95%CI: -0.02 to 0.55,  $P > 0.05$ ;  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ).[46]

**Table 4** Summary estimates of the associations between pregnancy, tinnitus, metabolic syndrome outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus passive control.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, ART: artificial reproductive technologies, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, HOMA-IR: homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance, QUICKI: quantitative insulin sensitivity check index, SMD: standardized mean difference

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

**Fig. 5.** Summary estimates of the associations between pregnancy, tinnitus, metabolic

433 syndrome outcomes, and melatonin treatment

434 Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted  
435 to the beneficial direction.

436 A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, ART: artificial  
437 reproductive technologies, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, HOMA-IR: homeostasis  
438 model assessment of insulin resistance, QUICKI: quantitative insulin sensitivity check index,  
439 SMD: standardized mean difference

440 Diamond indicates significant difference from control,  $p < 0.05$ ; Circle indicates non-  
441 significant effects.

442 † Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

443 †† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

444 \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

445

446 Diastolic (SMD = 0.87, 95% [CI]: 0.38 to 1.36,  $P < 0.001$ ; 9 trials, N = 510,  $I^2 = 84.3\%$ ) and  
447 systolic blood pressure (SMD = 0.85, 95% [CI]: 0.51 to 1.20,  $P < 0.005$ ; 9 trials, N = 510,  $I^2 =$   
448 68.7%) were also improved in patients with metabolic disease ( $P < 0.005$ ) with substantial  
449 heterogeneity (Fig. 5).[33] Quantitative analyses also showed significant improvements in  
450 fasting glucose (SMD = 0.30, 95% [CI]: 0.04 to 0.55,  $P < 0.05$ ; 2 trials, N = 504,  $I^2 = 36.7\%$ )  
451 and QUICKI (quantitative insulin sensitivity check index) (SMD = 0.46, 95% [CI]: 0.09 to  
452 0.83,  $P < 0.05$ ; 2 trials, N = 114,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), whereas a slight non-significant improvement was  
453 observed for hemoglobin A1c estimates (SMD = 0.27, 95% [CI]: -0.02 to 0.55,  $P > 0.05$ ; 4  
454 trials, N = 182,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ).[46]

No clear evidence ( $P > 0.05$ ) was found for HOMA-IR (homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance) and level of insulin.[42]

### 3.7 Oxidative stress

Two reviews[27,50] provided quantitative analyses regarding health conditions associated with oxidative stress but data on the range of P values or the total number of participants were not available (Table 5, Fig. 6). Melatonin treatment in patients under oxidative stress was associated with significantly improved SOD (superoxide dismutase) activity (SMD = 1.38, 95% [CI]: 0.13 to 2.62; 3 trials,  $I^2 = 86.9\%$ ), Gpx (glutathione peroxidase) (SMD = 1.36, 95% [CI]: 0.46 to 2.30; 5 trials,  $I^2 = 89.3\%$ ), GR (glutathione reductase) (SMD = 1.21, 95% [CI]: 0.65 to 1.77; 2 trails,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), MDA (malondialdehyde) (SMD = 0.79, 95% [CI]: 0.39 to 1.19; 8 trials,  $I^2 = 73.1\%$ ), and TAC (total antioxidant capacity) (SMD = 0.76, 95% [CI]: 0.30 to 1.21; 8 trials,  $I^2 = 80.1\%$ ), and GSH (glutathione) (SMD = 0.57, 95% [CI]: 0.32 to 0.83; 5 trials,  $I^2 = 15.1\%$ ).

**Table 5** Summary estimates of the associations between oxidative stress outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus placebo control.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, NR: not recorded, SMD: standardized mean difference

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

**Fig. 6.** Summary estimates of the associations between oxidative stress outcomes, and melatonin treatment. Melatonin treatment versus placebo control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, NR: not recorded, SMD: standardized mean difference

Diamond indicates significant difference from control,  $P < 0.05$ ; Circle indicates non-significant effects.

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

Overall estimates commonly had substantial or considerable heterogeneity, except for GR and GSH ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ).

No clear evidence was found for CAT (catalase) activity (SMD = 1.38, 95% [CI]: -1.42 to 4.18; 3 trials,  $I^2 = 96.6\%$ ) and NO (nitric oxide) (SMD = 0.24, 95% [CI]: -0.14 to 0.61; 2 trials,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ).

### 3.8 Health outcomes of discrete variables

As shown in Table 6 and Fig. 7, fifteen reviews provided meta-analyses consisting of discrete variables.[7,20,25,28,29,39,43,47,48,51-56] Health outcomes related to cancer were associated with distinct benefits. Remission of cancer had significantly increased (RR = 1.95, 95% [CI]: 1.49 to 2.54,  $P < 0.0001$ ; 8 trials, N = 761,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), and survival at one year also had significantly improved (RR = 1.90, 95% [CI]: 1.28 to 2.83,  $P < 0.005$ ; 5 trials, N = 490,  $I^2 = 61.9\%$ ). Side effects of radiochemotherapy of cancer also improved with consumption of melatonin, reducing the relative risk of fatigue (RR = 0.37, 95% [CI]: 0.28 to 0.48,  $P < 0.0001$ ;



5 trials,  $N = 568$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), neurotoxicity ( $RR = 0.19$ , 95% [CI]: 0.09 to 0.40,  $P < 0.0001$ ; 5 trials,  $N = 568$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ), and thrombocytopenia ( $RR = 0.13$ , 95% [CI]: 0.06 to 0.28,  $P < 0.0001$ ; 5 trials,  $N = 568$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) with low heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ).[52]

**Table 6** Summary estimates of the association between multiple health outcomes, and melatonin treatments made up of discrete variables. Melatonin treatment versus passive control. A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, AD: Alzheimer's disease, ART: artificial reproductive technologies, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, ICU: intensive care unit, OR: odds ratio, RR: risk ratio, SMD: standardized mean difference

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

‡ Indicates that the obtained effect size is the odds ratio of the fixed effect model and the original value of the study

§ Indicates that active control is used for the comparison

\*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

**Fig. 7.** Summary estimates of the association between multiple health outcomes, and melatonin treatments made up of discrete variables. Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

518 A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, AD: Alzheimer's  
519 disease, ART: artificial reproductive technologies, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, ICU:  
520 intensive care unit, OR: odds ratio, RR: risk ratio, SMD: standardized mean difference  
521 Diamond indicates significant difference from control,  $P < 0.05$ ; Circle indicates non-  
522 significant effects.

523 † Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

524 †† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

525 ‡ Indicates that the obtained effect size is the odds ratio of the fixed effect model and the  
526 original value of the study

527 § Indicates that active control is used for the comparison

528 \*  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $P < 0.005$

529

530 Patients undergoing ART showed statistically significant improvement in biochemical (RR  
531 = 1.23, 95% [CI]: 1.02 to 1.48,  $P < 0.05$ ; 6 trials,  $N = 671$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) or clinical pregnancy  
532 rates (RR = 1.23, 95% [CI]: 1.05 to 1.45,  $P < 0.05$ ; 10 trials,  $N = 1023$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) with low  
533 heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ),[47] but no evidence was shown in patients undergoing COS in  
534 clinical pregnancy rates (RR = 1.37, 95% [CI]: 0.99 to 1.88,  $P > 0.05$ ; 5 trials,  $N = 680$ ,  $I^2 =$   
535  $0.0\%$ ).[48] Also, there was no clear evidence in terms of live birth rates and miscarriage rates  
536 of ART patients ( $P > 0.05$ ). [7,36,54,56]

537 Preoperative patients showed significant reduction in the incidence of emergence agitation  
538 (RR = 0.31, 95% [CI]: 0.16 to 0.60,  $P < 0.005$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 36$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$ ) when compared with

placebo, but no clear evidence was found when compared with midazolam (RR = 0.48, 95% [CI]: 0.15 to 1.52,  $P > 0.05$ ; 3 trials,  $N = 31$ ,  $I^2 = 36.8\%$ ).[25]

Perioperative patients' need for analgesics was significantly reduced (RR = 0.50, 95% [CI]: 0.30 to 0.82,  $P < 0.0001$ ; 5 trials,  $N = 411$ ,  $I^2 = 53.5\%$ ) with non-substantive heterogeneity ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ).[20]

Other health outcomes (e.g., in-hospital mortality, discontinuations of all-cause of AD,[39] drop-out for adverse effects/all causes of children/adolescents with sleep-onset insomnia,[28,43] side effects including headache, nausea, dizziness, or depression among surgical patients[29], incidence of delirium[7,36,55]) indicated no clear evidence ( $P > 0.05$ ) for the effect of exogenous melatonin.

## 4 Discussion

The present study is the first quantitative umbrella review based solely on randomized controlled trials to estimate the association between the exogenous melatonin supplementation and general health conditions as well as 84 different health outcomes. A significant proportion of the included meta-analyses examined psychiatric patients, pregnancy patients, and surgical patients.

Most summary estimates supported the notion that exogenous melatonin may provide a solution to sleep problems, oxidative parameters, pregnancy rate, postoperative pain, and anxiety.

We observed robust evidence, supported by a P-value less than 0.001 with non-considerable heterogeneity, for studies on sleep-promoting effect, surgical outcomes (e.g., anxiety-preoperative VAS, need for analgesic requirements), pregnancy (e.g., number of oocytes retrieved, top-quality embryos), metabolic disease (diastolic blood pressure), and cancer (e.g., remission rate, 1-year survival rate, and side effects of fatigue and neurotoxicity).

We observed suggestive evidence supported by a P-value of less than 0.001 in surgical patients with postoperative pain and metabolic disorders.

Exogenous melatonin overall did not affect the cognitive functions measured by MMSE and ADAS-cog assessments of patients with psychiatric disorders or dementia, unlike the effectiveness over sleep problems. Additionally, they had no improvement in the activities of daily living in patients with dementia.

Differently, on add-on prolonged-release melatonin (PRM) in moderate Alzheimer's disease was found to have improvement on cognitive performance measured by MMSE ( $P=0.044$ ) and

Instrumental Activities of Daily Living ( $P=0.004$ ) compared with placebo.[57] The range of the duration of psychiatry patients included in our study is 1 week to 3.5 years, as shown in Table. S3. The contrary result of the mentioned study suggests that the effectiveness of exogenous melatonin may vary depending on the duration of melatonin release.

Our results on neurodegenerative diseases may be explained by the antioxidant and neuroprotector role of melatonin. A direct regulatory effect of melatonin on the activities of protein kinases and protein phosphates was reported.[58] Specifically the capacity of melatonin to ameliorate  $\beta$ -amyloid pathology may play a role in the treatment of Alzheimer-like neurodegeneration.[59]

The clinical pregnancy and biochemical pregnancy rates on women with ART have also shown improvement with melatonin intervention. Melatonin supplementation can relate this effect with its effect of reducing oxidative stress, as we summarized in Fig. 6. Oxidative stress is known as a major contributing factor negatively affecting oocyte quality of development after fertilization.[60,61] In the same context, our meta-analyses of oxidative stress reduction may support the association with the effectiveness in human pregnancy. We can also explain this association based on the ability of melatonin to correct the pathophysiology during pregnancy due to abortion.[62]

Concerning cancer, melatonin as an anti-cancer agent is actively studied, which may involve biochemical and molecular mechanisms,[63] including inhibition mechanisms of cancer metastasis.[64] Specifically, melatonin may alter the adhesion and gap junctional intracellular communication or induce apoptotic cell death.[63]

## **5 Conclusion**

Present umbrella review provides a comprehensive summary of the published meta-analyses concerning the effect of exogenous melatonin supplementation on various health outcomes. To date, the randomized controlled trials have provided robust evidence for overall sleep problems, pregnancy rate and progression, postoperative course and pain, metabolic syndrome, and remission/side effects of cancer.

Relationships between exogenous melatonin and different health outcomes likely exist but are supported by still limited evidence. We could not specify the effect of melatonin on specific types of cancer. Well-designed randomized controlled studies with a large sample size are needed to supplement the considerable heterogeneity of surgical patients and the deficient number of studies. This information can further provide more in-depth knowledge on what types of cancer should be targeted with melatonin.

Future studies adopting detailed population reporting, attempting the subgroup analysis based on the duration of exogenous melatonin are needed. Through the investigation, the quantified association between health outcomes and the precise method of melatonin supplementation would have resulted.

## **Author contribution**

All authors made substantial contributions to all the following: (1) the conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, (3) final approval of the version to be submitted. This manuscript has been reviewed and approved by all authors.

617    **Acknowledgement**

618       None provided financial support for the conduct of the research and/or preparation of the  
619    article.

## References

- [1] Opie LH, Lecour S. Melatonin has multiorgan effects. *Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Pharmacother* 2016;2:258-65.
- [2] Reiter RJ, Rosales-Corral S, Tan DX, Jou MJ, Galano A, Xu B. Melatonin as a mitochondria-targeted antioxidant: One of evolution's best ideas. *Cell Mol Life Sci* 2017;74:3863-81.
- [3] Cipolla-Neto J, Amaral FG, Afeche SC, Tan DX, Reiter RJ. Melatonin, energy metabolism, and obesity: A review. *J Pineal Res* 2014;56:371-81.
- [4] Biggio G, Biggio F, Talani G, Mostallino MC, Aguglia A, Aguglia E, et al. Melatonin: From neurobiology to treatment. *Brain Sci* 2021;11.
- [5] Pevet P, Challet E, Felder-Schmittbuhl MP. Melatonin and the circadian system: Keys for health with a focus on sleep. *Handb Clin Neurol* 2021;179:331-43.
- [6] Sun SY, Chen GH. Treatment of circadian rhythm sleep-wake disorders. *Curr Neuropsychopharmacol* 2021.
- [7] Yang CP, Tseng PT, Pei-Chen Chang J, Su H, Satyanarayanan SK, Su KP. Melatonergic agents in the prevention of delirium: A network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Sleep Med Rev* 2020;50:101235.
- [8] Gitto E, Aversa S, Reiter RJ, Barberi I, Pellegrino S. Update on the use of melatonin in pediatrics. *Journal of pineal research* 2011;50:21-8.
- [9] Shavali S, Ho B, Govitrapong P, Sawlom S, Ajijmaporn A, Klongpanichapak S, et al. Melatonin exerts its analgesic actions not by binding to opioid receptor subtypes but by increasing the release of  $\beta$ -endorphin an endogenous opioid. *Brain Research Bulletin* 2005;64:471-9.
- [10] Andersen L, Werner M, Rosenberg J, Gögenur I. A systematic review of peri-operative melatonin. *Anaesthesia* 2014;69:1163-71.
- [11] Mozdżan M, Mozdżan M, Chałubiński M, Wojdan K, Broncel M. The effect of melatonin on circadian blood pressure in patients with type 2 diabetes and essential hypertension. *Archives of medical science: AMS* 2014;10:669.
- [12] Hansen MV, Andersen LT, Madsen MT, Hageman I, Rasmussen LS, Bokmand S, et al. Effect of melatonin on depressive symptoms and anxiety in patients undergoing breast cancer surgery: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Breast cancer research and treatment* 2014;145:683-



95.

- [13] Seely D, Wu P, Fritz H, Kennedy DA, Tsui T, Seely AJ, et al. Melatonin as adjuvant cancer care with and without chemotherapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Integrative cancer therapies* 2012;11:293-303.
- [14] Foley HM, Steel AE. Adverse events associated with oral administration of melatonin: A critical systematic review of clinical evidence. *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* 2019;42:65-81.
- [15] Grigg-Damberger MM, Ianakieva D. Poor quality control of over-the-counter melatonin: What they say is often not what you get. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 2017;13:163-5.
- [16] Bliwise DL, Ansari FP. Insomnia associated with valerian and melatonin usage in the 2002 national health interview survey. *Sleep* 2007;30:881-4.
- [17] Black LI, Clarke TC, Barnes PM, Stussman BJ, Nahin RL. Use of complementary health approaches among children aged 4–17 years in the united states: National health interview survey, 2007–2012. *National health statistics reports* 2015:1.
- [18] Aromataris E, Fernandez R, Godfrey CM, Holly C, Khalil H, Tungpunkom P. Summarizing systematic reviews: Methodological development, conduct and reporting of an umbrella review approach. *JBIC Evidence Implementation* 2015;13:132-40.
- [19] Shea BJ, Hamel C, Wells GA, Bouter LM, Kristjansson E, Grimshaw J, et al. Amstar is a reliable and valid measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2009;62:1013-20.
- [20] Wang ZL, Y.Lin, D.Ma, J. Effect of melatonin on postoperative pain and perioperative opioid use: A meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis. *Pain Pract* 2020.
- [21] Cochran WG. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics* 1954;10:101-29.
- [22] Sterne JA, Egger M. Regression methods to detect publication and other bias in meta-analysis. *Publication bias in meta-analysis: Prevention, assessment and adjustments* 2005;99:110.
- [23] Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- [24] Madsen BKZ, D.Møller, A. M.Rosenberg, J. Melatonin for preoperative and postoperative anxiety in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;12:Cd009861.
- [25] Mihara TN, N.Ka, K.Oba, M. S.Goto, T. Effects of melatonin premedication to prevent emergence

- agitation after general anaesthesia in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2015;32:862-71.
- [26] Abdelgadir ISG, M. A.Akobeng, A. K. Melatonin for the management of sleep problems in children with neurodevelopmental disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Dis Child* 2018;103:1155-62.
- [27] Morvaridzadeh MS, E.Agah, S.Nachvak, S. M.Fazelian, S.Moradi, F.Persad, E.Heshmati, J. Effect of melatonin supplementation on oxidative stress parameters: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pharmacol Res* 2020;161:105210.
- [28] Wei SS, M. G.Tang, X.Kuang, L.Meng, H.Ni, S.Xiao, M.Zhou, X. Efficacy and safety of melatonin for sleep onset insomnia in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Sleep Med* 2020;68:1-8.
- [29] Zhang JW, Y.Xu, H.Yang, J. The influence of melatonin on sleep quality after laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2019;29:1-6.
- [30] McCleery JS, A. L. Pharmacotherapies for sleep disturbances in dementia. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2020.
- [31] Xu JW, L. L.Dammer, E. B.Li, C. B.Xu, G.Chen, S. D.Wang, G. Melatonin for sleep disorders and cognition in dementia: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen* 2015;30:439-47.
- [32] Baglioni C, Bostanova Z, Bacaro V, Benz F, Hertenstein E, Spiegelhalder K, et al. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials evaluating the evidence base of melatonin, light exposure, exercise, and complementary and alternative medicine for patients with insomnia disorder. *J Clin Med* 2020;9.
- [33] Akbari MO, V.Mirhosseini, N.Lankarani, K. B.Tabrizi, R.Keshtkaran, Z.Reiter, R. J.Asemi, Z. The effects of melatonin supplementation on blood pressure in patients with metabolic disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Hum Hypertens* 2019;33:202-9.
- [34] Liira JV, J. H.Costa, G.Driscoll, T. R.Sallinen, M.Isotalo, L. K.Ruotsalainen, J. H. Pharmacological interventions for sleepiness and sleep disturbances caused by shift work. *Sao Paulo Medical Journal* 2015;133:67.

- [35] Li Y, Xu Z. Effects of melatonin supplementation on insulin levels and insulin resistance: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Horm Metab Res* 2021;53:616-24.
- [36] Wang HY, Chen TY, Li DJ, Lin PY, Su KP, Chiang MH, et al. Association of pharmacological prophylaxis with the risk of pediatric emergence delirium after sevoflurane anesthesia: An updated network meta-analysis. *J Clin Anesth* 2021;75:110488.
- [37] Kamath AR, Z. A. Melatonin for atypical antipsychotic-induced metabolic adverse effects: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Biomed Res Int* 2018;2018:4907264.
- [38] Sun CHZ, W.Yang, X. H.Cai, D. B.Ng, C. H.Ungvari, G. S.Li, H. Y.Wu, Y. J.Ning, Y. P.Xiang, Y. T. Adjunctive melatonin for tardive dyskinesia in patients with schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *Shanghai Arch Psychiatry* 2017;29:129-36.
- [39] Wang YYZ, W.Ng, C. H.Ungvari, G. S.Wei, W.Xiang, Y. T. Meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials of melatonin in alzheimer's disease. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2017;32:50-7.
- [40] Chan VL, K. Efficacy of dietary supplements on improving sleep quality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Postgrad Med J* 2021.
- [41] Li TJ, S.Han, M.Yang, Z.Lv, J.Deng, C.Reiter, R. J.Yang, Y. Exogenous melatonin as a treatment for secondary sleep disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Neuroendocrinol* 2019;52:22-8.
- [42] van Geijlswijk IMK, H. P.Smits, M. G. The use of exogenous melatonin in delayed sleep phase disorder: A meta-analysis. *Sleep* 2010;33:1605-14.
- [43] Cheng YS, Tseng PT, Wu MK, Tu YK, Wu YC, Li DJ, et al. Pharmacologic and hormonal treatments for menopausal sleep disturbances: A network meta-analysis of 43 randomized controlled trials and 32,271 menopausal women. *Sleep Med Rev* 2021;57:101469.
- [44] Oh SNM, S. K.Jho, H. J. Analgesic efficacy of melatonin: A meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials. *J Clin Med* 2020;9.
- [45] Bao TZ, L.Yang, K.Li, Y.Ren, F.Zhang, Y.Gao, Z. Can melatonin improve the osteopenia of perimenopausal and postmenopausal women? A meta-analysis. *Int J Endocrinol* 2019;2019:5151678.
- [46] Doosti-Irani AO, V.Mirhosseini, N.Mansournia, M.Reiter, R. J.Kashanian, M.Rahimi, M.Razavi, M.Asemi, Z. The effects of melatonin supplementation on glycemic control: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Hormone and Metabolic Research* 2018;50:783-90.

- [47] Hu KLY, X.Wang, S.Zhang, D. Melatonin application in assisted reproductive technology: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2020;11:160.
- [48] Seko LMM, R. M.Leitao, V. M.Teixeira, D. M.Nastri, C. O.Martins, W. P. Melatonin supplementation during controlled ovarian stimulation for women undergoing assisted reproductive technology: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Fertil Steril* 2014;101:154-61.e4.
- [49] Delpino FM, Figueiredo LM. Melatonin supplementation and anthropometric indicators of obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nutrition* 2021;91-92:111399.
- [50] Ghorbaninejad P, Sheikhsossein F, Djafari F, Tijani AJ, Mohammadpour S, Shab-Bidar S. Effects of melatonin supplementation on oxidative stress: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Horm Mol Biol Clin Investig* 2020;41.
- [51] Siddiqi NH, J. K.Clegg, A.Teale, E. A.Young, J.Taylor, J.Simpkins, S. A. Interventions for preventing delirium in hospitalised non-icu patients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016.
- [52] Wang YMJ, B. Z.Ai, F.Duan, C. H.Lu, Y. Z.Dong, T. F.Fu, Q. L. The efficacy and safety of melatonin in concurrent chemotherapy or radiotherapy for solid tumors: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2012;69:1213-20.
- [53] Chen JJ, Chen YW, Zeng BY, Hung CM, Zeng BS, Stubbs B, et al. Efficacy of pharmacologic treatment in tinnitus patients without specific or treatable origin: A network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;39:101080.
- [54] Tseng PT, Yang CP, Su KP, Chen TY, Wu YC, Tu YK, et al. The association between melatonin and episodic migraine: A pilot network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials to compare the prophylactic effects with exogenous melatonin supplementation and pharmacotherapy. *J Pineal Res* 2020;69:e12663.
- [55] Wu YC, Tseng PT, Tu YK, Hsu CY, Liang CS, Yeh TC, et al. Association of delirium response and safety of pharmacological interventions for the management and prevention of delirium: A network meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2019;76:526-35.
- [56] Yi M, Wang S, Wu T, Zhang X, Jiang L, Fang X. Effects of exogenous melatonin on sleep quality and menopausal symptoms in menopausal women: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Menopause* 2021;28:717-25.
- [57] Wade AG, Farmer M, Harari G, Fund N, Laudon M, Nir T, et al. Add-on prolonged-release melatonin

- for cognitive function and sleep in mild to moderate alzheimer's disease: A 6-month, randomized, placebo-controlled, multicenter trial. *Clin Interv Aging* 2014;9:947-61.
- [58] Dolphin AC. G protein modulation of voltage-gated calcium channels. *Pharmacol Rev* 2003;55:607-27.
- [59] Wang JZ, Wang ZF. Role of melatonin in alzheimer-like neurodegeneration. *Acta Pharmacol Sin* 2006;27:41-9.
- [60] Goud AP, Goud PT, Diamond MP, Gonik B, Abu-Soud HM. Reactive oxygen species and oocyte aging: Role of superoxide, hydrogen peroxide, and hypochlorous acid. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine* 2008;44:1295-304.
- [61] Lord T, Aitken RJ. Oxidative stress and ageing of the post-ovulatory oocyte. *Reproduction* 2013;146:R217-R27.
- [62] Tamura H, Nakamura Y, Terron MP, Flores LJ, Manchester LC, Tan D-X, et al. Melatonin and pregnancy in the human. *Reproductive Toxicology* 2008;25:291-303.
- [63] Blask DE, Sauer LA, Dauchy RT. Melatonin as a chronobiotic/anticancer agent: Cellular, biochemical, and molecular mechanisms of action and their implications for circadian-based cancer therapy. *Curr Top Med Chem* 2002;2:113-32.
- [64] Su SC, Hsieh MJ, Yang WE, Chung WH, Reiter RJ, Yang SF. Cancer metastasis: Mechanisms of inhibition by melatonin. *J Pineal Res* 2017;62.

## Tables

**Table 1** Summary estimates of the associations between psychiatric disorder, dementia, Alzheimer's disease outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Outcomes	Health Outcomes	Condition	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Psychiatric Disorder	Diastolic blood pressure	Psychiatric disorders <sup>37 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.76 <sup>+</sup> (0.30 to 1.22)	3	80	0.001	0.0	0.502	6 / 15
	Abnormal involuntary movement scales	Schizophrenia <sup>38</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.66 <sup>+</sup> (-1.49 to 2.81)	4	130	0.547	93.2	0.000	6 / 14
	Systolic blood pressure	Psychiatric disorders <sup>37 *</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.42 <sup>+</sup> (0.05 to 0.79)	4	118	0.020	0.0	0.837	6 / 15
	Total sleep time	Children with autistic spectrum disorder <sup>36 ***</sup>	SMD	1.00 <sup>+</sup> (0.28 to 1.73)	4	213	0.007	79.3	0.002	6 / 15
		Children with neurodisability <sup>26 *</sup>	SMD	0.33 <sup>+</sup> (0.05 to 0.61)	3	199	0.023	0.0	0.895	6 / 15
	Sleep onset latency	Children with autistic spectrum disorder <sup>26 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.95 <sup>+</sup> (0.57 to 1.34)	4	213	0.000	35.6	0.198	6 / 15
		Children with neurodisability <sup>27 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.66 <sup>+</sup> (0.36 to 0.96)	3	183	0.000	0.0	0.865	6 / 15
		Children with ADHD <sup>27 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.61 <sup>+</sup> (0.27 to 0.94)	2	143	0.000	0.0	NA	6 / 15
Dementia	Daytime sleep / nighttime sleep ratio	Dementia <sup>30 *</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.33 <sup>+</sup> (0.02 to 0.64)	3	184	0.036	0.0	0.922	7 / 16
	Total sleep time	Dementia, duration ≥ 4 weeks <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.32 <sup>+</sup> (0.05 to 0.60)	6	426	0.022	46.9	0.093	6 / 13
		Dementia, duration 10d-10w <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.25 <sup>+</sup> (0.01 to 0.49)	8	497	0.041	40.2	0.111	6 / 13
	Sleep efficiency	Dementia, duration 10d-8w <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.29 <sup>+</sup> (0.04 to 0.53)	4	375	0.024	32.0	0.221	6 / 13
		Dementia <sup>31</sup>	SMD	0.18 <sup>+</sup> (-0.06 to 0.43)	6	446	0.140	38.0	0.153	6 / 13
	MMSE	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD	0.26 <sup>+</sup> (-0.28 to 0.80)	3	162	0.343	52.1	0.124	7 / 16
	Number of adverse events per person	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.25 <sup>+</sup> (-0.10 to 0.60)	2	151	0.158	0.0	NA	7 / 16
	Nocturnal sleep time	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD	0.24 <sup>+</sup> (-0.07 to 0.55)	4	184	0.132	0.0	0.809	7 / 16
	ADAS-cog	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.19 <sup>+</sup> (-0.14 to 0.52)	3	162	0.265	0.0	0.596	7 / 16
	Nocturnal time awake	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.18 <sup>+</sup> (-0.17 to 0.52)	2	151	0.318	0.0	NA	7 / 16
	Activities of daily living	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.12 <sup>+</sup> (-0.21 to 0.45)	3	162	0.474	0.0	0.639	7 / 16
	Carer-rated sleep quality	Dementia <sup>30</sup>	SMD	0.07 <sup>+</sup> (-0.35 to 0.50)	3	164	0.733	31.6	0.232	7 / 16
Alzheimer	Nocturnal sleep time	AD <sup>38 *</sup>	SMD	0.26 (0.01 to 0.51)	6	305	0.040	9.0	0.360	6 / 14
	Sleep time during daytime	AD <sup>39</sup>	SMD	0.15 (-0.14 to 0.44)	4	210	0.310	0.0	0.940	6 / 14
	Sleep efficiency	AD, duration ≥ 4w <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.34 <sup>+</sup> (0.06 to 0.63)	2	198	0.017	0.0	NA	6 / 13
		AD, duration 10d-8w <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.26 <sup>+</sup> (0.01 to 0.52)	3	239	0.044	0.0	0.390	6 / 13
		AD <sup>39</sup>	SMD	0.14 (-0.17 to 0.44)	5	287	0.380	33.0	0.200	6 / 14
	ADAS-cog	AD <sup>39</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.25 (-0.21 to 0.70)	2	75	0.290	0.0	NA	6 / 14
	MMSE	AD <sup>39</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	-0.33 (-0.73 to 0.06)	4	182	0.090	38.0	0.190	6 / 14

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, AD: Alzheimer's disease, ADAS-cog: Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale cognitive subscale, ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, d: day/days, MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination, NA: not available, NR: not recorded, SMD: standardized mean difference, w: week/weeks

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

**Table 2** Summary estimates of the associations between sleep disorder outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Outcomes	Health Outcomes	Condition	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Sleep disorder	Dim light melatonin onset	DSPD <sup>42 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	1.66 <sup>+</sup> (1.20 to 2.12)	6	238	0.000	51.3	0.163	4 / 10
		Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.00 <sup>+</sup> (-0.08 to 0.08)	5	271	0.000	52.6	0.077	5 / 13
	Sleep onset latency	DSPD <sup>42 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	1.34 <sup>+</sup> (0.74 to 1.95)	8	317	0.000	80.7	0.000	4 / 10
		Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.92 <sup>+</sup> (0.48 to 1.36)	6	326	0.000	70.5	0.005	5 / 13
		Children with neurodevelopmental disorders <sup>26 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.82 <sup>+</sup> (0.45 to 1.17)	11	581	0.000	73.9	0.000	6 / 15
		Insomnia, by physiological indices <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.71 (0.35 to 1.08)	19	NR	NR	78.8	NR	4 / 13
		Secondary sleep disorder <sup>41 **</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.33 <sup>+</sup> (0.10 to 0.56)	7	304	0.005	2.9	0.403	5 / 14
		Shift work sleep disorder, next day <sup>34</sup>	SMD	0.31 <sup>+</sup> (-0.01 to 0.64)	5	148	0.060	0.0	0.820	7 / 15
		Insomnia <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.24 (0.15 to 0.33)	14	NR	NR	0.0	NR	4 / 13
		Shift work sleep disorder <sup>34</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.10 <sup>+</sup> (-0.35 to 0.55)	3	162	0.672	37.9	0.200	7 / 15
	Sleep efficiency	Secondary sleep disorder <sup>41</sup>	SMD	1.10 <sup>+</sup> (-0.26 to 2.45)	3	142	0.110	88.3	0.000	5 / 14
		Insomnia, by physiological indices <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD	0.55 (-0.05 to 1.15)	18	NR	NR	87.9	NR	4 / 13
		Insomnia <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD	0.25 (-0.28 to 0.78)	16	NR	NR	95.7	NR	4 / 13
	Total sleep time	DSPD <sup>42</sup>	SMD	0.93 <sup>+</sup> (-0.02 to 1.88)	6	235	0.054	88.6	0.000	4 / 10
		Children with neurodevelopmental disorders <sup>18 ***</sup>	SMD	0.82 <sup>+</sup> (0.37 to 1.24)	9	541	0.000	80.1	0.000	6 / 15
		Secondary sleep disorder <sup>31 *</sup>	SMD	0.54 <sup>+</sup> (0.06 to 1.02)	3	142	0.026	32.6	0.227	5 / 14
		Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>20 ***</sup>	SMD	0.46 <sup>+</sup> (0.21 to 0.71)	5	262	0.000	3.4	0.387	5 / 13
	Total sleep time, next day	Shift work sleep disorder <sup>34 *</sup>	SMD	0.35 <sup>+</sup> (0.07 to 0.63)	7	263	0.015	20.4	0.274	7 / 15
	Total sleep time, next night	Shift work sleep disorder <sup>34 *</sup>	SMD	0.32 <sup>+</sup> (0.02 to 0.58)	3	234	0.015	0.0	0.634	7 / 15
	Sleep onset time	DSPD <sup>42 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.98 <sup>+</sup> (0.60 to 1.36)	9	304	0.000	54.2	0.026	4 / 10
		Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.79 <sup>+</sup> (0.54 to 1.04)	6	323	0.000	0.0	0.966	5 / 13
	Wake-up time	DSPD <sup>42 *</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.58 <sup>+</sup> (0.07 to 1.09)	5	195	0.027	59.5	0.042	4 / 10
		Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>20</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.23 <sup>+</sup> (-0.04 to 0.50)	4	209	0.099	0.0	0.764	5 / 13
	Nocturnal awakening frequency	Children with neurodevelopmental disorders <sup>18</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.75 <sup>+</sup> (-0.38 to 1.89)	5	277	0.190	91.2	0.000	6 / 15
		Insomnia, by physiological indices <sup>30 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.07 (-0.29 to 0.44)	14	NR	NR	71.0	NR	4 / 13
		Insomnia <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	-0.18 (-4.16 to 3.81)	8	NR	NR	99.4	NR	4 / 13
	Sleep quality	Shift work sleep disorder <sup>26</sup>	SMD	0.25 <sup>+</sup> (-0.19 to 0.69)	4	291	0.264	59.7	0.059	7 / 15
		After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>21</sup>	SMD	-0.10 <sup>+</sup> (-0.41 to 0.21)	2	165	0.530	0.0	NA	4 / 11
	Subjective severity of sleep problem	Insomnia <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>+</sup>	0.45 (-0.37 to 1.28)	18	NR	NR	94.4	NR	4 / 13



	Sleep disturbance	Menopausal women <sup>41 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.42 (-0.54 to 1.38)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
	Sleep time during daytime	Shift work sleep disorder <sup>34 ***</sup>	SMD	0.36 <sup>†</sup> (0.12 to 0.61)	7	263	0.004	0.0	0.440	7 / 15
	Nocturnal sleep time	Shift work sleep disorder <sup>34 *</sup>	SMD	0.32 <sup>†</sup> (0.06 to 0.58)	3	234	0.015	0.0	0.634	7 / 15
	Daytime sleepiness	Insomnia <sup>32 ††</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.27 (0.06 to 0.48)	4	NR	NR	0.0	NR	4 / 13
	Light-off time	Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.08 <sup>†</sup> (-0.22 to 0.37)	3	179	0.604	0.0	0.627	5 / 13

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, DSPD: delayed sleep phase disorder, MLT: melatonin, NA: not available, SMD: standardized mean difference

<sup>°</sup> Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

<sup>†</sup> Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

<sup>††</sup> Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

**Table 3** Summary estimates of the associations between postoperative pain, surgical anxiety, postoperative course outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Outcomes	Health Outcomes	Condition	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Pain	Time for the first analgesic requirement	Surgical patients <sup>20 ***</sup>	SMD	5.81 <sup>†</sup> (2.57 to 9.05)	2	100	0.000	92.2	NA	5 / 14
	Postoperative pain	24h postoperative <sup>20 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	1.94 <sup>†</sup> (1.09 to 2.78)	9	728	0.000	96.0	0.000	5 / 14
		Surgical patients, acute pain, general anesthesia <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.82 (0.25 to 1.40)	11	NR	NR	93.0	NR	6 / 14
		Surgical patients, acute pain, local, epidural anesthesia <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.28 (-0.28 to 0.83)	3	NR	NR	62.2	NR	6 / 14
	Post-, intraoperative opioid consumption	Surgical patients, acute pain, general anesthesia <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	2.76 (1.53 to 4.00)	7	NR	NR	96.3	NR	6 / 14
		Surgical patients, acute, procedural pain <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	1.44 (0.53 to 3.44)	3	NR	NR	97.5	NR	6 / 14
		Surgical patients <sup>20 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	1.23 <sup>†</sup> (0.43 to 2.04)	7	517	0.003	93.9	0.000	5 / 14
	Postoperative pain	3h after laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.86 <sup>†</sup> (-0.97 to 2.69)	2	165	0.360	95.0	NA	4 / 11
		1h after laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.26 <sup>†</sup> (-0.56 to 1.08)	2	165	0.530	81.0	NA	4 / 11
	Chronic pain	Surgical patients <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.65 (0.34 to 0.96)	5	NR	NR	39.4	NR	6 / 14
	Procedural pain	Surgical patients, acute pain <sup>44</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.50 (-0.54 to 1.54)	2	NR	NR	85.3	NA	6 / 14
Anxiety	Anxiety-preoperative VAS	Preoperative and postoperative <sup>24 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.87 <sup>†</sup> (0.56 to 1.19)	18	1264	0.000	85.2	0.000	7 / 16
	Postoperative anxiety STAI	Preoperative and postoperative <sup>24 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.70 <sup>†</sup> (0.23 to 1.18)	2	73	0.004	0.0	NA	7 / 16
	Anxiety-postoperative VAS	Preoperative and postoperative <sup>24 *</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.59 <sup>†</sup> (0.08 to 1.09)	7	524	0.022	86.5	0.000	7 / 16
Postoperative course	Sleepiness after 3 days	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.10 <sup>†</sup> (-0.23 to 0.44)	2	162	0.540	9.0	NA	4 / 11
	Sleep quality	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.10 <sup>†</sup> (-0.21 to 0.41)	2	162	0.530	0.0	NA	4 / 11
	Well-being	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	-0.05 <sup>†</sup> (-0.36 to 0.26)	2	162	0.760	0.0	NA	4 / 11

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, h: hour/hours, SMD: standardized mean difference, STAI: state-trait anxiety inventory, VAS: visual analogue scale

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

\* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.005

**Table 4** Summary estimates of the associations between pregnancy, tinnitus, metabolic syndrome outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Outcomes	Health Outcomes	Condition	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Metabolic syndrome	Insulin	Metabolic syndrome <sup>35 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	1.84 (1.13 to 2.56)	8	376	0.000	0.00	0.540	5 / 14
		Metabolic syndrome <sup>46</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.15 <sup>†</sup> (-0.35 to 0.66)	4	182	0.553	63.4	0.042	4 / 12
	Systolic blood pressure	Metabolic syndrome <sup>33 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.87 (0.38 to 1.36)	9	510	0.000	84.3	NR	6 / 15
	Diastolic blood pressure	Metabolic syndrome <sup>33 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.85 (0.51 to 1.20)	9	510	0.001	68.7	NR	6 / 15
	HOMA-IR	Metabolic syndrome <sup>35 **</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.56 (0.24 to 0.89)	7	344	0.001	22.0	0.260	5 / 14
		Metabolic syndrome <sup>46</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.17 <sup>†</sup> (-0.28 to 0.63)	3	150	0.459	48.3	0.145	4 / 12
	Body weight	Obesity <sup>49 *</sup>	SMD	0.48 (0.02 to 0.94)	17	1065	0.038	92.0	< 0.01	6 / 13
	QUICKI	Metabolic syndrome <sup>46 *</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.46 <sup>†</sup> (0.09 to 0.83)	2	114	0.016	0.0	NA	4 / 12
		Metabolic syndrome <sup>35 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.01 (0.01 to 0.01)	5	276	0.000	0.0	0.590	5 / 14
	BMI	Obesity <sup>49 *</sup>	SMD	0.31 (0.00 to 0.63)	18	877	0.049	80	< 0.01	6 / 13
	Fasting glucose	Metabolic syndrome <sup>46 *</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.30 <sup>†</sup> (0.04 to 0.55)	2	504	0.022	36.7	NA	4 / 12
	Hemoglobin A1c	Metabolic syndrome <sup>46</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.27 <sup>†</sup> (-0.02 to 0.55)	3	194	0.065	0.0	0.560	4 / 12
	Waist circumference	Obesity <sup>49</sup>	SMD	0.18 (-0.23 to 0.60)	12	607	0.383	83.0	0.378	6 / 13
	Severity of tinnitus	Tinnitus <sup>53</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	-0.13 (-0.74 to 0.48)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
Migraine	Migraine frequency	Episodic migraine <sup>55 nt</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	1.71 (0.14 to 3.27)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
Pregnancy	Number of matured oocytes	ART <sup>47 ***</sup>	SMD	0.56 (0.27 to 0.85)	7	738	0.000	66.0	0.007	6 / 14
	Number of top-quality embryos	ART <sup>47 ***</sup>	SMD	0.53 (0.27 to 0.79)	3	232	0.000	0.0	0.816	6 / 14
	Number of oocytes retrieved	ART <sup>47 *</sup>	SMD	0.34 (0.01 to 0.67)	7	738	0.040	75.0	0.001	6 / 14
		COS <sup>48</sup>	SMD	0.30 <sup>†</sup> (-0.02 to 0.63)	5	680	0.071	73.0	0.005	6 / 15
Menopausal women	Psychological symptoms	Menopausal women <sup>56</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	0.00 (-0.32 to 0.37)	6	NR	0.884	70.3	0.005	4 / 13
	Sleep quality	Menopausal women <sup>56</sup>	SMD <sup>†</sup>	-0.66 (-1.54 to 0.22)	4	NR	0.141	89.40	0.000	4 / 13

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, ART: artificial reproductive technologies, BMI: body mass index, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, HOMA-IR: homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance, QUICKI: quantitative insulin sensitivity check index, SMD: standardized mean difference

° Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

**Table 5** Summary estimates of the associations between oxidative stress outcomes, and melatonin treatment

Melatonin treatment versus placebo control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Outcomes	Health Outcomes	Condition	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Oxidative stress	PCO (protein carbonyl)	Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	1.78 (0.58 to 2.97)	3	NR	0.004	95.6	0.040	5 / 13
	CAT (catalase) activity	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	1.38 (-1.42 to 4.18)	3	NR	NR	96.6	0.000	7 / 14
	SOD (superoxide dismutase) activity	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	1.38 (0.13 to 2.62)	3	NR	NR	86.9	0.000	7 / 14
		Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD	0.24 (-0.36 to 0.83)	2	NR	0.439	0.0	NR	5 / 13
	Gpx (glutathione peroxidase)	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	1.36 (0.46 to 2.30)	5	NR	NR	89.3	0.000	7 / 14
		Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD	-0.61 (-1.91 to 0.67)	3	NR	0.350	83.6	NR	5 / 13
	GR (glutathione reductase)	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	1.21 (0.65 to 1.77)	2	NR	NR	0.0	0.679	7 / 14
	TAC (total antioxidant capacity)	Under oxidative stress <sup>50 *</sup>	SMD	1.03 (0.24 to 1.81)	8	NR	0.011	91.6	NR	5 / 13
		Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	0.76 (0.30 to 1.21)	8	NR	NR	80.1	0.000	7 / 14
	MDA (malondialdehyde)	Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.84 (0.40 to 1.48)	9	NR	0.001	83.8	0.007	5 / 13
		Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.79 (0.39 to 1.19)	8	NR	NR	73.1	0.001	7 / 14
	GSH (glutathione)	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD	0.57 (0.32 to 0.83)	5	NR	NR	15.1	0.319	7 / 14
		Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD	0.41 (-0.16 to 0.98)	5	NR	0.163	79.1	NR	5 / 13
	NO (nitric oxide)	Under oxidative stress <sup>13</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.24 (-0.14 to 0.61)	2	NR	NR	0.0	0.941	7 / 14
		Under oxidative stress <sup>50 ***</sup>	SMD <sup>°</sup>	0.03 (-1.18 to 1.24)	8	NR	0.962	95.6	NR	5 / 13

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, NR: not recorded, SMD: standardized mean difference

<sup>°</sup> Indicates that the direction of positive effect size has been reversed

<sup>†</sup> Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

**Table 6** Summary estimates of the association between multiple health outcomes, and melatonin treatments made up of discrete variables

Melatonin treatment versus passive control. Positive direction of the effect size has converted to the beneficial direction.

Condition / Outcome	Health Outcomes	Condition / Control	Effect metrics	Effect size (95% CI)	N. trial	N. total	P value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	Egger's P	A2-CD / A2
Tinnitus	Response rate	Tinnitus <sup>53††</sup>	RR	41.00 (2.42 to 693.88)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
Cancer	Remission	Cancer <sup>52***</sup>	RR	1.95 (1.49 to 2.54)	8	761	<0.0001	0.0	0.980	3 / 11
	Survival at 1 year	Cancer <sup>52**</sup>	RR	1.90 (1.28 to 2.83)	5	490	0.001	61.9	0.030	3 / 11
Pregnancy	Rate of clinical pregnancy	COS <sup>48</sup>	RR	1.37 <sup>*</sup> (0.99 to 1.88)	5	680	0.056	0.0	0.796	6 / 15
		ART <sup>47*</sup>	RR	1.23 <sup>*</sup> (1.05 to 1.45)	10	1203	0.012	0.0	0.944	6 / 14
	Biochemical pregnancy rate	ART <sup>47*</sup>	RR	1.23 <sup>*</sup> (1.02 to 1.48)	6	671	0.032	0.0	0.481	6 / 14
	Miscarriage rate	ART <sup>47</sup>	RR	1.25 <sup>*</sup> (0.66 to 2.37)	5	674	0.496	0.0	0.933	6 / 14
	Live birth rate	ART <sup>47</sup>	RR	1.20 <sup>*</sup> (0.83 to 1.72)	3	291	0.335	0.0	0.812	6 / 14
Migraine	Response rate	Episodic migraine <sup>54††</sup>	OR	1.19 <sup>*</sup> (0.37 to 3.78)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
Mortality	In-hospital mortality	Non-ICU patients <sup>51</sup>	RR	0.84 (0.37 to 1.88)	3	543	0.670	0.0	0.710	6 / 15
Alzheimer	Discontinuation of all cause	AD <sup>39</sup>	RR	0.77 (0.51 to 1.16)	6	453	0.210	0.0	0.430	6 / 14
Delirium	Incidence of delirium	Delirium patients <sup>55††</sup>	OR	0.76 <sup>*</sup> (0.30 to 1.87)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
		Non-ICU patients <sup>38</sup>	RR	0.41 (0.09 to 1.89)	3	529	0.250	78.0	0.010	6 / 15
		Delirium patients <sup>7††</sup>	OR	0.16 <sup>*</sup> (0.03 to 0.75)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	6 / 15
		Pediatric patients after sevoflurane anesthesia <sup>36††</sup>	OR	0.05 <sup>*</sup> (0.01 to 0.46)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
Pain	Need for analgesic requirements	Surgical patients <sup>52**</sup>	RR	0.50 <sup>*</sup> (0.30 to 0.82)	5	411	0.006	53.5	0.072	5 / 14
Preoperative	Incidence of emergence agitation	Preoperative children / Midazolam <sup>17</sup>	RR <sup>§</sup>	0.48 (0.15 to 1.52)	3	31	0.209	36.8	0.205	6 / 14
		Preoperative children <sup>17**</sup>	RR	0.31 (0.16 to 0.60)	3	36	0.001	0.0	0.375	6 / 14
Side-effects	Drop-out for adverse effects	Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28</sup>	RR	3.22 <sup>*</sup> (0.14 to 75.8)	7	431	0.468	0.0	1.000	5 / 13
	Headache	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	RR	1.25 (0.42 to 3.71)	2	162	0.680	7.0	NA	4 / 11
	Drop-out for all causes	Children and adolescent with sleep onset insomnia <sup>28</sup>	RR	1.23 <sup>*</sup> (0.52 to 2.91)	7	431	0.639	0.0	0.573	5 / 13
		Menopausal women <sup>43††</sup>	RR	1.21 (0.30 to 4.78)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 / 16
	Nausea	Surgical patients <sup>20</sup>	OR	1.15 <sup>*</sup> (0.68 to 1.94)	5	417	0.590	0.0	NR	5 / 14
	Dizziness	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	RR	1.09 (0.14 to 8.40)	2	162	0.940	51.0	NA	4 / 11
	Depression	After laparoscopic cholecystectomy <sup>29</sup>	RR	1.03 (0.15 to 7.21)	2	162	0.970	0.0	NA	4 / 11
	Fatigue	After radiochemotherapy of cancer <sup>52***</sup>	RR	0.37 (0.28 to 0.48)	5	568	<0.0001	0.0	0.530	3 / 11
	Neurotoxicity	After radiochemotherapy of cancer <sup>52***</sup>	RR	0.19 (0.09 to 0.40)	5	568	<0.0001	0.0	0.950	3 / 11
	Thrombocytopenia	After radiochemotherapy of cancer <sup>52***</sup>	RR	0.13 (0.06 to 0.28)	5	568	<0.0001	0.0	0.990	3 / 11

A2: AMSTAR 2 total score, A2-CD: AMSTAR 2 critical domain score, AD: Alzheimer's disease, ART: artificial reproductive technologies, COS: controlled ovarian stimulation, ICU: intensive care unit, OR: odds ratio, RR: risk ratio, SMD: standardized mean difference

† Indicates the effect size obtained by reanalysis

†† Indicates that the original study designed network meta-analysis

‡ Indicates that the obtained effect size is the odds ratio of the fixed effect model and the original value of the study

§ Indicates that active control is used for the comparison

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.005$

## Figures

Figure 1






Figure 2






Figure 3




Figure 4






Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7

