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ABSTRACT

Basic experimental models in Homeopathy are of major interest because they could get insightful data about the ability of high dilutions to work in a biological system. Due to the extreme difficulty in the highlighting any possible effect and trusting its reliability, methods should be particularly stringent and highly standardized. Confounders, handling process, pre-analytical errors, misleading statistics and misinterpretations may lead to experimental biases. This article tries to elucidate those factors causing bias, taking into account some recent reported evidence in the field.

© 2017 Transdisciplinary University, Bangalore and World Ayurveda Foundation. Publishing Services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Background

Marzotto et al. reported that a plant extract from Arnica montana L. from Boiron Laboratoires (Lyon, France) in 30% v/v EtOH/water contained 36.0 mg/100 ml of sesquiterpene lactones, namely 1.05 × 10⁻³ M. The 1:100 preparation named 1c, was used as the starting solution for a series of further 1:100 dilutions in 30% v/v EtOH/water, which showed an effect on the expression of some extracellular matrix genes when tested on IL-4 polarized THP-1 cells [1]. The paper is particularly interesting but raised fundamental concerns about the experimental setting in basic Homeopathy, which is the objective of this article.

First, in order to calculate the molarity of sesquiterpene lactones in the alcoholic preparation, the authors referred to Staneva et al. who identifi ed at least eight components in an Arnica extract related to helenalin and dihydrohelenalin by 1H NMR spectroscopy and assumed an average molar mass for dihydrohelenalin-derived compounds of 340.41 [2]. The calculation evaluated by Marzotto et al. which does not rely on any reported chromatographic data, would be an approximation to the estimation done by Staneva et al. in Arnica montana (erroneously reported as Arnica m.), i.e. helenalin and 11α,13-dihydrohelenalin esters, giving the reported theoretical molarity [1,2]. The A. montana 2c made in 30% v/v EtOH/water should therefore contain 51.43 mM EtOH and 10.5 nM sesquiterpene lactones. If considering helenalin and 11α,13-dihydrohelenalin as the major compounds from A. montana in the extract, the authors showed an effect using doses at least three orders of magnitude lower, than those ones previously reported as effective on in vitro immune cells [1,3–5]. If true, this interesting result raises the conundrum of the activity associated with further dilutions, e.g. Arnica 5c, as this preparation should be made by 51.43 mM EtOH and 0.0001 fM sesquiterpene lactones, with a ratio EtOH/lactones = 5 × 10¹⁴ to 1, a circumstance for which it is very difficult to exclude the molar activity of ethanol with respect to the negligible one of lactones. The same UV–VIS performed by the authors on Arnica 1c shows clearly solely the UV absorbance of ethanol, at 205 nm for an A1cm > 1.0 at its lowest εM value [1]. Therefore, the molar fraction of the chemical components in an A. montana L. extract, would suggest that ethanol is the only chemical bioactive species aside from water, which should be present in the centesimal dilutions.
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2. Ethanol as a confounder and controls performance

The role of ethanol should be better highlighted even though it is difficult to believe that the dilutions may work due to its existence. Ethanol was used in several experimental papers using homeopathic dilutions [6–8], raising comments elsewhere [9–11]. Verma et al. reported recently that ethanol is able to induce the release of nanosized membrane extracellular vesicles able to induce macrophage activation [12]. There is no doubt that ethanol has a chemical activity in those systems where the molar mass of the active principle is absolutely negligible [10,13,14]. However, the most frequent criticism is this comment is that ethanol is present both in controls and in herbal dilutions (cases) and hence, this solvent could not be considered a statistical confounding [15]. If ethanol is present, at the same concentration, both in dilutions and in controls, its confounding effect should be negligible or even null. However, this is true only if both controls and cases are processed in a double blind fashion and are prepared with the same procedure and handling in a high stringency condition. Pre-analytical biases may occur in this case. Batch-derived biases were even reported for gene microarray, particularly in pooling the RNA samples [16,17] and therefore, any difference in the handling, storage and treatment of the ethanol batches of dilutions may interfere and affect the reliability of the results. We must admit that, from a chemical point of view and based on the issues addressed above, a 30% EtOH/water is perfectly similar to, e.g. an Arnica 15c into 30% ETOH/water, because both systems are practically made by only ethanol and water mixed together, due to the negligible or even null amount of sesquiterpene lactones (SLs) in the 15 [1]. Therefore, researchers are most probably comparing two controls at all, may stand in the conclusive remarks on the reported evidence. Confounders are therefore occurring in the chemical activity of the solvent (ethanol) and in control biases.

3. A statistical evaluation can shed a light on possible biases

Controls should have a highly homogeneous distribution of their inner variance. Previous comments on data variability in experimental Homeopathy showed that even the distribution of standard error of mean (SEM) may lead to statistical significance, due to alpha error in a H0 null hypothesis [9]. If controls have no homoscedasticity in their data distribution, then a control may bear a “biological” effect due to the existence of a chemical confounder. The herbal dilution with an EtOH/active principle ratio > 10^10 to 1, is practically a control, where the only chemical active species is the alcohol, as SLs are negligible or practically lacking [1]. Ethanol has a specific activity on gene expression and on differentially expressed genes (DEGs) and may cause bias in the estimation of p values, particularly if performed with an approach, such as Friedman test, which has the very low power of the sign test [14,18]. In this case, effects can be related to ethanol as the main confounder of the dilutions [1,10,15].

To give a possible example of this issue, in a recent paper, statistics was performed using a Friedman sign test, which is less powerful than other non-parametric rank tests, such as the Wilcoxon–Mann Withney test [11,18]. This evidence resembles previous reported data, with RT-PCR [6]. According to the authors, any dilution in 30% v/v EtOH/water was able to change DEG patterns, with p < 0.05 in a Wilcoxon test [1]. An evaluation performed on data from Supplementary Tables in the paper [1], using a non-parametric Wilcoxon–Mann Withney rank test, gave the results showed in Table 1. The simple matching of any dilution, from 3c to 15c, vs the control mean (averaging 5 separate experiments) using the RPKM values, gave the following results (bold character = non-significant, i.e. p > 0.05 outputs).

![Table 1](image-url)

| Sample         | Statistics      | Test 1 | Test 2 | W-value | Mean difference | Sum of POS ranks | Sum of NEG ranks | Z-value | Kolmogorov–Smirnov (P) | p value |
|----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|---------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 3c | 34 | 686.74 | 176 | 34 | -2.6506 | P = 0.98314 | 0.00804 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 5c | 35 | 688.14 | 175 | 35 | -2.6133 | P = 0.98314 | 0.00906 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 10c | 51 | 638.44 | 159 | 51 | -2.016 | P = n.s. | 0.04338 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 15c | 15 | 673.69 | 195 | 15 | -3.599 | P = 0.98314 | 0.00707 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 3c | 36 | 642.04 | 174 | 36 | -2.576 | P = n.s. | 0.00988 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 5c | 31 | 689.82 | 179 | 31 | -2.7626 | P = n.s. | 0.00578 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 10c | 36 | 508.87 | 174 | 36 | -2.576 | P = n.s. | 0.00988 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 15c | 48 | 640.12 | 162 | 48 | -2.128 | P = n.s. | 0.03318 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 3c | 14 | 675.37 | 196 | 14 | -3.3973 | P = 0.98314 | 0.00068 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 5c | 37 | 643.72 | 173 | 37 | -2.5386 | P = n.s. | 0.01108 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 10c | 38 | 687.89 | 172 | 38 | -2.5013 | P = n.s. | 0.001242 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 15c | 0 | 506.94 | 210 | 0 | -3.9199 | P = n.s. | 0 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 3c | 62 | 638.19 | 148 | 62 | -1.6053 | P = n.s. | 0.1074 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 5c | 11 | 673.44 | 199 | 11 | -3.5093 | P = n.s. | 0.00044 |
| 20 Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney 1CTRL Pooled 10c | 40 | 641.79 | 170 | 40 | -2.4266 | P = n.s. | 0.0151 |

*Cluster 01 – Controls. | 1 vs 2 | p = 0.00026; | 2 vs 3 | p = 0.00116; | 3 vs 4 | p = 0.00068; | 4 vs 5 | p = 0.01016; | 1 vs 3 | p = 0.0151; | 1 vs 4 | p = 0.05238; | 1 vs 5 | p = 0.07346; | 2 vs 4 | p = 0.00005; | 2 vs 5 | p = 0.10044; | 3 vs 5 | p = 0.24604, Bold letter: biased or critical values. About 70% control matches are biased.
a) [A. montana 2c] p = 0.01108; [A. montana 3c] p = 0.01242; [A. montana 5c] p = 0.0226; [A. montana 9c] p = 0.01684; [A. montana 15c] p = 0.0477

b) [A. montana 2c] p = 0.35238; [A. montana 3c] p = 0.09102; [A. montana 5c] p = 0.37346; [A. montana 9c] p = 0.22628; [A. montana 15c] p = 0.65994, (bold character p > 0.05, i.e. not significant), assessing therefore a circumstance that can be retrieved also from Tables 1 and 2, where dilutions are matched to controls of each single experiment. Data suggest that the variance distribution within the control series is not homogeneously dispersed and give possible biases in the interpretation of the presumptive working of homeopathic dilutions. To ascertain homeocasodicastasis, a Bartlett’s test should be accomplished. The Bartlett’s test on the control distribution showed that this variability was highly significant (p < 0.0001, ð = 409.19452). The overall RPKM evaluation of the signed rank comparison between all averaged controls and means for each tested dilution, gave the following statistics:

c) [A. montana 2c] p = 0.13622; [A. montana 3c] p = 0.23404; [A. montana 5c] p = 0.21498; [A. montana 9c] p = 0.21499; [A. montana 15c] p = 0.17702, which should suggest the existence of a possible bias in the distribution used to evaluate the dilution activity on THP-1 cells, as these comparisons would indicate the complete absence of effects on the gene expression of macrophages by A. montana alcoholic extracts. This evidence seems to contradict the conclusive remark forwarded by the authors about the activity of Arnica [1]. Goodness of fit test, performed with a Shapiro–Wilk test and a Lilliefors-van Soers test assessed that no control match is biased. Bartlett’s tests on controls showed that this variability was highly significant (p < 0.0001, ð = 409.19452). The overall RPKM evaluation of the signed rank comparison between all averaged controls and means for each tested dilution, gave the following statistics:

4. Possible further causes of high dilutions working

While possible biases in statistics due to confounders might generate a misunderstanding in the interpretation of experimental Homeopathy, the question which arises here is that can ethanol help dilutions into water generating nanosized structures. According to some authoritative reports, nanobubbles might be generated upon the replacement of ethanol by water, as an effect of the super-saturation resulting from either the greater solubility of air gases in the alcohol than water or by the exothermal mixing of ethanol into water [31,32]. Further detailed research has shown that the EtOH/water solvent usually contains large-scale structures within the range of 100 nm, a hallmark that seems to be commonly

Table 2
Wilcoxon–Mann Whitney test of A. montana effects on IL-4 treated THP-1 gene expression (RPKM).^

| Sample   | Statistics       | Test 1 | Test 2 | W-value | Mean difference | Sum of POS ranks | Sum of NEG ranks | Z-value | Kolmogorov–Smirnov (P) | P value (2-tailed) |
|----------|------------------|--------|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 20       | Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney | 1 CTRL Pooled 3c | 72 | -27.47 | 72 | 118 | -0.9296 | P = n.s. | 0.35238 |
|          |                   | 2 CTRL | 239 | 18.55 | 239 | 257 | -0.1764 | P = 0.97184 | 0.85716 |
|          |                   | 3 CTRL | 90 | -24.47 | 90 | 100 | -0.0201 | P = n.s. | 0.84148 |
|          |                   | 4 CTRL | 75 | -25.9 | 75 | 115 | -0.8048 | P = n.s. | 0.42372 |
|          |                   | 5 CTRL | 74 | -27.34 | 74 | 116 | -0.8451 | P = n.s. | 0.39532 |
| 20       | Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney | 1 CTRL Pooled 5c | 75 | -29.73 | 75 | 115 | -0.8048 | P = n.s. | 0.42372 |
|          |                   | 2 CTRL | 40 | -31.79 | 40 | 150 | -2.2133 | P = 0.97808 | 0.0271 |
|          |                   | 3 CTRL | 86 | -26.73 | 86 | 104 | -0.3822 | P = n.s. | 0.71884 |
|          |                   | 4 CTRL | 74 | -28.16 | 74 | 116 | -0.8451 | P = n.s. | 0.39532 |
|          |                   | 5 CTRL | 76 | -29.6 | 76 | 114 | -0.7614 | P = n.s. | 0.44726 |
| 20       | Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney | 1 CTRL Pooled 9c | 91 | -22.81 | 91 | 99 | -0.161 | P = n.s. | 0.87288 |
|          |                   | 2 CTRL | 53 | -26.26 | 53 | 118 | -1.4154 | P = 0.97184 | 0.1556 |
|          |                   | 3 CTRL | 90 | -19.81 | 90 | 100 | -0.2012 | P = n.s. | 0.84148 |
|          |                   | 4 CTRL | 81 | -21.24 | 81 | 109 | -0.5634 | P = n.s. | 0.57948 |
|          |                   | 5 CTRL | 71 | -22.68 | 71 | 119 | -0.9563 | P = n.s. | 0.33204 |
| 20       | Wilcoxon–U-Mann Whitney | 1 CTRL Pooled 15c | 85 | -23.71 | 85 | 85 | -0.4024 | P = n.s. | 0.68916 |
|          |                   | 2 CTRL | 50 | -25.77 | 50 | 140 | -1.8109 | P = 0.97908 | 0.0703 |
|          |                   | 3 CTRL | 83.5 | -20.71 | 83.5 | 106.5 | -0.4628 | P = n.s. | 0.64552 |
|          |                   | 4 CTRL | 84 | -22.14 | 84 | 106 | -0.4427 | P = 0.97908 | 0.65994 |
|          |                   | 5 CTRL | 80 | -23.58 | 80 | 110 | -0.6036 | P = n.s. | 0.5485 |

^ Cluster 02 – Controls. [1 vs 2] p = 0.25848; [2 vs 3] p = 0.14706; [3 vs 4] p = 0.90448; [4 vs 5] p = 0.27572; [1 vs 3] p = 0.68916; [1 vs 4] p = 0.63122; [1 vs 5] p = 0.4985; [2 vs 4] p = 0.29372; [2 vs 5] p = 0.68916; [3 vs 5] p = 0.0763. Bold letter: biased or critical values. No control match is biased. Bartlett’s tests on controls p = 0 ð = 409.19452. 
shared by any daylife used aqueous systems [33]. This can be considered a “mesoscale inhomogeneity” with a long-lived feature and a relatively slow kinetics of formation that can be detected upon mixing the solutes and solvents. The nature of these structures has been recently investigated, also in EtOH/water mixtures, with static and dynamic light scattering, equilibrated with air at 1 atm and nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA) and results did not confirm the hypothesis that these structures are nanobubbles stabilized by the solutes and contaminants adsorbed at the gas/solvent interface [33]. Some authors performed an interesting study on the presence of nanosized structures, by using a NanoSight LM10 (Malvern), equipped with laser at 532 nm and the NanoSight NTA 3.0 analysis software to analyze data [1]. Their graph has a bewildering similarity with the plot frame of the UV–VIS spectra, probably because the authors re-elaborated the NTA outputs with the same elaboration software used for the UV–VIS, yet not reported in the methods section. This cannot warrant for being fully aware of the NTA outputs and give a forthright comment about the interesting data of these nanostructures in Arnica 1c, namely if these nanostructures are really nanosized elements, nanobubbles or a mesoscale inhomogeneity. The plot represented in ref. [1] about NTA was not released by the NanoSight NTA 3.0 analysis software [1,34]. Actually, those structures might be either micro-nanobubbles (MNBs) or supra-molecular nanostructures, the authors should have better performed an analysis with optical microscopy by employing the total internal reflection fluorescence excitation (TIRF) to assess nanobubbles > 100 nm [35]. Further techniques adapted to detect nanosized structures in the dilutions, such as atomic force microscopy (AFM) or also CryoTEM, should be evaluated, in order to ameliorate the reliability of the reported results [1].

MNBs are micro- or nanoscopic gas filled cavities which should derive from bubbles generated by a vigorous mixing of gases (generally from environmental air) into a liquid, where the mechanical stress should create a wide range of bubble diameters. Most of these air-filled cavities disappear rapidly, as they have a buoyancy that leads them to rise to the surface of the liquid and burst in equilibrium with the atmospheric pressure, according to Stoke’s equation and following the nature of particles at low Reynolds number [36,37]. According to the authors, these nano-sized structures in Arnica 1c formed a colloidal heterogeneously polydispersed system, of about $1.83 \times 10^6$ particles/ml with a mean dimension of 274 nm and a $\zeta$-potential of $-25.54$ mV [1]. The negative $\zeta$-potential should suggest they are MNBs [38]. Although the authors did not specify this, probably they caught aliquots from the bulk liquid. While most of nanobubbles are in the interface gas/liquid and in a lesser extent on the solid/liquid interfaces of the container walls, stable MNBs have a half-life from 1.0 s to 100 s; sec, particularly in water [39], and probably the structures observed by Marzotto et al. are not MNBs [40]. Moreover, ethanol, according to recent reports, cannot form surface nanobubbles, contrarily to other organic solvents such as formamide [41]. Ethanol/water systems usually contain large-scale structures within the range of 100 nm, in a “mesoscale inhomogeneity” with a long-lived feature and a relatively slow kinetics of formation that can be detected upon mixing the solutes and solvents. Investigation with static and dynamic light scattering, equilibrated with air at 1 atm and nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA) did not confirm the hypothesis that these structures are nanobubbles stabilized by the solutes and contaminants adsorbed at the gas/solvent interface [33]. Furthermore, nanostructures with dimensions higher than 180 nm can be very rarely described as exosomes [42]. When describing the theoretical composition of an A. montana 9c (final working concentration) the calculation should be as follows: a) Ethanol = $5.14 \times 10^{-4}$ M; b) active principles (sesquiterpene lactones) = $1.05 \times 10^{-22}$ M; c) supramolecular structures = unknown. In these conditions, the only chemical species appear to be the single ethanol. In this case, a great concern may be raised about the reliability of the reported results.

### Table 3

**A. Bullet points of issues to be addressed, B. Possible bias in the experimental setting.**

| Issue | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| **A** | Herbal preparation | The analytical pattern of the herbal preparation (UV-HPLC, IR-HPLC, NMR, other) must be reported in any paper concerning herbal remedies. |
| Dilutions | Each tested dilution should be evaluated for the presence of chemical molar mass, due to recent evidence and models [43,44]. |
| Nanoparticles | Nanosized particles and $\zeta$-potential should be evaluated in each tested dilution. |
| Nanobubbles | Reported results and plots must be produced directly from the NanoSight NTA analysis software upon throughput elaboration of data from the analytical instrument (e.g. NanoSight LM10 (Malvern)). |
| Experimental setting | An optical microscopy of the nanostructures (TIRF or AFM) should be considered for any dilution tested. |
| Controls | Double Blind fashion of the setting should be accomplished. |
| Statistics | Batch effects on the microarray geneSET evaluation. |
| Minor points | 30% ethanol/water dilutions (sham) should be prepared and tested perfectly matched with any herbal dilution. |
| **B** | Dilutions | False discovery rate (FDR) analysis should be assessed by an improved estimation of p value based on the mixture model [45,46]. |
| Controls | In taxonomy the name of the genus is punctuated, the species not, e.g. A. montana instead of Arnica m. |
| Statistics and setting | Dilutions stored for at least 12 months may be not similar to fresh prepared controls. |
| Minor points | Controls (sham dilutions) are not matched with cases because are prepared and treated in a different manner than cases (herbal dilutions) and without a double blind setting. |
| Statistics and setting | Environmental EMF can cause bias in the statistics of microarray study [47]. |
| Pooling samples/data | The use of Friedman test should be carefully addressed. Friedman test should be considered a generalization of the sign test and in this sense it has a modest statistical power of the sign test, both for normal and non normal distributions [18]. |
| Bias on microarray due to batch effects | Bias can be introduced when RNA samples are pooled due to insufficient ability to test geneets. Pooling appears to lower the efficiency of the labeling or hybridization steps, causing artefacts, as reported in Kendziorski’s experiment [16], |

B. Possible bias in the experimental setting.

| Issue | Description |
|-------|-------------|
| Bias on microarray due to batch effects | Bias can be introduced when RNA samples are pooled due to insufficient ability to test geneets. Pooling appears to lower the efficiency of the labeling or hybridization steps, causing artefacts, as reported in Kendziorski’s experiment [16], |
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5. Conclusion

Experimental setting in Homeopathy is particularly sensitive to bias, due to the very subtle mechanisms underlying the possibility that negligible doses of biochemical active principles cause effects on standardized and well suited in vitro biological models. Particularly for confounders, used also in solvents and for control setting, researchers must pay particular attention to the possibility that their analytical system might be tarnished by gross biases due to these confounders. Even statistics may hide bias due to an incorrect or not properly used statistical method.

In our opinion, in order to ascertain if the reported effects are caused by some chemical activity within the dilutions, the authors might address the bullet points recommended in Table 3.

Sources of funding

None.

Conflict of interest

None.

References

[1] Marzotto M, Bonafini C, Olioso D, Baruzzi A, Bettinetti L, Di Leva F, et al. Arnica montana stimulates extracellular matrix gene expression in a macrophage cell line differentiated to wound-healing phenotype. PLoS One 2016 Nov 10;11(11):e0166340.
[2] Stanzera J, Denkova P, Todorova M, Evtatleva L. Quantitative analysis of sesiquiterpen lactones in extract of Arnica montana L. by 1H NMR spectroscopy. J Pharm Biomed Anal 2011 Jan 5;54(1):94–9.
[3] Gertsch J, Sticher O, Schmidt T, Heilmann J. Influence of helenanolide-type sesiquiterpen lactones on gene transcription profiles in Jurkat T cells and human peripheral blood cells: anti-inflammatory and cytotoxic effects. Biochem Pharmacol 2003 Dec 1;66(11):2141–53.
[4] Jakobs A, Steinmann S, Heinrich SM, Schmidt TJ, Klempnauer KH. Helanin acetate, a natural sesiquiterpen lactone with anti-inflammatory and anti-cancer activity, disrupts the cooperation of CCAAT-box/enhancer-binding protein beta (C/EBPb) and co-activator p300. J Biol Chem 2016 Dec 9;291(50):26098–108.
[5] Lysy G, Knorre A, Schmidt TJ, Pahl HL, Merfort I. The anti-inflammatory sesiquiterpen lactone helanin inhibits the transcription factor NF-κappaB by directly targeting p65. J Biol Chem 1999 Dec 11;274(30):33508–16.
[6] Olioso D, Marzotto M, Bonafini C, Brizzi M, Bellavite P. Arnica montana effects on gene expression in a human macrophage cell line. Evaluation by quantitative real-time PCR. Homeopathy 2016 May;105(2):131–47.
[7] Marzotto M, Olioso D, Brizzi M, Tononi C, Cristofolleti M, Bellavite P. Extreme sensitivity of gene expression in human SH-SYSY neurocytes to ultra-low doses of Gelsemium sempervirens. BMC Complement Altern Med 2014 Mar 19;14:104.
[8] Magagnoli P, Forfelli A, Zanolini E, Marzotto M, Bellavite P. Dose-effect study of Gelsemium sempervirens in high dilutions on anxiety-related responses in mice. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2010 Jul 21;20(4):533–45.
[9] Chirumbolo S, Bjerkland G. Commentary: Arnica montana effects on gene expression in a human macrophage cell line: evaluation by quantitative real-time PCR. Front Immunol 2016 Sep 7:2780.
[10] Chirumbolo S. On Gelsemium and complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) in anxiety and experimental neurology. Neurol Ther 2015 Jun;4(1):1–10.
[11] Chirumbolo S. Plant-derived extracts in the neuroscience of anxiety on animal models: biases and comments. Int J Neurosci 2012 Apr;122(4):177–88.
[12] Verma VK, Li H, Wang R, Hirsova P, Mushref M, Liu Y, et al. Alcohol stimulates macrophage activation through caspase-dependent hepatocyte derived release of CD40L containing extracellular vesicles. J Hepatol 2016 Mar;64(3):651–60.
[13] Chirumbolo S. Gelsemine and Gelsemium sempervirens L. extracts in animal behavioral test: comments and related biases. Front Neuro 2011 May 16;2:31.
[14] Chirumbolo S. High diluted molecules and gene expression. Front Pharmacol 2014 Aug 14;5:183.
[15] Bellavite P. Gelsemium sempervirens and animal behavioral models. Front Neuro 2011 Sep 12;2:36.
[16] Mary-Huard T, Daudin JJ, Baccini M, Biggeri A, Bar-Hen A. Biases induced by pooling samples in microarray experiments. Bioinformatics 2007 Jul 1;23(13):1613–8.
[17] Fasold M, Binder H. Variation of RNA quality and quantity are major sources of batch effects in microarray expression data. Microarrays (Basel) 2014 Dec 16;3(4):322–39.
[18] Zimmerman DW, Zumbo BD. Relative power of the Wilcoxon test, the Friedman test, and repeated measures ANOVA on ranks. J Exp Educ 1993;62(1):75–86.
[19] Parekh S, Ziegenhain C, Vieth B, Etard W, Hellmann I. The impact of amplification on differential expression analyses by RNA-seq. Sci Rep 2016 May 9;6:25533.
[20] Rajkumar AP, Qvist P, Lazarus R, Lescai F, Ju J, Nyegaard M, et al. Experimental validation of methods for differential gene expression analysis and sample pooling in RNA-seq. BMC Genomics 2015 Jul 25;16:548.
[21] Wang C, Gong B, Bushel PR, Thierry-Mieg J, Thierry-Mieg D, Xu J, et al. The concordance between RNA-seq and microarray data depends on chemical treatment and transcript abundance. Nat Biotechnol 2014 Sep;32(9):926–32.
[22] Yuan F, Lei Y, Wang Q, Estberg LB, Huang Z, Scott GI, et al. Moderate ethanol administration accentuates cardiomyocyte contractile dysfunction and mitochondrial injury in high fat diet-induced obesity. Toxicol Lett 2015 Mar 18;233(3):267–77.
[23] Cahill A, Stalley GJ, Wang X, Hoek JB. Chronic ethanol consumption causes alterations in the structural integrity of mitochondrial DNA in aged rats. Hepatology 1999 Oct;30(4):881–8.
[24] Bolink JM, Karana R, Chiang PJ, Kilburn BA, Romero R, Diamond MP, et al. Apoptosis of alcohol-exposed human placental cytotrophoblast cells is downstream of intracellular calcium signaling. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 2014 Jun;38(6):1646–53.
[25] Guan Z, Lui CY, Morkin E, Bahl JL. Oxidative stress and apoptosis in cardiomyocyte induced by high-dose alcohol. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol 2004 Dec;44(6):696–702.
[26] Zhang J, He S, Zhou W, Yuari B. Ethanol induces oxidative stress and apoptosis in human umbilical vein endothelial cells. Int J Clin Exp Med 2016(6):2:4125–30.
[27] Rehman S, Chandel N, Salhan D, Rai P, Sharma R, Singh T, et al. Ethanol and vitamin D receptor in T cell apoptosis. J Neuroimmune Pharmacol 2013 Mar;8(1):251–61.
[28] Pourhoseingholi MA, Baghestani AR, Vahedi M. How to control confounding effects by statistical analysis. Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench 2012;5(2):79–83.
[29] Chiba Y. The sign of the unmeasured confounding bias under various standard populations. Biom J 2009;51(4):670–6.
[30] Sit N. Study designs in medicine. Balk Med J 2014;31(4):273–7.
[31] Simonsen AR, Hansen PL, Klosgen B. Nanobubbles give evidence of incomplete wetting at a hydrophobic interface. J Colloid Interface Sci 2004 May 1;273(1):291–9.
[32] Yang S, Dammer SM, Bremond N, Zandvliet HJ, Kooij ES, Lohse D. Characterization of nanobubbles on hydrophobic surfaces in water. Langmuir 2007 Jun 19;23(13):7072–7.
[33] Sedlak M, Rak D. Large-scale inhomogeneities in solutions of low molar mass compounds and mixtures of liquids: supramolecular structures or nanobubbles? J Phys Chem B 2013 Feb 28;117(8):2495–504.
[34] Filipe V, Hawe A, Jiskoot W. Critical evaluation of Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis (NTA) by NanoSight for the measurement of nanoparticles and protein aggregates. Pharm Res 2010 May;27(5):796–810.
[35] Chan EU, Ohi CD. Total internal reflection fluorescence microscopy for the study of nanobubble dynamics. Phys Rev Lett 2012;109:174501.
[36] Bunkin NF, Shkirin AV, Sayuzov NV, Babenko VA, Sychev AA, Penkov NV, et al. Formation and dynamics of ion-stabilized gas nanobubble phase in the bulk of aqueous NaCl solutions. J Phys Chem B 2016 Feb 25;120(7):1291–303.
[37] Bunkin NF, Yurchenko SO, Sayuzov NV, Shkirin AV. Structure of the nanobubble clusters of dissolved air in liquid media. J Biol Phys 2012 Jan;38(1):121–52.
[38] Usukiya FY, Enari M, Furukawa T, Nakagawa R, Makino Y, Kawagoe Y, et al. Zeta-potential of micro and/or nano-bubbles in water produced by some kind of gases. IFAC Proc Vol 2010;43(26):283–8. 3rd IFAC Conference in Modelling and Control in Agriculture, Horticuture and Post-Harvest Processing – Agricontrol.
[39] Ljunggren S, Eriksson JC. The lifetime of a colloid-sized gas bubble in water and the cause of the hydrophobic attraction. Colloids Surf A Physicochem Eng Asp 1997:129:151–5.
[40] Jin F, Ye J, Hong L, Lam H, Wu C. Slow relaxation mode in mixtures of water and organic molecules: supramolecular structures or nanobubbles? J Phys Chem B 2007 Mar 8;111(9):2255–61.
[41] An H, Liu G, Atkin R, Craig VSJ. Surface nanobubbles in nonaqueous media: looking for nanobubbles in DMSO, formamide, propylene carbonate, ethylammonium nitrate and propylammonium nitrate. ACS Nano 2015;9:7596–607.
[42] Soo CY, Song Y, Zheng Y, Campbell EC, Riches AC, Gunn-Moore F, et al. Nanoparticle tracking analysis monitors microvesicle and exosome secretion from immune cells. Immunology 2012 Jun;136(2):192–7.

[43] Chikramane PS, Kalita D, Suresh AK, Kane SG, Bellare JR. Why extreme dilutions reach non-zero asymptotes: a nanoparticulate hypothesis based on froth flotation. Langmuir 2012 Nov 13;28(45):15864–75.

[44] Chirumbolo S. Bias in homeopathy: technical notes Malays. J Med Biol Res 2015;2(3):191–4.

[45] Pawitan Y, Murthy KR, Michiels S, Ploner A. Bias in the estimation of false discovery rate in microarray studies. Bioinformatics 2005 Oct 15;21(20):3865–72. Erratum in: Bioinformatics. 2005 Dec 15;21(24):4435.

[46] Liao JC, Lin Y, Selvanayagam ZE, Shih WJ. A mixture model for estimating the local false discovery rate in DNA microarray analysis. Bioinformatics 2004 Nov 1;20(16):2694–701.

[47] Mayo MS, Gajewski BJ, Morris JS. Some statistical issues in microarray gene expression data. Radiat Res 2006 Jun;165(6):745–8.