Efficacy and Safety of Polyherbal formulation as an add-on to the standard of care in mild to moderate COVID-19: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

Authors :

Sr. No.	Name	Affiliation	Email ID
1.	Prof. Dr. Suresh B. Patankar*	AMAI Charitable Trust, Pune	sureshpatankarace@gmail.com
2.	Dr. Hrishikesh Rangnekar	Quest Clinical Services, Pune	h.rangnekar@questclinicalservices.co.in dr.rangnekar@gmail.com
3.	Dr. Kalpana Joshi	Dept. of Biotechnology, Sinhgad College of Engineering, Pune	kalpanajoshi1788@gmail.com
4.	Dr. Kishor Suryawanshi	YCM Hospital, Pune	drkishorsuryawanshi@gmail.com
5.	Dr. Pravin Soni	YCM Hospital, Pune	drpravinsoni18@gmail.com
6.	Dr. Anupama Gorde	Sinhgad Institute of Dental Sciences, Pune	drpatankar02@yahoo.in
7.	Dr. Tejas Shah	Krsnaa Diagnostics Pvt. Ltd. Pune	sktejas09@gmail.com
8.	Mr. Sagar Patankar	AMAI Charitable Trust, Pune	sagarpatankar87@gmail.com
9.	Dr. Diwakar Jha	SHRIPAD Medisearch Pvt. Ltd., Pune	drdjha@gmail.com
10.	Dr. Rajesh Raje	AMAI Charitable Trust, Pune	researchhace2@gmail.com

Corresponding Author*

1 **Efficacy and Safety of Polyherbal formulation as an add-on to the standard of care in mild to** 2 **moderate COVID-19: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial**

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **Objective:** To assess the efficacy and safety of polyherbal formulation (designated as IP) in
5 comparison to placebo as add on to the standard of care (SoC) among patients with mild to moderate
6 novel corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19)

7 **Methods:** Laboratory proved patients of mild to moderate COVID-19 disease were randomized to
8 either placebo or IP as an add-on to SoC. Using quantitative reverse transcription-polymerase chain
9 reaction (qRT-PCR), we assessed the effect on viral load (VL). Change in immunological parameters
10 such as blood lymphocyte subset, serum immunoglobulin was determined. The clinical improvement
11 was assessed using a numerical rating scale (NRS) and WHO ordinal scale. Patients were followed for
12 30 days after randomization.

13 **Results:**In total, 72 patients were randomized to either placebo (n=33) and IP (n=39). Fifty-two
14 patients (n=21 in placebo and n=31 in IP arm) had qRT-PCR on day 0 and day 4. There was
15 significant reduction in VL in IP arm (from 662081 copies/mL on day 0 to 48963 copies/mL on day 4;
16 $p=0.002$)) but not in the placebo arm (from 385670 copies/mL on day 0 to 66845 copies/mL on day 4,
17 $p=0.106$). Change in the NRS score and WHO ordinal scale score was significant in both treatment
18 arms. However, the difference between the two groups was statistically significant in favour of drug
19 group, . The increase in Th1 response was significant in the IP arm ($p=0.023$) but not in the placebo
20 arm ($p=0.098$), thus implying immunomodulatory activity in the drug. No safety concerns were
21 observed in any of the trial participants.

22 **Conclusion:** This study finds that polyherbal formulation reduces viral load and contributes to
23 immunomodulation and improvement in clinical conditions when used as add-on to the standard care

24 in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 without any side effects. These findings need to be
25 further confirmed in a large, prospective, randomized study.

26 **Keywords:** COVID-19, herbal medication, viral load, immuno modulation.

27

28 INTRODUCTION

29 Novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is a significant contributor to morbidity and
30 mortality in affected individuals. World Health Organization, as of 23 April 2021, reports 144,358,956
31 confirmed cases of COVID-19, including 3,066,113 deaths [1]. Since its first identification in
32 December 2019, there is now a fair understanding of the COVID-19 disease pathogenesis. Hyper
33 stimulated immune response causing systemic inflammatory response syndrome or “cytokine storm”
34 is known to be implicated in progression to severe COVID-19 [2,3]. Such immune response correlates
35 linearly with the viral load that in turn correlates with disease severity [4,5]. Modulating the immune
36 response in COVID-19 is now an established treatment approach. The RECOVERY trial showed that
37 dexamethasone 6 mg once daily for ten days significantly lowered 28-day mortality in hospitalized
38 COVID-19 patients [6]. Also, treatment with specific interleukin -6 inhibitor tocilizumab did not
39 improve survival but reduced the likelihood of progression to the composite outcome of mechanical
40 ventilation or death [7]. With Itolizumab, an anti-CD6 humanized monoclonal antibody with an
41 immunomodulating action on T effector cells, there was a significant reduction in 30-day mortality
42 along with significant improvement in clinical immunological, and oxygen parameters [8]. Thus,
43 modulating immune response can help to improve clinical parameters and mortality outcomes,
44 especially in hospitalized moderate to severe COVID-19 patients.

45 Herbal formulations have long been assessed for their potential immune modulating effects [9,10]. In
46 an in-vitro study (*data on file*), we observed that a combination of herbals (IP) such as Ashwagandha

47 (*Withaniasomnifera*), Vidanga (*Embeliaribes*), Guduchi (*Tinospora cordifolia*), Haritaki (*Terminalia*
48 *chebula*), Aamalaki (*Embllica officinalis*), Shatavari (*Asparagus racemosus*), Yashtimadhu
49 (*Glycyrrhiza glabra*), Ginger (*Zinziber officinale*), Pippali (*Piper longum*), Shankha Bhasma and
50 Jasath Bhasma showed antiviral activity against SARS-CoV-2. As the search for potential antiviral
51 and immune modulating therapy for COVID-19 is ongoing, this could be potentially beneficial.
52 Therefore, we conducted this randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study to determine the
53 effect of the polyherbal formulation on viral load and immunological parameters and clinical
54 improvement in mild to moderate COVID-19 disease when used as an add-on to the SoC.

55 MATERIALS AND METHODS

56 *Design and Population*

57 This study was a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial to assess the safety and efficacy
58 of polyherbal drug formulation (designated as IP) in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19. The
59 study was conducted at a single center in Pune, Maharashtra, India. We enrolled adults of age 18
60 years and above, diagnosed with laboratory-proven COVID-19 disease of mild to moderate severity
61 who were admitted to the hospital as per the isolation protocol. Pregnant and lactating females, any
62 respiratory symptoms of >7 days, patients with known pathology affecting the respiratory system,
63 diagnosed hematological disorders, patients with a terminal illness, any other condition which in the
64 view of the investigator would interfere with the general clinical well-being of the participant and
65 those not willing to participate in the study were excluded. The trial was conducted as per the ethical
66 principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, good clinical practice recommendations and applicable local
67 regulatory guidelines. The study was approved by the Board of Research Studies (BORS) and
68 Institutional Ethics Committee of Yashwantrao Chavan Memorial Hospital, Pimpri, Pune. Informed
69 consent was obtained from all the participants before enrolment. The study was registered with the

clinical trial registry of India (CTRI/2020/07/026570).The study protocol was published in a peer-reviewed journal [11].

Study treatments and follow-ups

Patients with a known positive status of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 disease were screened for the study. Eligible and consenting patients were enrolled. Patients were randomized using computer-generated randomization codes to receive either IP or placebo as an add-on to the recommended standard care (SoC) for COVID-19. IP in the title was a combination of IP1 and IP2, having the following ingredients. IP1: Shunthi (*Zinziber officinale*), Vidanga (*Embelia ribes*), Yashtimadhu (*Glycyrrhiza glabra*), Shankhabhasma and Jasath Bhasma. IP2 contains: Haritaki (*Terminalia chebula*), Guduchi (*Tinospora cordifolia*), Shatavari (*Asparagus racemosus*), Aamalaki (*Emblica officinalis*), Pippali (*Piper longum*), Ashwagandha (*Withania somnifera*) and Jasath Bhasma. The investigational products were manufactured per API guidelines. Patients were advised to take one capsule, two times a day (of each IP1 and IP2) or placebo, after meals. Patients received a prepacked carton of study treatment for a total duration of 30 days. Capsule IP1 and IP2 were given for the first 15 days, and last 15 days they were given only IP2. Patients receiving placebo also received 2 capsules twice a day for first 15 days and for next 15 days, one capsule twice a day (Image 1). All the patients continued their routine diet and physical activity and other prescribed treatment as per Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) and World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines in circulation at the time of study conduct.

During baseline visit (Day 0) nasopharyngeal swab was taken for qRTPCR, numerical rating scale (NRS) was filled for clinical status and the blood was withdrawn for various immunological inflammatory and safety markers. Patients had three follow-ups during the 30-day treatment period. First follow-up visit was done at day 4±1. qRTPCR, NRS was repeated at this visit and any clinical adverse events were recorded. Second follow-up was done clinically or telephonically (if they were

94 discharged) on day 15±2 to record any clinical deterioration in clinical condition and to record
 95 adverse effects if any. Last follow-up was at day 30±2 to document clinical condition, adverse effects
 96 and perform laboratory investigations. In this last follow-up, study personnel visited patients in their
 97 homes to avoid their repeat visit to site as it was active COVID-19 hospital. Patients were asked to
 98 visit any time if they observed any deterioration in clinical condition or had developed any untoward
 99 reactions.

100 *Quantitative estimation of viral load using qRT-PCR*

101 Three viral loci RdRP, N gene and E gene and a human gene as internal control (RNaseP) were
 102 detected using GenePath Diagnostics' indigenously developed qRT-PCR assay, CoViDx One v2.1.1
 103 keeping appropriate controls and standards. Ten micro litres of extracted nucleic acid was used as an
 104 input for the qRT-PCR. Quantitative estimation for each genomic target was performed using
 105 standards, for which the number of genome copies were already known. The threshold cycle (Ct
 106 value) for each genomic target was extrapolated to the viral load of standards to estimate the number
 107 of copies/uL which were then converted to copies/mL for each gene for each sample. Average number
 108 of copies/ ml was calculated for each sample that accounts for the approximate viral load in the
 109 sample. Ct values for control human gene (RNaseP) ensured the adequacy of sample and served as
 110 control for nucleic acid extraction and nucleic acid amplification.

111 On the day of first encounter with patients, they were subjected to thorough clinical and laboratory
 112 investigations. After signing of informed consent, their demographic details, and clinical parameters
 113 were recorded. Oxygen saturation was assessed using pulse oximeter. We investigated viral load (VL)
 114 with quantitative RT-PCR for COVID-19, and blood was drawn for lymphocyte subset analysis
 115 (absolute neutrophil count, absolute lymphocyte count, TH1, TH2, Treg cells, NK Cells and CD
 116 markers such as CD3, CD4, CD3: CD8 ratio) as well as serum IgG and IgM levels (not specific to
 117 COVID-19). Liver function tests and renal function tests were performed as a part of safety

assessment.. Blood investigations were repeated on day 30 for immunological markers, and for safety assessments. We performed all the tests at a single accredited laboratory .

Outcome measures

Primary efficacy outcome measure was change in viral load. Secondary efficacy outcome measures were change in disease severity score and change in immunological and inflammatory markers. Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) was used for overall disease severity. 0 was considered for normal, 1 to 3 for mild, 4 to 6 for moderate and 7 to 10 for severe severity of the disease. Patients were asked to rate the disease severity on the NRS. Also, change in immunological parameters such as lymphocyte subset analysis (TH1, TH2, Th17), NK Cells and CD markers, serum IgG and IgM levels and Covid19 antibodies were assessed. Inflammatory and other markers like C - reactive protein and D-Dimer, Sr. Ferritin were assessed in a small portion of enrolled subjects. Primary safety measure was incidence of adverse reactions (clinical and/or laboratory parameters).

Statistical analysis: Sample size:

Two sided significance level (1 alpha)	95			
Power (1-beta. % chance of detecting)	80	Sample Size Exposed	28	27
Ratio of sample size, Unexposed/ exposed	1	Sample Size Non exposed	28	27
% of Unexposed with outcome	5	Total Sample Size	56	54
% of Exposed with outcome	35	References: Kelsey et al, Methods in Observational Epidemiology, 2 nd edition, table 12-15, Fleiss, Statistical Methods For Rates and Proportions, formulas 3.18 and 3.19.		
Odds ratio	10			
Risk/ Prevalence ratio	7			
Risk/ Prevalence	30			

Results are rounded up to the nearest integer

Results from OpenEpi, Version 3, open source calculator –SSC cohort.

Considering drop-outs, 72 patients were enrolled. Data was entered in to the Microsoft excel sheet version 2016 and was analyzed with SPSS software. Categorical variables were presented as frequency and percentage. Statistical comparisons of categorical data were done with Chi square test

or Fischer exact test. For continuous variables, normal distribution was assessed by plotting the histograms. Normally distributed data was presented using mean and standard deviations (SD) and non-normally distributed data presented as median (Interquartile range (IQR) 25-75). Student t-test and Mann-Whitney U test were applied accordingly to test the statistical differences in continuous independent variables. For before and after analysis, we used paired t test and Wilcoxon signed rank sum test to determine the statistical significance. P value <0.05 was considered significant for all comparisons.

RESULTS

Participant enrolment flow

Between August and September 2020, we screened 92 patients of which 72 were randomized to either placebo (n=33) or IP (n=39). Figure 1 shows study flow of the participant. Overall, 66 patients completed the 30-day follow-up (placebo n= 31; IP n=35).

Demographic parameters (Table no. 1)

Mean age was 43 years and 47 years in placebo and IP group (p=0.336). There was no difference in proportion of males and females in two groups (p=0.150).

Effect on Viral Load (VL) (Table no. 2)

Overall, 52 patients had undergone qRT-PCR on day 4 (31 in drug arm, 21 in placebo arm). IP treatment was associated with significant reduction in median VL (from 662081 virus copies/mL (IQR: 56904 to 19485712) on day 0 to 48963 copies/mL (IQR: 8774 to 1248257) day 4; $p=0.002$). In placebo group also, there was reduction in VL but it was non-significant (from 385670 copies/mL (IQR: 30807 to 131511846) on day 0 to 66845 copies/mL (IQR: 11978 to 836124.5) on day 4 ($p=0.106$)). Standard of care was continued in both the groups.

Clinical Assessment (Table No. 3)

In the IP arm, there was significant reduction in NRS from day 0 to day 4 ($4.3 (\pm 1.13)$ $1.74 \pm (1.03)$, $p < 0.0001$). In Placebo arm as well, there was significant reduction in NRS score (4.26 ± 1.09 to 3.16 ± 1.03 , $p < 0.0001$). Baseline scores of both the groups were similar, with P value 0.78; the difference between drug and placebo arm of 'after' was statistically highly significant. Later, upon WHO ordinal scale was available, and retrospectively the scores were assigned to the patients' condition, on day 0 and 4, IP arm was at $1.63 (\pm 0.84)$ and $1.03 (\pm 0.45)$ respectively with p value 0.0001; whereas, for placebo, these values were $1.71 (\pm 0.78)$ and $1.26 (\pm 0.63)$ with p value 0.03. P value for drug arm was highly significant (> 0.01).

Blood Biomarkers for immunity and inflammation

Changes in the inflammatory and immunological parameters are shown in Table 4, between day 0 and day 30. There was significant increase in absolute B cell count, absolute T cell count, absolute CD3, CD4 and T helper cells as well as in the ratio of absolute CD3 and CD8 cells in both IP and placebo arm. Change in absolute NK cell count was significant in placebo arm ($p = 0.020$) but not in drug arm ($p = 0.067$). However, the magnitude of change was higher with IP than the placebo. The increase in Th1 response was significant with IP treatment ($p = 0.023$) but not with the placebo treatment ($p = 0.098$). The IgG antibodies reduced significantly in both placebo and IP arm. However, the effect on IgM was non-significant in both groups. Covid antibodies were done on day 30. P value was not significant, however around 20% more antibodies were noted in drug arm than placebo arm. Due to inadequate sample size for CRP, D Dimer analysis was not feasible, however, average 50% reduction in CRP was seen in SoC + drug arm whereas increase in the SoC + Placebo arm was seen. Similar trend was seen for D Dimer also. Less number of patients opted for blood withdrawal during follow-up visits, and majority of them denied the blood letting.

Safety

There were no serious adverse events in the drug arm. One SAE occurred in placebo (+SoC) arm, which was ‘prolongation of hospitalization’ due to Covid related pneumonia, which got resolved later. LFT, RFT were not deranged in any of the patient, confirming safety. No drug-drug interaction with the SoC was seen.

DISCUSSION

Since December 2019, COVID -19 pandemic has been around the globe affecting millions of individuals with significant contribution in morbidity and mortality. Despite being present for over a year, definite therapies are limited for COVID-19. Modulating immunological response with steroids has been found beneficial in hospitalized patients. However, in a large majority of patients who have mild to moderate disease, effective treatment is necessary to prevent disease progression as well as shedding of the virus to lower the transmission rates. Thus, reducing the viral load may assist in achieving this objective. Viral load independently correlates with the risk of intubation and in-hospital mortality [12,13]. We observed that IP was associated with significant reduction in viral load at day 4. Reducing the viral load can help in early symptom recovery. It was evident as NRC was significantly reduced.

Anti-viral activity of IP therefore can be helpful in early recovery of mild to moderate COVID-19 patients. Among currently employed antiviral agents, early treatment with favipiravir was reported to be associated with lower in VL at day 6 In hospitalized patients with COVID-19 [14].

Another antiviral agent that is used widely is remdesivir. However, remdesivir did not appear to affect rates of viral RNA load decline and mortality when compared with placebo in severe hospitalized COVID-19 patients [15]. Thus, initiating an antiviral agent before the peak viral load might be necessary. It may be difficult in clinical situation to predict the time of peak VL. In this study, IP was initiated as soon as individuals were tested positive for COVID-19 which might have helped in early improvement in clinical NRS score.

In addition to lowering VL, modulating immune response is now an established strategy. In inflammatory response, Th1 pathway is associated with increase in the release of proinflammatory cytokines like IL-1, IL-2, IL-12, TNF- α , IFN- γ , etc. Dysregulated immune response is associated with development of cytokine storm. Most recent data demonstrated that COVID-19 might affect lymphocytes, especially T lymphocytes. The absolute number of T lymphocytes, CD4+ T cells, and CD8+ T cells decreased in infected individuals [16]. Immunomodulatory activity of single plants as well as polyherbal formulations from Ayurveda are well reported [17]. Modulation of immune response was evident in our study. Though placebo with SoC also showed significant effect, the change in Absolute CD3, CD4 and T helper cells was numerically higher with IP treatment. Tregs and their functions are compromised in severe COVID-19 patients, engendering unrestrained immune cell activation resulting in damaged lungs in severe COVID-19 patients [18]. There is less reduction of Tregs in the IP group as compared to the placebo group indicates a good inflammatory control in the IP group. In severe COVID-19 patients, NK cell number and function is reduced, resulting in decreased clearance of infected and activated cells, and unchecked elevation of tissue-damaging inflammation markers. Restoration of NK cell effector functions has the potential to correct the delicate immune balance required to effectively overcome SARS-CoV-2 infection [19,20]. Though the statistical significance was not reached, increase in the number of NK cells was higher in IP group than that of placebo. It probably indicates a potential to preserve and enhance the NK cell function that might assist in viral clearance.

The in-vitro study conducted with study drug with remdesivir used as a positive control for viral inhibition. Inhibition of virus replication is determined based on the fold change in the Ct value in TS-treated cells compared to the control. After 24 hours, % inhibition of E-gene was 9.10% and of N gene, it was 21.93%. After 48 hours, N gene inhibition was same as 24 hours however E gene was

further inhibited to 28.43% (*data on file*). Thus, clinical effects of viral load reduction identified with qRT-PCR are supported by the in-vitro data.

Protocol of the study was published in BMC's 'Trials' (2020)21:943. It was for the first time that any study protocol pertaining to an Ayurveda intervention was published in the BMC journal. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-020-04906-x>)

At individual level, each ingredient has unique properties and for example, Guduchi (*Tinospora cordifolia*), Haritaki (*Terminalia chebula*), Amalaki (*Eblica officinalis*) has shown efficacy as anti-viral drugs, as an anti-oxidant, as an immune modulator; for Amalaki, a paper entitled, 'Structure-based drug designing for potential antiviral activity of selected natural products from Ayurveda against SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein and its cellular receptor'. At least four natural compounds from *Tinospora cordifolia* showed high binding efficacy against SARS-CoV-2 targets involved in attachment and replication of the virus, hence validating the merit of using *Tinospora cordifolia* in the clinical management of infection caused by SARS-CoV-2. There is a certain efficacy of natural compounds from *Tinospora cordifolia* against SARS-CoV-2 protease, surface glycoprotein and RNA polymerase [21-22]. Extract of *T. chebula* increased spleen lymphocyte proliferation. Based on RT-PCR analysis, the expression of cytokines (IL-2, IL-10 and TNF- α), was more in *T. chebula* -treated than in other control groups [23]. Antioxidant properties of *Piper longum*, *Zinziber officinale* are also well-known [24,25]. Antiviral activity of Vidanga (*Embelia ribes*) against Influenza virus and antioxidant activity are well established [26]. Anti-inflammatory, antiviral effects of Yashtimadhu (*Glycyrrhiza glabra*) are also well-known [27,28]. Shatavari (*Asparagus racemosus*) has many activities including antioxidant and Immunomodulatory activities [29,30]. Minerals in the drug, Shankha (incinerated conch shell) Bhasma is helpful to tackle gastric symptoms related to the disease and Jasath Bhasma (zinc oxide) has an antiviral activity [31]. Jasath Bhasma is the purified zinc from Ayurvedic process to yield optimum effect of zinc supplementation. Due to antioxidant effects of

Zinc, it protects against ROS and RNS. Zinc helps modulate cytokine release and induces proliferation of T cells and helps to maintain skin and mucosal membrane integrity. Zinc has a central role in cellular growth and differentiation of immune cells. It is essential for intracellular binding of tyrosine kinase to T cell receptors, required for T lymphocyte development and activation. Zinc supports Th1 response [32].

When we discuss about the possible mechanism of action, the approach is such that the combination acts 'as a whole'. There are multiple phyto-ingredients and a lot of chemical entities that act on multiple targets in various systems of the body. By virtue of such entity-rich drug, a milieu is created in the body, which is prepared to take care of the infection at multiple levels, organs and systems. Since it has shown positive results in reducing viral load and immune modulation of TH1 response, the same herbo-mineral formulation can have role for prophylactic action towards the virus. Limitation of the study is smaller number of participants.

Currently the formulation is known as Capsule CoviLyzer™ and Capsule Abayakasthaa plus^R, and is manufactured by Ishaanav Nutraceuticals Pvt. Ltd.

CONCLUSION

With COVID-19 pandemic being ongoing in 2021, search for potential antiviral therapies is ongoing. This polyherbal combination drug was identified to provide effective antiviral activity in mild to moderate COVID-19 patients. Potential immunomodulatory effects observed with drug can also assist in preventing inflammatory tissue damage and may help reduce the intensity of systemic inflammatory syndrome. The investigational drug was found to be safe with no serious adverse event and it can be safely given along with Standard of Care to enhance its therapeutic activity in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 disease for reducing viral load, cytokine storm and clinical

recovery. Another study on severely affected Covid patients would be worthwhile to explore of this formulation, along with the standard of care.

Funding:

The trial was funded by AMAI Trust, Pune

Conflict of interest:

Dr. Suresh Patankar is member of AMAI trust.

Disclosures:

None

REFERENCES

1. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. Available from <https://covid19.who.int/>
2. McGonagle D, Sharif K, O'Regan A, Bridgewood C. The Role of Cytokines including Interleukin-6 in COVID-19 induced Pneumonia and Macrophage Activation Syndrome-Like Disease. Autoimmun Rev. 2020; 19:102537. Doi:10.1016/j.autrev.2020.102537
3. Birra D, Benucci M, Landolfi L, Merchionda A, Loi G, Amato P, et al. COVID 19: a clue from innate immunity. Immunol Res. 2020; 68:161-168. Doi: 10.1007/s12026-020-09137-5.
4. Yazdanpanah F, Hamblin MR, Rezaei N. The immune system and COVID-19: Friend or foe?. Life Sci. 2020; 256:117900. Doi:10.1016/j.lfs.2020.117900
5. Leligidowicz A, Feldmann J, Jaye A, Cotten M, Dong T, McMichael A, et al. Direct relationship between virus load and systemic immune activation in HIV-2 infection. J Infect Dis. 2010; 201:114-22. Doi: 10.1086/648733.
6. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, Mafham M, Bell JL, Linsell L, et al. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2021; 384:693-704. Doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2021436.

7. Salama C, Han J, Yau L, Reiss WG, Kramer B, Neidhart JD, et al. Tocilizumab in patients hospitalized with Covid-19 pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2021; 384:20-30. Doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2030340.
8. Kumar S, De Souza R, Nadkar M, Guleria R, Trikha A, Joshi SR, et al. A two-arm, randomized, controlled, multi-centric, open-label phase-2 study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Itolizumab in moderate to severe ARDS patients due to COVID-19. *Expert OpinBiolTher*. 2021; 21:675-686. Doi: 10.1080/14712598.2021.1905794
9. Gautam M, Saha S, Bani S, Kaul A, Mishra S, Patil D, et al. Immunomodulatory activity of *Asparagus racemosus* on systemic Th1/Th2 immunity: implications for immunoadjuvant potential. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2009; 121:241-7. Doi: 10.1016/j.jep.2008.10.028
10. Vetvicka V, Vetvickova J. Immune enhancing effects of WB365, a novel combination of *Ashwagandha* (*Withaniasomnifera*) and *Maitake* (*Grifolafrondosa*) extracts. *N Am J Med Sci*. 2011; 3:320-4. Doi: 10.4297/najms.2011.3320
11. Rangnekar H, Patankar S, Suryawanshi K, Soni P. Safety and efficacy of herbal extracts to restore respiratory health and improve innate immunity in COVID-19 positive patients with mild to moderate severity: A structured summary of a study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. 2020;21:943. Doi: 10.1186/s13063-020-04906-x.
12. Westblade LF, Brar G, Pinheiro LC, Paidoussis D, Rajan M, Martin P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load predicts mortality in patients with and without cancer who are hospitalized with COVID-19. *Cancer cell*. 2020; 38:661-71. Doi: 10.1016/j.ccell.2020.09.007.
13. Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, Simon MS, Rajan M, Park J, et als. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load on Risk of Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020:ciaa851. Doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa851..
14. Doi Y, Hibino M, Hase R, Yamamoto M, Kasamatsu Y, Hirose M, et al. A prospective, randomized, open-label trial of early versus late favipiravir therapy in hospitalized patients

329 with COVID-19. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2020; 64: e01897-20. Doi:
330 10.1128/AAC.01897-20.

331 15. Wang Y, Zhang D, Du G, Du R, Zhao J, Jin Y, et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe
332 COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. Lancet. 2020;
333 395:1569-1578. Doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31022-9.

334 16. Zhao R, Sun Y, Zhang Y, Wang W, Wang S, Wang C, et al. Distinguishable Immunologic
335 Characteristics of COVID-19 Patients with Comorbid Type 2 Diabetes Compared with
336 Nondiabetic Individuals. Mediators Inflamm. 2020; 2020:6914878. Doi:
337 10.1155/2020/6914878.

338 17. Kumar D, Arya V, Kaur R, Bhat ZA, Gupta VK, Kumar V. A review of immunomodulators
339 in the Indian traditional health care system. Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and
340 Infection. 2012; 45:165-84. Doi: 10.1016/j.jmii.2011.09.030

341 18. Stephen-Victor E, Das M, Karnam A, Pitard B, Gautier JF, Bayry J. Potential of regulatory T-
342 cell-based therapies in the management of severe COVID-19. EurRespir J. 2020; 56:2002182.
343 Doi: 10.1183/13993003.02182-2020

344 19. Mahmoudi S, Rezaei M, Mansouri N, Marjani M, Mansouri D. Immunologic Features in
345 Coronavirus Disease 2019: Functional Exhaustion of T Cells and Cytokine Storm. J
346 ClinImmunol. 2020; 40:974-976. Doi: 10.1007/s10875-020-00824-4.

347 20. van Eeden C, Khan L, Osman MS, Cohen Tervaert JW. Natural Killer Cell Dysfunction and
348 Its Role in COVID-19. Int J Mol Sci. 2020; 21:6351. Doi: 10.3390/ijms21176351

349 21. Sagar V, Kumar AHS. Efficacy of natural compounds from *Tinosporacordifolia* against
350 SARS-CoV-2 protease, surface glycoprotein and RNA polymerase. Virology. 2020:1-0. Doi:
351 10.21203/rs.3.rs-27375/v1

22. Adhikari B, Marasini BP, Rayamajhee B, Bhattarai BR, Lamichhane G, Khadayat K, et al. Potential roles of medicinal plants for the treatment of viral diseases focusing on COVID-19: A review. *Phytother Res.* 2021; 35:1298-1312. Doi: 10.1002/ptr.6893
23. Aher V, Wahi A. Immunomodulatory activity of alcohol extract of *Terminalia chebularetzcombretaceae*. *Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research.* 2011;10(5):567-75. Doi: 10.4314/tjpr.v10i5.5.
24. Nahak G, Sahu RK. Phytochemical evaluation and antioxidant activity of *Piper cubeba* and *Piper nigrum*. *Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science.* 2011; 1:153-157.
25. Bekkouch O, Harnafi M, Touiss I, Khatib S, Harnafi H, Alem C, et al. In Vitro Antioxidant and In Vivo Lipid-Lowering Properties of *Zingiberofficinale* Crude Aqueous Extract and Methanolic Fraction: A Follow-Up Study. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* 2019:9734390. Doi: 10.1155/2019/9734390.
26. Vaghela JS, Sisodia SS. In vitro antioxidant activity of *Embeliaribes* fruit extracts. *J Global Pharma Technol.* 2011; 3:14-30.
27. Anagha K, Manasi D, Priya L, Meera M. Scope of *Glycyrrhizaglabra* (*Yashtimadhu*) as an Antiviral agent: A Review. *Int J CurrMicrobiol App Sci.* 2014; 3:657-65.
28. Asl NN, Hosseinzadeh H. Review of antiviral effects of *Glycyrrhizaglabra* L. and its active component, glycyrrhizin. *Journal of Medicinal Plants.* 2007; 6:1-12.
29. Sharma U, Kumar N, Singh B, Munshi RK, Bhalerao S. Immunomodulatory active steroidal saponins from *Asparagus racemosus*. *Medicinal Chemistry Research.* 2013; 22:573-9. Doi: 10.1007/s00044-012-0048-4
30. Karuna DS, Dey P, Das S, Kundu A, Bhakta T. In vitro antioxidant activities of root extract of *Asparagus racemosus* Linn. *Journal of traditional and complementary medicine.* 2018; 8(1):60-5. Doi: 10.1016/j.jtcme.2017.02.004

31. Subramani Paranthaman Balasubramani, Padma Venkatasubramanian, Subrahmanya Kumar Kukkupuni Bhushan Patwardhan. Plant-based Rasayana drugs from Ayurveda. Chinese Journal of Integrative Medicine; 2011; volume 17: pages88–94Doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11655-011-0659-5>
32. Maggini S, Pierre A, Calder PC. Immune Function and Micronutrient Requirements Change over the Life Course. Nutrients. 2018; 10:1531. Doi: 10.3390/nu10101531

Table 1: Baseline characteristics in two groups

Parameters	SoC + Placebo (n=33)	SoC + IP (n=39)	P value (between groups)
Age (years)	43.0 (34.0 - 58.0)	47.0 (40.0 – 56.0)	0.336
Gender			
Male	20 (60.6)	17 (43.6)	0.150
Female	13 (39.4)	22 (56.4)	

Data presented as median (IQR) or n (%); *SoC = Standard of Care

Table 2: Change in viral load in two groups

Viral load	SoC + Placebo (N=21)	SoC + IP (N=31)	P value (between groups)
Baseline	385670 (30807 to 131511846)	662081 (56904 to 19485712)	0.758
Day 4	66845 (11978 to 836124.5)	48963 (8774 to 1248257)	0.845
P value	0.106	0.002	

Table 3: Clinical Improvement

NRS score	SoC + Placebo (n=31)	SoC + IP (n=35)	P value (between groups)
Baseline	4.26±1.09	4.3±1.13	0.781
Follow-up	3.16±1.03	1.74±1.03	<0.0001

P value	<0.0001	<0.0001	
WHO Ordinal Scale	SoC + Placebo (n=31)	SoC + IP (n=35)	
Baseline	1.71 (± 0.78)	1.63 (± 0.84)	0.58
Follow-up	1.26 (± 0.63)	1.03 (± 0.77)	0.33
P value	0.03	0.0001	

391

392 **Table 4: Changes in inflammatory and immunological parameters**

Parameters	SoC + Placebo (n=14)	SoC + IP (n=15)	P value (between groups)
Total leucocyte count			
Baseline	6257.1 $\pm$ 4488.6	7240.0 $\pm$ 2580.4	0.472
Follow-up	7200.0 $\pm$ 1669.6	7606.7 $\pm$ 1547.5	0.502
Change from baseline	942.6 (3005.0 to -1119.3)	366.7 (1720.2 to -986.8)	
P value	0.341	0.570	
Absolute B cell count			
Baseline	193.4 $\pm$ 102.6	255.9 $\pm$ 154.7	0.215
Follow-up	317.9 $\pm$ 213.5	437.3 $\pm$ 270.5	0.200
Change from baseline	124.5 (205.1 to 43.8)	181.4 (282.4 to 80.5)	
P value	0.005	0.002	
Absolute T cell count			
Baseline	710.5 $\pm$ 389.4	836.8 $\pm$ 455.6	0.431
Follow-up	1512.7 $\pm$ 477.8	1720.9 $\pm$ 611.7	0.319
Change from baseline	802.2 (1094.5 to 510.0)	884.1 (1230.7 to 537.5)	
P value	<0.0001	<0.0001	
Absolute CD3, CD4 and T helper cells			
Baseline	399.8 $\pm$ 239.1	515.5 $\pm$ 314.8	0.278
Follow-up	834.8 $\pm$ 261.3	1055.7 $\pm$ 417.6	0.102
Change from baseline	435.0 (628.1 to 242.1)	540.2 (737.1 to 343.4)	
P value	<0.0001	<0.0001	
Absolute CD3: CD8			
Baseline	270.7 $\pm$ 128.6	299.7 $\pm$ 183.5	0.629
Follow-up	571.4 $\pm$ 195.7	607.3 $\pm$ 258.8	0.679
Change from baseline	300.7 (406.1 to 195.4)	307.6 (455.8 to 159.3)	
P value	<0.0001	0.001	
Absolute T_{reg} counts			
Baseline	5.9 $\pm$ 5.0	6.5 $\pm$ 7.1	0.817
Follow-up	3.6 $\pm$ 2.7	4.8 $\pm$ 2.9	0.244
Change from baseline	-2.3 (0.35 to -5.1)	-1.7 (2.1 to -5.3)	
P value	0.082	0.358	
Absolute NK Cell count			
Baseline	10.4 $\pm$ 9.0	9.9 $\pm$ 11.4	0.898
Follow-up	17.6 $\pm$ 9.5	28.3 $\pm$ 32.5	0.248
Change from baseline	7.2 (13.0 to 1.3)	18.3 (38.1 to -1.5)	

P value	0.020	0.067	
Neutrophils (%)			
Baseline	63.7±16.6	63.9±17.1	0.969
Follow-up	54.4±7.9	51.7±9.3	0.422
Change from baseline (95% CI)	-9.3 (-1.5 to -17.0)	-12.2 (-2.6 to -21.9)	
P value	0.023	0.017	
Absolute neutrophil count			
Baseline	4457.1±4597.1	4615.4±2562.2	0.914
Follow-up	3985.7±1346.1	4046.1±1158.0	0.902
Change from baseline (95% CI)	-3555.4 (1581.4 to -2524.3)	-569.3 (799.3 to -1937.8)	
P value	0.628	0.383	
Lymphocyte (%)			
Baseline	25.7±12.6	27.2±14.7	0.776
Follow-up	32.8±7.1	37.0±7.0	0.135
Change from baseline (95% CI)	7.1 (13.7 to 0.5)	9.8 (18.5 to 1.1)	
P value	0.036	0.031	
Absolute lymphocyte counts			
Baseline	1250.0±462.7	1653.8±773.1	0.109
Follow-up	2342.9±734.5	2846.1±810.0	0.103
Change from baseline (95% CI)	1092.9 (1515.0 to 670.7)	1192.3 (1698.8 to 685.8)	
P value	<0.0001	<0.0001	
Th cell response	SoC + Placebo	SoC + IP	
Ab Th1			
Baseline	209.5 (45.3 to 419.8)	164 (27 to 501)	0.861
Follow-up	347 (215.8 to 529.3)	430 (235 to 683)	0.338
P value for change	0.098	0.023	
Ab Th2			
Baseline	143 (66.5 to 230)	164 (80 to 398)	0.318
Follow-up	424 (343.7 to 593.8)	593 (351 to 768)	0.338
P value for change	0.005	0.003	
Antibody levels	SoC + Placebo	SoC + IP	
IgG			
Baseline	1301.4±284.9	1593.6±309.5	0.015
Follow-up	1132.3±223.9	1356.6±260.5	0.021
Change from baseline (95% CI)	-169.1 (-42.9 to -295.4)	-237.0 (-79.9 to -394.1)	
P value	p=0.012	p=0.007	
IgM			
Baseline	117.7±77.2	98.8±40.6	0.438
Follow-up	113.0±62.9	89.9±28.4	0.420
Change from baseline (95% CI)	-4.7 (8.2 to -17.5)	-8.9 (8.8 to -26.7)	
P value	p=0.450	p=0.295	
COVID Antibodies	Placebo	Drug	
	5.1±2.5	6.0±2.7	0.353

393

394

Figure Legends

Image 1: Treatment administration in two groups

399 **Figure 1: Consort Study flow Chart**

400

401