Efficacy of Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine in COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Zakariya Kashour[1], MD, MSc, Muhammad Riaz[2] PhD, Musa A. Garbati[3] MD, Oweida AlDosary[4], MD, Haytham Tlayjeh[5], MD, , Dana Gerber[6], MLIS, M. Hassan Murad[7,8], MD, MPH, M. Rizwan Sohail[9,10],MD, Tarek Kashour[11*], MBChB, Imad M. Tleyjeh[4,9,12,13], MD, MSc[*]

1. Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
2. Department of Statistics, Quaid Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan
3. Infectious Diseases Unit, Department of Medicine, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Nigeria
4. Infectious Diseases Section, Department of Medical Specialties King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
5. Department of Intensive Care, King Abdulaziz Medical City, King Saud bin Abdulaziz for Health Sciences and King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
6. Mayo Clinic Libraries, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA
7. Division of Health Care Policy & Research, Department of Health Sciences Research
8. Division of Preventive, Occupational and Aerospace Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine
9. Division of Infectious Diseases, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine and Science, Rochester, MN, USA
10. Department of Cardiovascular Diseases, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine and Science, Rochester, MN, USA
11. Department of Cardiac Sciences, King Fahad Cardiac Center, King Saud University Medical City, Riyadh Saudi Arabia
12. Department of Epidemiology, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine and Science, Rochester, MN, USA
13. College of Medicine, Al Faisal University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Keywords: COVID-19, hydroxychloroquine, efficacy, meta-analysis

Running Title: Efficacy of antimalarials in COVID-19 disease

*** These two authors contributed equally to this manuscript**
Corresponding Author:
Imad M. Tleyjeh, MD, MSc, FACP, FIDSA
Professor of Medicine and Epidemiology
Section of Infectious Diseases, King Fahd Medical City
PO Box 59046, Riyadh 11525, Saudi Arabia
Phone: 00966112889999
Tleyjeh.Imad@mayo.edu

Alternate corresponding author:
Tarek Kashour, MBChB, FRCPC
Professor of Cardiac Sciences
Department of Cardiac Sciences, King Fahad Cardiac Center
King Saud University Medical City
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
tkashour@ksu.edu.sa

Summary: This systematic review and meta-analysis showed that in-hospital treatment of COVID-19 patients with antimalarials medications failed to reduce short-term mortality and morbidity with potential harm if used in combination with azithromycin.

Abstract:

Background

The antimalarial agents, chloroquine (CQ) and hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) show promising SARS-CoV-2 anti-viral activity in vitro; however, clinical studies have reported conflicting results. We sought to systematically evaluate the effect of CQ and HCQ with or without azithromycin (AZ) on outcomes of COVID-19 patients.

Methods

We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies published through July 7, 2020. We searched Medline, Embase, EBM Reviews, Scopus, Web of Science, preprints and grey literature. We included studies that assessed COVID-19 patients treated with CQ or HCQ, with or without AZ. We pooled only adjusted effect estimates of mortality using a random effect model and estimated between studies heterogeneity using I^2 statistic. We summarized the effect of CQ or HCQ on viral clearance and ICU admission/ mechanical ventilation.

Results

Out of 1463 citations screened for eligibility, five RCTs and 14 cohort studies were included (20,263 patients, all hospitalized but with a variable disease severity spectrum). Thirteen studies (1 RCT and 12 cohorts) with 19,573 patients examined the effect of HCQ on short term mortality. The pooled adjusted OR was 1.05 (95% CI 0.96-1.15, I^2=0 %, p=0.647). Six cohort studies examined the effect of HCQ and AZ combination among 3430 patients. After excluding a study that examined only patients with cancers, the pooled adjusted OR was (1.15, 95% CI 0.99-1.34, I^2=0.0%). Two cohort studies and three RCTs found no significant effect of HCQ on viral clearance. One RCT with 48 patients demonstrated improved viral clearance in patients treated

with CQ and HCQ. Three cohort studies found that HCQ with or without AZ had no significant effect on mechanical ventilation/ ICU admission.

Conclusion

Moderate certainty evidence suggests that HCQ, with or without AZ, lacks efficacy in reducing short-term mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Our findings are consistent with the recommendations from medical societies that HCQ should only be used to treat COVID-19 patients in the context of clinical trials. Trials of HCQ as pre-exposure prophylaxis are ongoing.

Introduction:

The COVID-19 pandemic has claimed hundreds of thousands of human lives and caused enormous economic damage. While the race to develop an effective vaccine continues, repurposing of approved drugs remains the most logical treatment approach for SARS-CoV-2 infection and its complications.

Since the discovery of antiviral effects of Chloroquine (CQ) and hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) more than 50 years ago, interest in exploring their therapeutic potential against various viral infections continued relentlessly [1]. CQ/HCQ have been tested against numerous viruses such as Human deficiency virus-1 (HIV-1), SARS, MERS-CoV, influenza, dengue, Ebola, Zika, chikungunya and other viruses [2-10].

Several mechanisms have been proposed for the anti-SARS-CoV-2 effects of CQ/HCQ. All of which are secondary to their ability to raise intracellular pH which affects particularly the endosome function [11, 12]. CQ/HCQ can interfere with all stages of the viral life cycle [11]. They have the potential to hinder SARS-CoV-2 binding to its cell membrane receptor, ACE2 through their interference with glycosylation process of the ACE2 protein that results in reducing its binding affinity to SARS-CoV-2 virus. CQ/HCQ could also prevent fusion of the viral particles to the host cell membrane and prevent their cell entry. Furthermore, CQ/HCQ can also inhibit viral replication, assembly and release of viral particles from the host cells [11].

CQ/HCQ also alter endosomal antigen processing and modulate both, the innate and adaptive immune responses [11, 12]. This leads to decreased production of pro-inflammatory cytokines like tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α), and interleukins-1 beta and 6 (IL-1β and IL-6).

Additionally, CQ/HCQ improve endothelial function and reduce prothrombotic state [13]. These properties could have favorable effects in patients with severe COVID-19 disease.

With the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 virus and its rapid spread across the globe, it was natural to test the antiviral effects of CQ/HCQ against this new threatening infection. The enthusiasm for their widespread clinical use in the treatment of COVID-19 disease escalated with the early studies reporting their effective in vitro antiviral effects against SARS-CoV-2 virus [14-16].

An early interim analysis of 100 COVID-19 patients was reported by a group from China where they found that CQ therapy was associated with less severe pneumonia, shorter disease course and faster viral clearance [17]. Another small nonrandomized study of 20 patients from France revealed reduced nasopharyngeal viral carrier sate at 6 days after the initiation of treatment with HCQ and azithromycin (AZ) [18]. These limited data along with the political support for CQ/HCQ use led clinicians worldwide to use them indiscriminately and to include them in their institutional protocols and guidelines for the treatment of COVID-19 disease as a monotherapy or in combination with AZ. This rapid adoption of CQ/HCQ was associated with astronomical increase in CQ/HCQ prescription of approximately 2000% [19].

While numerous large randomized clinical trials (RCTs) were started in different countries worldwide, several observational studies addressing the efficacy and safety of CQ/HCQ in the treatment of COVID-19 disease got published along with preliminary results from some RCTs. These studies have different methodologies and sample sizes, and produced mixed results ranging from reduced mortality and improved other clinical outcomes to increased mortality among COVID-19 patients.

The absence of robust clinical evidence for their efficacy and the potential serious drug induced adverse events associated with CQ/HCQ use, calls for rigorously conducted systematic reviews/meta-analyses of the available clinical data to present a clearer picture about their efficacy and provide data-informed view regarding their utility in the treatment of COVID-19. In this study, we set to perform a systematically review and meta-analysis of the literature regarding the efficacy of CQ or HCQ in patients with COVID-19.

Methods:

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

We followed Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) [20] guidelines for reporting systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies guidelines.

Literature Search

The literature was searched by a medical librarian for the concepts of CQ or HCQ combined with COVID-19. The search strategies were created using a combination of keywords and standardized index terms. Searches were run through July 7, 2020 in Ovid EBM Reviews, Ovid Embase (1974+), Ovid Medline (1946+ including epub ahead of print, in-process & other non-indexed citations), Scopus (1970+) and Web of Science (1975+). Search strategies are provided in the supplement table 1. We also searched for unpublished manuscripts using the medRxiv services operated by Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory and Research Square preprints. In addition, we searched Google Scholar and the references of eligible studies and review articles.

Two reviewers independently identified eligible studies (ZK and OA) and 4 reviewers (ZK, MG, OA, HT) extracted the data into a pre-specified data collection form. A senior reviewer verified all data included in the analyses (IT).

Two reviewers (ZK and OA) independently assessed risk of bias for each study using the (RoB 2) of the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials [21] and the Newcastle–Ottawa instrument for cohort studies and case–control studies [22]. Reviewers judged each criterion for risk of bias and resolved any disagreements by discussion with a third senior reviewer. We assessed the certainty of evidence for each of our outcomes using the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) approach [23, 24]. This method evaluates the certainty of evidence by assessing the following domains: Limitations, indirectness, inconsistency, imprecision, and publication bias.

Statistical analysis

We pooled studies using the DerSimonian-Laird random-effects model (and constructed corresponding forest plots). Pooled adjusted effect estimates (ORs and HRs) were obtained by combining the estimates of log (adjusted effect estimate) from each study. Endpoints that we considered a priori for the meta-analysis were: (1) short term mortality, (2) mechanical ventilation/ ICU admission and (3) viral clearance. We evaluated heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic which estimates the variability percentage in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than to chance—the larger the I^2, the greater the heterogeneity. We conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the impact of (1) risk of bias in included studies, and (2) the selection of study population (general populations vs. specific populations), on the overall estimate of effect. We constructed funnel plots and performed an Egger precision-weighted linear regression test as a

statistical test of funnel plot asymmetry and publication bias. All analyses were conducted using Stata version 16 statistical software (StataCorp, College Station, Texas).

Results:

Included studies

Out of 1,896 papers screened for eligibility, 5 RCTs [25-29], 14 cohort studies [30-43] were included (Figure 1) with a total of 20,263 patients. Characteristics of included studies are described in Tables 1 and 2. Characteristics of the patients in each study can be found in Supplementary Table 5. All studies reported on patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Alberici et al. also included out-patients (39%). Most of the studies included patients presenting with varying levels of severity; Ip et al. [33] , Magagnoli et al. [35], Rosenberg et al. [39] included patients who were hypoxic, t or were admitted to the ICU, in addition to patients with relatively more stable vitals. Paccoud et al. [38] included patients with varying pneumonia severity. Yu et al. only studied patients with critical disease whereas Geleris et al. [1] and Mahevas et al. [1] excluded them.

The quality of the observational studies was assessed using the Newcastle- Ottawa Scale (Supplementary Table 11). With regards to patient selection, all but four studies had adequate representation of a general population with COVID-19 infection. Alvarez et al. [31] and Alberici et al. [30] studied hemodialysis patients, Yu et al. [42] studied patients with severe COVID-19 infection, and Kuderer et al. [34] studied patients with cancer. With regards to comparability, three studies [30, 31, 37] did not adequately adjust for confounders in their analyses. Given the relatively short course of disease, all studies were considered to have had a satisfactory follow-

up duration. Three studies [30, 31, 42] that assessed mortality were considered at high risk of bias, and a sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding these studies to assess heterogeneity. The results of the Cochrane ROB assessment for RCTs are found in supplementary table 12. Of the 5 included RCTs 3 were considered high risk [27-29], one RCT was low risk [25], and one had no available manuscript for quality assessment [26].

Some studies were initially included in our review as eligible studies but were later excluded for various reasons. Chen Z et al. [44] reported time to clinical recovery and changes in radiologic parameters. Feng et al. [45] reported disease progression in patients receiving chloroquine, whereas only Esper [46] reported hospitalization in outpatients taking HCQ compared to controls (1.9 vs 5.4 P<0.0001). Four studies were excluded over serious methodology concerns [47-50] and one study was retracted due to concerns over the validity of the patient information [51] . GRADE was used to assess the certainty of evidence for each outcome. The findings were then summarized, along with the overall certainty of evidence (Table 3).

Treatment efficacy

Mortality

A total of 13 studies [26, 30, 31, 33-36, 38-42] (1 RCT and 12 cohorts) with 19,573 patients examined the effect of HCQ on short term mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. The pooled adjusted OR was 0.93 (95% 0.79-1.11, I^2=59.3%, p=0.003) indicating no significant association between HCQ and mortality. There was moderate heterogeneity among the included studies. In a sensitivity analysis, after excluding the 3 studies with high risk of bias [30, 31, 42] the pooled adjusted OR was 1.05 (95% CI 0.96-1.15, I^2=0 %, p=0.647).

A total of 6 cohort studies [33-35, 39-41] with 3430 patients examined the effect of HCQ and AZ combination on mortality. The pooled adjusted OR was 1.32 (95% 1.00- 1.75, I^2=68.1% p=0.008) with a higher odds for mortality in the combination therapy group compared with the control group. Excluding the study of Kuderer et al. [34], that included only patients with cancers, eliminated this heterogeneity (adjusted OR=1.15, 95% CI 0.99-1.34, I^2=0.0%). There was no publication bias on visual inspection of funnel plots (Supplementary Figures 2-5). Additionally, Egger's regression did not detect any significant publication bias (p= 0.276).

Viral Clearance

Three RCTs (2 with high risk of bias [28, 29] and one with low risk [25] of bias assessed using Cochrane ROB scale for quality assessment of RCTs) and two cohort study [37, 43] (with a high risk of bias assessed using NOS) assessed the effect of HCQ on viral clearance. One RCT [29] demonstrated significant improvement in time to viral clearance (2.0 days IQR: 2.0-3.5); while the other two didn't show any significant effect on time to viral clearance: 0.46 (95% CI 0.04-5.75) and 0.846 (95% CI 0.58- 1.23) respectively. Neither cohort studies demonstrated an association between HCQ and slower viral clearance adjusted OR 5.68 (95% CI 1.05-10.08) [37] and adjusted HR1.53 (95% CI 0.83- 2.94) [43] respectively.

Two RCTs [27, 29] with high risk of bias studied the effect of chloroquine on viral clearance. In one study with 22 patients [27], there was no significant effect on viral clearance OR 1.07 (95% CI 0.44- 2.56). Another RCT with 48 patients found a significant difference in time to viral

clearance in the CQ group compared with the control group 2.5 days (IQR: 2.0-3.8) and, vs 7.0 days (IQR: 3.0-10.0) respectively [29].

Six studies in our meta-analysis evaluated the effect of therapy on viral clearance; of which five had a high risk of bias and thus effect estimates were not pooled together.

Mechanical ventilation/ ICU admission

Three cohort studies assessed the association between HCQ and the composite outcome of mechanical ventilation or ICU admission [35, 36, 41] . None of the studies found any association between HCQ and the composite outcome [1.1 (95% CI 0.476- 2.5), 1.43 (95% CI 0.53-3.79) and 0.81 (95% CI 0.55- 1.18) respectively].

Additionally, two cohorts [35, 41] failed to demonstrate any significant association between HCQ+AZ and the composite outcome of mechanical ventilation or ICU admission AEE 0.43 (95% CI 0.16- 1.12) and 0.976 (95% CI 0.64- 1.49) respectively.

Discussion:

Main findings

Our systematic review and meta-analysis included 12 cohorts and 1 RCT, which addressed the association between HCQ therapy in improving and mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 disease. Among a total of 19573 patients, we found with moderate level of certainty, that HCQ monotherapy did not reduce short-term mortality among COVID-19 patients, which remained statistically non-significant even after excluding three studies at high risk of bias. These observations did not change when we included in the model only the cohort studies. Moreover, we found that the use of combination of HCQ and AZ was associated with a trend of increased mortality. The study by Kruderer et al. analyzed cancer patients and demonstrated higher mortality than other studies creating significant heterogeneity. Excluding this study did not decrease the risk of mortality. Because of the limited number of studies and/or high risk of bias, we could not meta-analyze other clinical outcomes such as viral clearance, risk of ICU admission, and need for mechanical ventilation.

Our findings of lack of efficacy of HCQ in the inpatient clinical setting despite its effective in vitro inhibitory actions against SARS-CoV-2 virus is consistent with previous observations with other viral illnesses. Numerous studies demonstrated significant in vitro inhibitory effects of CQ/HCQ against coronaviruses and non-coronaviruses [11]. For example, CQ at half-maximum effective concentration (EC_{50}) of 8.8 ± 1.2 µM effectively inhibited SARS-CoV replication in Vero E6 cells [3]. CQ was also shown to inhibit MERS-CoV and alphacoronavirus HCoV-229E replication in vitro in a dose dependent manner [4] . Likewise, CQ/HCQ exhibited in vitro inhibitory effects against several other viruses such as HIV-1, influenza, dengue, Ebola, Zika, chikungunya viruses and others [2, 5-10]. Although CQ/HCQ have shown consistent broad

spectrum in vitro antiviral effects, their in-vivo and clinical antiviral effects were disappointing. For instance, CQ was ineffective in preventing or ameliorating influenza following viral challenge in mouse and ferret models [5] and did not prevent influenza infection in a randomized, double-blind placebo-controlled trial in humans [52]. CQ also resulted in worse outcomes in a guinea pig model of Ebola infection [7] and was shown to enhance chikungunya viral infections in different animal models including non-human primates [53]. Moreover, CQ was s ineffective in improving the course of chikungunya in humans [53, 54]. CQ was also tested in a randomized controlled trial of 307 patients with dengue virus and failed to reduce duration of viremia or NS1 antigenemia [55]. In the case of HIV-1, the use of CQ/HCQ was inconclusive and hence they were not endorsed for routine use in the treatment of HIV-1 infection [56].

Possible reasons for lack of efficacy of HCQ in the treatment of COVID-19 disease

The discrepancy between the observed in vitro anti-SARS-CoV-2 effects of CQ/HCQ and the lack of efficacy in clinical studies, which mirrors previous observations with other viral infections could be due to three main reasons:

First, most of in vitro studies employ pre-treatment protocols where cells are treated with the drugs before infecting them with the tested virus. In vitro studies that compared pre-treatment and post-infection treatment have shown that CQ/HCQ have less effective antiviral activities if added after infection [4, 16, 57]. For example, Vincent et al. [57] showed that e CQ at 0.1, 1.0 and 10 µM added 20-24 hours before the infection with SARS-CoV decreased infectivity by 28%, 53% and 100%. However, if CQ is added 3-5 hours after infecting the cells, higher concentrations of CQ of up to 50 µM were needed to decrease infectivity [57]. This may raise the possibility that chronic or prophylactic use of CQ/HCQ may reduce the risk of acquiring

SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, a recent large population study of 14,250 individuals showed that chronic use of HCQ was not protective against SARS-CoV-2 infection [58].

Second, a wide range of EC_{50} values were reported for CQ and HCQ and in the case of SARS-CoV-2, the EC_{50} for CQ ranges between 1.13 and 7.36 µM and between 0.72 and 17.31 µM for HCQ [11]. It is worth noting that the lowest EC_{50} of 0.72 µM for HCQ was reported by Yao et al in their post-infection experiments, was different from the lowest EC_{50} of 5.85 µM in their pre-treatment experiments [16]. None of the other investigators reported such lower EC_{50} for CQ of HCQ with SARS-CoV-2 or any other viruses. Achieving adequate blood and tissue drug concertation is essential for proper antiviral activity In mice, a high dose of 90 mg/kg twice a day of CQ was necessary to achieve a steady state blood levels of 2.5 µg/ml [8]. Considering high doses of CO/HCQ in COVID-19 patients can be associated with increased adverse events as shown in a recent RCT where high dose CQ has been shown to be associated with significant toxicity in COVID-19 patients [59]. In addition, it is not clear what is the optimal CQ or HCQ blood levels for effective antiviral action since the suggested levels were based on widely differing in vitro EC_{50} estimates. In a study of 40 HIV-1 patients treated with HCQ 800 mg/day for 8 weeks, the range of HCQ blood concentration was 0.27-1.0 µg/ml [60]. Only those HIV-1 patients who achieved the highest HCQ blood concentrations had favorable response to HCQ [60]. There are only two small studies that looked at the pharmacokinetics of HCQ in COVID-19 patients [18, 60] [61] . In the first study Gautret et al. determined the mean HCQ levels in 20 patients treated with HCQ 600 mg/day and was 0.46 µg/ml [18]. This blood concentration is lower than the lowest estimated levels of 0.48 µg/ml based on the lowest effective in vitro concentration of 0.72 µM. Perinel et al showed that only 61% of 13 patients treated with HCQ

600 mg/day achieved what they considered the minimum therapeutic concentration of 1 µg/ml with the mean time to reach this concentration of 2.7 days [61]. Based on published data and their own, Balevic et al. found that the average serum/plasma HCQ concentration were below the lowest antiviral target levels for SARS-CoV-2 of 0.48 µg/ml in all studies [62]. These studies indicate that current HCQ dosing is probably suboptimal to achieve adequate blood levels necessary for effective antiviral activity.

Third, Antimalarials exhibit anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory effects where they can decrease the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines, and improve endothelial function and reduce prothrombotic state [12, 13]. These effects would be very beneficial in patients with severe COVID-19 disease; however, HCQ reduce the affinity of toll-like receptor 7 and 9 (TLR7 and TLR9) to viral RNA and also inhibit cyclic GMP-AMP synthase (cGAS) pathway and hence it inhibits type I interferon response which is the first defense line of the innate immune system against viral infections [12]. This effect might counteract the direct antiviral effects of HCQ and reduce its efficacy in treating COVID-19 disease.

Further research is needed to address these important issues to improve the clinical utility of CQ/HCQ for the treatment of COVID-19 disease, which should include exploring alternate administration routes like intra nasal application and inhalation therapy.

Safety of CQ/HCQ in the context of COVID-19 disease

Our meta-analysis not only revealed lack of efficacy of HCQ in improving the outcomes of COVID-19 patients but also suggests possible increased risk of mortality when used in combination with AZ. Several studies have shown increased risk of cardiac toxicity among

COVID-19 patients treated with CQ/HCQ. Our group have recently conducted a meta-analysis on CQ/HCQ induced cardiac toxicity in COVID-19 patients, which revealed [63] increased risk of QTc prolongation and discontinuation of drug due to QT prolongation. In addition, CQ/HCQ was associated with a clinically significant risk malignant arrhythmias and cardiac arrest [59]. It has also been a common practice to use HCQ in combination with AZ for COVID-19 during the current pandemic. AZ has s been linked to increased risk of sudden cardiac death [63, 64]. Hence, the concomitant use of CQ/HCQ and AZ or other QT prolonging agents could potentially increase the risk of serious cardiac arrhythmias and death. Increased risk of 30-day cardiac death, angina and heart failure complications associated with the combination therapy of HCQ and AZ has also been reported in a recent preprint of a large population study of 323,122 patients [64]. Our findings are consistent with the IDSA recommendations on the use of CQ/HCQ in COVID-19 disease [65], and the recent systematic reviews [62-64]. However, our study has several advantages over the previous reviews (supplementary table 13). First, it is the only study that included both qualitative and quantitative analyses. Second, it has the largest number of identified studies and therefore patient population because our search is the most up to date. Third, in contrast to all previous studies, we included only studies that reported adjusted effect estimates and therefore we avoided including studies at high risk of bias due to confounding. Fourth, we provided adequate assessment of the certainty of evidence using the GRADE classification. Finally, we offered a comprehensive discussion regarding the probable mechanisms of lack of efficacy of HCQ in COVID-19, which will inform and stimulate further research in this area.

Strengths and Limitations:

This meta-analysis has several strengths. Firstly, published and unpublished studies were included, which reduces publication bias. We also employed rigorous methodologies where we excluded studies that did not report adjusted odds or hazard ratios and those with poor methodology. We analyzed and reported monotherapy and combination therapy separately. We also examined mortality and other clinical outcomes separately and performed sensitivity analyses to eliminate sources of between studies heterogeneity. However, our study has several limitations; all of our included studies except one were observational studies which are prone to bias; including confounding by allocation, survival bias and residual confounding. Our group and others have shown that survivor bias, which occurs because patients who live longer are more likely to receive treatment than those who die early, could change associations from benefit to harm [66] [67]. Moreover, as with all observational studies, residual confounding could inflict any observed association [68] even with appropriate adjustment or propensity score matching. Nevertheless, the direction of these biases is supposed to be in favor of hydroxychloroquine efficacy. In addition, our pooled estimates are consistent with the results of the interim report from the RECOVERY trial which lends support to our findings.

Conclusion:

This systematic review and meta-analysis indicate with moderate level of certainty, that hydroxychloroquine monotherapy lacks efficacy in reducing short-term mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 disease based on moderate level of evidence. We also found that the use of hydroxychloroquine in combination with azythromycin is likely associated with increased short-term mortality among COVID-19 patients.

Funding:

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosures and conflict of interests:

All authors have no financial disclosures or conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Table 1 Characteristics of Randomized Clinical Trials

Study/ year	Country/ Setting	Number of patients	Case selection	Control selection	Intervention/ Exposure	Comparator	Outcome
Chen J et al. 2020	China	30	Confirmed COVID-19 cases	N/A	HCQ	Conventional therapy	Viral clearance by day 7 or death
Chen L et al. 2020	China	48	PCR confirmed infection or lung changes characteristic of COVID-19	Patients were assigned to 1 of 3 groups using a computer-generated randomization number	HCQ or CQ	SOC	Primary outcome: Time to clinical recovery Secondary outcome: time to SARS-CoV-2 RNA negativity
Tang W et al. 2020	China/Inpatient	150	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	Random assignment with stratification	HCQ loading dose of 1200mg followed by 200mg 3 times day for up to 3 weeks	SOC	Primary outcome: Negative conversion of SARS–CoV–2 by 28 days and clinical improvement within 28 days in patients with severe infection
Huang M, et al. 2020	China/Inpatient	22	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	Patients randomized to receive Lopinavir/Ritonavir	CQ 500 mg orally twice daily for 10 day	Lopinavir/Ritonavir	Primary outcome: Time to viral clearance and rate of viral clearance at days 10 and 14 Secondary outcomes: Rate of hospital discharge at day 14, clinical recovery at day 10 and radiologic recovery at

							days 10 and 14
Horby et al. 2020	UK/Inpatient	4674	Suspected or confirmed COVID-19 cases	Random assignment	HCQ 800mg every 6 hours for 2 doses followed by 400mg after 6 hours. Then 400mg twice daily for 9 days	SOC	28-day mortality

CQ: Chloroquine; HCQ: Hydroxychloroquine; N/A: Not applicable; RT-PCR: Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction; SOC: Standard of care

Table 2 Characteristics of Cohort studies

Study/ year	Country/ Setting	Number of patients	Case selection	Control selection	Intervention/ Exposure	Comparator	Outcome
Alberici et al. 2020	Italy/Inpatient + Outpatient	94	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	NR	HCQ	Lop/R and Darunavir/R	Clinical deterioration
An M et al. 2020	China/Inpatient	40	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	NR	HCQ	SOC	Time to viral clearance
Geleris et al. 2020	USA/Inpatient	1376	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	NR	HCQ	No HCQ	Intubation or death
Ip et al. 2020	USA/Inpatient	2512	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	Selected from convenience sample	1- HCQ 800mg pood in day one and 400mg in day 2-5 2- HCQ+AZ 3- AZ	SOC	Mortality
Magagnoli et al. 2020	USA/Inpatient	368	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	NR	HCQ or HCQ+AZ	Standard supportive care	Death and the need for mechanical ventilation
Mahevas et al. 2020	France/Inpatient	173	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 and requiring Oxygen	Patients with no HCQ	HCQ (600mg/day) within 48 hours of admission	SOC/No HCQ	The primary outcome: survival without transfer to the intensive care unit at day 21. Secondary outcomes: Overall survival, survival without acute respiratory distress syndrome, and discharge from hospital by day 21
Mallat et al. 2020	UAE/Inpatient	34	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	NR	HCQ 400mg twice daily for 1 day, followed by 400 mg daily for 10 days	No HCQ	Time to negative NPS

Paccoud et al. 2020	France/ Inpatient	84	Patients hospitalized with PCR confirmed COVID 19 infection	Patients hospitalized before decision to treat all patients with HCQ was made	HCQ 200 mg 3 times daily for 10 days	SOC	Primary: Mortality, ICU admission Secondary: Time to death or discharge, symptoms after 5 days
Rosenberg et al. 2020	USA/Inpatient	1438	PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2	Random sampling	1- HCQ 400mg po bd then 200mg po bd + AZ 2- HCQ alone 3- AZ alone	SOC	Primary outcome: in-hospital mortality. Secondary outcomes: cardiac arrest and abnormal electrocardiogram findings (arrhythmia or QT prolongation)
Sanchez-Alvarez et al. 2020	Spain/Dialysis patients	868	Documented SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus infection	NR	HCQ (85%) and the combination of Lop/R(40%). A third of the patients received the 3 drugs together. Steroids, interferon and tocilizumab used were less frequently.	NA	Mortality
Sbidian et al. 2020	France	4,642	Patients hospitalized with PCR confirmed COVID-19 infection	NR	600 mg on day 1, followed by 400 mg daily for 9 additional days. AZ 500mg on day 1 followed by 250 mg for 4	SOC	All-cause 28-day mortality

					more days		
Singh et al. 2020	USA/Inpatient	3372	Diagnosed with COVID-19	NR	HCQ+AZ	No HCQ	Mortality, need for mechanical ventilation.
Yu et al. 2020	China/ICU + Inpatient	568	All patients with lab confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, and a medical history and imaging characteristic of COVID-19	NR	HCQ (200 mg twice per day) for 7–10 days	No HCQ	In-hospital death and hospital stay time (day)

AZ: AZ; CQ: Chloroquine; HCQ: Hydroxychloroquine; ICU: Intensive care unit; N/A: Not applicable; NPS: Nasopharyngeal swab; RT-PCR: Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction; SOC: Standard of care

Table 3 Summary of Outcomes, key findings, and certainty of evidence

Treatment	Outcome	Study design: No. of studies	Findings and Magnitude of Effect	Strength of evidence
HCQ	Mortality	RCT:1 Cohort:12	1. Studies with moderate and high risk of bias, with consistent but imprecise EE's found no significant association between HCQ and mortality EE's ranged from 0.32 (0.16- 0.62) to 2.61 (1.10-6.17) 2. Pooled adjusted OR from 9 cohort studies at moderate risk of bias and 1 RCT at low risk of bias found no significant association between HCQ and mortality: 1.05 (95% CI 0.96-1.15 I^2=0 %, p=0.647), with no heterogeneity or evidence of publication bias	Moderate (No effect)
	Viral Clearance	RCTs: 3 Cohort: 2	Studies with Low and high risk of bias, inconsistent and imprecise EE's found no association between HCQ and viral clearance. EE's ranged from: 0.46 (95% CI 0.04- 5.75) to 5.68 (95% CI 1.05-10.08).	Very low
	Mechanical ventilation/ ICU admission	Cohort: 3	Studies with moderate risk of bias, consistent and precise results found no significant association between HCQ and the composite outcome EE's ranged from 0.81 (95% CI 0.55- 1.18) to 1.43 (95% CI 0.53-3.79)	Very low
HCQ+ AZ	Mortality	Cohort:6	1. Studies with moderate risk of bias showed a trend towards increased mortality. AEE ranged from 0.98 (0.75- 1.28) to 2.93 (1.79- 4.79) 2. Pooled adjusted OR=1.15, 95% CI 0.99-1.34, I^2=0.0%) from 5 cohort studies at moderate risk for bias.	Low (Higher mortality)
	Mechanical ventilation/ ICU admission	Cohort: 2	Studies with moderate risk of bias, consistent and precise results found no significant association between HCQ+AZ and the composite outcome	Very low
CQ	Viral Clearance	RCTs: 2	1 RCT with high risk of bias, in consistent and imprecise EE's showed no significant effect of Chloroquine on viral clearance EE:1.07 (0.44,2.56). 1 RCT with high risk of bias demonstrated shorted time to viral clearance in the CQ group (Median 2.5 days IQR 2-3.8) vs control group (Median 7 days IQR 2-10)	Very low

AEE: Adjusted effect estimate; AZ: AZ; CI: Confidence interval CQ: Chloroquine EE: Effect estimate; HCQ: Hydroxychloroquine; RCT: Randomized clinical trial

Figure 1 PRISMA Flow Diagram of Eligible Studies



Figure 2 Association between Hydroxychloroquine and short-term mortality in COVID-19 patients: (All cohorts and 1 RCT)



Figure 3 Association between Hydroxychloroquine and short-term mortality in COVID-19 patients: (Excluding studies at high risk for bias)



Figure 4 Association between Hydroxychloroquine and AZ combination and short-term mortality in COVID-19 patients