medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Clearing the fog: Is HCQ effective in reducing COVID-19 progression: A randomized controlled trial

List of Authors:

Designation and Qualification: (corresponding author): **Sultan Mehmood Kamran, FCPS medicine, Senior Registrar Pulmonology, Pak Emirates Military Hospital Rawalpindi**

Address for correspondence (Workplace): Department of Pulmonology Pak Emirates Military Hospital Rawalpindi; Telephone No. Office: 00923008501100

E-mail address: sultanmajoka79@hotmail.com

Mention Contribution of Each Author to the Manuscript According to ICJME Criteria

1. **Dr Sultan Mehmood Kamran:** Data curation, Software, Writing- Original draft preparation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing, formal analysis

2. **Dr Zill e Humayun Mirza:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Visualization, Supervision, resources

3. **Dr Brig Arshad Naseem:** Conceptualization, Visualization, Supervision, resources

4. **Dr Farrukh Saeed:** Project administration Conceptualization,

5. **Dr Rizwan Azam: Methodology,** Data curation, Validation

6. **Dr Naqeeb Ullah:** Investigation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing, proof reading

7. **Dr Wazir Ahmad:** Project administration, data collection

8. **Dr Salman Saleem:** Writing, Reviewing and proof reading, designing

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract:

Objective: To analyze the efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) plus standard of care (SOC) compared with SOC alone in reducing disease progression in Mild COVID-19

Design: A single centre, open label randomized controlled trial

Place and Duration: Pulmonology department, Pak emirates Military Hospital (PEMH) from 10 April 2020 to 31 May 2020.

Methodology: Five hundred patients of both genders having age between 18-50 years who were PCR positive and had Mild COVID-19 were selected. Patients assigned to standard dose of HCQ (400mg 12 hourly day 1 then 200mg 12 hrly for next 4 days) plus SOC were 349 while 151 patients received SOC comprising of Vit C, Vit D, and Zinc only (control group). Primary outcome was progression of disease while secondary outcome was PCR negativity on day 7 and 14. The results were analyzed on SPSS version 23. P value <0.05 was considered significant.

Results: Median age of intervention group (34 $\pm$ 11.778 years) and control group (34 $\pm$ 9.813 years). Disease progressed in 16 patients, 11 (3.15%) were in intervention group as compared to 5 (3.35%) in control group, (p value = 0.865). PCR negativity in intervention and control groups were (day 7, 182 (52.1%) vs. 54 (35.7%) (p value = 0.001), (day 14, 244 (69.9%) vs. 110 (72.8%) (p value = 0.508). Consecutive PCR negativity at day 7 and 14 was observed in 240 (68.8%) in intervention group compared to 108 (71.5%) in control group. (p value = 0.231).

Conclusion: Addition of HCQ to standard of care treatment in Mild COVID-19 neither prevents disease progression nor is it significantly associated with successive PCR negativity on day 7 and 14.

Key words: COVID-19, viral clearance, mild infection, disease progression, trial, HCQ

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Trial registration: NCT04491994

Abstract word count: 249

Manuscript Word Count: 2314

Ethical review of research project

The research project titled "Clearing the fog: Is HCQ effective in reducing COVID-19 progression" has been reviewed by ethical review committee of Pak Emirates Military Hospital (PEMH) Rawalpindi and got legal and ethical approvals prior to initiation of the research work carried out on subject. All experiments were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulation. Grant of approval is attached as separate file.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Beyond supportive care, there are currently no proven treatment options for coronavirus disease (COVID-19)[1]. As mortality in patients with critical category is quite substantial[2], hence every effort has to be made to intervene early and aggressively in order to prevent progression of disease. Globally, approximately eight million confirmed cases of Covid-19 have been reported with an outcome based overall mortality of 5.51%[3]. In Pakistan, there is exponential rise in Covid-19 cases in last few months. Nevertheless, data from various international studies shows that 81% of patients have had mild to moderate disease, which includes non-pneumonia and pneumonia cases[4]. Management of mild disease is equally important as this is the main bulk involved in transmission of disease to others. It is well known fact that asymptomatic carriers and patients with mild disease are also the main sources of disease transmissibility[5]. Therefore, it is a matter of utmost importance to detect mild cases earlier and start some investigational treatment in carefully selected hospitalized patients. Different investigational treatment options have been tried in different severity categories of COVID-19. Out of many therapeutic off-label options, HCQ seems more suitable owing to its known safety profile, side effects, posology and drug interactions[6]. HCQ has been found to have good in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2[7]and better safety profile than chloroquine[8]. A small study on 36 patients shows that hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) treatment is significantly associated with viral load reduction/disappearance in COVID-19 patients[9]. Similarly, it has been hypothesized that HCQ might inhibit cytokine storm by reducing CD154 expression in T cells, thus reducing chances of disease progression[10]. Therapeutic role of HCQ can be determined by time required for virologic clearance as well as to see whether disease is getting worse or not on the basis of symptoms aggravation and monitoring laboratory markers of Cytokine release storm. In Pakistan, PEMH is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the largest Covid-19 designated hospital in the country. This hospital has already treated more than 3000 Covid-19 patients so far including many asymptomatic and mild cases. On the basis of limited evidence available, HCQ was given after consent to Mild Covid-19 patients with an aim to achieve early viral clearance and prevent progression of disease. Later on, we analyzed the data to assess the response.

Methodology

This single Centre, parallel open label randomized controlled trial was carried out at department of Pulmonology, Pakistan Emirates Military Hospital (PEMH). The study design was approved by institutional ethical review committee. Five hundred admitted patients from both genders with Mild confirmed COVID-19 were included after their written consent. The study protocol and approval documents are available online. A case was considered confirmed on the basis of positivity of RT-PCR of combined Oropharyngeal and Nasopharyngeal swabs. Severity of disease was defined as per criteria designed by WHO[11]. Mild disease meant Patients with uncomplicated upper respiratory tract viral infection having non-specific symptoms such as low-grade fever (fever < 100F for < 3 days), fatigue, body aches, cough (with or without sputum production), anorexia, muscle pain, sore throat, nasal congestion, anosmia, headache and rarely diarrhea, nausea, and vomiting. PCR sampling was done on day 7 and 14 of admission. Any chronic health condition for which patients were on prior treatment was considered as co morbidity. In Hospital, HCQ was given to patients after written consent and after considering its contraindications. Three hundred and forty-nine (349) patients were included in intervention group and given HCQ in addition to standard of care treatment. Standard dose of HCQ was 400 mg by mouth twice a day for day one followed by 200 mg 12 hourly for next 4 days. The patients who did not give consent for treatment with HCQ or had a known allergy to HCQ or chloroquine or had another known

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

contraindication to treatment with the study drug, including retinopathy, G6PD deficiency and QT prolongation served as controls. Controls were matched with participants on the basis of age, gender and co morbids and comprised of 151 patients. Standard of care (SOC) treatment comprised of oral Vit C, oral Zinc, oral Vit-D and tablet Paracetamol (for body aches/fever), intravenous fluids, hemodynamic monitoring, and laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 and baseline blood parameters. Data regarding age, co-morbidities, history of contact with a positive patient, days since contact, duration of symptoms, PCR status with date and base line labs/X-ray chest were recorded. Any patient with day 0 CRP greater than 6mg/dl, Absolute lymphocyte count (ALC) < 1000 or evidence of infiltrates on X-ray chest were excluded. Daily temperature, respiratory rate (RR) and resting O2 saturation with pulse oximetry were monitored in all patients during their hospitalization. After start of treatment, development of fever > 101 F for > 72 hours, shortness of breath by minimal exertion (10-Step walk test), derangement of basic lab parameters (ALC < 1000 or raised CRP) or appearance of infiltrates on CXR during course of treatment was labeled as progression irrespective of PCR status. PCR status of patients was checked after 7 days and 14 days of initiation of treatment. Statistical interpretation of data was performed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. Results were expressed as mean, standard deviation (±SD) for all continuous variables and frequency and percentage for categorical data. We used t-test and chi-square test as appropriate to the nature and distribution of the variables. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results:

During the study, a total of 500 patients of Mild COVID-19 were included, with a mean age of 35.96 ± 11.2 years (intervention group: 34 + 11.778 vs. control group: 34 + 9.813), males 466 (93.2%) and females 34 (6.8%). Most patients were healthy young individuals with co-morbids only in 38 (7.6%). Diabetes Mellitus (DM) in 15 (3%) being the commonest disease. Positive contact history was found in 315 (63%) patients. Among constitutional symptoms, cough 163 (32.6%), low grade fever 133 (26.6%), body aches 96 (19.2%), anosmia 83(16.6%) and fatigue 56 (11.2%) were the most common. Less common symptoms were sore throat 33 (6.6%), diarrhea 21 (4.2%) and headache 21 (4.2%). Completely asymptomatic patients were 101 (20.2%). HCQ in addition to SOC treatment was given to intervention group comprising of 349 (69.8%) patients while 151 (30.2%) patients of control group received only SOC treatment.

Among 16 patients who showed disease progression (Table-1), 11 (3.15%) were from intervention group, and 5 (3.3%) from control group with p value of 0.940. Co morbids were present in 31 (8.9%) patients in intervention group, and 7 (4.66%) (p value = 0.095) in control group. In intervention group, out of 11 patients with diseases progression, 4/31 (12.9%) were with co morbids as compared to 2 out of 7 (28.6%) in control group (p value = 0.304). Overall, Progression of disease was significantly associated with presence of co morbidities as 6 (15.8%) patients out of 38 with co morbids showed progression as compared to only 10 (2.2%) out of 462 patients without co morbids. (p-value < 0.00001).

Overall, PCR negativity was observed in 236 (47.2%) patients on day 7 and in 354 (70.8%) patients on day 14. Effects of HCQ on PCR status of study population is given in Table 2. Day wise PCR negativity in intervention and control groups respectively were as follows; (day 7: 182

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(52.1%) vs. 54 (35.7%) (p value = 0.001), (day 14; 244 (69.9%) vs. 110 (72.8%) (p value = 0.508). Successive day 7- and 14-day PCR negativity was observed in 240 (68.8%) patients in intervention group vs. 106 (70.1%) in control group (p value = 0.231) PCR remained positive in 62 (17.8%) patients of intervention group vs. 32 (21.2%) patients of control group (p value=0.231).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table-1. Assessment of Effect of HCQ on progression of disease

EFFECT of HCQ	Treatment		p Value
	HCQ plus standard of care	Standard of care alone	
Overall Progression	11/349 (3.15%)	5/151 (3.3%)	0.940
Progression in co morbids	4/31 (12.9%)	2/7 (28.6%)	0.304

Chi-square test applied.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table-2. Assessment of Effect of HCQ on RT-PCR status of study population

PT-PCR at day 7	**TREATMENT**		**p-value**
	Intervention group n=349	**Control group n=151**	
Negative	182 (52.1%)	54 (35.8%)	0.001
Positive	167 (47.9%)	97 (64.2%)	
RT-PCR at Day 14			
Negative	244 (69.9%)	110 (72.9%)	0.508
Positive	105 (30.1%)	41 (27.1%)	
RT-PCR negativity at Day 7 and 14	240 (68.8%)	106 (70.1%)	0.321
RT- PCR positivity at Day 7 and 14	62 (17.8%)	32 (21.2%)	
RT-PCR Negative on Day 7 but positive on day 14	36 (10.3%)	8 (5.3%)	

Chi-square test applied.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

Although there was much hype about effectiveness of HCQ in treating COVID-19 but our study did not show any significant benefit of using HCQ. Firstly, HCQ did not prevent progression of disease in patients with or without co morbids although it was postulated to dampen cytokine release storm by Dan Zhou et al[10]. Secondly, as far as PCR negativity was concerned, its addition to supportive treatment showed significantly better early PCR negativity at day 7, but at day 14 there was not much difference in PCR negativity between the two studied groups. Nonetheless, it did not show any side effects in our study. We used the same doses of HCQ as used by Yao X et al[12] and no side effects were observed in their study also. Results of our study are also contrary to a highly publicized study done by Gao J et al[13] which showed early viral clearance and decreased rate of disease progression. Comparatively it was a study with smaller sample size (n=100) and they used Chloroquine instead of HCQ used in our study. As far as viral clearance at day 7 is concerned, our results are similar to that of non-randomized control trial from France by Gautret et al[9]. Their study showed significantly better viral clearance at day 6 of inclusion ((70% vs. 12.5%; P = 0.001) with use of 600mg/day of HCQ for 10 days. However, in addition to HCQ, they also used Azithromycin. Although highly rated initially, this study had only 20 participants in interventional arm out of which 6 removed from study due to intolerance to medication. In addition, it was a non-randomized trial containing major biases between studied groups, and patients were not followed till day 14 to see viral clearance again. In comparison, we followed patients at day 14 and found that a subset of day 7 PCR negatives turned positive again on day 14. This observation found in our study might be because of false negative PCR at day 7 owing to variable sensitivities of testing kits or a false positive PCR at day 14 due to presence of non-infective dead viral particles. When we compare results of our study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

with RCT done by Chen J et al[14,] interestingly it is found that although day 7 PCR results of our study are showing clear edge to HCQ but the primary endpoints in both studies are comparable. Chen J et al used the same dose of HCQ as in our study but in moderate COVID-19 as compared to mild category used in our research. Their study showed that HCQ did not prevent progression of disease and there was similar viral clearance between supportive treatment group and HCQ group (93.3% vs. 86.7%) (p value > 0.05) at day 7. However, sample size included 30 patients and PCR status was not checked at day 14.

Our study demonstrates similar results as recommended by Infectious diseases society of America by Adarsh bhimraj et al [15]. They analyzed three RCTs and six comparative cohort studies done on confirmed COVID-19 patients who were hospitalized and treated with HCQ. They studied many variables such as mortality, clinical progression, clinical improvement and adverse events and concluded that HCQ failed to show any benefit in term of viral clearance or halting progression of disease. In our study disease progression was significantly higher in patients with co morbidities even at younger age. This observation is proven in a large-scale study which had demonstrated that patients with chronic diseases are at higher risk of disease progression[16]**.** As at start of pandemic in Pakistan, our hospital had policy to admit every PCR positive case, hence, the median age of our study population was relatively younger. In our study 93.2% population was male. Overall, it has been seen that corona viruses such as severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)-CoV and the Middle East respiratory syndrome–CoV (MERS) predominantly affect male gender[17] and may be for same genetic reasons SARS-CoV-2 is also predominantly affecting male population.

Nevertheless, there are certain limitations of our study as well. Firstly, the main subgroup in which study was done were males so the results cannot be generalized to both genders. Secondly,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the study was done in mild cases and moderate/severe cases were not included so it cannot be determined whether HCQ is of any benefit in advanced COVID-19 or not. Thirdly, the patients were not followed up after discharge from the hospital hence, exact progression of disease could not be ascertained. Fourthly, we did not use quantitive RT-PCR to exactly determine the viral load which is a strong bias to affect viral clearance. Fifthly, PCR positivity at day 14 is of uncertain significance because it is now evident that after 10th day onset of illness, presence of non-replicable viral nucleic acid material only, are being picked up by the PCR[18,19] and such patients are regarded as non-infective. Finally, even with best sampling techniques, sensitivity of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 ranges between 34-80%[20] so exact estimation of viral clearance will definitely remain under question. Despite the limitations, our study is first of its own kind in Pakistan which is reinforced by a larger sample size and relatively longer follow up time.

Conclusion

Our study shows that addition of HCQ to supportive treatment in mild COVID-19 cases is not significantly associated with prevention of disease progression. Despite showing significantly early PCR negativity at day 7, day 14 PCR results are similar to that of non HCQ arm. The findings of our study correlate with the results of various clinical trials done internationally.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Off-label use of medicines for COVID-19 [Internet]. Who.int. 2020 [cited 5 July 2020]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/off-label-use-of-medicines-for-covid-19.
2. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020; 8(5):475-481.
3. Infection prevention and control during health care when coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is suspected or confirmed .3rd ed. WHO; 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-IPC-2020.4
4. Wu Z, McGoogan J. Characteristics of and Important Lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China. JAMA. 2020; 323(13):1239.
5. Hoehl S, Rabenau H, Berger A, Kortenbusch M, Cinatl J, Bojkova D et al. Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Returning Travelers from Wuhan, China. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;382(13):1278-1280.
6. Colson P, Rolain J, Raoult D. Chloroquine for the 2019 novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents. 2020;55(3):105923.
7. Biot C, Daher W, Chavain N, Fandeur T, Khalife J, Dive D et al. Design and Synthesis of Hydroxyferroquine Derivatives with Antimalarial and Antiviral Activities. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. 2006;49(9):2845-2849.
8. Murray J, Lee M. Re: Marmor et al.: American Academy of Ophthalmology Statement: Recommendations on screening for chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

retinopathy (2016 Revision). (Ophthalmology 2016;123:1386-1394). Ophthalmology. 2017;124(3):e28-e29.

9. Gautret P, Lagier J, Parola P, Hoang V, Meddeb L, Mailhe M 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. 2020;:105949.

10. Zhou D, Dai S, Tong Q. COVID-19: a recommendation to examine the effect of hydroxychloroquine in preventing infection and progression. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2020;75(7):1667-1670.

11. World Health Organization. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection (SARI) when COVID-19 disease is suspected. Interim guidance. Pediatria i Medycyna Rodzinna. 2020;16(1):9-26.

12. Yao X, Ye F, Zhang M, Cui C, Huang B, Niu P et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of Optimized Dosing Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2020.

13. Gao J, Tian Z, Yang X. Breakthrough: Chloroquine phosphate has shown apparent efficacy in treatment of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical studies. BioScience Trends. 2020;14(1):72-73.

14. Jun C, Danping L, Li L, Ping L, Qingnian X, Lu X et al. A pilot study of hydroxychloroquine in treatment of patients with moderate COVID-19. J Zhejiang Univ (Med Sci), 2020, 49(2): 215-219.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Bhimraj A, Morgan R, Shumaker A, Lavergne V, Baden L, Cheng V et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2020;

16. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. The Lancet. 2020;395(10223):507-513.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365; this version posted August 4, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Channappanavar R, Fett C, Mack M, Ten Eyck P, Meyerholz D, Perlman S. Sex-Based Differences in Susceptibility to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection. The Journal of Immunology. 2017;198(10):4046-4053.Wölfel R, Corman V, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller M et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581(7809):465-469.

18. Wölfel R, Corman V, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller M et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581(7809):465-469.

19. Young B, Ong S, Kalimuddin S, Low J, Tan S, Loh J et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. JAMA. 2020;323(15):1488.

20. Bruning AHL, Leeflang MMG, Vos JMBW, Spijker R, de Jong MD, Wolthers KC, et al. Rapid Tests for Influenza, Respiratory Syncytial Virus, and Other Respiratory Viruses: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis [Internet]. 2017 Sep 15 [cited 2020 Apr 1];65(6):1026–32. Available from: http://academic.oup.com/cid/article/65/6/1026/3829590/Rapid-Tests-for-Influenza-Respiratory-Syncytial