

# Comprehensive Systematic Review to Identify putative COVID-19 Treatments: Roles for Immunomodulator and Antiviral Treatments

*The University of Birmingham 622 COVID-19 taskforce*

Thomas Hill<sup>1</sup>, Mark Baker<sup>2</sup>, Lawrence Isherwood<sup>2</sup>, Lennard YW Lee<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Oncology, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham, Mindelsohn Way, Edgbaston B15 2GW, United Kingdom <sup>2</sup>Birmingham Medical School, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT <sup>3</sup>Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT

**Corresponding Author:** Lennard YW Lee, Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK. L.lee.2@bham.ac.uk, 0121 414 3511

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

**Running Title:** Immunomodulators and antivirals and putative Treatment for COVID-19

**Keywords:** Systematic review, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, treatment, trial, antiviral, immunomodulators

## Abstract

**Objectives:** To identify putative COVID-19 treatments and identify the roles of immunomodulators and antivirals in disease management.

**Design:** Systematic review.

**Data sources:** PubMed, bioRxiv.org and medRxiv.org were searched for studies suggestive of effective treatments for COVID-19. Additional studies were identified via a snowballing method applied to the references of retrieved papers as well as a subsequent targeted search for drug names.

**Review methods:** Inclusion criteria included any case series or randomised control trials in any language that were published from 18th December 2019 to 18th April 2020 and described COVID-19 treatment. Of an initial 2140 studies identified from the initial search, 29 studies were found to meet the inclusion criteria and included in this comprehensive systematic review.

**Results:** 19 studies of antiviral treatments for COVID-19 have been reported and seven studies for immunomodulatory treatments. Six randomised controlled trials have been published with one positive trial for Hydroxychloroquine. This small study consisted of 31 patients though subsequent studies showed contradictory findings. All the remaining studies were observational studies, retrospective case reviews or non-randomised trials and these results are difficult to interpret due to methodological issues.

**Conclusions:** To date, an impressive number of studies have been performed in a short space of time, indicative of a resilient clinical trials infrastructure. However, there is a lack of high quality evidence to support any novel treatments for COVID-19 to be incorporated into the current standard of care. The majority of the studies of treatments for COVID-19 could only be found in pre-print servers. Future clinical reviews should therefore be Comprehensive Systematic Reviews involving pre-print studies to prevent potential unnecessary replications of clinical studies.

## Introduction

SARS-CoV-2 is a betacoronavirus of the *Coronaviridae* family; a group of enveloped positive single strand RNA viruses. The virus causes acute respiratory syndrome and was first identified in Hubei province, China in December 2019. Clinically, the presentation of SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19 varies from none or minor 'common cold' symptoms, to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), resulting in severely impaired respiratory function. The highly infectious nature and potential severity of the pathogenicity of COVID-19 has put significant burden on healthcare, social and economic resources. Mortality increases with age, with the highest mortality among people over 80 years of age with a case fatality rate of 21.9% (1). The standard of care treatment of COVID-19 is largely supportive, consisting of maintaining adequate oxygenation, cardiovascular perfusion and treatment of concurrent infection.

The exact mechanisms by which SARS-CoV-2 causes morbidity and mortality are poorly described. Autopsy studies have identified diffuse alveolar damage. On one hand, this might suggest a direct viral cytopathic effect on alveolar cells (2). Conversely, pneumocyte damage may also arise from ARDS, a form of rapid widespread inflammation in the lung, which arises as a consequence of activation of tissue resident macrophages, resulting in chemokine secretion leading to tissue ingress of peripheral immune cells including neutrophils and lymphocytes and further organ damage (2). There may also be a temporal dimension to the disease course of COVID-19, which may progress through different phases. It is hypothesised the initial phases and symptoms are predominantly driven by viral replication (early infection viral phase), with a late phase, and morbidity/mortality, driven by the host immune response.

The global pharmaceutical COVID-19 drug development pipeline has been developed de novo since December 2019. Broadly, two forms of treatments are under investigation. Firstly, antiviral therapy where the intention is to limit and contain viral replication, and secondly, immunomodulatory therapy with the aim to control the hyperinflammatory immune response.

In this review, we have performed a systematic review of all treatments for COVID-19 up to April 18<sup>th</sup> 2020 and described the potential utility of antiviral and immunomodulatory strategies. This comprehensive systematic review includes all published trials, but also includes pre-print studies which are significantly more numerous and not reviewed in any previous systematic review.

## Methods

### Search Strategy

A systematic review of PubMed, bioRxiv.org and medRxiv.org was performed to find original research articles providing information of interventional treatments against COVID-19. The search strategy was based on the following keywords, "COVID-19", "coronavirus", "SARS-CoV-2" and "treatment" (MeSH search terms of (((('COVID-19') OR 'Coronavirus') OR 'SARS-CoV-2') AND 'Treatment')). To expand the search, a snowballing method was applied to the references of retrieved papers with a subsequent targeted search for drug names. Research abstracts were independently reviewed by two authors to select studies that met our inclusion criteria before the full-text review of selected studies. Discrepancies and doubts of the relevance of the sources were solved by consensus with two or more authors. This systematic review was performed according to PRISMA guidelines (3).

### Study Selection

Clinical studies were included in this study if they were, i) case series or RCTs, ii) from 18<sup>th</sup> of December 2019 to 18<sup>th</sup> of April 2020, iii) in any language and iv) describing COVID-19 treatment. Studies were excluded if, i) they reported on dietary modification including traditional herbal medications, ii) retrospective review of existing anti-hypertensives, iii) systematic reviews, iv) reporting on different forms of oxygen/ventilation, v) case reports, or vi) any commentaries or reviews.

The data and clinical findings were identified and entered into a pre-defined data extraction form, which was filled in by two reviewers. Differences were resolved by consensus. The following data were extracted; title, first author name, date of publication, publication journal, country, treatment, treatment dosage, trial design, number of patients, participant demographics, setting of treatment, outcome data, adverse events and control group.

## Results

### Search Results

A search of PubMed, bioRxiv, medRxiv and a targeted search initially yielded a total of 2147 articles related to the treatment of COVID-19 (Figure 1). In total 204 articles were reviewed in detail and 29 articles were found to be relevant to this comprehensive systematic review.

In total, 13 of these reviews were published in journals, but a significant number were from a pre-print journal (n= 16, 55.2%). In total, there were six RCTs, two non-randomised controlled trials, 10 observational studies, and 11 retrospective case reviews. The total number of patients exposed to these experimental drugs was 2,304, with 56.16% being male (one study did not report gender). The majority of studies were from China (n=21, 72.4%) and Europe (n=5, 17.2%). Overall, a positive trial outcome was reported in 18 studies (62.0%).

The clinical settings for these studies were not well defined. The majority of studies (93.1%, n=27) investigated patients in a hospital setting. Although nine studies were conducted on patients described as severely or critically ill, only one study explicitly stated that it occurred in an intensive therapy unit (ITU) setting. There were no studies performed in an outpatient setting.

The efficacy/outcome measures were extremely heterogeneous and many studies lacked statistical analysis or significance. In terms of reported endpoints of the study, the majority were based on clinical assessment (n=12, 41.4%), some used viral markers (n=7, 24.1%) and a minority used clinical management decisions, such as decision for ITU admission or change in ventilation (n=5, 17.2%). Only two trials used survival as their end point. A significant proportion of studies did not report on adverse events (n=8, 27.5%).

There were 19 studies reporting on antiviral treatment for patients with COVID-19, seven studies investigated immunomodulatory treatment, and three studies looked at Dipyridamole, plasminogen, and low molecular weight heparin. There were six RCTs for antiviral treatments, but no RCTs for an immunomodulatory COVID-19 strategy.

### Antiviral Treatment

Several different types of antiviral treatments for COVID-19 have been analysed to date, three targeting viral entry (Arbidol, Hydroxychloroquine and Chloroquine), two targeting viral polymerases (Favipiravir, Remdesivir) and three protease inhibitors (Lopinavir, Danoprevir, Ritonavir) and one of convalescent plasma.

The largest study of antiviral treatment for COVID-19 to date was for Favipiravir versus a proposed standard of care, Arbidol (4). This was a prospective randomized trial in 236 patients. This study of Favipiravir did not show any evidence of improvement of clinical recovery at day seven compared to Arbidol. It is also notable that there was also no evidence that would suggest Arbidol could be used as an antiviral treatment for COVID-19.

The anti-malarials, Chloroquine and its less toxic derivative Hydroxychloroquine are believed to have antiviral properties. This is mediated through an inhibition of terminal glycosylation of *Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2)*, an enzyme attached to the outer surface (cell membranes) of cells in the lungs (5). However, it is likely that anti-inflammatory properties of these drugs also exist (6). The evidence for Chloroquine was from a 2b safety study, however, this was halted early due to significant toxicities. There were two RCTs for the use of Hydroxychloroquine. The first study was performed in a total of 62 patients and found that an unusual outcome measure, 'time to clinical recovery' (TTCR), which consists of reduction of body temperature and cough, was significantly improved (7). Unfortunately, the second RCT of Hydroxychloroquine in 150 patients showed no improvement in its primary outcome - 28-day negative conversion rate (8).

Two RCTs have been performed for Lopinavir/Ritonavir; the first involved a total of 86 patients and the second 199 patients. Both studies showed no improvement in any primary or secondary outcome measures with significant toxicities (9) (10).

Finally, there is a retrospective cohort study suggestive that Remdesivir might have efficacy. Remdesivir is a nucleotide analogue prodrug which inserts into viral RNA chains, causing their premature termination (11). A retrospective case review was performed for 53 patients who were treated with Remdesivir. The majority of these patients were receiving invasive ventilation. In this cohort, 47% of patients were discharged and 13% died. However, 60% of patients had an adverse event (12).

### ***Immunomodulatory Treatment***

Two broad immunomodulatory treatment strategies for COVID-19 have been reported. Immunomodulatory treatments were either broad in nature (corticosteroids and intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG)) or targeted through the use of Siltuximab and Tocilizumab against IL-6 and Meplazumab against CD-147.

The largest study of immunomodulatory treatment for COVID-19 to date is for IVIG versus the standard of care (13). This was a multicentre retrospective cohort study of 325 adults with COVID-19. The study reported that its primary outcome, 28 day and 60 day mortality was not improved with IVIG treatment. However, in subgroup analysis of critical patients, IVIG seemed to reduce the 28 day mortality, reduce patient inflammatory responses and also improved some organ function.

Corticosteroids have well described systemic anti-inflammatory effects, through the up-regulation of anti-inflammatory proteins and down-regulation of pro-inflammatory proteins (14). Two studies report on the role of corticosteroids in COVID-19 patients; both of which demonstrate corticosteroid therapy have no benefit in viral clearance, symptom resolution or mortality. The larger of the two studies, a retrospective case review of 244 patients suggested that not only did corticosteroids not improve patient's clinical outcomes, but that a higher steroid dose was significantly associated with elevated mortality risk (15). This study reported that every 10mg increase in Hydrocortisone equivalent dose was associated with an additional 4% mortality risk.

Finally, there were two key studies looking at the impact of targeted immunomodulatory treatment on COVID-19. Siltuximab is a monoclonal antibody that binds to and prevents the action of the pro-inflammatory cytokine IL-6 (16). In 21 hospitalised COVID-19 patients treated on Siltuximab, clinical improvement was observed in 33% of study participants (17). Tocilizumab is a monoclonal antibody that binds to IL-6 (18). In an observational study of 30 COVID-19 patients in an intensive care setting, treatment with Tocilizumab was found to reduce patient's mechanical ventilation requirements and need for ITU admission, of which 20% were discharged (19).




Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram detailing comprehensive systematic review strategy

## Immunomodulatory treatment

Title	Author	Date of publication	Journal	Country	Treatment	Treatment dose	Trial Design	No. patients	Participant demographics	Setting	Outcome	Adverse Events	Control Group
Clinical Efficacy of Intravenous Immunoglobulin Therapy in Critical Patients with COVID-19: A Multicenter Retrospective Cohort Study (13)	Shao Ziyun	11 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	China	IVIg + Soc Vs. Soc	Varied	Retrospective case review	174 Vs. 151 (n=325)	Mean age=58. M=189 F=136	Severe/critical hospitalised patients	No difference in mortality/discharge rate. Subgroup showed benefit only in critical COVID-19	No information	Yes
Adjuvant corticosteroid therapy for critically ill patients with COVID-19 (15)	Xiaofan Lu	7 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	China	Corticosteroids + Soc Vs. Soc	Varied	Retrospective case review	151 Vs. 93 (n=244)	Median age=62. M=128 F=116	Critically ill ITU patients	Significantly elevated mortality risk	No information	Yes
Corticosteroid treatment of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) (20)	Lei Zha	8 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	The Medical Journal of Australia	China	Methylprednisolone + Soc Vs. Soc	40mg OD/BD	Observational study	11 Vs. 20 (n=31)	Median age=39. M=20 F=11	Hospitalised patients	No significant difference to virus clearance, to discharge, or to symptom resolution	No information	Yes
Meplazumab treats COVID-19 pneumonia: an open labelled, concurrent controlled add-on clinical trial (21)	Huijie Bian	24 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	China	Meplazumab Vs. Soc	10mg day 1,2,5	Open label study	17 Vs. 11 (n=28)	Median age=51 (IQR 49-67) Vs. 64 (IQR 43-67). Genders not reported	Mild, severe & critical symptoms	Improvement in discharge rate & severity. Improvement in time to negative swab	None reported	Yes
Use of siltuximab in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia requiring ventilatory support (17)	Giuseppe Gritti	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	Italy	Siltuximab	IV 11mg/kg/day for 1 hour	Retrospective case review	21 (n=21)	Median age=64. M=18 F=3	Hospitalised patients	Clinical improvement (removal of CPAP/NIV), n=7 (33%). No clinically relevant change, n=9 (43%). Worsening of condition (mechanical ventilation) or death, n=5 (24%). CRP decreased in all surviving patients	No information	No
Effective Treatment of Severe COVID-19 Patients with Tocilizumab (22)	Xu Xiaoling	26 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	ChinaXiv	China	Tocilizumab	400mg	Retrospective case review	21 (n=21)	Mean age=56.8 (16.5) M=18 F=3	Severe or critically ill hospitalised patients	Significant clinical improvement in all, dramatic reduction in temperature on first day, 19 discharged.	None reported	No
Interleukin-6 blockade for severe COVID-19 (19)	Mathilde Roumier	April 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2020 <i>Identified after initial searches</i>	medRxiv	France	Tocilizumab Vs. Soc	Varied, 8mg/kg	Observational study	30 Vs. 29 (n=59)	Median age=50. M=47 F=12	Severe rapidly deteriorating hospitalised patients	Curbs 'cytokine storm', reduced ITU admission, reduced mechanical ventilation required	n=2 mild hepatic cytotoxicity n=1 VAP	Yes

Table 1: Summary of clinical trials for immunomodulatory treatments against COVID-19.

## Antiviral treatment

Title	Author	Date of publication	Journal	Country	Treatment	Treatment dose	Trial design	No. patients	Participant demographics	Setting	Outcome	Adverse events	Control group
Chloroquine diphosphate in two different dosages as adjunctive therapy of hospitalized patients with severe respiratory syndrome in the context of coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection: Preliminary safety results of a randomized, double-blinded, phase IIb clinical trial (CloroCovid-19 Study) (23)	Mayla Borba	16 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	Brazil	Chloroquine Diphosphate	600mg BD vs. 450mg BD	Double blinded randomised controlled trial	41 Vs. 40 (n=81)	Mean age=51.1 (13.9). M=61 F=20	Hospitalised patients	No significant difference, recommends lower dosage	One developed severe rhabdomyolysis, two on 600mg developed ventricular fibrillation before death	No
Hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial (8)	Wei Tang	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	China	Hydroxychloroquine Vs. Soc	800mg OD	Randomised controlled trial	75 Vs.75 (n=150)	Mean age=46.1 (14.7). M=82 F=68	Hospitalised patients with CT changes	No improvement in 28-day negative seroconversion rate	30% diarrhoea	Yes
No evidence of clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 infection with oxygen requirement: results of a study using routinely collected data to emulate a target trial (24)	Mathieu Mahevas	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	France	Hydroxychloroquine Vs. Soc	600mg OD	Retrospective case review	84 Vs. 97 (n=181)	Median age=60. M=128 F=53	Hospitalised patients requiring oxygen	No difference in ITU transfer rate or mortality	9.5% had ECG changes	Yes
Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: preliminary results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial (25)	Philippe Gautret	20 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	France	Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin Vs. unspecified antibiotic or no treatment	600mg OD <i>All received Hydroxychloroquine, 5 received Azithromycin</i>	Open label non-randomised clinical trial	20 Vs. 16 (n=36)	Mean age=45.1 (22.0). M=15 F=21	Hospitalised patients	Significant reduction in viral carriage at day 6. More efficient in combined group	No information	Yes
Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: results of a randomized clinical trial (7)	Zhaowei Chen	22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	China	Hydroxychloroquine Vs. Soc	400mg OD	Randomised controlled trial	31 Vs. 31 (n=62)	Mean age=44.7 (15.3). M=29 F=33	Mild hospitalised patients not requiring oxygen	Improved time to clinical recovery	6.4% rash and headaches	Yes
Clinical and microbiological effect of a combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in 80 COVID-19 patients with at least a six-day follow-up: A pilot observational study (26)	Philippe Gautret	11 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	Travel Medicine and Infectious Diseases	France	Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin	200mg Hydroxychloroquine TDS with Azithromycin 500mg D1, then 250mg OD for D2-D5) + Ceftriaxone if NEWS score>5	Pilot observational study	80 (n=80)	Median age=52.5 (42-62). M=43 F=37	Hospitalised patients	78 (97.5%) improved clinically, rapid decrease in viral load, quick ITU discharge (mean 5 days)	Nausea or vomiting 2.5% Diarrhoea 5% Blurred vision 1.2%	No
Clinical efficacy of lopinavir/ritonavir in the treatment of Coronavirus disease 2019 (27)	X.-T.Ye	24 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences	China	Lopinavir/Ritonavir + Soc Vs. Soc	400/100mg BD	Observational study	42 Vs. 5 (n=47)	Range=5-68. M=22 F=25	Hospitalised patients	No significant difference in temperature reduction except in those with admission temperature >37.5 degrees	None reported	Yes
An exploratory randomized controlled study on the efficacy and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir or arbidol treating adult patients hospitalized with mild/moderate COVID-19 (ELACO) (9)	Yueping Li	15 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	China	Lopinavir/Ritonavir Vs. Arbidol Vs. Soc	400mg/100mg BD Vs 200mg TDS	Randomised controlled trial	34 Vs. 35 Vs. 17 (n=66)	Mean ages=50.7 (15.4) Vs. 50.5 (14.6) Vs. 44.3. M=40 F=46	Mild/moderate hospitalised patients	No improvement in clinical outcome	Lopinavir/Ritonavir - 35.3%. Arbidol - 14.3%. All minor, one patient with severe diarrhoea	Yes
A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19 (10)	Bin Cao	18 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	The New England journal of medicine	China	Lopinavir/Ritonavir Vs. Soc	400mg/100mg BD	Randomised controlled trial	99 Vs. 100 (n=199)	Median age=58 (49-68). M=120 F=79	Hospitalised patients with a SaO <sub>2</sub> ≤ 94% or a PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> < 300mmHg	No difference in time to clinical improvement	18.9% had gastrointestinal adverse effects	Yes



Factors associated with prolonged viral shedding and impact of Lopinavir/Ritonavir treatment in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection (28)	Dan Yan	30 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	China	Lopinavir/Ritonavir Vs. Soc	400mg/100mg BD	Retrospective case review	78 Vs. 42 (n=120)	Median age=52 (35-63). M=54 F=66	Mild/severe/critical hospitalised patients	Shortened SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding in treatment group	No information	Yes
Patients of COVID-19 may benefit from sustained lopinavir-combined regimen and the increase of eosinophil may predict the outcome of COVID-19 progression (29)	Liu Fang	12 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	International journal of infectious diseases	China	Lopinavir	400mg BD	Descriptive case series	10 (n=10)	Median age=42 (IQR 34-50). M=4 F=6	Hospital inpatient	Improvement in viral load, radiography, hypokalaemia, lymphopenia and hypoalbuminaemia	Diarrhoea, vomiting, hypokalaemia, hypoalbuminaemia	No
Arbidol combined with LPV/r versus LPV/r alone against Corona Virus Disease 2019: A retrospective cohort study (30)	Lisi Deng	11 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	The Journal of infection	China	Arbidol + Lopinavir / Ritonavir Vs. Lopinavir / Ritonavir	200mg TDS + 400mg/100mg BD Vs. 400mg/100mg BD	Retrospective cohort study	16 Vs. 17 (n=33)	Mean age=44.6 (15.73). M=17 F=16	Non ITU hospital inpatient	Statistically significant improvement in negative nasopharyngeal swabs at both day 7 and 14 of admission. Statistically significant improvement in CT chest findings after 7 days	None reported	Yes
Experimental Treatment with Favipiravir for COVID-19: An Open-Label Control Study (31)	Qingxian Cai	18 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	Engineering	China	Favipiravir + Interferon α Vs. Lopinavir / Ritonavir + Interferon α	1600mg BD D1 then 600mg BD D2-D14 + 5 million units BD Vs. 400mg/100mg BD + 5 million units BD	Open-label nonrandomised control study	35 Vs. 45 (n=80)	Median age=47 (IQR = 35.8-61). M=35 F=45	Non ITU hospital inpatient	Statistically significant shorter viral clearance time and improvement in chest imaging on day 14 after treatment	Less in the test arm of the trial	Yes
First Clinical Study Using HCV Protease Inhibitor Danoprevir to Treat Naïve and Experienced COVID-19 Patients (32)	Hongyi Chen	24 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	China	Danoprevir/Ritonavir A-interferon at doctors' discretion	100 mg/100mg A-interferon, 5 million units	Interventional clinical trial	11 (n=11)	Median age=44 (18-66). M=4 F=7	Hospitalised patients	After 4-11 days of enrolment all discharged	None reported	No
Favipiravir versus Arbidol for COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial (4)	Chang Chen	15 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	medRxiv	China	Favipiravir Vs. Arbidol	1600mg twice first day then 600mg BD vs. 200mg TDS	Randomised controlled trial	116 Vs.120 (n=236)	>65 years = 164. <65 years = 70. M=110 F=126	Hospitalised patients with CT changes	No improvement in clinical recovery rate at day 7	Raised uric acid 16/116 (14%) in Favipiravir group	Yes
Compassionate Use of Remdesivir for Patients with Severe Covid-19. (12)	Grein J	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	The New England journal of medicine	Various United States	Remdesivir	200mg IV D1 then 100mg PO for D2-D10	Open label study	53 (n=53)	Median age=64 (IQR 48-71). M=40 F=13	Hospitalised patients with SaO <sub>2</sub> <94%	Clinical improvement after 28 days in 84%. Mortality 13%	23% experienced serious adverse events. 60% experienced some adverse event	No
Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma (33)	Chenguang Shen	27 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	Journal of the American medical association	China	Convalescent plasma with a serum sars-cov-2-specific elisa antibody titre > than 1:1000 and a neutralising antibody titre > than 40	400ml	Open label study	5 (n=5)	Not reported. M=3 F=2	Critically ill, hospitalised patients	Improvement in clinical status (body temperature, sofa score, pao <sub>2</sub> /fio <sub>2</sub> , viral load, serum antibody titre, ARDS, ECMO support)	None reported	No
Effectiveness of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19 patients (34)	Kai Duan	6 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America	China	Convalescent plasma with a neutralising antibody titre > 1:640	200ml	Open label study	10 (n=10)	Median age=52.5 (IQR 45-59.5). M=6 F=4	Severe hospitalised patients	Significant improvement in clinical symptoms, oxyhaemoglobin saturation and rapid neutralization of viraemia	None reported	No
Epidemiological Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore (35)	Young, Barnaby Edward	3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2020	Journal of the American medical association	Singapore	Lopinavir / Ritonavir + Soc Vs. Soc	400mg/100mg BD	Descriptive case series	5 Vs. 13 (n=18)	Median age=47. M=9 F=9	Hospital inpatient including ITU	Equivocal: 3/5 fever resolved and oxygen requirement reduced, 2/5 deteriorated with progressive respiratory failure	80% nausea, vomiting and/or diarrhoea. 60% abnormal liver function tests	Yes

Table 2: Summary of clinical trials for antiviral treatments against COVID-19.

## Other treatment

Title	Author	Date of publication	Journal	Country	Treatment	Treatment dose	Trial design	No. patients	Participant demographics	Setting	Outcome	Adverse events	Control group
The potential of low molecular weight heparin to mitigate cytokine storm in severe COVID-19 patients: a retrospective clinical study (36)	Chen Shi	28 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	medRxiv	China	Low molecular weight heparin + Soc Vs Soc	Varied	Retrospective case review	21 Vs. 21 (n=42)	Median age=69. M=27 F=15	Hospitalised patients	Improvement in IL-6 levels	No information	Yes
Therapeutic effects of dipyridamole on COVID-19 patients with coagulation dysfunction (37)	Xiaoyan Liu	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2020	medRxiv	China	Dipyridamole Vs. Soc	150mg TDS	Retrospective case review	12 Vs. 10 (n=22)	Mean age=53 Vs. 58. M=15 F=7	Mild and severe cases	58.4% of trial group were discharged after 2 weeks Vs. 40% in control group	No information	Yes
Plasminogen improves lung lesions and hypoxemia in patients with COVID-19 (38)	Yuan Yuan Wu	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2020	QJM: monthly journal of the Association of Physicians	China	Atomization inhalation of freeze-dried plasminogen	10mg in 2mg saline BD in severe/critical, OD in moderate	Observational study	13 (n=13)	Median age=48. M=10 F=3	Moderate, severe, or critical hospitalised patients	Improvement in CT, rapid improvement in oxygen saturation in critical, significant reduction in heart rate in moderate	None reported	No

Table 3: Summary of clinical trials for other treatments against COVID-19.




Figure 2: Time course of SARS-CoV-2 infection and timing and results of clinical studies included in this Comprehensive Systematic Review

## Discussions

The rapid global transmission of SARS-CoV-2 has caused significant strain to healthcare systems around the world and is now associated with major morbidity and mortality. The global medical research community has launched a relatively large number of clinical studies in the course of just a few months. The ability to launch these analyses in the middle of a global pandemic, for an essentially unknown disease, is a testament of the robustness of healthcare systems, excellence of individual hospitals/clinicians and is something never seen before in the history of modern medicine.

Unfortunately, this systematic review of clinical trials to date has discovered no high-quality trials identifying drug efficacy against COVID-19. One small RCT of Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin was positive but this has not yet been validated and had methodological flaws. However, there are many promising retrospective case studies for antivirals and immunomodulatory treatments, but these remain challenging to interpret due to self-fulfilment bias or trial design. It is also particularly surprising that there are a number of interventions which have negative/no evidence for, which are being tested in very large UK studies. This might be an artefact of a lack of recent clinical reviews or potential oversight of the evidence to date.

Nevertheless, there are a number of valuable insights which may be observed from the studies to date.

Firstly, it would appear that pre-print servers are an extremely good mechanism for disseminating literature/data. With a rapidly ensuing pandemic, the weeks/months required for publication of manuscripts in a peer-reviewed journal may mean that some studies could be needlessly replicated with potential adverse human impact. Whilst not part of the formal process for systematic reviews, the use of pre-print servers would ensure a contemporary review and facilitate a Comprehensive Systematic Review.

Secondly, most of the reported studies investigated hospitalised patients. There is only one study that has emerged out of an intensive care setting. Potentially, this may reflect the relative difficulties of performing studies or case series in ITU. Conversely, More concerning, it is possible that drug interventions against COVID-19 in an ITU setting may have minimal effect. It might be an unsurmountable challenge for a pharmaceutical intervention to reverse respiratory and multi-organ failure, once a patient enters the hyperimmune phase with an ensuing severe cytokine release syndrome.

Finally, looking to the future, this comprehensive systematic review has identified a number of trial design strategies which would improve future clinical trials. Most of the trials treat a heterogenous patient cohort. As clinical outcomes of patients from COVID-19 vary depending on age, sex and co-morbidities, a poorly defined or heterogenous trial inclusion criteria is unlikely to be compatible with efficient trial design. Furthermore, there appear to be a multitude of unvalidated surrogate study endpoints utilised for COVID-19 trials, such as ITU admissions, changes in viral load, seronegativity and cytokine panels. Survival of patients is the definitive end point and one which is rarely utilised but is of great importance. It is therefore of great regret that these trial methodological flaws continue to be repeated in newly launched nationally prioritised studies.

In summary, we have performed a Comprehensive Systematic Review of all pre-print and published articles to date to identify treatments against COVID-19. Unfortunately, there is no high-quality evidence to back any particular intervention, either antiviral or immunomodulatory to form a COVID-19 standard of care. We hope that this work will help ensure the next generation of COVID-19 clinical trials in the UK might have more efficient trial design using better targets and potentially expose less patients to risks beyond COVID-19.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the doctors, nurses, medical students and healthcare staff working tirelessly on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham.

## Author Contributions

TH, MB, LI, LL: Study design, literature review and manuscript drafting. All authors contributed equally.

**Licence statement:** The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution and convert or allow conversion into any format including without limitation audio, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based in whole or part on the on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights to exploit all subsidiary rights that currently exist or as may exist in the future in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above. All research articles will be made available on an open access basis.

## Patient and public involvement statement:

As we have conducted a systematic review, we have not conducted any primary research with patient involvement. We have no reason to believe that the studies we have included were not carried out *with* patients, carers, or members of the public, rather than on them.

**Dissemination declaration:** We do not plan to disseminate results to study participants and patient organisations as it is not possible and not applicable.

## REFERENCES

1. WHO. Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-\(covid-19\)](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/report-of-the-who-china-joint-mission-on-coronavirus-disease-2019-(covid-19))
2. Xu Z, Shi L, Wang Y, Zhang J, Huang L, Zhang C, et al. Pathological findings of COVID-19 associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020 Apr 1;8(4):420–2.
3. PRISMA. PRISMA [Internet]. TRANSPARENT REPORTING of SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS and META-ANALYSES. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>
4. Chen C, Zhang Y, Huang J, Yin P, Cheng Z, Wu J, et al. Favipiravir versus Arbidol for COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037432>
5. Hydroxychloroquine [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 25]. Available from: <https://www.drugbank.ca/drugs/DB01611>
6. Schrezenmeier E, Dörner T. Mechanisms of action of hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine: implications for rheumatology. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2020 Mar;16(3):155–66.
7. Chen Z, Hu J, Zhang Z, Jiang S, Han S, Yan D, et al. Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: results of a randomized clinical trial. *medRxiv*. 2020 Apr 10;2020.03.22.20040758.
8. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial | medRxiv [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.10.20060558v1>
9. Li Y, Xie Z, Lin W, Cai W, Wen C, Guan Y, et al. An exploratory randomized controlled study on the efficacy and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir or arbidol treating adult patients hospitalized with mild/moderate COVID-19 (ELACOI). *medRxiv*. 2020 Apr 15;2020.03.19.20038984.
10. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, Liu W, Wang J, Fan G, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 18 [cited 2020 Apr 23]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7121492/>
11. Amirian ES, Levy JK. Current knowledge about the antivirals remdesivir (GS-5734) and GS-441524 as therapeutic options for coronaviruses. *One Health*. 2020 Jun 1;9:100128.
12. Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D, Diaz G, Asperges E, Castagna A, et al. Compassionate Use of Remdesivir for Patients with Severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Apr 10;NEJMoa2007016.
13. Shao Z, Feng Y, Zhong L, Xie Q, Lei M, Liu Z, et al. Clinical efficacy of intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in critical patients with COVID-19: A multicenter retrospective cohort study [Internet]. *Intensive Care and Critical Care Medicine*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.11.20061739>
14. Barnes PJ. How corticosteroids control inflammation: Quintiles Prize Lecture 2005. *Br J Pharmacol*. 2006 Jun;148(3):245–54.
15. Lu X, Chen T, Wang Y, Wang J, Zhang B, Li Y, et al. Adjuvant corticosteroid therapy for critically ill patients with COVID-19 [Internet]. *Respiratory Medicine*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.07.20056390>
16. Davis CC, Shah KS, Lechowicz MJ. Clinical Development of Siltuximab. *Curr Oncol Rep*. 2015 May 19;17(7):29.
17. Gritti G, Raimondi F, Ripamonti D, Riva I, Landi F, Alborghetti L, et al. Use of siltuximab in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia requiring ventilatory support. *medRxiv*. 2020 Apr 15;2020.04.01.20048561.
18. Sebba A. Tocilizumab: The first interleukin-6-receptor inhibitor. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2008 Aug 1;65(15):1413–8.

19. Roumier M, Paule R, Groh M, Vallee A, Ackermann F. Interleukin-6 blockade for severe COVID-19 [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.20.20061861>
20. Zha L, Li S, Pan L, Tefsen B, Li Y, French N, et al. Corticosteroid treatment of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Med J Aust* [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 23];n/a(n/a). Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.5694/mja2.50577>
21. Bian H, Zheng Z-H, Wei D, Zhang Z, Kang W-Z, Hao C-Q, et al. Meplazumab treats COVID-19 pneumonia: an open-labelled, concurrent controlled add-on clinical trial [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.21.20040691>
22. Xu X, Han M, Li T, Sun W, Wang D, Fu B, et al. Effective Treatment of Severe COVID-19 Patients with Tocilizumab. :12.
23. Borba MGS, Val F de A, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Chloroquine diphosphate in two different dosages as adjunctive therapy of hospitalized patients with severe respiratory syndrome in the context of coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection: Preliminary safety results of a randomized, double-blinded, phase IIb clinical trial (CloroCovid-19 Study) [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.07.20056424>
24. Mahevas M, Tran V-T, Roumier M, Chabrol A, Paule R, Guillaud C, et al. No evidence of clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 infection with oxygen requirement: results of a study using routinely collected data to emulate a target trial [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.10.20060699>
25. Gautret P, Lagier J-C, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020 Mar;105949.
26. Gautret P, Lagier J-C, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Sevestre J, et al. Clinical and microbiological effect of a combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in 80 COVID-19 patients with at least a six-day follow up: A pilot observational study. *Travel Med Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 11 [cited 2020 Apr 23]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7151271/>
27. Clinical efficacy of lopinavir/ritonavir in the treatment of Coronavirus disease 2019 [Internet]. *European Review*. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <https://www.europeanreview.org/article/20706>
28. Factors associated with prolonged viral shedding and impact of Lopinavir/Ritonavir treatment in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection | medRxiv [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.22.20040832v2>
29. Liu F, Xu A, Zhang Y, Xuan W, Yan T, Pan K, et al. Patients of COVID-19 may benefit from sustained lopinavir-combined regimen and the increase of eosinophil may predict the outcome of COVID-19 progression. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis*. 2020 Mar 12;
30. Deng L, Li C, Zeng Q, Liu X, Li X, Zhang H, et al. Arbidol combined with LPV/r versus LPV/r alone against Corona Virus Disease 2019: A retrospective cohort study. *J Infect*. 2020 Mar 11;
31. Cai Q, Yang M, Liu D, Chen J, Shu D, Xia J, et al. Experimental Treatment with Favipiravir for COVID-19: An Open-Label Control Study. *Engineering* [Internet]. 2020 Mar 18 [cited 2020 Apr 23]; Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095809920300631>
32. Chen H, Zhang Z, Wang L, Huang Z, Gong F, Li X, et al. First Clinical Study Using HCV Protease Inhibitor Danoprevir to Treat Naïve and Experienced COVID-19 Patients [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.22.20034041>
33. Shen C, Wang Z, Zhao F, Yang Y, Li J, Yuan J, et al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 27;

34. Duan K, Liu B, Li C, Zhang H, Yu T, Qu J, et al. Effectiveness of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19 patients. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020 Apr 6;
35. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 3;
36. Shi C, Wang C, Wang H, Yang C, Cai F. The potential of low molecular weight heparin to mitigate cytokine storm in severe COVID-19 patients: a retrospective clinical study | medRxiv [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.28.20046144v3>
37. Liu X, Li Z, Liu S, Chen Z, Zhao Z, Huang Y, et al. Therapeutic effects of dipyridamole on COVID-19 patients with coagulation dysfunction [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Feb [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.02.27.20027557>
38. Wu Y, Wang T, Guo C, Zhang D, Ge X, Huang Z, et al. Plasminogen improves lung lesions and hypoxemia in patients with COVID-19. *QJM Mon J Assoc Physicians*. 2020 Apr 10;