

1 **Comparable Efficacy of Curcumin and Proton Pump Inhibitor for Functional**  
2 **Dyspepsia: A Randomized Double-blind Controlled Trial.**

3 Pradermchai Kongkam<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Wichittra Khongkha<sup>3\*</sup>, Chawin Lopimpisuth<sup>1</sup>, Chisanucha  
4 Chumsri<sup>1</sup>, Prach Kosarussawadee<sup>1</sup>, Phanupong Phutrakool<sup>4</sup>, Sittichai Khamsai<sup>5</sup>, Kittisak  
5 Sawanyawisuth<sup>5</sup>, Thanyachai Sura<sup>6</sup>, Pochamana Phisalprapa<sup>7</sup>, Thanwa Buamahakul<sup>8</sup>,  
6 Sarawut Siwamogsatham<sup>1</sup>, Jaenjira Angsusing<sup>9</sup>, Pratchayanan Poonniam<sup>9</sup>, Kulthanit  
7 Wanaratna<sup>9</sup>, Monthaka Teerachaisakul<sup>9</sup>, Krit Pongpirul<sup>1,10,\*\*</sup>

8

9 Authors' affiliations:

- 10 1. Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand  
11 2. King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok, Thailand  
12 3. Chao Phraya Abhaibhubejhr Hospital, Prachin Buri, Thailand  
13 4. Chula Data Management Center, Research Affairs, Faculty of Medicine,  
14 Chulalongkorn University  
15 5. Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand  
16 6. Faculty of Medicine, Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand  
17 7. Faculty of Medicine, Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand  
18 8. Ratchaburi Hospital, Ratchaburi, Thailand  
19 9. Department of Thai Traditional and Alternative Medicine, Ministry of Public Health,  
20 Nonthaburi, Thailand  
21 10. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

22

23 \*Co-first author, equally contributed to this study

24 **\*\*Corresponding Author: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Krit Pongpirul, MD, MPH, PhD. Department of**  
25 **Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok**  
26 **10330, Thailand**

27 Email: [doctorkrit@gmail.com](mailto:doctorkrit@gmail.com)

28

29 Word count: 3248

30

31 **Keywords: Functional dyspepsia, Omeprazole, Curcumin, Turmeric**

32

33 **Abbreviations:**

34 AE Adverse Events

35 C Curcumin

36 C+O Curcumin+Omeprazole

37 EPS Epigastric Pain Syndrome

38 O Omeprazole

39 PDS Postprandial Distress Syndrome

40 PPIs Proton Pump Inhibitors

41 SAE Serious Adverse Events

42 SF-LDQ Short-Form Leeds Dyspepsia Questionnaire

43 SODA Severity of Dyspepsia Assessment (SODA)

44

45

46

## ABSTRACT

### 47 **Objectives**

48 Curcumin has been claimed to have gastrointestinal benefits, including dyspepsia, a common  
49 disorder that could be managed in a primary care setting with behavioral and dietary  
50 modifications as well as over-the-counter medications. This study aimed to compare the  
51 efficacy of curcumin versus omeprazole in improving patient-reported outcomes.

### 52 **Design**

53 Patients with functional dyspepsia were randomized to curcumin alone (C), omeprazole alone  
54 (O), or curcumin plus omeprazole (C+O). Patients in the combination group received 2  
55 capsules of 250 mg curcumin 4 times daily and 1 capsule of 20 mg omeprazole once daily for  
56 28 days. The primary outcomes were functional dyspepsia symptoms on days 28 and 56  
57 assessed using the Severity of Dyspepsia Assessment (SODA) scores. Secondary outcomes  
58 were the occurrence of adverse events (AEs) and serious adverse events (SAEs).

### 59 **Results**

60 A total of 206 enrolled patients were randomly assigned to the three groups, of which 151  
61 completed the study. Demographic data (age  $49.7 \pm 11.9$  years; female 73.4%), clinical  
62 characteristics, and baseline dyspepsia scores were comparable between the three groups.  
63 SODA scores in each group showed significant improvement on day 28 and day 56 in the  
64 pain, non-pain, and satisfaction categories. No significant differences were observed among  
65 the three groups and no serious adverse events occurred.

### 66 **Conclusion**

67 Curcumin and omeprazole have comparable efficacy for functional dyspepsia with no  
68 obvious synergistic effect.

69

70 **Key Messages:**

71 **What is already known:**

- 72 • Dyspepsia is one of the most common disorders in which patients usually try  
73 behavioral and diet modifications, and over-the-counter drugs before seeing a  
74 physician.
- 75 • Proton pump inhibitors have been established as an effective treatment for functional  
76 dyspepsia.
- 77 • Curcumin, an active ingredient in turmeric, is currently used for the treatment of  
78 dyspepsia in countries in Southeast Asia.
- 79 • However, there is no clinical trial evidence to support the use of curcumin as a first-  
80 line treatment.

81 **What this study adds:**

- 82 • Based on this double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial, oral curcumin is safe and  
83 well tolerated.
- 84 • Patients with functional dyspepsia were treated with curcumin, curcumin plus  
85 omeprazole, and omeprazole, which showed a similar significant symptomatic  
86 improvement.
- 87 • There was no synergistic effect detected between omeprazole and curcumin.

88 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy.**

- 89 • This study provides a possible additional drug option for patients with functional  
90 dyspepsia.
- 91 • More clinical trials are required to assess long-term outcomes and adverse events.

92

## 93 INTRODUCTION

94 Dyspepsia is a frequently occurring disorder that can be caused by a variety of factors, with  
95 no evidence of other structural diseases that exhibit similar symptoms. Although dyspepsia is  
96 common, most patients do not schedule an appointment with a doctor to treat this condition.  
97 One-quarter of patients with dyspepsia have symptoms that require specific treatment, while  
98 the rest do not have the symptoms that define them as functional dyspepsia (1). According to  
99 Rome IV criteria, patients diagnosed with functional dyspepsia have postprandial fullness,  
100 early satiation, epigastric pain or burning, and no evidence of structural disease (including at  
101 upper endoscopy) to explain the symptoms. Postprandial Distress Syndrome (PDS) and  
102 Epigastric Pain Syndrome (EPS) are two types of functional dyspepsia (2).

103 Most patients with functional dyspepsia in a primary care setting would be treated  
104 with behavioral and dietary modifications, as well as over-the-counter medications, before  
105 seeing a physician. Over-the-counter proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) are commonly  
106 recommended in several countries, whereas patients with persistent symptoms require  
107 medical attention for possible *Helicobacter pylori* infection (3-5). The recent Cochrane  
108 systematic review on the use of PPIs for functional dyspepsia showed better overall  
109 effectiveness with the number needed to treat 11 (6). However, prolonged use of PPIs  
110 demonstrated a potential increased risk of fractures, micronutrient deficiencies, infection, etc.  
111 Due to the lack of a higher-quality study, these possible adverse effects remain controversial  
112 (7-9).

113 Turmeric, scientifically named *Curcuma longa* L., is a plant that has been used  
114 extensively for a long period. The active ingredient of its rhizome, curcumin, is used  
115 medically topically and orally. In addition to nourishing creams and cosmetics, curcumin  
116 powder capsules have been used for the treatment of dyspepsia and other gastrointestinal  
117 problems. Turmeric is one of the herbs that is frequently used to alleviate symptoms similar

118 to dyspepsia among Thai people and those who live near Thailand. However, few  
119 conventional physicians have chosen this herbal medicine as the first drug of choice against  
120 functional dyspepsia. This is in part due to a lack of research comparing the efficacy and side  
121 effects of curcumin with PPI in the treatment of functional dyspepsia. This study aimed to  
122 compare the efficacy of curcumin versus PPI in the treatment of patients with functional  
123 dyspepsia in a placebo-controlled double-blind trial.

124

## 125 **METHODS**

### 126 **Study Design**

127 This multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group trial was  
128 conducted at the Thai Traditional Medicine Institute and Chao Phraya Abhaibhubejhr  
129 Hospital from June 2019 to April 2020. The patients were randomly assigned into three  
130 groups: curcumin+omeprazole (C+O), curcumin only (C only), and omeprazole only (O  
131 only).

### 132 **Study Population**

133 Patients who were willing to participate in this trial were evaluated for eligibility: symptoms  
134 compatible with functional dyspepsia, between 18 and 70 years, ECOG performance status 0  
135 or 1, not taken aspirin or NSAIDs for the past 3 months, not taken curcumin or food that  
136 significantly contained curcumin during 4 weeks before the study, no symptoms of irritable  
137 bowel syndrome (constipation, diarrhea, and frequent defecation), not taken herbal  
138 medication or medication that can affect gastrointestinal symptoms and diseases, and not  
139 taking PPIs during the 4 weeks before the study. Patients who were pregnant/breastfeeding;  
140 had a curcumin allergy; had gallstones; had ulcers or lumps in their stomach, duodenum, or  
141 esophagus; had severe inflammation of the gastric mucosa oesophageal mucosa or intestinal  
142 mucosa; had been infected with gastric *Helicobacter pylori*; had diseases that would hinder

143 the treatment of functional dyspepsia, or had symptoms or physical signs that are a warning  
144 sign of serious diseases incompatible with functional dyspepsia, were excluded from this  
145 study. All patients underwent gastroscopy to confirm the functional dyspepsia diagnosis.

#### 146 **Randomization and Blinding**

147 Participants were recruited at the Institute of Thai Traditional Medicine, Department of Thai  
148 Traditional and Alternative Medicine, Ministry of Public Health, Bangkok, Thailand, and  
149 Chao Phraya Abhaibhubejhr Hospital, a tertiary care hospital in Prachinburi, Thailand. The  
150 eligible participants were randomly allocated into the three groups using a block  
151 randomization of size six at a ratio of 1:1:1. The identification numbers were generated and  
152 inserted into the opaque concealed envelope by researchers from the Institute of Thai  
153 Traditional Medicine, who were not involved in the care of the volunteers. Clinicians, data  
154 collectors, and patients were blinded during this entire process. The randomization  
155 identification number was assigned to three groups with the code of each participant and  
156 delivered sealed envelopes to the doctor conducting the research in the area.

#### 157 **Recruitment**

158 Methods for recruiting participants include being a patient under the care of physicians in  
159 both institutions, creating electronic media, printed media, promoting flyers, contacting the  
160 patient's physician to introduce the researcher to the participants, and publicizing the study in  
161 healthcare facilities that provide both conventional and traditional Thai medicine services.

#### 162 **Treatment and safety protocol**

163 Each group of enrolled participants was provided with the medications in-person at both sites.  
164 The provided medications were packaged in two sizes: large capsules (250 mg of curcumin or  
165 placebo), and small capsules (20 mg of omeprazole or placebo). Each participant was  
166 instructed to take two large capsules four times a day and one small capsule once a day for 28  
167 days.

168 Any possible side effects could be reported at any time, while patients were formally  
169 assessed for possible adverse events on day 28. The following discontinuation criterion was  
170 applied: (1) participants were allergic to the medication or unable to take the medication, (2)  
171 participants did not follow up on the evaluation of treatment, (3) participants were unable to  
172 tolerate the side effects of the medication, (4) pathological examination results of lesions in  
173 the esophagus, stomach, or duodenum, show compatibility with certain cancers or tumors,  
174 and (5) the endoscopy was unsuccessful. The study termination criteria included (1) serious  
175 adverse events (SAEs) of up to 3 percent or occurring in 6 or more volunteers and the matter  
176 has been brought to the ethics committee for consideration of the need to discontinue research  
177 and (2) doubts or serious ethical errors in the research process.

#### 178 **Outcome Measurements**

179 The Short-Form Leeds Dyspepsia Questionnaire (SF-LDQ) and the Severity of Dyspepsia  
180 Assessment (SODA) were used to measure the extent of the symptoms at the beginning of the  
181 study. Later, only SODA was used to observe the changes in severity on day 28 and day 56.  
182 Each measurement was performed in the clinics, except for that of day 56 which was  
183 conducted by telephone interview.

184 The secondary goal was to evaluate possible adverse events. On day 28, after  
185 evaluation, the patients were thoroughly examined by physical examination and interviews to  
186 determine whether an undesirable episode occurred during treatment.

#### 187 **Sample Size Calculation**

188 The sample size was calculated using a formula to compare the difference in scores by  
189 referring to Rosner and Bernard. However, the number of patients per group was 63, due to  
190 the possibility of loss, and in the case that participants have another disorder detected after  
191 endoscopy, which accounts for about 10%, the authors have therefore specified the sample  
192 size to be 70 people in each group.



193 **Ethics Consideration**

194 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee for Research in Human Subjects in the  
195 Fields of Thai Traditional and Alternative Medicine (TAMEC No. 11-2561). Participants  
196 provided their written consent to participate in the study.

197 **Statistical Analysis**

198 Descriptive and analytical statistics were performed by using STATA/MP statistical software  
199 release 15 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX). The generalized estimating equation (GEE)  
200 was used to analyze the primary outcomes at a statistical significance level of 0.05.

201

202 **RESULTS**

203 A total of 241 patients were evaluated for eligibility; of these, 206 met the inclusion criteria  
204 and were enrolled and randomized into the three groups. The most common reason for  
205 ineligibility was incompatibility with the diagnosis of functional dyspepsia, followed by  
206 incorrect age, recent intake of PPI, being pregnant or breastfeeding, current *Helicobacter*  
207 *pylori* infection, and rejection of consent.

208 Overall, 69, 69, and 68 patients were randomly assigned to the C+O, C, and O groups;  
209 of these, 16, 20, and 19 dropped out, respectively. Detailed numbers and explanations for  
210 exclusion and dropout are shown in the CONSORT diagram (Figure 1). Baseline  
211 demographic and clinical characteristics were similar in the C+O, C, and O groups, of which  
212 the summation is given in Table 1.

213

( insert Figure 1 about here )

214

215

216 **Table 1. Characteristics of the Participants.**

	C+O (n=69)	C only (n=69)	O only (n=68)	p-value
<b>Demographics</b>				
- Female, n (%)	49 (71.01)	50 (72.46)	52 (76.47)	0.756
- Age (years)	49.54 ± 12.10	49.97 ± 11.96	49.3 ± 11.65	0.946
- Height (cm)	159.03 ± 8.62	158.8 ± 9.01	159.04 ± 7.56	0.982
- Weight (kg)	62.13 ± 12.19	62.71 ± 13.38	63.43 ± 12.36	0.835
- BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.44 ± 3.56	24.79 ± 4.43	25.05 ± 4.39	0.693
<b>Vital signs</b>				
- Pulse rate (beats/min)	78.19 ± 12.01	78.38 ± 8.41	80.82 ± 10.24	0.253
- Respiratory rate (beats/min)	19.22 ± 1.46	20.03 ± 7.51	19.12 ± 1.40	0.433
- Body temperature (°C)	36.82 ± 0.37	36.81 ± 0.27	36.85 ± 0.26	0.705
- Systolic blood pressure	128.36 ± 13.85	129.96 ± 14.37	126.15 ± 16.13	0.321
- Diastolic blood pressure	77.65 ± 10.96	78.58 ± 9.69	75.96 ± 10.48	0.328
<b>Dyspepsia group, n(%)</b>				
- Postprandial Distress Syndrome (PDS)	43 (63.24)	42 (60.87)	46 (67.65)	0.704
- Epigastric Pain Syndrome (EPS)	25 (36.76)	27 (39.13)	22 (32.35)	
<b>Laboratory</b>				
- White blood cells (cells/mm <sup>3</sup> )	6914.48 ± 2107.4	7401.08 ± 2199.63	7710.48 ± 2540.89	0.137
- Hemoglobin (g/dL)	13.56 ± 2.87	12.9 ± 1.40	12.42 ± 1.87	0.011
- Hematocrit (%)	40.04 ± 5.15	39.24 ± 3.16	39.12 ± 4.46	0.418
- Platelet count (cells/mm <sup>3</sup> )	260000 ± 57830.24	250000 ± 55400.04	270000 ± 93237.94	0.494
- AST (SGOT) (U/L)	26.76 ± 9.81	27.90 ± 13.38	25.43 ± 7.89	0.436
- ALT (SGPT) (U/L)	25.48 ± 16.96	25.64 ± 16.19	28.22 ± 22.11	0.658
- Total bilirubin (mg/dL)	1.11 ± 2.89	1.07 ± 2.91	1.04 ± 3.45	0.991
- INR	0.95 ± 0.15	0.99 ± 0.12	0.99 ± 0.1	0.113
- Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.81 ± 0.38	0.89 ± 0.59	0.91 ± 1.05	0.715
- Sodium (mmol/L)	139.5 ± 2.1	139.81 ± 2.38	137.59 ± 16.22	0.367
- Potassium (mmol/L)	3.96 ± 0.43	3.81 ± 0.43	3.92 ± 0.35	0.127
- Chloride (mmol/L)	104.08 ± 4.37	103.77 ± 3.9	103.5 ± 3.38	0.703
- Total CO <sub>2</sub> (mmol/L)	24.76 ± 2.93	25.61 ± 6.98	25.08 ± 3.32	0.598

217

218 **Dyspepsia symptom severity**

219 At baseline, SF-LDQ did not show significant differences, whereas the overall SODA scores  
 220 (pain intensity, non-pain symptoms, and satisfaction) were comparable between the three  
 221 groups (Table 2). On day 28, a significant improvement in SODA pain intensity and non-pain  
 222 symptoms scores was observed in three groups: the pain intensity decreased by -5.41 (95%CI  
 223 -7.37, -3.45), -6.22 (95%CI -8.20, -4.25), and -6.98 (95%CI -8.95, -5.02) among the groups  
 224 C+O, C and O, respectively, while the non-pain symptoms decreased by -2.41 (95%CI -3.29,

225 -1.52), -2.45 (95%CI -3.34, -1.56), and -2.55 (95%CI -3.44, -1.66) among the groups C+O, C  
226 and O, respectively. On the other hand, the SODA satisfaction scores significantly improved  
227 by 0.86 (95%CI 0.01, 1.72) only in group C.

228

229 **Table 2. Baseline SF-LDQ and SODA Scores.**

Factor	C+O (n=69)	C only (n=69)	O only (n=68)	p-value
SODA				
- Pain intensity (2-47)	25.80 ± 3.22	25.14 ± 4.09	26.26 ± 3.74	0.208
- Non-pain symptoms (7-35)	16.14 ± 3.18	15.58 ± 3.21	15.74 ± 2.69	0.530
- Satisfaction (2-23)	11.78 ± 1.98	11.84 ± 1.65	11.68 ± 2.29	0.891
SF-LDQ				
- Method 1 (Sum frequency)	7.90 ± 4.23	7.01 ± 4.06	7.12 ± 3.56	0.360
- Method 2 (Sum severity)	7.97 ± 4.25	6.88 ± 4.14	6.85 ± 3.65	0.182
- Method 3 (Total)	15.87 ± 8.44	13.90 ± 8.16	13.96 ± 7.20	0.258
- Method 4 (Highest frequency)	3.16 ± 1.15	3.20 ± 1.02	3.41 ± 0.80	0.290
- Method 5 (Highest severity)	3.19 ± 1.18	3.19 ± 1.03	3.31 ± 0.87	0.721

230

231 The comparison of day 0 with day 56 showed a significant improvement in each  
232 category of SODA scores. Also, the comparison of day 28 and day 56 showed positive  
233 changes in each category. The exhaustive numbers for each SODA score were available in  
234 Table 3. Furthermore, the detailed analysis of the SODA scores on non-pain symptoms  
235 divided according to item 7 to item 13 was available in Table 4. Figures 2, 3, and 4 visually  
236 demonstrated changes in SODA scores visually based on pain intensity, nonpain symptoms,  
237 and satisfaction, respectively. In all, each summary statistics was displayed by their mean and  
238 95% confidence intervals.

239 ( insert Figure 2, 3, and 4 about here )

240 Analysis of SODA scores by a GEE did not show significant differences between the  
241 C+O group versus the C group, the C+O group versus the O group, and the C group versus  
242 the O group (Table 5).

243

244 **Table 3. Comparative Changes in SODA Scores among the C+O, C only, and O only groups.**

SODA Score	Day 0 (95% CI)	Day 28 (95% CI)	Day 56 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 28 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 28 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Pain intensity (2-47)</b>										
o C+O	25.80 (24.15, 27.45)	20.39 (18.63, 22.14)	17.57 (15.75, 19.39)	<0.001	-5.41 (-7.37, -3.45)	<0.001	-2.82 (-4.88, -0.76)	0.007	-8.23 (-10.25, -6.21)	<0.001
o C only	25.14 (23.49, 26.8)	18.92 (17.15, 20.69)	15.55 (13.69, 17.42)	<0.001	-6.22 (-8.20, -4.25)	<0.001	-3.37 (-5.48, -1.26)	0.002	-9.59 (-11.65, -7.53)	<0.001
o O only	26.26 (24.6, 27.93)	19.28 (17.52, 21.04)	15.64 (13.76, 17.52)	<0.001	-6.98 (-8.95, -5.02)	<0.001	-3.64 (-5.75, -1.52)	0.001	-10.62 (-12.70, -8.54)	<0.001
o p-value	0.642	0.484	0.228		0.491		0.914		0.259	
<b>Non-pain symptoms (7-35)</b>										
o C+O	16.14 (15.40, 16.89)	13.74 (12.95, 14.53)	11.50 (10.68, 12.32)	<0.001	-2.41 (-3.29, -1.52)	<0.001	-2.24 (-3.17, -1.31)	<0.001	-4.65 (-5.56, -3.74)	<0.001
o C only	15.58 (14.84, 16.32)	13.13 (12.34, 13.93)	10.81 (9.98, 11.64)	<0.001	-2.45 (-3.34, -1.56)	<0.001	-2.32 (-3.27, -1.38)	<0.001	-4.77 (-5.69, -3.85)	<0.001
o O only	15.74 (14.99, 16.48)	13.18 (12.39, 13.98)	11.15 (10.29, 12)	<0.001	-2.55 (-3.44, -1.66)	<0.001	-2.03 (-3, -1.07)	<0.001	-4.59 (-5.53, -3.64)	<0.001
o p-value	0.553	0.502	0.514		0.964		0.791		0.462	
<b>Satisfaction (2-23)</b>										
o C+O	11.78 (11.15, 12.41)	12.22 (11.54, 12.90)	12.69 (11.98, 13.39)	0.123	0.44 (-0.41, 1.28)	0.309	0.47 (-0.42, 1.35)	0.304	0.90 (0.04, 1.77)	0.041
o C only	11.83 (11.20, 12.47)	12.70 (12.01, 13.38)	12.88 (12.16, 13.60)	0.038	0.86 (0.01, 1.72)	0.048	0.19 (-0.72, 1.09)	0.689	1.05 (0.17, 1.93)	0.020
o O only	11.68 (11.04, 12.31)	12.41 (11.73, 13.08)	12.74 (12.01, 13.47)	0.049	0.73 (-0.11, 1.57)	0.090	0.34 (-0.57, 1.25)	0.468	1.07 (0.18, 1.96)	0.019
o p-value	0.941	0.622	0.927		0.680		0.921		0.959	

245 C, Curcumin; O, Omeprazole

246 **Table 4. Comparative Changes in SODA Non-pain Scores among the C+O, C only, and O only groups.**

SODA Score	Day 0 (95% CI)	Day 28 (95% CI)	Day 56 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 28 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 28 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value
<b>Non-pain symptoms (7-35)</b>										
• Burping/belching										
○ C+O	2.10 (1.91, 2.30)	1.79 (1.58, 2)	1.51 (1.3, 1.73)	<0.001	-0.31 (-0.55, -0.07)	0.011	-0.28 (-0.53, -0.02)	0.032	-0.59 (-0.83, -0.34)	<0.001
○ C only	2.16 (1.96, 2.36)	1.81 (1.60, 2.02)	1.57 (1.35, 1.79)	<0.001	-0.35 (-0.59, -0.11)	0.004	-0.24 (-0.49, 0.02)	0.068	-0.59 (-0.84, -0.34)	<0.001
○ O only	2.06 (1.86, 2.26)	1.80 (1.59, 2.01)	1.47 (1.24, 1.69)	<0.001	-0.26 (-0.50, -0.02)	0.036	-0.33 (-0.59, -0.08)	0.011	-0.59 (-0.84, -0.34)	<0.001
• Heartburn										
○ C+O	2.49 (2.27, 2.72)	1.82 (1.58, 2.06)	1.29 (1.04, 1.54)	<0.001	-0.67 (-0.96, -0.39)	<0.001	-0.53 (-0.83, -0.23)	0.001	-1.20 (-1.50, -0.91)	<0.001
○ C only	2.10 (1.88, 2.33)	1.54 (1.30, 1.79)	1.30 (1.04, 1.55)	<0.001	-0.56 (-0.85, -0.27)	<0.001	-0.25 (-0.55, 0.06)	0.118	-0.80 (-1.10, -0.50)	<0.001
○ O only	2.19 (1.96, 2.42)	1.43 (1.19, 1.68)	1.36 (1.10, 1.62)	<0.001	-0.76 (-1.04, -0.47)	<0.001	-0.08 (-0.39, 0.23)	0.620	-0.83 (-1.14, -0.53)	<0.001
• Bloating										
○ C+O	2.72 (2.48, 2.97)	1.91 (1.66, 2.17)	1.79 (1.52, 2.06)	<0.001	-0.81 (-1.11, -0.51)	<0.001	-0.13 (-0.44, 0.19)	0.429	-0.94 (-1.25, -0.63)	<0.001
○ C only	2.72 (2.48, 2.97)	2.01 (1.75, 2.27)	1.48 (1.21, 1.75)	<0.001	-0.72 (-1.02, -0.42)	<0.001	-0.53 (-0.85, -0.21)	0.001	-1.25 (-1.56, -0.93)	<0.001
○ O only	2.85 (2.61, 3.1)	2.12 (1.86, 2.38)	1.72 (1.44, 2)	<0.001	-0.73 (-1.04, -0.43)	<0.001	-0.40 (-0.72, -0.08)	0.015	-1.13 (-1.45, -0.82)	<0.001
• Passing gas										
○ C+O	2.23 (2.04, 2.43)	1.91 (1.70, 2.12)	1.57 (1.35, 1.79)	<0.001	-0.32 (-0.58, -0.06)	0.016	-0.34 (-0.61, -0.07)	0.014	-0.66 (-0.93, -0.39)	<0.001
○ C only	2.01 (1.82, 2.21)	1.67 (1.46, 1.88)	1.35 (1.13, 1.58)	<0.001	-0.35 (-0.61, -0.09)	0.009	-0.32 (-0.59, -0.04)	0.026	-0.66 (-0.93, -0.39)	<0.001
○ O only	2.01 (1.82, 2.21)	1.91 (1.70, 2.12)	1.48 (1.26, 1.71)	<0.001	-0.11 (-0.37, 0.15)	0.413	-0.42 (-0.70, -0.14)	0.003	-0.53 (-0.80, -0.26)	<0.001
• Sour Taste										
○ C+O	1.75 (1.58, 1.93)	1.40 (1.21, 1.58)	1.23 (1.04, 1.42)	<0.001	-0.36 (-0.58, -0.13)	0.002	-0.17 (-0.40, 0.07)	0.165	-0.52 (-0.75, -0.29)	<0.001
○ C only	1.70 (1.52, 1.87)	1.27 (1.08, 1.46)	1.05 (0.85, 1.24)	<0.001	-0.43 (-0.65, -0.20)	<0.001	-0.22 (-0.46, 0.02)	0.068	-0.65 (-0.88, -0.42)	<0.001
○ O only	1.71 (1.53, 1.88)	1.48 (1.29, 1.67)	1.28 (1.08, 1.49)	0.002	-0.23 (-0.45, 0)	0.049	-0.20 (-0.44, 0.04)	0.111	-0.42 (-0.66, -0.19)	<0.001
• Nausea										
○ C+O	1.77 (1.61, 1.92)	1.36 (1.19, 1.53)	1.14 (0.96, 1.31)	<0.001	-0.41 (-0.61, -0.20)	<0.001	-0.22 (-0.44, -0.01)	0.044	-0.63 (-0.84, -0.42)	<0.001
○ C only	1.67 (1.51, 1.82)	1.22 (1.05, 1.39)	1.09 (0.91, 1.26)	<0.001	-0.45 (-0.66, -0.24)	<0.001	-0.13 (-0.35, 0.09)	0.246	-0.58 (-0.80, -0.37)	<0.001
○ O only	1.60 (1.44, 1.76)	1.21 (1.04, 1.38)	1.13 (0.94, 1.31)	<0.001	-0.39 (-0.60, -0.18)	<0.001	-0.09 (-0.31, 0.14)	0.453	-0.48 (-0.70, -0.26)	<0.001

SODA Score	Day 0 (95% CI)	Day 28 (95% CI)	Day 56 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 28 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 28 (95% CI)	p-value	Day 56 – Day 0 (95% CI)	p-value
• Bad Breath										
○ C+O	1.65 (1.50, 1.81)	1.16 (0.99, 1.32)	1.08 (0.90, 1.25)	<0.001	-0.50 (-0.70, -0.30)	<0.001	-0.08 (-0.29, 0.13)	0.455	-0.58 (-0.78, -0.37)	<0.001
○ C only	1.54 (1.38, 1.69)	1.21 (1.05, 1.38)	1.11 (0.94, 1.29)	<0.001	-0.33 (-0.53, -0.12)	0.001	-0.10 (-0.31, 0.12)	0.368	-0.42 (-0.63, -0.22)	<0.001
○ O only	1.53 (1.37, 1.68)	1.27 (1.11, 1.44)	1.1 (0.92, 1.28)	<0.001	-0.26 (-0.46, -0.06)	0.012	-0.17 (-0.39, 0.04)	0.117	-0.43 (-0.64, -0.22)	<0.001

247 C, Curcumin; O, Omeprazole

248 **Table 5. Pairwise Comparison of SODA Scores.**

SODA Scores	C+O vs C only (95% CI)	p-value	C+O vs O only (95% CI)	p-value	C only vs O only (95% CI)	p-value
Pain intensity (2-47)	-1.23 (-3.09, 0.64)	0.197	-0.70 (-2.57, -1.17)	0.461	0.52 (-1.35, 2.40)	0.584
Non-pain symptoms (7-35)	-0.54 (-1.37, 0.28)	0.196	-0.42 (-1.25, 0.40)	0.316	0.12 (-0.71, 0.95)	0.776
Satisfaction (2-23)	0.22 (-0.41, 0.86)	0.486	0.03 (-0.60, 0.66)	0.929	-0.20 (-0.83, 0.44)	0.546

249 C, Curcumin; O,

Omeprazole

250 **Adverse events**

251 Adverse events included anxiety, diarrhea, drowsiness, flatulence, headache, and vomiting. In  
252 the group C+O, these occurred in two patients (2.90%), including one diarrhea (1.45%), one  
253 drowsiness (1.45%), one headache (1.45%), and one vomiting (1.45%). In Group C only,  
254 these occurred in three patients (4.35%), including one incident of anxiety (1.45%), one  
255 diarrhea (1.45%), one flatulence (1.45%), and one vomiting (1.45%). No serious adverse  
256 events took place.

257

258 **Discussion**

259 Curcumin is a low molecular weight hydrophobic polyphenol extracted from turmeric.  
260 Curcumin possesses a wide spectrum of biological properties, including anti-inflammatory,  
261 antioxidant, antiproliferative, and antimicrobial properties. Numerous clinical trials have  
262 established the pharmacological properties of curcumin. Mechanisms of symptom generation  
263 in patients with functional digestive disorders are poorly understood, due to the absence of a  
264 mucosal injury that could explain their distressing symptoms (10). Transient receptor  
265 potential vanilloid type 1 (TRPV1) receptors have been shown to play a critical role in the  
266 detection and transmission of somatic and visceral nociceptive neural signals(11), and have  
267 been implicated in the induction of symptoms in these diseases. TRPV1 is a multimodal  
268 sensory transducer that can be activated by a variety of harmful stimuli including heat, low  
269 pH, endogenous lipid derivatives such as anandamide, and exogenous vanilloid-containing  
270 substances such as capsaicin (12). In particular, curcumin shares the same vanilloid ring  
271 moiety as capsaicin, making TRPV1 a likely target, and it has been shown in animals that  
272 curcumin inhibits capsaicin-induced TRPV1 activation competitively (13). Increased TRPV1  
273 signaling has been suggested to contribute to visceral hypersensitivity in functional  
274 gastrointestinal diseases, including esophageal hypersensitivity(13). Additionally, TRPV1

275 receptors are highly expressed throughout the gastrointestinal tract and enteric nervous  
276 system, and there is evidence that curcumin can inhibit gastrointestinal nociception and  
277 reverse intestinal hypersensitivity through peripheral terminals. With this mechanism of  
278 action in mind, it cannot be ruled out that this molecule may be beneficial in the treatment of  
279 patients with functional dyspepsia and irritable bowel syndrome, which are disorders that  
280 remain clinically challenging in the presence of currently available medications and whose  
281 patients may benefit from curcumin's pharmacological properties on TRPV1 as a novel pain  
282 modulator. Curcumin has been clinically studied in patients with inflammatory bowel  
283 disease, irritable bowel syndrome, ulcers, *Helicobacter pylori* infections, and even  
284 pancreatitis. Curcumin is effective in the treatment of gastric ulcers, erosions, and dyspepsia  
285 (14, 15), with ulcers and erosions reduced or even eradicated after administration of curcumin  
286 (3,000 mg/day) administration for up to 12 weeks, while abdominal pain and discomfort were  
287 significantly reduced. This explains why in this study we compared curcumin with a PPI as a  
288 treatment for functional dyspepsia.

289         Similarly to the findings of the current study, curcumin is safe in numerous human  
290 studies, with only minor toxicity associated with this polyphenol(16). Velayudhan et al. also  
291 documented the traditional use of curcumin and noted that even a single oral dose of up to  
292 8000 mg was not detected in the serum(17). Therefore, curcumin is increasingly being  
293 viewed as a biomolecule capable of being administered for an extended period without  
294 causing adverse effects(18). After 72 hours, safety was assessed in a dose increase study  
295 involving 34 healthy volunteers who received curcumin doses ranging from 500 to 12,000  
296 mg. Only seven subjects reported mild disturbances, including headache, skin rash, diarrhea,  
297 and yellow stool(19). Another study, which lasted 1-4 months, found that increasing the dose  
298 of curcumin from 0.45 to 3.6 g/d resulted in rare cases of nausea and diarrhea, as well as  
299 increased alkaline phosphatase and lactate dehydrogenase (20). Some patients treated with



300 doses as high as 8 g/d for two weeks complained of abdominal pain and bulky size (21). The  
301 findings of the current study confirmed the safety of curcumin compared to PPIs when used  
302 to treat functional dyspepsia.

303       Recently published Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews demonstrated that PPI  
304 was more effective than placebo in the treatment of functional dyspepsia, regardless of the  
305 dose or duration of treatment (6, 22). The presence of reflux symptoms or different subtypes  
306 of functional dyspepsia had no effect on the effect of PPI over placebo. PPIs may be slightly  
307 more effective in alleviating general symptoms of dyspepsia than H2RA and prokinetics.  
308 However, several previous studies have demonstrated adverse events associated with long-  
309 term PPI use (23, 24). Therefore, trials are required that examine the longer-term benefits  
310 and harms (at least six to twelve months) benefits and harms of PPI in functional dyspepsia.  
311 To expand the treatment options for patients with functional dyspepsia, we decided to  
312 compare PPI and curcumin in this study. The findings of the current study indicate that there  
313 are no significant adverse events associated with the short-term use of PPI and curcumin.

314       To our knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate the efficacy of curcumin in  
315 functional dyspepsia. Curcumin is effective in all subtypes of functional dyspepsia. Curcumin  
316 and omeprazole are both effective for functional dyspepsia and do not appear to have a  
317 synergistic effect. Although the most recent Thailand dyspepsia guidelines (2018) (28)  
318 recommended that patients with undiagnosed dyspepsia who do not have alarm symptoms  
319 receive an empirical trial of PPI for 4-8 weeks as first-line therapy. Prokinetic agents may be  
320 used in patients with unexplained dyspepsia who do not improve after empirical PPI therapy.  
321 Furthermore, prokinetic agents, tricyclic antidepressants, and cytoprotective agents have been  
322 shown to improve symptoms in patients with functional dyspepsia after the failure of PPI  
323 therapy. Although this guideline did not specifically mention curcumin as a treatment option

324 for functional dyspepsia, the new findings from our study may justify considering curcumin  
325 in clinical practice.

326 As a multicentre randomized controlled trial, this study is highly reliable. The study's  
327 subject is also noteworthy because functional dyspepsia is a prevalent disorder in the general  
328 population. The chosen drug is a proton pump inhibitor, widely used, has been approved for  
329 over-the-counter use, and is the first-line therapy for patients with functional dyspepsia. The  
330 medication chosen as a comparator is curcumin, a popular herbal remedy in the general  
331 population. In the context of gastrointestinal disorders, there is no precedent for comparing  
332 two drugs in a double-blind randomized controlled trial. The study participants met all  
333 criteria and were also diagnosed separately by endoscopy to rule out the presence of  
334 symptoms consistent with other diseases. They were also tested for H Pylori and those with  
335 infection were isolated.

336 In addition, the research methods are completely bias-free, as the individuals who  
337 administered the drugs, the participants who received the drugs, and the individuals who  
338 performed the assessment were unaware of the type of medications taken by the participants.  
339 The trial was carried out in hospitals frequented by the participants, namely hospitals in other  
340 provinces and Thai traditional medicine hospitals. The assessment used standardized  
341 questionnaires, and the individuals who conducted it were also certified for accuracy in the  
342 assessment. The number of participants was determined statistically accurately using  
343 standardized research methods.

344 The number of participants and the randomization used to assign them to different  
345 groups were conducted in a confidential and unbiased manner. All individuals involved in the  
346 drug administration process were unaware of the types of drugs distributed or to whom they  
347 were distributed. The statistical tests used in this study were conducted using appropriate  
348 materials and according to accepted statistical principles.

349 Two additional follow-up appointments have been scheduled to address the side  
350 effects of the study. Blood tests were performed on participants during the second follow-up  
351 to assess liver function. No abnormal symptoms were observed after the administration of  
352 either of the drugs.

353 The study findings indicated that the required number of participants was reached.  
354 However, it was discovered that several participants did not provide follow-up information  
355 after medication administration, which is the weakness of the study. However, the number of  
356 participants who provided this information was sufficient for statistical analysis and the  
357 majority of the participants attended the follow-up. Therefore, it can be deduced from the  
358 results that even if the number of participants followed after drug administration increased,  
359 the study findings would not be significantly different. Another limitation of this study is the  
360 absence of long-term follow-up data for all patients after treatment. This is a question that  
361 will require further investigation.

362 The strength of the study is that the findings can be applied to patients with functional  
363 dyspepsia who visit their doctor in general clinics or hospitals since the study settings  
364 correspond to the daily operations of physicians who already encounter this group of patients.  
365 According to the research findings, patients with functional dyspepsia would have additional  
366 drug options in addition to proton pump inhibitors alone, with no additional side effects. The  
367 study findings can be made completely public. The study was partially funded by government  
368 organizations, ensuring that there was no bias in the selection of particular medications.  
369 Additionally, this study is the first well-designed randomized controlled trial of curcumin  
370 versus PPI in functional dyspepsia. Functional dyspepsia was confirmed by endoscopy and *H.*  
371 *pylori* infection was ruled out. Although we strictly exercised the method to ensure the high  
372 integrity of the experiment, this study was subject to limitations, including a small number of  
373 patients who were lost to follow-up and a lack of long-term follow-up data.

374 Future studies in this issue will examine the long-term benefit and harms (at least 6-12  
375 months) benefit and harms of curcumin in functional dyspepsia; the results of the use of  
376 curcumin on demand long-term in functional dyspepsia; and the efficacy of curcumin in other  
377 functional gastrointestinal disorders.

378 **Conclusion**

379 Curcumin and omeprazole have comparable efficacy for functional dyspepsia with no  
380 obvious synergistic effect.

381

382 **Funding statement:** This study received financial support from the Department of Thai  
383 Traditional and Alternative Medicine, Ministry of Public Health, Nonthaburi, Thailand.

384 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

385 **Author's Contributions:**

- 386 • Pradermchai Kongkam: Data curation, Writing original draft, Review and Editing
- 387 • Wichitra Khongkha: Data curation, Writing original draft, Review and Editing
- 388 • Chawin Lopimpisuth: Writing original draft, Review and Editing
- 389 • Chisanucha Chumsri: Writing original draft, Review and Editing
- 390 • Prach Kosarussawadee: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 391 • Phanupong Phutrakool: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 392 • Sittichai Khamsai: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 393 • Kittisak Sawanyawisuth: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 394 • Thanyachai Sura: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 395 • Pochamana Phisalprapa: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 396 • Thanwa Buamahakul: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 397 • Sarawut Siwamogsatham: Data curation, Review and Editing
- 398 • Jaenjira Angsusing: Administration, Data curation, Review and Editing
- 399 • Pratchayanan Pooniam: Administration, Data curation, Review and Editing
- 400 • Kulthanit Wanaratna: Supervision, Data curation, Review and Editing
- 401 • Monthaka Teerachaisakul: Supervision, Funding, Data curation, Review and Editing
- 402 • Krit Pongpirul: Study Design, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Writing original draft,  
403 Review and Editing

## 404 Reference

- 405 1. Bytzer P, Talley NJ. Dyspepsia. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2001;134(9\_Part\_2):815-22.
- 406 2. Stanghellini V, Chan FK, Hasler WL, Malagelada JR, Suzuki H, Tack J, et al. Gastrointestinal  
407 Disorders. *Gastroenterology*. 2016;150(6):1380-92.
- 408 3. Lacy BE, Talley NJ, Locke GR, 3rd, Bouras EP, DiBaise JK, El-Serag HB, et al. Review article: current  
409 treatment options and management of functional dyspepsia. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*.  
410 2012;36(1):3-15.
- 411 4. Malfertheiner P, J MO, Fischbach W, Lamer P, Leodolter A, Stolte M, et al. *Helicobacter pylori*  
412 eradication is beneficial in the treatment of functional dyspepsia. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*.  
413 2003;18(6):615-25.
- 414 5. Sugano K, Tack J, Kuipers EJ, Graham DY, El-Omar EM, Miura S, et al. Kyoto global consensus  
415 report on *Helicobacter pylori* gastritis. *Gut*. 2015;64(9):1353.
- 416 6. Pinto-Sanchez MI, Yuan Y, Hassan A, Bercik P, Moayyedi P. Proton pump inhibitors for functional  
417 dyspepsia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;11(11):Cd011194.
- 418 7. Ngamruengphong S, Leontiadis GI, Radhi S, Dentino A, Nugent K. Proton pump inhibitors and risk  
419 of fracture: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Am J Gastroenterol*.  
420 2011;106(7):1209-18; quiz 19.
- 421 8. Nehra AK, Alexander JA, Loftus CG, Nehra V. Proton Pump Inhibitors: Review of Emerging  
422 Concerns. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2018;93(2):240-6.
- 423 9. Jaynes M, Kumar AB. The risks of long-term use of proton pump inhibitors: a critical review. *Ther*  
424 *Adv Drug Saf*. 2018;10:2042098618809927-.
- 425 10. Savarino E, Zentilin P, Savarino V. NERD: an umbrella term including heterogeneous  
426 subpopulations. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2013;10(6):371-80.
- 427 11. Knowles CH, Aziz Q. Visceral hypersensitivity in non-erosive reflux disease. *Gut*. 2008;57(5):674-  
428 83.
- 429 12. Caterina MJ, Rosen TA, Tominaga M, Brake AJ, Julius D. A capsaicin-receptor homologue with a  
430 high threshold for noxious heat. *Nature*. 1999;398(6726):436-41.
- 431 13. Guarino MP, Cheng L, Ma J, Harnett K, Biancani P, Altomare A, et al. Increased TRPV1 gene  
432 expression in esophageal mucosa of patients with non-erosive and erosive reflux disease.  
433 *Neurogastroenterol Motil*. 2010;22(7):746-51, e219.
- 434 14. Prucksunand C, Indrasukhsri B, Leethochawalit M, Hungspreugs K. Phase II clinical trial on effect  
435 of the long turmeric (*Curcuma longa* Linn) on healing of peptic ulcer. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med*  
436 *Public Health*. 2001;32(1):208-15.
- 437 15. Kositchaiwat C, Kositchaiwat S, Havanondha J. *Curcuma longa* Linn. in the treatment of gastric  
438 ulcer comparison to liquid antacid: a controlled clinical trial. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 1993;76(11):601-  
439 5.
- 440 16. Lao CD, Ruffin MT, Normolle D, Heath DD, Murray SI, Bailey JM, et al. Dose escalation of a  
441 curcuminoid formulation. *BMC Complement Altern Med*. 2006;6:10.
- 442 17. Cheng AL, Hsu CH, Lin JK, Hsu MM, Ho YF, Shen TS, et al. Phase I clinical trial of curcumin, a  
443 chemopreventive agent, in patients with high-risk or pre-malignant lesions. *Anticancer Res*.  
444 2001;21(4b):2895-900.
- 445 18. Sharma RA, Euden SA, Platton SL, Cooke DN, Shafayat A, Hewitt HR, et al. Phase I clinical trial of  
446 oral curcumin: biomarkers of systemic activity and compliance. *Clin Cancer Res*.  
447 2004;10(20):6847-54.
- 448 19. Carroll RE, Benya RV, Turgeon DK, Vareed S, Neuman M, Rodriguez L, et al. Phase IIa clinical trial  
449 of curcumin for the prevention of colorectal neoplasia. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)*. 2011;4(3):354-  
450 64.
- 451 20. Ford AC, Forman D, Bailey AG, Axon AT, Moayyedi P. Initial poor quality of life and new onset of  
452 dyspepsia: results from a longitudinal 10-year follow-up study. *Gut*. 2007;56(3):321-7.
- 453 21. Tack J, Masaoka T, Janssen P. Functional dyspepsia. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol*. 2011;27(6):549-57.

- 454 22. Pittayanon R, Yuan Y, Bollegala NP, Khanna R, Leontiadis GI, Moayyedi P. Prokinetics for  
455 functional dyspepsia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;10(10):Cd009431.
- 456 23. Compare D, Pica L, Rocco A, De Giorgi F, Cuomo R, Sarnelli G, et al. Effects of long-term PPI  
457 treatment on producing bowel symptoms and SIBO. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2011;41(4):380-6.
- 458 24. Waldum HL, Fossmark R. Proton pump inhibitors and gastric cancer: a long expected side effect  
459 finally reported also in man. *Gut*. 2018;67(1):199-200.

460

461 **Figure Legends**

462 Figure 1. CONSORT Diagram.

463 Figure 2. Comparative Changes in SODA Pain Scores.

464 Figure 3. Comparative Changes in SODA Nonpain Scores.

465 Figure 4. Comparative Changes in SODA Satisfaction Scores.

466



Enrollment

Assessed for eligibility (n = 241)

- Excluded (n = 35)
- Incompatible with functional dyspepsia (n = 19)
  - Not in the age between 18-70 (n = 3)
  - PPI intake during the 4 weeks prior to the study (n = 1)
  - Pregnant or breast feeding (n = 2)
  - Infected with gastric *Helicobacter pylori*. (n = 9)
  - No consent form (n = 1)

Allocation

Randomized (n = 206)

Allocation to Group C+O  
(n=69)

Allocation to Group C  
(n=69)

Allocation to Group O  
(n=68)

Follow-up

Consent withdrawn (n = 2)  
Lost to follow-up (n = 14)

Consent withdrawn (n = 2)  
Lost to follow-up (n = 17)  
Other reason (n = 1)

Consent withdrawn (n = 18)  
Lost to follow-up (n = 1)

Analysis

Intention to treat (n = 69)

Intention to treat (n = 69)

Intention to treat (n = 68)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.08.22283167>; this version posted December 9, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).





