The Efficacy of Saffron in the Treatment of Mild to Moderate Depression: A Meta-analysis
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ABSTRACT
Herbal products, especially Hypericum perforatum extracts, have been widely used as first-line treatments for mild to moderate depression. Recently, several randomized, controlled clinical trials have been conducted to evaluate the efficacy of another plant, saffron (Crocus sativus), in mild to moderate depression. We have carried out a literature review of currently available published randomized, controlled clinical trials to give an up-to-date evaluation of the efficacy of saffron in mild to moderate depression, compared to placebo or routinely used antidepressants. The meta-analysis is reported according to the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines using the PICO (patients, intervention, comparison, outcome) format and was conducted using the statistical programs Comprehensive Meta-analysis and RevMan. PubMed, Embase, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and Web of Science databases were searched for relevant studies. Only placebo or active controlled, randomized clinical studies involving patients suffering from mild to moderate depression and using pharmacological doses of saffron per os were included. Hedges’ g was used to calculate effect sizes. Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration tool, and heterogeneity was tested by both performing the Cochran’s Q test and calculating Higgins’ I² indicator. Eleven randomized trials were included in the qualitative analysis, and nine were pooled for statistical analysis. According to the present meta-analysis, saffron has a significant effect on the severity of depression. Available data from randomized, controlled clinical trials support that saffron is significantly more effective than placebo (g = 0.891; 95% CI: 0.369–1.412, p = 0.001), and non-inferior to tested antidepressant drugs (g = −0.246; 95% CI: −0.495–0.004, p = 0.053).

Introduction
According to the World Health Organization, depression affects 300 million people worldwide [1], and is a leading cause of disability. For the treatment of mild or moderate depression in adults, several types of antidepressants are available, including TCAs, MAOIs, SSRIs, SNRIs, NDRIs, and SARIs [2, 3]. However, initial antidepressant therapy may not provide adequate relief for the patient, either because of the medicine’s adverse reactions or because of the lack of immediate efficacy. Therefore, novel agents with a more favorable safety profile and efficacy are needed. Herbs may provide an alternative to synthetic antidepressants
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with a better balance of benefits and potential harms [4], as has been confirmed for *Hypericum perforatum*, which is the active component of several marketed medicines.

*Crocus sativus* L. (saffron), belonging to the Iridaceae family, is one of the most expensive spices in the world, and it has been used as a medicinal plant in traditional Arabic and Islamic medicine for hundreds of years [5]. Its major bioactive secondary metabolites, possessing a significant antioxidant activity, include crocin, picrocrocin, safranal, and crocetin [6]. Several preclinical studies have confirmed the antidepressant effects of crocin and crocetin [7]. Recently, the antidepressant activity of some antioxidants has also been evaluated, and *N*-acetylcysteine as well as curcumin are reported to have the potential to ameliorate depressive symptoms [8, 9]. Meta-analyses support that serum total antioxidant capacity and antioxidant levels might be lower, while serum free radical and oxidative damage product levels might be higher in depressed patients than in healthy controls [10, 11]. Thus, herbs with a significant antioxidant content, such as saffron, may have a promising antidepressant activity, and, therefore, they are worth being studied. However, so far, little is known about the mechanism of action of saffron in depression.

Although several RCTs have been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of saffron in mild to moderate depression, the robustness of findings from individual studies have not been reassessed statistically in a meta-analysis. Therefore, the aim of the present literature review and meta-analysis was to synthesize currently available published evidence and evaluate the antidepressant efficacy of saffron, and to assess the safety profile of the plant based on the included trials. In order to complete this task, the following PICO (patients, intervention, comparison, outcome) format was applied: P = patients with mild to moderate depression, I = pharmacological doses of saffron given *per os*, C = placebo or routinely used antidepressant, and O = changes in the severity of the depression.

### Results

Literature searches were performed in Embase, PubMed, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and Web of Science databases using the search terms saffron and depression. After removing duplicates, the search yielded a total of 175 potentially relevant reports. Eligible RCTs were selected according to the flow chart presented in [Fig. 1](#).

After screening titles and abstracts (Table 1S, Supporting Information), 21 publications were retrieved for full-text screening, of which 9 RCTs were also excluded: in 2 studies, the effects of saffron products were analyzed without a comparator [12, 13], and in 4 RCTs, saffron was combined with nutraceuticals [14, 15] or fluoxetine [16, 17]. In two studies, the effects of purified crocin was evaluated [18, 19], and the aim of our meta-analysis was to focus on the efficacy of *C. sativus* rather than on its purified compounds. In one study [20], the patients involved were not suffering from mild to moderate depression, therefore, this study did not comply with our PICO. After reviewing the articles, it became clear that one trial, including three treatment arms, was published in two different papers [21, 22]. Consequently, we considered these two papers as one RCT. Therefore, a total of 11 placebo-controlled, randomized trials with 531 patients were included in the qualitative analysis [21–32].

Altogether, ten articles reporting on nine trials were included in our final quantitative analysis [21–27, 29–31]. Akhondzadeh et al. [32] provided the baseline HAM-D scores numerically, but the outcomes were shown only graphically in a figure, therefore, we could not include the results of this trial in the quantitative analysis. However, the authors claim that saffron (30 mg/day) and imipramine (100 mg/day) treatment for 6 weeks resulted in signif-
The efficacy of saffron versus the comparator (placebo or the antidepressant drug) was assessed based on the changes in the BDI scores compared to placebo after 12 weeks of administration.

Overall, the methodological quality of the trials included in our meta-analysis was reckoned to be acceptable, mostly with a low or unclear risk of bias. Most of the studies showed a low risk of randomization bias. The study published in two different papers [21, 22] included a contradictory description of randomization, so these two papers were judged to have a high risk of randomization bias. Tabeshpour et al. [25] failed to describe the methods used for random sequence generation, allocation and blinding; therefore, this study was reckoned to have an unclear risk of selection, performance, and detection bias. In three studies, patients were assessed several times during the study, but only the results of the last assessment were presented numerically in the publications [21, 22, 30, 31]. Therefore, attrition bias and reporting bias for these studies remained unclear. In three papers [21, 22, 31] that report on two studies, it was not mentioned whether the intervention and the comparator were identical in size, shape, color, and odor. In one study [30], the person who accomplished the randomization performed the allocation too, and therefore allocation bias of this RCT was unclear. Studies with an unclear risk of other bias did not report on the exact baseline scores regarding the severity of depression [21, 22, 25, 29, 31].

All the included clinical trials were conducted in Iran, where saffron is easily accessible [33], from 2004 until 2018. The findings of the present meta-analysis also support the relative safety of C. sativus. In an included trial, none of the patients reported any adverse reactions after treatment with a saffron preparation [31]. Abedimanesh et al. [24] did not report adverse reactions as an outcome. In all other included trials, patients experienced various adverse reactions, such as drowsiness, sedation, anxiety, headache, sweating, nausea, changes in appetite, constipation, dry mouth, palpitation, and tremor. After collecting data on all reported adverse reactions, the results were analyzed by Fisher’s exact test (two-sided) and the incidence of the reported adverse reactions was not significantly different from that associated with placebo (Table 25, Supporting Information). Patients who received the TCA imipramine experienced sedation (p = 0.017) and dry mouth (p = 0.035) significantly more often than patients in the saffron group [32]. Otherwise, the incidence of adverse reactions was not significantly different between the treatment arms in any of the included studies. After combining all available safety data, we concluded that tremors occurred significantly more often (p = 0.047) in the saffron group than in the placebo group (Table 35, Supporting Information) [22, 30].
The present meta-analysis was designed to synthesize currently available evidence on the usage of saffron in the treatment of mild to moderate depression. A comprehensive literature search yielded seven recently published trials besides those included in a previous and last published meta-analysis on this topic [34].

Based on our most up-to-date meta-analysis, saffron (C. sativus) is statistically significantly superior to placebo in the treatment of mild to moderate depression, and non-inferior to SSRI antidepressants (fluoxetine, citalopram). Limitations of our literature review and meta-analysis are largely related to the primary studies. All the included trials were performed in Iran. In several trials, patients with various comorbidities (e.g., coronary artery disease) were included, yielding an inhomogeneous patient population for the meta-analysis, and it is reasonable to assume that this factor may have influenced the primary results regarding treatment efficacy. The authors of several papers are overlapping, suggesting that their preconceptions about the efficacy of saffron may have caused bias in the RCTs as well. The number of trials reporting the same outcomes was too low to properly assess publication bias by funnel plots or by performing Egger’s test. Nevertheless, 11 RCTs, including a total of more than 500 patients (256 of whom received saffron), demonstrated both the superiority of saffron versus placebo, and non-superiority compared to SSRIs (fluoxetine, citalopram).

Saffron is considered to be safe even in amounts much higher than the typical use, up to daily doses of 1.5 g [38]. One study concluded that higher doses of saffron (200–400 mg daily) may cause alterations of some hematological and biochemical parameters, but these changes are within the normal limits [39]. Despite its relative safety, saffron may cause allergic reactions. According
to a case report, even anaphylactic reactions can develop in patients with multiple allergies [40]. Apart from hypersensitivity, no other serious adverse events ascribed to saffron are reported in the literature. Our analysis confirmed the relative safety of saffron and its active constituents, since the incidence of adverse events was not statistically different between the saffron and placebo groups. However, the number of patients involved in the analyzed studies was relatively low, therefore a comprehensive evaluation

**Table 2** Published outcomes of the included clinical trials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author (year)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Daily dose</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Treatment duration (weeks)</th>
<th>Reduction of HAM-D score from baseline to study end (mean ± SEM)</th>
<th>BDI-II score, baseline (mean ± SEM)</th>
<th>BDI-II score after 8 weeks (mean ± SEM)</th>
<th>Reduction of BDI-IA score from baseline to study end (mean ± SEM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kashani (2018) [23]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.10 ± 0.83</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.39 ± 0.83</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abedinamash (2017) [24]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26.10 ± 2.68</td>
<td>21.05 ± 2.68</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27.42 ± 2.16</td>
<td>27.47 ± 2.16</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabeshpour (2017) [25]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20 ± 5.7</td>
<td>8.4 ± 3.7</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19.7 ± 5.3</td>
<td>15.3 ± 5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashani (2017) [27]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.50 ± 0.35</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluoxetine</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.71 ± 0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghajar (2017) [26]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.13 ± 1.09</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citalopram</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.27 ± 0.67</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazidi (2016) [28]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>100 mg</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.69 ± 2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.35 ± 4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahman-souri (2014) [29]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.65 ± 0.98</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluoxetine</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.30 ± 0.88</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basti (2007) [30]</td>
<td>petal of Crocus sativus</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.00 ± 0.94</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluoxetine</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.50 ± 1.13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moshiri (2006) [31]</td>
<td>petal of Crocus sativus</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.01 ± 1.27</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.05 ± 1.12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorbala (2005) [22]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.20 ± 1.07</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluoxetine</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.00 ± 1.35</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhondzadeh (2005) [21]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.20 ± 1.07</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placebo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.10 ± 1.18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhondzadeh (2004) [32]</td>
<td>saffron</td>
<td>100 mg</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>approx. 10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imipramine</td>
<td>30 mg</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>approx. 10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2** Effects of saffron on the severity of mild to moderate depression compared to placebo in a random effects model (n = 5).
of safety is required through further clinical studies and pharmaco-vigilance activities.

In summary, our results clearly suggest that saffron reduces the severity of depression based on HAM-D and BDI scores, but the optimum dose and duration of treatment is still unclear. In the analyzed studies, the frequency of adverse reactions did not differ significantly from that of the placebo groups. Considering the limitations, a prudent conclusion is that further and larger trials, performed by independent research groups and employing standard endpoints, are needed to assess the efficacy of saffron with a lower risk of bias.

Methods

The meta-analysis was reported according to PRISMA protocol [41]. Literature searches were conducted before February 9, 2018 using the following search queries: [(“saffron”/exp OR saffron) AND (“depression”/exp OR depression)] for EMBASE; [(“crocus”/MeSH Terms OR “crocus”/All Fields OR “saffron”/All Fields) AND (“depressive disorder”/MeSH Terms OR “depressive”/All Fields AND “disorder”/All Fields) OR “depressive disorder”/All Fields] OR “depression”/All Fields OR “depression”/MeSH Terms] for PubMed; [“saffron AND depression in Title, Abstract, Keywords in Trials”] for the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials; and [TOPIC: (saffron AND depression) Timespan: All years. Indexes: SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, ESCI.] for Web of Science. To reveal all relevant studies, the reference lists of all identified articles were inspected. No language, publication date, or publication status restrictions were declared. For the purpose of transparency, this meta-analysis was based only on publicly available data, and neither the authors of the included articles nor the manufacturers of the saffron products used in the included trials were contacted to obtain additional information.

Eligibility criteria

All randomized, controlled trials that evaluated the effects of pharmacological doses of saffron (C. sativus L.) administered per os to patients suffering from mild to moderate depression were included. The comparator could be placebo or any of the routinely used antidepressant drugs. Trials that studied combinations of saffron with other treatments as well as studies without an explicit description of the applied product were excluded. Abstracts, conference abstracts, case series, and case reports were also excluded.

Study selection

The Mendeley 1.17.9 software package was used for record management. After removing duplicates and records without an abstract, the remaining records were screened for eligibility by two authors (B.T., D.C.) based on the title and abstract of the published original papers. The eligibility of the full texts of the remaining records was assessed by two reviewers independently (B.T., D.C.). Disagreement between reviewers was resolved by discussion or, if it was necessary, by consulting with a third reviewer (T.K.).

Data extraction and synthesis of the results

Study characteristics and results were extracted independently by two reviewers. Differences in extracted data were resolved by discussion.

The following data items were extracted from the included papers: characteristics of study design, characteristics of the patient population and sample size, intervention details, type of comparator, outcome measures, and overall results. Data on depression severity (HAM-D and BDI scores) were extracted as an outcome measure.

Risk of bias

For the quantitative analyses, each included study was evaluated by two authors using the Cochrane Collaboration tool for assessing the risk of bias, along seven specific domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other sources of bias. For each domain, studies were judged to have a high (red), unclear (yellow), or low (green) risk of bias (Figs. 15 and 25, Supporting Information). Disagreement regarding the quality of included studies were resolved by discussion. Risk of bias summary table and figure were generated by the RevMan 5 software [42].

Statistical analyses

Hedges’ g with 95% confidence intervals was selected for the calculation of effect sizes, as it adjusts for bias in small samples by weighting the pooled standard deviations by sample size [43].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study name</th>
<th>Hedges’ g</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
<th>Z-Value</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noorbala, 2005</td>
<td>-0.518</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-1.150</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-1.598</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basili, 2007</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-0.937</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>-1.042</td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharghi, 2018</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.728</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>-0.889</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshrahi-Mourou, 2014</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.761</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>-0.842</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khashi, 2016</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.495</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-1.932</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3 Effects of saffron on the severity of mild to moderate depression compared to synthetic antidepressants in a fixed effects model (n = 5).
Fisher’s exact test (two-sided) was used for the assessment of clinical complications and adverse reactions. Heterogeneity was tested by both performing Cochran’s Q test [44] and calculating Higgins’ $I^2$ indicator [45]. The Q statistic was computed as the weighted sum of individual study effects’ squared deviations from the pooled effect, with the weights being used in the pooling method. P values were obtained by comparing the test statistics with a chi-square with $k-1$ degrees of freedom (where $k$ was the number of studies). A p value of less than 0.05 was considered suggestive of significant heterogeneity. The $I^2$ index corresponds to the percentage of total variability across studies resulting from heterogeneity. Based on Cochrane’s handbook, a rough classification of the $I^2$ index is as follows: low (0–40%), moderate (30–60%), substantial (50–90%), and considerable variability (75–100%) [42]. Depending on the magnitude of heterogeneity, a fixed effects model (using the Mantel-Haenszel method) [46] or a random effects model (using the DerSimonian-Laird method) [47] was employed. All the statistical analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (version 3, Biostat Inc.).

Supporting information

Risk of bias summary, risk of bias graph, and a summary of clinical complications and adverse reactions are available as Supporting information. The list of excluded studies and the reasons for exclusion are also presented as Supporting Information.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by an Economic Development and Innovation Operative Programme Grant (GINOP 2.3.2-15-2016-00048 to P.H.) and an Institutional Developments for Enhancing Intelligent Specialization Grant (EFOP-3.6.2-16-2017-00006) awarded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, a János Bolyai Research Scholarship awarded by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (to D.C.), and a research grant (115796) awarded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (to D.C.). The authors thank Dora Bokor, PharmD, for proofreading the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References


Tóth B et al. The Efficacy of... Planta Med 2019; 85: 24–31

This document was downloaded for personal use only. Unauthorized distribution is strictly prohibited.


Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1960; 23: 56–62


