

# Efficacy and Safety of Two Polyherbal Combinations: E-MA-H and E-MA-HP in Male Sexual Dysfunction

Mugdha P. Kulkarni, BAMS,<sup>1</sup> Bhakti S. Shinde, BAMS,<sup>2</sup>  
Manoj Kumar V. Chaudhari, MD, PhD,<sup>3</sup> Ganesh M. Avhad, BAMS,<sup>4</sup>  
Shrikant V. Pensalwar, MBBS, B. S. V. Prasad, MD,<sup>5</sup>  
Manoj Kumar M. Deshpande, MD,<sup>6</sup> and Richard A. Rosenbloom, MD, PhD<sup>1\*</sup>

Efficacy and safety of 2 herbal products—E-MA-H at 2 dose levels, low (HLD) and high (HHD), and E-MA-HP (HP) capsules—versus placebo (PL) was evaluated in subjects with male sexual dysfunction. Males aged 21–60 with erectile dysfunction, premature ejaculation, or other form of sexual dysfunction were studied in this triple-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallel-groups trial. Subjects received any one of the following 4 interventions: E-MA-H 2 capsules at night (HLD) for 60 days; E-MA-H 2 capsules twice daily for 30 days, followed by 2 capsules at night for 30 days (HHD); E-MA-HP (HP) 2 capsules twice daily for 60 days; or placebo (PL) 2 capsules twice daily for 60 days. All dosage regimens were standardized to 2 capsules twice daily by using 2 matching placebo capsules as the morning dose for HLD and on days 31–60 for HHD. Efficacy outcome measures were the international index of erectile function; index for premature ejaculation; erectile dysfunction inventory of treatment satisfaction; subjects' and investigators' global assessment. Safety was assessed through adverse events; hematology; blood chemistry. Of 148 subjects enrolled, 1 was excluded from analysis; data on the intention-to-treat population of 147 (PL = 36, HLD = 38, HHD = 37, HP = 36) were analyzed. There was a significant ( $P < 0.01$ ) increase in the total international index of erectile function score (mean  $\pm$  SEM) in subjects receiving HLD ( $16.28 \pm 1.39$ ), HHD ( $15.40 \pm 1.22$ ), and HP ( $18.55 \pm 1.36$ ) compared with PL ( $6.83 \pm 1.52$ ). The same pattern was seen with increase in index for premature ejaculation scores: HLD ( $9.68 \pm 1.17$ ), HHD ( $10.27 \pm 1.05$ ), HP ( $11.36 \pm 1.20$ ) versus PL ( $3.77 \pm 1.04$ ). There was no significant difference in effect among the active treatment groups. The incidence of adverse events was similar in all the groups. Laboratory evaluations did not show any clinically significant abnormality in any of the groups. Treatment with HLD, HHD, and HP is well tolerated, and more effective than placebo ( $P < 0.01$ ), in subjects with erectile dysfunction, premature ejaculation, and other forms of sexual dysfunction.

*Keywords:* E-MA-H, erectile dysfunction, herbal, premature ejaculation, randomized controlled

## INTRODUCTION

Delivering an ultimate sexual performance has been an eternal quest for men. Despite the advent of Sildenafil being largely successful in erectile dysfunction (ED), its safety concerns continue to fuel the research drive in sexual medicine.

Although the focus so far has been on evaluation of patients with single conditions, a contrasting situation is encountered in clinical practice, where men frequently present with varying forms of sexual

<sup>1</sup>ENovate Biolife, Division of Exotic Naturals, Redwood City, CA;

<sup>2</sup>Vedic Lifesciences Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, India; <sup>3</sup>Ashtang Ayurveda Hospital, Pune, India; <sup>4</sup>Ruby Hall Clinic, Pune, India; <sup>5</sup>M.V.P. Medical Hospital, Nashik, India; and <sup>6</sup>Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Pune, India.

\*Address for correspondence: 1416 Tanglewood Drive, North Wales, PA 19454. E-mail: drrosenbloom@comcast.net

dysfunction entrapped in a vicious cycle. Erectile dysfunction the most prevalent form of sexual dysfunction in men is often accompanied by problems of premature ejaculation (PE) and low sexual desire.<sup>1</sup> To treat these conditions with a complex regimen is demanding on the clinician and may adversely affect patient compliance and ultimately his relief. There is a need for a treatment option which empowers the physician to simplify the prescription for successful management of multiple aspects of male sexual dysfunction (MSD).

Use of Alternative and complementary therapies is being increasingly contemplated to plug the lacunae in the existing approaches of conventional medicine. Apparently men with sexual dysfunction too, resort to therapies claiming a complete and natural restoration of sexual function. However, lack of strong scientific evidence does not support the usage of natural aphrodisiacs<sup>2</sup> and, therefore, inhibits the acceptance of such therapies by the scientific community.

E-MA-H (H) and E-MA-HP (HP) are two novel formulations comprised of traditional herbs and minerals (Table 1.) documented for their aphrodisiac and sexual enhancement properties. In an uncontrolled study of nine men, E-MA-H was found to significantly improve the erectile function and other aspects of sexual function (unpublished data). It was thus necessary to examine in a double blind randomized, placebo controlled trials, the efficacy and safety of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP (with two additional ingredients) in subjects with MSD. In order to arrive at a convenient, less frequent, "user-friendly" dosage regimen that would facilitate patient compliance, study objectives included the evaluation of E-MA-H high dose (HHD) versus E-MA-H low dose (HLD). A subgroup analysis was also incorporated to examine whether the effect of the treatments differed between three study populations pre-identified on the basis of

predominance of a sexual condition (ED, PE or other than ED and PE).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Administration

Before initiation, the study was approved by Intersystem Biomedica Ethics Committee, Mumbai, India. Rigorous measures were adopted to ensure the authenticity and unbiased nature of the trial. Blinding and randomization were performed by a research coordinator, not otherwise involved in trial related activities. During site initiation visits, it was ensured that all personnel involved in execution of the trial were adequately trained in ICH- GCP and protocol required procedures. Freely given informed consent was obtained from male subjects and their female partners before they entered the trial. Regular monitoring visits were made to sites to check trial compliance with approved protocol and ICH-GCP.


### Study population

Males 21-60 years of age, suffering from mild to moderate form of sexual dysfunction as evidenced by at least one of the following conditions— an international index of erectile function (IIEF)—erectile function (EF) domain score in the range of 11-21, IIEF-remaining part score (sum of scores for sexual desire, intercourse satisfaction, orgasmic function, and overall satisfaction) between 21-30, and index for premature ejaculation (IPE) score between 18-28 – were eligible for this study. Those with hormonal abnormalities (including low serum testosterone, i.e., <200 ng/dl), major psychiatric or systemic disorders, uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular complications, AIDS, or a history of alcohol and substance abuse were excluded. Patients in whom sexual dysfunction could be attributable to spinal cord injury, penile fibrosis, phimosis, or medications known to cause sexual dysfunction were also excluded.

One hundred forty-eight eligible subjects were randomized to receive any one of the following 4 regimens for 2 months: (1) placebo 2 capsules twice a day; (2) E-MA-H 2 capsules at night and 2 placebo capsules at morning (HLD); (3) E-MA-H 2 capsules twice a day initially for 1 month and then E-MA-H 2 capsules at night and placebo 2 capsules in the morning for the next month (HHD); or (4) E-MA-HP 2 capsules twice a day. No other medication for sexual dysfunction was allowed during the study. After an initial visit in 7 days, subsequent follow-up visits were scheduled at fortnightly intervals. IIEF and IPE questionnaires were administered at each follow-up visit. On

**Table 1.** Composition of E-MA-H & E-MA-HP.

Latin name	E-MA-HP	
	Common name	Part used
Tribulus terrestris	Gokhru	Fruit
Withania somnifera	Ashwagandha	Roots/Rhizomes
Asparagus adscendens	Safed musli	Roots/Rhizomes
Mucuna pruriens	Kawach	Seed
Asteracantha longifolia	Gokhulakanta	Entire plant
Curculigo orchiooides	Kali musli	Roots/Rhizomes
Asphaltum	Shilajeet	Exudate
E-MA-HP contains 2 more ingredients as follows:		
Anacyclus pyrethrum	Akarkarbh	Root
Piper longum	Pippali	Fruit



**FIGURE 1.** Disposition of patients.

completion of 1 month, and at study end, subject and partner satisfaction were assessed by the Erectile Dysfunction Inventory for Treatment Satisfaction (EDITS). Additionally at study end, investigators performed global assessment of treatment, and subjects gave their opinion regarding continuation of treatment. Adverse events (AEs) were recorded at each visit.

## RESULTS

One hundred forty subjects completed the study duration of 2 months (Figure 1). Treatment groups were well balanced in terms of demographics and baseline scores of IIEF, IPE (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Baseline comparison of groups.

Variable N	PL 36	HLD 38	HDD 37	HP 36	P*
Age (yrs)	40.1 ± 1.49	39.7 ± 1.09	40.2 ± 1.51	39.6 ± 1.21	0.98
Weight (kg)	64.2 ± 1.89	67.9 ± 1.36	67.8 ± 2.18	67.6 ± 2.26	0.47
Erectile function score	17.69 ± 0.54	18.15 ± 0.83	19.45 ± 0.60	17.61 ± 0.74	0.20
Remaining 4 domain of IIEF	27.44 ± 0.77	26.31 ± 0.83	26.97 ± 0.74	26.97 ± 0.84	0.79
PE scale score	26.47 ± 1.03	27.18 ± 0.93	27.40 ± 0.82	26.88 ± 0.98	0.90

Data are expressed as mean ± SEM.

\*For comparison among the groups by 1-way analysis of variance.

PL, placebo.

**Table 3.** Effect on hematological parameters.

Variable	Group	N	Day Sc	Day 60	Change	P <sub>w</sub>	P <sub>b</sub>
Hb, (g/dL)	PL	36	14.59 ± 0.29	14.43 ± 0.30	-0.16 ± 0.11	0.157	0.079
	HLD	38	15.17 ± 0.24	14.19 ± 0.22	-0.25 ± 0.12	0.042	
	HHD	37	15.23 ± 0.16	14.89 ± 0.15	-0.34 ± 0.11	0.004	
	HP	36	14.55 ± 0.24	14.69 ± 0.19	0.14 ± 0.19	0.468	
RBC, (m/mm <sup>3</sup> )	PL	36	5.12 ± 0.09	5.02 ± 0.08	-0.09 ± 0.06	0.137	0.063
	HLD	38	5.16 ± 0.09	5.06 ± 0.09	-0.10 ± 0.04	0.011	
	HHD	37	5.09 ± 0.08	4.93 ± 0.10	-0.16 ± 0.06	0.007	
	HP	36	4.91 ± 0.11	4.96 ± 0.10	0.05 ± 0.07	0.480	
Total WBC, (000/mm <sup>3</sup> )	PL	36	7.01 ± 0.26	7.21 ± 0.26	0.20 ± 0.20	0.325	0.648
	HLD	38	7.37 ± 0.29	7.21 ± 0.26	-0.16 ± 0.29	0.589	
	HHD	37	7.80 ± 0.34	7.86 ± 0.39	0.06 ± 0.25	0.824	
	HP	36	7.13 ± 0.27	7.44 ± 0.28	0.31 ± 0.34	0.360	
Neutrophils, (%)	PL	36	59.05 ± 1.49	57.72 ± 1.28	-1.33 ± 1.33	0.325	0.267
	HLD	38	59.21 ± 1.26	58.68 ± 1.13	-0.53 ± 1.00	0.602	
	HHD	37	59.62 ± 1.58	56.86 ± 1.58	-2.76 ± 1.53	0.079	
	HP	36	59.44 ± 1.54	60.33 ± 1.31	0.89 ± 1.36	0.520	
Lymphocytes, (%)	PL	36	29.89 ± 1.10	31.42 ± 0.98	1.53 ± 1.22	0.219	0.471
	HLD	38	31.10 ± 1.08	30.92 ± 0.95	-0.18 ± 0.81	0.820	
	HHD	37	29.76 ± 1.36	30.76 ± 1.23	1.00 ± 1.25	0.431	
	HP	36	29.47 ± 1.36	28.72 ± 1.17	-0.75 ± 1.17	0.541	
Eosinophils, (%)	PL	36	4.39 ± 0.65	4.53 ± 0.73	0.14 ± 0.52	0.789	0.489
	HLD	38	3.55 ± 0.49	3.66 ± 0.50	0.11 ± 0.36	0.771	
	HHD	37	4.86 ± 1.04	5.94 ± 1.59	1.08 ± 0.64	0.101	
	HP	36	4.17 ± 0.57	4.50 ± 0.55	0.33 ± 0.41	0.422	
Monocytes, (%)	PL	36	6.25 ± 0.41	5.86 ± 0.39	-0.39 ± 0.36	0.289	0.541
	HLD	38	5.68 ± 0.29	6.26 ± 0.34	0.58 ± 0.31	0.074	
	HHD	37	5.19 ± 0.35	5.89 ± 0.37	0.70 ± 0.42	0.102	
	HP	36	6.36 ± 0.30	6.03 ± 0.29	-0.33 ± 0.34	0.328	
Basophils, (%)	PL	36	0.42 ± 0.08	0.39 ± 0.08	-0.03 ± 0.10	0.786	0.931
	HLD	38	0.45 ± 0.08	0.47 ± 0.08	0.02 ± 0.09	0.768	
	HHD	37	0.62 ± 0.11	0.54 ± 0.08	-0.08 ± 0.13	0.539	
	HP	36	0.56 ± 0.08	0.53 ± 0.12	-0.03 ± 0.14	0.838	
ESR, (mm at 1 h)	PL	36	3.58 ± 0.40	4.00 ± 0.49	0.42 ± 0.55	0.450	0.309
	HLD	38	3.24 ± 0.31	4.84 ± 0.67	1.60 ± 0.77	0.043	
	HHD	37	4.81 ± 1.33	3.97 ± 0.34	-0.84 ± 1.32	0.531	
	HP	36	4.11 ± 0.54	5.61 ± 0.79	1.50 ± 0.58	0.014	
Serum creatinine, (mg/dL)	PL	36	0.93 ± 0.02	0.93 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.02	0.904	0.646
	HLD	38	0.99 ± 0.02	0.98 ± 0.03	-0.01 ± 0.02	0.653	
	HHD	37	0.90 ± 0.02	0.91 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.02	0.731	
	HP	36	0.89 ± 0.03	0.92 ± 0.03	0.03 ± 0.03	0.265	
SGPT (AST), IU/mL	PL	36	25.08 ± 1.86	24.47 ± 1.83	-0.61 ± 0.99	0.542	0.334
	HLD	38	32.16 ± 2.47	27.82 ± 1.74	-4.34 ± 2.18	0.054	
	HHD	37	27.27 ± 1.41	23.95 ± 1.58	-3.32 ± 1.44	0.027	
	HP	36	30.47 ± 2.14	28.17 ± 2.32	-2.30 ± 2.17	0.294	

P<sub>w</sub>, analysis of baseline versus day 60 within each treatment group (paired *t* test).

P<sub>b</sub>, analysis of change across 4 treatment groups (1-way analysis of variance).

duration. Incidence of gastrointestinal events was the highest in each group and more frequent in the placebo group.

Treatment groups were also assessed for incidence of any AEs commonly associated with Sildenafil namely: headache (10.8%), flushing

(10.9%), abnormal vision (3.6%), dyspepsia (3%), nasal congestion (2.1%), dizziness (2.9%), and palpitation (1%).<sup>3</sup> In the present study, headache and heartburn (acidity) was reported at around 2% rate, whereas no cases of flushing or dizziness were reported. Upper respiratory tract

**Table 4.** Occurrence of AEs.

	Total	Placebo	HLD	HHD	HP
<b>GI</b>					
Abdominal pain	2	1	0	1	0
Diarrhea	1	0	1	0	0
Acidity	9	3	1	2	3
Constipation	3	1	2	0	0
Flatulence	9	2	1	3	3
Hemorrhoids	1	1	0	0	0
Nausea and vomiting	2	2	0	0	0
Upset Stomach	8	2	3	2	1
Total GI	35	12	8	8	7
<b>RT</b>					
Allergic rhinitis	2	1	0	1	0
Common cold and cough	10	3	2	3	2
Pharyngitis	2	1	0	0	1
Breathlessness	1	0	0	0	1
Total RT	15	5	2	4	4
<b>Skin</b>					
Skin reaction	4	1	2	1	0
Herpes zoster	1	0	1	0	0
Total skin	5	1	3	1	0
Others	25	6	4	7	8
Total	80	24	17	20	19

GI, gastrointestinal; RT, respiratory tract.

conditions, which may have resulted in nasal congestion (if any), were reported at comparatively lower rate.

### Efficacy

The intent-to-treat population for efficacy consisted of 147 patients. Efficacy evaluation was conducted by applying analysis of variance and then Scheffe test

for multiple comparisons. In the analysis of Global assessments by investigator and subjects' opinion, active treatments were compared against placebo using Fisher exact test and Pearson  $\chi^2$  test.

### Improvement in IIEF-erectile function domain

E-MA-H (HLD and HHD) and E-MA-HP showed statistically significant increases in IIEF-EF scores as compared with placebo (Table 5). In subjects receiving low dose of E-MA-H, the ability to get an erection during sexual activity (question 1 of IIEF) increased by 48.52% and was the highest amongst all groups. Subjects treated with E-MA-HP saw a maximum increase (48%) in the ability to maintain erections after penetration (question 4 of IIEF).

### Improvement in IIEF-other than EF domains

Mean increases in the remaining part of the IIEF were significantly higher in subjects treated with E-MA-H (both doses) and E-MA-HP as compared with placebo. The improvement, however, did not vary significantly across the active treatment groups.

The percentage improvement in individual domains was always higher in the active groups than with placebo; the highest increase occurring in the E-MA-HP group each time.

### Improvement in IPE scores

Mean increases in IPE scores were significantly greater in subjects treated with either dose of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP as compared with those who received placebo. No significant differences were observed in the increased IPE scores between the active treatment groups.

**Table 5.** Effect on efficacy variables.

Efficacy variable	Group	N	Baseline	Day 60	P
IIEF (erectile function domain)	PL	36	17.69 ± 0.54	20.75 ± 0.82	
	HLD	38	18.15 ± 0.83	24.86 ± 0.81	0.004
	HHD	37	19.45 ± 0.60	25.45 ± 0.62	0.042
	HP	36	17.61 ± 0.74	25.25 ± 0.71	0.000
IIEF (sexual desire, intercourse satisfaction, orgasmic function, overall satisfaction domain)	PL	36	27.44 ± 0.77	31.16 ± 0.97	—
	HLD	38	26.31 ± 0.83	35.84 ± 0.94	0.000
	HHD	37	26.97 ± 0.74	36.29 ± 0.77	0.000
	HP	36	26.97 ± 0.84	37.52 ± 0.76	0.000
IPE (index of premature ejaculation)	PL	36	26.47 ± 1.03	30.25 ± 1.33	—
	HLD	38	27.18 ± 0.93	36.86 ± 1.17	0.005
	HHD	37	27.40 ± 0.82	37.67 ± 0.91	0.002
	HP	36	26.88 ± 0.98	38.25 ± 0.96	0.000

The P value is for change in mean score from baseline as compared with placebo, using analysis of variance and Scheff test. IIEF and IPE data are expressed as mean ± SEM.

**Table 6.** Effect on serum testosterone levels.

	Baseline	Day 60	<i>P</i>
PL (n = 36)	538.23 ± 34.06	529.75 ± 34.19	—
HLD (n = 38)	553.13 ± 34.45	507.37 ± 30.67	0.799
HHD (n = 37)	579.10 ± 28.61	477.11 ± 28.49	0.104
HP (n = 37)	513.84 ± 24.99	480.07 ± 32.31	0.929

Data are expressed as Mean ± SEM.

The *P* value is for changes in mean testosterone levels as compared with placebo, using analysis of variance and Scheff test.

Serum testosterone levels were found to be decreased in all study groups at study end; the changes, however, were not of clinical relevance (Table 6). Subjects and female partners of active group demonstrated greater scores of treatment satisfaction by EDITS as compared with those of the placebo group (Table 7).

All of the 3 active treatments received significantly greater number (*P* = 0.00) of satisfactory responses (including excellent, very good and good) from the investigators for their efficacy as compared with placebo (Table 8). The proportion of subjects who wanted to continue therapy was significantly larger in the active groups than that in the placebo group (Table 9). Results obtained from subgroup analyses corresponded with those of the overall analysis.

## DISCUSSION

Results of this study demonstrate that E-MA-H (at low and high dose) and E-MA-HP were effective in subjects with mild to moderate MSD. The methodological rigor that yielded these results deserves attention, especially in the context of concerns over the quality of clinical trials of herbal medicines. Reviews of previous studies evaluating the effect of herbs commonly used in MSD cite several methodological flaws. Though trials examining the efficacy of Korean red ginseng have found it to be better than placebo, these trials were

**Table 7.** Effect on patient and partner satisfaction.

EDITS	Patient		Partner	
	Day 60	<i>P</i>	Day 60	<i>P</i>
PL	54 ± 4.25 (n = 34)	—	61.5 ± 6.80	—
HLD	78.55 ± 3.04 (n = 36)	0.000	77.36 ± 4.36	0.211
HHD	75.83 ± 2.56 (n = 36)	0.000	77.35 ± 3.86	0.234
HP	73.16 ± 3.51 (n = 36)	0.000	77.38 ± 5.11	0.193

Data are expressed as Mean ± SEM.

*P* value is for comparison with placebo, using ANOVA and Scheff test.

www.americantherapeutics.com

**Table 8.** Global assessment by investigator.

	PL	HLD	HHD	HP
Satisfactory (excellent, very good, or good)	14	34*	30†	30†
Unsatisfactory (fair or poor)	18	1*	6†	6†

\*The value of *P* = 0.00 is significant when compared with placebo using 1-sided Fischer test.

†The value of *P* = 0.001 is significant when compared with placebo using Pearson  $\chi^2$  test.

generally burdened with issues of inadequate reporting of ethical approval, blinding, randomization and baseline comparisons.<sup>4</sup> Another popular herbal ingredient Yohimbine (the primary active constituent in the bark of an African tree), has been shown to be superior to placebo in treating men with ED.<sup>5</sup> However, the size of the trials evaluating Yohimbine was generally small (only 1 of 7 trials studied 100 men), and statistical benefit for Yohimbine over placebo was detected in only 1 trial. In comparison, the present study seems to have considerably addressed these shortcomings.

The efficacy and safety results of this study are in support of the traditionally acclaimed role and add to the existing body of evidence for the aphrodisiac properties of the herbs present in E-MA-H and E-MA-HP. *Curculigo orchioides* when administered to rats demonstrated a pronounced effect on the spermatogenesis and sexual orientation toward female rats.<sup>6-8</sup> The sexually invigorating effect of *Mucuna pruriens* was evidenced in 2 studies showing significant improvements in sexual behavior, libido, and potency of diabetic and healthy rats.<sup>9,10</sup> *Tribulus terrestris* was shown to have a marked aphrodisiac effect through improvement in sexual behavior, increase in prostrate weight, and intracavernous pressure.<sup>11,12</sup>

Current understanding of sexual dysfunction in men considers it to be an alteration in any 1 or more phases

**Table 9.** Subject's opinion.\*

	Yes	No
PL (n = 30)	14	16
HLD (n = 35)	32†	3†
HHD (n = 36)	29‡	7‡
HP (n = 35)	28‡	7‡

\*As assessed by a yes or no response to the question: Would you take the same product in future if you suffer from the same condition?

†The value of *P* < 0.001 compared with placebo using 1-sided Fischer test.

‡The value of *P* < 0.01 compared with placebo using Pearson  $\chi^2$  test.

American Journal of Therapeutics (2011) 18(2)

of the sexual response cycle as follows: libido, erection, ejaculation, and orgasm. The IIEF is a validated instrument equipped to measure each of these constituent domains. Thus a significant increase in all domains of the IIEF accompanied by a significant increase in the IPE scores indicates an all-round improvement in the quality of sexual functioning (libido, erection, orgasm, and ejaculation) in subjects receiving E-MA-H and E-MA-HP. This implies that E-MA-H and E-MA-HP could have a regulatory influence on the physiological functioning and integration of numerous processes that go into the satisfactory sexual functioning of men. Such versatile ability to improve all aspects of sexual function is most warranted in several conditions (notably depression and anxiety) where co-existing forms of MSD often masquerade each other posing a daunting challenge to the physician to determine which dysfunction developed first.

In addition to the normal functioning of the essential components of the sexual response cycle, an important aspect of sexual satisfaction in a man is his partner's sexual satisfaction. It has been well recognized that sexual dysfunction is a "couple's problem," and not just the identified patient's problem.<sup>13</sup> Greater treatment satisfaction scores of EDITS (patient and partner version) corroborated by positive results of subjects and investigators assessments only ascertain the beneficial effect of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP.

One of the study objectives left unsatisfactorily achieved was the determination of a therapeutic dose facilitating patient compliance. Of the 3 actives, E-MA-H (low dose) produced the most consistent results across all efficacy parameters. Inexplicably responses to high dose of E-MA-H were not significantly different than those to low dose. This could possibly be explained by the threshold effect due to which a higher dose was unable to elicit any greater response than the lower dose. This requires confirmation in further dose determination studies.

Despite the overall improvement of sexual function, treatment with E-MA-H and E-MA-HP had no significant impact on the testosterone levels of men in this study. Any contribution of a testosterone like action to enhancement of libido or erectile function is thus ruled out. Nevertheless the finding is consistent with the fact that ED was only occasionally improved by testosterone therapy.<sup>14</sup> Further, it is postulated that the antistress<sup>15,16</sup> properties of a few ingredients (Asparagus and *Shilajeeet*) and the ability of others<sup>17</sup> (Withania and Tribulus) to increase nitric oxide production may have resulted in the improved libido and erectile function, respectively.

*American Journal of Therapeutics* (2011) 18(2)

Subject age is one of the most strongly associated factors of MSD. The Massachusetts male aging study found that more than 50% of men aged 40–70 have a minimal, moderate, or severe degree of erectile dysfunction.<sup>18</sup> After age, a higher probability of impotence was directly correlated with heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, associated medications, and indices of anger and depression. It was noteworthy that the beneficial results of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP were observed in older adults (average age of subjects was 40 years); however, all other risk factors including uncontrolled diabetes were excluded in the present study. Thus the efficacy of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP in sexual dysfunction with common comorbid conditions remains to be determined in future studies.

The AE profile of E-MA-H and E-MA-HP as demonstrated in this study is of special relevance in view of currently available drugs, which have reported considerable safety and tolerability concerns.<sup>19</sup> This leads to a possible application in patients in whom use of Sildenafil is contraindicated due to concomitant use of nitrates and  $\alpha$  blockers.

## CONCLUSION

The study has adopted a comprehensive approach to assessment of sexual function in men; different from examination of individual components or aspects. E-MA-HP and both doses of E-MA-H in this study were effective and well tolerated in the management of multiple aspects of MSD. Further studies should aim at confirming the optimum dose and mechanism of action.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Study authors would like to thank Dr. Sonawane Navneet and Mr. Chaudhary Jayesh for their contribution to study design and Dr. Nanivadekar Arun for his contribution to data analysis and interpretation.

## REFERENCES

1. Kubin1 M, Wagner G, Fugl-Meyer AR. Epidemiology of erectile dysfunction. *Int J Impot Res.* 2003;15:63–71.
2. Shamloul R. Natural aphrodisiacs. *J Sex Med.* 2010;7(1 Pt 1): 39–49.
3. Konstantinos Hatzimouratidis. Sildenafil in the treatment of erectile dysfunction: an overview of the clinical evidence. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2006;1:403–414.
4. Dai-Ja Jang, Myeong Soo Lee, Byung-Cheul Shin, et al. Red ginseng for treating erectile dysfunction: a systematic review. *Br J Clin Pharmacol.* 2008;66:444–450.

www.americantherapeutics.com

5. Ernst E, Pittler MH. Yohimbine for erectile dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Urol.* 1998;159:433–436.
6. Chauhan NS, Dixit VK. Spermatogenic activity of rhizomes of *Curculigo orchoides* Gaertn in male rats. *Int J Appl Res Nat Prod.* 2008;1:26–31.
7. Chauhan NS, Rao ChV, Dixit VK. Effect of *Curculigo orchoides* rhizomes on sexual behaviour of male rats. *Fitoterapia.* 2007;78(7–8):530–534.
8. Mayank T, Dixit VK. Effect of some vajikaran herbs on peniculation activities and in vitro sperm count in male. *Sexuality Disability.* 2007;25:203–207.
9. Suresh S, Prakash S. Effect of *Mucuna pruriens* (Linn.) on sexual behavior and sperm parameters in streptozotocin-induced diabetic male rat. *J Sex Med.* doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2010.0 1831.
10. Suresh S, Prithviraj E, Prakash S. Dose- and time-dependent effects of ethanolic extract of *Mucuna pruriens* Linn. Seed on sexual behaviour of normal male rats. *J Ethnopharmacol.* 2009;122:497–501.
11. Gauthaman K, Adaikan PG, Prasad RN. Aphrodisiac properties of *Tribulus Terrestris* extract (Protodioscin) in normal and castrated rats. *Life Sci.* 2002;71:1385–1396.
12. Gauthaman K, Ganesan AP, Prasad RN. Sexual effects of puncturevine (*Tribulus terrestris*) extract (protodioscin): an evaluation using a rat model. *J Altern Complement Med.* 2003;9:257–265.
13. Masters WH, Johnson VE. As cited by MA Perelman. Sex coaching for physicians: combination treatment for patient and Partner. *Int J Impot Res.* 2003;15(Suppl 5): S67–S74.
14. Tenover JL. Testosterone replacement therapy in older adult men. *Int J Androl.* 1999;22:300–306.
15. Kanwar AS, Bhutani KK. Effects of *Chlorophytum arundinaceum*, *Asparagus adscendens* and *Asparagus racemosus* on pro-inflammatory cytokine and corticosterone levels produced by stress. *Phytother Res.* 2010;24: 1562–1566. doi: 10.1002/ptr.3218.
16. Shibnath G. Chemistry of shilajit, an immunomodulatory Ayurvedic *rasayan*. *Pure Appl Chem.* 1990;62:1285–1288.
17. Iuvone T, Esposito G, Capasso F, et al. Induction of nitric oxide synthase expression by *Withania somnifera* in macrophages. *Life Sci.* 2003;72:1617–1625.
18. Feldman HA, Goldstein I, Hatzichristou DG, et al. Impotence and its medical and psychosocial correlates: results of the Massachusetts male aging study. *J Urol.* 1994;151:54–61.
19. Tsertsvadze A, Fink HA, Yazdi F, et al. Oral phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors and hormonal treatments for erectile dysfunction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:650–661.