Open Access



Neural stem/progenitor cell therapy for Alzheimer disease in preclinical rodent models: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Zijing Zhou^{1,2†}, Ben Shi^{1,2†}, Yaxing Xu^{1,2}, Jinyu Zhang^{1,2}, Xin liu^{1,2}, Xinghong Zhou^{1,2}, Baofeng Feng^{1,2,3}, Jun Ma^{1,2,3*} and Huixian Cui^{1,2,3}

Abstract

Background: Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a common progressive neurodegenerative disease characterized by memory impairments, and there is no effective therapy. Neural stem/progenitor cell (NSPC) has emerged as potential novel therapy for AD, and we aim to explore whether neural stem/progenitor cell therapy was effective for rodent models of AD.

Methods: We searched PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library and Web of Science up to December 6, 2022. The outcomes included cognitive function, pathological features and BDNF. The GetData Graph Digitizer software (version 2.26) was applied to extract numerical values, and RevMan 5.3 and Stata 16 were used to analyze data. The SYRCLE risk of bias tool was used to assess study quality.

Results: We evaluated 22 mice studies and 8 rat studies. Compared to control groups, cognitive function of NSPC groups of both mice studies (SMD = -1.96, 95% Cl -2.47 to -1.45, $l^2 = 75\%$, P < 0.00001) and rat studies (SMD = -1.35, 95% Cl -2.11 to -0.59, $l^2 = 77\%$, P = 0.0005) was apparently improved. In mice studies, NSPC group has lower A β deposition (SMD = -0.96, 95% Cl -1.40 to -0.52, P < 0.0001) and p-tau level (SMD = -4.94, 95% Cl -7.29 to -2.95, P < 0.0001), higher synaptic density (SMD = 2.02, 95% Cl 0.50-3.55, P = 0.009) and BDNF (SMD = 1.69, 95% Cl 0.61-2.77, P = 0.002). Combined with nanoformulation (SMD = -1.29, 95% Cl -2.26 to -0.32, $l^2 = 65\%$, P = 0.009) and genetically modified (SMD = -1.29, 95% Cl -1.92 to -0.66, $l^2 = 60\%$, P < 0.0001) could improve the effect of NSPC. In addition, both xenogeneic and allogeneic transplant of NSPC could reverse the cognitive impairment of AD animal models.

Conclusions: Our results suggested that NSPC therapy could improve the cognitive function and slow down the progression of AD. Due to the limitations of models, more animal trials and clinical trials are needed.

Keywords: Alzheimer disease, Neural stem/progenitor cell, Rodent models, Systematic review and meta-analysis

[†]Zijing Zhou and Ben Shi contribute equally

*Correspondence: Junmahmu@163.com

² Hebei Research Center for Stem Cell Medical Translational Engineering, Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang 050017, Hebei Province, China Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Introduction

Alzheimer disease (AD) is a common, progressive, and devastating neurodegenerative disease. The pathological features of the disease are the presence of extracellular amyloid- β (A β)-containing senile plaques and intracellular hyperphosphorylated tau-containing neurofibrillary tangles (NFT), neuroinflammation, synaptic loss and neuronal death, neocortical atrophy and the progressive

© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

deterioration of cognitive function [1, 2]. AD can be divided into familial Alzheimer disease (FAD) and sporadic AD (SAD) among the genetic factors. Most patients with Alzheimer's disease (>95%) have the sporadic form, which is characterized by a late onset (80-90 years of age) and is the consequence of the failure to clear the amyloid- β (A β) peptide from the interstices of the brain [3]. Familial Alzheimer's disease (FAD) presents basic similarities to sporadic AD, but with important differences. Onset is in mid-life or earlier, and the genetics follows a dominant Mendelian pattern, with 100% penetrance in most pedigrees [4]. The pathogenesis of AD is complex, involving multiple molecular signaling pathways. Cholinergic deficiency, amyloid beta $(A\beta)$ toxicity, tau protein hyperphosphorylation, synaptic dysfunction, oxidative stress, and neuroinflammation, were proposed to be responsible for AD development [5]. In 2018, Alzheimer's Disease International estimated a dementia prevalence of about 50 million people worldwide, projected to triple in 2050, with two-thirds living in lowincome and middle-income countries.

Today, only five drugs have been approved by the FDA for AD treatment: donepezil, rivastigmine, galantamine, tacrine and memantine. The first four drugs are acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (AChEIs), while the last one is an *N*-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (NMDAR) antagonist [6]. Clinical studies show some other approaches to AD, such as acupuncture, behavioral training and brain stimulation, including deep brain stimulation (DBS) [7], repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) [8] and transcranial electrical stimulation (tDCS and tACS) [8, 9]. But current treatments are unable to achieve satisfactory therapeutic outcomes, new treatments are urgently needed.

In recent years, stem cell therapy has received growing attention as a potential regenerative therapy for neurodegenerative diseases including AD due to regeneration of neural tissue, stabilizing the neuronal networks, providing neurotrophic support and alleviating neurodegeneration at different neuronal circuitry levels [10]. In clinical trials, researchers are conducting the safety and efficacy of Mesenchymal Stem Cells and Autologous Adipose Tissue Derived Mesenchymal Stem Cells. Phase I clinical trials of human umbilical cord blood derived mesenchymal stem cells and Longeveron Mesenchymal Stem Cells preliminary prove that MSC therapy was feasible, relatively and sufficiently safe and well tolerated [11, 12]. As for other animal models, there are more types of stem cells-induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), neural stem cells (NSCs), mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) and embryonic stem cells (ESCs). Neural stem/progenitor cells (NSPCs) are the multipotent stem cells that are capable of proliferation, self-renewal and generation of new neurons, astrocytes and oligodendrocytes [13]. NSPCs were used for some animal models, which have evaluated the safety and effectiveness of NSPC therapy. But there is no meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy and synthesize evidence of NSPC therapy in AD models. Therefore, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to assess the efficacy of NSPC therapy of experimental AD rodents, and our study will provide support for clinical treatment of NSPC for AD.

Methods

Data sources and search strategy

Four database (PubMed, Embase, Web of Science and Cochrane Library) were searched for experimentally controlled studies of the effect of NSPC therapies on AD models from their inception to December 6, 2022. The search strategy used a combination of terms from medical subject headings (MeSH) and free-text keywords. The subject headings were "Alzheimer Disease" AND "Neural Stem Cells" AND "Mice" OR "Rats." Combined with free words: (Alzheimer Dementia OR Dementia, Alzheimer OR Alzheimer's Disease OR Alzheimer Syndrome) AND (Neural Stem Cell OR Neural Progenitor Cell OR neural stem/progenitor cell) AND (mouse OR rat). Manual search and other methods were used to identify other relevant articles. Information of detailed search strategy is shown in Additional file 1: Table S1.

Criteria for consideration and extraction

Inclusion criteria (1) AD mice/rats treated by NSPCs; (2) Studies provided data about MWM or $A\beta$ level; (3) Studies were published in English. *Exclusion criteria* (1) No in vivo texting; (2) Review or conference abstract; (3) No NSPC group or con-

trol group; (4) No outcome or incomplete data.

Study selection

The literature retrieved from each database was imported into the NoteExpress, and the duplicated papers were removed. Then, titles and abstracts were scrutinized to determine the eligible studies after excluding the irrelevant articles. Then, full-text papers were obtained reviewed for the final eligibility according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria stated above. Two researchers independently select the studies, and a third researcher was consulted to resolve any disagreements.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Two researchers independently evaluated article quality and extracted data, and disagreements were addressed by discussion with a third reviewer. We extracted the following data from each study: first author, year, location, sex, species, weight and year of animals, method of AD model induction, source of NSPC, dose of cells, way and location of administrated, groups of trials, assessment time, immunosuppression or not and outcome. If data were only shown by graphs, the GetData Graph Digitizer software (version 2.26) was applied to extract numerical values. When SD was not reported, it was calculated by $\sqrt{N \times SE}$, and N means the sample size. If the required information was not obtained, the study was deleted. The SYRCLE risk of bias tool was used to evaluate the quality of animal studies [14].

Statistical analysis

Cochrane Collaboration Software RevMan 5.3 and Stata 16 were used to analyze data. The combined effect size was calculated as standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence interval (CI) between treatment group and control group. Heterogeneity was statistically evaluated by I^2 value, $I^2 \leq 50\%$ indicated homogeneity and fixed-effect models were employed, or random-effect models were used instead. Subgroup analyses were performed to indicate statistical significance. Publication bias was investigated by visual inspection of funnel plots. All tests were two-sided, and P < 0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance.

Results

Search results

A total of 2098 articles were initially retrieved from 4 databases, and 1316 records were obtained after removing 782 duplicates. Then after screening titles and abstracts, 86 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility. Fifty-six of them were excluded because of full text unavailable, Chinese paper, conference abstract or review, no in vivo texting, no NSPC or AD model and no outcome or incomplete data. Finally, 22 mice trials [15–36] and 8 rat trials [37–44] were selected (Fig. 1). Funnel plots were used to evaluate publication bias (Additional file 2: Fig. S1).

Study characteristics and quality

Of 30 studies, 22 were mice models and 8 were rat models. The location of studies included China, Korea, the USA, Israel, Sweden, Iran, Japan and Egypt (Fig. 2a). The gender of the experimental animal of all studies included only male, or only female, or the mixed, except for 9 studies with no statements (Fig. 2b). Of all mice models, APP-swe/PS1dE9 mice were used in 11 studies, Tg2576 mice and APP/PS1/tau 3 × Tg AD mice were used in 3 studies, SAMP8 mice were used in 2 studies, and Tg-tau mice, NSE/APPsw transgenic mice and ICR mice infused with

ibotenic acid were used in other studies. Sixteen studies used mice NSPC, 6 studies used human NSPC, and 3 studies used immunosuppression. As for rat model, 6 studies used SD rats and 2 used Wistar rats, while the method of AD is different, such as infusing AF64A solution, A β , okadaic acid (OA), IgG-saporin, ibotenic (IBO) acid and nucleus basalis of Meynert (nbM) lesioning. Four studies used rat NSPC, other 4 studies including 2 used human NSPC and 2 used mice NSPC, and 3 of them used immunosuppression. Of all studies, there were 14 studies combined with other treatment methods. In almost all studies, NSPCs were stereotactically transplanted, only 1 was intranasally transplanted and 3 studies were intra-cerebroventricular injection. Information on study characteristics, study quality and publication bias is shown in Tables 1, 2, Additional files 3: Table S2, and 2: Fig. S1.

Cognitive function

Cognitive function was assessed by Morris water maze (MWM), and we extracted the data of escape latency from the last day of the learning phase. Nineteen of mice studies [15–23, 25–30, 32, 33, 35, 36] included MWM testing, we used a random-effect model to compare NSPC group (205 mice) and control group (190 mice), and the analysis showed that compared with the control group, NSPC could improve cognitive function apparently (SMD= – 1.96, 95% CI – 2.47 to – 1.45, I^2 =75%, P < 0.00001) (Fig. 3a). Eight rat studies [37–44] included MWM texting, we also used a random-effect model, and the outcome showed that cognitive function compared with control group (83 rats) and NSPC group (84 rats) improved apparently (SMD= – 1.35, 95% CI – 2.11 to – 0.59, I^2 =77%, P=0.0005)(Fig. 3b).

Pathological features

Aβ deposition

In mice studies, 9 studies [15, 16, 18, 24, 26, 28, 32, 35, 36] reported the difference of NSPC group (52 mice) and control group (52 mice) about $A\beta$ deposition. We used a fixed-effect model for low heterogeneity (P=0.14, $I^2=35\%$). Meta-analyses showed that $A\beta$ deposition after NSPC treatment was significantly lower than AD models (SMD = -0.96, 95% CI - 1.40 to -0.52, P < 0.0001) (Fig. 4).

Synaptic density

We used synaptophysin (SYP) expression to evaluate synaptic density to ensure if synaptic loss had been ameliorated, and 7 mice studies [16, 18, 20, 27–29, 32] reported it. Because of high heterogeneity (P < 0.00001, $I^2 = 82\%$) (Additional files 4: Fig. S2), we used a random-effect



model, which showed that SYP expression of NSPC group (44 mice) was significantly higher than control group (44 mice), suggesting that NSPC promotes synaptic density recovery (SMD=2.02, 95% CI 0.50–3.55, P=0.009). Sensitivity analysis showed that high heterogeneity could be explained by the work of McGinley et al. [18]. After it was excluded, the level of heterogeneity decreased (P=0.07, $l^2=51\%$) (Fig. 5).

Anti-inflammatory effect

IL-1 β expression was used to assess anti-inflammatory effect of NSPC treatment, and 4 mice studies [18, 26, 32, 33] reported it. A random-effects model was used for the analysis because of the high heterogeneity (*P*=0.002, *I*²=80%), and the results indicated that IL-1 β expression did not change significantly (SMD = -1.37, 95% CI - 3.13 to 0.39, *P*=0.13) (Fig. 6).



P-tau

A total of 3 mice studies [25, 31, 32] compared p-tau level between NSPC group (19 mice) and control group (21 mice), and we used a random-effects model for the analysis because of the high heterogeneity (P=0.08, $I^2=60\%$). The outcome showed that the *p*-tau level of NSPC group is lower (SMD = -4.94, 95% CI -7.29 to -2.59, P < 0.0001) (Additional files 5: Fig. S3). Sensitivity analysis showed that high heterogeneity could be explained by the work of Zhang et al. [25]. After it was excluded, the level of heterogeneity decreased (P=0.55, $I^2=0\%$) (Fig. 7). But due to the small number of data, we need more studies to make a conclusion.

Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF)

A total of 10 mice studies [16, 19, 24, 28, 30, 32–34, 36, 45] reported BDNF level, we used a random-effect model to compare BDNF level between NSPC group (55 mice) and control group (55 mice) because of high heterogeneity (P=0.0003, l^2 =71%). BDNF level of NSPC group was higher than control group (SMD=1.69, 95% CI 0.61–2.77, P=0.002) (Fig. 8).

Effect of NSPC combined with other treatment

A total of 14 studies used NSPC combined with other treatment, we divided them into 3 group: a: NSPC combined with nanoformulation (4 studies) [15, 33, 41, 42], b: genetically modified NSPC (7 studies) [15–17, 30, 36, 37, 40], and c: NSPC administration with other drug (4 studies with 5 drugs) [29, 35, 43, 44]. We used a subgroup analysis to compare the effect between combination group with NSPC group on cognitive function (Fig. 9). The

outcome proved that both combined with nanoformulation (SMD = -1.29, 95% CI -2.26 to -0.32, $I^2 = 65\%$, P = 0.009) and genetically modified NSPC (SMD = -1.29, 95% CI -1.92 to -0.66, $I^2 = 60\%$, P < 0.0001) can enhance the effect of NSPC therapy. But consolidated analysis suggested that there was no statistically significant difference in cognitive function between NSPC treatment and NSPC administration with other drug (SMD = -0.74, 95% CI -2.12 to 0.64, $I^2 = 89\%$, P = 0.29).

Effect of NSPC xenogeneic and allogeneic transplant for cognitive function

Nineteen of mice studies and 8 rat studies included MWM testing, and we divided them into 2 groups: xenogeneic transplant group (7 studies) [17, 18, 32, 35–37, 44] and allogeneic transplant group (20 studies) [15, 16, 19–23, 25–30, 33, 38–43]. We used a subgroup analysis to evaluate the effect of NSPC xenogeneic transplant and allogeneic transplant on cognitive function (Fig. 12). The outcome proved that both xenogeneic transplant (SMD = -1.10, 95% CI -1.86 to -0.35, $I^2 = 73\%$, P = 0.004) and allogeneic transplant (SMD = -2.01, 95% CI -2.50 to -1.53, $I^2 = 74\%$, P < 0.00001) treatment could improve cognitive function apparently.

Sensitivity analysis

To evaluate the stability of the results, we further performed a sensitivity analysis through the sequential omission of each study. For the pooled SMD, outcome of cognitive function, $A\beta$ deposition and BDNF level were not significantly affected by any study.

References	Location	Animal sex	Animal species	Animal year	Group	Type and source of NSPC	Way of administrated	Delivered location	Dose of NSPC	Immunosuppression	Assessment time	Parameter
Huang [15]	China	Female	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	9 months	AD + PBS AD + NSC AD + nanoformulation- NSC AD + NEP-NSC	Mice NSC from hip- pocampus	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	1 × 10 ⁵	z	1 month 6 months	80
Wu [16]	China	ΥN	Tg2576 mice	16 months	Tg+Vehicle Tg+NSC Tg+BDNF-NSC	Mice NSC from post- natal day 1 hippocam- pus	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	1 × 10 ⁵	z	8 weeks	0040
Lee [17]	Korea	male	ICR mice	A	 IBO acid + NSC (<i>n</i> = 9) IBO acid + PBS (<i>n</i> = 7) IBO acid + NGF-NSC (<i>n</i> = 9) 	Human NSC from 14-week fetal brain	Stereotactically transplanted	Cortex	2 × 10 ⁵	z	4 weeks	Θ
McGinley [18]	USA	Male	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	12 weeks	AD + vehicle ($n = 10$) AD + NSC ($n = 10$)	Human cortex- derived NSC	Stereotactically transplanted	Fimbria fornix	1.8 × 10 ⁵	~	16 weeks	0246
Zhao [19]	China	male	SAMP8 mice	8 months	SAMP8 + sham opera- tion $(n = 10)$ SAMP8 + NSC $(n = 10)$	Mice NSC from embryo	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	5×10^{5}	Z	15 days	00
Zhang [20]	China	male	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	12 months	Tg + PBS (n = 10) Tg + NSC (n = 10)	Mice NSC	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	5×10^5 to 1×10^6	z	10 weeks	Ū€
Zhang [21]	China	AN	APPswe/ PS1dE9mice	12 months	Tg + vehicle (n = 20) Tg + NSC (n = 20)	Mice NSC from 14 days embryo	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	2.5-5 × 10 ⁶	Z	5 weeks 10 weeks	Θ
Mathew [22]	USA	NA	APP/PS1/tau 3 × Tg AD mice	18 months	3xTg-AD + vehicle (n = 9) 3xTg-AD + NSC (n = 18)	Mice NSC (postnatal day 1)	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	1×10^{5}	Z	1 month	Θ
Chen [23]	China	Male	APP/PS1/tau 3 × Tg AD mice	12 months	3xTg-AD + PBS (<i>n</i> = 10) 3xTg-AD + NSC (<i>n</i> = 10)	Mice NSC from hip- pocampus and sub- ependymal zone of 1 2.5 days fetal brain	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	2 × 10 ⁶	z	8 weeks	Θ

 Table 1
 Characteristics of mice trials

References	Location	Animal sex	Animal species	Animal year	Group	Type and source of NSPC	Way of administrated	Delivered location	Dose of NSPC	Immunosuppression	Assessment time	Parameter
Lu [24]	China	male	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	3.5 months	AD + saline AD + NSC	Human NSC from hippocam- pus of 6–8-week embryos	Intransally transplanted	Nasal cavity	1×10^{6} , 4 times	>	3 months 4 months	1 2€60
Zhang [25]	China	AA	Tg-tau mice	40 weeks	$T_{g} + PBS (n = 11)$ $T_{g} + NSC (n = 11)$	Mice NSC from hippocam- pus on postnatal day1	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	2 × 10 ⁵	z	4 weeks	© 0
Zhang [26]	China	male	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	12 months	AD + PBS (n = 20) AD + NSC (n = 20)	Mice NSC from embryonic day 14	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	5 × 10 ⁵ to 1 × 10 ⁶	Z	10 weeks	000
Zhang [27]	China	NA	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	10 months	AD + Vehicle ($n = 15$) AD + NSC ($n = 15$)	Mice NSC from embryonic day 14	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	1 × 10 ⁶	z	8 weeks	$\mathbb{O}^{\textcircled{1}}$
Zhang [28]	China	AA	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	12 months	AD + Vehicle ($n = 20$) AD + NSC ($n = 20$)	Mice NSC from embryonic day 14	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	5 × 10 ⁵ to 1 × 10 ⁶	Z	8 weeks	124
Zhou [29]	China	male	SAMP8 mice	8 months	SAMPB control ($n = 10$) SAMPB+NSC ($n = 10$) SAMPB+NSC + 10) SAMPB SAMPB+NSC + Huang-DiSan ($n = 10$)	Mice NSC from embryonic day 12–16	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	1 × 10 ⁶	z	15 days	Ū. ()
Ofra [30]	Israel	male	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	11 months	AD + sham AD + NPC AD + IL-1ra-NPC	Mice NPC	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	4000 spheres	z	1 month	020
Armijo [31]	USA	male and female	APP/PS1/tau 3 × Tg AD mice	17 months	3xTg-AD + PBS 3xTg-AD + NPC	Mice NPC from tail-tip fibroblasts	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	5 × 10 ⁵	z	1 month 2 months	0
Lee [32]	Korea	NA	NSE/APPsw transgenic mice	13 months	APP + Vehicle APP + NSC	Human NSC from 13-week fetal brain	ICV	Lateral ventricles	5 × 10 ⁵	>	6 weeks 12 weeks	00000

Table 1 🤅	continued)											
References	Location	Animal sex	Animal species	Animal year	Group	Type and source of NSPC	Way of administrated	Delivered location	Dose of NSPC	Immunosuppression	Assessment time	Parameter
Li [33]	China	male and female	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	12 months	AD + Vehicle ($n = 10$) AD + NSC ($n = 10$)	Mice NSC from embryonic day 14	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	2.5-5 × 10 ⁶	z	3 weeks	060
Li [34]	China	V N	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	AA	AD + Saline AD + NSC AD + CSeM/let-7b NPs-NSC	Mice NSC from hip- pocampus	Stereotactically transplanted	A	۲Z	z	30 days	00
Lilja [35]	Sweden	male and female	Tg2576 Mice	6–9 months	Tg + Vehicle + saline (n = 9) Tg + NSC + saline $(n = 9)$ Tg + NSC + JN403 (n = 5) Tg + NSC + $(+)$ -phen- serine $(n = 7)$	Human NSC	Stereotactically transplanted	Hippocam- pus	2.5 × 10 ⁴	z	5 weeks	8 0
Park [36]	Korea	Ч	APPswe/ PS1dE9 mice	18 months	AD + saline $(n = 10)$ AD + NSC $(n = 10)$ AD + CHAT-NSC $(n = 10)$	Human NSC from 15-week fetal brain	ICV	Lateral ventricles	1 × 10 ⁶	z	4 weeks	000
NA not repor level, (syna	ted, <i>AD</i> Alzhei ptic density, (imer's diseas ઊ anti-inflan	e, NSC neural ste nmatory effect, (em cell, NPC net © brain-derivet	ural progenitor cell, N No, γ d neurotrophic factor level	' Yes, IBO acid	ibotenic acid, <i>ICV</i> i	intra-cerebrove	ntricular injecti	ion, ① Morris water maze	e test, \mathbb{Q} A β dept	sition, ③ p-tau

Table 2 Cr	aracteristi	ics of rat t	rrials										
References	Location	Animal sex	Animal species	Animal weight	Animal year	Group	Type and source of NSPC	Way of administrated		Dose of NSPC	Immunosuppression	Assessment time	Parameter
Park [37]	Korea	Male	SD rat	220–230 g	AN	AF 64A (n = 15) AF 64A + NSC (n = 15) AF 64A + ChAT NSC (n = 15)	Human NSC from 15-week fetal brain	ICV	Right ventricle	1 × 10 ⁶	z	4–5 weeks 8–9 weeks	WMW
Moghadam [38]	Iran	Male	SD rat	about 300 g	NA	nbM lesion + vehicle ($n = 6$) nbM lesion + NPC ($n = 6$)	Mice NPC differentia- tion from ESC	Stereotactically transplanted	Right nbM	2 × 10 ⁵	~	4 weeks	WMW
Tang [39]	China	Male	Wistar rat	200–250 g	3-4 months	$A\beta \ (n=10)$ $A\beta + NPC \ (n=10)$	Mice NPC from embryonic fibroblasts	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus	AN	~	4 weeks 16 weeks	WMW
Wu [40]	Japan	Male	Wistar rat	270–290 g	A	OA ($n = 12$) OA + NSC ($n = 12$) OA + NSC-hNGF-eGFP ($n = 12$)	Rat NSC from 17-day rat forebrain cerebral cortex	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus and cerebral cortex	2 × 10 ⁵	z	30 days	WMW
Chen [41]	China	Male	SD rat	200–250 g	A	lgG-saporin ($n = 8$) lgG-saporin + NSC ($n = 8$) lgG- saporin + NSC + NGF- saporin + NSC + NGF-	Rat NSC from embry- onic day 13.5–15.5	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus and basal forebrain	Ч	z	4 weeks	WMW
Cui [42]	China	Female	SD rats	Ч Ч	۲	$A\beta (n = 15)$ $A\beta + NSC (n = 15)$ $A\beta + NSC + DSP (n = 15)$	Rat NSC from hip- pocampus on postna- tal day1	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus	5×10^{5}	z	4 weeks	WMW
Hu [43]	China	Female	SD rats	ΥZ	8 weeks	AB $(n = 18)$ AB + NSC $(n = 18)$ AB + NSC + ASI $(n = 18)$	Rat NSC from embryonic day 14	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus	1 × 10 ⁵	z	4 weeks	WMW
Shaymaa [44]	Egypt	Male	SD rats	200–250 g	3 months	 IBO acid (n = 10) IBO acid + NSC (n = 10) IBO acid + NSC + ROO (n = 10) 	Human adult OBNSCs	Stereotactically transplanted	Hip- pocampus	2.4 × 10 ⁵	~	7 weeks	WMW

NA not reported, 5D rat Sprague Dawley rat, OA okadaic acid, IBO acid Ibotenic acid, NSC neural stem cell, NPC neural progenitor cell, N no, Yyes, OBNSCs olfactory bulb neuronal stem cells, DSP designer self-assemble peptide, ROO rosemary oil, MWM Morris water maze, ICV intra-cerebroventricular injection, nbM nucleus basalis of Meynert



NSPC treatment group and control group

and control group

	N	SC/NPC		C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Huang 2021	9.4	1.67	4	13.69	0.95	4	3.5%	-2.75 [-5.09, -0.40]	
Lee 2015	0.8	0.55	3	1.19	0.45	3	6.6%	-0.62 [-2.33, 1.09]	
Lilja 2015	5.68	2.18	9	7.91	2.59	9	19.9%	-0.89 [-1.87, 0.09]	
Lu 2021	156.32	56.54	5	351.72	87.39	5	5.7%	-2.40 [-4.23, -0.57]	<u> </u>
McGinley 2018	1.24	0.087	10	1.57	0.22	10	16.0%	-1.89 [-2.98, -0.80]	
Park 2020	150.25	55.077	5	215.52	96.38	5	11.2%	-0.75 [-2.06, 0.56]	
Wu 2016	0.67	0.34	5	1	0.15	5	9.8%	-1.13 [-2.53, 0.26]	
Zhang 2014	181.21	12.08	5	182.55	12.08	5	12.4%	-0.10 [-1.34, 1.14]	
Zhang 2016	45.45	21.21	6	45.45	27.27	6	14.9%	0.00 [-1.13, 1.13]	-
Total (95% CI)			52			52	100.0%	-0.96 [-1.40, -0.52]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	12.31, df Z = 4.30	= 8 (P = (P < 0.00	0.14); P 01)	²= 35%					-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours NSC/NPC Favours control
Fig. 4 Forest plot sho	ows the n	nean effe	ect size	and 959	% confi	dence	interval (CI) for A β deposition o	f mice studies between NSPC treatment group

	N	SC/NPC		C	Control			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Lee 2015	1.5	0.21	3	1	0.25	3	14.5%	1.73 [-0.58, 4.05]	+
McGinley 2018	0.68	0.074	10	0.74	0.11	10	0.0%	-0.61 [-1.51, 0.29]	
Wu 2016	1.4	0.16	6	1	0.3	6	23.9%	1.54 [0.18, 2.89]	
Zhang 2013	1.19	0.098	6	0.73	0.2	6	19.6%	2.70 [0.96, 4.43]	
Zhang 2014	1.12	0.024	5	0.72	0.024	5	1.7%	15.05 [6.49, 23.62]	
Zhang 2017	1.36	0.23	4	0.74	0.17	4	14.6%	2.67 [0.37, 4.96]	
Zhou 2018	0.69	0.028	10	0.57	0.062	10	25.7%	2.39 [1.18, 3.59]	
Total (95% Cl)			34			34	100.0%	2.40 [1.27, 3.54]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	= 0.94; C	hi² = 10	.27, df=	= 5 (P =	0.07); P	²= 51%			-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect	: Z= 4.14	(P < 0.	0001)						Favours control Favours NSC/NPC
Fig. 5 Forest plot sho	ws the r	nean ef	fect siz	e and 9	95% cor	nfidenc	e interva	(CI) for synaptic densit	y of mice studies between NSPC treatment group

and control group



	N	SC/NPC		Co	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
Armijo 2021	1.1	0.17	7	1.91909	0.26	7	66.6%	-3.49 [-5.34, -1.64]	
Lee 2015	0.8	0.041	6	1	0.041	5	33.4%	-4.46 [-7.07, -1.85]	
Zhang 2021	0.91	0.11	6	2.12	0.16	9	0.0%	-7.97 [-11.45, -4.49]	
Total (95% CI)			13			12	100.0%	-3.81 [-5.32, -2.30]	▲
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.35, df	= 1 (P =	0.55);	l² = 0%					
Test for overall effect	Z = 4.95	i (P < 0.1	00001)						Favours NSC/NPC Favours control

Fig. 7 Forest plot shows the mean effect size and 95% confidence interval (CI) for p-tau level of mice studies between NSPC treatment group and control group

	NS	C/NPC		C	ontrol		:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Lee 2015	1.12	0.14	4	1	0.18	3	12.9%	0.64 [-0.94, 2.22]	- +
Li 2017	0.34	0.082	4	0.12	0.053	4	9.6%	2.77 [0.41, 5.13]	
Li 2018	0.33	0.05	3	0.11	0.0052	3	3.6%	4.95 [-0.09, 9.99]	
Lu 2021	303.23	59.26	6	324.19	39.5	6	14.8%	-0.38 [-1.53, 0.76]	
Ofra 2014	8,041.31	630.71	8	6,619.47	757.01	8	14.4%	1.93 [0.68, 3.18]	
Park 2020	0.7	0.29	5	0.15	0.075	5	11.9%	2.35 [0.53, 4.16]	
Wu 2016	9.8	1.41	12	5.31	2.83	12	15.4%	1.94 [0.94, 2.94]	
Zhang 2014	2.26	0.028	5	0.99	0.028	5	0.2%	40.97 [17.87, 64.07]	
Zhang 2019	3.019	0.63	5	2.53	0.57	6	14.4%	0.75 [-0.50, 2.00]	
Zhao 2016	0.75	0.027	3	0.55	0.027	3	2.8%	5.93 [-0.02, 11.87]	
Total (95% CI)			55			55	100.0%	1.69 [0.61, 2.77]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	= 1.70; Chi ² : : Z = 3.07 (P	= 30.69, = 0.002)	df = 9 (f	P = 0.0003)); I² = 719	6			-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours control Favours NSC/NPC

Fig. 8 Forest plot shows the mean effect size and 95% confidence interval (CI) for BDNF level of mice studies between NSPC treatment group and control group



Discussion

Current treatments of AD are unable to achieve satisfactory therapeutic outcomes, so an effective and safe treatment is urgently required. We explored whether NSPC could be used to treat AD. Our meta-analysis of 30 studies made a comprehensive summary about the effect of NSPC therapy on the mice and rat model of AD. Pooled analyses confirmed that NSPC therapy could improve cognitive function in the preclinical models of AD. Our analysis also suggests that inject NSPC with nanoformulation and genetically modified boost the efficacy of NSPC treatment. Therefore, the present meta-analysis provides significant clues for human clinical trials on NSPC therapy.

Alzheimer's disease is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder, which is a major cause of dementia [46], so we chose cognitive function as outcome indicate. The pathological features of AD include the presence of extracellular A β -containing senile plaques and intracellular hyperphosphorylated tau-containing NFT, neuroinflammation and synaptic loss, so we used A β deposition, synaptic density, anti-inflammatory effect and p-tau level as pathological indication. We found that BDNF was observed in several studies, so we analyzed the change of BDNF to evaluate the function of NSPC therapy.

Morris water maze (MWM) experiment is widely used in scientific research to assess the learning and memory of animals [47]. Almost all studies use MWM experiment as behavioral experiments to observe whether cognitive function has improved. In this analysis, we used the data of escape latency from the last day of the learning phase to evaluate the cognitive function. Compared to control group, almost all data of NSPC treatment group were lower, which means that NSPC therapy could improve the learning and memory function of AD model and ameliorate the deterioration of cognitive function. The subgroup analysis of assessment time in mice trials showed that after 3 months, NSPC therapy still has effectiveness (SMD = -1.18, 95% CI -2.07 to 0.30, $I^2 = 6\%$, P = 0.009) (Fig. 10). But in rat studies, after 1 month, NSPC does not work (SMD = -1.62, 95% CI -4.74 to 1.50, $I^2 = 92\%$, P = 0.31) (Fig. 11).

 $A\beta$ is one of the key initiating factors of AD pathogenesis. Accumulation of $A\beta$ results in loss of synapses, neuroinflammation and ultimately cognitive deficits [48]. Our analysis collected the data about $A\beta$ expression of NSPC

	Exp	erimental	I	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 xenogeneic tra	nsplant								
Lee 2012	108.26	49.54	9	141.28	48.55	7	3.9%	-0.64 [-1.66, 0.38]	
Lee 2015	11.5	10.39	12	13.5	7.12	10	4.2%	-0.21 [-1.05, 0.63]	
Lilja 2015	30.29	26.47	9	49.12	17.65	9	4.0%	-0.80 [-1.77, 0.17]	
McGinley 2018	21.83	11.07	10	37.67	20.03	10	4.1%	-0.94 [-1.87, -0.00]	
Park 2012	223.33	154.33	7	233.33	145.52	7	3.9%	-0.06 [-1.11, 0.99]	
Park 2020	51.06	42.61	10	164.54	44.85	10	3.6%	-2.48 [-3.71, -1.26]	
Shaymaa 2022	30.59	2.66	10	40.03	2.9	10	3.2%	-3.25 [-4.67, -1.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			67			63	26.9%	-1.10 [-1.86, -0.35]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	= 0.75; Chi	r = 22.15	df = 6	(P = 0.00)	01); l² = 7	3%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.85 ((P = 0.004	H)						
2.1.2 allogeneic tran	snlant								
Chen 2014	16	4.5	10	21.25	5	10	4.0%	-1.06[-2.010.11]	
Chen 2015	30.81	7.56		48.26	20.93		3.8%	-1.05[-2.11_0.02]	
Cui 2016	19.77	5.23	15	36.34	61	15	3.9%	-2.84 [-3.89, -1.79]	
Hu 2016	41.12	14.26	18	56.64	15.36	18	4.5%	-1.02 [-1.72, -0.32]	
Huang 2021	28.36	12.14	8	42.68	12.41	8	3.8%	-1.10 [-2.18, -0.03]	
Li 2017	11.92	2.67	10	23.8	3.88	10	3.2%	-3.42 [-4.89, -1.95]	
Mathew 2009	13.73	7.91	18	26.27	20.85	9	4.2%	-0.90 [-1.74, -0.06]	
Moghadam 2009	20.74	3.73	6	29.17	3.72	6	3.1%	-2.09 [-3.61, -0.57]	
Ofra 2014	74.03	7.3	9	96.97	6.78	9	3.2%	-3.10 [-4.57, -1.63]	
Tang 2008	31.66	8.14	8	40.03	7.61	7	3.8%	-1.00 [-2.09, 0.10]	
Wu 2008	59.46	21.24	12	61.92	15.93	12	4.3%	-0.13 [-0.93, 0.67]	
Wu 2016	59.47	27.47	12	95.15	11.45	12	4.1%	-1.64 [-2.58, -0.69]	
Zhang 2013	13.01	3.19	10	22.57	3.98	10	3.5%	-2.54 [-3.78, -1.30]	
Zhang 2014	12.32	2.58	20	24.04	4.17	20	4.0%	-3.31 [-4.30, -2.33]	
Zhang 2015	12.07	4.48	10	24.83	2.41	10	3.2%	-3.40 [-4.86, -1.93]	
Zhang 2016	12.42	4.92	10	22.97	3.98	10	3.7%	-2.26 [-3.43, -1.08]	<u> </u>
Zhang 2017	10.61	3.061	10	24.08	4.29	10	3.1%	-3.46 [-4.95, -1.98]	
Zhang 2021	34.73	9.65	8	65.12	8.35	6	2.8%	-3.12 [-4.84, -1.39]	
Zhao 2016	58.47	8.75	10	72.45	9.04	10	3.9%	-1.51 [-2.52, -0.49]	<u> </u>
Zhou 2018	57.07	4.55	10	78.28	6.57	10	3.1%	-3.59 [-5.12, -2.07]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			222			210	73.1%	-2.01 [-2.50, -1.53]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	= 0.88; Chi	² = 73.43	df = 1	9 (P < 0.0)0001); P	²= 74%	•		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.09 ((P < 0.000	001)						
Total (95% Cl)			289			273	100.0%	-1.78 [-2.20, -1.35]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	= 0.93; Chi	² = 107.5	8, df =	26 (P < 0	.00001);	l ² = 76	%	-	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.16 ((P < 0.000)01)						-4 -2 U 2 4
Test for subaroup dif	ferences:	Chi² = 3.9	4. df=	1 (P = 0.	05), I ² = 7	74.6%			
Fig. 10 Forest plots	of subgra	oup analy	/sis by	effect o	f NSPC a	alloger	neic trans	plant and NSPC xenog	eneic transplant for cognitive function in
preclinical rodent mo	odels								

group and control group; compared to control group, $A\beta$ deposition of NSPC group was significantly lower, so we can conclude that NSPC decreases $A\beta$ accumulation. Tau proteins are microtubular neuronal proteins. The tau proteins have a microtubule binding domain, which is involved in polymerization and stabilization of the microtubule assembly to maintain the integrity of the cytoskeleton. Hyperphosphorylation results in decreased affinity of the tau proteins to microtubules. The hyperphosphorylated tau forms NFTs and gets deposited in the cytosol and can no longer perform the function of maintaining the structure of the cell [46]. Moreover, it would impair cognitive function. Of all studies, 3 studies [25, 31, 32] reported p-tau level and suggested that NSPC treatment would reduce p-tau aggregation (Fig. 12).

A synaptic damage in the neocortex and limbic system causes memory impairment and generally is observed at the early stages of AD [49]. SYP is a specific protein on the membrane of synaptic vesicles, which may be involved in the formation of synaptic vesicles and dendrite spine. Here, we used SYP to evaluate synaptic density. The data of NSPC group were higher than control group, and it can prove that NSPC transplantation enhances synaptic density, attenuated the synaptotoxic properties of A β and promoted synaptic plasticity [32]. Electrophysiological recording of 2 studies [31, 45] also proved that NSPC transplantation promoted synaptic plasticity.

Many studies now point to the involvement of neuroinflammation playing a fundamental role in the progression of the neuropathological changes that are observed in AD [50]. Unlike other risk factors and genetic causes of AD, neuroinflammation is not typically thought to be causal on its own but rather a result of one or more of the other AD pathologies or risk factors associated with AD and serves to increase the severity of the disease by

	N	ISPC		C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 ≤1 month									
Huang 2021	28.36	12.14	8	42.68	12.41	8	4.8%	-1.10 [-2.18, -0.03]	
Lee 2012	108.26	49.54	9	141.28	48.55	7	4.9%	-0.64 [-1.66, 0.38]	
Li 2017	11.92	2.67	10	23.8	3.88	10	4.0%	-3.42 [-4.89, -1.95]	
Mathew 2009	13.73	7.91	18	26.27	20.85	9	5.3%	-0.90 [-1.74, -0.06]	<u> </u>
Ofra 2014	74.03	7.3	9	96.97	6.78	9	4.0%	-3.10 [-4.57, -1.63]	
Park 2020	51.06	42.61	10	164.54	44.85	10	4.5%	-2.48 [-3.71, -1.26]	
Zhang 2021	34.73	9.65	8	65.12	8.35	6	3.5%	-3.12 [-4.84, -1.39]	
Zhao 2016	58.47	8.75	10	72.45	9.04	10	4.9%	-1.51 [-2.52, -0.49]	<u> </u>
Zhou 2018	57.07	4.55	10	78.28	6.57	10	3.9%	-3.59 [-5.12, -2.07]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			92			79	39.7%	-2.07 [-2.82, -1.32]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.90; Chi	i² = 27.7	'0, df = 1	8 (P = 0.0	0005); P	'= 71%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.42 ((P < 0.0	0001)						
2 1 2 >1 month < 2 n	nonthe								
Chen 2014	16	4.5	10	21.25	5	10	5.0%	-1.06 [-2.01 -0.11]	
Loo 2016	0.6	4.0	21	21.20	545	10	5.0%	-0.40[-2.01,-0.11]	
Lee 2015 Lilio 2015	20.20	26.47	21	10.12	17.66	13	5.0%	-0.49[-1.12, 0.14]	
Lija 2015 Wu 2016	50.25	20.47	12	95.12	11.05	12	5.0%	-0.00[-1.77, 0.17]	<u> </u>
7hang 2012	12.01	21.47	10	22.67	2.00	10	1.6%	-1.04 [-2.30, -0.03]	
Zhang 2013 Zhang 2014	12.32	2.58	20	22.07	4 17	20	5.0%	-2.34 [-3.70, -1.30]	
Zhang 2014 Zhang 2015	11.65	2.00	10	24.04	4.74	10	3 9 %	-3.63[-5.16]-2.10]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	11.00	2.12	92	24.00	4.24	90	34.0%	-1.84 [-2.74, -0.93]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.21: Chi	i ² = 35.9	34. df = 1	6 (P < 0.0	00001):	I ² = 839	%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.98 ((P < 0.0	001)	- (
2.1.3 >2 months≤3	months								
Lee 2015	11.5	10.39	12	13.5	7.12	10	5.3%	-0.21 [-1.05, 0.63]	
Zhang 2015	12.07	4.48	10	24.83	2.41	10	4.0%	-3.40 [-4.86, -1.93]	
Zhang 2016	12.42	4.92	10	22.97	3.98	10	4.6%	-2.26 [-3.43, -1.08]	
Zhang 2017	10.61	3.061	10	24.08	4.29	10	4.0%	-3.46 [-4.95, -1.98]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			42			40	17.8%	-2.26 [-3.94, -0.58]	
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	2.54; Ch	i ² = 23.4	1, df =	3 (P < 0.0	0001); l ^a	'= 87%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.63 ((P = 0.0	08)						
2.1.4 >3 months									
Huang 2021	37.53	3.28	4	45.86	3.96	5	3.4%	-2.01 [-3.82, -0.20]	
McGinley 2018	21.83	11.07	10	37.67	20.03	10	5.1%	-0.94 [-1.87, -0.00]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			14			15	8.5%	-1.18 [-2.07, -0.30]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.04; Chi	i ² = 1.07	', df = 1	(P = 0.30	0); I ² = 6	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.62 ((P = 0.0	09)						
Total (95% Cl)			240			224	100.0%	-1.95 [-2.44, -1.46]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.01; Chi	i ² = 90.3	32, df = 3	21 (P < 0	.00001)	; l² = 77	7%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.78 ((P < 0.0	0001)						-4 -2 U Z 4
Test for subaroup diff	erences:	Chi² = 2	2.65. df	= 3 (P = 0).45), I²	= 0%			ravouis (experimental) ravouis (control)
Fig. 11 Forest plots of	of subgro	oup ana	alysis b	y assess	ment ti	ime foi	r cogniti	ve function in mice mo	del

exacerbating β -amyloid and tau pathologies [51, 52]. IL-1 β has been described as a "master regulator" within the brain inflammatory cascade, and disruptions to IL-1 β can delay the onset of neuroinflammation and neurodegeneration [53]. We used IL-1 β expression to evaluate neuroinflammation, though the data we collected of NSPC group were lower than control group, and there was no statistical significance between two groups. One study quantified the density of microglia and astrocytes and proved that NSCs transplantation reduced the density of astrocytes and microglia, suggesting that NSCs inhibit neuroinflammation [24, 54].

In the brain, BDNF is expressed by glutamatergic neurons and glial cells, such as astrocytes isolated from the

cortex and hippocampus [54, 55]. BDNF is a neurotrophin that modulates the survival of stem cells and progenitors, neurogenesis and neuronal differentiation, the branching and survival of differentiated neurons and the formation and maturation of the dendritic spine and synapses. Thus, BDNF influences learning and memory [56]. And our analysis demonstrated that NSPC treatment could improve BDNF level to ameliorate the condition of AD.

Limitations

Several potential limitations of our meta-analysis should be considered. First, although we performed stratified and sensitivity analyses, the heterogeneity among studies



could not be remarkably reduced. This may influence the stability of the results. Second, data of $A\beta$ deposition, SYP expression, tau level and more indicators were lacked in several studies, and role of NSPC in AD alleviation requires further evaluation. Third, our meta-analysis only observed mice and rat models, which are not able to well simulate the physical conditions of human suffered from AD.

Conclusion

The data of our meta-analysis revealed, NSPC transplantation may enhance the cognitive function and reduce AD burden, while the nanoformulation and genetically modification may promote the effect of NSPC therapy. Which would provide the theoretical foundation and guide for clinical trials of NSPC for AD. Both xenogeneic and allogeneic transplant of NSPC could improve the cognitive function of AD animals. More animal studies and human trials are needed for further investigation.

Abbreviations

AD: Alzheimer's disease; NSPC: Neural stem/progenitor cell; SMD: Standard mean difference; CI: Confidence interval; $A\beta$: Amyloid- β ; NFT: Neurofibrillary tangles; FAD: Familial Alzheimer disease; SAD: Sporadic Alzheimer disease; AChEIs: Acetylcholinesterase inhibitors; NMDAR: *N*-Methyl-D-aspartate receptor; DBS: Deep brain stimulation; rTMS: Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation; MSC: Mesenchymal stem cell; iPSC: Induced pluripotent stem cell; NSC: Neural stem cell; SC: Embryonic stem cell; MeSH: Medical subject

headings; SD rat: Sprague Dawley rat; OA: Okadaic acid; IBO acid: Ibotenic acid; OBNSCs: Olfactory bulb neuronal stem cells; DSP: Designer self-assemble peptide; ROO: Rosemary oil; MWM: Morris water maze; SYP: Synaptophysin; BDNF: Brain-derived neurotrophic factor; ICV: Intra-cerebroventricular injection; nbM: Nucleus basalis of Meynert.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi. org/10.1186/s13287-022-03231-1.

Additional file 1: Table S1. The detailed search strategy.

Additional file 2: Fig. S1. Evaluation of publication bias. Funnel plots for A β deposition (A), mice cognitive function (B), rat cognitive function (C) and BDNF (D).

Additional file 3: Table S2. SYRCLE's RoB tool for each experimental animal studies.

Additional file 4: Fig. S2. Forest plot for synaptic density of mice studies between NSPC treatment group and control group. It had high heterogeneity before the work of McGinley et al. was excluded.

Additional file 5: Fig. S3. Forest plot for p-tau level of mice studies between NSPC treatment group and control group. Because of high heterogeneity, we used a random-effect model.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Hebei Medical University and funded by Natural Science Foundation of China (81801278), China Scholarship Council (201608130015), Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2019206637), Key Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2020206557), Overseas researcher Program in Hebei Provincial Department of human resources and social security (C20190509) and Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2015206409).

Author contributions

JM and HXC conceived and designed the study. ZJZ, BS and YXX selected the articles and extracted and cross-checked the data. ZJZ, BS, JYZ, XL, XHZ and BFF contributed to the statistical analysis. ZJZ wrote the first draft of the manuscript. ZJZ, BS and JM revised and discussed the final edition. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This study was funded by Natural Science Foundation of China (81801278), China Scholarship Council (201608130015), Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2019206637), Key Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2020206557), Overseas researcher Program in Hebei Provincial Department of human resources and social security (C20190509) and Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (H2015206409).

Availability of data and materials

All supporting data are included in the article.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹Hebei Medical University-National University of Ireland Galway Stem Cell Research Center, Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang 050017, Hebei Province, China. ²Hebei Research Center for Stem Cell Medical Translational Engineering, Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang 050017, Hebei Province, China. ³Human Anatomy Department, Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang 050017, Hebei Province, China.

Received: 6 September 2022 Accepted: 25 December 2022 Published online: 05 January 2023

References

- 1. Larson EB, Kukull WA, Katzman RL. Cognitive impairment: dementia and Alzheimer's disease. Annu Rev Public Health. 1992;13(1):431–49.
- Yankner BA, Lu T. Amyloid β-protein toxicity and the pathogenesis of Alzheimer disease. J Biol Chem. 2009;284(8):4755–9.
- Masters CL, et al. Alzheimer's disease. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2015;1:15056.
 Wolfe MS. In search of pathogenic amyloid β-peptide in familial Alzhei-
- mer's disease. Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci. 2019;168:71–8. 5. Ju Y, Tam KY. Pathological mechanisms and therapeutic strategies for
- Alzheimer's disease. Neural Regen Res. 2022;17(3):543–9.
 Kevadiya BD, et al. Neurotheranostics as personalized medicines. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2019;148:252–89.
- Ponce FA, et al. Bilateral deep brain stimulation of the fornix for Alzheimer's disease: surgical safety in the ADvance trial. J Neurosurg. 2016;125(1):75–84.
- Koch G, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation of the precuneus enhances memory and neural activity in prodromal Alzheimer's disease. Neuroimage. 2018;169:302–11.
- Martorell AJ, et al. Multi-sensory Gamma stimulation ameliorates Alzheimer's-associated pathology and improves cognition. Cell. 2019;177(2):256-271.e22.
- Sakthiswary R, Raymond AA. Stem cell therapy in neurodegenerative diseases: from principles to practice. Neural Regen Res. 2012;7(23):1822–31.
- 11. Kim HJ, et al. Intracerebroventricular injection of human umbilical cord blood mesenchymal stem cells in patients with Alzheimer's disease dementia: a phase I clinical trial. Alzheimers Res Ther. 2021;13(1):154.

- Brody M, et al. Results and insights from a phase I clinical trial of Lomecel-B for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimers Dement. 2022. https://doi.org/10. 1002/alz.12651.
- Tincer G, et al. Neural stem/progenitor cells in Alzheimer's disease. Yale J Biol Med. 2016;89(1):23–35.
- 14. Hooijmans CR, et al. SYRCLE's risk of bias tool for animal studies. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14:43.
- 15. Huang D, et al. A nanoformulation-mediated multifunctional stem cell therapy with improved beta-amyloid clearance and neural regeneration for Alzheimer's disease. Adv Mater. 2021;33:13.
- Wu CC, et al. Gain of BDNF function in engrafted neural stem cells promotes the therapeutic potential for Alzheimer's disease. Sci Rep. 2016;6:27358.
- Lee HJ, et al. Human neural stem cells genetically modified to express human nerve growth factor (NGF) gene restore cognition in the mouse with ibotenic acid-induced cognitive dysfunction. Cell Transplant. 2012;21(11):2487–96.
- McGinley LM, et al. Human neural stem cell transplantation improves cognition in a murine model of Alzheimer's disease. Sci Rep. 2018;8:1–10.
- Zhao L, et al. Acupuncture improves cerebral microenvironment in mice with Alzheimer's disease treated with hippocampal neural stem cells. Mol Neurobiol. 2017;54(7):5120–30.
- Zhang W, et al. NSCs promote hippocampal neurogenesis, metabolic changes and synaptogenesis in APP/PS1 transgenic mice. Hippocampus. 2017;27(12):1250–63.
- Zhang W, et al. Neural stem cell transplantation enhances mitochondrial biogenesis in a transgenic mouse model of Alzheimer's disease-like pathology. Neurobiol Aging. 2015;36(3):1282–92.
- Blurton-Jones M, et al. Neural stem cells improve cognition via BDNF in a transgenic model of Alzheimer disease. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2009;106(32):13594–9.
- Chen S, et al. Neural stem cell transplantation improves spatial learning and memory via neuronal regeneration in amyloid-beta precursor protein/presenilin 1/tau triple transgenic mice. Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Dement. 2014;29(2):142–9.
- 24. Lu MH, et al. Intranasal transplantation of human neural stem cells ameliorates Alzheimer's disease-like pathology in a mouse model. Front Aging Neurosci. 2021;13:650103.
- 25. Zhang HA, et al. Neural stem cell transplantation alleviates functional cognitive deficits in a mouse model of tauopathy. Neural Regen Res. 2022;17(1):152–62.
- 26. Zhang Q, et al. Neural stem cell transplantation decreases neuroinflammation in a transgenic mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. J Neurochem. 2016;136(4):815–25.
- Zhang W, et al. Effects of neural stem cells on synaptic proteins and memory in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. J Neurosci Res. 2014;92(2):185–94.
- Zhang W, et al. Neural stem cell transplants improve cognitive function without altering amyloid pathology in an APP/PS1 double transgenic model of Alzheimer's disease. Mol Neurobiol. 2014;50(2):423–37.
- 29. Zhou CL, et al. Combined acupuncture and HuangDiSan treatment affects behavior and synaptophysin levels in the hippocampus of senescence-accelerated mouse prone 8 after neural stem cell transplantation. Neural Regen Res. 2018;13(3):541–8.
- Ben Menachem-Zidon O, et al. Intra-hippocampal transplantation of neural precursor cells with transgenic over-expression of IL-1 receptor antagonist rescues memory and neurogenesis impairments in an Alzheimer's disease model. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014;39(2):401–14.
- 31. Armijo E, et al. Induced pluripotent stem cell-derived neural precursors improve memory, synaptic and pathological abnormalities in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. Cells. 2021;10(7):1802.
- 32. Lee IS, et al. Human neural stem cells alleviate Alzheimer-like pathology in a mouse model. Mol Neurodegener. 2015;10:38.
- Li B, et al. Regulation and effects of neurotrophic factors after neural stem cell transplantation in a transgenic mouse model of Alzheimer disease. J Neurosci Res. 2018;96(5):828–40.
- 34. Li Y, et al. Positively charged polyprodrug amphiphiles with enhanced drug loading and reactive oxygen species-responsive release ability for traceable synergistic therapy. J Am Chem Soc. 2018;140(11):4164–71.

- 35. Lilja AM, et al. Neural stem cell transplant-induced effect on neurogenesis and cognition in Alzheimer Tg2576 mice is inhibited by concomitant treatment with amyloid-lowering or cholinergic α7 nicotinic receptor drugs. Neural Plast. 2015;2015:370432.
- Park D, et al. Human neural stem cells encoding ChAT gene restore cognitive function via acetylcholine synthesis, a beta elimination, and neuroregeneration in APPswe/PS1dE9 mice. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(11):3958.
- Park D, et al. Human neural stem cells over-expressing choline acetyltransferase restore cognition in rat model of cognitive dysfunction. Exp Neurol. 2012;234(2):521–6.
- Moghadam FH, et al. Transplantation of primed or unprimed mouse embryonic stem cell-derived neural precursor cells improves cognitive function in Alzheimerian rats. Differentiation. 2009;78(2–3):59–68.
- Tang J, et al. Embryonic stem cell-derived neural precursor cells improve memory dysfunction in A beta (1–40) injured rats. Neurosci Res. 2008;62(2):86–96.
- 40. Wu S, et al. Neural stem cells improve learning and memory in rats with Alzheimer's disease. Pathobiology. 2008;75(3):186–94.
- Chen Y, et al. Treatment efficacy of NGF nanoparticles combining neural stem cell transplantation on Alzheimer's disease model rats. Med Sci Monit. 2015;21:3608–15.
- Cui G, et al. Designer self-assemble peptides maximize the therapeutic benefits of neural stem cell transplantation for Alzheimer's disease via enhancing neuron differentiation and paracrine action. Mol Neurobiol. 2016;53(2):1108–23.
- Haiyan H, et al. Effect of astragaloside IV on neural stem cell transplantation in Alzheimer's disease rat models. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2016;2016:3106980.
- 44. Rezk S, et al. Effects of rosemary oil (rosmarinus officinalis) supplementation on the fate of the transplanted human olfactory bulb neural stem cells against ibotenic acid-induced neurotoxicity (Alzheimer model) in rat. Metab Brain Dis. 2022;37(4):973–88.
- Zhang T, et al. Human neural stem cells reinforce hippocampal synaptic network and rescue cognitive deficits in a mouse model of Alzheimer's disease. Stem Cell Rep. 2019;13(6):1022–37.
- Khan S, Barve KH, Kumar MS. Recent advancements in pathogenesis, diagnostics and treatment of Alzheimer's disease. Curr Neuropharmacol. 2020;18(11):1106–25.
- Tian H, et al. Analysis of learning and memory ability in an Alzheimer's disease mouse model using the morris water maze. J Vis Exp. 2019. https://doi.org/10.3791/60055.
- 48. Musiek ES, Holtzman DM. Three dimensions of the amyloid hypothesis: time, space and "wingmen." Nat Neurosci. 2015;18(6):800–6.
- Overk CR, Masliah E. Pathogenesis of synaptic degeneration in Alzheimer's disease and Lewy body disease. Biochem Pharmacol. 2014;88(4):508–16.
- Kinney JW, et al. Inflammation as a central mechanism in Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's Dement Transl Res Clin Interv. 2018;4:575–90.
- McGeer PL, Rogers J. Anti-inflammatory agents as a therapeutic approach to Alzheimer's disease. Neurology. 1992;42(2):447–9.
- 52. Zotova E, et al. Inflammation in Alzheimer's disease: relevance to pathogenesis and therapy. Alzheimers Res Ther. 2010;2(1):1.
- 53. Basu A, Krady JK, Levison SW. Interleukin-1: a master regulator of neuroinflammation. J Neurosci Res. 2004;78(2):151–6.
- Clarke LE, et al. Normal aging induces A1-like astrocyte reactivity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018;115(8):E1896–905.
- 55. Andreska T, et al. High abundance of BDNF within glutamatergic presynapses of cultured hippocampal neurons. Front Cell Neurosci. 2014;8:107.
- Nagahara AH, Tuszynski MH. Potential therapeutic uses of BDNF in neurological and psychiatric disorders. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2011;10(3):209–19.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

