medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Efficacy of honey and *Nigella sativa* against COVID-19: HNS-COVID-PK Trial

Sohaib Ashraf, MBBS*[#1], Shoaib Ashraf, PhD[#2], Muhammad Ahmad Imran, MBBS[3,4], Moneeb Ashraf, MBBS[4, 5], Larab Kalsoom, MBBS[4, 6], Uzma Nasim Siddiqui, MBBS[7], Muhammad Ghufran, MBBS[8], Nighat Majeed, MBBS[6], Iqra Farooq, MBBS[9,10], Zaighum Habib MS[11], Abubakar Hilal, MBBS[1], Zain-ul-Abdin, MBBS[1,12], Ayesha Khaqan, MBBS[1], Muhammad Kiwan Akram, M.Phil.[13], Sidra Ashraf, M. Phil[14], Rutaba Akmal, FSc[15], Sundas Rafique, MBBS[4,16], Khawar Nawaz, MD[17], Shahroze Arshad, MBBS[12,18], Sohail Ahmad, PhD[19], Kanwal Hayat, M.Phil.[1], Ali Arshad, MBBS[5, 11, 20], Muhammad Faisal Nadeem, PhD[21], Muhammad Hassan, MBBS[22], Abeer-bin-Awais, MBBS[23], Muhammad Azam, PhD[24], Muhammad Suhail, MBBS[26], Sibgha Zulfiqar, MBBS[27], Imran Anwar, MBBS[28], Saulat Sarfraz MBBS[23], Ayesha Hamayoun, PhD[29], Amber Malik, MBBS[30]. Hui Zheng, PhD[31,32], Talha Mahmood, MD[33], Mahmood Ayyaz, MBBS[10,34], Ali Ahmad, PhD[35], Muhammad Ashraf, PhD[36], Qazi Abdul Saboor, MBBS[1], Mateen Izhar, PhD[4]

*Correspond Author:

Sohaib Ashraf: sohaib-ashraf@outlook.com

Joint First Author

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Affiliations:

1. Department of Cardiology, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
2. Department of Pathobiology, Riphah College of Veterinary Sciences, Riphah University, Lahore, Pakistan.
3. Department of Microbiology, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
4. Division of Telemedicine, Doctor's Lounge, Lahore, Pakistan.
5. Department of Pharmacology, Kingedward Medical University, Mayo Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan.
6. Department of Internal Medicine, Services Institute of Medical Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
7. Department of Internal Medicine, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
8. Medico Cirujano, ESACHS (Empresa de Servico Externo de la Asociacion Chilena de Seguridad), Chile.
9. Department of Pediatrics surgery, Children Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan.
10. Department of Surgery, Services Institute of Medical Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
11. Department of Orthopedics, Tehsil Head Quarter, Ferozwala, Shaikhupura, Pakistan
12. Division of General Medicine, Ali Clinic, Lahore, Pakistan.
13. Department of Nutrition, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
14. Department of Biochemistry, College of Veterinary Sciences, Jhung, Pakistan.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

15. Department of Community Medicine, Sahara Medical College, Narowal, Pakistan.
16. Department of Internal Medicine, Mayo Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan.
17. Department of Pediatrics, Sunny Downstate/Kings Country Medical Center, New York, USA.
18. Department of Pediatrics Oncology, Shaukat Khanum Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan,
19. Department of Poultry Production, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
20. Department of Cardiology, Punjab Institute of Cardiology, Lahore, Pakistan.
21. Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
22. Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
23. Department of Radiology, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
24. Department of Statistics, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.
25. Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.
26. Department of Anatomy, Shaikh Khalifa Bin Zayed Al-Nahyan Medical and Dental College, Lahore, Pakistan
27. Department of Physiology, Shaikh Khalifa Bin Zayed Al-Nahyan Medical and Dental College, Lahore, Pakistan

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

28. Department of General Surgery, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
29. Department of Community Medicine, Shaikh Khalifa Bin Zayed Al-Nahyan Medical and Dental College, Lahore, Pakistan
30. Department of Cardiology, Evercare Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan.
31. Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
32. Biostatistics Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
33. Department of Pulmonology, Shaikh Zayed Post-Graduate Medical Institute, Lahore, Pakistan.
34. Division of General Surgery, National Hospital and Medical Center, Lahore, Pakistan
35. Centre Hospitalier Universitaire (CHU) Sainte Justin/University of Montreal, Montreal, Qc, Canada.
36. Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND:

No definitive treatment exists for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Honey and Nigella sativa (HNS) has established anti-viral properties. Hence, we investigated efficacy of HNS against COVID-19.

METHODS:

We conducted a multicenter-randomized-controlled-trial in COVID-19 patients. Randomized patients received either honey (1 gm/Kg/day) and Nigella sativa (80 mg/Kg/day) or placebo upto 13 days. The outcomes included symptoms alleviation, viral clearance, and 30-day mortality.

RESULTS

Of 313 patients, 210 moderate and 103 severe underwent randomization. Among these 107 were assigned to HNS whereas 103 to placebo for moderate cases. For severe cases, 50 were given HNS and 53 placebo. HNS resulted in symptoms alleviation by 3 and 7 days in moderate and severe disease, respectively (Hazard Ratio [HR]: 6.11; 95% Confidence Interval [CI]: 4.23-8.84, P<0.0001 and HR: 4.04; 95% CI, 2.46-6.64, P<0.0001). HNS also cleared the virus 4 days earlier in moderate (HR: 5.53; 95% CI: 3.76-8.14, P<0.0001) and severe cases (HR: 4.32; 95% CI: 2.62-7.13, P<0.0001). HNS further led to a better clinical score on day 6 with normal activities in 63.6% (moderate, OR: 0.07; 95% CI: 0.03-0.13, P<0.0001) and 28% (severe, OR: 0.03; 95% CI: 0.01-0.09, P<0.0001) patients. A reduction in 30-day mortality among severe patients was shown with HNS (4% versus 18.87%, OR: 0.18; 95% CI: 0.02-0.92, P=0.029). No HNS-related adverse effects were observed.

CONCLUSIONS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

HNS improved symptoms, viral clearance and mortality in COVID-19 patients. Thus, HNS represents an affordable therapy and can be used alone or in combination with other treatments to achieve potentiating effects against COVID-19. (Funded by Smile Welfare Organization, Shaikh Zayed Medical Complex and Services Institute of Medical Sciences; NIH Clinical Trial Register number: **NCT04347382.**)

KEY WORDS

COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Honey, Nigella sativa, Randomized Controlled Trial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

BACKGROUND:

The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has infected more than forty million people and has resulted in more than a million deaths in the world[1]. In the absence of an effective prophylactic vaccine, there is a dire need for finding effective treatments for COVID-19 patients. At a minimum, an ideal treatment should expedite symptomatic recovery, decrease viral transmission in the community by earlier viral clearance from the infected patients and reduce morality. In this context, certain treatments including hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin, lopinavir-ritonavir, remdesivir, dexamethasone, convalescent plasma and antibody therapies have shown some efficacy[2-8]. However, there is still a long way to go before we have an effective treatment regimen for severe COVID-19 patients. To this end, we have conducted a clinical trial in which we have investigated the potential efficacy of a combination of honey and *Nigella sativa* (HNS) in treating COVID-19 patients.

Both components of HNS have anti-viral, anti-microbial, anti-inflammatory and immune-modulatory effects with proven safety profiles[9-13]. Beneficial effects of honey against different viruses including rubella virus, Herpes Simplex virus, Hepatitis virus, and Varicella Zoster virus have been reported earlier[14, 15]. Moreover, in silico molecular docking studies have shown that six flavonoid compounds from honey might inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication by binding to the viral 3-chymotrypsin-like-cysteine protease[16]. Honey has also shown efficacy against several multidrug resistant bacteria, especially in synergism with antibiotics[17, 18]. Honey also exhibits immunity-boosting effects mainly via its polyphenolic components, which stimulate both innate and adaptive immune responses[19]. Its use has shown to be beneficial in upper respiratory tract infections[20].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Nigella sativa (NS), a widely used medicinal plant of the family Ranunculaceae and commonly known as Black Cumin/Kalonji, has been shown to exert antiviral effects against a variety of viruses such as Mouse Cytomegalovirus and HCV[21-23]. It has also been shown to decrease replication of SARS-CoV in-vitro in cell cultures[24]. Moreover, molecular docking studies have shown that some of its components such as nigelledine, α-hederin and thymoquinone, etc., have high affinity with several SARS-CoV-2 enzymes and proteins. In fact, they exhibit an energy complex score better than that of chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine and favipiravir, the drugs that have shown some anti-SARS-CoV-2 effects[25]. The components' antimicrobial properties against various microbes as well as their anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory effects have also been established[13, 26, 27].

As honey and *Nigella sativa* show similar pharmacological profiles, we reasoned that the combination could be more effective in attenuating severity of the disease, controlling viral replication and curing COVID-19 patients. In fact the combination has been used successfully in a variety of disease conditions[28-32]. We report here that the HNS treatment results in earlier recovery and viral clearance in COVID-19 patients.

METHODOLOGY:

PATIENTS

2523 suspected COVID-19 presenting within three months of study duration in four health care facilities were tested for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR of their nasopharyngeal swabs in International Organization for Standardization (ISO) certified designated laboratories of Pakistan. The test positive, adult males and non-pregnant females, who presented to seek medical care within 96 h

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of ailment underwent randomization. Exclusion criteria included having no or mild clinical symptoms, inability to give written consent, multi-organ dysfunction, ventilator support, septic shock, known hypersensitivity to HNS and chronic illness other than hypertension and diabetes mellitus.

TRIAL DESIGN AND OVERSIGHT

This was an investigator-initiated, open-label-placebo and randomized controlled trial conducted from April 30 to July 29, 2020 in four medical care facilities in Pakistan (Shaikh Zayed Medical Complex, Services Institute of Medical Sciences, Doctor's Lounge and Ali Clinic; all located in Lahore). Written informed consent was obtained from each participant. Eligible patients were stratified based upon the severity of their clinical symptoms into two groups: mild to moderate (cough, fever, sore throat, nasal congestion, malaise and/or shortness of breath), and severe cases (fever and/or cough along with pneumonia, severe dyspnea, respiratory distress, tachypnea (>30 breaths/min) or hypoxia (SpO2 <90% on room air)[33]. The severity of the disease was defined as outlined in the Clinical Management Guidelines for COVID-19 by the Ministry of National Health Services, Pakistan. Within each of these two groups, patients were randomized (by lottery) into treatment and control groups. The HNS group received honey (1 gm) plus *Nigella sativa* seeds (80 mg) per kg body weight orally in 2-3 divided doses daily for up-to 13 days while the control group received placebo (empty capsules). Additionally, each patient in the trial received standard care therapy (SCT) as advised by the treating physician, following the clinical management guidelines for COVID-19 established by the Ministry of National Health Services of Pakistan. SCT primarily comprised of anti-pyretic drugs, antibiotics, supplemental oxygen and mechanical ventilation.

The trial was approved by the institutional review boards of Shaikh Zayed Medical Complex and Services Institute of Medical Sciences. It was supervised by an independent trial steering

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

committee. The trial's executive committee vouched for accuracy, anonymity of the data and for compliance (Supplementary Appendix 1). The trial was conducted as an urgent study during peak of the COVID-19 outbreak in Pakistan (May-July 2020), and in accordance with principles of Good Clinical Practice Guidelines of the International Conference on Harmonization.

CLINICAL AND LABORATORY MONITORING

The study participants were assessed for clinical symptoms daily by an on-site investigator for 13 days. During the study, when a patient recovered and remained asymptomatic for 48 h, he/she underwent a second SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test within the next 48 h (Figure 1). If the patient tested negative, he/she was deemed to have cleared the infection and his/her treatment was stopped. In case of a positive test, a third PCR test was performed on day 14 with no further follow-up. A clinical grading score (CGS) was recorded for each patient on day 0, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12. It was based on a seven-point ordinal scale: grade 1 (not hospitalized, no evidence of infection and resumption of normal activities), grade 2 (not hospitalized, but unable to resume normal activities), grade 3 (hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen), grade 4 (hospitalized, requiring supplemental oxygen), grade 5 (hospitalized, requiring nasal high-flow oxygen therapy and/or noninvasive mechanical ventilation), grade 6 (hospitalized, requiring ECMO and/or invasive mechanical ventilation) and grade 7 (death). This scale has previously been used as end point in clinical trials in COVID-19 patients[3, 4]. Body temperature was measured, and fever was graded as no fever (0; 98-99 °F), mild (1; >99-<100 °F), moderate (2; 100-101.9 °F) and severe (3; ≤102°F). Serum C-reactive Protein (CRP) levels were measured by ELISA kit (Invitrogen, USA).

Safety outcomes including adverse events were categorized according to the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events, version 4.0. Laboratory investigations were assessed as a part of the protocol as per recommendations of the treating

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

physician. Trial safety was monitored by the trial steering committee. For the patients who were discharged before day 13 or were home-quarantined, the follow-up was done by telemedicine.

OUTCOME MEASURES

The primary outcomes were viral clearance (negative RT-PCR for the SARS-CoV-2 RNA), alleviation of clinical symptoms and the lowering of CGS on day 6. Secondary outcomes included reduction in fever degree (day 4), CRP levels (day 6), severity of symptoms (day 8), CGS score (day 10) and mortality on day 30.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In univariate analyses, we used a log-rank test to compare time taken for viral clearance, alleviation of symptoms, time to improvement in severity of clinical symptoms, degree of fever, cough, shortness of breath, myalgia and how sick do you feel. Kaplan Meier method was applied to estimate survival curves for time for alleviation of symptoms and viral clearance. The Fisher's Exact test was used to compare 30-day mortality. In the multivariate analyses, we used a multivariate regression models to adjust for the effects of age (<40 or >=40), gender, baseline clinical status grade, history of diabetes/hypertension and oxygen use. In the multivariate analyses of ordinal outcomes, we used ordinal logistic regression models assuming proportional odds. We also used a linear regression model to analyze the continuous outcome CRP and Cox proportional hazards models to analyze time to symptom alleviation and the time to viral clearance. SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) was used for these analyses.

RESULTS:

DEMOGRAPHIC AND CLINICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PATIENTS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Initial COVID-19 screening was done on 2523 patients of which 1046 patients tested positive for the SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid. From these patients, 313 met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Based upon the spectrum of their clinical symptoms, they were stratified into two groups: moderate and severe. The two groups comprised 210 and 103 patients, respectively. The patients within each of the two groups were randomly assigned to the treatment and control groups. The number of patients in moderate control, moderate HNS, severe control and severe HNS were 103, 107, 53 and 50, respectively. Their baseline demographics with clinical and laboratory parameters are shown in Table 1. Paracetamol and azithromycin were the top two prescribed drugs as part of the SCT. Two patients opted for home quarantine despite needing oxygen therapy.

PRIMARY OUTCOMES

Primary outcomes are shown in Table 2. Alleviation of COVID-19 symptoms for patients in the HNS groups occurred earlier than control groups: 4 versus 7 days for the moderate patients (HR: 6.11; 95% CI: 4.23-8.84; P<0.0001) and 6 versus 13 days for the severe disease patients (HR: 4.04; 95% CI: 1.53-3.58; P<0.0001). Viral clearance (being negative for the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test) occurred 4 days sooner in the HNS group for both moderate (HR: 5.53; 95% CI: 3.76-8.14; P<0.0001) and severe cases (HR: 4.32; 95% CI: 2.62-7.13; P<0.0001). The Kaplan-Meier curves for these variables are shown in Figure 2. In moderate patients, the HNS group resumed while control group was unable to resume activities of daily life as evident by the lower median CGS at day 6 (odds ratio: 0.07; 95% CI: 0.03-0.13; P<0.0001). Meanwhile, in severe groups, the HNS cases were discharged whereas the control cases were hospitalized on supplemental oxygen as per median CGS at day 6 (Odds Ratio: 0.03; 95% CI: 0.01-0.09; P<0.0001).

SECONDARY OUTCOMES

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

There were significant differences in all secondary outcomes between the treatment and control groups (see Table 2 for secondary outcomes). In moderate COVID-19 patients, degree of fever (median) was 100-101.9°F (moderate) in the control group while HNS arm participants were afebrile on day 4 (OR: 0.05; 95% CI: 0.03-0.1; P <0.0001). A significant reduction in degree of fever was observed in the severe cases on day 4 (OR: 0.21; 95% CI: 0.09-0.46; P=0.0001). CRP levels decreased significantly (P <0.0001) on day 6 in both the HNS groups compared with their respective control groups. As per median degree of symptom severity on day 8, 98.13% patients were asymptomatic in HNS treated moderate cases in comparison to 56.31% in the control group (OR: 0.009; 95% CI: 0.001-0.08; P<0.0001). In severe cases, more patients were asymptomatic in the HNS group while more had moderate symptoms (median) in the control arm (OR: 0.1; 95% CI: 0.04-0.24). By day 10, 96.26% of the moderate cases patients fully resumed normal activities with HNS compared to 68.93% in control group (OR: 0.07; 95% CI: 0.02-0.21). For the severe group, the median CGS at day 10 revealed that HNS cases resumed normal activities while control patients were still hospitalized requiring oxygen therapy (OR:0.05; 95% CI: 0.02-0.15). The distribution of patients in the ordinal-scale categories over time is shown in Figure 3. Thirty-day morality was 18.87% in control group and 4% with HNS therapy (OR: 0.18 95% CI: 0.02-0.92).

ADDITIONAL OUTCOMES

In HNS group, median day achievement of normal status on ordinal scale was earlier in severity of symptoms (moderate, 5 versus 8, HR; 4.49 (3.15-6.38), P<0.0001 and severe, 7 versus 13 HR; 2.74 (1.68-4.49) , P<0.0001), degree of fever [4 versus 8, HR; 4.17 (2.98-5.84), P<0.0001 and severe 6 versus 10, HR; 2.64 (1.74-4.11), P<0.0001), degree of cough [moderate 5 versus 7, HR; 2.67 (1.73-4.12), P<0.0001 and severe 6 versus 9, HR; 2.04 (1.26-3.31), P=0.0001], degree of shortness of breath (severe 6 versus 13 HR; 2.39 (1.48-3.87), P<0.0001), degree of myalgia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(moderate 4 versus 6 HR; 3.34 (2.14-5.25), P<0.0001) severe 5 versus 9, HR; 2.75 (1.62-4.69), P<0.0001) and how sick do you feel (moderate 5 versus 8 HR (3.55 (2.55-4.93), P<0.0001 and severe 7 versus 13 HR; 2.87 (1.75-4.69), P<0.0001) (Table 2). Distribution on degree of fever, cough, myalgia, feeling of sickness, emotional status, shortness of breath, oxygen saturation, oxygen requirement and severity of symptoms over 13 days is given in supplementary Tables S2-S10. No evident adverse effects were noted with HNS.

DISCUSSION

The study was a multicenter open-label, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial investigating the therapeutic efficacy of HNS against COVID-19. To the best of our knowledge, this trial is the first of its kind in which a combination of two natural substances was investigated. Current study showed superior efficacy of HNS for COVID-19 in all studied outcomes. About half of the patients in the control groups required double time to become asymptomatic compared with those in the HNS group (Figure 2). In severe cases, HNS group had a significantly lower recovery time compared with the control group (6 days versus 13 days, P<0.0001). In comparison to this, the recovery time reported for remdesivir was 10 days versus 15 days for the control (P<0.001)[5] whereas lopinavir-ritonavir resulted in no decrease in the recovery time (16 days versus 16 days; P=0.09)[3]. In our study, in ~50% of cases, SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR became negative 4 days sooner in HNS than in control groups. Mortality among severe cases in comparison to control group was 27.0% (versus 25.0%) for hydroxychloroquine[2], 19.2% (versus 25.0%) for lopinavir-ritonavir[3], 15.7% (versus 24.0%) for convalescent plasma[34], 11.4% (versus 15.2%) for remdesivir[5], 22.9% (versus 25.7%) for dexamethasone[8] and only 4% (versus 18.87%) for HNS. Thus, HNS provided clinical superiority in reducing mortality in COVID-19 patients. Of note, combined mortality data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

provided by Solidarity and ACTT-1 for remdesivir and by Solidarity and Recovery trial for lopinavir-ritonavir failed to provide statistical improvement in mortality[35]. In contrast to these drugs, HNS represents a safer and more affordable option that can be used as an in-house remedy.

The trial results show that the use of HNS in COVID-19 patients promotes viral clearance and reduces severity of the disease. The beneficial effects of the treatment are particularly encouraging as our inclusion criteria were very stringent: excluding asymptomatic patients as well as patients with mild symptoms. The trial results are in line with anti-viral, anti-microbial, anti-inflammatory and immune stimulating effects of honey and *Nigella sativa*[9-13]. Anti-diabetic, anti-hypertensive, cardio-protective and broncho-dilatory properties of HNS make it even more beneficial in diabetic, hypertensive, cardiac and asthmatic patients which have a higher COVID-19 associated mortality [36, 37]. Furthermore, anti-platelet and anti-coagulant effects of HNS also shield COVID-19 patients from thromboembolic complications, which are main cause of morbidity and death in this disease[38]. Hepato- and reno-protective nature of HNS gives added advantage over other drugs in limiting COVID-19 related hepatic and renal injuries[36, 37]. Anti-pyretic, analgesic and antitussive properties of HNS also provide symptomatic relief[39, 40]. Furthermore, HNS's antimicrobial properties and synergism with other antibiotics against superadded infections prevent sepsis related deaths [17, 18]. These findings strengthen the use of HNS as a potential candidate for combating SARS-CoV-2 worldwide.

Our study has some limitations including the fact that it was an open label study. Honey and NS were not administered as individual treatments to the patients. Hence, the effects of each of the two components of HNS (i.e., honey and NS) as well as their additive or synergistic effects, if any,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

remain unknown. Patients on ventilator support were not enrolled in this study. Also, we cannot exclude any favorable psychological effect of HNS on its users due to their religious beliefs. A multinational study with larger sample size is required to investigate potential variations in responses to the treatment in COVID-19 patients from different racial and ethnic origins.

CONCLUSIONS

HNS is a safe and effective therapy for COVID-19 patients and promotes viral clearance, quicker recovery and survival. Its affordability (< $5 for the whole treatment course), over the counter availability and ease of administration (as an easily practicable home-based remedy) will make this treatment very attractive. Furthermore, as an inexpensive nutraceutical, HNS could be used alone or in combination with other drugs for additive effects. The treatment is very likely to reduce burden on health care systems in a significant manner.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The authors would like to pay gratitude to all the trial steering committee members and patients who participated in this research. Special thanks to the Government of Pakistan and Smile Welfare Organization for providing free COVID-19 testing facilities and honey and *Nigella sativa.* All the clinicians, paramedical and laboratory staff who assisted the conduction of this study are worth appreciating. The team would like to acknowledge Zaheer Ahmad, PhD, (Professor of Botany, Government University Lahore, Pakistan) for testing the purity of honey and *Nigella sativa* used in the trial.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

SA, ShA, MoA and MAI contributed equally to this paper and share joint first authorship. SA, ShA, AA, MA, QAS and MI share joint corresponding authorship. LK, UNS, and MG were co-chief authors of this draft. SA, MAI, AA and MA contributed to conception, designing, acquisition of data, manuscript drafting and intellectual input. SA and MoA proposed the hypothesis and study design and obtained the funding. RA, KH, HR and ABA added the research delivery to the study centers. MA, MoA, SiA and MFN contributed biochemical, pharmacological and pharmaceutical inputs along with dosimetry. MKA, SoA, MAz and HZ led the development of data cleaning and analysis and took responsibility for the results in this draft and future analysis. SA, MoA, RA and AH drafted the first version of the manuscript. NM, IF, SR, AbH, ZA, AK, ZH, ShaA, HR, ABA, KH and AAr represented the conduction and validation of the data compilation and analysis in the manuscript. KN, MSu, SZ, IA, AH, AM, TM, SS, MeA, AA, MA, QAS and MI has overlooked the conduction and validity of the trial along with contributed to intellectual inputs in study protocol and methodology along with final manuscript write up. MeA and MI made sure validity of the data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations in their institutes. All authors are responsible for their contributions, providing critical edits and final authorization of the article. The corresponding authors attest the authenticity of that all listed authors meet authorship criteria.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1: Study Flow Chart. Team A: Responsible for the recruitment and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing; Team B: Daily evaluated degree of fever, cough, myalgia, shortness of breath, oxygen therapy, how sick do you feel and rate emotional status; Team C: Reported clinical grading scale (CGS) on seven-point ordinal scale assessment as 0, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 days; Team D conducted follow-up PCR and CRP determinations..

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study participants*				
Parameter	**Total (n=313)**	**Control (n=156)**	**Honey-*Nigella Sativa* (n=157)**	**P-Value[ʃ]**
Age (Years)				
≤40	156 (49.84)	80 (51.28)	76 (48.4)	0.48
40-59	93 (29.71)	45 (28.85)	48 (30.57)	
60-79	52 (16.61)	26 (16.67)	26 (16.56)	
≥80	12 (3.83)	5 (3.2)	7 (4.45)	
Sex				
Male	178 (56.87)	88 (56.41)	90 (57.32)	0.87
Female	135 (43.13)	68 (43.59)	67 (42.68)	
Profession				
Health care[¶]	71 (22.68)	38 (24.36)	33 (21.02)	0.48
Non-Health care	242 (77.32)	118 (75.64)	124 (78.98)	
Co-Morbidities				
Hypertension	99 (31.63)	51 (32.69)	48 (30.57)	0.69
Diabetes Mellitus	115 (36.74)	60 (38.46)	55 (35.03)	0.53
Onset of symptoms before admission				
48 hours	88 (38.1)	49 (41.53)	39 (34.51)	0.22
72 hours	143 (61.9)	69 (58.47)	74 (65.49)	
96 hours	82 (36.44)	38 (35.51)	44 (37.29)	
Severity of Symptoms				
Moderate	210 (67.09)	103 (66.03)	107 (68.15)	0.69

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Severe	103 (32.91)	53 (33.97)	50 (31.85)	
ARDS	57 (17.38)	28 (17.95)	29 (16.86)	0.9
Chest X-Ray				
Normal	217 (66.16)	101 (64.74)	116 (73.88)	0.71
Pneumonic Patch	12 (3.66)	8 (5.13)	4 (2.54)	
Unilateral Infiltrates	40 (12.2)	19 (12.18)	21 (13.38)	
Bilateral Infiltrates	59 (17.99)	28 (17.94)	31 (19.74)	
Clinical Grading Score at day 0				
Median Grade Score (IQR)	3 (2-4)	3 (2-4)	3 (2-4)	0.73
2- Not hospitalized with unable to resume normal activities	139 (44.41)	68 (43.59)	71 (45.22)	
3- Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen	71 (22.68)	35 (22.44)	36 (22.93)	
4- Hospitalized, requiring low flow supplemental oxygen	44 (14.06)	23 (14.74)	21 (13.38)	
5- Hospitalized, requiring high flow supplemental oxygen	59 (18.85)	30 (19.23)	29 (18.47)	
Patients hospitalized in				
Shaikh Zayed Hospital	78 (25.66)	39 (25.83)	39 (25.49)	0.56
Services Institute of Medical Sciences	91 (29.93)	48 (31.79)	43 (28.1)	
Doctors Lounge	52 (17.11)	27 (17.88)	25 (16.34)	
Ali Clinic	83 (27.3)	37 (24.5)	46 (30.07)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Patients showing symptoms				
Fever	303 (96.81)	152 (97.44)	151 (96.17)	0.53
SOB	106 (33.87)	56 (35.9)	50 (31.85)	0.45
Cough	192 (61.34)	90 (57.69)	102 (64.97)	0.19
Myalgia	169 (53.99)	89 (57.05)	80 (50.96)	0.28
Patients receiving¥				
Panadol	297 (94.89)	147 (94.23)	150 (97.54)	0.6
Azithromycin	231 (73.8)	120 (76.92)	111 (70.7)	0.21
Montelukast	106 (33.87)	56 (35.9)	50 (31.85)	0.45
Supplemental Oxygen	105 (33.55)	55 (35.25)	50 (31.85)	0.52
Low Molecular Weight Heparin	72 (23)	38 (24.36)	34 (21.66)	0.57
Hydrocortisone	83 (26.52)	45 (28.85)	38 (24.2)	0.35
Multivitamins	147 (46.96)	73 (46.8)	74 (47.13)	0.95
Tanzobactam + Piperacillin	73 (23.32)	42 (26.92)	31 (19.74)	0.13
Ivermectin	114 (36.42)	60 (38.46)	54 (34.39)	0.45
Meropenem	62 (19.81)	35 (22.43)	27 (17.2)	0.25

* Data are presented as no. (%) unless indicated. The Intention-to-Treat analysis was performed on all the patients who had undergone randomization. ECMO: Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; CRP: C-reactive protein; AST: Aspartate transaminase; ALT: Alanine transaminase; ECG: Electrocardiography; ARDS: Acute respiratory distress syndrome; SOB: Shortness of breath.

∫ $P \leq 0.05$ was determined significant

¶ Medical doctors, nurses and pharmacists.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

¥ These medications were part of standard care therapy as per decision of treating physician and clinical Management Guidelines for COVID-19 by Ministry of National Health Services, Pakistan.

Table 2. Primary and Secondary Outcome (Intention-to-Treat Population) *

PRIMARY OUTCOME	**Moderate COVID-19 Cases**				**Severe COVID-19 Cases**			
	Control Group	**HNS group**	**Effect Estimate** (95% Confidence Interval) [Ω]	**P-Value**	**Control Group**	**HNS group**	**Effect Estimate** (95% Confidence Interval) [Ω]	**P-Value**
Time Taken (days) For alleviation of symptoms in days (IQR) [§¥]	7 (7-8)	4 (3-4)	6.11 (4.23-8.84)	<0.0001	13 (9-15)	6 (5-7)	4.04 (2.46-6.64)	<0.0001
Time Taken (days) for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR clearance (IQR) [§¥]	10 (9-12)	6 (6-7)	5.53 (3.76-8.14)	<0.0001	12 (11-17)	8.5 (8-9)	4.32 (2.62-7.13)	<0.0001
Clinical Grading Score at day 6								
Median CGS (IQR)	1 (1-2)	0 (0-1)	0.07 (0.03-0.13)	<0.0001	3 (3-4)	1.5 (0-2)	0.03 (0.01-0.09)	<0.0001
1= Not hospitalized with resumption of normal activities - n (%)	11 (10.68)	68 (63.55)			1 (1.4)	14 (28)		
2= Not hospitalized, but unable to resume normal activities- n (%)	51 (49.51)	35 (32.71)			1 (1.4)	11 (22)		
3= Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen- n (%)	35 (33.98)	3 (2.8)			10 (13.7)	13 (26)		
4= Hospitalized, requiring low flow supplemental oxygen- n (%)	4 (3.88)	1 (0.93)			23 (31.5)	10 (20)		
5= Hospitalized, requiring high flow nasal oxygen- n (%)	2 (1.94)	0 (0)			13 (17.8)	2 (4)		

6= Hospitalized, requiring mechanical ventilation- n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)			3 (4.1)	0 (0)		
7=Death- n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)			2 (2.7)	0 (0)		
SECONDARY OUTCOMES								
Degree of Fever at Day 4[¶3]								
Median Degree Score (IQR)	2 (1-2)	0 (0-1)			2 (1-3)	2 (1-2)		
0= No Fever- n (%)	4 (3.88)	63 (58.88)			2 (3.77)	11 (22)		
1= Mild Fever- n (%)	30 (29.13)	31 (28.97)	0.05 (0.03-0.1)	<0.0001	12 (22.64)	13 (26)	0.21 (0.09-0.46)	0.0001
2= Moderate Fever- n (%)	60 (58.25)	12 (11.21)			23 (43.4)	24 (48)		
3= Severe Fever- n (%)	9 (8.74)	1 (0.93)			16 (30.19)	2 (4)		
Mean CRP Level at Day 6 (mg/l) ± SD	9.44 ± 4.94 (n=67)	6.15 ± 2.45 (n=61)	-3.16 (-4.52 - -1.81)	<0.0001	23.32 ± 8.73 (n=44)	15.83 ± 7.17 (n=36)	-8.48 (-11.82 - -5.13)	<0.0001
Severity of Symptoms at Day 8[¶3]								
Median Score (IQR)	0 (0-2)	0 (0-0)			2(1-3)	0(0-1)		
0= Asymptomatic- n (%)	58 (56.31)	105 (98.13)			10 (19.61)	35 (70)		
1= Mild Symptoms- n (%)	18 (17.48)	2 (1.87)	0.009 (0.001-0.08)	<0.0001	15 (29.41)	7 (14)	0.1 (0.04-0.24)	<0.0001
2= Moderate Symptoms- n (%)	21 (20.39)	0 (0)			4 (7.84)	2 (4)		
3= Severe Symptoms- n (%)	6 (5.83)	0 (0)			22 (43.14)	6 (12)		
Clinical Grading Score at day 10[†3]								
Median Score (IQR)	1 (1-2)	1 (1-2)			4 (2-4)	1 (1-1)		
1= Not hospitalized with resumption of normal activities- n (%)	71 (68.93)	103 (96.26)	0.07 (0.02-0.21)	<0.0001	10 (18.87)	39 (78)	0.05 (0.02-0.15)	<0.0001

2= Not hospitalized, but unable to resume normal activities- n (%)	26 (25.24)	3 (2.8)			13 (24.53)	2 (4)		
3= Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen- n (%)	2 (1.94)	0			2 (3.77)	3 (6)		
4= Hospitalized, requiring low flow supplemental oxygen- n (%)	2 (1.94)	1 (0.93)			16 (30.19)	4 (8)		
5= Hospitalized, requiring high flow nasal oxygen- n (%)	1 (0.97)	0			4 (7.55)	1 (2)		
6= Hospitalized, requiring mechanical ventilation- n (%)	1 (0.97)	0			4 (7.55)	1 (2)		
7=Death- n (%)	0 (0)	0			4 (7.55)	0 (0)		
30 Day Mortality[€]	1 (1.37)	0	0 (0-0)	0.49	10 (18.87)	2 (4)	0.18 (0.02-0.92)	0.029
ADDITIONAL OUTCOMES								
Median time to clinical improvement of severity of symptoms (95% CI) [¶] **— days**								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	5 (5-6)	3 (3-4)	2.88 (2.10-3.94)	<0.0001	5 (5-7)	3 (3-4)	2.26 (1.48-3.45)	<0.0001
Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	8 (7-9)	5 (4-5)	4.18 (2.97-5.89)	<0.0001	12 (7-non-estimable)	5 (5-6)	2.59 (1.6-4.14)	<0.0001
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	8 (8-9)	5 (4-6)	4.49 (3.15-6.38)	<0.0001	13 (10-non-estimable)	7 (6-8)	2.74 (1.68-4.49)	<0.0001
Median time to clinical improvement of degree of fever (95% CI) [ł] **— days**								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	5 (4-5)	3 (non-estimable)	2.54 (1.87-3.46)	<0.0001	3 (3-4)	3 (2-3)	1.80 (1.18-2.75)	0.0003

Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	7.5 (7-8)	4 (4-5)	3.96 (2.84-5.52)	<0.0001	7 (6-8)	5 (4-5)	2.23 (1.45-3.43)	<0.0001
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	8 (7-8)	4 (4-5)	4.17 (2.98-5.84)	<0.0001	10 (8-11)	6 (6-7)	2.64 (1.7-4.11)	<0.0001
Median time to clinical improvement of cough (95% CI) [hu]— days								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	4 (4-6)	3 (non-estimable)	2.32 (1.53-3.53)	<0.0001	4 (3-4)	3 (3-4)	1.04 (0.66-1.63)	0.82
Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	6 (5-6)	5 (4-5)	2.27 (1.46-3.55)	<0.0001	7 (6-8)	5 (5-6)	1.59 (0.98-2.59)	0.03
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	7 (6-8)	5 (4-6)	2.67 (1.73-4.12)	<0.0001	9 (8-10)	6 (6-7)	2.04 (1.26-3.31)	0.001
Median time to clinical improvement of shortness of breath (95% CI) [φ]— days								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	2 (2-non-estimable)	2 (non-estimable)	1.33 (0.14-12.82)	0.617	6 (4-11)	3 (3-4)	2.65 (1.7-4.14)	<0.0001
Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	2 (non-estimable)	2 (non-estimable)	1 (0.09-11.03)	1	7 (6-12)	4 (4-5)	2.94 (184-4.7)	<0.0001
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	2 (2-non-estimable)	2 (non-estimable)	1.33 (0.14-12.82)	0.617	13 (8-non-estimable)	6 (4-6)	2.39 (1.48-3.87)	<0.0001
Median time to clinical improvement of myalgia (95% CI) [ф]— days								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	4 (3-4)	3 (non-estimable)	2.3 (1.52-3.46)	<0.0001	4 (3-7)	3 (3-4)	1.83 (1.1-3.05)	0.0033
Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	6 (6-7)	4 (4-5)	3.09 (1.92-4.98)	<0.0001	8.5 (6-11)	5 (4-5)	2.64 (1.53-4.54)	<0.0001
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	6 (6-7)	4 (4-5)	3.34 (2.14-5.23)	<0.0001	9 (7-11)	5 (4-6)	2.75 (1.62-4.69)	<0.0001
Median time to clinical improvement of “how sick do you feel” (95% CI) [Σ]— days								
Improvement of one category on ordinal scale	5 (4-5)	3 (non-estimable)	2.58 (1.9-3.51)	<0.0001	5 (4-9)	4 (3-4)	1.82 (1.12-2.77)	0.0012

Improvement of two category on ordinal scale	7 (7-8)	5 (4-5)	3.27 (2.37-4.51)	<0.0001	8 (7-non-estimable)	5 (5-6)	2.18 (1.37-3.48)	0.0002
Achievement of normal status on ordinal scale	8 (7-9)	5 (4-6)	3.55 (2.55-4.93)	<0.0001	13 (10-non-estimable)	7 (6-8)	2.87 (1.75-4.69)	<0.0001

***** The Intention-to-Treat analysis was performed on all the patients who had undergone randomization. n=number of patients, IQR: Interquartile Range, ECMO: Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; CRP: C-reactive protein.

Ω The effect estimate for time to symptom alleviation, viral clearance and median time to clinical improvements are hazard ratios, for CRP are mean differences, and for ordinal variables are odds ratios.

¥ Median number of days (95% confidence interval) with hazard ratio estimation using log-rank test.

ʒ Ordinal logistic regression models assuming proportional odds applied (multivariable regression models to adjust for the effects of patient age, gender, baseline clinical status grade, and history of diabetes/hypertension.)

ƨ Time taken for the alleviation of symptoms was the difference between date of enrollment and becoming clinically asymptomatic.

§ Viral load clearance was the difference between date of first positive and next negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR.

† Clinical status grading was assessed on 6th and 10th day using the seven-level ordinal scale representing effect estimate as odds ratio (95% confidence interval).

ʅ Fever is classified as mild, moderate and severe. None (0) 98-99 °F, mild (1) <100 °F, moderate (2) 100-101.9 °F, severe (3) ≤ 102°F

β Mean CRP ± Standard deviation for number of patients (n) shown with effect estimate as mean difference adjusted for the co-variants

¶ Severity of symptoms is classified as mild, moderate and severe. Mild denotes symptoms of upper respiratory tract viral infection i.e. low grade fever, dry cough, sore throat, nasal congestion, malaise, Moderate are respiratory symptoms (fever, cough and shortness of breath) without signs of severe pneumonia and severe is classified as fever associated with severe dyspnoea, respiratory distress, tachypnea (> 30 breaths/min), and hypoxia (SpO2 < 90% on room air)

€ Fischer exact P value (2-tail), significant if <0.05.

ɦ Cough is categorized from 0 to 3; None (0), Mild (1) occasional, transient cough, Moderate (2) frequent cough, slightly influencing day time activities, Severe (3): frequent cough, significantly influencing daytime activities

ɸ Shortness of Breath is grouped as Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 4 and Grade 5. Grade 1=Not troubled by breathlessness except on strenuous exercise, Grade 2=Short of breath when hurrying

on the level or walking up a slight hill, Grade 3=Walks slower than most people on the level, stops after a mile or so, or stop after 15 minutes walking at own pace, Grade 4=Stops for breath after walking about 100 yds or a few minutes on level ground and Grade 5=Too breathless to breathless when undressing.

ɗb Myalgia is graded as none (0), mild (1), moderate (2), and severe (3) on subjective basis.

Σ How Sick Do You Feel is categorized as none (0), mild (1), moderate (2), and severe (3) on subjective basis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Kinetic changes in outcomes. A. Mean oxygen saturation spO2 over time in severe cases; Kaplan-Meier probability curves for time taken (in days) for alleviation of symptoms in moderate (B) and severe cases (C); Kaplan-Meier probability curves for time taken (in days) for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

vial clearance in moderate (D) and severe cases (E).ns = non-significant, *= P<0.05, **=P<0.001, ***=P<0.0001.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Kinetics of clinical status grading in Ordinal-Scale in COVID-19 patients. The Figure shows kinetic changes in clinical grade score (in 7-point ordinal-scale) in COVID-19 patient receiving the treatment (HNS) or placebo (Control). Note increases numbers of patients within scale 1 in the HNS group both for the moderate and severe cases.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES:

1. Wang L-s, Wang Y-r, Ye D-w, Liu Q-q. A review of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) based on current evidence. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents. 2020:105948.

2. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. 2020.

3. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, Liu W, Wang J, Fan G, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19. 2020;382(19):1787-99.

4. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, Azevedo LCP, Veiga VC, Avezum A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19. 2020.

5. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, Mehta AK, Zingman BS, Kalil AC, et al. Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Final Report. 2020.

6. Spinner CD, Gottlieb RL, Criner GJ, López JRA, Cattelan AM, Viladomiu AS, et al. Effect of remdesivir vs standard care on clinical status at 11 days in patients with moderate COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. 2020;324(11):1048-57.

7. Kewan T, Covut F, Al-Jaghbeer MJ, Rose L, Gopalakrishna KV, Akbik B. Tocilizumab for treatment of patients with severe COVID-19: A retrospective cohort study. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;24:100418.

8. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 — Preliminary Report. 2020.

9. Kwakman PH, Zaat SA. Antibacterial components of honey. IUBMB life. 2012;64(1):48-55.

10. Abd-El Aal A, El-Hadidy M, El-Mashad N, El-Sebaie A. Antimicrobial effect of bee honey in comparison to antibiotics on organisms isolated from infected burns. Annals of Burns and fire disasters. 2007;20(2):83.

11. Khan SU, Anjum SI, Rahman K, Ansari MJ, Khan WU, Kamal S, et al. Honey: Single food stuff comprises many drugs. Saudi journal of biological sciences. 2018;25(2):320-5.

12. Forouzanfar F, Bazzaz BSF, Hosseinzadeh H. Black cumin (Nigella sativa) and its constituent (thymoquinone): a review on antimicrobial effects. Iranian journal of basic medical sciences. 2014;17(12):929.

13. Majdalawieh AF, Fayyad MW. Immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory action of Nigella sativa and thymoquinone: A comprehensive review. International immunopharmacology. 2015;28(1):295-304.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

14. Hashemipour MA, Tavakolineghad Z, Arabzadeh S, Iranmanesh Z, Nassab SJWacocr, practice. Antiviral Activities of Honey, Royal Jelly, and Acyclovir Against HSV-1. 2014;26(2):47.

15. Shahzad A, Cohrs RJJTb. In vitro antiviral activity of honey against varicella zoster virus (VZV): A translational medicine study for potential remedy for shingles. 2012;3(2).

16. Hashem H. IN Silico approach of some selected honey constituents as SARS-CoV-2 main protease (COVID-19) inhibitors. 2020.

17. Almasaudi SB, Al-Nahari AA, El Sayed M, Barbour E, Al Muhayawi SM, Al-Jaouni S, et al. Antimicrobial effect of different types of honey on Staphylococcus aureus. Saudi journal of biological sciences. 2017;24(6):1255-61.

18. Jenkins R, Cooper R. Improving antibiotic activity against wound pathogens with manuka honey in vitro. PLoS One. 2012;7(9).

19. Boukraâ L. Honey in traditional and modern medicine. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2016.

20. Abuelgasim H, Albury C, Lee J. Effectiveness of honey for symptomatic relief in upper respiratory tract infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine. 2020:bmjebm-2020-111336.

21. Oyero OG, Toyama M, Mitsuhiro N, Onifade AA, Hidaka A, Okamoto M, et al. Selective inhibition of hepatitis c virus replication by Alpha-zam, a Nigella sativa seed formulation. African journal of traditional, complementary and alternative medicines. 2016;13(6):144-8.

22. Barakat EMF, El Wakeel LM, Hagag RS. Effects of Nigella sativa on outcome of hepatitis C in Egypt. World journal of gastroenterology: WJG. 2013;19(16):2529.

23. Salem ML, Hossain MS. Protective effect of black seed oil from Nigella sativa against murine cytomegalovirus infection. International journal of immunopharmacology. 2000;22(9):729-40.

24. Ulasli M, Gurses SA, Bayraktar R, Yumrutas O, Oztuzcu S, Igci M, et al. The effects of Nigella sativa (Ns), Anthemis hyalina (Ah) and Citrus sinensis (Cs) extracts on the replication of coronavirus and the expression of TRP genes family. Molecular biology reports. 2014;41(3):1703-11.

25. Koshak AE, Koshak EA. Nigella sativa l. as a potential phytotherapy for covid-19: A mini-review of in-silico studies. Current Therapeutic Research. 2020:100602.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

26. Kulyar MF-e-A, Li R, Mehmood K, Waqas M, Li K, Li JJP. Potential influence of Nagella sativa (Black cumin) in reinforcing immune system: A hope to decelerate the COVID-19 pandemic. 2020:153277.

27. Eteraf-Oskouei T, Najafi MJIjobms. Traditional and modern uses of natural honey in human diseases: a review. 2013;16(6):731.

28. Ameen NMA, Altubaigy F, Jahangir T, Mahday IA, Mohammed EA, Musa OAAJJoMPR. Effect of Nigella sativa and bee honey on pulmonary, hepatic and renal function in Sudanese in Khartoum state. 2011;5(31):6857-63.

29. Bhatti I, Inayat S, Uzair B, Menaa F, Bakhsh S, Khan H, et al. Effects of nigella sativa (Kalonji) and honey on lipid profile of hyper lipidemic smokers. 2016;50(3):376-84.

30. Moghimipour E, Ghorbani A, Malayeri A, Siahpoosh A, Khodadoost M, Rajaeipour M, et al. Evaluation of Nigella sativa and honey combination for treatment of kidney stone: a randomized, placebo controlled clinical trial. 2019;5(1).

31. Javadi SMR, Hashemi M, Mohammadi Y, MamMohammadi A, Sharifi A, Makarchian HRJAcb. Synergistic effect of honey and Nigella sativa on wound healing in rats. 2018;33(6):518-23.

32. Al Jaouni SK, Halawa T, Hussein A, Al Najjar S, Almuhayawi MS, Harakeh SJJoAH. Nigella sativa and Saudi honey diminish infections and improve the survival in a kostmann's syndrome patient: Case report. 2017;8(3):119.

33. Clinical Management Guidelines for COVID-19. Ministry of National Health Services, Pakistan.Third Version.

34. Li L, Zhang W, Hu Y, Tong X, Zheng S, Yang J, et al. Effect of Convalescent Plasma Therapy on Time to Clinical Improvement in Patients With Severe and Life-threatening COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2020;324(5):460-70.

35. Pan H, Peto R, Abdool Karim Q, Alejandria M, Henao Restrepo AM, Hernandez Garcia C, et al. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19; interim WHO SOLIDARITY trial results. 2020:2020.10.15.20209817.

36. Tavakkoli A, Mahdian V, Razavi BM, Hosseinzadeh H. Review on Clinical Trials of Black Seed (Nigella sativa) and Its Active Constituent, Thymoquinone. Journal of pharmacopuncture. 2017;20(3):179-93.

37. Cianciosi D, Forbes-Hernández TY, Afrin S, Gasparrini M, Reboredo-Rodriguez P, Manna PP, et al. Phenolic compounds in honey and their associated health benefits: A review. 2018;23(9):2322.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20217364; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

38. Ahmed A, Khan RA, Azim MK, Saeed SA, Mesaik MA, Ahmed S, et al. Effect of natural honey on human platelets and blood coagulation proteins. Pakistan journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2011;24(3):389-97.

39. Al-Ghamdi MJJoe. The anti-inflammatory, analgesic and antipyretic activity of Nigella sativa. 2001;76(1):45-8.

40. Alzubier AA, Okechukwu PNJWASET. Investigation of anti-inflammatory, antipyretic and analgesic effect of Yemeni Sidr Honey. 2011;5:41-6.