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1. Introduction

Sofosbuvir, another medicine for the treatment of HCV, was affirmed. It has been affirmed for Food Drug Administration (FDA) on December 6, 2013. This medicine treats over 90% of patients and is fruitful against probably the most well-known HCV strains[1]. The concoction name is L-Alanine, N-[(P,S,2′R)-2′-deoxy-2′-fluoro-2′-methyl-P-phenyl-5′-uridylyl]-, 1-methyl ethyl ester and C22H29FN3O9P [2] is its sub-atomic recipe. Sofosbuvir is a nucleotide simple and is a profoundly dynamic NS5B polymerase inhibitor in HCV. NS5B is one of the non-basic proteins basic for the blend of viral ribonucleic corrosive (RNA) [3]. In mix with numerous different medications with and without PEG-INF, Sofosbuvir has shown high adequacy against HCV [1].

Ribavirin is an antiviral medication which is non-particular, anthepatitis. In 1970 it was combined. Its solid antiviral range action was accounted for in 1972 [4]. The compound name for this medication is 1-[4a]-ribofuranosyl-1,2,4-triazole-3-carboxamide. Ribavirin is a remedially utilized simple of guanosine as an expansive range antiviral agent [5].

Ribavirin had been explored for the treatment of HCV contamination in the mid 1990s. Notwithstanding perceptions of upgrades in serum aminotransferase levels [6] and hepatic histology [7], ribavirin had no huge impact on HCV RNA levels when utilized as a solitary operator. As respects virology freedom, drawing out the course of treatment didn't give any profit (Hoofnagle et al., 1996). Despite the fact that ribavirin was just utilized in blend for the therapy of interminable HCV infection [8].

Silymarin is a characteristic cancer prevention agent got from the seeds and products of the Silybum marianum plant(Milk thistle). It is made out of four flavonolignans, viz. Silybin, silydianin, isosilybin, and silychristin[9]. Milk thorn has been generally utilized for more than 2000 years in customary medication, particularly as a treatment for hepatic disorders [10]. It's known for its effect on hepatoprotection. This has been utilized to treat numerous liver sicknesses, including intense or constant viral hepatitis, hepatitis brought about by poisons, cirrhosis, and alcoholic hepatitis [11]. Silymarin capacities as a cell reinforcement, intracellular glutathione receptor, cell layer porousness stabilizer and receptor to keep hepatotoxic substances from coming to the hepatocytes. This additionally encourages the blend of ribosomal RNA reproducing liver recovery and forestalls the change of liver stellate cells into myofibroblasts, accordingly forestalling the affidavit of collagen strands in the liver[12,13].

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Animals

Weight of 45 grown-up male pale skinned person mice (25–30 g) was utilized. They were bought from the National Research Center in Dokki, Cairo(N.R.C.) and housed for seven days in plastic confines for convenience with our lab conditions.

2.2 Tried medications

As indicated by Paget and Barns condition, sofosbuvir was managed at a portion level of 50 mg/kg/day[14]. This was broken down in the blink of an eye before ingestion of refined water. Portion sum for ribavirin was 20 mg/kg/day according to Rao & Rahiman [15]. This was broken down in the blink of an eye before ingestion of refined water. Portion levels of Silymarin were infused at 70 mg/kg/day According to Mereish, et al [16]. This was broken up in Saline 75/25 (v/v) in propylene glycol. Every one of the prescriptions inspected were infused intraperitoneously.
2.3 Treatment schedule
The trial creatures were arranged into 9 gatherings, each included 5 creatures. The creature got different medicines as appeared:

- **Group (1):** Control gathering, five mice not infused.
- **Group (2):** Solvent gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml propylene glycol in saline75/25(v/v)daily for five days.
- **Group (3):** Ribavirin gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml ribavirine every day for five days.
- **Group (4):** Sofosbuvir gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml sofosbuvir every day for five days.
- **Group (5):** Ribavirin and Sofosbuvir gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml ribavirine and sofosbuvir together every day for five days.
- **Group (6):** Silymarin gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml silymarin every day for five days.
- **Group (7):** Ribavirin, Sofosbuvir and Silymarin gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml ribavirine, sofosbuvir and silymarin every day for five days.
- **Group (8):** Ribavirin, Sofosbuvir then Silymarin gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml ribavirine and sofosbuvir together every day for five days then with 0.5ml silymarin day by day for an additional five days.
- **Group (9):** Silymarin then Ribavirin , Sofosbuvir gathering, five mice were infused intraperitoneally with 0.5ml silymarin day by day for five days then with 0.5ml ribavirine and sofosbuvir together day by day for an additional five days.

2.4 Cytogenetic evaluation
A) Chromosomal preparation experiment
Out of the last injection animals were sacrificed after 24 hours. For mitotic index and chromosome aberration tests, the bone marrow cells were obtained from mice femurs. Savage reported [17].

B) Sperm morphology assay
Two epididymis were taken from each mouse and carefully minced in isotonic solution with scissors to obtain sperms. Process the solution to remove large tissues. Sperm suspension was stained by 0.05 percent Eosin [18]. The suspension of sperm dispersed over a sterile slid and was examined under a light microscope. 1000 sperms for morphological abnormalities were examined for each specimen.

2.5 Statistical analysis
For each category the data were represented as mean±SE and subjected to ANOVA (one-way) statistical analysis. P<0.05 was taken as value standard (Green, 2009).

3. Results

3.1 Chromosomal evaluation
The structural chromosomal aberration was observed in well-spread fields per mice of 50 metaphases. The standard sample in Fig (1a) shows that mice have 20 pairs of chromosomes. Chromosomal anomalies depicted as ring Fig (1b), deletion (figure 1c), chromatid fragmentation Figure (1d), centromeric attenuation Fig (1e), centromeric fusion Fig (1f), end to end Fig (1 g).

3.2 Total chromosomal aberration
The data in table (1) and Fig (2) represent the mean value of total chromosome aberration in chromosome in 50 well spread bone marrow cells of the metaphase mice. The mean value of SL treated animals (85.40±5.59) was substantially higher than the control group (12.60±2.62). However this is due to the high mean value of the SL solvent group (48.80±4.23).

The mean value of S and R treated animals (217.6±10.99) as opposed to the control group (12.60±2.62) was very significantly increased. When SL is injected before S and R drugs to protect cells, it decreases the mean value (180.00±3.89) as compared to S and R alone (217.6±10.99).

If SL is combined with drugs S and R, the mean value falls to (183.2±4.91) as opposed to S and R alone (217.6±10.99). But the highly significant decrease in the mean value is obtained when SL was used as a treatment, after S and R the mean value decreased to (117.4±4.58) compared to S and R alone (217.6±10.99).

Both of these findings suggest that using SL as a treatment after treatment with S and R was more effective than the preventive effect of SL and at the same time as administering both SL and S and R in minimizing the overall chromosomal aberration caused by treatment with S and R.

3.3 Sperm morphology evaluation
Table (2) and Fig (3) data represent the mean value of total abnormality of the sperm. These data indicate that the mean value between the control group (14.00±2.69) and the SL group (70.65±13.41) had substantially improved.

The mean values of S and R treated animals (110.00±21.15) as opposed to the control group (14.00±2.69) were very increased significantly. When SL is injected before S and R drugs to protect the cell, it reduces the mean value (56.67±10.04) as opposed to S and R alone (110.00±21.15).

If SL is combined with drugs S and R, the mean value falls to (34.66±7.15) as opposed to S and R alone (110.00±21.15). But the highly significant decrease in the mean value is obtained when SL was used as a treatment, after S and R the mean value decreased to (22.33±7.33) compared to S and R alone (110.00±21.15).

The findings also show that using SL as a treatment after treatment with S and R was more effective than its protective effect and at the same time decreasing the
total sperm abnormalities than injecting both SL and S and R.


Table (1) The average structural chromosomal aberration in mice bone marrow cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Ring</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
<th>chromatid fragmentation</th>
<th>Centromeric attenuation</th>
<th>centromeric fussion</th>
<th>end to end</th>
<th>Total aberrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>(4.40±0.68)</td>
<td>(2.60±0.51)</td>
<td>(2.00±0.32)</td>
<td>(1.00±0.55)</td>
<td>(1.00±0.32)</td>
<td>(1.60±0.24)</td>
<td>(12.60±2.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent</td>
<td>(9.80±0.66)</td>
<td>(15.00±0.84)</td>
<td>(5.40±0.68)</td>
<td>(8.20±0.58)</td>
<td>(5.60±0.81)</td>
<td>(4.80±0.66)</td>
<td>(48.80±4.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>(22.00±1.14)</td>
<td>(26.80±1.36)</td>
<td>(14.00±1.14)</td>
<td>(34.00±2.66)</td>
<td>(14.40±2.34)</td>
<td>(10.20±1.11)</td>
<td>(121.40±9.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>(19.40±1.94)</td>
<td>(34.80±2.13)</td>
<td>(17.40±2.20)</td>
<td>(44.20±3.68)</td>
<td>(12.00±0.71)</td>
<td>(15.00±1.55)</td>
<td>(209.80±12.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R+S</td>
<td>(27.20±1.77)</td>
<td>(39.40±2.18)</td>
<td>(23.80±1.16)</td>
<td>(86.80±3.88)</td>
<td>(20.60±1.08)</td>
<td>(19.80±0.92)</td>
<td>(217.60±10.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>(10.60±0.67)</td>
<td>(15.60±1.60)</td>
<td>(15.80±1.02)</td>
<td>(27.00±1.58)</td>
<td>(9.20±0.32)</td>
<td>(7.20±0.37)</td>
<td>(85.40±5.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R+S+SL</td>
<td>(18.60±0.51)</td>
<td>(35.20±0.66)</td>
<td>(21.40±0.51)</td>
<td>(72.20±1.36)</td>
<td>(19.40±1.36)</td>
<td>(16.40±0.51)</td>
<td>(183.20±4.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL—</td>
<td>(21.40±0.51)</td>
<td>(32.60±0.68)</td>
<td>(20.40±0.75)</td>
<td>(70.80±0.80)</td>
<td>(18.00±0.45)</td>
<td>(16.80±0.80)</td>
<td>(180.00±3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S+R</td>
<td>(13.20±0.80)</td>
<td>(19.40±0.87)</td>
<td>(23.80±0.58)</td>
<td>(40.40±1.24)</td>
<td>(10.20±0.58)</td>
<td>(10.40±0.51)</td>
<td>(117.4±4.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = Ribavirin . S = Sofosbuvir . SL = Silymarin . *** Very Highly Significant(P≤0.001)
** Highly Significant(P≤0.01) * Significant(P≤0.05)
Evaluation of the Role of the Silymarin in Modulating the Cytotoxicity of Sofosbuvir and Ribavirin

**Fig (2)** The average structural chromosomal aberration in mice bone marrow cells.  
R = Ribavirin  .   S = Sofosbuvir  .  SL = Silymarin  .

Table (2) The average of the sperm head abnormalities in male mice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Without hook</th>
<th>Banana</th>
<th>Amorphous</th>
<th>Hummer</th>
<th>Total aberrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>7.00 ± 0.58</td>
<td>5.33 ± 1.20</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.33</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.58</td>
<td>14.00 ± 2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent</td>
<td>8.33 ± 0.88</td>
<td>8.33 ± 1.86</td>
<td>2.00 ± 0.58</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.33</td>
<td>19.99 ± 3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>34.67 ± 4.10</td>
<td>33.33 ± 9.26</td>
<td>4.00 ± 1.73</td>
<td>2.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>74.00 ± 15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>37.33 ± 1.45</td>
<td>83.00 ± 4.73</td>
<td>5.66 ± 0.88</td>
<td>3.00 ± 1.15</td>
<td>128.99 ± 8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R+S</td>
<td>24.67 ± 6.64</td>
<td>67.67 ± 12.03</td>
<td>9.00 ± 1.15</td>
<td>8.66 ± 1.33</td>
<td>110 ± 21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>20.33 ± 2.91</td>
<td>43.00 ± 9.29</td>
<td>3.66 ± 0.33</td>
<td>3.66 ± 0.88</td>
<td>70.65 ± 13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R+S+SL</td>
<td>15.00 ± 3.79</td>
<td>16.33 ± 1.33</td>
<td>2.00 ± 1.15</td>
<td>1.33 ± 0.88</td>
<td>34.66 ± 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL—S+R</td>
<td>31.00 ± 5.51</td>
<td>17.33 ± 2.03</td>
<td>4.67 ± 1.67</td>
<td>3.67 ± 0.83</td>
<td>56.67 ± 10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S+R—SL</td>
<td>11.00 ± 5.00</td>
<td>6.00 ± 1.00</td>
<td>2.33 ± 0.33</td>
<td>3.00 ± 1.00</td>
<td>22.33 ± 7.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = Ribavirin .  S = Sofosbuvir .  SL = Silymarin .

*** Very Highly Significant (P≤0.001)

* Significant(P≤0.05)   ** Highly Significant(P≤0.01)

Fig (4) The average sperm head abnormalities observed in male mice.

R = Ribavirin .  S = Sofosbuvir .  SL = Silymarin Discussion

4. Discussion

The objective of this investigation is to decide the defensive impact of silymarin on the chromosome and sperm as a characteristic item against the reactions of sofosbuvir and ribavirin as an antiviral medication. There have been not many distributed examinations on the effect of sofosbuvir and sofosbuvir - ribavirin on chromosomes and sperms in creatures when utilizing these drugs, as far as anyone is concerned. Our examination discoveries have demonstrated that ribavirin and sofosbuvir as an antiviral drug cause cytogenetic impacts, including chromosome ring, cancellation, chromatid discontinuity, centromeric weakening, and end-to-end combination. These discoveries coordinated (Narayana .et al.) who announced genotoxic and cytotoxic rodent bone marrow ribavirin[19]. Additionally, (Seetharama,) said ribavirin is a powerful mutagen that causes chromosome basic harm, and goes about as a cytotoxic specialist in mice. This present medication's genotoxicity isn't polished under portion subordinate pattern [20]. There have likewise been a few human preliminaries that concur with these results as, (Tatar et al) revealed that ribavirin has a genotoxic impact reversible in vivo in humans [21]. It distributed comparative outcomes (Tatar,). These discoveries uncovered that ribavirin has a reversible genotoxic
impact in people and this impact might be ascribed to ribavirin harmful metabolites [22].

The discoveries additionally recommend that sofosbuvir and ribavirin cause mice sperm head imperfections, for example, without pin, banana, nebulous, and head structure hammer. These discoveries concur with (Narayana, et al.) who revealed that ribavirin essentially influences the morphology of the sperm and is a mutagen of the germ cells in rodents [23]. Also, (Narayana, et al.) announced that ribavirin or its metabolites go about as cytotoxins in rodent testis and have a portion and time-subordinate impact on the epididymal sperm count [24].

Additionally, (D’Souza,) and (Seetharama & Narayana) who said ribavirin initiates point transformations in the germ cells consequently actuating unpredictable sperm formation[25,20]. Comparative discoveries were distributed ribavirin was related with harmfulness of reversible germ cells, mutagenicity, and diminishes in the sperm count [26]. In addition, (El-Kholy, et al.) announced that sovaldi and sovaldi-ribavirin actuated regenerative issues as uncovered by diminished serum testosterone levels, poisonous and degenerative consequences for test histology [27].

In our investigation , we found that almost all gatherings that infused silymarin either previously or after or with the medication influence chromosomal abberism and sperm anomalies to diminish. These discoveries are steady with who inferred that RBV in mice is a genotoxic and cytotoxic medication, and that silymarin pretreatment limits this harmfulness. Use of silymarin as a preventive prescription is prompted in patients taking RBV as a restorative antiviral drug[29].

5.Conclusion

As seen in the tests, sofosbuvir and ribavirin cause chromosome aberration to the structure. Circle, deletion, fragmentation of chromatids, centromeric attenuation, centromeric fusion, and end to end were observed. They also cause head anomalies to include sperm without hook, banana, amorphous head and hummer head. Using silymarin as a medication to combat the side effect of sofosbuvir and ribavirin is so successful.
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