1

May 21th 2021

Low-field thoracic magnetic stimulation 1 increases peripheral oxygen saturation levels in 2 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients: a 3 single-blind, sham-controlled, crossover study 4 Saul M Dominguez-Nicolas^{1,2}, Elias Manjarrez³ 5 ¹Centro de Investigación de Micro y Nanotecnología, Universidad Veracruzana, Calzada 6 7 Ruiz Cortines 455 Boca del Rio, Veracruz 94294, México ²Facultad de Ingeniería Eléctrica y Electrónica, Universidad Veracruzana, Calzada Ruiz 8 Cortines 455, Boca del Rio, Veracruz 94294, México 9 ³Instituto de Fisiología, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 14 Sur 6301, 10 Colonia San Manuel, Apartado Postal 406, CP 72570, Puebla, Puebla, México. 11 12 Running title: LF-ThMS improves SpO2 levels in a single session 13 14 Number of words: Text 5661, abstract (215), introduction (625), discussion (1373) 15 Number of text pages: 25 16 Number of Figures: 4 17 Number of Tables: 3 18 Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04895267 19 20 *Corresponding Authors: 21 22 23 Dr. Saul M Dominguez-Nicolas Centro de Investigación de Micro y Nanotecnología, Universidad Veracruzana 24 Calzada Ruiz Cortines 455 Boca del Rio, Veracruz 94294, Mexico 25 26 saudominguez@uv.mx 27 Dr. Elias Manjarrez 28 29 Instituto de Fisiología, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. 30 14 sur 6301, Col. San Manuel A.P. 406, C.P. 72570 Puebla, Pue., México 31 Tels.: +5222-22-29-5500 Ext 7326, Fax: +5222-22-33-4511 32 eliasmanjarrez@gmail.com 33 elias.manjarrez@correo.buap.mx 34 35 36 37 **Keywords:** LF-ThMS, SARS-CoV-2, oxygen saturation, virus spike protein, thorax, 38 lungs, pulsed magnetic stimulation, SpO2, hyperthermia, magnetic therapy, virus 39 inactivation, COVID-19 40 41 42 43 44 45

May 21th 2021

2

46 Abstract

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) may cause 47 low oxygen saturation (SpO2) and respiratory failure in coronavirus disease (COVID-19) 48 patients. Hence the increase of SpO2 levels could be crucial for the quality of life and 49 recovery of these patients. Here we introduce an electromagnetic device termed low-50 field thoracic magnetic stimulation (LF-ThMS) system. This device was designed to non-51 invasively deliver a pulsed magnetic field from 100 to 118 Hz and 10.5 to 13.1 mT (i.e., 52 105 to 131 Gauss) to the dorsal thorax. We show that these frequencies and magnetic 53 flux densities are safe for the patients. We also present a proof-of-concept that a single 54 55 session of LF-ThMS applied for 30 minutes to the dorsal thorax of 17 COVID-19 patients significantly increases their SpO2 levels. We designed a single-blind, sham-controlled, 56 crossover study on 5 COVID-19 patients who underwent two sessions of the study (real 57 and sham LF-ThMS) and 12 COVID-19 patients who underwent only the real LF-ThMS. 58 We found a statistically significant correlation between magnetic flux density, frequency, 59 or temperature associated with the real LF-ThMS and SpO2 levels in all COVID-19 60 patients. However, the five patients of the sham-controlled study did not exhibit a 61 significant change in their SpO2 levels during sham stimulation. All the patients did not 62 63 present adverse events after the LF-ThMS intervention.

- 64
- 65
- 66
- 67
- 68

3

May 21th 2021

69 Introduction

70 Although recent studies about the structure and function of SARS-CoV-2 may help develop new targeted treatments against COVID-19, there is still not a universally 71 approved treatment for this sickness [1,2]. For instance, some pharmacological 72 treatments include the controversial use of azithromycin, ivermectin, oseltamivir, 73 remedesivir, favipiravir, tocilizumab, ribavirin, 74 lopinavir, interferon β-1b. 75 lopinavir/ritonavir, hydroxychloroquine, or chloroquine phosphate (for review, see [1,3,4]). Many of them are based mainly on case studies, prospective, or retrospective 76 observational studies, with a low number of randomized controlled trials and low quality 77 78 of study design to guarantee their efficacy and safety [5]. Moreover, in severe cases, many countries employ empiric antimicrobial therapy, mechanical ventilation, 79 convalescent plasma therapy, or combinations of antiviral and anti-inflammatory drugs 80 [6,7]. Because fever and acute respiratory failure are common symptoms, the 81 management of these patients includes antipyretics and oxygen therapy to increase 82 SpO2 levels during respiratory distress. Hence the development of new methods to 83 increase SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients could become a potential complement of 84 oxygen masks, ventilators, or other modalities to improve oxygenation. 85

This study aimed to present a proof-of-concept that a 30 minutes single-session of dorsal LF-ThMS can be employed to increase SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients significantly. We hypothesized that the variables associated with LF-ThMS, as frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature in the dorsal thorax, might be correlated to SpO2 levels in these patients. Our proof-of-concept research could be helpful to design future randomized controlled trials intended to develop plausible LF-ThMS treatments in the successful management of these patients.

May 21th 2021

4

93 We acknowledge that several magnetic field interventions are controversial, but others are gaining an excellent reputation as the transcranial magnetic stimulation. This 94 controversy could be due to the low quality of study designs alongside the exaggerated 95 promotion of alternative therapies intended only for lucrative practices. Therefore, to 96 avoid misinterpretations with our research, we included a single-blind, sham-controlled, 97 crossover study on 5 COVID-19 patients who underwent two sessions of the study (real 98 and sham LF-ThMS) and 12 COVID-19 patients who underwent only the real LF-ThMS. 99 Moreover, we applied LF-ThMS in a short time range, i.e., in a 30 minutes single-100 intervention to measure SpO2 values. In this form, we avoided confounding factors 101 102 related to the spontaneous recovery by natural immunity, common in many COVID-19 patients several days after the contagion. 103

Regarding safety, our LF-ThMS device applied to the dorsal thorax produces low-104 intensity magnetic flux densities in a safe range of 10.5 to 13.1 mT at 100 to 118 Hz. 105 Such magnetic fields are within the frequency range of extremely low-frequency (0–300 106 Hz) magnetic fields (ELF-MFs) to study the interaction between ELF-MFs and neuronal 107 systems [8,9,10]. Our LF-ThMS device also produces heat with a safe temperature 108 range from 27.5 to 44 °C, consistent with the well-known tolerance of the isolated and 109 110 perfused dog lung to hyperthermia in this temperature range [11,12]. Rickaby et al. (1991) [11] found that temperatures below 44.4 °C for two hours had no detectable 111 influence on the following measured variables of lung weight, extravascular water, 112 vascular volume, serotonin uptake, urea permeability, surface area product, perfusion 113 pressure, and lung compliance. In line with such findings, Cowen et al. (1992) [12] 114 confirmed that the isolated dog lung with perfusion was tolerant to hyperthermia up to 115

May 21th 2021

5

about 44 °C for 1 hour. Other studies claim that hyperthermia in this range is beneficial
and enhances the immune response [13,14,15].

Our results demonstrate that LF-ThMS locally applied to the dorsal thorax of COVID-19 patients is safe and valuable to significantly increase SpO2 levels during a single LF-ThMS intervention of 30 minutes. This is in line with models predicting the electrical [16] or thermal inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 [17] in the environment or with the hypothesis that hydro-thermotherapy or photobiomodulation could help in the treatment of COVID-19 patients [18,19].

124 Materials and methods

125 Study design

We designed a single-blind, sham-controlled, crossover study on 5 COVID-19 126 subjects who underwent two sessions of the study (sham or real LF-ThMS) and 12 127 COVID-19 subjects who underwent only the real LF-ThMS stimulation. The study was 128 performed following the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by a local ethics 129 committee from the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Mexico (protocol: 130 Oficio No. SIEP/C.I./065A/2020, book number: 2, sheet number: 133, registration 131 number: 818, date: July 3, 2020). The study was registered in ClinicalTrials.gov 132 133 (Identifier: NCT04895267). All subjects voluntarily participated with full understanding and signed informed consent. The SPIRIT-Checklist is included as a supplementary file. 134

135 **Patients**

We applied LF-ThMS on the dorsal thorax to 17 patients (25-81 years of age) who were selected according to the following criteria. The inclusion criteria were: 1) Adult patients diagnosed with mild to moderate COVID-19 disease without pneumonia. The COVID-19 disease severity was interpreted by the clinical assessment of

May 21th 2021

6

physicians, who followed the interim guidance for the clinical management of COVID-19 140 141 from the world health organization, May 27, 2020. 2) Patients with a SpO2 level less or equal to 90 %, exhibiting difficulty breathing, but not intubated patients. The physicians 142 selected this set of patients because they had a low risk of developing a severe clinical 143 condition with pneumonia or with a chance of being intubated. 3) Patients with similar 144 pharmacological treatment against COVID-19. All the patients were medicated by 145 146 physicians in respiratory medicine with Azithromycin (500 mg), Ivermectin (6 mg), and Oseltamivir (75 mg). The most prevalent comorbidities in these patients were diabetes 147 and hypertension. 148

The exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory failure requiring urgent intubation, 2) COVID-19 patients with impaired consciousness or during pregnancy, 3) patients with metallic implants in the thorax, abdomen or arms, or electronic medical devices such as pacemakers, and 4) children.

The criteria for discontinuing the LF-ThMS intervention were the participant request, SpO2 decrease, or any discomfort reported by the patient during the intervention. The strategy for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size was the description of favorable results obtained from other patients

157 Low-field thoracic magnetic stimulation (LF-ThMS) device

Dominguez-Nicolas developed the first custom-designed LF-ThMS device (patent pending by Dominguez-Nicolas SM, 2020) to modulate alternating current in a coil pair to generate low magnetic flux densities and magnetic hyperthermia for COVID-19 patients. Previous patents and experimental studies also induce magnetic hyperthermia [20-23], but they reach up to 71 °C (160 °F), not suitable for our application. Instead, we employed an electronic circuit in our LF-ThMS device to limit the temperature and

May 21th 2021

7

magnetic flux density levels up to 44 °C and 13.1 mT for its safe use in the dorsal thorax of COVID-19 patients. In this form, we avoided harmfulness or adverse effects. The LF-ThMS device consisted of a virtual instrument, a PCI-DAS6031 acquisition board (Measurement Computing), an electronic board for the coupling between the digital signal and power, a power source of 0-15 Vcc, and 6-30 A, and two rings made of coils to generate LF-ThMS. We used 1.7 cm of cotton cloth disk between the LF-ThMS rings and the patient's skin to allow homogeneous heat diffusion.

To generate the magnetic field, we used alternating current from 100 to 118 Hz 171 with a peak amplitude of 8 A, polarized at 12 Vcc with a regulated power source of 0-15 172 Vcc and 6-30 A. We fabricated a couple of rings for LF-ThMS with an internal diameter 173 of 9.5 cm and 130 turns. The LF-ThMS device emitted magnetic flux densities in the 174 range of 10.5 to 13.1 mT. These were calculated theoretically with the Biot-Savart law 175 and physically with a magnetic field sensor (475 DSP Gaussmeter, Lakeshore). We also 176 used a thermocouple sensor (model NTC 10k) for monitoring temperature changes due 177 to the LF-ThMS. Both the Gaussmeter and thermocouple sensors were helpful to 178 calibrate magnetic flux densities and temperatures in a safe range (Table 1). 179

The main electronic components of the LF-ThMS device consist of a power relay RL of two poles, a 12 Vcc coil, silver alloy contacts of Vcc/10A or 250 Vca/10A, Q NPN 2N2222 transistor, 10 k Ω resistance at 0.25 Watts, and a D IN4007 semiconductor diode. We also employed a PCI-DAS6031 board to energize the RL at 10 Vcc and a virtual instrument developed in Delphi Borland 7. Figure 1 shows the electronic circuit of our LF-ThMS device, and Table 1 shows the frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature associated with the LF-ThMS during a 30 minutes single session.

8

May 21th 2021

187 **LF-ThMS protocol**

The LF-ThMS was locally applied on the dorsal thorax while the patients were 188 kept in a prone position. The LF-ThMS intensity was successively increased every 5 min 189 during a single session of 30 min, following the values of frequency, magnetic flux 190 density, and temperature indicated in Table 1. The protocol for the proof of concept 191 consisted of a single LF-ThMS session of 30 minutes, although other daily sessions in 192 three or four other consecutive days were applied to verify its reproducibility. The 193 rationale of presenting here only the results from the first session was to evaluate the 194 hypothesis that SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients are significantly correlated with the 195 196 magnetic flux density and temperature during 30 minutes of LF-ThMS intervention (see discussion section). 197

Figure 2A illustrates anatomical landmarks and coordinates of the LF-ThMS rings. We positioned the center of these LF-ThMS rings using palpable skeletal landmarks. We employed the spinous process of C7 (i.e., *vertebra prominens*) as zero landmarks (see a gray circle in Figure 2A). The center of these rings was positioned 8.5 cm below this landmark and bilaterally ± 6 cm on the dorsal thorax (see black arrows in Figure 2A).

The device allowed a gradual increase in the frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature, as illustrated in Figure 2B, 2C, and 2D, respectively. The patients rested for three hours after the session, and they did not report any discomfort during or after the magnetic stimuli. In contrast, they felt more comfortable, mainly because the LF-ThMS improved their breathing from the first minutes of the session. We checked on the health conditions of all the patients after receiving the LF-ThMS. In addition, in 11/17 patients, we monitored their SpO2 levels at the end of six months (see Results section).

9

May 21th 2021

211 Sham stimulation

The coils were positioned in the same coordinates for sham exposure, but the pulse generator was not turned on. Subjects were blinded for the real LF-ThMS or sham stimulation conditions.

215 Peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO2) level, magnetic flux density, and temperature

216 *monitoring*

The peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO2) level was monitored with a conventional fingertip pulse oximeter (model C101H1) every 5 minutes during the 30 minutes LF-ThMS session. Thus, seven SpO2 measurements, including the control (time zero, at 27.5 °C and 0 mT, without LF-ThMS and compensating the terrestrial magnetic field), were obtained per subject. In this way, we were able to quantify the repeatability of effects of LF-ThMS through the study in different patients.

223 Statistical analysis

We analyzed the statistical differences among the SpO2 levels related to each 224 LF-ThMS intensity. For data normally distributed (Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, 225 P>0.05) with homogeneity of variances, we used parametric one-way repeated-226 measures ANOVA under the null hypothesis that the dependent variables "SpO2 levels" 227 228 were the same across the different LF-ThMS intensities. We also employed Mauchly's test to verify that the assumption of sphericity was not violated. We performed a 229 pairwise post hoc test using the corrected Bonferroni adjustment. All effects are reported 230 231 as significant if p<0.001.

Moreover, a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was employed to examine whether there is a statistically significant linear correlation between SpO2 levels and frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature changes during the LF-

May 21th 2021

10

ThMS intervention. The sample size was n=35 SpO2 measurements during seven LF-ThMS levels (including the control) in five patients of the sham-controlled experiment and n=119 SpO2 values in another 12 patients. The correlation coefficient was calculated for n-2=33 or n-2=117 degrees of freedom (DF), and the correlation was reported as significant if p<0.001. Data were expressed as mean ± standard deviation in the main text and the figures.

241 **Results**

We measured the SpO2 level for all the patients before the LF-ThMS intervention. We found that COVID-19 patients presented similar symptoms. On the first day of magnetic stimulation, we found that the patients experienced difficulty breathing with a low SpO2 level of 86.6 \pm 2.2 % (N=17 patients), consistent with COVID-19 signs and breathlessness symptoms. However, we found that during the LF-ThMS, the patients exhibited a gradual increase in their SpO2 levels. No adverse events or discomfort sensations were reported during or after the LF-ThMS.

249 **Comparisons between the SpO2 levels of COVID-19 patients in the sham and real**

250 *LF-ThMS*

In the controlled study, we observed no statistically significant changes in SpO2 levels during sham stimulation (five subjects, Figure 3A). We performed parametric oneway repeated-measures ANOVA to examine statistical significance between SpO2 levels during the sham stimulation in all the patients. The differences in the mean values among the sham groups are not great enough to exclude the possibility that the difference is due to random sampling variability, i.e., there is no statistically significant difference [F=0.165, DF=6, p=0.984].

May 21th 2021

11

258 However, during the real LF-ThMS, we observed statistically significant changes 259 in SpO2 levels in response to real LF-ThMS in 5 COVID-19 subjects who previously underwent sham stimulation (green triangles and green line: Figure 3B) and in the other 260 12 COVID-19 subjects who underwent only the real LF-ThMS (orange circles and gray 261 line: Figure 3B). We performed parametric one-way repeated-measures ANOVA to 262 examine statistical significance between groups: "control SpO2 levels" and "SpO2 levels 263 during the LF-ThMS interventions" in all the patients (17 subjects). The differences in the 264 mean values among the treatment groups were more significant than would be expected 265 by chance [F=13.872, DF=6, p<0.001]. The post hoc test indicated that the significant 266 main effect exhibited significant differences (p<0.001) between the "control SpO2 levels" 267 and the "SpO2 levels obtained after 20 min of LF-ThMS interventions" (Table 2). In 268 contrast, no statistically significant differences (p>0.05) were found before 20 min of LF-269 ThMS interventions (Table 2). This indicates that the LF-ThMS at the frequency and 270 magnetic flux density employed produces changes in SpO2 levels only after 20 minutes 271 of LF-ThMS application. 272

273 Correlations among the frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature elicited 274 by the LF-ThMS versus the SpO2 levels of COVID -19 patients

In the controlled study, we also examined whether SpO2 levels exhibited correlations with the sham session time. We observed no statistically significant correlation between SpO2 levels and session time in the sham condition (Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient r=0.07, DF=33, p=0.65, gray regression line, Figure 3A). However, we obtained a statistically significant correlation between SpO2 values and session time in the real LF-ThMS applied to the same five subjects that

May 21th 2021

12

previously underwent the sham stimulation (Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient r=0.81, DF=33, p<0.001, green regression line, Figure 3B).

Finally, we examined whether the SpO2 levels exhibited correlations with the LF-283 ThMS session time, frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature for all the 284 patients. Figure 3B and Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C show significant correlations between 285 these measurements. Pearson's product-moment correlation method was used to test 286 for significant correlations. We obtained a p<0.001 with 117 or 100 degrees of freedom 287 and correlation coefficients r = 0.64, 0.58, 0.55, and 0.64, as indicated (see Figure 3B,288 and Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C). These statistically significant results suggest that the 289 changes in SpO2 levels during a 30 min LF-ThMS session are related to their 290 associated variables: frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature. These findings 291 provide support to our hypothesis. 292

293 Adverse events

We did not find adverse effects during or after the LF-ThMS intervention. We also 294 made a follow-up on the health conditions of all the patients. We found that five days 295 after successive LF-ThMS sessions, the mean SpO2 level was 98.3 ± 0.7 % for 17 296 patients (Table 3). We also found a mean SpO2 level of 98.4 ± 0.8 %, for 11 patients, six 297 months after the LF-ThMS intervention (Table 3). Such normal SpO2 levels indicate that 298 the LF-ThMS did not produce adverse events in the oxygen saturation. In the follow-up 299 on the general health conditions after five days or six months, the physicians confirmed 300 that the patients did not exhibit any adverse event or secondary effect after the LF-301 ThMS intervention. These findings indicate that 30 minutes of LF-ThMS intervention on 302 the dorsal thorax of COVID-19 patients is safe at the frequencies, magnetic flux 303

May 21th 2021

13

densities, and temperatures of 100 to 128 Hz, 10.5 to 13.1 mT, and 27.5 to 44 °C, respectively.

306 **Discussion**

We found statistically significant correlations between SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients and LF-ThMS variables in a time range of 30 minutes, but not in the shamcontrolled study.

310 **Reproducibility**

Our findings were reproducible in all the patients in a time range of 30 minutes of 311 LF-ThMS intervention. Interestingly, our results were also reproducible in three or four 312 313 other subsequent sessions. However, we did not present such data because the changes could be associated with an ongoing daily recovery of the patients due to 314 unknown immune mechanisms and not necessarily due to the daily LF-ThMS 315 intervention. Hence, future studies of randomized controlled trials will be necessary to 316 examine the potential use of this LF-ThMS application as therapy during consecutive 317 daily sessions in covid-19 patients. Therefore, the principal value of our results is that in 318 the sham-controlled study, we found a reproducible and significant correlation between 319 LF-ThMS associated variables and SpO2 levels in a short time range of 30 minutes. 320

321 Possible interference of LF-ThMS hyperthermia with the virus-host protein 322 interactions

It is well known that several viral protein complexes mediate the entry and replication of SARS-CoV-2 into the cells, manipulating the host mRNA translation, subsequent viral protein production, antivirus immunity, and inflammation response to inducing lung infection and pneumonia. Specifically, this pathogen is a single-stranded RNA virus with gene fragments expressing structural and nonstructural proteins [24-26].

May 21th 2021

14

Several viral protein complexes are involved in the entry and replication of this virus into 328 329 the cells; for instance, the virus spike (S) protein and the nonstructural protein 1 (nsp1). The first one mediates cell entry via binding with angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 in 330 host cells (AEC2), and the second one, the crucial virus-host interactions [27,28]. 331 Because there is evidence that a temperature increase of tissue can affect proteins and 332 enhance the immune response [14,15], it is tempting to speculate that hyperthermia 333 produced by the LF-ThMS may acutely interfere with these viral proteins and improve 334 respiratory function. 335

Possible interference of LF-ThMS magnetic flux with the virus-host electrical interactions

Another possibility is that the magnetic stimuli could also directly interfere with the 338 positively charged site in the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, disturbing the electrical binding 339 between the virus protein and the negatively charged human-cell receptors. This is 340 consistent with recent simulation studies, reporting a positively charged site (called 341 polybasic cleavage site) positioned 10 nanometers from the actual binding site on the 342 SARS-CoV-2 spike protein [29]. These authors found that the positively charged site 343 allows strong bonding between the virus protein and the negatively charged cell 344 receptors. In their simulation, Qiao and Olvera de la Cruz [29] designed a negatively 345 charged molecule to bind to the positively charged cleavage site, with the idea that 346 blocking this site inhibits the virus from bonding to the host cell [29]. Therefore, it is also 347 tempting to speculate that interfering with the electrostatic interaction during the binding 348 action of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein and the ACE2 receptors, or the nsp1 could 349 mitigate the viral infection. This possible mode of action of the LF-ThMS is also 350

May 21th 2021

15

consistent with the claim that electrostatic precipitators are also valuable for eliminating
 airborne virus particles [30,31].

353 **Possible interference of LF-ThMS hyperthermia with the immune response and** 354 **interferon activity**

Another mechanism by which the LF-ThMS up to 44 °C could improve SpO2 355 levels in COVID-19 patients is the enhanced immune response due to the dorsal 356 357 thorax's increased temperature during the intervention. This is consistent with reports that hyperthermia potentiates the immune response against cancer through immune 358 cells' activation [15,32,33]. Some of the immune cells activated by hyperthermia are the 359 360 natural killer cells, dendritic cells, and cytotoxic T-lymphocytes, which alter the cellsurface molecules on cancer cells, modifying adhesion molecules on immune cells and 361 endothelial cells [32]. 362

Previous studies claimed that Interferons could have a potential role in treating COVID-19 patients [34]. However, recent investigations demonstrated that the SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 is an Interferon-stimulated gene in human airway epithelial cells [35]. This means that interferons could help or damage, depending on the infection stage for each COVID-19 patient. In this context, we suggest that LF-ThMS should be applied at the first stages of the COVID-19 infection to enhance interferon activity by an increased temperature, in which the interferons may confer an antiviral state on cells.

370 **Possible interference of LF-ThMS in inflammation and cytokine storm**

Finally, because the inflammation and cytokine storm are the main factors contributing to breathing, ventilation, and oxygenation, in COVID-19 patients, it will be necessary to examine in future studies whether the LF-ThMS has an impact on these factors.

16

May 21th 2021

375 Advantages and limitations

The first potential advantage of the thoracic LF-ThMS is that the subjects did not 376 require oxygen therapy with face masks, mainly because during the LF-ThMS session, 377 the patients significantly increased their SpO2 levels 20 minutes after the LF-ThMS 378 (p<0.001, Table 2). The second advantage is that the device for LF-ThMS is easy to 379 reproduce, and the electronic components are not expensive. It may be possible that 380 several pulsed electromagnetic field devices employed in physical therapy worldwide 381 could be adapted to emit magnetic fields at 100 to 118 Hz, 10.5 to 13.1 mT (105 to 131 382 Gauss), and 27.5 to 44 °C. 383

The main limitations of our study are the following. We do not know the physiological mechanisms through which the administered LF-ThMS during a 30 min session improved SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients. We also did not explore whether the LF-ThMS intervention enhances the patients' immune response or whether it impacts the electrical charges of the SARS-CoV-2 viral proteins or the inflammation and cytokine storm in COVID-19 patients. However, our study will motivate future investigations in this research field.

Another limitation of our study is that it will be necessary to know the real temperature in the lungs associated with variations in temperature of the external dorsal thorax by LF-ThMS. It is expected that such temperatures should be lower than those on the external dorsal thorax due to the diffusion processes of heat transfer occurring in the skin, muscle, and scapula. In the same context, it will be necessary to examine the magnetic flux density reached into the lungs, which should be attenuated as a function of depth.

May 21th 2021

17

Finally, while there is a consensus that repetitive magnetic stimulation is helpful in the non-invasive modulation of brain neural activity in humans, the use of similar interventions in other regions of the human body is still controversial. Besides such a limitation, here we found the experimental correlation of LF-ThMS variables: magnetic flux density, frequency, and temperature with SpO2 levels in 17 COVID-19 patients, five of them in a single-blind, sham-controlled, crossover study.

404 **Perspectives**

Although the increased SpO2 levels may be attributed to the altered perfusion consequent to warming or the impact of magnetic factors inactivating the SARS-CoV-2 virus, at this moment, these are only speculations. Therefore, future studies will be necessary to examine the physiological mechanisms of these significant correlations.

Besides previous studies suggest that magnetic stimulation could be helpful in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [36] and phrenic nerve activation [37], future studies examining this issue by using the LF-ThMS in humans or animal preparations will also be necessary. Other future perspectives include developing wearable and portable devices for LF-ThMS, combined with oximeters and respiratory magnetograms [38]. Such devices could help examine in more detail respiratory improvements after the thoracic LF-ThMS in COVID-19 patients.

Here our LF-ThMS protocol is not intended to demonstrate its use as therapy but is instead designed to examine the hypothesis that LF-ThMS could be helpful to increase SpO2 levels in COVID-19 patients in a short range from 0 to 30 minutes. In this context, our findings are relevant because they could motivate future randomized clinical trials to examine whether the LF-ThMS could be helpful as a potential therapy.

May 21th 2021

Conclusions

We conclude that our findings are relevant at this stage, mainly because they provide evidence that 30 minutes of LF-ThMS on the dorsal thorax at 100 to 118 Hz, 10.5 to 13.1 mT (105 to 131 Gauss), and 27.5 to 44 °C is safe in COVID-19 patients. We also conclude that the LF-ThMS variables (frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature) exhibit a statistically significant correlation with SpO2 levels in the time range of 30 minutes, showing that the LF-ThMS significantly increases peripheral oxygen saturation levels in COVID-19 patients.

- ...

May 21th 2021

446 **References**

- Babaei F, Mirzababaei M, Nassiri-Asl M, Hosseinzadeh H. Review of registered
 clinical trials for the treatment of COVID-19. Drug Dev Res. 2020;(ddr.21762).
 doi:10.1002/ddr.21762
- Haneef K, Asghar MU, Ali A. Novel immunogenomic insights of corona virus disease (COVID-19): Available potential immunotherapeutics, current challenges, immune cell recognition and ongoing managerial strategies. Biomed Res Ther.
 2020;7(8):3906-3915.
- Tobaiqy M, Qashqary M, Al-Dahery S, et al. Therapeutic management of patients
 with COVID-19: a systematic review. Infection Prevention in Practice.
 2020;2(3):100061.
- 457 4. Chen P-L, Lee N-Y, Cia C-T, Ko W-C, Hsueh P-R. A review of treatment of 458 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Therapeutic repurposing and unmet 459 clinical needs. Front Pharmacol. 2020;11:584956.
- 5. Daou F, Abou-Sleymane G, Badro DA, Khanafer N, Tobaiqy M, Al Faraj A. The
 history, efficacy, and safety of potential therapeutics: A narrative overview of the
 complex life of COVID-19. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(3):955.
- Gálvez-Romero JL, Palmeros-Rojas O, Real-Ramírez FA, et al. Cyclosporine A
 plus low-dose steroid treatment in COVID-19 improves clinical outcomes in
 patients with moderate to severe disease: A pilot study. J Intern Med.
 2020;(joim.13223). doi:10.1111/joim.13223
- A67 7. Naveja JJ, Madariaga-Mazón A, Flores-Murrieta F, et al. Union is strength: antiviral
 and anti-inflammatory drugs for COVID-19. Drug Discov Today. 2021;26(1):229239.

May 21th 2021

20

470	8.	Di Lazzaro V, Capone F, Apollonio F, et al. A consensus panel review of central
471		nervous system effects of the exposure to low-intensity extremely low-frequency
472		magnetic fields. Brain Stimul. 2013;6(4):469-476.
473	9.	Robertson JA, Théberge J, Weller J, Drost DJ, Prato FS, Thomas AW. Low-
474		frequency pulsed electromagnetic field exposure can alter neuroprocessing in
475		humans. J R Soc Interface. 2010;7(44):467-473.
476	10	. Cook CM, Thomas AW, Keenliside L, Prato FS. Resting EEG effects during
477		exposure to a pulsed ELF magnetic field. Bioelectromagnetics. 2005;26(5):367-
478		376.
479	11	. Rickaby DA, Fehring JF, Johnston MR, Dawson CA. Tolerance of the isolated
480		perfused lung to hyperthermia. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 1991;101(4):732-739.
481	12	. Cowen ME, Howard RB, Mulvin D, Dawson CA, Johnston MR. Lung tolerance to
482		hyperthermia by in vivo perfusion. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg. 1992;6(4):167-172;
483		discussion 173.
484	13	. Cohen M. Turning up the heat on COVID-19: heat as a therapeutic intervention.
485		F1000Res. 2020;9:292.
486	14	. Dieing A, Ahlers O, Hildebrandt B, et al. The effect of induced hyperthermia on the
487		immune system. Prog Brain Res. 2007;162:137-152.
488	15	. Peer AJ, Grimm MJ, Zynda ER, Repasky EA. Diverse immune mechanisms may
489		contribute to the survival benefit seen in cancer patients receiving hyperthermia.
490		Immunol Res. 2010;46(1-3):137-154.
491	16	. Sen A, Khona D, Ghatak S, et al. Electroceutical fabric lowers zeta potential and
492		eradicates Coronavirus infectivity upon contact. ChemRxiv. Published online 2020.

493 doi:10.26434/chemrxiv.12307214.v1

May 21th 2021

494	17. Yap TF, Liu Z, Shveda RA, Preston DJ. A predictive model of the temperature-
495	dependent inactivation of coronaviruses. Appl Phys Lett. 2020;117(6):060601.
496	18. Ramirez FE, Sanchez A, Pirskanen AT. Hydrothermotherapy in prevention and
497	treatment of mild to moderate cases of COVID-19. Med Hypotheses.

- 498 2021;146(110363):110363.
- 19. Sigman SA, Mokmeli S, Monici M, Vetrici MA. A 57-year-old African American man
- 500 with severe COVID-19 pneumonia who responded to supportive 501 photobiomodulation therapy (PBMT): First use of PBMT in COVID-19. Am J Case
- 502 Rep. 2020;21:e926779.
- 503 20. Guibert R, Guibert B. Combined thermotherapy and electrotherapy technique.
 504 1994;number 5,315,994.
- 21. Zee J. Heating the Patient: A Promising Approach? Ann. Oncol. 2002;13(8):1173–
 1184.
- 507 22. Wust P, Hildebrandt B, Sreenivasa G, et al. Hyperthermia in combined treatment of
 508 cancer. Lancet Oncol. 2002;3(8):487-497.
- 509 23. Chang D, Lim M, Goos JACM, et al. Biologically targeted magnetic hyperthermia:
 510 Potential and limitations. Front Pharmacol. 2018;9:831.
- 24. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel
 coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. Lancet.
 2020;395(10224):565-574.
- 25. Chan JF-W, Kok K-H, Zhu Z, et al. Genomic characterization of the 2019 novel
 human-pathogenic coronavirus isolated from a patient with atypical pneumonia
 after visiting Wuhan. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):221-236.

May 21th 2021

517	26. Huang Y, Yang C, Xu X-F, Xu W, Liu S-W. Structural and functional properties of
518	SARS-CoV-2 spike protein: potential antivirus drug development for COVID-19.
519	Acta Pharmacol Sin. 2020;41(9):1141-1149.

- 520 27. Min Y-Q, Mo Q, Wang J, Deng F, Wang H, Ning Y-J. SARS-CoV-2 nsp1:
- 521 Bioinformatics, potential structural and functional features, and implications for 522 drug/vaccine designs. Front Microbiol. 2020;11:587317.
- 28. Yuan S, Peng L, Park JJ, et al. Nonstructural protein 1 of SARS-CoV-2 is a potent
 pathogenicity factor redirecting host protein synthesis machinery toward viral RNA.
- 525 Mol Cell. 2020;80(6):1055-1066.e6.
- 29. Qiao B, Olvera de la Cruz M. Enhanced binding of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein to
 receptor by distal polybasic cleavage sites. ACS Nano. 2020;14(8):10616-10623.
- 30. Kettleson EM, Ramaswami B, Hogan CJ Jr, et al. Airborne virus capture and
 inactivation by an electrostatic particle collector. Environ Sci Technol.
 2009;43(15):5940-5946.
- 31. Leung WWF, Sun Q. Electrostatic charged nanofiber filter for filtering airborne
 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) and nano-aerosols. Sep Purif Technol.
 2020;250(116886):116886.
- 32. Terunuma H. Potentiating Immune System by Hyperthermia. In: Hyperthermic
 Oncology from Bench to Bedside. Springer Singapore; 2016:127-135.
- 33. Tydings C, Sharma KV, Kim A, Yarmolenko PS. Emerging hyperthermia
 applications for pediatric oncology. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2020;163-164:157-167.
- 34. Haji Abdolvahab M, Moradi-Kalbolandi S, Zarei M, Bose D, Majidzadeh-A K,
 Farahmand L. Potential role of interferons in treating COVID-19 patients. Int
 Immunopharmacol. 2021;90(107171):107171.

May 21th 2021

541	35. Ziegler CGK, Allon SJ, Nyquist SK, et al. SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 is an
542	interferon-stimulated gene in human airway epithelial cells and is detected in
543	specific cell subsets across tissues. Cell. 2020;181(5):1016-1035.e19.
544	36. Man WD-C. Magnetic stimulation for the measurement of respiratory and skeletal
545	muscle function. Eur Respir J. 2004;24(5):846-860.
546	37. Similowski T, Fleury B, Launois S, Cathala HP, Bouche P, Derenne JP. Cervical
547	magnetic stimulation: a new painless method for bilateral phrenic nerve stimulation
548	in conscious humans. J Appl Physiol. 1989;67(4):1311-1318.
549	38. Dominguez-Nicolas SM, Juarez-Aguirre R, Herrera-May AL, et al. Respiratory
550	magnetogram detected with a MEMS device. Int J Med Sci. 2013;10(11):1445-
551	1450.
552	
553	
554	
555	
556	
557	
558	
559	
560	
561	
562	
563	
564	

May 21th 2021

565 Figure legends

Figure 1. Electronic circuit employed in the low-field thoracic magnetic stimulation (LF-ThMS) device. This electronic circuit modulates the intensity and frequency of the alternating current producing the magnetic fields, limiting the maximum temperature to 44 °C, and the magnetic flux density up to 13.1 mT at 118 Hz.

Figure 2. Experimental arrangement. **A.** Anatomical landmarks for the positioning of the LF-ThMS coils in the dorsal thorax of COVID-19 patients. The gray circle indicates the anatomical landmark called the "spinous process of C7" or "*vertebra prominens*". **B-D.** Gradual increase (every 5 min) from 0 to 30 minutes of pulsed stimulus frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature during the application of LF-ThMS to COVID-19 patients. The stimulation consisted of applying LF-ThMS for 30 minutes on the dorsal aspect of the thorax.

Figure 3. Comparative results obtained from the sham-controlled study and the real LF-577 ThMS intervention. A. Peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO2) levels versus time during the 578 sham stimulation for five COVID-19 patients. Blue circles represent the grand average of 579 these SpO2 levels B. SpO2 levels versus time during the LF-ThSM stimulation. The 580 green triangles represent the grand average of SpO2 values during the real LF-ThSM in 581 582 the same five patients that received sham stimulation in A. The orange symbols illustrate the grand average SpO2 levels in 12 COVID-19 patients versus time during a single 583 session of LF-ThMS. The green and gray circles (raw data) show the SpO2 values 584 obtained for all the patients (every 5 minutes) versus the time in minutes. A statistically 585 significant correlation (p<0.001, Pearson's product-moment correlation) was found for 586 "SpO2 values" versus "stimulation time" during real LF-ThMS but not during sham 587 stimulation. 588

May 21th 2021

612

589	Figure 4. The same as Figure 3B, but for the correlation between SpO2 levels and the
590	variables related to the real LF-ThMS applied to 17 COVID-19 patients. The Pearson's
591	correlation coefficients (r), degrees of freedom (DF), and p values (p<0.001) are shown
592	above each graph.
593	Tables
594	Table 1. Variables associated with the LF-ThMS (frequency, magnetic flux density,
595	temperature) and the mean SpO2 levels in 17 COVD-19 patients.
596	Table 2. One way repeated measures ANOVA for the SpO2 values of 17 COVID-19
597	patients in control conditions (0 minutes) and during the LF-ThMS at 10, 15, 20, 25, and
598	30 minutes. The Bonferroni t-test was used for multiple comparisons versus the control
599	group.
600	Table 3. Follow-up on the SpO2 values for all the patients after the LF-ThMS. Six
601	months after the LF-ThMS intervention, the patients reported no adverse events, and
602	they exhibited normal SpO2 levels.
603	
604	
605	
606	
607	
608	
609	
610	
611	

May 21th 2021

613

614

615



May 21th 2021



May 21th 2021



Time (min)

Figure 3





Stimulation Time (min)

May 21th 2021



Figure 4

654

30

May 21th 2021

655

656

	Time (min)	Frequency (Hz)	Magnetic flux density (mT)	Temperature °C	SpO2 (%) mean±SD	Number of patients
	0	0	0	27.5±0.2	86.6±2.2	. 17
	5	100	10.5±0.01	29.3±0.07	86.7±2.0	17
	10	103	10.7±0.04	35.2±0.08	88.0±2.1	17
	15	105	11.1±0.12	41.4±0.3	88.8±2.2	17
	20	110	11.6±0.02	43.3±0.2	90.1±2.4	17
	25	115	12.2±0.2	44±0.05	91.4±2.5	17
	30	118	13.1±0.15	43.9±0.01	92.2±3.2	17
658 659			Ta	ble 1		
660						
661						
662						
663						
664						
665						
666						
667						
668						
669						
670						
671						
672						

May 21th 2021

673

- . . .
- 675

	Comparison	Diff of Means	t	Ρ	Significance
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (30 min)	5.588	6.655	<0.001	Yes
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (25 min)	4.824	5.745	<0.001	Yes
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (20 min)	3.529	4.203	<0.001	Yes
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (15 min)	2.176	2.592	0.065	No
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (10 min)	1.353	1.611	0.66	No
	SpO2 (0 min) vs. SpO2 (5 min)	0.118	0.14	1	No
676					
677					
678		Table 2			
679					
680					
681					
682					
683					
684					
685					
686					
687					
688					
689					
690					

May 21th 2021

		Before LF-ThMS	30 minutes after Sham Stimulus	30 minutes after LF-ThMS	Five days after LF-ThMS	Six months after LF-ThMS
	Patients	SpO2 (%)	SpO2 (%)	SpO2 (%)	SpO2 (%)	SpO2 (%)
	Patient 1	88	_	98	98	99
	Patient 2	86	_	97	98	97
	Patient 3	89	_	96	98	97
	Patient 4	90	_	97	99	99
	Patient 5	87	_	91	98	99
	Patient 6	90	_	93	99	99
	Patient 7	87	_	91	97	98
	Patient 8	88	_	93	98	98
	Patient 9	87	_	91	99	99
	Patient 10	86	_	90	98	99
	Patient 11	84	_	88	97	99
	Patient 12	83	_	86	99	_
	Patient 13	84	85	93	99	_
	Patient 14	85	86	90	99	_
	Patient 15	88	88	93	99	_
	Patient 16	83	83	90	98	_
	Patient 17	88	88	91	99	_
		86.6 ± 2.2	86 ± 2.1	92.2 ± 3.2	98.3 ± 0.7	98.4 ± 0.8
694						
695						
696	Table 3					
697						
698						
699						
700						
701						

May 21th 2021

703 Ethics and reporting

- 704 We declare that all relevant ethical guidelines have been followed and ethics committee
- 705 approval has been obtained. All necessary patient/participant consent has been
- obtained. SPIRIT-Checklist was included as a supplementary file.

707 Acknowledgments

708 We thank Prof. Robert Simpson for proofreading the English document.

709 Data Availability Statement

The authors confirm that all data underlying the findings are fully available without

restriction upon request. All relevant data are within the paper.

712 Author contributions

513 SMDN conceived the therapeutic application of magnetic stimuli in COVID-19 patients,

developed the first LF-ThMS prototype, and performed the experiments. EM and SMDN

conceived the proof-of-concept and hypothesis of this study. EM performed the data

analysis. EM designed the single-blind, sham-controlled, crossover study on 5 COVID-

19 patients, wrote the paper, and contributed to calibrate and improve the safeness of

the original LF-ThMS prototype.

719 **Funding**

Centro de Investigación de Micro y Nanotecnología (SMDN), National Council of
Science and Technology, Mexico, CONACyT Fronteras de la Ciencia #536 (EM),
Cátedra Marcos Moshinsky (EM), and VIEP-PIFI-FOMES-PROMEP-BUAP-Puebla
(EM), Comité de Internacionalización and VIEP BUAP (EM), México.

724 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.