**Table no 1: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Nausea (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Nausea** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 6 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -30.0 |
| Grade I | 12 | 60.0 | 1 | 5.0 | -55.0 |
| Grade II | 2 | 10.0 | 5 | 25.0 | +15.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 60.0 | +60.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 10.0 | +10.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 9 | 45.0 | 18 | 90.0 | +45.0 |
| Grade I | 8 | 40.0 | 2 | 10.0 | -30.0 |
| Grade II | 3 | 15.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -15.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.549 | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on Grade 0 was noticed , strongly significant in Group B with 45.0% compared to -30% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 2: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Vomiting (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Vomiting** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 14 | 70.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -70.0 |
| Grade I | 6 | 30.0 | 16 | 80.0 | +50.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 20.0 | +20.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 14 | 70.0 | 20 | 100.0 | +30.0 |
| Grade I | 4 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -20.0 |
| Grade II | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -10.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.488 | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on Grade 0 was noticed, strongly significant in Group B with 30.0% compared to -70.0% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 3: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Abdominal Pain (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Abdominal pain** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 13 | 65.0 | 4 | 20.0 | -45.0 |
| Grade I | 7 | 35.0 | 10 | 50.0 | +15.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 25.0 | +25.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.0 | +5.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 14 | 70.0 | 20 | 100.0 | +30.0 |
| Grade I | 3 | 15.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -15.0 |
| Grade II | 3 | 15.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -15.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.114 | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on Grade 0 was noticed, strongly significant in Group B with 30.0% compared to poor prognosis of -45.0% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 4: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Jaundice (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Jaundice** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 20 | 100.0 | 7 | 35.0 | -65.0 |
| Grade I | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 65.0 | +65.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 13 | 65.0 | 17 | 85.0 | +20.0 |
| Grade I | 6 | 30.0 | 2 | 10.0 | -20.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.0 | +5.0 |
| Grade III | 1 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -5.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.008\*\* | | 0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on grade 0 with 20.0% was noticed in Group B when compared to negative outcome of - 65.0% in Group A with P=0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 5: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Bitter taste (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Bitter Taste** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 6 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -30.0 |
| Grade I | 14 | 70.0 | 8 | 40.0 | -30.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 30.0 | +30.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 30.0 | +30.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 5 | 25.0 | 18 | 90.0 | +65.0 |
| Grade I | 13 | 65.0 | 2 | 10.0 | -55.0 |
| Grade II | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -10.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.642 | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on grade 0 with 65.0% was noticed in Group B when compared to Negative outcome of -30.0% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No.6: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Diarrhoean (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Diarrhoea** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 13 | 65.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -65.0 |
| Grade I | 7 | 35.0 | 20 | 100.0 | +65.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 13 | 65.0 | 20 | 100.0 | +35.0 |
| Grade I | 5 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -25.0 |
| Grade II | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -10.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.509 | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on grade 0 with 35.0% was noticed in Group B when compared to Negative outcome of -65.0% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 7: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Insomnia (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Insomnia** | **BT** | | **AT** | | **% change** |
| **No** | **%** | **No** | **%** |
| Group A | Grade 0 | 19 | 95.0 | 10 | 50.0 | -45.0 |
| Grade I | 1 | 5.0 | 6 | 30.0 | +25.0 |
| Grade II | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 15.0 | +15.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.0 | +5.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group B | Grade 0 | 13 | 65.0 | 20 | 100.0 | +35.0 |
| Grade I | 6 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -30.0 |
| Grade II | 1 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 | -5.0 |
| Grade III | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Group IV | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | P value | 0.044\* | | <0.001\*\* | | - |
| Inference | Positive outcome on grade 0 with 35.0% was noticed in Group B when compared to Negative outcome of -45.0% in Group A with P<0.001\*\* | | | | | |

**Table No. 8: Efficacy evaluation of Jawarish Amla on Renal Function Tests (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Renal function tests** | **Group** | **BT** | **AT** | **diff** | **P value** |
| Serum Creatinine mg/dl | Group A | 0.87±0.12 | 0.94±0.12 | +0.07 | 0.067+ |
| Group B | 0.87±0.19 | 0.88±0.12 | +0.01 | 1.000 |
|  | 0.943 | 0.166 | 0.248 | - |
| Inference | There was increase of Serum Creatinine n groups of both groups after treatment when compared to pre-treatment but both were in the normal range. Moreover, this after treatment increase in group A is Suggestive significant (P value 0.067+) which is considered as a negative outcome. However, group B showed non-significant increase (P value1.000). | | | | |
| Serum Uric Acid mg/dl | Group A | 5.35±1.43 | 5.89±1.45 | +0.55 | 0.068+ |
| Group B | 5.48±1.47 | 5.75±1.58 | +0.27 | 0.437 |
| P value | 0.770 | 0.772 | 0.537 | - |
| Inference | There was increase of S.U.A in groups of both groups after treatment when compared to pre-treatment but both were in the normal range. Moreover, this after treatment increase in group A is Suggestive significant (P value 0.068+) which is considered as a negative outcome. However, group B showed non-significant increase (P value0.437). | | | | |

**Table No. 9: Efficacy evaluation of *Jawarish Amla* on Liver Function Tests (n=40)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Liver Function Tests** | **Group** | **BT** | **AT** | **diff** | **P value** |
| SGOT IU/L | Group A | 23.60±8.94 | 33.15±12.64 | +9.65 | 0.005\*\* |
| Group B | 44.55±63.40 | 23.80±8.16 | -20.75 | 0.140 |
| P value | 0.152 | 0.008\*\* | 0.034\* | - |
| Inference | Mean and SD of SGOT after treatment showed decrease with a difference of -20.75 (P value 0.140) in group B, whereas group A showed an increase in difference of +9.65 (P value 0.005\*\*) which was strongly significant negative outcome showing the hepato-toxicity of DOTS regime in placebo group. Moreover, after treatment intergroup results were strongly significant positive outcome (P value 0.008\*\*) and intergroup differences were moderately significant (P value 0.0340\*), showing the hepato-protective effect of *Jawarish Amla*in test group. | | | | |
| SGPT IU/L | Group A | 22.30±11.20 | 39.00±22.95 | +16.70 | <0.001\*\* |
| Group B | 46.55±72.67 | 23.10±12.20 | -23.45 | 0.162 |
| P value | 0.148 | 0.009\*\* | 0.020\* | - |
| Inference | Mean and SD of SGPT after treatment showed decrease with a difference of -23.45 (P value 0.162) in group B, whereas group A showed an increase in difference of +16.70 (P value <0.001\*\*) which was strongly significant negative outcome showing the hepato-toxicity of DOTS regime in placebo group. Moreover, after treatment intergroup results were strongly significant positive outcome (P value 0.009\*\*) and intergroup differences were moderately significant (P value 0.020\*), showing the hepato-protective effect of Jawarish Amlain test group. | | | | |
| Alkaline Phosphatase IU/L | Group A | 125.40±33.33 | 141.20±33.31 | +15.80 | 0.069+ |
| Group B | 158.95±73.16 | 118.60±29.68 | -40.35 | 0.036\* |
| P value | 0.070+ | 0.029\* | 0.007\*\* | - |
| Inference | Mean and SD of Alk.Phosphatase after treatment showed a moderately significant decrease with a difference of -40.35 (P value 0.036\*) in group B, whereas group A showed an increase in difference of +15.80 (P value 0.069+) which was Suggestive significant negative outcome showing the hepato-toxicity of DOTS regime in placebo group. Moreover, after treatment intergroup results were moderately significant positive outcome (P value 0.029\*) and intergroup differences were strongly significant (P value 0.007\*\*), showing the hepato-protective effect of *Jawarish Amla*in test group. | | | | |
| Total Bilirubin mg/dl | Group A | 0.59±0.22 | 0.84±0.25 | +0.25 | 0.002\*\* |
| Group B | 0.68±0.32 | 0.67±0.45 | -0.011 | 0.932 |
| P value | 0.295 | 0.150 | 0.069+ | - |
| Inference | Mean and SD of Total Bilirubin after treatment showed a decrease with a difference of -0.011 (P value 0.932) in group B, whereas group A showed a highly significant increase in difference of +0.25 (P value 0.002\*\*) which was strongly significant negative outcome showing the hepato-toxicity of DOTS regime in placebo group. Moreover, intergroup differences were Suggestive significant (P value 0.069+), showing the hepato-protective effect of *Jawarish Amla*in test group. | | | | |