# Nigella Sativa reduces COVID-19 risk: real-time meta analysis of 14 studies

@CovidAnalysis, July 2025, Version 23 https://c19early.org/nsmeta.html

### Abstract

Significantly lower risk is seen for ventilation, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance. 11 studies from 10 independent teams in 8 countries show significant benefit.

Meta analysis using the most serious outcome reported shows 43% [24-57%] lower risk. Results are similar for Randomized Controlled Trials and higher quality studies. Early treatment is more effective than late treatment.

Results are very robust — in exclusion sensitivity analysis 11 of 14 studies must be excluded to avoid finding statistically significant efficacy in pooled analysis.

No treatment is 100% effective. Protocols combine safe and effective options with individual risk/benefit analysis and monitoring. Dietary sources may be preferred. The quality of non-prescription supplements varies widely <sup>1-3</sup>. All data and sources to reproduce this analysis are in the appendix.

Other meta analyses show significant improvements with nigella sativa for mortality<sup>4,5</sup> and viral clearance<sup>5</sup>.

Control	
Nigella Sativa	
Nigella Sativa for COVID-19	c19early.org

Serious Outcome Risk

-				July 2025
Improvement,	Studie	s, Pa	tients	Relative Risk
🗟 All studies	43%	14	3K	
🚊 Mortality	57%	5	1K	<b></b>
Wentilation	62%	1	150	<b>_</b>
🚆 ICU admission	40%	2	471	<b></b>
Hospitalization	34%	5	1K	
Recovery	<b>64%</b>	5	862	
🧟 Cases	51%	3	654	<b>_</b>
🌞 Viral clearance	62%	4	345	<b>_</b>
RCTs	41%	10	1K	<b>-♦-</b>
🚊 RCT mortality	57%	5	1K	<b></b>
🧝 Prophylaxis	46%	4	907	<b>_</b>
🎭 Early	46%	7	1K	-•
述 Late	9%	3	610	
			0	0.5 1 1.5+
				Favors Favors

nigella sativa

control







c19early.org

### NIGELLA SATIVA FOR COVID-19 — HIGHLIGHTS

Studies to date suggest that Nigella Sativa reduces risk with very high confidence for hospitalization, recovery, cases, and in pooled analysis, high confidence for viral clearance, and low confidence for mortality and ventilation.

Early treatment and prophylaxis are more effective than late treatment.

13th treatment shown effective in January 2021, now with p = 0.00016 from 14 studies.

Real-time updates and corrections with a consistent protocol for 172 treatments. Outcome specific analysis and combined evidence from all studies including treatment delay, a primary confounding factor.

# 14 nigella sativa COVID-19 studies

	Impro	vement. RR [Cl]		Treatment	Control			July 2025
Ashraf (RCT) Al-Haidari (RCT) Aldwihi Koshak (RCT) Bencheqr (DB RCT) Said (RCT) Idris	82% 96% 24% 75% 69% 77% 39%	0.18 [0.04-0.80] 0.04 [0.00-0.70] 0.76 [0.54-1.03] 0.25 [0.03-2.22] 0.31 [0.01-7.19] 0.23 [0.04-1.23] 0.61 [0.44-0.84]	death death hosp. hosp. hosp. recovery recov. time	2/157 0/160 85/345 1/91 0/29 30 (n) 26 (n)	11/156 14/259 152/393 4/92 1/23 30 (n) 25 (n)	HN9-COVI	)-PK	
Early treatment	46%	0.54 [0.36-0.	81]	88/838	182/978	-	$\bigcirc$	46% lower risk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.08, I <sup>2</sup> = 44.1%, p	= 0.0028							
Karimi (RCT) Setayesh (RCT) Faruq (RCT)	Impro 51% -8% 6%	vement, RR [Cl] 0.49 [0.09-2.66] 1.08 [0.07-16.7] 0.94 [0.63-1.38]	death death death	Treatment 2/192 1/38 29/75	Control 4/189 1/41 31/75			CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup> ICU patients
Late treatment	9%	0.91 [0.62-1.	33]	32/305	36/305		<	9% lower risk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.63							
Al-Haidari Shehab Chandra (RCT) Daneshfard (RCT)	Impro 62% 0% 49% 34%	vement, RR [CI] 0.38 [0.31-0.46] 1.00 [0.36-2.74] 0.51 [0.16-1.59] 0.66 [0.49-0.89]	symp. case severe case cases symp. case	Treatment 68/188 4/39 4/52 37/89	Control 180/188 22/214 8/53 53/84	-		CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup>
Prophylaxis	46%	0.54 [0.35-0.	85]	113/368	263/539	-	$\bigcirc$	46% lower risk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12, I <sup>2</sup> = 75.0%, p	= 0.008							
All studies	43%	0.57 [0.43-0.	76]	233/1,511	481/1,822			43% lower risk
<sup>1</sup> CT: study uses combined treatment         0         0.25         0.5         0.75         1							1.25 1.5 1.75 2+	
$Tau^2 = 0.12 I^2 = 67.5$	6 n=0	00016	Effect extraction	n pre-specified	endix)	Favors	nigella sativa	Favors control A





Figure 1. A. Random effects meta-analysis. This plot shows pooled effects, see the specific outcome analyses for individual outcomes. Analysis validating pooled outcomes for COVID-19 can be found below. Effect extraction is pre-specified, using the most serious outcome reported. For details see the appendix. B. Timeline of results in nigella sativa studies. The marked dates indicate the time when efficacy was known with a statistically significant improvement of ≥10% from ≥3 studies for pooled outcomes, one or more specific outcome, pooled outcomes in RCTs, and one or more specific outcome in RCTs. Efficacy based on RCTs only was delayed by 6.4 months, compared to using all studies. Efficacy based on specific outcomes was delayed by 15.1 months, compared to using pooled outcomes. Efficacy based on specific outcomes in RCTs was delayed by 8.7 months, compared to using pooled outcomes in RCTs.

# Introduction

#### Immediate treatment recommended

SARS-CoV-2 infection primarily begins in the upper respiratory tract and may progress to the lower respiratory tract, other tissues, and the nervous and cardiovascular systems, which may lead to cytokine storm, pneumonia, ARDS, neurological injury<sup>7-19</sup> and cognitive deficits<sup>10,15</sup>, cardiovascular complications<sup>20-24</sup>, organ failure, and death. Even mild untreated infections may result in persistent cognitive deficits<sup>25</sup>—the spike protein binds to fibrin leading to fibrinolysis-resistant blood clots, thromboinflammation, and neuropathology. Minimizing replication as early as possible is recommended.





Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 spike protein fibrin binding leads to thromboinflammation and neuropathology, from<sup>6</sup>.

SARS-CoV-2 infection and replication involves the complex interplay of 100+ host and viral proteins and other factors <sup>A,26-33</sup>, providing many therapeutic targets for which many existing compounds have known activity. Scientists have predicted that over 9,000 compounds may reduce COVID-19 risk <sup>34</sup>, either by directly minimizing infection or replication, by supporting immune system function, or by minimizing secondary complications.

### Analysis

We analyze all significant controlled studies of nigella sativa for COVID-19. Search methods, inclusion criteria, effect extraction criteria (more serious outcomes have priority), all individual study data, PRISMA answers, and statistical methods are detailed in Appendix 1. We present random effects meta-analysis results for all studies, studies within each treatment stage, individual outcomes, Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), and higher quality studies.

### Treatment timing

Figure 3 shows stages of possible treatment for COVID-19. Prophylaxis refers to regularly taking medication before becoming sick, in order to prevent or minimize infection. Early Treatment refers to treatment immediately or soon after symptoms appear, while Late Treatment refers to more delayed treatment.





Figure 3. Treatment stages.

# **Preclinical Research**

15 In Silico studies support the efficacy of nigella sativa<sup>35-49</sup>.

5 In Vitro studies support the efficacy of nigella sativa  $^{40,42,50-52}$ .

2 In Vivo animal studies support the efficacy of nigella sativa 47,53.

Thomas investigate a novel formulation of nigella sativa that may be more effective for COVID-19.

Preclinical research is an important part of the development of treatments, however results may be very different in clinical trials. Preclinical results are not used in this paper.

# **Results**

Table 1 summarizes the results for all stages combined, for Randomized Controlled Trials, after exclusions, and for specific outcomes. Table 2 shows results by treatment stage. Figure 4 plots individual results by treatment stage. Figure 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 show forest plots for random effects meta-analysis of all studies with pooled effects, mortality results, ventilation, ICU admission, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance.



	Relative Risk	Studies	Patients
All studies	<b>0.57</b> [0.43-0.76] ***	14	3,333
After exclusions	<b>0.51</b> [0.38-0.70] ****	12	2,930
RCTs	<b>0.59</b> [0.40-0.85] **	10	1,915
Mortality	<b>0.43</b> [0.15-1.20]	5	1,342
ICU admission	<b>0.60</b> [0.22-1.61]	2	471
Hospitalization	<b>0.66</b> [0.53-0.84] ***	5	1,410
Recovery	<b>0.36</b> [0.20-0.66] **	5	862
Cases	<b>0.49</b> [0.31-0.79] **	3	654
Viral	<b>0.38</b> [0.18-0.84] *	4	345
RCT mortality	<b>0.43</b> [0.15-1.20]	5	1,342
RCT hospitalization	<b>0.47</b> [0.24-0.92] *	4	672

**Table 1.** Random effects meta-analysis for all stages combined, forRandomized Controlled Trials, after exclusions, and for specificoutcomes. Results show the relative risk with treatment and the 95%confidence interval. \* p<0.05</td>\*\* p<0.01</td>

	Early treatment	Late treatment	Prophylaxis
All studies	<b>0.54</b> [0.36-0.81] **	<b>0.91</b> [0.62-1.33]	<b>0.54</b> [0.35-0.85] **
After exclusions	<b>0.54</b> [0.36-0.81] **	<b>0.61</b> [0.15-2.57]	<b>0.49</b> [0.31-0.79] **
RCTs	<b>0.18</b> [0.07-0.45] ***	<b>0.91</b> [0.62-1.33]	<b>0.65</b> [0.49-0.86] **
Mortality	<b>0.13</b> [0.04-0.49] **	<b>0.91</b> [0.62-1.33]	
ICU admission		<b>0.60</b> [0.22-1.61]	
Hospitalization	<b>0.75</b> [0.60-0.93] **	<b>0.50</b> [0.22-1.15]	
Recovery	<b>0.36</b> [0.18-0.76] **	<b>0.33</b> [0.17-0.65] **	
Cases			<b>0.49</b> [0.31-0.79] **
Viral	<b>0.38</b> [0.18-0.84] *		
RCT mortality	<b>0.13</b> [0.04-0.49] **	<b>0.91</b> [0.62-1.33]	
RCT hospitalization	<b>0.27</b> [0.04-1.61]	<b>0.50</b> [0.22-1.15]	

**Table 2.** Random effects meta-analysis results by treatment stage. Results show the relative risk with treatment and the 95% confidence interval. \* p<0.05 \*\* p<0.01 \*\*\* p<0.001.



Figure 4. Scatter plot showing the most serious outcome in all studies, and for studies within each stage. Diamonds shows the results of random effects meta-analysis.



14 nigella s	4 nigella sativa COVID-19 studies										
Ashraf (RCT) Al-Haidari (RCT) Aldwihi Koshak (RCT) Bencheqr (DB RCT) Said (RCT) Idris	Impro 82% 96% 24% 75% 69% 77% 39%	vement, RR [Cl] 0.18 [0.04-0.80] 0.04 [0.00-0.70] 0.76 [0.54-1.03] 0.25 [0.03-2.22] 0.31 [0.01-7.19] 0.23 [0.04-1.23] 0.61 [0.44-0.84]	death   death   hosp.   hosp.   hosp.   recovery   recov. time	Treatment 2/157 0/160 85/345 1/91 0/29 30 (n) 26 (n)	Control 11/156 14/259 152/393 4/92 1/23 30 (n) 25 (n)	HN9-COV	//D-PK ∎ 1			ly 2025 ст <sup>1</sup>	
Early treatment	46%	0.54 [0.36-0	.81]	88/838	182/978		$\diamond$	-	46% lov	wer risk	
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.08, I <sup>2</sup> = 44.1%, p Karimi (RCT) Setayesh (RCT) Faruq (RCT)	= 0.0028 Impro 51% -8% 6%	ovement, RR [Cl] 0.49 [0.09-2.66] 1.08 [0.07-16.7] 0.94 [0.63-1.38]	] death ] death ] death	Treatment 2/192 1/38 29/75	Control 4/189 1/41 31/75				IC	CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup> CU patients	
Late treatment	9%	0.91 [0.62-1	.33]	32/305	36/305		<	$\frown$	<u> </u>	wer risk	
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p = Al-Haidari Shehab Chandra (RCT) Daneshfard (RCT)	0.63 Impro 62% 0% 49% 34%	ovement, RR [Cl] 0.38 [0.31-0.46] 1.00 [0.36-2.74] 0.51 [0.16-1.59] 0.66 [0.49-0.89]	] symp. case ] severe case ] cases ] symp. case	Treatment 68/188 4/39 4/52 37/89	Control 180/188 22/214 8/53 53/84		•	_		CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup>	
Prophylaxis	46%	0.54 [0.35-0	.85]	113/368	263/539		$\langle \rangle$	>	46% lov	wer risk	
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12, I <sup>2</sup> = 75.0%, p	= 0.008										
All studies	43%	0.57 [0.43-0	.76]	233/1,511	481/1,822		$\diamond$	-	43% lov	wer risk	
<sup>1</sup> CT: study uses comb	oined tr	eatment	Effect extractio	n pre-specified		0 0.25	0.5 0.	75 1	1.25 1.5	1.75 2+	
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12, I <sup>2</sup> = 67.5%	%, p = 0	.00016	(most serious c	Favors	nigella s	ativa	Favors co	ntrol			

**Figure 5.** Random effects meta-analysis for all studies. This plot shows pooled effects, see the specific outcome analyses for individual outcomes. Analysis validating pooled outcomes for COVID-19 can be found below. Effect extraction is pre-specified, using the most serious outcome reported. For details see the appendix.



Figure 6. Random effects meta-analysis for mortality results.









Figure 8. Random effects meta-analysis for ICU admission.



Figure 9. Random effects meta-analysis for hospitalization.



5 nigella sa	c19early.org											
	Impro	vement, RR [CI]	Treatment	Control		July 2025						
Ashraf (RCT) Koshak (RCT) Said (RCT) Idris	84% 43% 77% 39%	0.16 [0.11-0.24]         no recov.           0.57 [0.42-0.78]         no recov.           0.23 [0.04-1.23]         recovery           0.61 [0.44-0.84]         recov. time	107 (n) 34/91 30 (n) 26 (n)	103 (n) 60/92 30 (n) 25 (n)	HNSEOVID-PK	CT <sup>1</sup>						
Early treatment	64%	0.36 [0.18-0.76]	34/254	60/250		64% lower risk						
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.44, I <sup>2</sup> = 91.3%, p	Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.44, l <sup>2</sup> = 91.3%, p = 0.0069											
	Impro	vement, RR [CI]	Treatment	Control								
Karimi (RCT)	67%	0.33 [0.17-0.65] no recov.	184 (n)	174 (n)		CT <sup>1</sup>						
Late treatment	67%	0.33 [0.17-0.65]	184 (n)	174 (n)		67% lower risk						
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.0013											
All studies	64%	0.36 [0.20-0.66]	34/438	60/424		64% lower risk						
<sup>1</sup> CT: study uses com	pined tre	eatment			 0 0.25 0.5 0.75	 1 1.25 1.5 1.75 2+						
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.38, I <sup>2</sup> = 88.69	%, p = 0.	0011		Favors nigella sativa	Favors control							

#### Figure 10. Random effects meta-analysis for recovery.











# **Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs)**

Figure 13 shows a comparison of results for RCTs and observational studies. Random effects meta analysis of RCTs shows 41% improvement, compared to 40% for other studies. Figure 14, 15, and 16 show forest plots for random effects meta-analysis of all Randomized Controlled Trials, RCT mortality results, and RCT hospitalization results. RCT results are included in Table 1 and Table 2.



Figure 13. Results for RCTs and observational studies.

### RCTs have many potential biases

RCTs help to make study groups more similar and can provide a higher level of evidence, however they are subject to many biases <sup>55</sup>, and analysis of double-blind RCTs has identified extreme levels of bias <sup>56</sup>. For COVID-19, the overhead may delay treatment, dramatically compromising efficacy; they may encourage monotherapy for simplicity at the cost of efficacy which may rely on combined or synergistic effects; the participants that sign up may not reflect real world usage or the population that benefits most in terms of age, comorbidities, severity of illness, or other factors; standard of care may be compromised and unable to evolve quickly based on emerging research for new diseases; errors may be made in randomization and medication delivery; and investigators may have hidden agendas or vested interests influencing design, operation, analysis, reporting, and the potential for fraud. All of these biases have been observed with COVID-19 RCTs. There is no guarantee that a specific RCT provides a higher level of evidence.

### Conflicts of interest for COVID-19 RCTs

RCTs are expensive and many RCTs are funded by pharmaceutical companies or interests closely aligned with pharmaceutical companies. For COVID-19, this creates an incentive to show efficacy for patented commercial products, and an incentive to show a lack of efficacy for inexpensive treatments. The bias is expected to be significant, for example Als-Nielsen et al. analyzed 370 RCTs from Cochrane reviews, showing that trials funded by for-profit organizations were 5 times more likely to recommend the experimental drug compared with those funded by nonprofit organizations. For COVID-19, some major philanthropic organizations are largely funded by investments with extreme conflicts of interest for and against specific COVID-19 interventions.

### RCTs for novel acute diseases requiring rapid treatment

High quality RCTs for novel acute diseases are more challenging, with increased ethical issues due to the urgency of treatment, increased risk due to enrollment delays, and more difficult design with a rapidly evolving evidence base. For COVID-19, the most common site of initial infection is the upper respiratory tract. Immediate treatment is likely to be most successful and may prevent or slow progression to other parts of the body. For a non-prophylaxis RCT, it makes sense to provide treatment in advance and instruct patients to use it immediately on symptoms, just as some governments have done by providing medication kits in advance. Unfortunately, no RCTs have been done in this way. Every treatment RCT to date involves delayed treatment. Among the 172 treatments we have analyzed, 67% of RCTs involve very late treatment 5+ days after onset. No non-prophylaxis COVID-19 RCTs match the potential real-world use of early treatments. They may more accurately represent results for treatments that require visiting a medical facility, e.g., those requiring intravenous administration.

### Observational studies have been shown to be reliable

Evidence shows that observational studies can also provide reliable results. *Concato et al.* found that well-designed observational studies do not systematically overestimate the magnitude of the effects of treatment compared to RCTs. *Anglemyer et al.* analyzed reviews comparing RCTs to observational studies and found little evidence for



significant differences in effect estimates. We performed a similar analysis across the 172 treatments we cover, showing no significant difference in the results of RCTs compared to observational studies, RR 0.98 [0.92-1.05]<sup>61</sup>. Similar results are found for all low-cost treatments, RR 1.00 [0.91-1.09]. High-cost treatments show a nonsignificant trend towards RCTs showing greater efficacy, RR 0.92 [0.84-1.02]. Details can be found in the supplementary data. Lee et al. showed that only 14% of

### RCT vs. observational from 5,918 studies c19early.org Jul 2025

Low-cost treatments High-profit treatments	RR 1.00 0.92	Cl [0.91-1.09] [0.84-1.02]				_	*				
All treatments	0.98	[0.92-1.05]					$\diamond$	2%	diff	eren	се
			l 0 h	<sup>0.25</sup> RCT ighe	<sup>0.5</sup> s sł r efi	0.75 now ficac	1 1	1.25 RCT	<sup>1.5</sup> 「s sl r eff	1.75 now icac	2+ y

Figure 17. For COVID-19, observational study results do not systematically differ from RCTs, RR 0.98 [0.92-1.05] across 172 treatments <sup>58</sup>.

the guidelines of the Infectious Diseases Society of America were based on RCTs. Evaluation of studies relies on an understanding of the study and potential biases. Limitations in an RCT can outweigh the benefits, for example excessive dosages, excessive treatment delays, or remote survey bias may have a greater effect on results. Ethical issues may also prevent running RCTs for known effective treatments. For more on issues with RCTs see <sup>63,64</sup>.

### Using all studies identifies efficacy 8+ months faster (9+ months for low-cost treatments)

Currently, 55 of the treatments we analyze show statistically significant efficacy or harm, defined as  $\geq 10\%$  decreased risk or >0% increased risk from  $\geq 3$  studies. Of these, 58% have been confirmed in RCTs, with a mean delay of 7.7 months (64% with 8.9 months delay for low-cost treatments). The remaining treatments either have no RCTs, or the point estimate is consistent.

### Summary

We need to evaluate each trial on its own merits. RCTs for a given medication and disease may be more reliable, however they may also be less reliable. For off-patent medications, very high conflict of interest trials may be more likely to be RCTs, and more likely to be large trials that dominate meta analyses.



c19early.org

# 10 nigella sativa COVID-19 Randomized Controlled Trials

<b>J</b>				-	0					Jul	y 20	25
Ashraf (RCT) Al-Haidari (RCT) Koshak (RCT) Bencheqr (DB RCT) Said (RCT)	Impro 82% 96% 75% 69% 77%	vement, RR [C1] 0.18 [0.04-0.80] 0.04 [0.00-0.70] 0.25 [0.03-2.22] 0.31 [0.01-7.19] 0.23 [0.04-1.23]	death death hosp. hosp. recovery	7/157 0/160 1/91 0/29 30 (n)	Control 11/156 14/259 4/92 1/23 30 (n)	HN COVI	D-PK	-				CT <sup>1</sup>
Early treatment	82%	0.18 [0.07-0.4	45]	3/467	30/560		>		82	% lov	ver ri	isk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.00026											
Karimi (RCT) Setayesh (RCT) Faruq (RCT)	Impro 51% -8% 6%	vement, RR [Cl] 0.49 [0.09-2.66] 1.08 [0.07-16.7] 0.94 [0.63-1.38]	death death death	Treatment 2/192 1/38 29/75	Control 4/189 1/41 31/75			-	-	IC'	J patie	CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup> ents
Late treatment	9%	0.91 [0.62-1.3	33]	32/305	36/305		<	$\langle \rangle$	>>9	% lov	ver ri	isk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.63											
Chandra (RCT) Daneshfard (RCT)	Impro 49% 34%	vement, RR [Cl] 0.51 [0.16-1.59] 0.66 [0.49-0.89]	cases symp. case	Treatment 4/52 37/89	Control 8/53 53/84			<u> </u>				CT <sup>1</sup> CT <sup>1</sup>
Prophylaxis	35%	0.65 [0.49-0.3	36]	41/141	61/137		$\langle$	>	35	% lov	ver ri	isk
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.003											
All studies	41%	0.59 [0.40-0.3	85]	76/913	127/1,002		$\langle$		41	% lov	ver ri	isk
<sup>1</sup> CT: study uses comb	pined tre	eatment				 0 0.25	0.5	0.75 1	1.25	1.5	1.75	2+
$T_{211}^2 = 0.08 \ l^2 = 27.79$	6 n=0	0051	Effect extraction pre-specified			Favors	nidella	sativa	Favor	s cor	trol	

**Figure 14.** Random effects meta-analysis for all Randomized Controlled Trials. This plot shows pooled effects, see the specific outcome analyses for individual outcomes. Analysis validating pooled outcomes for COVID-19 can be found below. Effect extraction is pre-specified, using the most serious outcome reported. For details see the appendix.



Figure 15. Random effects meta-analysis for RCT mortality results.



#### 4 nigella sativa COVID-19 RCT hospitalization results c19early.org July 2025 Control Improvement, RR [CI] Treatment Koshak (RCT) 75% 0.25 [0.03-2.22] hosp. 1/91 4/92 Bencheqr.. (DB RCT) 69% 0.31 [0.01-7.19] hosp. 0/29 1/23 BOSS-001 Early treatment 73% 0.27 [0.04-1.61] 1/120 5/115 73%-lower risk Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I<sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p = 0.15 Improvement, RR [CI] Treatment Control Karimi (RCT) 70% 0.30 [0.15-0.61] hosp. 184 (n) 174 (n) $CT^1$ $CT^1$ Setayesh (RCT) 29% 0.71 [0.63-0.81] hosp. time 38 (n) 41 (n) Late treatment 50% 0.50 [0.22-1.15] 222 (n) 215 (n) 50% lower risk Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.31, I<sup>2</sup> = 81.7%, p = 0.1 All studies 53% 0.47 [0.24-0.92] 5/330 53% lower risk 1/342 0.75 0.25 0.5 1.5 <sup>1</sup> CT: study uses combined treatment 1.75 2+ Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.21, I<sup>2</sup> = 54.1%, p = 0.027 Favors nigella sativa Favors control

Figure 16. Random effects meta-analysis for RCT hospitalization results.

# **Exclusions**

To avoid bias in the selection of studies, we analyze all non-retracted studies. Here we show the results after excluding studies with major issues likely to alter results, non-standard studies, and studies where very minimal detail is currently available. Our bias evaluation is based on analysis of each study and identifying when there is a significant chance that limitations will substantially change the outcome of the study. We believe this can be more valuable than checklist-based approaches such as Cochrane GRADE, which can be easily influenced by potential bias, may ignore or underemphasize serious issues not captured in the checklists, and may overemphasize issues unlikely to alter outcomes in specific cases (for example certain specifics of randomization with a very large effect size and well-matched baseline characteristics).

The studies excluded are as below. Figure 18 shows a forest plot for random effects meta-analysis of all studies after exclusions.

Faruq, potential data issue.

Shehab, unadjusted results with no group details.



Nigella Sativa reduces COVID-19 risk: real-time meta analysis of 14 studies

# 12 nigella sativa COVID-19 studies after exclusions

12 nigella s	2 nigella sativa COVID-19 studies after exclusions									
	Impro	vement, RR [Cl]		Treatment	Control			501y 2025		
Ashraf (RCT) Al-Haidari (RCT) Aldwihi Koshak (RCT) Bencheqr., (DB RCT) Said (RCT)	82% 96% 24% 75% 69%	0.18 [0.04-0.80] 0.04 [0.00-0.70] 0.76 [0.54-1.03] 0.25 [0.03-2.22] 0.31 [0.01-7.19]	death death hosp. hosp. hosp.	2/157 0/160 85/345 1/91 0/29 30 (p)	11/156 14/259 152/393 4/92 1/23 30 (p)	HNS COVID P	K	CT <sup>1</sup>		
Idris	39%	0.61 [0.44-0.84]	recovery recov. time	26 (n)	25 (n)	-				
Early treatment	46%	0.54 [0.36-0.	81]	88/838	182/978	<		46% lower risk		
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.08, I <sup>2</sup> = 44.1%, p =	= 0.0028									
Karimi (PCT)	Impro	vement, RR [Cl]	death	Treatment	Control			CT1		
Setayesh (RCT)	-8%	1.08 [0.07-16.7]	death	1/38	1/41		-	CT <sup>1</sup>		
Late treatment	39%	0.61 [0.15-2.	57]	3/230	5/230			39% lower risk		
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, I <sup>2</sup> = 0.0%, p =	0.51									
	Impro	vement, RR [CI]		Treatment	Control					
Al-Haidari	62%	0.38 [0.31-0.46]	symp. case	68/188	180/188			071		
Daneshfard (RCT)	49% 34%	0.51 [0.16-1.59] 0.66 [0.49-0.89]	cases symp. case	4/52 37/89	8/53 53/84			CT <sup>1</sup>		
Prophylaxis	51%	0.49 [0.31-0.	79]	109/329	241/325	<		51% lower risk		
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.11, I <sup>2</sup> = 79.2%, p =	= 0.0032									
All studies	49%	0.51 [0.38-0.	70]	200/1,397	428/1,533	<		49% lower risk		
<sup>1</sup> CT: study uses comb	pined tre	eatment			1	 D 0.25 0	.5 0.75 1	1.25 1.5 1.75 2+		
Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.10, I <sup>2</sup> = 65.2%	6, p < 0.	.0001	Effect extraction (most serious ou	pre-specified utcome, see app	endix)	Favors nic	gella sativa	Favors control		

Figure 18. Random effects meta-analysis for all studies after exclusions. This plot shows pooled effects, see the specific outcome analyses for individual outcomes. Analysis validating pooled outcomes for COVID-19 can be found below. Effect extraction is pre-specified, using the most serious outcome reported. For details see the appendix.

# Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity in COVID-19 studies arises from many factors including:

### Treatment delay

The time between infection or the onset of symptoms and treatment may critically affect how well a treatment works. For example an antiviral may be very effective when used early but may not be effective in late stage disease, and may even be harmful. Oseltamivir, for example, is generally only considered effective for influenza when used within 0-36 or 0-48 hours<sup>67,68</sup>. Baloxavir marboxil studies for influenza also show that treatment delay is critical – Ikematsu et al. report an 86% reduction in cases for post-exposure prophylaxis, Hayden et al. show a 33 hour reduction in the time to alleviation of symptoms for treatment within 24 hours and a reduction of 13 hours for treatment within 24-48 hours, and Kumar et al. report only 2.5 hours improvement for inpatient treatment.



c19early.org

Treatment delay	Result
Post-exposure prophylaxis	86% fewer cases <sup>69</sup>
<24 hours	-33 hours symptoms <sup>70</sup>
24-48 hours	-13 hours symptoms <sup>70</sup>
Inpatients	-2.5 hours to improvement <sup>7</sup>



Figure 19 shows a mixed-effects meta-regression for efficacy as a function of treatment delay in COVID-19 studies from 172 treatments, showing that efficacy declines rapidly with treatment delay. Early treatment is critical for COVID-19.



**Figure 19.** Early treatment is more effective. Meta-regression showing efficacy as a function of treatment delay in COVID-19 studies from 172 treatments.

#### Patient demographics

Details of the patient population including age and comorbidities may critically affect how well a treatment works. For example, many COVID-19 studies with relatively young low-comorbidity patients show all patients recovering quickly with or without treatment. In such cases, there is little room for an effective treatment to improve results, for example as in López-Medina et al.

#### SARS-CoV-2 variants

Efficacy may depend critically on the distribution of SARS-CoV-2 variants encountered by patients. Risk varies significantly across variants<sup>73</sup>, for example the Gamma variant shows significantly different characteristics<sup>74-77</sup>. Different mechanisms of action may be more or less effective depending on variants, for example the degree to which TMPRSS2 contributes to viral entry can differ across variants<sup>78,79</sup>.

#### Treatment regimen

Effectiveness may depend strongly on the dosage and treatment regimen.



#### Medication quality

The quality of medications may vary significantly between manufacturers and production batches, which may significantly affect efficacy and safety. *Williams et al.* analyze ivermectin from 11 different sources, showing highly variable antiparasitic efficacy across different manufacturers. *Xu et al.* analyze a treatment from two different manufacturers, showing 9 different impurities, with significantly different concentrations for each manufacturer. Non-prescription supplements may show very wide variations in quality<sup>1,2</sup>.

#### Other treatments

The use of other treatments may significantly affect outcomes, including supplements, other medications, or other interventions such as prone positioning. Treatments may be synergistic<sup>82-98</sup>, therefore efficacy may depend strongly on combined treatments.

#### Effect measured

Across all studies there is a strong association between different outcomes, for example improved recovery is strongly associated with lower mortality. However, efficacy may differ depending on the effect measured, for example a treatment may be more effective against secondary complications and have minimal effect on viral clearance.

#### Meta analysis

The distribution of studies will alter the outcome of a meta analysis. Consider a simplified example where everything is equal except for the treatment delay, and effectiveness decreases to zero or below with increasing delay. If there are many studies using very late treatment, the outcome may be negative, even though early treatment is very effective. All meta analyses combine heterogeneous studies, varying in population, variants, and potentially all factors above, and therefore may obscure efficacy by including studies where treatment is less effective. Generally, we expect the estimated effect size from meta analysis to be less than that for the optimal case. Looking at all studies is valuable for providing an overview of all research, important to avoid cherry-picking, and informative when a positive result is found despite combining less-optimal situations. However, the resulting estimate does not apply to specific cases such as early treatment in high-risk populations. While we present results for all studies, we also present treatment time and individual outcome analyses, which may be more informative for specific use cases.

# **Pooled Effects**

Pooled effects are no longer required to show efficacy as of May 2022

This section validates the use of pooled effects for COVID-19, which enables earlier detection of efficacy, however pooled effects are no longer required for nigella sativa as of May 2022. Efficacy is now known based on specific outcomes for all studies and when restricted to RCTs. Efficacy based on specific outcomes was delayed by 15.1 months compared to using pooled outcomes. Efficacy based on specific outcomes in RCTs was delayed by 8.7 months compared to using pooled outcomes in RCTs.

### Combining studies is required

For COVID-19, delay in clinical results translates into additional death and morbidity, as well as additional economic and societal damage. Combining the results of studies reporting different outcomes is required. There may be no mortality in a trial with low-risk patients, however a reduction in severity or improved viral clearance may translate into lower mortality in a high-risk population. Different studies may report lower severity, improved recovery, and lower mortality, and the significance may be very high when combining the results. *"The studies reported different outcomes"* is not a good reason for disregarding results. Pooling the results of studies reporting different outcomes allows us to use more of the available information. Logically we should, and do, use additional information when evaluating treatments—for example dose-response and treatment delay-response relationships provide additional evidence of efficacy that is considered when reviewing the evidence for a treatment.



#### Specific outcome and pooled analyses

We present both specific outcome and pooled analyses. In order to combine the results of studies reporting different outcomes we use the most serious outcome reported in each study, based on the thesis that improvement in the most serious outcome provides comparable measures of efficacy for a treatment. A critical advantage of this approach is simplicity and transparency. There are many other ways to combine evidence for different outcomes, along with additional evidence such as dose-response relationships, however these increase complexity.

#### Ethical and practical issues limit high-risk trials

Trials with high-risk patients may be restricted due to ethics for treatments that are known or expected to be effective, and they increase difficulty for recruiting. Using less severe outcomes as a proxy for more serious outcomes allows faster and safer collection of evidence.

### Validating pooled outcome analysis for COVID-19

For many COVID-19 treatments, a reduction in mortality logically follows from a reduction in hospitalization, which follows from a reduction in symptomatic cases, which follows from a reduction in PCR positivity. We can directly test this for COVID-19.

Analysis of the the association between different outcomes across studies from all 172 treatments we cover confirms the validity of pooled outcome analysis for COVID-19. Figure 20 shows that lower hospitalization is very strongly associated with lower mortality (p < 0.00000000001). Similarly, Figure 21 shows that improved recovery is very strongly associated with lower mortality (p < 0.00000000001). Considering the extremes, *Singh et al.* show an association between viral clearance and hospitalization or death, with p = 0.003 after excluding one large outlier from a mutagenic treatment, and based on 44 RCTs including 52,384 patients. Figure 22 shows that improved viral clearance is strongly associated with fewer serious outcomes. The association is very similar to *Singh et al.*, with higher confidence due to the larger number of studies. As with *Singh et al.*, the confidence increases when excluding the outlier treatment, from p = 0.000000082 to p = 0.000000033.



Figure 20. Lower hospitalization is associated with lower mortality, supporting pooled outcome analysis.





Figure 21. Improved recovery is associated with lower mortality, supporting pooled outcome analysis.





Pooled outcomes identify efficacy 5 months faster (7 months for RCTs)

Currently, 55 of the treatments we analyze show statistically significant efficacy or harm, defined as  $\geq$ 10% decreased risk or >0% increased risk from  $\geq$ 3 studies. 88% of these have been confirmed with one or more specific outcomes, with a mean delay of 4.9 months. When restricting to RCTs only, 57% of treatments showing statistically significant efficacy/harm with pooled effects have been confirmed with one or more specific outcomes, with a mean delay of 7.3 months. Figure 23 shows when treatments were found effective during the pandemic. Pooled outcomes often resulted in earlier detection of efficacy.







### Limitations

Pooled analysis could hide efficacy, for example a treatment that is beneficial for late stage patients but has no effect on viral clearance may show no efficacy if most studies only examine viral clearance. In practice, it is rare for a nonantiviral treatment to report viral clearance and to not report clinical outcomes; and in practice other sources of heterogeneity such as difference in treatment delay is more likely to hide efficacy.

#### Summary

Analysis validates the use of pooled effects and shows significantly faster detection of efficacy on average. However, as with all meta analyses, it is important to review the different studies included. We also present individual outcome analyses, which may be more informative for specific use cases.

# **Discussion**

### **Publication bias**

Publishing is often biased towards positive results, however evidence suggests that there may be a negative bias for inexpensive treatments for COVID-19. Both negative and positive results are very important for COVID-19, media in many countries prioritizes negative results for inexpensive treatments (inverting the typical incentive for scientists that



value media recognition), and there are many reports of difficulty publishing positive results <sup>100-103</sup>. For nigella sativa, there is currently not enough data to evaluate publication bias with high confidence.

One method to evaluate bias is to compare prospective vs. retrospective studies. Prospective studies are more likely to be published regardless of the result, while retrospective studies are more likely to exhibit bias. For example, researchers may perform preliminary analysis with minimal effort and the results may influence their decision to continue. Retrospective studies also provide more opportunities for the specifics of data extraction and adjustments to influence results.

Figure 24 shows a scatter plot of results for prospective and retrospective studies. 0% of retrospective studies report a statistically significant positive effect for one or more outcomes, compared to 92% of prospective studies, consistent with a bias toward publishing negative results. The median effect size for retrospective studies is 12% improvement, compared to 57% for prospective studies, suggesting a potential bias towards publishing results showing lower efficacy.



Figure 24. Prospective vs. retrospective studies. The diamonds show the results of random effects meta-analysis.

#### Funnel plot analysis

Funnel plots have traditionally been used for analyzing publication bias. This is invalid for COVID-19 acute treatment trials — the underlying assumptions are invalid, which we can demonstrate with a simple example. Consider a set of hypothetical perfect trials with no bias. Figure 25 plot A shows a funnel plot for a simulation of 80 perfect trials, with random group sizes, and each patient's outcome randomly sampled (10% control event probability, and a 30% effect size for treatment). Analysis shows no asymmetry (p > 0.05). In plot B, we add a single typical variation in COVID-19 treatment trials — treatment delay. Consider that efficacy varies from 90% for treatment within 24 hours, reducing to 10% when treatment is delayed 3 days. In plot B, each trial's treatment delay is randomly selected. Analysis now shows highly significant asymmetry, p < 0.0001, with six variants of Egger's test all showing  $p < 0.05^{104-111}$ . Note that these tests fail even though treatment delay is uniformly distributed. In reality treatment delay is more complex — each trial has a different distribution of delays across patients, and the distribution across trials may be biased (e.g., late treatment trials may be more common). Similarly, many other variations in trials may produce asymmetry, including dose, administration, duration of treatment, differences in SOC, comorbidities, age, variants, and bias in design, implementation, analysis, and reporting.





Figure 25. Example funnel plot analysis for simulated perfect trials.

### Conflicts of interest

Pharmaceutical drug trials often have conflicts of interest whereby sponsors or trial staff have a financial interest in the outcome being positive. Nigella Sativa for COVID-19 lacks this because it is an inexpensive and widely available supplement. In contrast, most COVID-19 nigella sativa trials have been run by physicians on the front lines with the primary goal of finding the best methods to save human lives and minimize the collateral damage caused by COVID-19. While pharmaceutical companies are careful to run trials under optimal conditions (for example, restricting patients to those most likely to benefit, only including patients that can be treated soon after onset when necessary, and ensuring accurate dosing), not all nigella sativa trials represent the optimal conditions for efficacy.

### Limitations

Summary statistics from meta analysis necessarily lose information. As with all meta analyses, studies are heterogeneous, with differences in treatment delay, treatment regimen, patient demographics, variants, conflicts of interest, standard of care, and other factors. We provide analyses for specific outcomes and by treatment delay, and we aim to identify key characteristics in the forest plots and summaries. Results should be viewed in the context of study characteristics.

Some analyses classify treatment based on early or late administration, as done here, while others distinguish between mild, moderate, and severe cases. Viral load does not indicate degree of symptoms — for example patients may have a high viral load while being asymptomatic. With regard to treatments that have antiviral properties, timing of treatment is critical — late administration may be less helpful regardless of severity.

Details of treatment delay per patient is often not available. For example, a study may treat 90% of patients relatively early, but the events driving the outcome may come from 10% of patients treated very late. Our 5 day cutoff for early treatment may be too conservative, 5 days may be too late in many cases.

Comparison across treatments is confounded by differences in the studies performed, for example dose, variants, and conflicts of interest. Trials with conflicts of interest may use designs better suited to the preferred outcome.

In some cases, the most serious outcome has very few events, resulting in lower confidence results being used in pooled analysis, however the method is simpler and more transparent. This is less critical as the number of studies increases. Restriction to outcomes with sufficient power may be beneficial in pooled analysis and improve accuracy when there are few studies, however we maintain our pre-specified method to avoid any retrospective changes.



Studies show that combinations of treatments can be highly synergistic and may result in many times greater efficacy than individual treatments alone <sup>82-98</sup>. Therefore standard of care may be critical and benefits may diminish or disappear if standard of care does not include certain treatments.

This real-time analysis is constantly updated based on submissions. Accuracy benefits from widespread review and submission of updates and corrections from reviewers. Less popular treatments may receive fewer reviews.

No treatment or intervention is 100% available and effective for all current and future variants. Efficacy may vary significantly with different variants and within different populations. All treatments have potential side effects. Propensity to experience side effects may be predicted in advance by qualified physicians. We do not provide medical advice. Before taking any medication, consult a qualified physician who can compare all options, provide personalized advice, and provide details of risks and benefits based on individual medical history and situations.

### Notes

5 of 14 studies combine treatments. The results of nigella sativa alone may differ. 5 of 10 RCTs use combined treatment. Currently all studies are peer-reviewed. Other meta analyses show significant improvements with nigella sativa for mortality<sup>4,5</sup> and viral clearance<sup>5</sup>.

### Reviews

Many reviews cover nigella sativa for COVID-19, presenting additional background on mechanisms and related results, including <sup>112-119</sup>.

### Other studies

Additional preclinical or review papers suggesting potential benefits of nigella sativa for COVID-19 include <sup>134-162</sup>. We have not reviewed these studies in detail.

# Perspective

### Results compared with other treatments

SARS-CoV-2 infection and replication involves a complex interplay of 100+ host and viral proteins and other factors <sup>26-33</sup>, providing many therapeutic targets. Over 9,000 compounds have been predicted to reduce COVID-19 risk <sup>34</sup>, either by directly minimizing infection or replication, by supporting immune system function, or by minimizing secondary complications. Figure 26 shows an overview of the results for nigella sativa in the context of multiple COVID-19 treatments, and Figure 27 shows a plot of efficacy vs. cost for COVID-19 treatments.





Figure 26. Scatter plot showing results within the context of multiple COVID-19 treatments. Diamonds shows the results of random effects meta-analysis. 0.6% of 9,000+ proposed treatments show efficacy<sup>163</sup>.



Figure 27. Efficacy vs. cost for COVID-19 treatments.



# Conclusion

Studies to date suggest that nigella sativa is an effective treatment for COVID-19. Significantly lower risk is seen for ventilation, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance. 11 studies from 10 independent teams in 8 countries show significant benefit. Meta analysis using the most serious outcome reported shows 43% [24-57%] lower risk. Results are similar for Randomized Controlled Trials and higher quality studies. Early treatment is more effective than late treatment. Results are very robust — in exclusion sensitivity analysis 11 of 14 studies must be excluded to avoid finding statistically significant efficacy in pooled analysis.

Other meta analyses show significant improvements with nigella sativa for mortality<sup>4,5</sup> and viral clearance<sup>5</sup>.

# **Study Notes**

# Al-Haidari



Prophylaxis study with 376 mostly high-risk patients, 188 treated with nigella sativa, showing significantly lower cases with treatment. Black seeds 40mg/kg orally once daily.

### Al-Haidari



Open-label RCT with 419 patients in Iraq, 160 treated with Nigella Sativa, showing lower mortality and severe cases with treatment. Black seeds 40mg/kg orally once daily for 14 days.



# Aldwihi



Retrospective survey-based analysis of 738 COVID-19 patients in Saudi Arabia, showing lower hospitalization with vitamin C, turmeric, zinc, and nigella sativa, and higher hospitalization with vitamin D. For vitamin D, most patients continued prophylactic use. For vitamin C, the majority of patients continued prophylactic use. For nigella sativa, the majority of patients started use during infection. Authors do not specify the fraction of prophylactic use for turmeric and zinc.

### Ashraf



RCT with 157 patients treated with honey and nigella sativa, and 156 control patients, showing significantly faster recovery and viral clearance.

Honey (1gm/kg/day) plus encapsulated nigella sativa seeds (80mg/kg/day) orally in 2-3 divided doses daily for up to 13 days.



### Bencheqroun



52 patient RCT in the USA with nigella sativa component thymoquinone, showing improved recovery with treatment. There was a significantly faster decline in the total symptom burden, and a significant increase in CD8+ and helper CD4+ central memory T lymphocytes. The treatment group contained 5 more vaccinated patients and 7 more overweight patients. Authors also present in vitro results showing an inhibitory effect with five SARS-CoV-2 variants including omicron.

# Chandra



RCT 251 high-risk individuals in India, mostly with direct contact with COVID-19 positive patients, testing polyherbal formulations Infuza, which includes nigella sativa, and Kulzam. Both formulations showed lower risk, without statistical significance, while the best results were from the combination of both.



# Daneshfard



RCT 173 family members of COVID-19 patients, showing lower incidence of COVID-19 symptoms with nasal drops containing nigella sativa oil and olea europaea oil. One drop in each nostril twice daily for 7 days.

### Faruq



Open label randomized trial of 150 ICU patients in Bangladesh, showing shorter ICU stay and lower requirements for increased oxygen support including mechanical ventilation with nigella sativa treatment, but no significant difference in mortality.

The large baseline difference in convalescent plasma usage suggests an error or randomization problem.



### Idris



Prospective study of 51 mild COVID-19 cases in Nigeria, showing faster recovery and improved viral clearance with nigella sativa oil (NSO) treatment. NSO patients received 5mL twice daily in addition to usual care (zinc, vitamin C and a multivitamin).

# Karimi



RCT 358 hospitalized patients in Iran, 184 receiving treatment with a combination of nigella sativa and several other herbal medicines, showing shorter hospitalization time and improved recovery with treatment. IR.TUMS.VCR.REC.1399.024.

### Koshak





RCT 183 mild COVID-19 outpatients in Saudi Arabia, 91 treated with Nigella Sativa, showing lower hospitalization and faster recovery with treatment. 500mg Nigella Sativa oil (MARNYS Cuminmar) twice daily for 10 days. NCT04401202.

### Said



120 patient RCT comparing vitamin D, nigella sativa, and combined vitamin D+nigella sativa, showing improved symptom recovery and viral clearance with both vitamin D and nigella sativa, and further improvements with the combination of both. All patients received vitamin C, zinc, and lactoferrin.



# Setayesh

Nigella Sativa Setayesh et al. LATE TREATMENT RCT

		Improver	nent	Relative Ris	sk				
<u> </u>	Mortality	-8%							
0	Oxygen time	27%	-	•					
	Hospitalization time	29%	-	•-					
		C	0.5	1	1.5	2+			
			Favors	S	Favors				
			nigella sa	itiva	control				
Is <b>late</b> treatment with nigella sativa + combined treatments beneficial for COVID-19? RCT 79 patients in Iran (June - September 2020) Lower need for oxygen therapy (p=0.007) and shorter hospitalization (p<0.0001)									
Seta	Setayesh et al., Integrative Medicine, Jun 2022 <b>c19</b> early.org								

Small RCT 41 patients treated with nigella sativa, glycyrrhiza glabra, punica granatum, and rheum palmatum, and 41 control patients, showing shorter hospitalization with treatment.

### Shehab



Retrospective survey-based analysis of 349 COVID-19 patients, showing no significant difference with nigella sativa prophylaxis in unadjusted analysis. REC/UG/2020/03.

# Appendix 1. Methods and Data

We perform ongoing searches of PubMed, medRxiv, Europe PMC, ClinicalTrials.gov, The Cochrane Library, Google Scholar, Research Square, ScienceDirect, Oxford University Press, the reference lists of other studies and metaanalyses, and submissions to the site c19early.org. Search terms are nigella sativa and COVID-19 or SARS-CoV-2. Automated searches are performed twice daily, with all matches reviewed for inclusion. All studies regarding the use of nigella sativa for COVID-19 that report a comparison with a control group are included in the main analysis. Sensitivity analysis is performed, excluding studies with major issues, epidemiological studies, and studies with minimal available information. Studies with major unexplained data issues, for example major outcome data that is impossible to be correct with no response from the authors, are excluded. This is a living analysis and is updated regularly.

We extracted effect sizes and associated data from all studies. If studies report multiple kinds of effects then the most serious outcome is used in pooled analysis, while other outcomes are included in the outcome specific analyses. For example, if effects for mortality and cases are reported then they are both used in specific outcome analyses, while mortality is used for pooled analysis. If symptomatic results are reported at multiple times, we use the latest time, for example if mortality results are provided at 14 days and 28 days, the results at 28 days have preference. Mortality alone is preferred over combined outcomes. Outcomes with zero events in both arms are not used, the next most serious outcome with one or more events is used. For example, in low-risk populations with no mortality, a reduction in mortality with treatment is not possible, however a reduction in hospitalization, for example, is still valuable.



Clinical outcomes are considered more important than viral outcomes. When basically all patients recover in both treatment and control groups, preference for viral clearance and recovery is given to results mid-recovery where available. After most or all patients have recovered there is little or no room for an effective treatment to do better, however faster recovery is valuable. An IPD meta-analysis confirms that intermediate viral load reduction is more closely associated with hospitalization/death than later viral load reduction <sup>164</sup>. If only individual symptom data is available, the most serious symptom has priority, for example difficulty breathing or low SpO<sub>2</sub> is more important than cough. When results provide an odds ratio, we compute the relative risk when possible, or convert to a relative risk according to Zhang et al. Reported confidence intervals and p-values are used when available, and adjusted values are used when provided. If multiple types



Figure 28. Mid-recovery results can more accurately reflect efficacy when almost all patients recover. *Mateja* et al. confirm that intermediate viral load results more accurately reflect hospitalization/death.

of adjustments are reported propensity score matching and multivariable regression has preference over propensity score matching or weighting, which has preference over multivariable regression. Adjusted results have preference over unadjusted results for a more serious outcome when the adjustments significantly alter results. When needed, conversion between reported *p*-values and confidence intervals followed *Altman*, *Altman* (*B*), and Fisher's exact test was used to calculate *p*-values for event data. If continuity correction for zero values is required, we use the reciprocal of the opposite arm with the sum of the correction factors equal to  $1^{168}$ . Results are expressed with RR < 1.0 favoring treatment, and using the risk of a negative outcome when applicable (for example, the risk of death rather than the risk of survival). If studies only report relative continuous values such as relative times, the ratio of the time for the treatment group versus the time for the control group is used. Calculations are done in Python (3.13.5) with scipy (1.16.0), pythonmeta (1.26), numpy (2.3.1), statsmodels (0.14.4), and plotly (6.2.0).

Forest plots are computed using PythonMeta<sup>169</sup> with the DerSimonian and Laird random effects model (the fixed effect assumption is not plausible in this case) and inverse variance weighting. Results are presented with 95% confidence intervals. Heterogeneity among studies was assessed using the I<sup>2</sup> statistic. Mixed-effects meta-regression results are computed with R (4.4.0) using the metafor (4.6-0) and rms (6.8-0) packages, and using the most serious sufficiently powered outcome. For all statistical tests, a *p*-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Grobid 0.8.2 is used to parse PDF documents.

We have classified studies as early treatment if most patients are not already at a severe stage at the time of treatment (for example based on oxygen status or lung involvement), and treatment started within 5 days of the onset of symptoms. If studies contain a mix of early treatment and late treatment patients, we consider the treatment time of patients contributing most to the events (for example, consider a study where most patients are treated early but late treatment patients are included, and all mortality events were observed with late treatment patients). We note that a shorter time may be preferable. Antivirals are typically only considered effective when used within a shorter timeframe, for example 0-36 or 0-48 hours for oseltamivir, with longer delays not being effective <sup>67,68</sup>.

We received no funding, this research is done in our spare time. We have no affiliations with any pharmaceutical companies or political parties.

A summary of study results is below. Please submit updates and corrections at https://c19early.org/nsmeta.html.

# **Early treatment**

Effect extraction follows pre-specified rules as detailed above and gives priority to more serious outcomes. For pooled analyses, the first (most serious) outcome is used, which may differ from the effect a paper focuses on. Other outcomes are used in outcome specific analyses.

Al-Haidari, 1/31/2021, Randomized Controlled Trial, Iraq, peer-reviewed, 3 authors, study period 5 September, 2020 - 15 November, 2020. risk of death, 95.8% lower, RR 0.04, p = 0.001, treatment 0 of 160 (0.0%), control 14 of 259 (5.4%), NNT 18, relative risk is not 0 because of continuity correction due to zero events (with



	reciprocal of the contrasting arm).
	risk of severe case, 92.6% lower, RR 0.07, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 2 of 160 (1.2%), control 44 of 259 (17.0%), NNT 6.4.
Aldwihi, 5/11/2021, retrospective, Saudi Arabia, peer-reviewed, survey, mean age 36.5, 8 authors, study period August 2020 - October 2020.	risk of hospitalization, 24.0% lower, RR 0.76, <i>p</i> = 0.09, treatment 85 of 345 (24.6%), control 152 of 393 (38.7%), NNT 7.1, adjusted per study, odds ratio converted to relative risk, multivariable.
Ashraf, 11/3/2020, Randomized Controlled Trial, placebo-controlled, Pakistan, peer-reviewed, 29 authors, study period 30 April, 2020 - 29 July, 2020, this trial uses multiple treatments in the treatment arm (combined with honey) - results of individual treatments may vary, trial NCT04347382 (history) (HNS-COVID-PK).	risk of death, 81.9% lower, RR 0.18, p = 0.01, treatment 2 of 157 (1.3%), control 11 of 156 (7.1%), NNT 17, all cases.
	risk of death, 67.1% lower, RR 0.33, $p = 0.49$ , treatment 0 of 107 (0.0%), control 1 of 103 (1.0%), NNT 103, relative risk is not 0 because of continuity correction due to zero events (with reciprocal of the contrasting arm), moderate cases.
	risk of death, 78.8% lower, RR 0.21, <i>p</i> = 0.03, treatment 2 of 50 (4.0%), control 10 of 53 (18.9%), NNT 6.7, severe cases.
	risk of no recovery, 83.6% lower, HR 0.16, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 107, control 103, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, moderate cases.
	risk of no recovery, 75.2% lower, HR 0.25, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 50, control 53, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, severe cases.
	risk of no viral clearance, 81.9% lower, HR 0.18, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 107, control 103, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, moderate cases.
	risk of no viral clearance, 76.9% lower, HR 0.23, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 50, control 53, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, severe cases.
Bencheqroun, 5/7/2022, Double Blind Randomized Controlled Trial, placebo-controlled, USA, peer- reviewed, mean age 45.0, 25 authors, study period 27 May, 2021 - 27 September, 2021, trial NCT04914377 (history) (BOSS-001).	risk of hospitalization, 69.3% lower, RR 0.31, $p = 0.44$ , treatment 0 of 29 (0.0%), control 1 of 23 (4.3%), NNT 23, relative risk is not 0 because of continuity correction due to zero events (with reciprocal of the contrasting arm).
	time to sustained clinical response, 9.1% lower, HR 0.91, <i>p</i> = 0.78, treatment 28, control 23, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, Kaplan–Meier.
	time to sustained clinical response, 35.5% lower, HR 0.65, <i>p</i> = 0.25, treatment 28, control 23, inverted to make HR<1 favor treatment, Kaplan–Meier, high-risk patients.
	risk of no viral clearance, 43.5% lower, RR 0.57, <i>p</i> = 0.31, treatment 5 of 21 (23.8%), control 8 of 19 (42.1%), NNT 5.5, day 14.
<i>Idris</i> , 1/15/2024, prospective, Nigeria, peer- reviewed, mean age 30.8, 8 authors, study period 27 October, 2020 - 20 May, 2021.	recovery time, 39.0% lower, relative time 0.61, $p = 0.003$ , treatment mean 4.5 (±1.51) n=26, control mean 7.38 (±2.2) n=25.
	risk of no viral clearance, 15.4% lower, RR 0.85, <i>p</i> = 1.00, treatment 3 of 13 (23.1%), control 6 of 22 (27.3%), NNT 24, day 5.
	L



	risk of no viral clearance, 40.5% lower, RR 0.60, <i>p</i> = 0.02, treatment 13 of 26 (50.0%), control 21 of 25 (84.0%), NNT 2.9, day 2.
Koshak, 8/15/2021, Randomized Controlled Trial, Saudi Arabia, peer-reviewed, 10 authors, study period 1 May, 2020 - 30 September, 2020, trial NCT04401202 (history).	risk of hospitalization, 74.7% lower, RR 0.25, $p = 0.37$ , treatment 1 of 91 (1.1%), control 4 of 92 (4.3%), NNT 31.
	risk of no recovery, 42.7% lower, RR 0.57, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 34 of 91 (37.4%), control 60 of 92 (65.2%), NNT 3.6.
Said (B), 11/8/2022, Randomized Controlled Trial, Egypt, peer-reviewed, 5 authors, study period 21 July, 2021 - 30 December, 2021, trial NCT04981743 (history).	risk of no recovery, 77.0% lower, OR 0.23, $p = 0.09$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, multivariable, dyspnea, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 89.0% lower, OR 0.11, <i>p</i> = 0.01, treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, dyspnea, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 80.0% lower, OR 0.20, $p = 0.003$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, multivariable, cough, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 77.0% lower, OR 0.23, $p = 0.01$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, cough, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 85.0% lower, OR 0.15, $p = 0.003$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, multivariable, fatigue, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 90.0% lower, OR 0.10, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, fatigue, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 85.0% lower, OR 0.15, $p = 0.04$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, multivariable, smell, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 67.0% lower, OR 0.33, $p = 0.23$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, smell, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 58.0% lower, OR 0.42, $p = 0.28$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, multivariable, taste, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 58.0% lower, OR 0.42, $p = 0.28$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, taste, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 82.0% lower, OR 0.18, $p = 0.05$ , treatment 30, control 30, sore throat, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 86.0% lower, OR 0.14, $p = 0.03$ , treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, sore throat, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 27.0% lower, OR 0.73, $p = 0.62$ , treatment 30, control 30, headache, RR approximated with OR.
	risk of no recovery, 56.0% lower, OR 0.44, $p$ = 0.21, treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, headache, RR approximated with OR.



risk of no recovery, 80.0% lower, OR 0.20, <i>p</i> = 0.05, treatment 30, control 30, diarrhea, RR approximated with OR.
risk of no recovery, 90.0% lower, OR 0.10, <i>p</i> = 0.03, treatment 30, control 30, adjusted per study, vitamin D and nigella sativa, multivariable, diarrhea, RR approximated with OR.
risk of no viral clearance, 61.0% lower, OR 0.39, <i>p</i> = 0.08, treatment 30, control 30, day 14, RR approximated with OR.
risk of no viral clearance, 85.0% lower, OR 0.15, <i>p</i> = 0.004, treatment 30, control 30, day 7, RR approximated with OR.
risk of no viral clearance, 91.0% lower, OR 0.09, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 30, control 30, vitamin D and nigella sativa, day 14, RR approximated with OR.
risk of no viral clearance, 87.0% lower, OR 0.13, <i>p</i> = 0.003, treatment 30, control 30, vitamin D and nigella sativa, day 7, RR approximated with OR.

# Late treatment

Effect extraction follows pre-specified rules as detailed above and gives priority to more serious outcomes. For pooled analyses, the first (most serious) outcome is used, which may differ from the effect a paper focuses on. Other outcomes are used in outcome specific analyses.

Faruq, 9/1/2023, Randomized Controlled Trial, Bangladesh, peer-reviewed, 4 authors, excluded in exclusion analyses: potential data issue.	risk of death, 6.5% lower, RR 0.94, <i>p</i> = 0.87, treatment 29 of 75 (38.7%), control 31 of 75 (41.3%), NNT 37.
	risk of mechanical ventilation, 61.9% lower, RR 0.38, $p = 0.01$ , treatment 8 of 75 (10.7%), control 21 of 75 (28.0%), NNT 5.8, day 14.
	risk of mechanical ventilation, 83.3% lower, RR 0.17, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 3 of 75 (4.0%), control 18 of 75 (24.0%), NNT 5.0, day 7.
	ICU stay, 23.5% lower, RR 0.77, <i>p</i> = 0.74, treatment 4 of 46 (8.7%), control 5 of 44 (11.4%), NNT 37, >28 days.
	ICU stay, 28.3% lower, RR 0.72, <i>p</i> = 0.46, treatment 9 of 46 (19.6%), control 12 of 44 (27.3%), NNT 13, >21 days.
	ICU stay, 33.6% lower, RR 0.66, <i>p</i> = 0.007, treatment 25 of 46 (54.3%), control 36 of 44 (81.8%), NNT 3.6, >14 days.
	ICU stay, 6.6% lower, RR 0.93, <i>p</i> = 0.43, treatment 41 of 46 (89.1%), control 42 of 44 (95.5%), NNT 16, >7 days.
<i>Karimi</i> , 10/4/2021, Randomized Controlled Trial, Iran, peer-reviewed, 37 authors, study period March 2020 - July 2020, this trial uses multiple treatments in the treatment arm (combined with several herbal medicines) - results of individual treatments may vary.	risk of death, 50.8% lower, RR 0.49, <i>p</i> = 0.45, treatment 2 of 192 (1.0%), control 4 of 189 (2.1%), NNT 93.
	risk of ICU admission, 60.6% lower, RR 0.39, p = 0.28, treatment 2 of 192 (1.0%), control 5 of 189 (2.6%), NNT 62.
	hospitalization time, 70.0% lower, HR 0.30, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 184, control 174, Cox proportional hazards, primary outcome.



	fever, 66.5% lower, OR 0.33, $p = 0.001$ , treatment 184, control 174, inverted to make OR<1 favor treatment, RR approximated with OR.
	dyspnea, 13.7% lower, OR 0.86, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 184, control 174, inverted to make OR<1 favor treatment, RR approximated with OR.
Setayesh, 6/3/2022, Randomized Controlled Trial, Iran, peer-reviewed, mean age 59.1, 7 authors, study period June 2020 - September 2020, this trial uses multiple treatments in the treatment arm (combined with glycyrrhiza glabra, punica granatum, and rheum palmatum) - results of individual treatments may vary, trial IRCT20200330046899N1.	risk of death, 7.9% higher, RR 1.08, <i>p</i> = 1.00, treatment 1 of 38 (2.6%), control 1 of 41 (2.4%).
	oxygen time, 26.8% lower, relative time 0.73, $p = 0.007$ , treatment mean 3.0 (±1.6) n=38, control mean 4.1 (±1.9) n=41.
	hospitalization time, 28.7% lower, relative time 0.71, $p < 0.001$ , treatment mean 5.7 (±1.9) n=38, control mean 8.0 (±1.8) n=41.

# Prophylaxis

Effect extraction follows pre-specified rules as detailed above and gives priority to more serious outcomes. For pooled analyses, the first (most serious) outcome is used, which may differ from the effect a paper focuses on. Other outcomes are used in outcome specific analyses.

Al-Haidari (B), 1/31/2021, prospective, Iraq, peer- reviewed, 3 authors.	risk of symptomatic case, 62.2% lower, RR 0.38, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 68 of 188 (36.2%), control 180 of 188 (95.7%), NNT 1.7.
<i>Chandra</i> , 7/5/2022, Randomized Controlled Trial, India, peer-reviewed, 12 authors, study period 18 September, 2020 - 21 May, 2021, this trial uses multiple treatments in the treatment arm (combined with Infuza polyherbal formulation) - results of individual treatments may vary, trial CTRI/2020/08/027222.	risk of case, 49.0% lower, RR 0.51, <i>p</i> = 0.36, treatment 4 of 52 (7.7%), control 8 of 53 (15.1%), NNT 14, Infuza.
	risk of case, 87.0% lower, RR 0.13, <i>p</i> = 0.03, treatment 1 of 51 (2.0%), control 8 of 53 (15.1%), NNT 7.6, Infuza and Kulzam.
	risk of case, 74.0% lower, RR 0.26, <i>p</i> = 0.09, treatment 2 of 51 (3.9%), control 8 of 53 (15.1%), NNT 9.0, Kulzam.
Daneshfard, 7/16/2023, Randomized Controlled Trial, Iran, peer-reviewed, mean age 39.5 (treatment) 34.0 (control), 16 authors, study period 16 June, 2021 - 22 May, 2022, this trial uses multiple treatments in the treatment arm (combined with olea europaea oil) - results of individual treatments may vary, trial IRCT20210515051305N1.	risk of symptomatic case, 34.1% lower, RR 0.66, $p = 0.006$ , treatment 37 of 89 (41.6%), control 53 of 84 (63.1%), NNT 4.6, any symptom.
	risk of symptomatic case, 97.3% lower, RR 0.03, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 1 of 89 (1.1%), control 35 of 84 (41.7%), NNT 2.5, fever.
	risk of symptomatic case, 65.7% lower, RR 0.34, <i>p</i> = 0.06, treatment 4 of 89 (4.5%), control 11 of 84 (13.1%), NNT 12, chest pain.
	risk of symptomatic case, 62.2% lower, RR 0.38, $p = 0.10$ , treatment 4 of 89 (4.5%), control 10 of 84 (11.9%), NNT 13, loss of taste/smell.
	risk of symptomatic case, 26.0% lower, RR 0.74, $p$ = 0.16, treatment 29 of 89 (32.6%), control 37 of 84 (44.0%), NNT 8.7, muscle ache.
	risk of symptomatic case, 6.2% higher, RR 1.06, <i>p</i> = 1.00, treatment 9 of 89 (10.1%), control 8 of 84 (9.5%), chills.



	risk of symptomatic case, 79.0% lower, RR 0.21, <i>p</i> = 0.001, treatment 4 of 89 (4.5%), control 18 of 84 (21.4%), NNT 5.9, cough.
	risk of symptomatic case, 76.4% lower, RR 0.24, <i>p</i> < 0.001, treatment 5 of 89 (5.6%), control 20 of 84 (23.8%), NNT 5.5, headache.
	risk of symptomatic case, 98.1% lower, RR 0.02, $p < 0.001$ , treatment 0 of 89 (0.0%), control 25 of 84 (29.8%), NNT 3.4, relative risk is not 0 because of continuity correction due to zero events (with reciprocal of the contrasting arm), vomiting.
Shehab, 2/28/2022, retrospective, multiple countries, peer-reviewed, survey, 7 authors, study period September 2020 - March 2021, excluded in exclusion analyses: unadjusted results with no group details.	risk of severe case, 0.2% lower, RR 1.00, <i>p</i> = 1.00, treatment 4 of 39 (10.3%), control 22 of 214 (10.3%), NNT 4173, unadjusted, severe vs. mild cases.

# **Supplementary Data**

Supplementary Data

# Footnotes

a. Viral infection and replication involves attachment, entry, uncoating and release, genome replication and transcription, translation and protein processing, assembly and budding, and release. Each step can be disrupted by therapeutics.

# References

- Crawford et al., Analysis of Select Dietary Supplement Products Marketed to Support or Boost the Immune System, JAMA Network Open, doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.26040.
- Crighton et al., Toxicological screening and DNA sequencing detects contamination and adulteration in regulated herbal medicines and supplements for diet, weight loss and cardiovascular health, Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, doi:10.1016/j.jpba.2019.112834.
- Chanyandura et al., Evaluation of The Pharmaceutical Quality of the Most Commonly Purchased Vitamin C (Ascorbic Acid) Formulations in COVID-19 Infection in South Africa, J. Basic Appl. Pharm. Sci., doi:10.33790/jbaps1100105.
- Kow et al., The effect of Nigella sativa on the risk of mortality in patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and metaanalysis of randomized trials, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7743.
- Umer et al., Nigella sativa for the treatment of COVID-19 patients: A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Food Science & Nutrition, doi:10.1002/fsn3.3906.

- Ryu et al., Fibrin drives thromboinflammation and neuropathology in COVID-19, Nature, doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07873-4.
- Rong et al., Persistence of spike protein at the skull-meningesbrain axis may contribute to the neurological sequelae of COVID-19, Cell Host & Microbe, doi:10.1016/j.chom.2024.11.007.
- 8. **Yang** et al., SARS-CoV-2 infection causes dopaminergic neuron senescence, Cell Stem Cell, doi:10.1016/j.stem.2023.12.012.
- Scardua-Silva et al., Microstructural brain abnormalities, fatigue, and cognitive dysfunction after mild COVID-19, Scientific Reports, doi:10.1038/s41598-024-52005-7.
- Hampshire et al., Cognition and Memory after Covid-19 in a Large Community Sample, New England Journal of Medicine, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2311330.
- Duloquin et al., Is COVID-19 Infection a Multiorganic Disease? Focus on Extrapulmonary Involvement of SARS-CoV-2, Journal of Clinical Medicine, doi:10.3390/jcm13051397.
- Sodagar et al., Pathological Features and Neuroinflammatory Mechanisms of SARS-CoV-2 in the Brain and Potential Therapeutic Approaches, Biomolecules, doi:10.3390/biom12070971.



- 13. **Sagar** et al., COVID-19-associated cerebral microbleeds in the general population, Brain Communications, doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcae127.
- Verma et al., Persistent Neurological Deficits in Mouse PASC Reveal Antiviral Drug Limitations, bioRxiv, doi:10.1101/2024.06.02.596989.
- Panagea et al., Neurocognitive Impairment in Long COVID: A Systematic Review, Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, doi:10.1093/arclin/acae042.
- Ariza et al., COVID-19: Unveiling the Neuropsychiatric Maze — From Acute to Long-Term Manifestations, Biomedicines, doi:10.3390/biomedicines12061147.
- Vashisht et al., Neurological Complications of COVID-19: Unraveling the Pathophysiological Underpinnings and Therapeutic Implications, Viruses, doi:10.3390/v16081183.
- Ahmad et al., Neurological Complications and Outcomes in Critically III Patients With COVID-19: Results From International Neurological Study Group From the COVID-19 Critical Care Consortium, The Neurohospitalist, doi:10.1177/19418744241292487.
- 19. **Wang** et al., SARS-CoV-2 membrane protein induces neurodegeneration via affecting Golgi-mitochondria interaction, Translational Neurodegeneration, doi:10.1186/s40035-024-00458-1.
- 20. **Eberhardt** et al., SARS-CoV-2 infection triggers proatherogenic inflammatory responses in human coronary vessels, Nature Cardiovascular Research, doi:10.1038/s44161-023-00336-5.
- 21. **Van Tin** et al., Spike Protein of SARS-CoV-2 Activates Cardiac Fibrogenesis through NLRP3 Inflammasomes and NF-κB Signaling, Cells, doi:10.3390/cells13161331.
- Borka Balas et al., COVID-19 and Cardiac Implications—Still a Mystery in Clinical Practice, Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine, doi:10.31083/j.rcm2405125.
- 23. AlTaweel et al., An In-Depth Insight into Clinical, Cellular and Molecular Factors in COVID19-Associated Cardiovascular Ailments for Identifying Novel Disease Biomarkers, Drug Targets and Clinical Management Strategies, Archives of Microbiology & Immunology, doi:10.26502/ami.936500177.
- 24. Saha et al., COVID-19 beyond the lungs: Unraveling its vascular impact and cardiovascular complications mechanisms and therapeutic implications, Science Progress, doi:10.1177/00368504251322069.
- Trender et al., Changes in memory and cognition during the SARS-CoV-2 human challenge study, eClinicalMedicine, doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102842.
- 26. **Dugied** et al., Multimodal SARS-CoV-2 interactome sketches the virus-host spatial organization, Communications Biology, doi:10.1038/s42003-025-07933-z.
- Malone et al., Structures and functions of coronavirus replication-transcription complexes and their relevance for SARS-CoV-2 drug design, Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, doi:10.1038/s41580-021-00432-z.
- Murigneux et al., Proteomic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 particles unveils a key role of G3BP proteins in viral assembly, Nature Communications, doi:10.1038/s41467-024-44958-0.

- 29. Lv et al., Host proviral and antiviral factors for SARS-CoV-2, Virus Genes, doi:10.1007/s11262-021-01869-2.
- Lui et al., Nsp1 facilitates SARS-CoV-2 replication through calcineurin-NFAT signaling, Virology, doi:10.1128/mbio.00392-24.
- Niarakis et al., Drug-target identification in COVID-19 disease mechanisms using computational systems biology approaches, Frontiers in Immunology, doi:10.3389/fimmu.2023.1282859.
- 32. **Katiyar** et al., SARS-CoV-2 Assembly: Gaining Infectivity and Beyond, Viruses, doi:10.3390/v16111648.
- Wu et al., Decoding the genome of SARS-CoV-2: a pathway to drug development through translation inhibition, RNA Biology, doi:10.1080/15476286.2024.2433830.
- 34. c19early.org, c19early.org/treatments.html.
- 35. Rahman et al., In silico Screening of Potential Drug Candidate against Chain a of Coronavirus Binding Protein from Major Nigella Bioactive Compounds, Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports, doi:10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i7697.
- Zafar Nayak Snehasis, S., Molecular Docking to Discover Potential Bio-Extract Substitutes for Hydroxychloroquine against COVID-19 and Malaria, International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), doi:10.21275/SR24323192940.
- 37. **Alkafaas** et al., A study on the effect of natural products against the transmission of B.1.1.529 Omicron, Virology Journal, doi:10.1186/s12985-023-02160-6.
- Ali et al., Computational Prediction of Nigella sativa Compounds as Potential Drug Agents for Targeting Spike Protein of SARS-CoV-2, Pakistan BioMedical Journal, doi:10.54393/pbmj.v6i3.853.
- Miraz et al., Nigelladine A among Selected Compounds from Nigella sativa Exhibits Propitious Interaction with Omicron Variant of SARS-CoV-2: An In Silico Study, International Journal of Clinical Practice, doi:10.1155/2023/9917306.
- Sherwani et al., Pharmacological Profile of Nigella sativa Seeds in Combating COVID-19 through In-Vitro and Molecular Docking Studies, Processes, doi:10.3390/pr10071346.
- Khan et al., Inhibitory effect of thymoquinone from Nigella sativa against SARS-CoV-2 main protease. An in-silico study, Brazilian Journal of Biology, doi:10.1590/1519-6984.25066.
- 42. **Esharkawy** et al., In vitro Potential Antiviral SARS-CoV-19-Activity of Natural Product Thymohydroquinone and Dithymoquinone from Nigela sativia, Bioorganic Chemistry, doi:10.1016/j.bioorg.2021.105587.
- Banerjee et al., Nigellidine (Nigella sativa, black-cumin seed) docking to SARS CoV-2 nsp3 and host inflammatory proteins may inhibit viral replication/transcription, Natural Product Research, doi:10.1080/14786419.2021.2018430.
- 44. Rizvi et al., Identifying the Most Potent Dual-Targeting Compound(s) against 3CLprotease and NSP15exonuclease of SARS-CoV-2 from Nigella sativa: Virtual Screening via Physicochemical Properties, Docking and Dynamic Simulation Analysis, Processes, doi:10.3390/pr9101814.



- 45. **Mir** et al., Identification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA-dependent RNA polymerase inhibitors from the major phytochemicals of Nigella sativa: An in silico approach, Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, doi:10.1016/j.sjbs.2021.09.002.
- Hardianto et al., Exploring the Potency of Nigella sativa Seed in Inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 Main Protease Using Molecular Docking and Molecular Dynamics Simulations, Indonesian Journal of Chemistry, doi:10.22146/ijc.65951.
- 47. **Maiti** et al., Active-site Molecular docking of Nigellidine to nucleocapsid/Nsp2/Nsp3/MPro of COVID-19 and to human IL1R and TNFR1/2 may stop viral-growth/cytokine-flood, and the drug source Nigella sativa (black cumin) seeds show potent antioxidant role in experimental rats, Research Square, doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-26464/v1.
- Duru et al., In silico identification of compounds from Nigella sativa seed oil as potential inhibitors of SARS-CoV-2 targets, Bulletin of the National Research Centre, doi:10.1186/s42269-021-00517-x.
- 49. **Bouchentouf** et al., Identification of Compounds from Nigella Sativa as New Potential Inhibitors of 2019 Novel Coronasvirus (Covid-19): Molecular Docking Study, ChemRxiv, doi:10.26434/chemrxiv.12055716.v1.
- Ali (B) et al., In vitro inhibitory effect of Nigella sativa L. extracts on SARS-COV-2 spike protein-ACE2 interaction, Current Therapeutic Research, doi:10.1016/j.curtheres.2024.100759.
- Bostancıklıoğlu et al., Nigella sativa, Anthemis hyaline and Citrus sinensis extracts reduce SARS-CoV-2 replication by fluctuating Rho GTPase, PI3K-AKT, and MAPK/ERK pathways in HeLa-CEACAM1a cells, Gene, doi:10.1016/j.gene.2024.148366.
- 52. **Maen** et al., Individual ingredients of NP-101 (Thymoquinone formula) inhibit SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus infection, Frontiers in Pharmacology, doi:10.3389/fphar.2024.1291212.
- Saghghaei et al., Protective effects of Nigella sativa oil thymoquinone and dexamethasone on bleomycin-induced lung fibrosis in rats, Veterinary Research Forum, doi:10.30466/vrf.2024.2024154.4196.
- 54. Thomas et al., A phase I clinical trial to evaluate the safety of thymoquinone -rich black cumin oil (BlaQmax®) on healthy subjects: Randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled prospective study, Toxicology Reports, doi:10.1016/j.toxrep.2022.04.020.
- Jadad et al., Randomized Controlled Trials: Questions, Answers, and Musings, Second Edition, doi:10.1002/9780470691922.
- Gøtzsche, P., Bias in double-blind trials, Doctoral Thesis, University of Copenhagen, www.scientificfreedom.dk/2023/05/16/bias-in-double-blind-trial s-doctoral-thesis/.
- 57. **Als-Nielsen** et al., Association of Funding and Conclusions in Randomized Drug Trials, JAMA, doi:10.1001/jama.290.7.921.
- 58. c19early.org (B), c19early.org/nssupp.html#fig\_rctobs.
- 59. **Concato** et al., NEJM, 342:1887-1892, doi:10.1056/NEJM200006223422507.

- 60. **Anglemyer** et al., Healthcare outcomes assessed with observational study designs compared with those assessed in randomized trials, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, Issue 4, doi:10.1002/14651858.MR000034.pub2.
- 61. c19early.org (C), c19early.org/rctobs.html.
- 62. Lee et al., Analysis of Overall Level of Evidence Behind Infectious Diseases Society of America Practice Guidelines, Arch Intern Med., 2011, 171:1, 18-22, doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2010.482.
- 63. **Deaton** et al., Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials, Social Science & Medicine, 210, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.005.
- 64. **Nichol** et al., Challenging issues in randomised controlled trials, Injury, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.03.033, www.injuryjournal.com/article/S0020-1383(10)00233-0/fulltex t.
- 65. **Faruq** et al., Role of Nigella Sativa (black cumin seeds)as an adjunct therapy in treating severe and critical COVID-19 infection compared to those with standard therapy : An open label randomized clinical trial, Bangladesh Critical Care Journal, doi:10.3329/bccj.v11i2.69187.
- 66. Shehab et al., Immune-boosting effect of natural remedies and supplements on progress of, and recovery from COVID-19 infection, Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, doi:10.4314/tjpr.v21i2.13.
- 67. **Treanor** et al., Efficacy and Safety of the Oral Neuraminidase Inhibitor Oseltamivir in Treating Acute Influenza: A Randomized Controlled Trial, JAMA, 2000, 283:8, 1016-1024, doi:10.1001/jama.283.8.1016.
- McLean et al., Impact of Late Oseltamivir Treatment on Influenza Symptoms in the Outpatient Setting: Results of a Randomized Trial, Open Forum Infect. Dis. September 2015, 2:3, doi:10.1093/ofid/ofv100.
- Ikematsu et al., Baloxavir Marboxil for Prophylaxis against Influenza in Household Contacts, New England Journal of Medicine, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1915341.
- Hayden et al., Baloxavir Marboxil for Uncomplicated Influenza in Adults and Adolescents, New England Journal of Medicine, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1716197.
- 71. **Kumar** et al., Combining baloxavir marboxil with standard-ofcare neuraminidase inhibitor in patients hospitalised with severe influenza (FLAGSTONE): a randomised, parallel-group, double-blind, placebo-controlled, superiority trial, The Lancet Infectious Diseases, doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00469-2.
- López-Medina et al., Effect of Ivermectin on Time to Resolution of Symptoms Among Adults With Mild COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial, JAMA, doi:10.1001/jama.2021.3071.
- 73. **Korves** et al., SARS-CoV-2 Genetic Variants and Patient Factors Associated with Hospitalization Risk, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2024.03.08.24303818.
- 74. **Faria** et al., Genomics and epidemiology of the P.1 SARS-CoV-2 lineage in Manaus, Brazil, Science, doi:10.1126/science.abh2644.
- 75. **Nonaka** et al., SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern P.1 (Gamma) infection in young and middle-aged patients admitted to the intensive care units of a single hospital in Salvador, Northeast



Brazil, February 2021, International Journal of Infectious Diseases, doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.08.003.

- 76. **Karita** et al., Trajectory of viral load in a prospective population-based cohort with incident SARS-CoV-2 G614 infection, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2021.08.27.21262754.
- 77. Zavascki et al., Advanced ventilatory support and mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 caused by Gamma (P.1) variant of concern compared to other lineages: cohort study at a reference center in Brazil, Research Square, doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-910467/v1.
- 78. Willett et al., The hyper-transmissible SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant exhibits significant antigenic change, vaccine escape and a switch in cell entry mechanism, medRxiv, doi:10.1101/2022.01.03.21268111.
- Peacock et al., The SARS-CoV-2 variant, Omicron, shows rapid replication in human primary nasal epithelial cultures and efficiently uses the endosomal route of entry, bioRxiv, doi:10.1101/2021.12.31.474653.
- Williams, T., Not All Ivermectin Is Created Equal: Comparing The Quality of 11 Different Ivermectin Sources, Do Your Own Research, doyourownresearch.substack.com/p/not-all-ivermectin-is-create d-equal.
- Xu et al., A study of impurities in the repurposed COVID-19 drug hydroxychloroquine sulfate by UHPLC-Q/TOF-MS and LC-SPE-NMR, Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry, doi:10.1002/rcm.9358.
- Jitobaom et al., Favipiravir and Ivermectin Showed in Vitro Synergistic Antiviral Activity against SARS-CoV-2, Research Square, doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-941811/v1.
- Jitobaom (B) et al., Synergistic anti-SARS-CoV-2 activity of repurposed anti-parasitic drug combinations, BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology, doi:10.1186/s40360-022-00580-8.
- Jeffreys et al., Remdesivir-ivermectin combination displays synergistic interaction with improved in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2, International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents, doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2022.106542.
- 85. **Ostrov** et al., Highly Specific Sigma Receptor Ligands Exhibit Anti-Viral Properties in SARS-CoV-2 Infected Cells, Pathogens, doi:10.3390/pathogens10111514.
- Alsaidi et al., Griffithsin and Carrageenan Combination Results in Antiviral Synergy against SARS-CoV-1 and 2 in a Pseudoviral Model, Marine Drugs, doi:10.3390/md19080418.
- Andreani et al., In vitro testing of combined hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic effect, Microbial Pathogenesis, doi:10.1016/j.micpath.2020.104228.
- De Forni et al., Synergistic drug combinations designed to fully suppress SARS-CoV-2 in the lung of COVID-19 patients, PLoS ONE, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0276751.
- Wan et al., Synergistic inhibition effects of andrographolide and baicalin on coronavirus mechanisms by downregulation of ACE2 protein level, Scientific Reports, doi:10.1038/s41598-024-54722-5.

- 90. Said et al., The effect of Nigella sativa and vitamin D3 supplementation on the clinical outcome in COVID-19 patients: A randomized controlled clinical trial, Frontiers in Pharmacology, doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.1011522.
- Fiaschi et al., In Vitro Combinatorial Activity of Direct Acting Antivirals and Monoclonal Antibodies against the Ancestral B.1 and BQ.1.1 SARS-CoV-2 Viral Variants, Viruses, doi:10.3390/v16020168.
- Xing et al., Published anti-SARS-CoV-2 in vitro hits share common mechanisms of action that synergize with antivirals, Briefings in Bioinformatics, doi:10.1093/bib/bbab249.
- Chen et al., Synergistic Inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 Replication Using Disulfiram/Ebselen and Remdesivir, ACS Pharmacology & Translational Science, doi:10.1021/acsptsci.1c00022.
- 94. **Hempel** et al., Synergistic inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 cell entry by otamixaban and covalent protease inhibitors: pre-clinical assessment of pharmacological and molecular properties, Chemical Science, doi:10.1039/D1SC01494C.
- Schultz et al., Pyrimidine inhibitors synergize with nucleoside analogues to block SARS-CoV-2, Nature, doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04482-x.
- Ohashi et al., Potential anti-COVID-19 agents, cepharanthine and nelfinavir, and their usage for combination treatment, iScience, doi:10.1016/j.isci.2021.102367.
- 97. Al Krad et al., The protease inhibitor Nirmatrelvir synergizes with inhibitors of GRP78 to suppress SARS-CoV-2 replication, bioRxiv, doi:10.1101/2025.03.09.642200.
- Thairu et al., A Comparison of Ivermectin and Non Ivermectin Based Regimen for COVID-19 in Abuja: Effects on Virus Clearance, Days-to-discharge and Mortality, Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International, doi:10.9734/jpri/2022/v34i44A36328.
- 99. Singh et al., The relationship between viral clearance rates and disease progression in early symptomatic COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-regression analysis, Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy, doi:10.1093/jac/dkae045.
- Meneguesso, A., Médica defende tratamento precoce da Covid-19, www.youtube.com/watch?v=X5FCrIm\_19U.
- 101. **Boulware**, D., Comments regarding paper rejection, twitter.com/boulware\_dr/status/1311331372884205570.
- 102. Meeus, G., Online Comment, twitter.com/gertmeeus\_MD/status/1386636373889781761.
- 103. twitter.com, twitter.com/KashPrime/status/1768487878454124914.
- 104. Rothstein, H., Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis: Prevention, Assessment and Adjustments, www.wiley.com/en-ae/Publication+Bias+in+Meta+Analysis:+Pr evention,+Assessment+and+Adjustments-p-9780470870143.
- 105. **Stanley** et al., Meta-regression approximations to reduce publication selection bias, Research Synthesis Methods, doi:10.1002/jrsm.1095.
- 106. **Rücker** et al., Arcsine test for publication bias in metaanalyses with binary outcomes, Statistics in Medicine, doi:10.1002/sim.2971.



- 107. **Peters**, J., Comparison of Two Methods to Detect Publication Bias in Meta-analysis, JAMA, doi:10.1001/jama.295.6.676.
- 108. **Moreno** et al., Assessment of regression-based methods to adjust for publication bias through a comprehensive simulation study, BMC Medical Research Methodology, doi:10.1186/1471-2288-9-2.
- 109. **Macaskill** et al., A comparison of methods to detect publication bias in meta-analysis, Statistics in Medicine, doi:10.1002/sim.698.
- 110. **Egger** et al., Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test, BMJ, doi:10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.
- 111. **Harbord** et al., A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses of controlled trials with binary endpoints, Statistics in Medicine, doi:10.1002/sim.2380.
- 112. **Alsalahi** et al., Immune stimulatory effect of Nigella sativa in healthy animal models: A systematic review and metaanalysis, Heliyon, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27390.
- 113. Donzelli, A., Neglected Effective Early Therapies against COVID-19: Focus on Functional Foods and Related Active Substances. A Review, MDPI AG, doi:10.20944/preprints202312.1178.v1.
- 114. Cyril et al., Nigella sativa and its chemical constituents: preclinical and clinical evidence for their potential anti-SARS-CoV-2 effects, Inflammopharmacology, doi:10.1007/s10787-023-01385-9.
- 115. Al-Gabri et al., Therapeutic Potential of Thymoquinone and Its Nanoformulations in Pulmonary Injury: A Comprehensive Review, International Journal of Nanomedicine, doi:10.2147/IJN.S314321.
- 116. **Ahmad (B)** et al., The potential role of thymoquinone in preventing the cardiovascular complications of COVID-19, Vascular Pharmacology, doi:10.1016/j.vph.2021.106899.
- 117. **Shad** et al., The role of thymoquinone, a major constituent of Nigella sativa, in the treatment of inflammatory and infectious diseases, Clinical and Experimental Pharmacology and Physiology, doi:10.1111/1440-1681.13553.
- 118. **Kulyar** et al., Potential influence of Nagella sativa (Black cumin) in reinforcing immune system: A hope to decelerate the COVID-19 pandemic, Phytomedicine, doi:10.1016/j.phymed.2020.153277.
- 119. **Ahmad (C)** et al., Covid-19 and thymoquinone: Connecting the dots, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.6793.
- 120. **Idris** et al., Nigella sativa oil (NSO) as an adjuvant in the management of mild COVID-19 infection in Kaduna state, The Nigerian Health Journal, doi:10.60787/tnhj-712.
- 121. **Said (B)** et al., The effect of Nigella sativa and vitamin D3 supplementation on the clinical outcome in COVID-19 patients: A randomized controlled clinical trial, Frontiers in Pharmacology, doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.1011522.
- 122. **Bin Abdulrahman** et al., The Effect of Short Treatment with Nigella Sativa on Symptoms, the Cluster of Differentiation (CD) Profile, and Inflammatory Markers in Mild COVID-19 Patients: A Randomized, Double-Blind Controlled Trial, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, doi:10.3390/ijerph191811798.

- 123. **Bencheqroun** et al., A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Multicenter Study to Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of ThymoQuinone Formula (TQF) for Treating Outpatient SARS-CoV-2, Pathogens, doi:10.3390/pathogens11050551.
- 124. Koshak et al., Nigella sativa for the treatment of COVID-19: An open-label randomized controlled clinical trial, Complementary Therapies in Medicine, doi:10.1016/j.ctim.2021.102769.
- 125. **Aldwihi** et al., Patients' Behavior Regarding Dietary or Herbal Supplements before and during COVID-19 in Saudi Arabia, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, doi:10.3390/ijerph18105086.
- 126. Al-Haidari et al., Clinical Trial of Black Seeds Against COVID – 19 in Kirkuk City / Iraq, Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, 15:3 (preprint 1/2021), www.researchgate.net/publication/352134969\_Clinical\_Trial\_ of\_Black\_Seeds\_Against\_COVID\_-19\_in\_Kirkuk\_City\_Iraq.
- 127. **Ashraf** et al., Honey and Nigella sativa against COVID-19 in Pakistan (HNS-COVID-PK): A multi-center placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7640.
- 128. Sebghatollahi et al., The adjuvant therapy of edible herbal product including colchicum bulb, olive leaf, black cumin seeds, lavender flower, and ginger rhizome on the outcome of patients with severe and critical COVID-19: A double-blind randomized controlled clinical trial, Avicenna Journal of Phytomedicine, doi:10.22038/ajp.2024.24633.
- 129. **Setayesh** et al., Efficacy of a Persian herbal medicine compound on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a randomized clinical trial, Integrative Medicine Research, doi:10.1016/j.imr.2022.100869.
- 130. **Karimi** et al., Efficacy of Persian medicine herbal formulations (capsules and decoction) compared to standard care in patients with COVID-19, a multicenter open-labeled, randomized, controlled clinical trial, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7277.
- 131. **Daneshfard** et al., Effect of Sinamaz nasal drop on asymptomatic family members of COVID 19 patients: An open-label randomized controlled trial, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7915.
- 132. **Chandra** et al., Efficacy of polyherbal formulations for prevention of COVID-19 infection in high-risk subjects: A randomized open-label controlled clinical trial, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7531.
- 133. Al-Haidari (B) et al., Preventive Value of Black Seed in People at Risk of Infection with COVID-19, Pakistan Journal of Medical and Health Sciences, 15:1, pjmhsonline.com/2021/jan/384.pdf.
- 134. Abdallah et al., Repurposing of Some Natural Product Isolates as SARS-COV-2 Main Protease Inhibitors via In Vitro Cell Free and Cell-Based Antiviral Assessments and Molecular Modeling Approaches, Pharmaceuticals, doi:10.3390/ph14030213.
- 135. **Hasan** et al., Potential medicinal plants used in the treatment of COVID-19: a review, Vegetable crops of Russia, doi:10.18619/2072-9146-2025-2-61-69.



- 136. **O. Abdellatif** et al., Fighting the Progress of COVID-19 by Enhancing Immunity: A Review of Traditional Sudanese Natural Products Containing Immune-Boosting Elements, Journal for Research in Applied Sciences and Biotechnology, doi:10.55544/jrasb.2.2.33.
- 137. **He** et al., Coinfection of COVID-19 and malaria: clinical profiles, interactions, and strategies for effective control, Malaria Journal, doi:10.1186/s12936-025-05315-8.
- Navacchia et al., Insights into SARS-CoV-2: Small-Molecule Hybrids for COVID-19 Treatment, Molecules, doi:10.3390/molecules29225403.
- 139. **Chatatikun** et al., Potential of traditional medicines in alleviating COVID-19 symptoms, Frontiers in Pharmacology, doi:10.3389/fphar.2024.1452616.
- 140. **Ferreira** et al., Potencialidades e riscos de espécies vegetais empregadas na terapêutica e/ou prevenção da COVID-19: revisão integrativa, OBSERVATÓRIO DE LA ECONOMÍA LATINOAMERICANA, doi:10.55905/oelv22n5-042.
- 141. Jaimes-Castelán et al., Drugs and natural products for the treatment of COVID-19 during 2020, the first year of the pandemic, Boletín Médico del Hospital Infantil de México, doi:10.24875/bmhim.23000016.
- 142. **Al-Jamal** et al., Treating COVID-19 with Medicinal Plants: Is It Even Conceivable? A Comprehensive Review, Viruses, doi:10.3390/v16030320.
- 143. **Sharad** et al., Indian herb-derived phytoconstituents based antiviral formulation: An oral rinse candidate for prevention of COVID-19 outbreaks, Authorea, Inc., doi:10.22541/au.170666690.05725131/v1.
- 144. **Sharun** et al., A comprehensive review on pharmacologic agents, immunotherapies and supportive therapeutics for COVID-19, Narra J, doi:10.52225/narra.v2i3.92.
- 145. **Bizzoca** et al., Natural compounds may contribute in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection: a narrative review, Food Science and Human Wellness, doi:10.1016/j.fshw.2022.04.005.
- 146. **Ramezani** et al., Effect of herbal compounds on inhibition of coronavirus; A systematic review and meta-analysis, Authorea, Inc., doi:10.22541/au.170668000.04030360/v1.
- 147. **Katre** et al., Review on development of potential inhibitors of SARS-CoV-2 main protease (MPro), Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, doi:10.1186/s43094-022-00423-7.
- 148. Liu et al., Plant-derived compounds as potential leads for new drug development targeting COVID-19, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.8105.
- 149. Dofuor et al., The Global Impact of COVID-19: Historical Development, Molecular Characterization, Drug Discovery and Future Directions, Clinical Pathology, doi:10.1177/2632010x231218075.
- 150. **Khaledi** et al., A Comprehensive Review of Herbal Recommendations with the Potential to Inhibit COVID-19 Infection, Journal of Medical Bacteriology, doi:10.18502/jmb.v11i5-6.14362.
- 151. **Shahali** et al., A Comprehensive Review on Potentially Therapeutic Agents against COVID-19 from Natural Sources, Current Traditional Medicine, doi:10.2174/2215083809666230203142343.

- 152. **Mehrabi** et al., Synthetic and Herbal Drugs Registered in Clinical Trials on COVID-19: a Review on Recent Research, Journal of Genetic Resources, doi:10.22080/jgr.2023.25147.1347.
- 153. **Srivastava** et al., Promising role of Vitamin D and plant metabolites against COVID-19: Clinical trials review, Heliyon, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e21205.
- 154. Jaber, S., The effect of a small polyphenolic and terpenoids phytochemical constituent on curing and preventing of Covid-19 infections, Pharmacia, doi:10.3897/pharmacia.70.e106534.
- 155. **Oliver** et al., Different drug approaches to COVID-19 treatment worldwide: an update of new drugs and drugs repositioning to fight against the novel coronavirus, Therapeutic Advances in Vaccines and Immunotherapy, doi:10.1177/25151355221144845.
- 156. Abou Baker et al., An overview on medicinal plants used for combating coronavirus: Current potentials and challenges, Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, doi:10.1016/j.jafr.2023.100632.
- Srivastava (B) et al., A Brief Review on Medicinal Plants-At-Arms against COVID-19, Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Infectious Diseases, doi:10.1155/2023/7598307.
- 158. Nayak et al., Prospects of Novel and Repurposed Immunomodulatory Drugs against Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Associated with COVID-19 Disease, Journal of Personalized Medicine, doi:10.3390/jpm13040664.
- 159. Kumar (B) et al., COVID-19 therapeutics: Clinical application of repurposed drugs and futuristic strategies for target-based drug discovery, Genes & Diseases, doi:10.1016/j.gendis.2022.12.019.
- 160. **Zeyad Bazbouz** et al., Plant phytochemicals as potential candidates for treating post-COVID-19 lung infections, Phytotherapy Research, doi:10.1002/ptr.7650.
- 161. **Chellasamy** et al., Docking and molecular dynamics studies of human ezrin protein with a modelled SARS-CoV-2 endodomain and their interaction with potential invasion inhibitors, Journal of King Saud University - Science, doi:10.1016/j.jksus.2022.102277.
- 162. Abdallah (B) et al., Bio-Guided Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 Main Protease Inhibitors from Medicinal Plants: In Vitro Assay and Molecular Dynamics, Plants, doi:10.3390/plants11151914.
- 163. c19early.org (D), c19early.org/timeline.html.
- 164. **Mateja** et al., The choice of viral load endpoint in early phase trials of COVID-19 treatments aiming to reduce 28day hospitalization and/or death, The Journal of Infectious Diseases, doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaf282.
- 165. Zhang et al., What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes, JAMA, 80:19, 1690, doi:10.1001/jama.280.19.1690.
- 166. **Altman**, D., How to obtain the P value from a confidence interval, BMJ, doi:10.1136/bmj.d2304.
- 167. **Altman (B)** et al., How to obtain the confidence interval from a P value, BMJ, doi:10.1136/bmj.d2090.



- 168. **Sweeting** et al., What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data, Statistics in Medicine, doi:10.1002/sim.1761.
- 169. **Deng**, H., PyMeta, Python module for meta-analysis, www.pymeta.com/.

