Antioxidant Supplements and Gastrointestinal Diseases: A Critical Appraisal
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Abstract
The gastrointestinal tract digests and absorbs dietary nutrients, protects the body against physical and chemical damage from contents in its lumen, provides immunity against external antigens, and keeps an optimum environment for the gut microbiota. These functions cannot be performed normally in several diseases of which the following are discussed here: irritable bowel syndrome and inflammatory bowel disease, which includes Crohn’s disease and ulcerative colitis. Because these diseases are associated with oxidative stress, a host of antioxidant supplements are used for maintenance and recovery of the gut functions. However, the benefits of these supplements have not been established. The available 80 human trials were rated for levels of confidence and for benefits of the antioxidant supplements. For Crohn’s disease, the supplements for which clear benefits occurred in at least 2 studies were allopurinol, Boswellia serrata (frankincense or shallaki), Artemisia species (wormwood), Tripterygium wilfordii (léi gōng téng), and omega-3 fatty acids. Similar beneficial supplements for ulcerative colitis were allopurinol, Matricaria chamomilla (chamomile), Curcuma longa (curcumin in turmeric), and omega-3 fatty acids. There was also a clear benefit for ulcerative colitis in 2 studies where a multiherbal Chinese medicine preparation and an Ayurvedic medicine preparation were used. For irritable bowel syndrome, there was only a marginal benefit of some of the antioxidant supplements. Thus, some antioxidant supplements may be beneficial at certain stages of specific diseases. This is consistent with the current concept that antioxidants act by inhibiting oxidative stress pathways in a tissue- and environment-specific manner and not by simply acting as scavengers.

Introduction
The problems in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract can lead to many diseases, but in this review only irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) and inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), which includes Crohn’s disease (CD) and ulcerative colitis (UC), are considered. IBS affects 10–25% of the population globally with a slightly higher prevalence...
in females compared to males [1]. CD inflicts individuals in the prime of life between 10 and 30 years of age [2]. In developed countries, the prevalence of CD exceeds 4 million [3] and, surprisingly, the prevalence of CD has increased following the improvement in human hygiene and industrialization [3]. The worldwide prevalence of UC varies between 0.5 and 24.5 per 100,000 [3]. While CD is more common among smokers, UC is more common in ex-smokers and nonsmokers [4]. For these diseases, a variety of therapies are used to attain remission of the symptoms and/or avoid relapse once the patient is in remission. The current understanding of the pathology suggests that oxidative stress may contribute to these diseases [5]. This review contains a critical appraisal of the efficacies of these supplements based on the available literature on human trials. No studies were found on antioxidant supplements and celiac disease and hence it was not discussed here. This review covers the structure and function of the GI tract, diagnosis, pathophysiology, and current treatment of the diseases followed by a rationale for the use of antioxidant supplements. The efficacies of different supplements are discussed, leading to a synopsis, recommendations, and a critical appraisal. This not a meta-analysis type of study, but instead is based on opinions of the authors because the vast variety of antioxidant supplements were used for different GI diseases at different stages and examined by different methods.

Structure and Function of the Gastrointestinal Tract

The GI tract is a tube with mucosa lining its lumen, followed by a set of layers of submucosa, and smooth muscle with a rich supply of nerves and blood vessels. The mucosa enables the GI tract to perform its main functions: digestion and absorption of nutrients from the diet, protection of the body against physical and chemical damage from luminal contents, and provision of immunity against them [5, 6]. The lining is made up of a single layer of epithelial cells. The small intestinal epithelium is extensively folded to provide a very large absorptive surface area, resulting in distinct villus and crypt regions. The mucosa contains several types of cells: enterocytes, Paneth, goblet, and enteroendocrine cells [5–8]. A large proportion (80%) of the mucosal cells are enterocytes whose main role is the absorption of nutrients and unconjugated bile salts. They may also be involved in chemical processing of food and cooperate with other cells in the induction of immunological tolerance to the ingested proteins [5, 6]. Paneth cells synthesize and secrete substantial quantities of antimicrobial peptides which are key mediators of host-microbe interactions, including homeostatic balance with colonizing microbiota and innate immune protection from enteric pathogens [5, 8]. They also secrete factors that help sustain and modulate the epithelial stem and progenitor cells. Goblet cells secrete mucin 2 polymers which form mucus that plays a key role in mucosal immunology [7]. Based on their location, there are several types of goblet cells. In the colon, the surface goblet cells secrete continuously to maintain the inner mucus layer, whereas goblet cells of the colonic and small intestinal crypts secrete upon stimulation such as after endocytosis or in response to acetylcholine [7]. Thus, the mucus system itself and the regulation of its secretion differ between the small and the large intestine [5, 7]. Enteroendocrine cells, distributed throughout the GI tract, form a large endocrine organ to aid in the control of GI secretion and motility, the regulation of food intake, postprandial glucose levels, and metabolism. They also communicate directly with neurons innervating the GI tract and thus form part of the gut “brain axis.” Beneath the endothelium is the lamina propria, which supports the mucosal epithelium. It consists of the extracellular matrix, blood and lymphatic vessels, neuronal and smooth muscle cells, and various immune cells (lymphocytes, macrophages) [5, 7, 8].

The mucosa is constantly being renewed as the stem cells in the crypt divide into progenitor cells, which can differentiate into secretory (Paneth, mucin-secreted goblet, and enteroendocrine cells) or absorptive (enterocyte) lineages [9]. The microenvironment surrounding the progenitor cells may determine the resulting cell types and their fate. The differentiated cells undergo apoptosis and are shed into the lumen in about 3 days. Damage to these structures, cross-talk between them, or imbalance in individual cell types diminishes barrier functions and sensitizes the GI tract with dietary antigens and GI normal microbiota, leading to various GI diseases [9].

Pathophysiology of Gastrointestinal Diseases

IBD is a multifactorial condition resulting from an interaction between genes and environmental factors [10]. Based on genome-wide association studies, there are 163 loci for IBD of which 110 are shared between CD and UC [11]. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms in the nucleotide-binding oligomerization domain gene (NOD2) may play an important role in CD. The NOD2 gene regulates barrier function, autophagy, and hypoprotection of...
the gut to normal microflora and health of Paneth cells. Three alleles of NOD2 (Arg702Trp, Gly908Arg, and 980fs981) have been studied extensively [10]. A large segment of CD patients in Western countries carry at least one mutated NOD2 allele. Persons with 2 of the mutated alleles have a 20- to 40-fold higher risk of developing CD. Thus, mutations in NOD2 gene are strong genetic risk factors for CD. The NOD2 binds muramyl dipeptide, which is a component of bacterial cell wall peptidoglycan [10], thereby leading to an upregulation of NF-κB expression. NOD2 may directly influence the composition of the gut microbiota by regulating the production of a subgroup of intestinal antimicrobial peptides known as cryptdins, which are produced by Paneth cells in the intestinal crypts. The patients with CD may also show decreased populations of Faecalibacterium prausnitzii and Roseburia species and increase in bacteria such as Escherichia coli [11].

Unlike UC, CD is confined to the large bowel with diffuse inflammation of the colonic and rectal mucosa. It is associated with colorectal cancer risk, which increases with the duration of symptoms [12]. In a study on Indian patients with UC, the risk of colorectal cancer was 900 times higher than the general population [12]. The basic mechanisms of UC may be similar to those of CD: increased membrane permeability, immune exaggeration, and decreased autophagy [13]. The hepatocyte nuclear factor 4-alpha (HNF4A) gene has been associated with UC [13]. HNF4A may regulate epithelial permeability since it controls adherens junctions, tight junctions, and desmosomes, which play an important role in cell-cell junctions. In UC, the basement membrane may also be compromised by mutations in the E-cadherin encoding gene CDH1 and the laminin β1 subunit encoding gene LAMB1 [13]. Another defense is through the production of anti-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-10 and TG-Fβ, which activate TH17 (Treg cells) which in turn suppresses antigen-presenting cells and dendritic cells to secrete IL-17 [13]. The solute carrier family 9 member (SLC9A) 3 gene, encoding an epithelial sodium/hydrogen exchanger, has also been implicated in UC, but not in CD [13]. It was hypothesized that there is a considerable overlap between IBS and UC [5]. Compared to healthy controls, the mucosal biopsy samples obtained from the colon, rectum, and terminal ileum of IBS patients show more inflammation [5]. There may also be similarities between IBS and UC in the alterations in the serotonergic and cytokine-related pathways. Yet, IBS may lack the expression of several proteins which are markers of UC [5].

**Microbiota and Gastrointestinal Diseases**

There is a symbiotic relationship between the microbiota and the gut: the human host contributes the nutrients needed for the survival of the microbes, which in turn aid the host in nutrition (e.g., converting indigestible dietary fibers into short-chain fatty acids butyrate, propionate, and acetate), protection against pathogens, and regulation of the immune responses [10, 14]. A disruption in the ecological balance of the GI microbiota can lead to GI diseases or be caused by them. In IBD there is a decrease in the population of several protective bacteria and an increase in the population of harmful bacteria [14]. Food poisoning may be viral, but is mostly due to bacterial contamination in food and water. A large portion of the population also has Helicobacter pylori infection, which can lead to secondary diseases [10, 14, 15]. The infecting bacteria, or the antibiotics used to eliminate them, may also alter the balance of the indigenous microbiota. Often these problems are overcome on their own with time, but sometimes probiotic supplementation may be needed [10, 14–18].

**Diagnosis of Gastrointestinal Diseases**

IBS is a chronic condition of the large bowel that is characterized by abdominal pain, cramping, bloating, gas, diarrhea, and/or constipation [1]. Patients may be categorized as diarrheal-predominant, constipation-predominant, and as having both. Unlike IBD, there are no macroscopic or microscopic changes in the bowel tissue structure, and therefore IBS is also called a "functional disorder of gastrointestinal tract" [1, 19]. It is diagnosed by exclusion criteria for cancer, IBD, and infections. IBD may be divided into CD and UC, which share several common symptoms except that the affected area in UC is the colon but in CD it may be the colon or ileum [20]. CD symptoms may include diarrhea, fever, fatigue, abdominal pain and cramping, blood in the stool (bright red blood in toilet bowl or darker blood mixed with stools), mouth sores, reduced appetite, weight loss, and anal fistulas [21]. For UC the part of the colon being inflamed is considered and the general symptoms are: diarrhea (often with blood or pus), abdominal pain and cramping, rectal pain, blood in the stool (bright red blood in toilet bowl or darker blood mixed with stools), urgency and inability to defecate, weight loss, fatigue, and fever [22]. There is no single test to diagnose CD or UC. The patient may undergo all or some of the following tests:
blood tests for anemia or infection, fecal occult blood test, colonoscopy (presence of clusters of inflammatory cells called granulomas point to CD), flexible sigmoidoscopy, computerized tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, capsule endoscopy, double-balloon endoscopy, and small bowel imaging. Diagnosis of either disease is made by ruling out other factors. Several indices and scoring systems of GI diseases have been used by investigators to determine the efficacies of supplements as indicated in Table 1.

Current Treatments of Gastrointestinal Diseases

CD and UC are chronic GI inflammatory diseases with periods of relapse and remission, and the treatments aim to achieve and maintain remission. The current treatments include a combination of anti-inflammatory (steroids), immunosuppressive agents (e.g., azathioprine, sulfasalazine, mesalamine, 6-mercaptopurine, and methotrexate) and anti-tissue necrosis factor-α (anti-TNF-α) even though some treatments may have serious adverse effects [23, 24]. For CD, a phase II clinical trial reported that 21 oligomeric antisense specific for SMAD7, which suppresses TGF-β1, achieved 65% remission as compared to 15% with placebo [25, 26]. The compound is ready for the phase III clinical trial. Probiotics and prebiotics may also be included in the treatment so as to normalize the GI microfloral ecosystem [14–18].

IBS treatment depends on the most bothersome symptoms of the patient. The treatment may include the use of antispasmodics, laxatives, dopamine antagonists, 5-hydroxy tryptamine-3 antagonists and/or 5-hydroxy tryptamine-4 agonists, sedatives, antibiotics, probiotics, modifications in diet and lifestyle, and complementary and alternative therapies [19]. For C-IBS, linaclotide and lubiprostone may be used and for D-IBS, cilansetron or ramosetron may be given. Rifaximin has emerged as a strong option for the treatment of IBS because of its broad-spectrum bactericidal activity in vitro, and its favorable tolerability profile [19]. Nitric oxide (NO) donors, opioid receptor agonists, and ketotifen have also been proposed for IBS treatment [19].

Rationale for the Use of Antioxidant Supplements in Gastrointestinal Diseases

Normal physiological processes result in the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) such as peroxide, superoxide, hydroxyl radical, and peroxynitrite. The ROS occur normally in the body at very low concentrations (nanomolar to micromolar) [27]. The body needs them for survival but excess ROS might have deleterious effects [28, 29] because the GI tract maintains an appropriate balance of the levels of ROS. The enzyme superoxide dismutase decreases the level of superoxide by catalyzing its conversion into molecular oxygen or hydrogen peroxide [27, 30]. Similarly, catalase also catalyzes the degradation of hydrogen peroxide into oxygen and water. Glutathione peroxidases decrease the levels of peroxides using reduced glutathione (GSH) [31]. This requires maintenance of an appropriate ratio of GSH and its oxidized form (GSSG). Whereas γ-glutamylcysteine ligase and GSH synthase are pivotal for the GSH synthesis, nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADPH)-dependent GSSG reductase is key to the conversion of GSSG to GSH. Ascorbate may also quench ROS and is converted into a transient unstable species and then into dehydroascorbate. Dehydroascorbate reductase uses GSH to recycle it back into ascorbate [27]. The reduced peroxiredoxin can also quench hydrogen peroxide and gets oxidized in the process. Thioredoxin can convert the peroxiredoxin back by oxidation of thioredoxin which in turn is reduced by thioredoxin reductase and NADPH+ [27]. The cysteine-cystine cycle also plays a key role in maintaining the appropriate balance of ROS [32].

High levels of ROS may damage cells by oxidizing lipids and DNA and protein in various tissues [27]. In the GI tract, the cellular redox potential may even determine the fate of the differentiating cells [9]. Wnt/β-catenin and Notch signaling pathways are major determinants of commitment of the cells for specialization. There may be a direct relationship among NADPH oxidase 1 (NOX-1)-dependent ROS generation, differential activation of Wnt/β-catenin or Notch signaling pathways, and intestinal proliferation and lineage commitment. Changes in the redox potentials of GSH/GSSG and cysteine/cystine (Cys/CySS) have been correlated with intestinal phenotypic transitions. Reducing potentials may favor cell proliferation, but a switch to oxidizing potentials may lead to cell growth arrest [9, 33].

Studies with animal models have shown that IBD leads to decreased glutathione concentrations, high DNA oxidation, lipid peroxidation, myeloperoxidase, and elevated TNF-α and malondialdehyde levels [34]. Catalase and superoxide dismutase levels are also altered in some models [34]. The gene ablation of inducible NO synthase (iNOS) in mice showed significant attenuation of UC indicating that iNOS and NO play a major role in UC [35]. In UC, the inflamed human lamina propria showed an increased
| Ref. | Disease | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 44 IBD | O: combination therapy after failed azathioprine monotherapy (n = 11) up to 8 months | 6-TGN levels in erythrocytes | 50 mg allopurinol with 50 mg azathioprine sufficient to raise 6-TGN level | ++** Small sample size, no clinical results |
| 45 IBD | O: combination therapy after failed monotherapy, given allopurinol + thiopurine (n = 77) up to 5 years | 6-TGN levels in erythrocytes | Long-term combination therapy effective and well tolerated | ++** No clinical results |
| 46 IBD | O: azathioprine combination therapy (n = 10; 8 CD, 2 UC), 12 weeks | 6-TGN levels in erythrocytes and hypoxanthine-guanine phosphoribosyltransferase | Increased hypoxanthine-guanine phosphoribosyltransferase and 6-TGN levels | ++** No clinical results |
| 85 UC | RDBP: prophylactic use of pouchitis (n = 273), 2 years | Pouchitis incidence and pouch function | No effects | ±***** Restorative surgery in UC may result in pouchitis |
| 48 UC | RDBP: combination therapy with mesalamine, patients in remission (n = 199), 12 months | Clinical and endoscopy after 1, 6 and 12 months | Combination therapy better for 6 but not 12 months | +***** High relapse rate in mesalamine alone in first 3 months |
| 47 UC | RDB: sulfasalazine and prednisol enema (n = 45) ± allopurinol (n = 46) or DMSO (n = 45), 12 months | Remission and relapse rate | 2 weeks: 51% in remission vs. 84% with allopurinol or DMSO; over 12 months 5% relapse with allopurinol or DMSO vs. 25% without | ++*** No placebo, limited measurements |
| 86 IBS | RDBP: (n = 58), 1–3 months | IBS, pain and distension scores, bowel habit satisfaction | Effects similar to placebo | ±*** |
| 87 IBS | RDBP crossover: (n = 110), 5 + 5 months | Gastrointestinal Symptoms Rating Score, IBS Quality of Life, EuroQol | Effects similar to placebo | ±**** Subjective questionnaires, high dropout |
| 88 IBS | O: constipation-predominated refractory patients (n = 33), 8 weeks | Self-rated VAS scores | Pain and discomfort decreased significantly | +* No placebo, subjective questionnaires |
| 89 UC | RDBP: (n = 44), 4 weeks | SCCAI, sigmoidoscope scores, and histological scores | Better than placebo for SCCAI and histological scores not for sigmoidoscopic scores | +*** Small sample size and short time |
| 90 UC | RDBC: compared with mesalamine (n = 120), 8 weeks | Colonoscopy, stools, abdominal pain, and distension | Effects similar to mesalamine | +**** This was a pilot study |
| 91 UC | RDBP: extract 1,200 or 1,800 mg or placebo (n = 224), 8 weeks | Colonoscopy, stools, abdominal pain, and distension | 1,800 mg gave better clinical response but adverse effects in half the patients | −***** Has in vitro inhibitory activity against TNF-α, IL-1β, and NF-κB |
| 92 IBS | O: bilberry and other compounds D-IBS (n = 21) and C-IBS (n = 10), 3 weeks | Stool frequency and consistency | Small improvement in C-IBS but not in D-IBS | +** Small sample, no control |
| 93 UC | O: mild to moderate active UC (n = 13), 6 weeks treatment + 3 weeks | Remission, CAI, SIBDQ fecal calprotectin, endoscopy, histology score | 63% remission at 6 weeks which did not last in the follow-up | ++** No control, small sample size |
| Ref. | Disease | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 52 CC | Boswellia serrata (frankincense, shalaki, salai) | RDBP: extract vs. placebo in collagenous colitis (n = 26), 6 weeks | Clinical remission, SF-36 questionnaire, colonoscopy, stools | More patients in remission 63.6 vs. 26.7%; no effect on colonoscopy or SF-36 | ++**** Small sample |
| 94 CC | | RDBP: collagenous colitis in remission (n = 82), 52 weeks | Remission maintenance, time to relapse, CDAI and IBDQ | Terminated early due to no difference | ± **** Good safety profile |
| 49 CD | | RDBP: extract (n = 44) vs. mesalamine (n = 39), 8 weeks | CDAI noninferiority vs. mesalamine | CDAI decreased: 90 (treated) and 53 points (controls) | + +**** |
| 53 CD | O: diet with curcumin, vitamins, microbiotics and others, juvenile CD (n = 6) | Clinical remission, weight gain | Prolonged remission (years) in most with continued therapy; improved patient growth | | + +** |
| 54 UC | O: active UC, resin (n = 20) vs. sulfasalazine (n = 10), 6 weeks | Remission, stool properties, histopathology, serum and blood biochemistry | More effective for remission (14/20) than sulfasalazine (4/10) | | + +** Small trial, short time period |
| Capsicum annum (chili pepper) | 95 IBS | RDBP: red pepper (n = 23) vs. placebo (n = 27), 6 weeks | Likert scale, pain, and bloating | Low efficacy at low doses, abdominal pain at higher doses | –*** Doses need to be optimized |
| 96 IBS | | RDBP: red pepper (n = 15) vs. placebo (n = 15), 5 weeks | Symptom score, epigastric pain, fullness, nausea | Relief more significant in pepper (60%) than placebo (30%) | +**** |
| 97 IBS | RP crossover: Guajillo chili vs. placebo (n = 10), 7 days each phase | Rectal pain threshold and upper abdominal discomfort | Decreased pain threshold, but increased upper abdominal discomfort | | –*** Small sample |
| Carnosine | 98 IBS | RDBP: dose escalation study 500, 1,000, 1,500 mg (n = 25), 12 weeks | Diarrhea symptoms | Diarrhea decreased after 1,500 mg | ++**** Gulf War syndrome |
| Matricaria chamomilla (chamomile) | 62 UC | RDBP: chamomile + myrrh + coffee charcoal vs. mesalamine (n = 96), 12 months | Noninferiority measured by CCAI and relapse rates | Relapse rates similar to mesalamine | + +**** Role of chamomile not clear |
| 61 UC | RDBP: chamomile + myrrh + coffee charcoal vs. mesalamine (n = 39), 12 months | CD4 + T-cell compartment | With mesalamine there was a steady decrease with flare but different patterns with chamo. | | + +**** Role of chamomile not clear |
| Curcumin (isolated from Curcuma longa which is turmeric) | 58 IBD | O: UC (n = 5), CD (n = 5), 3 months | Clinical assessment and blood parameters | Improvement with curcumin | + ** No controls, very small sample |
| 59 IBD | O: pediatric UC/CD patients (n = 11), 6 weeks | Tolerability in pediatric patients and disease indices | Improvement in some patients, 3 g/day tolerated in all patients | | ±* Small study, no controls, limited determinations |
| 55 IBS | RR: turmeric extract (72 or 144 mg) (n = 207), 8 weeks | Questionnaires on pain and discomfort, self-reported effectiveness | Similar improvement at both doses compared to initial baseline | | + ** IBS symptoms can fluctuate over time; no controls |
| 56 UC | RDBP: mesalamine plus curcumin/placebo refractory to mesalamine (n = 50), 1 month | Remission, SCCAI and endoscopy | Effective for all parameters | | ++**** Short duration of study |
| 57 UC | RDBP: mesalamine with curcumin enema or placebo (n = 45), 8 weeks | UCDAI, improvement in endoscopic activity, remission | More improvement in all parameters than by placebo | | ++**** Short study duration |
### Table 1 (continued)

| Ref. | Disease | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 99   | IBD     | O crossover: ferrous fumarate vs. iron sucrose (n = 19), 14 days each in iron deficiency anemia IBD | CDAl, UCDAI, general well-being, abdominal pain, vascular oxidative stress | Ferrous fumarate increased disease activity, iron sucrose increased oxidative stress | -** |
| 100  | UC      | RDBP: EGCG (n = 15) or placebo (n = 4), 7 weeks | Remission, UCDAI; IBD questionnaire | Remission 8/15 vs. placebo 0/4 (p = 0.1); UCDAI decrease in 10/15 vs. 0/4 with placebo | +** Small sample and short duration |
| 101  | IBS     | O: IBS (constipation/ diarrhea) patients (n = 41), 5 weeks | Stool properties and frequency | Improved bowel function | * Small sample size, no controls |
| 102  | CD      | O: active CD patients (n = 18), 4 weeks | CDAI, IL-6, TNF-a, CRP and total antioxidant potential | Improvement in all parameters | ** No adverse effects, small sample size, no controls |
| 103  | UC      | RDBP: combination therapy with mesalamine (n = 37), 4 weeks | Modified Truelove Witts Severity Index, remission | Small benefits for the measured parameters | *** Small sample and short duration |
| 104  | CD      | O: active CD patients (n = 16), 4 weeks | CDAI, endoscopic inflammation | No improvement | *+ It is a TNF-α inhibitor |
| 72   | IBS     | RDBP: oil vs. placebo (n = 90), 8 weeks | Pain and quality of life based on three types of questionnaires | Severity of pain decreased vs. placebo | ** High dropout rate |
| 69   | IBS     | RDBP: oil vs. placebo, D-IBS patients (n = 74), 6 weeks + 2 week follow-up | Change in symptoms at 3, 6 and 8 weeks | Small but significant difference at 6 weeks; none after the follow-up | **+ Abstract only available, dose not quoted |
| 71   | IBS     | RDBP: oil (n = 35) vs. placebo (n = 37) IBS-mixed or D-IBS, 4 weeks | Total IBS Symptom Score | Significantly better at 24 h; at 4 weeks: 40% reduction vs. 24% with placebo (p = 0.0246) | *** Used a sustained release preparation |
| 105  | IBS     | RDBP: oil vs. placebo, pediatric IBS (n = 42), 2 weeks | Neurological exam, gastrointestinal symptom rating scale, other variables | Pain decreased in 75% of treated group vs. 19% of placebo; no other changes | *** Short and small trial |
| 67   | IBS     | RDBP: oil (n = 52) vs. placebo (n = 49), 1 month | Pain, distension, stool frequency, flatulence, borborygmi | Symptoms improved significantly compared to placebo (p < 0.05) | **+*** Well tolerated, short duration |
| 68   | IBS     | RDBP: oil vs. placebo (n = 18), 3 weeks | Symptom severity, stool frequency | Worked better than placebo | ** Small sample and short duration |
| 70   | IBS     | RDBP oil vs. placebo (n = 57), 4 weeks + 4 week follow-up | Symptom changes and Total IBS Symptom Score at 0, 4, 8 weeks | Score decreased more at 4 (and 8 weeks) vs. 0 weeks (p < 0.01) vs. no change in placebo | +** Even at 8 weeks still partial effect |
| 106  | UC      | RBP: peel extract vs. placebo (n = 78), 4 weeks + 6 week follow-up | Lichtiger CAI | CAI decreased marginally, better than placebo at 4 but not 10 weeks | ±** |

GI Diseases and Antioxidants
| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 107  | IBS                         | RDBP: chronic constipation with/without IBS (n = 20), 1 month | Fecal weight and colonic transit time | Stool frequency increased and transit time decreased vs. no change with placebo | ++*** Small sample |
| 108  | UC                          | OR: psyllium (n = 35) or mesalamine (n = 37) or both (n = 30), 1 year | Maintenance of remission | Failure rate: psyllium (40%), mesalamine (35%) vs. both (30%) | ++*** |

**Pycnogenol**

| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 109  | CD                          | O: pediatric patients in remission (n = 15) vs. healthy controls (n = 15), 10 weeks | Oxidative stress markers | Positive improvement | +* Small study, good study on CDAI vs. oxidative stress |

**Resveratrol (red wine)**

| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 110  | UC                          | RDBP: resveratrol vs. placebo, active UC (n = 50), 6 weeks | Serum inflammatory markers, IBDQ-9, CCAI | Greater reduction in TNF-α, CRP, NF-κB and CCAI vs. placebo, increase IBDQ | **** Short duration, all changes were small |

**Superoxide dismutase**

| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 111  | CD                          | O: 2 trials; patients refractory to steroids (n = 26), used with desferroxamine | CDAI, anatomic healing | No relapse in 12 and 1 relapse in 9 patients | +* Open trials, placebo, more recent trials not found |

**Potentilla erecta (Tormentil)**

| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 112  | UC                          | O: escalating dose trial 1,200; 1,800; 2,400; 3,000 mg (n = 16), 3 weeks each with 4 week washout | Side effects, CAI, CRP, tannins | CAI decreased during treatment and increased during washout, no side effects | ++** Safety trial, small sample |

**Artemesia species (Wormwood)**

| Ref. | Disease (psyllium, isabgol) | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 64   | CD                          | RDBP: wormwood (n = 20) vs. placebo (n = 20) with decreasing steroids 10 weeks + 10 weeks no steroids, no wormwood | Change in prednisone use, CDAI, HAMD, IBDQ, VAS | 18 treated patients stayed off steroids, CDAI, HAMD, IBDQ, and VAS improved, placebo patients deteriorated without steroids | ++**** Longer duration study would be beneficial |
| 65   | CD                          | OC: usual medications with (n = 10) or without wormwood (n = 10), 6 weeks | TNF-α levels, CDAI, Hamilton Depression Scale, IBDQ | Improvement in all parameters with wormwood | ++** Small sample and short duration |

Types of trials: O, open, R, random, B, blind, DB, double blind, C, controlled, P, placebo controlled. Benefit ratings: ++, clear benefit, +, some benefit, ±, no benefit, –, adverse effects outweigh benefits. Quality of studies: ***** RDBP or RDB crossover or RDBC trials with good sample size and duration of several weeks to years, the number of stars decrease with the quality of trial. Indices and scoring systems of GI diseases: IBDQ (inflammatory bowel disease questionnaire) is the most comprehensive and contains 60 questions on current status and history of GI health, bowel movements and anxiety, general health, energy, ability to focus, medication, and other diseases [113]; CDAI (Crohn’s Disease Activity Index) is a weekly sum of the scores based on lost fluid or the number of very soft stools, abdominal pain, arthritis/arthritis, mucocutaneous lesions, iritis/uvitis, anal disease, external fistula, fever over 37.8°C, anti-diarrheal use, abdominal mass, low hematocrit, and body weight [114]; CDEIS (Crohn’s Disease Endoscopic Index of Severity) is based on locations of deep or superficial lengths of the surface involved in the disease and ulcerated surface [115]; IBS score is based on stomach pain, distension, bowel movement satisfaction and comfort, bowel habits and structure including passing of mucus and blood, effect of bowel movements on pain, history of absence from work due to stomach problems [116]; SCCAI (Simple Clinical Colitis Activity Index) is based on bowel frequency during the day and during the night, urgency for defecation, blood in stool, general well-being, and extracolonic features [117]; SIBDQ is a shorter version of the CDAI questionnaire; UCDAI (Ulcerative Colitis Disease Activity Index) is based on stool frequency, rectal bleeding, mucosal appearance, and the physician’s rating of disease activity [118]; Rutgeerts score, NRI (Nutrition Risk Index) EuroQol, Modified Truelove Witts Severity Index (also called Lichtiger CAI), DAI (Disease Activity Index), VAS score for pain, and Likert scale pain and bloating have also been used.
infiltration by neutrophils and myeloperoxidase activity [24]. At early stages of CD, there is a patchy necrosis of leukocytes near the crypts and an increased number of macrophages and granulocytes [35]. These phagocytic cells produce large amounts of NO and superoxide, resulting in the formation of peroxynitrite which can cause tyrosine nitration and also cause DNA damage. Thus, in CD and UC, there is an increased production of ROS and peroxynitrite by phagocytic cells (neutrophils, monocytes, and macrophages) that infiltrate the mucosa. The inflammation also results in increased TNF-α which in turn can activate iNOS, thereby producing even larger amounts of NO. TNF-α also activates NF-κB, which translocates to the nucleus and activates mucosal inflammation genes such as the cytokines IL-6, IL-8 IL-1β, IL-10, TNF-α, ICAM, and P-selectin [34, 35]. This inflammatory pathway further triggers the generation of ROS. The importance of oxidative stress in this pathway is further confirmed by the use of sulfasalazine and mesalamine in the therapy for IBD [23, 24, 34, 35].

The conventional hypothesis is that antioxidant supplements simply scavenge ROS. However, based on the kinetic constraints, it is not possible for any concentrations of antioxidant supplements to scavenge ROS sufficiently to prevent biological damage [32]. An alternative hypothesis is that antioxidant supplements modulate endogenous mechanisms that either decrease the production of ROS or increase the enzymes that decompose ROS. One key pathway by which several antioxidants work involves the nuclear factor erythroid-related factor 2 (Nrf2) and the electrophile response element (EpRE), which is also called the antioxidant response element (ARE) [32, 33]. Nrf2 is normally bound to Keap1 in the cytoplasm, but polyphenols dissociate this complex to release Nrf2 which is then phosphorylated and transported to the nucleus where it binds EpRE and results in the transcription of genes for several enzymes which can either degrade ROS or prevent their production [32, 33]. Several antioxidants including curcumin, boswellic acids, planar aromatics, phenols, and rosmarinic acid can activate the Nrf2 pathway in animals [32, 36–39]. Antioxidant supplements may also decrease ROS levels through action on other enzymes [40]. For example, one of the enzymes that generates superoxide anions is xanthine oxidase, and allopurinol inhibits it [85]. Curcumin inhibits the inflammatory pathway by decreasing the activities of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor, IL-1β and COX, the AKT/mTOR pathway that controls the energy, and also the insulin growth factor and insulin pathways [40]. Resveratrol influences the aryl hydrocarbon receptor, COX, protein kinase C, adenosine monophosphate (AMP) kinase, and sirtuin 1 [40]. Since individual tissues differ in the activities of the enzymes involved, the action of antioxidant supplements may also be tissue and disease dependent. Hence, it is important to determine which antioxidant supplements are efficacious specifically against GI diseases.

**Antioxidant Supplement Benefits: Analysis of Trials**

Vitamins, minerals, and related compounds which act as cofactors for key enzymes are important to human health and these, as well as the effects of exercise, have been examined extensively [41–43]. Here the focus is human trials that examined the efficacies of various antioxidant supplements against GI diseases.

The initial general Medline search using the following keywords resulted in 372 references: “celiac or Crohn’s or inflammatory bowel or irritable bowel or colitis” and “antioxidants” and “clinical trials”. A modified search using the following keywords and the name of each antioxidant led to a total of 340 publications: “celiac” or “Crohn’s” or “inflammatory bowel” or “irritable bowel” or “colitis”, and “trial”. However, very few of these searches were human clinical trials. Most of them were reviews or in vitro or animal studies. The original studies on human clinical trials are listed in Tables 1–3. These studies differed not only in the antioxidants tested, but also in the study methods, criteria, sample sizes, study duration, use of placebos or controls, rigor, and subjectivity (random, blind, open and questionnaires, types of clinical symptoms measured) [113–118]. Benefit ratings were provided for some guidance. A rating of “++” was given when there were either statistically significant benefits to the treated groups over the controls or there was a significant increase in the percent of patients with improvements and there were little or no adverse effects. The “+” rating was given for the cases where there were only marginal differences in some of the parameters, A rating of “±” was given when there were no statistically significant benefits. The studies where the adverse effects outweighed benefits received the rating “−”.

**Allopurinol**

Allopurinol had been tested as a combined therapy with routinely used drugs such as sulfasalazines or steroids [44–48, 85]. In 3 open studies on IBD, allopurinol combination therapy increased thioguanine nucleotide (6-TGN) levels to greater than with monotherapy levels...
with sulfasalazine, mesalamine or steroids (Table 1) [44–46]. In UC patients, combination therapy with allopurinol gave better relapse rates than sulfasalazine and prednisone enema alone, but the results on combination therapy with mesalamine were not as promising (Table 1) [47, 48]. Thus, allopurinol may be useful as an adjunct therapy to enhance the levels of the immunosuppressive metabolites like 6-TGN.

**Boswellia serrata**

*Boswellia serrata* resins contain boswellic acids such as acetyl-keto-β-boswellic acid which is a lipoxygenase inhibitor and may have anti-inflammatory properties [49]. *Boswellia* resins have been used in Ayurvedic medicine (shallaki or salai) [50] and in Europe (olibanum or frankincense) [51]. *Boswellia* extracts proved useful against collagenous colitis in one study but not in another (Table 1) [52, 94]. A random double-blind control study showed *Boswellia* extracts to be useful in CD but less efficacious than mesalamine [49]. Of greater interest is a small study on juvenile CD where capsules containing *Boswellia* plus several other ingredients were efficacious in maintaining remission over several years [53]. A small open study in patients with UC for ≥6 weeks indicated *Boswellia* extracts to be superior over sulfasalazine in maintaining remission [54]. Thus, *Boswellia* has been reported to be useful as a replacement for mesalamine and sulfasalazine in GI diseases, but its usefulness along with other antioxidants may be of greater value.

**Curcumin**

Curcumin is an antioxidant in turmeric (the rhizome of *Curcuma longa* or *Curcuma domestica*) which is used extensively as a spice. It inhibits inflammatory pathways by decreasing activities of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor, IL-1β, and COX; the AKT/mTOR pathway that controls the energy; and insulin pathways [40]. It is well tolerated. A random blind study with 207 patients over 8 weeks showed curcumin to be beneficial for IBS patients, but the study did not contain a placebo control [55]. In 2 independent random double-blind placebo controlled studies, combined therapy with curcumin and mesalamine was superior over mesalamine alone [56, 57]. In 2 small open studies curcumin showed marginal efficacy for IBD in adult and pediatric patients [58, 59]. It is noted that these 2 studies contained both UC and CD patients. Thus, the evidence for curcumin alone as a therapy for UC may be marginal, but the evidence is better for its usefulness in its combined therapy with mesalamine.

**Chamomile**

The term chamomile is used for members of Asteraceae, particularly *Matricaria chamomilla*. Their flowers contain antioxidant and anti-inflammatory compounds such as bisabolol, chamazulene, apigenin, and luteolin [60]. Two random double-blind controlled studies on UC patients found that a chamomile preparation which also contained myrrh and coffee charcoal was as effective as mesalamine [61, 62]. However, since the preparation contained many components, one cannot assign the beneficial effects to chamomile alone.

**Wormwood**

Wormwood or *Artemisia* species are members of Asteraceae and contain antioxidants such as artemesinin, myrcene, and camphor [63]. A small random double-blind placebo controlled study reported that therapy with wormwood extracts decreased or eliminated the need for steroids in CD patients [64]. Another open study also found wormwood to be beneficial for CD patients [65]. Both studies, however, had small sample sizes and short duration.

**Peppermint**

Peppermint (*Mentha piperita*) contains several antioxidants such as rosmarinic acid, eriocitrin, luteolin, and terpenes [66]. Table 1 lists 7 studies that examined the benefits of peppermint in IBS [67–72]. Based on these studies, at best peppermint has a marginal efficacy. However, it is important to note that there are no adverse reactions although there was a high dropout rate in one trial [72].

The following antioxidants have also been examined, but there is insufficient evidence concerning their benefits: *Aloe vera* [86–89] *Andrographis paniculata* [90, 91], bilberry [92, 93], *Capsicum* [95–97], carnosine [98], ferrous fumarate [99], green tea [100], kiwifruit [101], mastic gum [102], N-acetyl cysteine [103], oxpentifylline [104], pomegranate [106], psyllium [107, 108], Pycnogenol [109], resveratrol (red wine) [110], superoxide dismutase [11, 111], and tormentil [112] (Table 1).

**Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids or Fish Oil Supplements**

Omega-3 and omega-6 polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) are present in fish oil and also to some degree in plant flax seeds (*Linum usitatissimum*). PUFA and fish oil have been examined for their therapeutic effects on CD, UC, and IBS (Table 2) [73–78, 119–126, 129, 130]. Some of the studies examined PUFA along with several other ingredients and hence it is not possible to ascertain
| Ref. | Disease | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 75   | CD      | RDBP: n–3 FA, 2 trials (n = 363) (n = 375), 58 weeks | Maintenance of remission | No effect on relapse rates | ++**** No other medication |
| 74   | CD      | RDBP: n–3 FA, high risk of relapse (n = 78), 1 year | Relapse rate | 59 vs. 26% placebo stayed in remission | ++**** Similar dropout rates between groups |
| 73   | CD      | RDBP: 5-ASA or 5-ASA + n–3 FA, pediatric (n = 38), 1 year | Relapse rate | Lower (61%) relapse with n–3 FA than without (95%) | ++**** Relapse delayed with n–3 FA |
| 119  | CD      | RDBP: n–3 FA (n = 70) vs. low-carb diet (n = 65) vs. placebo (n = 69), 1 year; prednisone for 1st 2 months | Remission maintenance, CDAI, and CRP | n–3 FA not better than placebo; diet was better as long as maintained | ±**** |
| 120  | CD      | RDBP: impact powder with/without extra n–3 FA + arginine + RNA + protein (n = 31), 9 weeks | CDAI, leptin levels, BMI | Extract may have marginal benefits for CDAI | ±*** Role of n–3 FA not clear |
| 121  | CD      | RDBP: impact powder + AO or impact powder + AO + n–3 FA or placebo, patients in remission (n = 70), 3 months | Antioxidant levels, FA incorporation | Increase in antioxidant levels with AO treatment; n–3 FA resulted in better FA profile | ±*** 33% dropout rate |
| 122  | CD      | RDBP: impact powder with n–3 or n–6 FA (n = 31), active CD into remission (or decreased CDAI), 9 weeks | Clinical and biochemical markers for inflammation | n–3 FA and n–6 FA inhibited proinflammatory cytokines and decreased CDAI | ++**** Too many ingredients |
| 123  | CD      | RDBP: impact powder with n–3 or n–6 FA (n = 31), 9 weeks with prednisolone tapering | Insulin-like growth factors | All measured factors increased with both; no difference between groups | ±*** Role of PUFA not clear; too many ingredients used |
| 124  | CD/UC  | RDBP: seal oil (n = 20) vs. cod oil (n = 18), 2 weeks | Joint pain | Joint pain improved somewhat with both | ++ |
| 125  | CD/UC  | RP: seal oil (n = 10) vs. soy oil (n = 9), 10 days | Joint pain | Improvement with seal oil but not soy oil | +** Seal oil still better than baseline 6 months later |
| 78   | UC      | RO crossover: compare n–3 FA from fish oil vs. sulfasalazine (n = 10), 2 months | Blood parameters, CRP, total fecal nitrogen excretion | Sulfasalazine worked better than n–3 FA | ± Small study |
| 126  | UC      | RDBP: fish oil (n = 9) vs. placebo (n = 9), with standard meds, 6 months | Disease activity, clinical, histology, cytokines | All measured parameters decreased | ±** Confirmed in [127, 128] |
| 77   | UC      | RDBP crossover: sulfasalazine with or without fish oil (n = 9), 2 + 2 months | Antioxidant status in active UC, disease activity | Fish oil improved only the antioxidant status activity | +**** Small study |
| 129  | UC      | RDBP: supplement with fish oil, selenium, vit. E, vit. C, gum arabic, fructooligosaccharides vs. placebo (n = 121), 6 months | Prednisone use, DAI and histology | Prednisone use decreased | +**** Too many ingredients |
| 130  | UC      | O: MAX-EPA capsules, patients refractive to other treatment (n = 9), 8 weeks | Safety, tolerability, stool diaries, sigmoidoscopy, symptom response | Marked to moderate improvement in 7 patients, decreased steroid dose in 4 | ++** Pilot study, well tolerated |
| 76   | UC      | RDBP crossover: MAX-EPA vs. placebo, active UC, usual meds continued (n = 18), 4 + 4 months, 1 month washout | Flexible sigmoidoscopy, symptom review, rectal biopsy, pEG2, leukotriene B4 | Leukotriene B4 decreased, histology improved, weight gain; no changes with placebo | +**** Small study |
| Ref. | Disease | Trial characteristics | Outcome measures | Observation summary | Rating and comments |
|------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Léi gōng téng (Tripterygium wilfordii) | CD | RC: glycosides vs. azathioprine \(n = 90\), 52 weeks | Clinical and endoscopic recurrence postsurgery | Efficacy similar to azathioprine | ++*** High dropout rate – only 47 finished the study |
| 79 CD | RSBC: glycosides \(n = 21\) vs. mesalamine \(n = 18\), postoperative CD, 52 weeks | Clinical and endoscopic measurements, CDAI, Rutgeerts score | Fewer recurrences than with placebo \(4 \times 9\), Rutgeerts score better, CDAI similar | +*** Small trial |
| 80 CD | RC: glycosides vs. mesalamine \(n = 45\), postoperative CD, 52 weeks | CDAI clinical markers, ileocolonoscopy at end or (suspected) recurrence | Efficacy similar to mesalamine for up to 1 year | ++*** Based on abstract, small trial (paper in Chinese) |
| 81 CD | RBC: glycosides \(n = 21\) vs. sulfasalazine \(n = 18\), up to 52 weeks | CDAI, ESR, CRP ileocolonoscopy at end or (suspected) recurrence | Glycosides prevented recurrence better than sulfasalazine | ++*** Based on abstract, small trial (paper in Chinese) |
| Chinese herbal medicine blends | 131 IBS | RDBP: custom \(n = 38\), standard \(n = 45\) or placebo \(n = 33\), 16 weeks | Bowel symptoms, global improvement, interference in life style | Custom and standard herbal treatments equally better than placebo | +**** Standard preparation from 20 herbs |
| 132 IBSC | RDBP: herbal blend \(7\) capsules \(n = 61\) vs. placebo \(n = 64\), 8 weeks | Global symptom improvement questionnaires, symptom severity scale and Bristol Stool Form Scale | Symptoms improved significantly over placebo although pain did not change | +**** Prospective study |
| 133 IBS | RDBP: Tiaohe Ganpi Hexin decoction \(n = 20\) vs. placebo \(n = 20\), 4 weeks | Traditional Chinese medicine syndrome score, disappearance rate of symptoms, clinical symptom score | Some improvement seen in all parameters | +*** Small short-term study |
| 134 IBSD | RDBP: Changjishu \(n = 78\) vs. placebo \(n = 26\), 21 days | Effectiveness of capsule covering | Worked better than placebo | +*** |
| 135 IBSD | RDBP: 11-herb formula \(n = 60\) vs. placebo \(n = 59\), 8 weeks | Global symptom assessment, SF-36 questionnaire | No difference from placebo | +*** |
| 83 UC | RDBP: ulcerative proctitis, xilei san suppository \(n = 15\) or placebo \(n = 15\), 6 months | Remission at day 14, relapse rate after 180 days, Riley’s index for endoscopic and histologic exams, IBDQ | At day 14 remission higher in xilei san, at day 180 – 81.8% in remission vs. 16.7% placebo, other measures also improved | +**** Very small trial, not clear if this is an antioxidant |
| 136 UC | O: Shuxuening injection \(n = 47\) vs. no injection \(n = 44\), meds continued + healthy controls \(n = 20\), 14 days | Mayo scoring system, endoscopy, IL-6, TNF-a, SOD, MDA | Treatment group had significantly better results than untreated group (also improved) | +* Paper in Chinese, composition of drug not clear |
| Ayurvedic herbal blends | 137 IBS | O: Bilvadileha \(n = 45\) Rome III, 12 weeks | IBS severity score, Ayurvedic parameters | Symptoms were significantly improved (only 2% reported no effect of treatment) | +* Bilvadileha (10 herbs), no controls |
| 84 UC | O: oral administration of herbs plus \(Ficus glomerata\) enema while on usual meds \(n = 50\), 4 weeks | Changes in clinical parameters, lab tests, use of other drugs | Reduction in bowel movement frequency, blood in urine, steroid use (100%), sulfasalazine (80%), pain, weight loss | +** Small open short-term trial |
| 138 IBS | RDBP: Ayurvedic vs. standard therapy \(n = 169\), 6 weeks | Diarrhea, pain, and gas | Ayurvedic better for D-IBS, standard for pain, both better for gas than placebo | +*** Only abstract available |
whether the observed effects were due to PUFA. Several other studies had small sample sizes and/or were not properly controlled. Only 3 random double-blind placebo controlled trials were found [73–75]. One study found mesalazine to control remission in pediatric CD patients but 95% of patients relapsed within 1 year. Adjunct therapy with PUFA decreased this relapse rate to 61% [73]. The multicentered Epanova Program in Crohn's (EPIC) Study included 2 trials named EPIC1 and EPIC2 in which patients were in remission. In 1 year, relapse occurred in 32% with PUFA and 36% with placebo in EPIC1, and 48% with PUFA and 49% with placebo in EPIC2 [75]. Thus, PUFA were ineffective in maintaining the remission. Another study used enteric coated PUFA capsules for remission maintenance in patients who had a high risk of relapse and found PUFA to be more effective than placebo [74]. Thus, there is only a marginal evidence for a low-grade efficacy of PUFA against CD. The evidence seems to be similar or slightly better for PUFA efficacy against UC (Table 2). Of interest is a small random double-blind placebo crossover study where patients on prednisone or sulfasalazine reported significant improvement with PUFA [76]. Another random double-blind placebo crossover study showed that PUFA improved the oxidative stress status in active UC patients receiving sulfasalazine [77]. Another small study showed that PUFA have some efficacy against UC, but it is less than that of sulfasalazine [78]. Thus, the efficacy of PUFA or fish oil against CD or UC is, at best, marginal; however, none of the studies reported any adverse effects of PUFA supplementation.

Chinese and Ayurvedic Medicines

Léi gōng téng (Tripterygium wilfordii), which is rich in antioxidant polyglycosides, has been tested for its efficacy against CD (Table 3). The trials were random (some of them blind) with very small to medium sample sizes over a period of 1 year. Léi gōng téng performed better than azathioprine, mesalazine, and sulfasalazine [79–82]. It is cautioned that Léi gōng téng has male antifertility properties and this side effect is not monitored in these studies.

The remaining Chinese and Ayurvedic medicines reported in Table 3 contain multiple herb blends. There were 2 studies [83, 84] on UC in which the herbal medicines were significantly efficacious. The first was a study [83] on ulcerative proctitis patients using an enema of the multiherb drug xilei san. In this random double-blind placebo controlled trial, xilei san (Chinese medicine) showed improvement within 14 days, and after 6 months the remission rate was 81.8% with xilei san versus only 16.7% with the placebo. There was an overall improvement based on several parameters measured. The second was an open study [84] that used an Ayurvedic medicine containing the herbs Aegle marmelos Correa plus Bacopa monnieri plus a Ficus glomerata enema. In this study the patients were allowed to continue with steroids or sulfasalazine as needed. In 4 weeks, the patients showed significant improvement in their symptoms and stopped taking the other drugs. However, the sample sizes in both the studies were small and longer-term assessment is also needed. There are several other studies shown in Table 3 in which marginal or no benefits of the multiherbal preparations were observed on IBS or UC [131–138]. Thus, the multiple herbs were a mixture and even when they worked the active principles in them were not identified.

Critical Appraisal and Synopsis

The results reported on the effects of antioxidant supplements in GI diseases in Tables 1–3 are very heterogeneous. There may be many reasons for this. First, the definitions of different GI diseases overlap and possibly so do the diagnosis, etiology, and pathophysiology. The consequence is that different researchers have used a variety of indices to monitor the efficacies of the antioxidants. Some of the methods were quite subjective. Also, a lack of uniformity in the studies in following the Cochrane criteria for clinical trials added to the confusion. This led to assigning the ++, +, ±, and – ratings for the efficacies and separate star ratings for the rigor and quality of each study so that the reader may choose which substances they should explore more thoroughly. The reader is further cautioned that most studies did not comment on the quality of the antioxidant substances being used. These might vary with the subspecies used, suppliers, age of the products, and how the extracts were prepared.

Combined therapy of current treatments with allopurinol (that may decrease the generation of superoxide) has proved useful for CD and UC patients. Curcumin may also have provided a benefit for UC patients in combined therapy with mesalamine. Other substances for which benefits against CD might be Boswellia (frankincense or shallaki), Artemesia sp. (wormwood), T. wilfordii (Léi gōng téng), and fish oil, and for UC such antioxidants might be allopurinol, M. chamomilla (chamomile), and fish oil. Some studies showed benefits of multiherbal Chinese and Ayurvedic medicines in UC but the studies were not replicated in large clinical trials. For IBS patients, a number of substances that have small benefits and no adverse effects are listed in Tables 1 and 3.
Recommendations

Based on these findings, 3 levels of recommendations have been made. The first recommendation is that allopurinol and possibly curcumin should be used for combined therapy in IBD patients with the current treatments using mesalamine, azathioprine, sulfasalazine, and steroids. Secondly the combined therapy trials should be considered using the current treatments and the following antioxidants: Boswellia, Artemesia, T. wilfordii, fish oil, and chamomile. Studies on more promising antioxidants should be replicated that include Chinese and Ayurvedic medicine-based antioxidants. The third recommendation is that there was insufficient evidence for the benefits of several antioxidants against IBS, but these did not have any adverse effects.
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