A SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS OF THE TIME COURSE TO DEVELOP TREATMENTS FOR COVID-19

Binh T. Ngo, M.D.[1*], Marc S. Rendell, M.D.[2]

1. Keck USC School of Medicine
2020 Zonal Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90033

2. The Rose Salter Medical Research Foundation
34 Versailles
Newport Coast, CA 92657

ABSTRACT

Background. The spread of COVID-19 from Wuhan in China throughout the world has been alarmingly rapid. Epidemiologic techniques succeeded in containing the disease in China, but efforts were not as successful in the rest of the world, particularly the United States where there have been 2,079,592 confirmed cases with 115,484 deaths as of June 15, 2020. Projections are for continued new infections and deaths if no effective treatments can be activated over the next six months. We performed a systematic review to determine the potential time course for development of treatments and vaccines focusing on availability in the last half of 2020.

Methods. Publications: Our search was performed during the week of June 15, 2020 We reviewed up to date information from several sources to identify potential treatments for COVID-19: We used the Reagan-Udall Expanded Access Navigator COVID-19 Treatment Hub to track the efforts of companies to develop treatments. We then used the results to search for publications identified treatments on pubmed.gov and on medRxiv, the preprint server. We further used a targeted Google search to find announcements of trial results.

Clinical Trials: We searched for all investigational trials begun in the first quarter of 2020, with cut off on April 1, using several different sources: (A) covid-trials.org, then validated results on (B) clinicaltrials.gov and the (C) World Health Organization's International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP). We focused on trials which were completed or currently recruiting for patients, reasoning that the timeline to arrive at treatments by the end of the year would require completion within the next 6 months. We excluded studies which were clearly observational, with no randomization, control or com-

parison group. We further set a cutoff of 100 for numbers of subjects since smaller trial size could lack statistical power to establish superiority of the intervention over the control condition.

Results. Published Data: We found 44 publications reporting findings on 11 classes of agents. There were 12 publications related to hydroxychloroquine (HCQ),11 on tocilizumab, 4 publications related to remdesivir, four on lopanovir/ritonavir (LPV/R), four on interferons, three on favipiravir, two on convalescent plasma, one on meplazumab, one on corticosteroids, one on famotidine, and one on ivermectin. Of these, only 16 were randomized or active control studies; the rest were retrospective observational. Only two publications dealt with outpatient care, the rest all in hospitalized patients.

Clinical Trials: We found 409 trials meeting our minimum requirement of 100 subjects which were recruiting or completed. The WHO has launched the Solidarity megatrial performed in over 100 countries actively comparing HCQ, lopanovir/ritonavir (LPV/R) alone and in combination with interferon beta-1, and remdesivir. That trial is scheduled to complete enrollment in the first quarter of 2021. In addition, we found 46 trials of HCQ, 11 trials of LPV/R and 8 trials of interferons. There were 18 ongoing trials of antiviral agents, 24 immune modulator trials, 9 vaccine trials, and 62 trials of other agents. We excluded a large number of trials of Chinese traditional medications, reasoning that there was insufficient clinical experience with these agents outside China to offer these treatments to the rest of the world. Forty four trials were hoping to complete enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020. Of these, only 9 were conducted on outpatients. A few vaccine trials are hoping to complete Phase 3 enrollment by the end of the third quarter, but a prolonged follow-up of patients will likely be required.

Conclusion. Remdesivir and tocilizumab have now been granted emergency authorization in many countries for treatment of hospitalized patients. However, the disease is propagated primarily by infected ambulatory individuals. There are only a few randomized controlled studies in outpatients which can be expected to yield results in time to impact on the continuing epidemic in 2020. It will be necessary for public health authorities to make hard decisions with limited data to prevent the continued spread of the disease. The choices will be hardest in dealing with potential early release of vaccines.

Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, SARS-Cov-2, remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, favipiravir

*email: Binh.ngo@med.usc.edu

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus SARS-Cov-2 pandemic spread through the world with extraordinary speed from its origin in December 2019 in Wuhan City in the Hubei Province of China. As of June 15, 2020, there have been 7,941,791 confirmed cases and 434,796 deaths worldwide affecting 220 countries and territories (1). The illness produces mild or no symptoms in about 80% of infected individuals but, in about 20% manifests as a significant pneumonia which can progress to acute respiratory distress requiring mechanical ventilation in 5% of patients (2). Baud et al calculated a crude mortality ratio of 5.7% using confirmed cases, but that calculation is affected by the high percentage of asymptomatic and mild undiagnosed cases (3). A calculation based on the outbreak among the passengers and crew of the cruise ship Diamond Princess, essentially a captive population, suggested a case fatality ratio of 2.6% and infection fatality ratio of 1.3% (4). However, the mean age of the passengers was about 60, and mortality is definitely higher in the elderly and in those with chronic disease.

COVID-19 is a disease of dual pathogenicity with a characteristic sequence of events related to the primary viral attack and then, subsequently, with an overlapping hyperinflammatory reaction (5). The initial viremia manifests as an influenza like illness with cough, fever, myalgia and fatigue. In patients with severe disease, within seven days of onset of symptoms, bilateral multiple lobular and subsegmental areas of consolidation are typically seen on chest CT (6). The pneumonia causes dyspnea by 8 days which may progress to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) by 9 days. Cytokine levels in the patients with ARDS are more elevated than in those patients who do not progress, pointing to a severe immune reaction as the probable cause (7,8). There is additionally a coagulopathy which affects the lungs and other organs and can trigger cerebrovascular accidents (9,10).

Recently a new syndrome of pediatric multisystem inflammatory disorder has surfaced in children, previously thought minimally susceptible to severe COVID-19 disease (11,12). This appears to be a delayed autoimmune condition which can occur a month or more after the SARS-Cov-2 infection and has been fatal in a number of children (13).

In mainland China, vigorous efforts to contain the spread of COVID-19 by home isolation, closure of business activity, travel bans, and tracking and control of contacts succeeded. As of June 15, China had reported 84,823 confirmed cases 4634 deaths, but the number of new cases has declined to very low levels (1). Similar measures contained the epidemic in Korea, Taiwan and in New Zealand (14). That has not been the case in the rest of the world, particularly the United States, where, despite only a fifth of the population of China, there were 2,079,592 confirmed cases with 115,484 deaths as of June 15, 2020 (1). In the U.S.A., as in China, the planned response to the pandemic was through reduction of person to person contact. The process of social distancing began March 11, 2020. Schools and businesses were closed. Social gatherings and meetings ended. Recreation areas, parks, and beaches were closed. These efforts have blunted the spread of the disease, but not with the results achieved in China.

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus SARS-Cov-2 pandemic spread through the world with extraordinary speed from its origin in December 2019 in Wuhan City in the Hubei Province of China. As of June 15, 2020, there have been 7,941,791 confirmed cases and 434,796 deaths worldwide affecting 220 countries and territories (1). The illness produces mild or no symptoms in about 80% of infected individuals but, in about 20% manifests as a significant pneumonia which can progress to acute respiratory distress requiring mechanical ventilation in 5% of patients (2). Baud et al calculated a crude mortality ratio of 5.7% using confirmed cases, but that calculation is affected by the high percentage of asymptomatic and mild undiagnosed cases (3). A calculation based on the outbreak among the passengers and crew of the cruise ship Diamond Princess, essentially a captive population, suggested a case fatality ratio of 2.6% and infection fatality ratio of 1.3% (4). However, the mean age of the passengers was about 60, and mortality is definitely higher in the elderly and in those with chronic disease.

COVID-19 is a disease of dual pathogenicity with a characteristic sequence of events related to the primary viral attack and then, subsequently, with an overlapping hyperinflammatory reaction (5). The initial viremia manifests as an influenza like illness with cough, fever, myalgia and fatigue. In patients with severe disease, within seven days of onset of symptoms, bilateral multiple lobular and subsegmental areas of consolidation are typically seen on chest CT (6). The pneumonia causes dyspnea by 8 days which may progress to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) by 9 days. Cytokine levels in the patients with ARDS are more elevated than in those patients who do not progress, pointing to a severe immune reaction as the probable cause (7,8). There is additionally a coagulopathy which affects the lungs and other organs and can trigger cerebrovascular accidents (9,10).

Recently a new syndrome of pediatric multisystem inflammatory disorder has surfaced in children, previously thought minimally susceptible to severe COVID-19 disease (11,12). This appears to be a delayed autoimmune condition which can occur a month or more after the SARS-Cov-2 infection and has been fatal in a number of children (13).

In mainland China, vigorous efforts to contain the spread of COVID-19 by home isolation, closure of business activity, travel bans, and tracking and control of contacts succeeded. As of June 15, China had reported 84,823 confirmed cases 4634 deaths, but the number of new cases has declined to very low levels (1). Similar measures contained the epidemic in Korea, Taiwan and in New Zealand (14). That has not been the case in the rest of the world, particularly the United States, where, despite only a fifth of the population of China, there were 2,079,592 confirmed cases with 115,484 deaths as of June 15, 2020 (1). In the U.S.A., as in China, the planned response to the pandemic was through reduction of person to person contact. The process of social distancing began March 11, 2020. Schools and businesses were closed. Social gatherings and meetings ended. Recreation areas, parks, and beaches were closed. These efforts have blunted the spread of the disease, but not with the results achieved in China.

Epidemiologic models have varied on prediction of the continued spread of COVID-19 in the United States. The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) projected that the peak of deaths occurred in midApril with lessening by May 1, predicated however on maintenance of strict social distancing measures (15). Kissler et al performed simulations of the persistence of COVID-19 in the United States (16). Their model considered known data on the transmissibility of other less threatening betacoronaviruses, crossimmunity with those viruses, seasonal variations, and the impact of social distancing. They predicted that the peak of infections would occur in May with significant reduction by July. However, a significant resurgence of COVID-19 was then expected to follow the end of social distancing with secondary peaks occurring into 2021. The optimal scenario they simulated was for indefinite social distancing measures, which even early on has triggered massive unemployment and economic collapse in the United States. As a result, social distancing measures have been relaxed. Kissler et al stated that medications or vaccines for COVID-19 would obviously reduce the need for reliance on intensive social distancing.

Faced with a growing crisis in early January, Chinese health authorities began treating patients empirically with agents with demonstrated in vitro antiviral activity against coronaviruses and those used during the SARS 2002 and MERS outbreaks in China (17,18). The medications used included the antimalarial drugs hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) and chloroquine, the HIV protease inhibitor lopanovir-ritanovir (LPV/R), the Russian antiviral umifenovir, and traditional Chinese medical approaches. Subsequently, the antimalarial drugs hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) and chloroquine have been widely used to treat COVID-19 patients throughout the world, despite cautions from numerous regulatory bodies. The scientific basis for their use was in vitro evidence of an effect on blocking viral endosomal penetration as well as their known suppressive benefit on undesirable autoimmune effects (19). Thus far, the clinical results supporting the use of antimalarials for COVID-19 has been disappointing (20).

In view of the projections for resurgence of infections with relaxation of social distancing, our goal was to assess the projected timeline for development and release of pharmacologic agents to treat and to prevent COVID-19 over the next 6 months.

METHODS

Our search was carried on the week of June 15, 2020.

PUBLICATIONS: We reviewed up to date information from several sources to identify potential treatments for COVID-19: We used the Reagan-Udall Expanded Access Navigator which is a joint effort of the Reagan Udall Foundation and the FDA to track the efforts of companies engaging in research to enable access to investigational treatments for individuals who are unable to find or participate in an existing clinical trial. To address the global pandemic, the Foundation enhanced the Expanded Access Navigator to include a comprehensive COVID-19 Treatment Hub. We then identified all publications on proposed treatments using pubmed.gov to find peer reviewed articles but in addition we reviewed medRxiv to find preprint reports. We further carried out Google searches on each potential treatment to

find preliminary reports, typically presented as press releases. We have continued to add any new information forthcoming based on daily searches.

CLINICAL TRIALS: We searched for all investigational trials involving potential treatments using several different sources:

(A) covid-trials.org This is a registry to collate all trials in real time (21). Data are pulled from the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform, including those from the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry, ClinicalTrials.gov, Clinical Research Information Service - Republic of Korea, EU Clinical Trials Register, ISRCTN, Iranian Registry of Clinical Trials, Japan Primary Registries Network, and German Clinical Trials Register. Both automated and manual searches are done to ensure minimal duplicated entries and appropriateness to the research questions. Identified studies are then manually reviewed by two separate reviewers before being entered into the registry. Concurrently, the registry has developed artificial intelligence (AI)-based methods for data searches to identify potential clinical studies not captured in trial registries.

We cross validated information from covid-trials.org on (B) clinicaltrials.gov This is a registry of clinical trials information maintained by the United States National Library of Medicine for both federally and privately funded trials conducted under investigational new drug applications to test the effectiveness of experimental drugs. Data includes trials in the United States and 210 countries. We further cross referenced the trials on (C) the World Health Organization's International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP).

We determined which agents were currently available for clinical use, those with published trial results, those which were in ongoing active randomized clinical trial investigation, those which were in observational trials, those in trials projected to begin but not yet recruiting, agents in preclinical phase, and agents in planning phase. We than reviewed each trial to determine if the trials were completed, recruiting for patients, not recruiting or suspended. We only selected those which had completed or were actively recruiting by May 1, 2020, reasoning that the timeline to implement treatments by the end of the year would require completion within the next 3 months. We excluded studies which were clearly observational for treatment purposes, with no randomization, control or comparison group. We further set a cutoff of 100 for numbers of subjects since smaller trial size could lack statistical power to establish superiority of the intervention over the control condition. For each trial selected, we documented the setting of patient contact, either hospital or outpatient, the intended severity of disease in the trial population, the type of control procedure, the date the trial was initially registered, and the proposed date of completion of enrollment. We further reviewed all inclusion and exclusion requirements to verify intended severity of disease. We focused on any inclusion requirements based on duration of symptoms. We categorized the studies as either prevention (PREV) of SARS-Cov-2 infection in healthy subjects or treatment of established COVID-19 disease (TREAT).

RESULTS

PUBLISHED RESULTS ON COVID-19 TREATMENT: We first searched for all publications reporting on completed investigations of pharmaceutical treatment of COVID-19. As of June 15, we found 44 publications reporting findings on 11 classes of agents. There were, 12 publications related to hydroxychloroquine (HCQ),11 on tocilizumab, 4 publications related to remdesivir, four on lopanovir/ ritonavir (LPV/R), four on interferons, three on favipiravir, two on convalescent plasma, one on meplazumab, one on corticosteroids, one on famotidine, and one on ivermectin. There were 16 randomized or active control studies; the rest were retrospective observational. Only two publications dealt with outpatient care, the rest all in hospitalized patients.

The largest published randomized controlled trials were with remdesivir, an inhibitor of viral RNA polymerase. Two remdesivir trials were randomized controlled placebo trials. The first multicenter trial at ten hospitals in Hubei, China was halted in April due to failure to further enroll since no new cases were occurring (22). Eligible patients were adults (aged ≥18 years) admitted to the hospital with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, with an interval from symptom onset to enrollment of 12 days or less, radiologically confirmed pneumonia, and hypoxia. Patients were randomly assigned in a 2:1 ratio to intravenous remdesivir (200 mg on day 1 followed by 100 mg on days 2–10 in single daily infusions) or the same volume of placebo infusions for 10 days. Patients were permitted concomitant use of LPV/R, interferons, and corticosteroids. The trial had enrolled 237 patients when it was suspended due to lack of recruitment. Remdesivir use was not associated with a difference in time to clinical improvement (hazard ratio 1.23 [95% CI 0.87–1.75]).

A report of compassionate use of remdesivir found an overall mortality of 5% in patients not requiring mechanical ventilation but 18% in those who did (23). The largest trial of remdesivir in 1063 moderate to severely ill patients was a double blind randomized placebo controlled study carried out by the National Institute of Arthritis and Infectious Disease (NIAID). On April 29, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the NIAID, announced that the study had met its endpoint in that a faster time to clinical improvement and discharge was found with remdesivir treatment. On May 22, 2020 the actual trial results were published (24). The patients who received remdesivir had a median recovery time of 11 days (95% confidence interval [CI], 9 to 12), as compared with 15 days (95% CI, 13 to 19) for those who received placebo (rate ratio for recovery, 1.32; 95% CI, 1.12 to 1.55; P<0.001). The Kaplan-Meier estimates of mortality by 14 days after randomization were 7.1% with remdesivir and 11.9% with placebo (hazard ratio for death, 0.70; 95% CI, 0.47 to 1.04). There was no data documenting the rate of viral clearance. On the basis of this trial, the FDA issued an emergency authorization for use of remdesivir for severely ill COVID hospitalized patients. Subsequently, a report was published showing that in 397 hospitalized patients with moderate to severe disease, there was no difference in outcome comparing patients who received a 5 day course of remdesivir versus a 10 day course. The analysis was complicated by an imbalance in clinical severity; the patients randomized to 10 days of treatment had significantly more severe disease than those in the 5 day group. The 14 day mortality in the 5 day group was 8% versus 11% in the 10 day group. There was no data on viral clearance reported.

There were two randomized trials of favipiravir (FVP), which like remdesivir is an inhibitor of viral RNA polymerase. Favipiravir is given as an oral tablet whereas remdesivir only has an intravenous

route of administration. Both FVP trials were active control studies carried out in China (TABLE 1). In a study of 35 patients receiving FVP compared to 45 patients receiving LPV/R plus inhaled interferon alpha, a shorter viral clearance time was found for the FVP arm (median (interquartile range, IQR), 4 (2.5–9) days versus 11 (8–13) days, $P < 0.001$) (26). The FVP arm also showed significant improvement in chest imaging compared with the control arm, with an improvement rate of 91.4% versus 62.2% ($P = 0.004$). In a larger Chinese trial comparing 116 patients on FVP to 120 on umifenovir, the 7 day clinical recovery rate was 55.9% for the umifenovir group and 71% in the FVP group (27).The Chinese Health Ministry, after reviewing the studies, concluded that FVP was efficacious against COVID-19. In Russia, a state sponsored agency confirmed the response to favipiravir in a still unpublished study that they performed and approved the drug for clinical treatment beginning in multiple hospitals on June 12. In Japan, a clinical registry was established for all hospitalized COVID patients given FVP on a compassionate use basis. Data was released for 1918 patients on June 2 (28). The categorization of patients was somewhat different than in the remdesivir studies, making a direct comparison problematic. There was no control group nor data on viral clearance. Patients were treated on average 3 days post admission to the hospital. The 30 day overall mortality was 11.6%. For patients requiring supplemental oxygen, the 30 day mortality was 12.7%.

Published studies on hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) have been inconclusive, at best. In a small study in Marseille, France, COVID-19 patients were included in a single arm protocol to receive 600mg of HCQ daily, with daily viral load testing in nasopharyngeal swabs (29). Depending on their clinical presentation, azithromycin (AZT) was added to the treatment. Untreated patients from another center and patients who refused the protocol were included as negative controls. Presence and absence of virus at Day6-post inclusion was considered the end point. Twenty cases were treated in this study and showed a significant reduction of the viral carriage at D6-post inclusion compared to controls, and much lower average carrying duration than reported for untreated patients. AZT added to HCQ was significantly more efficient for virus elimination.

The same group has subsequently reported their experience with 1061 patients screened positive for SARS-Cov-2 and then treated with HCQ and AZT (30). Patients and asymptomatic contacts with positive viral tests were included, so there were outpatients as well as hospitalized individuals. There was no control population. After evaluating electrocardiograms to exclude patients at risk of QT prolongation, they used a combination of HCQ and AZT. Viral clearance was measured at days 2, 6, and 10 of treatment and further for patients who were deemed poor clinical responders. The patients were young (mean age 43.6). Good clinical outcome with successful viral clearance by ten days was obtained in 91.7% of the patients. Failure to clear the virus by ten days occurred in 47 patients (4.4%). Forty-six patients (4.3%) were classified as poor clinical response due to 10 patients transferred into the ICU and 30 who were hospitalized for ten days or more. There were 10 patients who died (mean age 79) due to respiratory failure giving a case fatality ratio of 0.9%.There were no sudden cardiac deaths.

In a small trial at Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University in a parallel-group randomized trial, 31 patients were assigned to receive 5-days of HCQ (400 mg/d) treatment (31). The body temperature recovery time and the cough remission time were significantly shortened in the HCQ treatment group, and 81% (25 of 31) had improvement in pneumonia compared with the control group (54.8%, 17 of 31). All

4 patients who progressed to severe illness were in the control group. However, two other Chinese studies showed no difference in viral clearance in HCQ treated subjects (32,33).

There have been many retrospective large observational trials which suggest that hospitalized patients on HCQ have worse outcomes with possible cardiac arrythmias (34-39) (Table 1). The difficulty in analyzing retrospective observational data is in the possibility of a selection bias choosing patients who were sicker for treatment. Propensity scoring can help adjust for bias, and comparability of groups after adjustment has been claimed. However, in a large study in New York (34), even after adjustment, the (Pao2:Fio2 [223] of HCQ patients was lower than that for the propensity scored non-HCQ patients [273]. According to a recent press release of unpublished data from the double blind placebo controlled RECOVERY trial in the United Kingdom, HCQ has no mortality benefit in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.

In a retrospective comparison study at NYU Langone Health for all patients admitted between March 2 and April 5, 2020 (39), there were a large number of patients treated with HCQ plus AZT. During the one month period, there was a move to add zinc 100 mg daily to the HCQ plus AZT regimen. Zinc supplementation has shown benefit in viral diseases both in inhibiting viral replication and in improvement of systemic immunity (40). Zinc administered within 24 hours of onset of symptoms has been claimed to reduce the duration of common cold symptoms in healthy people (41). There were 411 patients treated with HCQ+AZT+ zinc at NYU. There were only minor differences in the clinical characteristics of these patients compared to the 521 patients on HCQ and AZT who did not receive zinc. After adjustment for the time period when zinc first came to frequent use, there was a significantly lower mortality (13.1%) among the zinc treated patients compared to those who did not receive zinc (22.8%).

There is one reported prevention study with HCQ given for 5 days to healthy individuals with a significant exposure to SARS-Cov-2 (42). The incidence of new illness compatible with COVID-19 did not differ significantly between participants receiving hydroxychloroquine (49 of 414 [11.8%]) and those receiving placebo (58 of 407 [14.3%]); absolute difference −2.4 percentage points (95% confidence interval, −7.0 to 2.2; P=0.35).

Published results with Lopanovir/ritonavir (LPV/R) have been disappointing. A small Chinese trial of 44 patients found no difference in viral clearance compared to standard of care (43). In a randomized trial with 99 patients on LPV and 100 receiving standard care, there was no difference in time to clinical improvement, mortality or viral clearance (45). A potentially more favorable result was obtained in Hong Kong in a study of 86 patients assigned to triple combination therapy with LPV/R plus ribavirin plus interferon beta-1 (46). Compared to a control group of 41 patients receiving LPV/R alone, the combination group had a significantly shorter median time from start of study treatment to negative SARS-Cov-2 nasopharyngeal swab (7 days [IQR 5–11]) than the control group (12 days [8–15]; hazard ratio 4.37 [95% CI 1.86–10.24], p=0·0010). The time to complete alleviation of symptoms was 4 days [IQR 3–8] in the combination group vs 8 days [7–9] in the control group; HR 3.92 [95% CI 1.66–9.23. The timing of interferon administration was staggered based on time of symptom onset, so there were 34 patients in the combination group who did not receive interferon at all; those patients did not show

clinical or virological superiority to the LPV/R control group. This study was interpreted as supporting further trials focusing on interferon beta-1 as the primary treatment modality. A study of 81 hospitalized patients in Iran showed 28-day overall mortality significantly lower in the interferon treated group than the control group (19% vs. 43.6% respectively, p= 0.015) (49). Early administration significantly reduced mortality (OR=13.5; 95% CI: 1.5-118). Interferon nasal drops were administered to 2944 medical staff people in Huabei province (50). This cohort had not a single case of COVID-19, but there was no control group.

A very small pilot study of meplazumab, a monoclonal antibody to CD147, in 17 patients showed a marked improvement in viral clearance time from 13 days (6.5-19.5) in a control group of 11 patients to 3 days (1.5-4.5). This was accompanied by clinical and radiographic improvement (51).

Very hopeful data has emerged for the IL-6 inhibitor tocilizumab. An observational study in China suggested dramatic improvement in 21 patients with abatement of fever, decrease in oxygen requirement and reduction in lung lesions (52). Subsequently, there have been multiple reports of reduction of mortality and need for intubation in hospitalized severe and critically ill patients (38,53-61). It was announced on April 27 that tocilizumab treatment had succeeded in the randomized, controlled CORIMUNO-19 – TOCI trial for severely ill COVID-19 patients in France. On the basis of these as yet unpublished findings, the CDC issued an emergency use authorization for tocilizumab use in hospitalized patients.

There is also favorable data on convalescent plasma with a modest reduction in mortality (62,63). However, antibody levels vary in patients who have recovered from COVID-19 complicating the selection of donors (64). One published article points to mortality benefit of glucocorticoid treatment in severely ill patients (65). On June 16, a press release from the unpublished RECOVERY trial announced a 35% decrease in mortality of ventilator patients treated with dexamethasone. These findings alleviate the concern that the frequent use of glucocorticoids in critically ill ICU patients might worsen the viral infection. There is no information as yet as to potential concurrent effects of tocilizumab and glucocorticoid.

Two retrospective studies have suggested possible benefit with agents not ordinarily considered antiviral. Patients on famotidine in a observational study in New York City had lower mortality (66) as did ivermectin treated patients reviewed in Florida (67). The antiviral effect of famotidine may relate to blocking a protease needed for SARS-Cov-2 replication.

REVIEW OF CURRENT TRIALS: As of May 25, we identified 781 trials worldwide meeting our review criteria. Approximately half the trials were registered in mainland China, and 103 trials were registered in the United States (TABLE 2). There were 553 trials in the recruitment process or completed (SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1). We found 409 trials which were recruiting or completed

as of April 1 meeting the minimum requirement of 100 subjects. The World Health Organization has organized a megatrial appropriately named Solidarity to assess four separate treatment options: Remdesivir; LPV/R; LPV/R with Interferon beta-1a; and HCQ or chloroquine (68). The Solidarity Trial provides simplified procedures to randomize patients to one of the four agents or alternatively standard care. Brief identifying details and any other conditions are digitally recorded for the patient, who is then randomly allocated to one of the study options. Critical study information is to be collected only at randomization and when the patient is discharged or dies: which study drugs were given (and for how many days); whether ventilation or intensive care was received (and, if so, when it began), date of discharge, or date and cause of death while still in hospital. Data is transmitted centrally to the trial database. There are over 100 countries now participating. Completion of enrollment of 3,100 patients is estimated in the first quarter of 2021. Very recently, the antimalarial drug arm of the Solidarity study was terminated after review suggested no benefit in hospitalized patients.

OTHER TRIALS WITH THE SOLIDARITY AGENTS: In addition to and independent from the Solidarity trial, we found 46 still ongoing trials of HCQ, 11 trials of LPV/R and 8 trials of interferons (TABLE 3). Of these, ten of the HCQ trials focused on prevention of the disease. The University of Minnesota trial concluded recently suggesting no prophylaxis benefit of a five day course of HCQ on exposed patients (42). There is only one other prevention trial with HCQ with proposed completion of enrollment in the second quarter of 2020. There were seven HCQ trials conducted on ambulatory patients with diagnosed mild disease. Only two of these outpatient trials had proposed enrollment completion in the second quarter. There were 21 HCQ trials focused solely on hospitalized patients. Four of these trials had planned enrollment completion in the second quarter of 2020. The HCQ arm of the RECOVERY trial in hospitalized patients in the United Kingdom was halted on June 5 after preliminary data showed no change in mortality. The results are still unpublished.

Two prevention trials with LPV/R are currently enrolling, with earliest enrollment completion in the second quarter of 2020 for one and the third quarter for the other. There is one outpatient active comparison trial with HCQ with proposed enrollment end in the second quarter of 2020. There are two large active comparison trials with earliest enrollment end date in the first quarter of 2021. There is one large interferon prevention trial scheduled to complete enrollment in the second quarter of 2020.

ANTIVIRAL AGENTS: SARS-Cov-2 attacks cells by binding of the spike protein to the host cell ACE2 receptor. A specific serine protease TMPRSS2 then activates membrane fusion allowing viral RNA to enter the cell to be replicated with release of multiple virions. Numerous antiviral agents are now in active trials (TABLE 4). In addition to remdesivir and favipiravir, trials are ongoing with umifenovir, a membrane lipid fusion inhibitor with broad antiviral properties (69) and with camostat which is a potent serine protease inhibitor (70). A very large multicenter prevention trial has begun for hospital workers exposed to COVID-19 in Spain. This involves 4000 subjects who will be randomized to emicitrabine/tenofovir, an HIV agent, or to HCQ or to placebo. The trial has planned to meet its enrollment goal by the beginning of the third quarter of 2020.

IMMUNE MODULATORS: It is clear that the SARS-Cov-2 infection triggers an immune reaction that leads to the most serious consequences of the disease. Many trials are focusing on several interleukin inhibitors currently approved for treatment for rheumatoid arthritis and other autoimmune conditions to suppress the cytokine storm of COVID-19 (TABLE 5). Tocilizumab has just received emergency authorization. Selinexor has planned completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter as well. A trial of sarilumab which will run until 2021 recently completed its first phase and announced success in reducing CRP. These trials are all directed at severely ill COVID-19 inpatients. There is a large multicenter placebo-controlled trial of colchicine in non-severely ill outpatients scheduled to enroll 6000 patients by end of the third quarter of 2020.

OTHER STUDIES (SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 2):

CONVALESCENT PLASMA: Several studies of intravenous globulin as well as intravenous hyperimmune globulin plan completion of enrollment in the third quarter of 2020.

STEM CELLS: Several trials of mesenchymal stem cells are currently recruiting with one study planning completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020.

RENIN ANGIOTENSIN SYSTEM: Recognition of the role of the ACE2 receptor in SARS-Cov-2 cell entry has speculated interest that ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers might block viral access. There are a number of trials either adding the agents or withdrawing them. One small trial of losartan has been fully enrolled but no results have been posted as yet.

PULMONARY AND RESPIRATORY INTERVENTIONS: These studies are of great interest in managing the acute respiratory distress syndrome associated with COVID-19. There are many ongoing studies of mechanical and extracorporeal oxygenation. Most of the studies did not meet the criterion of 100 subjects or more (SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1). There was one ongoing study of hyperbaric oxygenation but not due to complete enrollment until the second quarter of 2021. Pirfenidone is an agent approved to treat pulmonary fibrosis, and one study is planning completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020.

SUPPLEMENTS: The suggestion that zinc may be a beneficial agent together with HCQ in COVID-19 has generated interest, but there is only one study underway, not including HCQ. A study of HCQ with and without zinc for prevention of COVID-19 infection is soon to begin in Tunisia.

GLUCOCORTICOIDS: Unpublished data from the RECOVERY trial has shown that steroid treatment in severely ill patients reduces mortality. A number of studies are trying to determine the appropriate timing of steroid use without impairing the response to the virus.

ANTICOAGULANTS: Several studies are focusing on prophylaxis for the COVID-19 hypercoagulable state. There are no current studies of the new direct oral anticoagulants.

TRADITIONAL CHINESE MEDICATIONS: There were 48 such studies. We did not include them in our search for agents which could be made available in the next 6 months for two reasons. First, these medications are not familiar to clinicians in the rest of the world. Second, the success of epidemiologic containment in China has made it unlikely that many projected trials would achieve enrollment.

VACCINES: The World Health Organization has identified 110 programs to develop a SARS-Cov-2 vaccine. Of these, seven have reached initial human trials (Table 5). There are four programs active in China, one in the United Kingdom and two in the United States. The conventional wisdom is that it will take a year to 18 months to implement a vaccination program. Clinical vaccine development is typically a multi-year three-phase process. During Phase I, small groups of people receive the trial vaccine. In Phase II, the clinical study is expanded and vaccine is given to people who have characteristics (such as age and physical health) similar to those for whom the new vaccine is intended. In Phase III, the vaccine is given to thousands of people and tested for efficacy and safety. SARS-Cov-2 vaccine developers have approached the regulatory bodies to request acceleration of the process. Moderna prepared the sequence of their proposed mRNA-1273 vaccine on January 13 only two days after China shared the genetic sequence of SARS-Cov-2. On February 7, 2020, the first clinical batch of vaccine was completed and shipped on February 24 to the NIH for use in their Phase 1 clinical study. On March 16, 2020, the NIH announced that the first participant in its Phase 1 study was dosed. On May 7, a successful antibody response was documented. The company reported that while a commercial vaccine is not likely to be available for at least 12-18 months, it is possible that under emergency use, a vaccine could be available to some people, possibly including healthcare professionals, in the fall of 2020. In the United Kingdom, administration of the Oxford vaccine ChAdOx1 nCoV-19, an attenuated adenovirus expressing the SARS-Cov-2 spike protein, reduced the viral load in a monkey model. A Phase II study involving 1090 healthy volunteers is underway. The INO-4800 DNA vaccine is in Phase I testing. In China, there are two inactivated SARS-Cov-2 vaccines in Phase I testing. One of the vaccines PiCoVacc has protected monkeys from infection (71). Cansino is advancing its recombinant adenovirus vector vaccine Ad5-nCoV to Phase II testing. Optimistic observers have suggested that a vaccine could be available by the beginning of 2021. A bold suggestion has been made to allow emergency authorization of favorable vaccine candidates by the fall. An additional approach has been suggested to attempt to stimulate non-specific immunity prior to availability of a vaccine using oral polio vaccine or BCG vaccination (72). There are two large prevention trials underway in the Netherlands and Australia using BCG vaccine in health care workers. These trials plan conclusion of enrollment, but not until the fourth quarter of 2020.

DISCUSSION

SARS-Cov-2 overwhelmed medical preparedness for the pandemic. Although epidemiologic containment was achieved in China, Korea,Taiwan, and New Zealand, efforts to stop the spread failed in much of the rest of the world. The United States, Brazil, and Europe have been particularly hard hit. In the United States, there were 10,111 new cases and 241 new deaths on May 24, at a time when numerous states and the federal government had just relaxed social distancing restrictions. Kissler et al modeled several scenarios of transmission with several periods of variably effective social distancing (16). Their projection is for a continuation of new cases and deaths occurring through July, with a possible resurgence in October. A similar modeling effort focusing on the projected reduction of epidemiologic restrictions suggested spread of disease without a pause at least until October (73).

The current pharmaceutical options available in the United States have been very limited. In China, it is not the practice to run placebo controlled trials with investigational agents without alternative choices for the patient. Consequently, their "standard of care" often includes many potentially effective agents, possibly confounding results. Furthermore, their guidance to physicians includes many options which are under active study in certain sites. In contrast to China, in the United States and Europe, there is an emphasis on randomized placebo controlled clinical trials to decide which agents should be widely used for treatment. Those trials are ongoing, but we found that only 40 of 164 trials are proposed to complete enrollment in the second quarter of 2020. It typically may take two months or more to follow patients to completion, verify and analyze data, thus impairing our goal to find treatments to be used during the next six months for ongoing disease. In the United States, remdesivir and tocilizumab are currently available on an emergency use basis, only for hospitalized severely ill patients. It is hoped that the availability of remdesivir and success of the immune modulators and glucocorticoids will improve in-hospital survival over the next few months.

Studies to date have understandably focused on hospitalized patients to try to prevent death. However, rescue from mortality is not the only goal in fighting COVID-19; it is essential to reduce the spread of the virus. Once patients are hospitalized, they only contribute minimally to the development of new cases, primarily in hospital workers. Community not hospital transmission is the major mode of propagation of SARS-Cov-2. We face a dilemma in having no currently approved prevention or treatment for outpatients with mild to moderate disease, the chief mode of spread of SARS-Cov-2.

The vaccines have been the principal hope held out by public health authorities in the United States. Progress on vaccine development has been extremely rapid, but the rapid development does not reduce the challenges of developing a vaccine to be administered to hundreds of millions of people (73). Although neutralizing antibodies can be produced by the vaccine candidate, the goal is to prove protection from the infection. The demonstration of protection requires Phase III observation and long term follow-up of an exposed vaccinated population. The length of follow-up depends on the degree of active transmission of SARS-Cov-2 during the post vaccination period. No matter how rapidly a vaccine advances to Phase III testing, the duration of follow-up cannot be shortened. In the case of SARS-Cov-2, that follow-up will have to be prolonged due to two factors. First, there is a risk of immune enhance-

ment of infection which occurs when induced antibodies increase entry and internalization of virus into myeloid cells (74). This major complication struck the newly developed dengue vaccine in 2017 (75,76). Second, the sinister autoimmune pathogenicity of SARS-Cov-2, evidenced by multisystem inflammatory disorder in children, raises the risk of delayed long term harm if the virus is not fully and immediately eradicated by the initial immune response to the vaccine.

For these reasons of needed long term safety observation, the deployment of an effective vaccine could be delayed for more than the 12-18 months currently contemplated. By that time, the primary pandemic may well be over due to infection of most of the world's population and ensuing herd immunity. The vaccine would then serve primarily to prevent a new resurgence. An alternative approach to immunization now is to increase the non-specific immune reaction to the initial infection. Vaccination with oral polio vaccine has been suggested by Drs. Chumakov and Gallo (72,78). Oral polio vaccine is no longer as freely available as their alternative suggestion of BCG vaccine. BCG vaccine has demonstrated heterologous enhancement of immunity (79,80). There are very large prevention trials now being conducted in the Netherlands and Australia using BCG vaccination to increase innate immunity to SARS-Cov-2 in health care workers, but those are not due to complete until the fourth quarter of 2020.

COVID-19 has shaken societies throughout the world. The Chinese have shown that strict epidemiologic control is possible, but their approach has not been fully successful in Western countries where two months of social distancing and quarantine has devastated the economies. Yet, the alternative is continued spread of the virus by person to person contact. There is also a contrast in the medical response comparing China to the Western countries. In China, empirical treatments have been offered and officially endorsed by the China National Health Commisson without proof of efficacy (81). The treatment options they recommend include alpha interferon, LPV/R, chloroquine and umifenovir. They included tociluzimab therapy for patients with cytokine storm prior to the announcement of the CORIMMUNO-TOCI results. They also include many Chinese traditional medications. In comparison, the most recent CDC guidelines developed together with an NIH panel for treatment of COVID-19 now include only remdesivir as well as tocilizumab for severe disease. The U.S. panel recommends against the use of remdesivir for mild to moderate disease outside of a clinical trial. They find no evidence for or against the use of antimalarial drugs and strongly recommend against hydroxychloroquine combined with azithromycin. They strongly recommend against the use of LPV/R and other protease inhibitors. The NIH expert panel has further recommended against the use of interferon. They have no recommended treatments for outpatients.

Ironically, the Western world has much stricter requirements for acceptance of clinical treatments than does the highly regimented Chinese society. That is only one of many incongruities which are affecting the time course of delivering treatments to arrest the spread of SARS-Cov-2. Paradoxically, the success of the Chinese in strict epidemiologic control has jeopardized the completion of the randomized controlled trials begun in China due to lack of patients to achieve statistical power. The remdesivir trials were suspended in China due to failure to accrue new infected patients. Similarly, the Chinese efforts to develop vaccines are affected by the need to demonstrate effectiveness in a population with ongoing exposure to COVID-19 which they no longer have.

On June 15, as this manuscript is being written, there were 132,581 new cases of COVID-19 and 3920 deaths worldwide, and in the United States, there were 21,754 new cases with 646 deaths (1). Efforts must be redirected to interfere with the community transmission of the virus. Shortages of testing supplies in the United States have thus far limited the ability to positively diagnose the disease, resulting in the recommendation of home quarantine for the majority of patients with suspicious symptoms. Those shortages are being rapidly remedied. Now, there is a need for therapy which can be used to treat outpatients with positive COVID-19 tests at the time of initial symptoms, not waiting for deterioration requiring hospital care. The Marseille group has treated everyone with a positive test with a combination of HCQ and AZT and provided substantial clinical and virologic data but without a control group. The NYU group treated all hospitalized patients with HCQ and AZT and showed an impressive effect of addition of zinc sulfate, but that was not in mild to moderate disease. They also had no control group for HCQ plus AZT. Remdesivir will be used primarily in severe disease and is administered intravenously, so not a practical outpatient treatment. Favipiravir, like remdesivir an inhibitor of RNA polymerase, is an oral tablet which could be used in early stages. It has now been released for treatment in Russia and in India, but not in the United States. It has known embryogenic risks, so its use requires restrictions on women of childbearing potential, as is the case with tretinoin for acne and thalidomide for multiple myeloma. Trials with camostat, the serine protease inhibitor, capable of blocking cell entry of SARS-Cov-2, are not due to end till the third or fourth quarter of the year. Famotidine is another potential treatment with minimal risk. Of course, none of these available treatments has been proven successful in randomized placebo controlled studies. There are strong arguments to avoid emergency use of agents until trials are completed and analyzed, but the agents being tested are not new (82). Most of them are drugs with well-known safety profiles approved for other conditions. BCG vaccination is still the norm for children in several countries. The conflict between clinical needs and the demand for rigorous proof of efficacy has resulted in curious events such as the President of the United States announcing that he is taking HCQ and zinc to prevent infection while the CDC and NIH have recommended against such treatment.

The projections suggest continued infections and deaths with a possible serious resurgence as social distancing restrictions are lifted. The Penn-Wharton Budget Model in the United States predicts that removing social distancing restrictions entirely could result in 200,000 more deaths by June 30, but, conversely, save 18,000,000 lost jobs (83). We face these dismal choices if we lack medications to prevent and to treat SARS-Cov-2 infections early before hospitalization. Epidemiologic containment of COVID-19 has not succeeded in the United States and most other countries. With social distancing measures now being relaxed, a large number of new cases and deaths will continue to occur if treatments are not forthcoming in the near future. We have documented that there are only a very few randomized controlled studies in outpatients which can be expected to yield results in time to impact on the continuing epidemic in 2020.

There is a precedent to resolve the conflict between immediate clinical needs and the requirements for rigorous controlled trials to prove efficacy. We should remember that the greatest success in fighting a pandemic occurred over the past two decades in the battle against the HIV virus which causes AIDS. AIDS was first recognized in 1981 in the gay community (84). The disease was a death sentence. By

1985, over 20,000 diagnoses and almost 10,000 deaths were recorded. There was widespread fear because there was no treatment, and projections of infection escalated into the millions. The first AIDS remedy was azidothymidine synthesized in 1964 in the hope that it would combat cancer. It was not successful. Twenty years later Dr. Samuel Broder, head of the National Cancer Institute, showed that the drug had activity against the HIV virus in vitro (85). Burroughs Wellcome launched a rapidly conceived trial with just 300 patients. They stopped the trial in 16 weeks claiming that more patients survived on azidothymidine. The FDA came under enormous pressure from AIDS activists to make the drug available. Azidothymidine was approved by the FDA on March 19, 1987 with only that one trial. It had taken 20 months for the FDA to give approval to release the drug. To this day, the design and results of the trial remain controversial.

The gay community continued to battle for early release of other medications to combat the AIDS pandemic. On October 11, 1988, a massive protest occurred at the FDA. It was back then Dr. Anthony Fauci who publicly advanced the idea of a parallel track to make drugs widely available even while studies are progressing: " Clearly, the standard approach to the design of clinical trials—that is, rigid eligibility criteria as well as the strict regulatory aspects that attend clinical trial investigations and drug approval—was not well-suited to a novel, largely fatal disease such as this with no effective treatments, and we had many intense discussions about how to make that approach more flexible and ethically sound. One example, which I and others worked closely with the AIDS activists to develop, was called a parallel track for clinical trials. The parallel track concept, which the United States Food and Drug Administration ultimately came to support, meant that there would be the standard type of highly controlled admission criteria and data collection for the clinical trial of a particular drug. In parallel, however, the drug also could be made available to those who did not meet the trial's strict admission criteria but were still in dire need of any potentially effective intervention, however unproven, for this deadly disease" (86).

The parallel track advocated by Dr. Fauci was adopted. Today there are 41 drugs or combinations approved by the FDA to treat and to prevent HIV infection. There is still no vaccine. There are now an estimated 1.1 million patients with HIV in the United States. Most have enjoyed near normal life expectancy thanks to the antiviral agents. The CDC has contributed greatly to limit the spread of HIV by advocating safe sex practices, but social distancing is not the norm for HIV. Rather pre-exposure prophylaxis endorsed by the CDC with a daily antiviral combination pill is currently adopted in wide segments of the at risk population (87).

Dr. Fauci has recently launched an NIAID randomized controlled study of the HCQ plus AZT combination. Interferon beta is one of the randomized controlled Solidarity Trial options. Favipiravir is in trials at Massachusetts General Hospital and Japan now. A randomized prevention trial with zinc and HCQ is about to begin in Tunisia, and zinc could be added to the NIAID HCQ plus AZT trial. A trial of famotidine has begun in New York. It makes sense to now invoke the parallel track for outpatient use of interferon beta, favipiravir, famotidine, and zinc while we await the eventual completions of

multiple trials. In Russia and India, the parallel track has been implemented, with favipiravir now offered as treatment throughout each country, even as further confirmatory studies proceed.

Nowhere is the decision more difficult than in the area of vaccination. The developers of several vaccines have made it clear that they can produce large quantities in a short time. Yet, it remains to be tested whether the immunity generated will be protective and, conversely, given the hyperinflammatory nature of SARS-Cov-2 infection, whether certain vaccines could actually be harmful. Acquiring conclusive answers will take a long experience. COVID-19 fueled by modern air travel, has engulfed the world, overwhelming containment, outspeeding well designed randomized placebo controlled clinical trials. We call on the public health authorities to make the parallel track immediately available in the United States. Cross international boundaries and accept data submitted in China, Russia and other countries, whether officially published or posted on line, and make promising agents available to treating physicians. If vaccines can be brought forward now, it is reasonable to authorize their use in very large parallel track studies in at risk populations, such as healthcare workers and the elderly. It is now necessary for public health authorities to make hard decisions despite limited current data.

REFERENCES

1) WHO Situation Report dashboard June 16, 2020

2) Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China. Summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA 2020; 323: 1239-1242

3) Baud D, Qi X, Nielsen-Saines K, Musso D, et al. Real estimates of mortality following COVID-19 infection. Lancet Infect Dis posted on line 2020 Mar 12

4) Russell TW, Hellewell J, Jarvis CI, et al. Estimating the infection and case fatality ratio for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using age-adjusted data from the outbreak on the Diamond Princess cruise ship, February 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020 Mar 26; 25(12): 2000256.

5) Wang D, Yin Y, Hu C, et al. Clinical course and outcome of 107 patients infected with the novel coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, discharged from two hospitals in Wuhan, China Critical Care. 2020; 24: 188

6) Huang C, Wang Y, Li X et al Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China Lancet 2020; 395: 497–506

7) Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, et al.Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. BMJ. 2020;368:m1091.

8) Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020; 395: 1054–62

(9) Connors JM, Levy JH. Thromboinflammation and the hypercoagulability of COVID-19. J Thromb Haemost. 2020 Apr 17.

(10) Ricardo J Jose, Ari Manuel. COVID-19 cytokine storm: the interplay between inflammation and coagulation storm: Lancet Respir Med 2020 Published Online April 27, 2020

(11) Verdoni L, Mazza A, Gervasoni A, et al. An outbreak of severe Kawasaki-like disease at the Italian epicentre of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic: an observational cohort study. Lancet. Published online May 13, 2020

12) Riphagen S, Gomez X, Gonzales-Martinez C, Wilkinson N, Theocharis P. Hyperinflammatory shock in children during COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet. 2020. Advance online publication, doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31094 https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)31094-1/fulltextexternal icon

13) CDC. Multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Distributed via the CDC Health Alert Network May 14, 2020

14) Cousins S New Zealand eliminates COVID-19. Lancet Published:May 09, 2020

(15) https://covid19.healthdata.org/projections

(16) Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E et al. Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period Science 2020;10.1126/science.abb5793 (2020

17) Park M, Ryan S, Thwaites RS, et al. COVID-19: Lessons from SARS and MERS First published:27 February 2020 Eur J Immun https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.202070035

18) Groneberg DA, Poutanen SM, Low DE, et al.Treatment and vaccines for severe acute respiratory syndrome. Lancet Infect Dis. 2005;5:147-55

(19) Liu J, Cao R, Xu M,et al. Cell Discovery. 2020; 6:16 Cell Discovery https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41421-020-0156-0www.nature.com/celldisc

(20) Pastick KA, Okafor EC, Wang F, et al. Review: Hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine for Treatment of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) .Open Forum Infectious Diseases, Volume 7, Issue 4, April 2020

(21) Thorlund KT, Dron L, Park J et al. A real-time dashboard of clinical trials for COVID-19. Lancet Digital Health published on line 24 Apr 20 https://doi.org/10.1016/ S2589-7500(20)30086-8

(22) Wang Y, Zhang D, Guanhua Du G, et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised,double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial Lancet Published Online April 29, 2020 https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0140-6736(20)31022-9

23) Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D. Compassionate use of remdesivir for patients with severe Covid-19 N Engl J Med April 10, 2020

24) Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE. Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report. May 22, 2020. New Engl J Med. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2007764

25)Goldman JD, Lye DCB, Hui DS, et al. Remdesivir for 5 or 10 days in patients with severe Covid-19. New Engl J Med May 27, 2020 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2015301

26) Cai Q, Yang M, Liu D, et al. Experimental treatment with favipiravir for COVID-19: An open-label control study Engineering (In Press)

27) Chen C, Huang J, Zhenshun Cheng Z, et al. Favipiravir versus Arbidol for COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037432.this version posted March 20, 2020.

28) Preliminary Report of the Favipiravir Observational Study in Japan （2020/5/15）
Favipiravir Observational Study Group. http://www.kansensho.or.jp/uploads/files/topics/ 2019ncov/covid19_casereport_en_200529.pdf Accessed 19 June 2020

29) Gautret P ,Lagier J-C , Parola P, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents (In Press)

(30) Million M, Lagierab J-C, Gautret P, et al. Early treatment of COVID-19 patients with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: A retrospective analysis of 1061 cases in Marseille, France Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease (In Press) Available online 5 May 2020, 101738

(31) Chen Z, Hu J, Zhang Z, et al. Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: results of a randomized clinical trial. medRxiv preprint doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.22.20040758.this version posted March 30, 2020.

(32) Chen J, Liu D, Liu L, et al. A pilot study of hydroxychloroquine in treatment of patients with common coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) J Zhejiang Univ (Med Sci) 2020, Vol. 49 Issue (1): 0-0 DOI: 10.3785/j.issn.1008-9292.2020.03.03

33) Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients mainly with mild to moderate COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial. BMJ 2020;369:m1849

34) Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. medRxiv 2020; published online April 23. DOI:10.1101/2020.04.16.20065920 (preprint).

(35) Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational study of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine Downloaded from nejm.org on May 13, 2020.

(36) Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of treatment with hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin with in-hospital mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York State. JAMA. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8630 Published online May 11, 2020.

37) Mahévas M, Tran VT, Roumier M, et al. Clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with covid-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational comparative study using routine care data. BMJ 2020;369:m1844

38) Ip A, Berry DA, Hansen E, et al, Hydroxychloroquine and tocilizumab therapy in COVID-19 patients - An observational study. MedRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.21.20109207

39) Carlucci P, Tania Ahuja T, Petrilli CM, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin plus zinc vs hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin alone: outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.02.20080036

40) Read SA, Obeid S,Ahlenstiel C, et al. The role of zinc in antiviral immunity. Adv Nutr. 2019 Jul; 10(4): 696–710.Published online 2019 Apr 22

41) Singh M, Das RR. Zinc for the common cold. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Apr; 2015(4): CD001364. Published online 2015 Apr 30.

42) Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for Covid-19. N Engl J Med June 3, 2020 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2016638

43) Li Y, Xie Z, Lin W, 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 preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.19.20038984.this version posted

44) Kim MS, Jang SW, Park YK, et al. Antibiotics for moderate COVID 19: A first report on the pharmacological outcomes from South Korea. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101 2020.05.13.20094193

45) Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020 May 7;382(19):1787-1799. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001282.

46) Hung IFN , Lung KC, Tso EYK,Triple combination of interferon beta-1b, lopinavir–ritonavir, and ribavirin in the treatment of patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19: an open-label, randomised, phase 2 trial Lancet, published on line 8 may 2020https://doi.org/10.1016/

47) Estebanez M, Ramirez-Olivencia G, Mata T, et al. Clinical evaluation of IFN beta1b in COVID-19 pneumonia: a retrospective study. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org /10.1101/ 2020.05.15.20084293

48) Zhou Q, Wei XS , Xiang X, Interferon-a2b treatment for COVID-19. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.06.20042580

49) Davoudi-Monfared E, Rahman H, Khalili H. Efficacy and safety of interferon beta-1a in treatment of severe COVID-19: A randomized clinical trial. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org / 10.1101/2020.05.28.20116467

50) Meng Z, Wang T, Chen L, et al. An experimental trial of recombinant human interferon alpha nasal drops to prevent COVID-19 in medical staff in an epidemic area. medRxiv .https://doi.org/10.1101/ 2020.04.11.20061473

51) Bian H, Zhao-Hui Zheng ZH, Ding Wei D. Meplazumab treats COVID-19 pneumonia: an open-labelled, concurrent controlled add-on clinical trial. medRxiv doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/ 2020.03.21.20040691

52) Xua X, Hanb M, Lia T, et al. Effective treatment of severe COVID-19 patients with tocilizumab 10970–10975 | PNAS | May 19, 2020 | vol. 117 | no. 20 www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/ pnas.2005615117

53) Somers EC, Eschenauer GA, Troost JP. Tocilizumab for treatment of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.29.20117358

54) Rossi B, Nguyen LS, Zimmermann, et al Effect of tocilizumab in hospitalized patients with severe pneumonia COVID-19: a cohort study medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/ 10.1101/2020.06.06.20122341

55) Martinez-Sanz J, Muriel A, l Ron R, et al. Effects of tocilizumab on mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: A Multicenter Cohort Study. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/ 10.1101/2020.06.08.20125245

56) Petrak R, Skorodin N, Van Hise N, et al. Tocilizumab as a therapeutic agent for critically ill patients infected with SARS-CoV-2. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/ 2020.06.05.20122622

57) Perrone P, Piccirillo MC, Ascierto PA, et al. Tocilizumab for patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. The TOCIVID-19 phase 2 trial. MedRXiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.01.20119149

58) Garcia EM, Caballero VR, Albiach L,et al. Tocilizumab is associated with reduction of the risk of ICU admission and mortality in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/ 10.1101/2020.06.05.20113738

59) Wadud N, Ahmed N, Shergil M, et al. Improved survival outcome in SARs-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome patients with Tocilizumab administration. MedRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.13.20100081

60) Sanchez-Montalva A, Selares-Nadal J, Espinosa-Pereiro J, et al. Early outcomes of tocilizumab in adults hospitalized with severe COVID19. An initial report from the Vall dHebron COVID19 prospective cohort study.doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.07.20094599

61) Ramaswamy M, Mannam P, Comer R, et al. Off-label real world experience using tocilizumab for patients hospitalized with COVID-19 disease in a regional community health system: A case-control study medRxiv. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.14.20099234

62) Li L, Zhang W, Hu Y, et al. Effect of convalescent plasma therapy on time to clinical improvement in patients with severe and life-threatening COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. Published online June 3, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.10044

63) Perotti C, Baldanti F, Bruno R, et al. Mortality reduction in 46 severe Covid-19 patients treated with hyperimmune plasma. A proof of concept single arm multicenter interventional trial. medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.26.20113373

64) Luchsinger LL, Ransegnola B, Jin D, et al. Serological analysis of New York City COVID19 convalescent plasma donors. medRxiv. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.14.20099234

65) Chroboczek T, Lacoste L, Wackenheim C, et al. Beneficial effect of corticosteroids in severe COVID-19 pneumonia: a propensity score matching analysis. MedRxiv: doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.20094755

66) Freedberg DE, Conigliaro J, Sobieszczyk ME, et al. Famotidine use is associated with improved clinical outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A propensity score matched retrospective cohort study medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20086694

67) Rajter JC, Sherman M, Fatteh N, et al. ICON (Ivermectin in COvid Nineteen) study: Use of ivermectin is associated with lower mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID19. medRxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.06.20124461

68) "'Solidarity' clinical trial for COVID-19 treatment". www.who.int. World Health Organization. Retrieved 22 April 2020

69) Haviernik J,1, Štefánik M, Fojtíková M et al. Arbidol (Umifenovir): A broad-spectrum antiviral drug that inhibits medically important arthropod-borne flaviviruses. Viruses. 2018 Apr; 10(4): 184.

70) Uno Y. Camostat mesilate therapy for COVID-19. Intern Emerg Med. 2020 Apr 29

71) Gao Q, Bao L, Mao H, et al. Development of an inactivated vaccine candidate for SARS-CoV-2. Science 06 May 2020

72) Chumakov K, Gallo R. Could an old vaccine be a godsend for new coronavirus? Using the oral polio vaccine could prevent or reduce the spread of COVID-19 to immunized individuals. USA Today 21 Apr 2020

73) Liu M, Thomadsen R, Yao S. Forecasting the spread of COVID-19 under different reopening strategies. medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.26.20113993

74) Diamond MS, Pierson TC. The challenges of vaccine development against a new virus during a pandemic. Cell Host Microbe. 2020;27(5):699-703.

75) Wan Y, Shang J, Sun S, et al. Molecular mechanism for antibody-dependent enhancement of coronavirus entry. J. Virol. 2020;94:e02015-19.

76) Fatima K, Syed NI. Dengvaxia controversy: impact on vaccine hesitancy. J Glob Health. 2018; 8(2): 020312.

77) Rosenbaum L.Trolleyology and the dengue vaccine dilemma. N Engl J Med. 2018; 26;379:305-307

78) Chumakov K, Benn CS, Aaby P, et al. Can existing live vaccines prevent COVID-19? Science 2020; 368: 1187-1188

79) Tanner R, Villarreal-Ramos B, Vordermeier HM, et al. The humoral immune response to BCG vaccination. Front Immunol. 2019;10:1317.

80) Moorlag SJCFM, Arts RJW, van Crevel R, et al. Non-specific effects of BCG vaccine on viral infections. Clin Microbiol Infect. (2019)

81) China National Health Commission. Chinese Clinical Guidance for COVID-19 Pneumonia Diagnosis and Treatment (7th edition 2020-03-16 12:00:32

82) Goodman JL, Borio L. Finding Effective Treatments for COVID-19. Scientific Integrity and Public Confidence in a Time of Crisis. JAMA. 2020;323(19):1899-1900. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.64

83) https://budgetmodel.wharton.upenn.edu accessed 21 May 2020

84) Sepkowitz KA. AIDS-The first 20 years. N Engl J Med 2001; 344:1764-1772

85) Broder S.The development of antiretroviral therapy and its impact on the HIV-1/AIDS pandemic. Antiviral Res. 2010; 85: 1-18

86) Fauci AS. Preface: Evolving ethical issues over the course of the AIDS pandemic. Public Health Rev 34, 2 (2012)

87) Harris NS, Johnson AS, Huang YA, et al. Vital Signs: Status of human immunodeficiency virus testing, viral suppression, and HIV preexposure prophylaxis - United States, 2013-2018. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2019 68:1117-1123

TABLE 1. PUBLISHED STUDIES AS OF JUNE 15, 2020. Each agent is listed along with the country originating the publication. The type of control procedure: RCT: Randomized controlled study PLAC: Placebo , soc: standard of care which is variable depending on each location. AC: Active control: the control options are listed in parenthesis. OBS: retrospective observation study

TREATMENT	LOCATION	TYPE OF CONTROL	NUMBER SUBJECTS	SETTING	SEVERITY	RESULTS
Remdesivir[22]	China	RCTPLAC vs soc	273	HOSP	SEV	mortality in remdesivir group 14%, control 13% 11% in remdesivir group with <10 days symptoms Vs 14% in placebo group, no difference in viral clearance
Remdesivir[23]	U.S.A.	RCTPLAC	1063	HOSP	SEV,CRIT	14 day mortality 7.6% vs 13.4% placebo
Remdesivir[24]	U.S.A.	OBS.	53	HOSP	SEV,CRIT	Mortality 18% (6 of 34 patients on mechanical ventilation 5% 1 of 19 of those not receiving mechanical ventilation
Remdesivir[25]	U.S.A.	AC(5 day vs 10 day, no control)	397	HOSP	MOD,SEV	10 day group had more severe disease, mortality 8% in 5 day group 11% in 10 day group
Favipiravir (FVP)[26]	China	AC(lpv/r vs favipiravir)	70	HOSP	MOD,SEV	4 day viral clearance time FPV vs 11 days lpv/r CT scan improvement 92% fvp vs 62% lpv/r
Favipiravir (FVP)[27]	China	AC (umifenovir vs favipiravir)	240	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Clinical recovery rate 56%umifenovir vs 71% fvp time to fever reduction and cough shorter fvp
Favipiravir (FVP)[28]	Japan	OBS (no control)	1918	HOSP	MOD,SEV,CRIT	Mortality 11.6% at one month
HCQ, azithromycin[29]	France	Non randomized control	20	MIXED	MIXED	Treated patients showed more rapid viral clearance than historical controls
HCQ[30]	FRANCE	OBS(hcq+azt, no control group)	1061	MIXED	MILD,MOD	0.9% overall mortality, no sudden death, no cardiac arrythmias

HCQ[31]	China	RCT(soc)	62	HOSP	MOD	shorter time to temperature recovery Pneumonia improvement 81% (HCQ) vs 55% soc no progression to severe status any HCQ patient versus 4 of 17 (soc)
HCQ[32]	China	RCT(soc)	30	HOSP	MOD	no differences in viral conversion
HCQ[33]	China	RCT(hcq vs soc)	150	HOSP	MILD,MOD	No difference in viral clearance at 28 days
HCQ[34]	U.S.A.	OBS(hcq vs no hcq)	338	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Mortality twice as high in patients chosen for HCQ treatment
HCQ[35]	U.S.A.	OBS (hcq vs no hcq)	1376	HOSP	MOD,SEV	no significant association between HCQ use and intubation or death (hazard ratio, 1.04, 95% confidence interval, 0.82 to 1.32). HCQ treated patients were sicker with ppO2 223 vs 360 for controls still lower than controls after propensity score matching 223 vs 273
HCQ[36]	U.S.A.	OBS (hcq+azt vs hcq vs azt)	1438	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Overall in-hospital mortality was 20.3%,25.7% hcq+azt, 19.9% hcq alone neither drug 17.7%, cardiac arrest more likely with hcq+azt
HCQ[37]	France	OBS (hcq vs no hcq)	181	HOSP	MOD,SEV	no difference in mortality or need to transfer to ICU
HCQ[38]	U.S.A.	OBS (hcq vs hcq vs azt)	1914	HOSP	MOD,SEV	30-day unadjusted mortality for patients receiving hydroxychloroquine alone, azithromycin alone, the combination or neither drug was 25%, 20%, 18%, and 20%,
HCQ[39]	U.S.A.	OBS (hcq+azt +zinc vs hzq +azt)	932	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Reduction in mortality with addition of zinc OR 0.449, 95% CI 0.271-0.744).
HCQ[42]	U.S.A.	RCTPLAC	821	OUTPAT	HEALTHY	No signficant difference in incidence of subsequent COVID-19 infection (11.8% HCQ, 14.3% PLAC, p=0.35)

LPV/R[43]	China	AC(lpv/r vs umifenovir vs no antiviral)	44	HOSP	MOD,SEV	No differences in viral load, clinical status, or CT scan
LPVR[44]	South Korea	AC(lpv/r +antibiotics vs HCQ+antibiotics vs soc)	97	HOSP	MOD	Time to viral clearance reduced by 50% with hcq + antibiotics compared to lpv/r and soc and shorter hospital stay as well
LPV/R[45]	China	RCT(soc)	199	HOSP	SEV	No differences in mortality, viral load; time to clinical improvement 1 day less in lpv/r group
LPV/R[46]	Hong Kong	AC(lpv/r+ribavirin+beta interferon vs lpv/r+ribavirin()	127	HOSP	MOD.SEV	Triple combination of interferon beta-1b, LPV/R, and ribavirin yielded more rapid viral clearance but attributable primarily to interferon
IFN-β[47]	Spain	OBS(IFN-β vs soc)	256	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Mortality 20.8% IFN vs 27.3% soc, p NS
IFN-a-2b[48]	China	OBS(IFN-a-2b vs umifenovir vs IFN-a-2b + umifenovir)	77	HOSP	MOD,SEV	More rapid viral clearance, decreased cytokine levels with IFN-a-2b
IFN- β-1a[49]	Iran	RCT (IFN- β-1a vs soc)	81	HOSP	SEV,CRIT	28-day overall mortality significantly lower in the IFN then the control group (19% vs. 43.6% respectively, p= 0.015). Early administration significantly reduced mortality (OR=13.5; 95% CI: 1.5-118)
IFN-α nasal drops[50]	China	OBS	2944	OUTPAT	HEALTHY	No cases compared to historical control
Meplazumab[51]	China	RCT(soc)	38	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Viral clearance 3 days (1.5-4.5) compared to 13 days(6.5-19.5) in control group
Tocilizumab[52]	China	OBS(no control)	20	HOSP	SEV,CRIT	no patient died, rapid defervescence, improvement in oxygenation
Tocilizumab[38]	U.S.A.	OBS (tocilizumab vs soc)	1914	HOSP	CRIT	30 day unadjusted mortality with and without tocilizumab of 46% versus 56%

Tocilizumab[53]	U.S.A.	OBS (tocilizumab vs soc)	154	HOSP	CRIT	tocilizumab was associated with a 45% reduction in hazard of death [hazard ratio 0.55 (95% CI 0.33, 0.90)]
Tocilizumab[54]	France	Matched cohort (tocilizumab vs soc)	168	HOSP	SEV	, tocilizumab was associated with a 51% reduction in composite of death and mechanical ventilation(HR)=0.49 (95% confidence interval (95CI)=0.3-0.81), p-value=0.005)
Tocilizumab[55]	Spain	OBS	1229	HOSP	SEV	Tocilizumab associated with decreased risk of death (aHR 0.34, 95% CI 0.16 to 0.72, p=0.005) and ICU admission or death (aHR 0.38, 95% CI 0.19 to 0.81, p=0.011) among patients with baseline CRP >150 mg/L,
Tocilizumab[56]	U.S.A.	OBS (tocilizumab early vs late treatment))	154	HOSP	CRIT	increased survival and avoidance mechanical ventilation with early treatment
Tocilizumab[57]	Italy	OBS	1221	HOSP	SEV	15.6% moratility at 14 days, 20% at 30 days in tocilizumab treate patients
Tocilizumab[58]	Spain	OBS(tocilizumab vs soc)	171	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Tocilizumab associated with decreased risk OF ICU admission (10.3% vs. 27.6%, P= 0.005) and need of invasive ventilation (0 vs 13.8%, P=0.001)
Tocilizumab[59]	U.S.A.	OBS (tocilizumab vs soc)	94	HOSP	CRIT	Survival rate 48 % in the control group and 61% in patients who received Tocilizumab P < 0.00001.
Tocilizumab[60]	Spain	OBS(tocilizumab vs soc)	82	HOSP	CRIT	7 day mortality with tocilizumab 26.8%. Age adjusted HR 2.1 if tocilizumab begun after onset of ARDS
Tocilizumab[61]	U.S.A.	OBS (tocilizumab vs soc)	86	HOSP	SEV	Reduced risk of death in patients who received Tocilizumab (RR 0.472; 95% CI 0.449-0.497 P < 0.00001)
Convalescent plasma[62]	China	RCT(soc)	103	HOSP	SEV.CRIT	time to clinical improvement at 28 days was 4.94 days shorter (95% CI, −9.33 to −0.54 days) in convalescent plasma group (HR, 2.15 [95% CI,

						1.07-4.32]; *P* = .03). No significant difference in critically ill patients. Mortality 28-day mortality (15.7% convalescent plasma vs 24.0% control ; *P* = .30)
Convalescent plasma[63]	Italy	OBS	46	HOSP	CRIT	7 day mortality 6.5%
Corticosteroid[65]	France	OBS(vs no steroid)	70	HOSP	MOD,SEV	Reduced risk of intubation -47.1% (95% confidence interval -71.8% to -22.5%).
Famotidine[66]	U.S.A.	OBS(famotidine vs soc)	1620	HOSP	MOD,SEV	HR for famotidine for death or intubation 0.43, 95% CI (0.21-0.88)
Ivermectin[67]	U.S.A.	OBS(ivermectin vs soc)	280	HOSP	MOD,SEV	lower mortality in the ivermectin group (25.2% versus 15.0%, OR 0.52, 95% CI 0.29-0.96, P=.03)

NUMBER OF REGISTERED TRIALS	
>100	China (323) United States (103)
>30	Spain (36) France (35)
>20	Iran (29) Italy (21)
>10	Germany (19) Canada(18) Netherlands(14) Brazil(13) Denmark(13) Japan (12) United Kingdom(12)
>5	Israel (9), Pakistan (9),Egypt (8) Mexico (8) South Korea (8)Belgium (6), Greece (6)
5	Colombia , Norway,Switzerland
4	Australia , Austria, India , Russia , Singapore , Thailand
3	Nigeria, South Africa, Sweden,Tunisia
2	Argentina, Hungary, Ireland, Poland, Qatar,Taiwan
1	Bahrain, Cuba, Czechia, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Macedonia, Malaysia, Monaco, New Zealand, Peru, Puerto Rico

TABLE 2. TRIALS IN EACH COUNTRY. Number of trials registered in various countries per WHO

TABLE 3. STUDIES WITH ANTIMALARIALS,LOPANOVIR/ RITONAVIR, OR INTERFERONS. The setting of each study, whether hospital or outpatient, the type of control (AC: Active control, RCT: randomized control; soc: standard of care; PLAC: placebo control, whether treatment (TREAT) or prevention (PREV), the severity of illness, number of subjects, quarter study initiated, quarter study projects completion of enrollment, and duration of symptoms for patient inclusion are listed. Studies projecting completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020 are bolded. Outpatient studies with planned completion by the end of the second quarter of 2020 are italicized.

OUTPATIENT OR HOSPITAL	TYPE OF CONTROL	PREVENTION OR TREATMENT	SEVERITY OF ILLNESS	NO OF SUBJECTS	BEGIN DATE	PROPOSED END OF ENROLLMENT	DURATION SYMPTOMS
				HCQ OR CHLOROQUINE			
OUT	RCT,PLAC	PREV (6)	HEALTHY, EXPOSED	360,3500,440,400,350,1700	Q1(20),Q2(20)	3 Q3(20), 2 Q4(20), 1 Q2(21)	N/A
OUT	AC azithromycin, AC LPV/r	PREV (2)	HEALTHY, EXPOSED	900,1200	Q1(20),Q2(20)	1 Q3(20, 1Q4(20)	N/A
OUT	RCT PLAC	PREV,TREAT	HEALTHY EXPOSED, MILD	3000	Q1(20)	***Q2(20)***	4
OUT	AC ascorbic acid	PREV	HEALTHY EXPOSED	2000	Q2(20)	Q3(20)	4
OUT	AC ascorbic acid	TREAT	MILD,MOD	1250	Q2(20)	Q3(21)	2
OUT	AC azithromycin	TREAT	MILD,MOD	1550	Q2(20)	Q1(21)	7
OUT	RCT PLAC	TREAT, PREV	MILD, HEALTHY EXPOSED	3040	Q1(20)	***Q2(20)***	5
OUT	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MILD	210	Q1(20)	NO DATE	7
OUT	MULTIDOSE PLAC	TREAT	MILD	400	Q2(20)	Q2(21)	ANY DUR
OUT	ac (azithromycin+hcq,hcq)	TREAT	MILD	160	Q2(20)	Q2(21)	ANY DUR
OUT	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MILD	1660	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	4
OUT	AC (lpv/r)	TREAT	MILD	150	Q1(20)	***Q2(20)***	ANY DUR
MIXED	AC azithromycin	TREAT	MOD,SEV	600	Q2(20)	Q2(21)	7
MIXED	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MIXED	210	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC azithromycin	TREAT (4)	MOD, SEV	630;500;226;300	Q2(20)	Q3,Q4(20)	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC, azithromycin	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	440	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MILD,MOD	300	Q2(20)	Q4(20)	3
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MIXED	250	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	2
HOSP	AC (resdemevir)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	700	Q1(20)	NO DATE	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC (lpv/r,losartan,PLAC)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	4000	Q1(20)	NO DATE	3
HOSP	AC (lpv/r,baricitinib,sarilumab,PLAC)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	1000	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC (faviparavir)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	150	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	14
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MOD, SEV	202	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MOD, SEV	350	Q2(20)	**Q2(20)**	5
HOSP	AC (faviparavir)	TREAT	SEV	150	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	14
HOSP	AC(chq,hcq)	TREAT	SEV	100	Q1(20)	Q2(21)	14
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	SEV	510	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	10
HOSP	AC (azithromycin)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	276	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	3
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	1000	Q2(20)	NO DATE	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	CRIT	500	Q1(20)	Q4(20)	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC(high vs low dose HCQ)	TREAT	CRIT	440	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC (hcq +/- famotidine)	TREAT	SEV	1200	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	1
HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV	220	Q2(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV	1300	Q2(20)	Q3(20)	2
HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MIXED	626	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	3
OUT	RCT(soc)	TREAT	MILD	400	Q2(20)	NO DATE	ANY DUR
				LOPANOVIR/RITANOVIR			
OUT	AC HCQ	PREV (2)	HEALTHY	1200,1220	Q2(20)	***Q2(20)***,Q3(21)	N/A
OUT	AC HCQ	TREAT	MILD, MOD	150	03/20/20	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
Mixed	AC(Mulitple)	TREAT	MIXED	500	04/20/20	Q4(20)	ANY DUR
Mixed	AC (Ebastine)	TREAT	MIXED	100	02/20/20	Q1(20)	ANY DUR
Mixed	AC (Carrimycin)	TREAT	MIXED	520	02/20/20	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
Mixed	AC HCQ	TREAT	MIXED	112	02/20/20	Q4(20)	ANY DUR
Hosp	AC HCQ,losartan	TREAT	MOD,SEV	4000	04/20/20	Q1(21)	3
Hosp	AC HCQ IFN, STEROID	TREAT	SEV	5000	02/20/20	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT(soc)	TREAT	SEV	160	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	MILD	328	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	7
				INTERFERON			
OUT	AC (thymosin)	PREV	HEALTHY	2944	Q1(20)	***Q2(20)***	N/A
OUT	AC(chimed)	TREAT	MILD	238	Q1(20)	Q1(22)	Q2(22)
MIXED	RCT (soc)	TREAT	MIXED	328	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	7
MIXED	AC(ebastine)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q1(20)	Q1(20)	ANY DUR
MIXED	AC (super compunded ifn)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
MIXED	AC(ifn+umifenovir,umifenovir)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
HOSP	AC(lpv/r, hcq, steroids))	TREAT	MIXED	5000	Q1(20)	Q2(21)	ANY DUR
HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MILD,MOD	400	Q1(20)	NO DATE	1

AGENT	HOSPITAL OR OUTPATIENT	TYPE OF CONTROL	TREAT OR PREVENT	SEVERITY	NUMBER SUBJECTS	BEGIN DATE	PROPOSED ENROLLMENT END	DISEASE DURATION
FAVIPIRAVIR	HOSP	RCT PLAC	TREAT	MIXED	210	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	ac (umifenovir)	TREAT	MIXED	240	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	12
	HOSP	AC(fvp, fvp combined with tociluzimab,soc)	TREAT	MIXED	150	Q1(20)	**Q2 (20)**	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC (fvp, fvp combined with chloroquine,soc)	TREAT	MIXED	150	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC (fvp+hcq, lpv+hcq)	TREAT	MOD,SEV	324	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
UMIFENOVIR	OUT	RCT(PLAC)	TREAT	MILD	380	Q1(20)	Q4(20)	ANY DUR
	MIXED	AC(lpv/r)	TREAT	MIXED	125	COMPLETED		ANY DUR
	MIXED	AC (azithromycin)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC(lpv/r, oseltamavir)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	400	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC (umifenovir+hcq , hcq+lpv)	TREAT	MIXED	200	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC (umifenovir+hcq , hcq+lpv)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
CAMOSTAT	MIXED	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MIXED	580	Q1(20)	Q4(20)	2
	HOSP	AC hcq+azithromycin, camostat+hcq,soc)	TREAT	MILD, MOD	250	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
EMITRICITABINE/ TENOFOVIR	OUT	AC (hcq,PLAC)	PREV	HEALTHY	4000	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	N/A
RIBAVIRIN	HOSP	AC (lpv/r+ifn b, ribavirin +lpv/r+ifn b)	TREAT	MILD, MOD	108	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
REMDESIVIR	HOSP	AC(hcq+remdesivir, hcq)	TREAT	MIXED	700	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
TRIAZAVIRIN	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MOD, SEV	240	Q1(20)	**Q2 (20)**	ANY DUR
IVERMECTIN	MIXED	RCT (soc)	TREAT	MIXED	100	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR

TABLE 4: ANTIVIRAL AGENTS. The setting of each study, whether hospital or outpatient, the type of control (AC: Active control, RCT: randomized control; soc: standard of care; PLAC: placebo control, whether treatment (TREAT) or prevention (PREV), the severity of illness, number of subjects, quarter study initiated, quarter study projects completion of enrollment, and duration of symptoms for patient inclusion are listed. Studies projecting completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020 are bolded. Outpatient studies with planned completion by the end of the second quarter of 2020 are italicized.

TABLE 5: IMMUNE MODULATORS. The setting of each study, whether hospital or outpatient, the type of control (AC: Active control, RCT: randomized control; soc: standard of care; PLAC: placebo control, whether treatment (TREAT) or prevention (PREV), the severity of illness, number of subjects, quarter study initiated, quarter study projects completion of enrollment, and duration of symptoms for patient inclusion are listed. Studies projecting completion of enrollment by the end of the second quarter of 2020 are bolded.

AGENT	HOSPITAL OR OUTPATIENT	TYPE OF CONTROL	TREAT OR PREVENT	SEVERITY	NUMBER SUBJECTS	BEGIN DATE	PROPOSED ENROLLMENT END	DISEASE DURATION
SARILUMAB	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	300	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	400	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	460	Q2(20)	NO DATE	ANY DUR
CD24F (blocks disinhibition of immune checkpoint)	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV	230	Q1(20)	Q2(21)	ANY DUR
COLCHICINE	OUT	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MILD	6000	Q1(20)	Q3 (20)	1
	HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	SEV	2500	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
IFX1 (monoclonal ab to complement)	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV	130	Q1(20)	NO DATE	14
SELINEXOR	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV	230	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
SILTUXIMAB	HOSP	AC (methlyprednisolone)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	200	Q2(20)	**Q2 (20)**	ANY DUR
TOCILIZUMAB	MIXED	AC (azithromycin + hcq)	TREAT	SEV	276	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	AC sarilumab)	TREAT	SEV	200	Q1(20)	Q2(21)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	188	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT(PLAC)	TREAT	CRIT	330	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT(PLAC)	TREAT	CRIT	100	Q2(20)	Q3(20)	ANY DUR

	HOSP	AC (anakinra, siltuximab, PLAC)	TREAT	CRIT	342	Q2(20)	Q3(20)	ANY DUR
	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MIXED	180	Q2(20)	Q2(22)	ANY DUR
LENZILUMAB	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	MOD,SEV	238	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
TJ003234 anti-GM-CSF monoclonal ab	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	144	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
THYMOSIN	HOSP	AC(PD-1)	TREAT	SEV	120	Q1(20)	Q1(21)	ANY DUR
CM4620 CRAC channel inhibitor	HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	SEV	144	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
LERONLIMAB	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	390	Q2(20)	Q4(20)	ANY DUR
ECULIZIMAB	HOSP	RCT soc)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	120	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR
CYTOKINE PROTEIN	HOSP	RCT (soc)	TREAT	MIXED	480	Q1(20)	**Q2(20)**	8
AVDORALIMAB	HOSP	RCT (PLAC)	TREAT	SEV,CRIT	108	Q2(20)	Q3 (20)	ANY DUR

COUNTRY	NAME	PROGRESS	NUMBER SUBJECTS	TYPE OF VACCINE	DATE BEGUN	COMPLETION DATE
United Kingdom		PHASE I/11	510,1090	attenuated adenovirus expressing spike protein	Q1(20)	ongoing
China	PicoVacc	PHASE I/11	744	inactivated coronavirus	Q2(20)	Q4(21)
China		PHASE I/11	100	lentiviral vector	Q1(20)	Q3(23)
United States	mRNA-1273	PHASE I/11	105	Lipid nanoparticle (LNP) dispersion containing an mRNA that encodes for the prefusion stabilized spike protein 2019-nCoV.	Q1(20)	Q3(21)
China	Ad5-nCoV,	PHASE II	500	Adenovirus vector recombinant vaccine	Q1(20)	Q1(21)
United States	INO-4800	PHASE 1	40	DNA vaccine with electroporation	Q2(20)	Q2(21)
Netherlands		RCT(PLAC)	1500	BCG Vaccination	Q1(20)	Q4(20)
Australia		RCT(PLAC)	4170	BCG Vaccination	Q1(20)	Q4(20)
China		PHASE I		Inactivated alum vaccine	Q2(20)	ongoing

TABLE 6: VACCINES. The country of origin of each vaccine is listed, with name if established, the number of subjects currently being tested, the type of vaccine, the quarter study initiated, and the quarter and year study projects completion