

1 **Original Article**

2 **Outcomes of Persons With COVID-19 in Hospitals With and**
3 **Without Standard Treatment With (Hydroxy)chloroquine**

4
5
6 **EJG Peters**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist and Acute Medicine Specialist,
7 Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Internal Medicine, Amsterdam
8 Infection and Immunity Institute, De Boelelaan 1117, NL-1081HV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
9 E.peters@amsterdamumc.nl

10
11 **D Collard**, MD, MSc, PhD-candidate, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Department of
12 Vascular Medicine, Amsterdam Cardiovascular Sciences, Meibergdreef 9, NL-1105AZ, Amsterdam,
13 The Netherlands. d.collard@amsterdamumc.nl

14
15 **S Van Assen**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist, Treant Zorggroep, Department of
16 Internal Medicine/Infectious Diseases, Boermarkeweg 60, NL-7824AA Emmen, The Netherlands.
17 s.vanassen@treant.nl

18
19 **M Beudel**, MD, PhD, Neurologist, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Department of
20 Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience institute, Meibergdreef 9, NL-1105AZ, Amsterdam, The
21 Netherlands. m.beudel@amsterdamumc.nl

22
23 **MK Bomers**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Disease Specialist. Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit
24 Amsterdam, Department of Internal Medicine, Amsterdam Infection and Immunity Institute, De
25 Boelelaan 1117, NL-1081HV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. m.bomers@amsterdamumc.nl

26
27 **J Buijs**, MD, PhD, Internist, Zuyderland Medical Center, Department of Internal Medicine,
28 Heerlen/Sittard, The Netherlands. j.buijs@zuyderland.nl

29
30 **LR De Haan**, MD, MSc, Resident Internal Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine,
31 Flevoziekenhuis, Hospitaalweg 1, NL-1315RA, Almere, The Netherlands. ldehaan@flevoziekenhuis.nl
32 dehaan.lianne@gmail.com

33
34 **W De Ruijter**, MD, PhD. Anaesthetist-Intensivist, Noordwest Ziekenhuisgroep, Alkmaar, the
35 Netherlands. w.de.ruijter@nwz.nl

36
37 **RA Douma**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist, Flevoziekenhuis, Department of
38 Internal Medicine, Hospitaalweg 1, NL-1315RA, Almere, The Netherlands.
39 rdouma@flevoziekenhuis.nl

40
41 **PWG Elbers**, MD, PhD, EDIC, Intensivist. Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department
42 of Intensive Care Medicine, Amsterdam Medical Data Science, Amsterdam Cardiovascular Sciences,
43 Amsterdam Infection and Immunity Institute, De Boelelaan 1117, NL-1081HV, Amsterdam, The
44 Netherlands. p.elbers@amsterdamumc.nl

45
46 **A Goorhuis**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist. Amsterdam UMC, Univ of Amsterdam,
47 Department of Infectious Diseases, Meibergdreef 9, NL-1105AZ, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

48 a.goorhuis@amsterdamumc.nl

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

50 **NC Gritters van den Oever**, MD, Anaesthetist-Intensivist, Treant Zorggroep, Intensive Care Unit,
51 Boermarkeweg 60, NL-7824AA Emmen, The Netherlands. n.gritters@treant.nl

52
53 **GHH Knarren**, MD, MSc, Internist-Acute Medicine Specialist. Viecuri MC Noord-Limburg, Department
54 of Internal Medicine, Venlo, The Netherlands. iknarren@viecuri.nl

55
56 **HS Moeniralam**, MD, PhD, Department of Internal Medicine and Intensive Care Unit, St Antonius
57 Ziekenhuis, Koekoekslaan 1, NL-3430CM Nieuwegein, The Netherlands.
58 moeniralam@antoniuziekenhuis.nl

59
60 **RLM Mostard**, Pulmonologist, Zuyderland Medical Center, Department of Pulmonology,
61 Heerlen/Sittard, The Netherlands. r.mostard@zuyderland.nl

62
63 **MJR Quanjel**, MD, MSc, Pulmonologist, St. Antonius Ziekenhuis, Department of Pulmonology,
64 Koekoekslaan 1, NL-3430CM, Nieuwegein, The Netherlands. m.quanjel@antoniuziekenhuis.nl

65
66 **AC Reidinga**, MD, MSc, Anaesthetist-Intensivist. Martini Hospital, Intensive Care Unit, Groningen,
67 The Netherlands. a.reidinga@mzh.nl

68
69 **R Renckens**, MD, PhD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist, Department of Internal Medicine,
70 Noordwest Ziekenhuisgroep, Alkmaar, the Netherlands. R.Renckens@nwz.nl

71
72 **JPW Van Den Bergh**, prof, MD, PhD, Internist-Endocrinologist. Viecuri MC Noord-Limburg,
73 Department of Internal Medicine, Venlo, The Netherlands. jvandenbergh@viecuri.nl

74
75 **IN Vlasveld**, MD, Internist-Infectious Diseases Specialist. Martini Hospital, Department of Internal
76 Medicine, Groningen, The Netherlands. i.vlasveld@mzh.nl

77
78 **JJ Sikkens**, MD, PhD Internist-Fellow Infectious Diseases, Clinical Epidemiologist. Amsterdam UMC,
79 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Internal Medicine, Amsterdam Infection and Immunity
80 Institute, De Boelelaan 1117, NL-1081HV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
81 j.sikkens@amsterdamumc.nl

82
83 **On behalf of the CovidPredict Study Group**

84
85 **Corresponding author:**
86 Edgar J.G. Peters, MD, PhD
87 Amsterdam UMC, Location VUmc
88 Department of Internal Medicine, Room ZH4A46, De Boelelaan 1117, NL-1081HV, Amsterdam, The
89 Netherlands. Tel: +31 62 571 6081, Fax: +31 84 871 8470, Email: e.peters@amsterdamumc.nl

90
91 **Running title:**
92 (Hydroxy)chloroquine among hospitals

93
94 **Keywords:**
95 Hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, mortality

96 **Abstract**

97

98 **Objective**

99 To compare survival of subjects with COVID-19 treated in hospitals that either did or did not
100 routinely treat patients with hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine.

101 **Methods**

102 We analysed data of COVID-19 patients treated in 9 hospitals in the Netherlands. Inclusion dates
103 ranged from February 27th 2020, to May 15th, when the Dutch national guidelines no longer
104 supported the use of (hydroxy)chloroquine. Seven hospitals routinely treated subjects with
105 (hydroxy)chloroquine, two hospitals did not. Primary outcome was 21-day all-cause mortality. We
106 performed a survival analysis using log-rank test and Cox-regression with adjustment for age, sex and
107 covariates based on premorbid health, disease severity, and the use of steroids for adult respiratory
108 distress syndrome, including dexamethasone.

109 **Results**

110 Among 1893 included subjects, 21-day mortality was 23.4% in 1552 subjects treated in hospitals that
111 routinely prescribed (hydroxy)chloroquine, and 17.0% in 341 subjects that were treated in hospitals
112 that did not. In the adjusted Cox-regression models this difference disappeared, with an adjusted
113 hazard ratio of 1.17 (95%CI 0.88-1.55). When stratified by actually received treatment in individual
114 subjects, the use of (hydroxy)chloroquine was associated with an increased 21-day mortality (HR
115 1.58; 95%CI 1.25-2.01) in the full model.

116 **Conclusions**

117 After adjustment for confounders, mortality was not significantly different in hospitals that routinely
118 treated patients with (hydroxy)chloroquine, compared with hospitals that did not. We compared
119 outcomes of hospital strategies rather than outcomes of individual patients to reduce the chance of
120 indication bias. This study adds evidence against the use of (hydroxy)chloroquine in patients with
121 COVID-19.

122 Introduction

123

124 The spread of SARS-CoV-2, leading to the current pandemic of COVID-19, has a profound global
125 impact on daily life, morbidity and mortality. Several preliminary studies have reported that the
126 antimalarial agents hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine, or (H)CQ, alone or in combination with the
127 antibiotic azithromycin, can have a suppressive effect on the viral replication, and might decrease the
128 mortality of COVID-19¹⁻⁴. So far, clinical studies have been hampered by (indication) bias^{1,2,4},
129 monocentre setup^{2,3}, small numbers of included subjects³, and concerns about the verifiability of
130 data, even leading to withdrawal of a publication⁴. Side effects of (H)CQ are well-known and
131 common, and include fever and cardiac arrhythmias. Randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs) are
132 currently being conducted to investigate the effect of (H)CQ on outcome of COVID-19. While we are
133 awaiting definite results from RCTs, cohort studies can provide quick closure of existing knowledge
134 gaps. When treatment assignment in cohort studies is based on prescriber discretion, the risk of
135 indication bias (even after covariate adjustment) remains high. However, our database of Dutch
136 hospitals contains data of subjects from hospitals that either routinely prescribed (H)CQ or did not
137 prescribe it at all, offering a unique opportunity to compare both strategies. The comparison of
138 different treatment strategies among hospitals leads to a significant reduction of (indication) bias.
139 The objective of this study was to compare the effect of hospital-wide COVID-19 treatment strategies
140 with or without routine (H)CQ use on all-cause 21-day mortality.

141

142

143

144 Methods

145

146 We used data from the ongoing CovidPredict Clinical Course Cohort containing over 2,000 persons
147 with COVID-19⁵, from 9 hospitals in the Netherlands, including two tertiary care hospitals. Included in
148 the database were all subjects admitted to hospital with positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR of nasopharynx,
149 throat, sputum or bronchoalveolar lavage samples, or CT-scan abnormalities that were typical for
150 COVID-19 (CO-RADS 4 and 5)⁶, without another explanation for the abnormalities than COVID-19.
151 Inclusion dates ranged from the first admitted case in the Netherlands on February 27th 2020, to May
152 15th, when the Dutch national guidelines no longer advised the use of (H)CQ. We excluded patients <
153 18 years and patients who were transferred to or from another hospital. Dosage of chloroquine base
154 was: loading dose of 600 mg, followed by 300 mg twice a day for a total of 5 days. Dosage of
155 hydroxychloroquine sulphate was 400 mg twice daily on the first day, followed by 200 mg twice daily
156 on days 2 to 5. Among the seven (H)CQ-hospitals, the timing of start of (H)CQ treatment differed;
157 three hospitals started at the moment of COVID-19 diagnosis, four started after diagnosis but only
158 when patients clinically deteriorated e.g., when there was an increase in respiratory rate or increase
159 in use of supplemental oxygen. The two hospitals that did not routinely treat subjects with (H)CQ
160 (i.e., the non-(H)CQ-hospitals), offered best supportive care, including oxygen therapy and
161 potentially antibiotic therapy, according to local guidelines and prescriber discretion. Participating
162 hospitals did not routinely prescribe other experimental medication (e.g., lopinavir/ritonavir,
163 remdesivir or steroids, see Table 1). Subjects who were incidentally treated with these drugs were
164 included in the study. Primary outcome was 21-day all-cause mortality, defined as hospital mortality,
165 or discharge to a hospice care facility. A waiver for the use of hospital record data was obtained
166 through the Institutional Review Board of Amsterdam UMC; however, patients were given the
167 opportunity to opt out. In the primary analysis, we compared effectiveness of (H)CQ versus non-
168 (H)CQ hospital strategies, irrespective of actual individual (H)CQ treatment. We performed a survival
169 analysis using log-rank test and Cox-regression with adjustment for age, sex and covariates based on

170 premonitory health (i.e., history of lung, kidney and cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, obesity,
171 and neoplasms or hematologic disease), disease severity during presentation (respiratory rate,
172 oxygen saturation) and the use of steroids, including dexamethasone, for adult respiratory distress
173 syndrome (ARDS)^{7,8}. We collected data according to the collection protocol of the World Health
174 Organization. Missing covariates were imputed using multiple imputation. As a sensitivity analysis,
175 we performed a complete case analysis using inverse probability weighting of propensity scores
176 (determined using the same covariates), and a subgroup analysis in hospitals who started (H)CQ from
177 the moment of diagnosis. Finally, we repeated the analyses comparing actually received treatment,
178 with (H)CQ. All statistical analyses were performed using R versions 3.6.3 (R Foundation, Vienna,
179 Austria).

180


181 Results

182

183 We analysed results of 1893 subjects admitted before May 15th 2020, 239 were excluded because
184 they were transferred from another hospital. Demographic data are shown in Table 1. Follow-up
185 data were missing for 28 (2.5%) subjects. In total, 1552 subjects were treated in hospitals where
186 (H)CQ was a standard part of treatment strategy ((H)CQ hospitals) and 341 in hospitals where (H)CQ
187 was not a standard part of treatment (non-(H)CQ hospitals). In (H)CQ-hospitals, 54.5% of the subjects
188 received (H)CQ, compared with 1.8% of the subjects in the non-(H)CQ-hospitals. Among the seven
189 (H)CQ-hospitals, two used hydroxychloroquine during the first half and chloroquine during the
190 second half of the epidemic, whereas five hospitals used chloroquine only. Subjects in (H)CQ-
191 hospitals were older (68 (SD: 14) vs 62 (SD: 15) years) and had a higher prevalence of chronic
192 pulmonary disease (27.7 vs 21.7%) than subjects in the non-(H)CQ-hospitals. Respiratory rate and
193 peripheral oxygen saturation during admission were similar in both hospital groups (see Table 1). In
194 (H)CQ-hospitals, 9.7% of subjects received corticosteroids for ARDS and 3.2% were in a study

195 protocol of an experimental SARS-CoV-2 directed antiviral (e.g., lopinavir/ritonavir) or
196 immunomodulatory drug trial (e.g., imatinib, anti-complement C5), versus 2.4% and 11.3% in non-
197 (H)CQ-hospitals, respectively. Figure 1 shows the survival of subjects in (H)CQ- versus non-(H)CQ-
198 hospitals. Unadjusted mortality at day 21 was significantly different between the (H)CQ- and non-
199 (H)CQ-hospitals (23.4% vs. 17.0%). However, in the adjusted Cox-regression models, this difference
200 disappeared, with an adjusted hazard ratio of 1.17 (95%CI 0.88-1.55, Table 2). The sensitivity analysis
201 of hospitals routinely starting (H)CQ treatment from the moment of COVID-19 diagnosis (i.e., (H)CQ
202 hospitals without the hospitals that initiated (H)CQ treatment upon clinical deterioration) compared
203 with non-(H)CQ-hospitals, showed similar results with a HR of 1.14 (95%CI 0.82-1.57) after
204 adjustment for age, sex, comorbidities, and disease severity at presentation. Complete case analysis
205 and the analysis using propensity scores showed similar results (see Table 3). Finally, when stratified
206 by actually received treatment, the use of (H)CQ was associated with an increased 21-day mortality
207 (HR 1.58; 95%CI 1.25-2.01, Table 3) in the full model. The sensitivity analysis of all hospitals and all
208 subjects can be found in Table 4.

209



210

211 Figure 1: Mortality of subjects in the (H)CQ-hospitals (blue) versus non-(H)CQ-hospitals (black).

212

213 Discussion

214

215 At first glance, our study results may seem to suggest that subjects treated in hospitals that routinely
216 prescribed (H)CQ had a significantly increased 21-day all-cause mortality compared with those in
217 hospitals that did not routinely prescribe (H)CQ. However, mortality was not significantly different
218 after adjustment for age, sex, medical history, disease severity at presentation and steroid use during
219 treatment. Similarly, we found an increased risk of death among subjects who had actually received
220 treatment with (H)CQ, which has likely been driven by indication bias, as in four of the seven (H)CQ-
221 hospitals, (H)CQ was only prescribed upon clinical deterioration. The unique characteristics of our

222 study cohort enabled a study design that minimized indication bias. Our results add further weight to
223 existing evidence against the use of (H)CQ for the treatment COVID-19.

224

225 The strength of this study is that data were collected in nine secondary and tertiary care hospitals in
226 the Netherlands during the COVID-19 epidemic. Data collection was set up prospectively and the
227 database included data on all consecutive subjects admitted to general medicine and pulmonology
228 wards, and to intensive care units. The database was set up according to the WHO standards, which
229 enabled data comparison and uniformity of data among the different participating centres. The
230 comparison of hospital-defined treatment strategies rather than the treatment actually received led
231 to a lower risk of indication bias compared with previous studies^{1,2}. We roughly estimate the extend
232 of the effect of indication bias to be the difference in outcome between the uncorrected and the
233 corrected model. Further strengths include the multicentre setup^{2,3}, as mentioned above, and the
234 relatively large numbers of included subjects³.

235

236 There are some limitations we need to address. Although health care in the Netherlands has a
237 homogeneous setup, there was some variability in standard protocols among the hospitals that could
238 have led to residual confounding. The two non-(H)CQ-hospitals were tertiary (academic) centres,
239 whereas the (H)CQ-hospitals comprised secondary care hospitals. Since we excluded subjects
240 transferred to and from other hospitals, the referral role of the tertiary care hospitals was minimized.
241 Furthermore, subjects in the (H)CQ hospitals were more likely to receive steroid treatment, while
242 subjects in the non-(H)CQ hospitals were more likely to receive other experimental
243 immunomodulatory drugs. The numbers of the individual types of medication were small, making it
244 impossible to draw conclusions from these differences. The results of the RECOVERY trial (publication
245 pending), suggested a lower mortality in patients treated with dexamethasone. Treatment with
246 dexamethasone could therefore have resulted in a lower mortality in the group of (H)CQ hospitals.
247 We did not find such an effect, even after correction in the full model. We also used extensive

248 covariate adjustments, using various methods to minimize influence of differences in patient
249 population among hospitals, and the similarity in outcomes between these methods is reassuring in
250 this regard. Finally, because not every subject in the (H)CQ-hospitals actually received (H)CQ, the
251 current efficacy estimate in our study is likely an underestimation of the true (H)CQ effect.
252 Performing an instrumental variable analysis would have provided an approximation of this true
253 effect, but because the current efficacy point estimates point toward harm rather than benefit of
254 (H)CQ, this likely would not have changed our conclusions.⁹

255
256 Despite the positive results of some studies resulting in widespread use of (H)CQ, our study did not
257 show a benefit of (H)CQ treatment. This may be explained by the timing of the administration of the
258 drug and its specific working mechanism. Chloroquine binds *in silico* and *in vitro* with high affinity to
259 sialic acids and gangliosides of SARS-CoV-2. These bindings inhibit the interaction at non-toxic plasma
260 levels with ACE-2 receptors and could hypothetically stop the cascade from formation of pulmonary
261 infiltrations to full blown ARDS and death¹⁰⁻¹². The antiviral activity might be more effective in the
262 pre-clinical setting as the deterioration in the hospital is more an effect of the cytokine storm
263 provoked by SARS-CoV-2 than an effect of the viral infection itself. This hypothesis might explain why
264 the clinical benefit for admitted subjects was absent in our study, although we did not observe a
265 difference in outcome among subjects treated early (at diagnosis) and among those treated later
266 upon clinical deterioration. Currently, clinical trials are underway to study (hydroxy)chloroquine in
267 admitted COVID-19 patients (e.g., NCT04261517 and NCT04307693). As post-exposure prophylaxis,
268 hydroxychloroquine does not seem to be effective to prevent COVID-19,¹³ but results of further
269 studies are pending¹⁴. Given the current evidence, we would argue against the use (H)CQ outside the
270 setting of randomized clinical trials.

271

272

273

274 Conflict of Interest Disclosure

275 The authors do not have any relevant financial or other disclosures.

276

277 Funding

278 No external funding has been received. Funding has been applied for at ZonMW

279

280 Acknowledgements

281 We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the CovidPredict Study Group for the data
282 collection, and dr. B.J.H. van den Born and prof. dr. A.H. Zwinderman for their help with the analysis
283 and interpretation of the data.

284

285

286 Contribution of authors

287 All authors have made substantial contributions to the following: (1) the conception and design of
288 the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or
289 revising it critically for important intellectual content, (3) final approval of the version to be
290 submitted.

291 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics**

292

	Overall	Non-(H)CQ hospital	(H)CQ hospitals
N	1893	341	1552
Age (mean (SD))	66.8 (14.7)	62.1 (15.2)	67.8 (14.3)
Women (%)	745 (39.4)	150 (44.0)	595 (38.3)
Chronic cardiac disease (%)	571 (30.7)	74 (21.8)	497 (32.7)
Hypertension (%)	888 (47.5)	156 (46.0)	732 (47.8)
Asthma or chronic pulmonary disease (%)	494 (26.6)	74 (21.7)	420 (27.7)
Chronic kidney disease (%)	210 (11.3)	38 (11.2)	172 (11.4)
Diabetes (%)	483 (26.2)	93 (27.3)	390 (25.9)
Malignant neoplasm or chronic hematologic disorder (%)	189 (10.2)	42 (12.4)	147 (9.7)
Smoking (%)	92 (6.4)	18 (6.5)	74 (6.4)
Obesity (%)	542 (30.6)	103 (35.4)	439 (29.6)
Use of (H)CQ	636 (42.6)	6 (1.8)	630 (54.5)
Use of steroids for ARDS (%)	119 (8.0)	8 (2.4)	111 (9.7)
Participation in drug trial (%)	73 (5.0)	37 (11.3)	36 (3.2)
Respiratory rate (mean (SD))	23.2 (7.1)	24.4 (7.7)	23.0 (6.9)
Temperature, °C, (median [IQR])	37.8 [37.0, 38.6]	37.3 [36.6, 38.2]	38.0 [37.1, 38.7]
Peripheral oxygen saturation, %, (median [IQR])	94.0 [91.0, 96.0]	94.5 [91.0, 97.0]	94.0 [91.0, 96.0]

	79.00 [40.2,		
CRP, mg/L, (median [IQR])	135.0]	82.6 [40.7, 134.6]	78.0 [40.0, 135.0]
WBC, 10 ⁹ /L, (median [IQR])	6.8 [5.2, 9.3]	6.7 [5.1, 9.2]	6.9 [5.2, 9.3]
PCR positive (%)	1771 (96.0)	302 (89.1)	1469 (97.6)
ICU-admission (%)	265 (14.0)	69 (20.2)	196 (12.6)

293

294 (H)CQ denotes (hydroxy)chloroquine; CRP C-reactive protein; WBC white blood cell count; PCR-

295 positive a positive test for COVID-19 based on polymerase chain reaction; ICU intensive care unit.

296

297

298 **Table 2: Results of Cox-regression models after stratification for treatment**

299 **strategy**

300

Cox-regression for treatment strategy

	HR	95%CI		p-value
(H)CQ treatment strategy	1.17	0.88	1.55	0.286
Women	1.05	0.86	1.30	0.614
Age	1.07	1.06	1.08	<0.001
Chronic cardiac disease	1.16	0.94	1.44	0.168
Asthma or chronic pulmonary disease	1.06	0.86	1.32	0.577
Chronic kidney disease (%)	1.06	0.80	1.40	0.691
Malignant neoplasm or chronic hematologic disorder (%)	1.38	1.04	1.83	0.025
Diabetes	1.32	1.06	1.65	0.013
Hypertension	0.97	0.78	1.20	0.786
Obesity	1.17	0.92	1.48	0.195
Peripheral oxygen saturation	0.95	0.94	0.97	<0.001
Respiratory rate	1.04	1.02	1.05	<0.001
Use of steroids for ARDS	1.57	1.13	2.17	0.007

301 (H)CQ denotes (hydroxy)chloroquine, ARDS acute respiratory distress syndrome. Columns of

302 confidence interval indicate lowest and highest values.

303

304 **Table 3: Results of Cox-regression models after stratification for actual treatment**

305

Cox-regression for actual treatment

	HR	95%CI		p-value
(H)CQ treatment	1.58	1.25	2.01	<0.001
Women	1.09	0.88	1.34	0.439
Age	1.07	1.06	1.08	<0.001
Chronic cardiac disease	1.21	0.97	1.50	0.092
Asthma or chronic pulmonary disease	1.05	0.85	1.30	0.662
Chronic kidney disease (%)	1.07	0.81	1.42	0.621
Malignant neoplasm or chronic hematologic disorder (%)	1.41	1.06	1.87	0.018
Diabetes	1.30	1.05	1.63	0.018
Hypertension	0.97	0.78	1.20	0.777
Obesity	1.17	0.92	1.48	0.191
Peripheral oxygen saturation	0.96	0.94	0.97	<0.001
Respiratory rate	1.03	1.02	1.05	<0.001
Use of steroids for ARDS	1.45	1.03	2.05	0.033

306 (H)CQ denotes (hydroxy)chloroquine, ARDS acute respiratory distress syndrome.

307

308

Table 4: Sensitivity Analysis

Complete case analysis using inverse probability weighting

For **actually received treatment**

	HR	95%CI		p-value
(H)CQ received treatment	1.48	1.26	1.73	<0.001

309

Complete case analysis using inverse probability weighting

For **treatment strategy**

	HR	95%CI		p-value
(H)CQ treatment strategy	1.21	1.03	1.44	0.024

310

311 (H)CQ denotes (hydroxy)chloroquine.

312

313

314

315 **References**

316

- 317 1. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or
318 Azithromycin With In-Hospital Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State. *JAMA* 2020.
- 319 2. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational Study of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized
320 Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 321 3. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of
322 COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*
323 2020:105949.
- 324 4. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or
325 without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. *Lancet* 2020.
- 326 5. <https://covidpredict.nl/en>. 2020. (Accessed 9 June, 2020,
- 327 6. Prokop M, van Everdingen W, van Rees Vellinga T, et al. CO-RADS - A categorical CT
328 assessment scheme for patients with suspected COVID-19: definition and evaluation. *Radiology*
329 2020:201473.
- 330 7. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2
331 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir*
332 *Med* 2020;8:475-81.
- 333 8. Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, et al. Factors associated with hospital admission and critical
334 illness among 5279 people with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York City: prospective cohort study.
335 *BMJ* 2020;369:m1966.
- 336 9. Instrumental variable analysis. 2020, at
337 [https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/2006/05000/Evaluating_Short_Term_Drug_Effects_Using](https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/2006/05000/Evaluating_Short_Term_Drug_Effects_Using_a.11.aspx)
338 [a.11.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/epidem/Fulltext/2006/05000/Evaluating_Short_Term_Drug_Effects_Using_a.11.aspx).)
- 339 10. Fantini J, Di Scala C, Chahinian H, Yahi N. Structural and molecular modelling studies reveal a
340 new mechanism of action of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine against SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Int J*
341 *Antimicrob Agents* 2020;55:105960.
- 342 11. Fan J, Zhang X, Liu J, et al. Connecting hydroxychloroquine in vitro antiviral activity to in vivo
343 concentration for prediction of antiviral effect: a critical step in treating COVID-19 patients. *Clin*
344 *Infect Dis* 2020.
- 345 12. Yao X, Ye F, Zhang M, et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of Optimized Dosing
346 Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus
347 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 348 13. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as
349 Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 350 14. Mitja O, Clotet B. Use of antiviral drugs to reduce COVID-19 transmission. *Lancet Glob Health*
351 2020;8:e639-e40.
- 352