Preventing disease after exposure to COVID-19 using hydroxychloroquine: A summary of a protocol for exploratory re-analysis of age and time-nuanced effects.

David M. Wiseman, PhD;[1] Pierre Kory, MD; [2] Dan Mazzucco, PhD;[3] Mayur S. Ramesh, MD[4]

[1] Synechion, Inc., Dallas, TX.

[2] Aurora St. Luke's Medical Center, Milwaukee, WI

[3] ZSX Medical, LLC, Philadelphia, PA

[4] Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, MI

Address for correspondence:

Synechion, Inc., 18208 Preston Road, Suite D9-405, Dallas, 75252
synechion@aol.com

Abstract

BACKGROUND: A recently published randomized trial (Boulware et al., 2020, NCT04308668) of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) for post-exposure prophylaxis found a reduction in Covid-19 of 17%. In the context of ambitious powering to detect a 50% reduction, this non-statistically significant finding could translate to a reduction of 22,000/130,828 cases (CDC 8/12/20) among US health care workers (HCW), impacting trajectory and resource utilization models that drive decisions on lockdowns and social distancing.

Data found only in the appendix of Boulware et al. suggested greater differences in the effect HCQ among sub-groups. There were reductions (36%) in younger (<35 years) and increases (110%) in older (>50 years) subjects. Our preliminary analysis revealed a significant negative correlation (slope -0.211, CI -0.328-0.094, p=0.016) between treatment lag and disease reduction, reaching 49% when initiated within one day (RR 0.51, CI 0.176-1.46, p=0.249).

There were also differences in disease reduction by HCQ by type of exposure (HCW - 8% vs. household contacts - 31%; RR 0.691, CI 0.398-1.2). The definitions of exposure severity did not discriminate between the numbers or duration (> 10 minutes) of exposures. Differences between exposure types may result from younger HCW and higher risks in less trained household contacts with little access to advanced PPE. The ex-protocol use of zinc and ascorbic acid were likely confounders, as was the possibly active folate placebo.

Exploratory reanalysis of the raw dataset may inform an age- and stage- nuanced approach to COVID-19 using HCQ testable by prospective studies and may provide insight into the various proposed mechanisms of HCQ.

OBJECTIVES: To conduct an exploratory re-analysis of the de-identified raw dataset from a randomized study of the use of HCQ for post-exposure prophylaxis of COVID-19 with view to further defining: a) The time dependent effect of HCQ, b) The age dependent effect of HCQ; c) The sub-stratification of time- and age-dependent effects by exposure type and risk level, as well as by the use of zinc and ascorbic acid. d) The design of future clinical trials to test the hypotheses generated by this study.

METHODS: Should granularity of data (by age, time-lag, level and type of exposure) be greater than that originally reported, Fisher Exact test will be used to compare the incidence of COVID-19 in HCQ- and control groups, for each sub-group stratification. Since the degree of loss of data granularity due to de-identification is yet unknown, exploratory analyses involving other demographic characteristics cannot be planned. Where sufficient data granularity exists, univariate regression analyses will be conducted to examine the effect of age- and time lag on any effect of HCQ. The possibility will be explored of conducting multivariate Cox regression analyses with propensity score matching to examine observational data relating to the use of zinc and ascorbic acid.

This analysis will be expanded should a dataset from a similarly designed study (Mitja et al., 2020, NCT04304053), with directionally similar results, become available. This protocol was devised using the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) incorporating the WHO Trial Registration Data Set.

Study Status:

Protocol version 1.1 (August 19 2020)
Protocol registered at: OSF Registries August 19 2020
Registration doi: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/9RPYT

SYNECHION, INC.
18208 PRESTON ROAD, SUITE D9-PMB 405, DALLAS, TX, 75252
TELEPHONE: (972) 931 5596 | 469 939 5596 CELL
INTERNET: WWW.SYNECHION.COM
EMAIL: SYNECHION@AOL.COM

Version 1.1 8/19/20

1 STUDY INFORMATION

1.1 Title

Scientific and public title: Preventing disease after exposure to COVID-19 using hydroxychloroquine: exploratory re-analysis of age and time-nuanced effects.

1.2 Authors

Responsible for protocol and analysis
David M. Wiseman PhD, MRPharmS, Synechion, Inc., Dallas, TX.

Responsible for review of protocol, analysis
Mayur S Ramesh MD. Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, MI
Pierre Kory, MD. Advocate Aurora Critical Care Service, Aurora St. Luke's Medical Center, Milwaukee, WI
Dan Mazzucco, PhD. ZSX Medical, LLC, Philadelphia, PA. Adjunct Professor, Biomedical Engineering, Rowan University, NJ

No professional writers will be employed.

1.3 Description

BACKGROUND: A recently published randomized trial found a non-statistically significant reduction in Covid-19 of 17% when hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) was used for postexposure prophylaxis.[1] Based on practical considerations[2] rather than considerations of clinical meaningfulness, the study was powered detect reduction of development of COVID-19 by 50%. Since this was a "pragmatic" clinical trial, where effect sizes are typically smaller than under tightly controlled "explanatory" trial conditions,[3] and with greater heterogeneity, this may have been over-ambitious. Based on CDC (cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html, 8/12/20) likely underestimates of 130,828 COVID-19 cases among Health Care Workers (HCW) in the USA, a 17% reduction in COVID-19 would have translated to a reduction of about 22,240 cases. Since a similar figure of 17% was considered clinically meaningful for a reduction of mortality using dexamethasone in severe hospitalized cases of COVID-19,[4] a 17% reduction of COVID-19 in certain populations may impact modeling of COVID-19 trajectory and health resource estimates that drive decisions on lockdowns and social distancing.

Supplemental data not discussed in the main body of the published paper suggested greater reductions of COVID-19 in a number of sub-groups. There were reductions (36%) in younger (<35 years) and increases (110%) in older (> 50 years) subjects. This is consistent with the findings of an observational prophylaxis study involving mainly younger HCW in India.[5] Our preliminary analysis revealed a statistically significant negative correlation (slope -0.211, 95%CI -0.328—0.094, p=0.016, rho CI -1 to -0.42, confirmed independently[6]) between treatment lag and reduction of COVID-19, reaching 49% when given within one day after exposure (RR 0.51, CI 0.176-1.46, p=0.249). The early use of HCQ is supported by mathematical modeling that considers the peaking of the viral load in the pharyngeal cavity and the effect of the drug to kill infected cells by enhancing cell-mediated immunity.[7]

Figure 1: Post-Exposure Prophylaxis with HCQ: Time Lag and Age Dependency



There were also differences in development of COVID-19 by type of exposure (HCW vs. household; (OR 0.53, CI 0.299-0.94, p = 0.031) in the placebo group, with a small (8%) reduction in COVID-19 with HCQ in HCW, and a 31% reduction in the household group (RR 0.691, CI 0.398-1.2, p=0.24). The definitions of severity of exposure did not however discriminate between the numbers of exposures or durations longer than 10 minutes. Differences between the different exposure types may have been accounted for by a lower age in the HCW group and higher exposure risk in household contacts, who may have had less access to advanced PPE than HCW as well as to training on hygiene practices. Differences between exposure risk related to type of in hospital-assignment and household risk among UK HCW and likely use of PPE has been suggested to account for differences in rates of COVID-19 in a UK study.[8]

The study also included observational data relating to use of zinc and Vitamin C. There was a higher incidence of symptoms when Vitamin C was used, both without (20.8% vs 11.2%, p=0.014) and with (14.3 vs. 10.6%, p=0.33) HCQ. For zinc there was a similar relationship in the HCQ group, but not in the placebo group. Since details about timing, dose and reasons for self-medicating with these agents are unknown, these observational data confound the overall findings, as does the use of folate for the placebo. In silico analyses show that folate may interact with SARS-Cov-2. [9,10] In an observational study, blood folic acid levels were significantly lower in severe COVID-19 patients.[11] For some other viruses there may be an association between folate deficiency/ supplementation and disease severity/ amelioration/prevention - Zika[12]; HPV[13,14]; HIV[15].

Accordingly, the now publicly released raw dataset may reveal important clues to inform an age- and stage- nuanced approach to COVID-19 using hydroxychloroquine testable by prospective studies. Data from a second[16] similarly designed study, with directionally similar results may soon become available for similar analyses.

Further examination of these data may also provide insight into the various proposed mechanisms of HCQ. At early stages, consistent with incubation period estimates of 3-8 days[17], HCQ alone may be effective in pre-emption because it interferes with viral attachment and initial infectivity. Using zinc (or Vitamin C) may be futile, ineffective or counterproductive in otherwise healthy individuals with no zinc dysregulation. HCQ may be sufficient in young people, however once infection has occurred, HCQ's actions as an ionophore[18] may be more important, and require the presence of zinc for viral inhibition.[19]

OBJECTIVES: To conduct more detailed analysis of the raw dataset relating the use of HCQ for post-exposure prophylaxis of COVID-19 with view to further defining:

a) The time dependent effect of HCQ, on post exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19.
b) The age dependent effect of HCQ, on post exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19.
c) The sub-stratification of time- and age-dependent effects by exposure type and risk level, as well as by the use of zinc and ascorbic acid.
d) The design of future clinical trials designed to test the hypotheses generated by this study.

METHODS: A *post hoc* exploratory re-analysis will be conducted of a dataset obtained from a randomized, controlled studies on the use of hydroxychloroquine to prevent COVID-19 after exposure, This analysis will be expanded should a dataset from a second similar study become available.

The re-analysis will explore apparent exposure risk, age and time-nuanced effects of HCQ with three main hypotheses:

a) That HCQ exerts a negative age-dependent effect in reducing COVID-19 when given prophylactically after exposure.
b) The HCQ exerts a negative time-dependent effect in reducing COVID-19 when given prophylactically after exposure.
c) That any age- and time-dependent effects of HCQ will be further dependent on type and risk level of exposure and the use of zinc or ascorbic acid.

This protocol was devised using the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) [20,21] incorporating the WHO Trial Registration Data Set[22] which it references.

1.4 Hypotheses

a) That HCQ exerts a negative age-dependent effect in reducing COVID-19 when given prophylactically after exposure.
b) The HCQ exerts a negative time-dependent effect in reducing COVID-19 when given prophylactically after exposure.
c) That any age- and time-dependent effects of HCQ will be further dependent on type and risk level of exposure and the use of zinc or ascorbic acid.

2 DESIGN PLAN

2.1 Study type

This study is a *post hoc* exploratory analysis of a dataset obtained from an original study[1] that was a randomized, controlled, blinded clinical trial with a pragmatic design with participants from the USA and Canada. Part of the data related to the use of zinc and ascorbic acid which were observational in nature. Data from a similarly designed but open-label, cluster randomized study[16] conducted in Spain, if available, will be subjected to similar analyses.

2.2 Blinding

The original study[1] was a double-blinded placebo-controlled study. The second study[16] was an open-label, cluster-randomized trial.

2.3 Is there any additional blinding in this study?

Details of blinding, implementation of allocation, enrollment, assignment of interventions and unblinding may be found in the publicly-released documentation for the original studies. No further blinding will be employed for the purposes of this exploratory re-analysis.

2.4 Study design

The original stud(y/ies) were interventional studies that used COVID-19 related endpoints to compare the performance of two groups - HCQ treatment vs. or placebo-[1] or no-[16] treatment. The current protocol will further stratify data by age-, treatment-lag, exposure type and risk level and zinc and ascorbic acid use.

2.5 Randomization

Details of randomization are found in the publicly-released documentation for the original studies. No further randomization will be employed for the purposes of this exploratory re-analysis. Zinc and ascorbic acid were used in one study,[1] but this use was not part of the protocol and was uncontrolled. Accordingly, data concerning zinc and ascorbic acid is considered as retrospective and observational.

3 SAMPLING PLAN

3.1 Existing data

The two studies have been published and examined along with their supplementary summary statistics released at the time of publication.[1 16] The raw dataset for the first[1] of these has been released and has been transmitted in email form to us by the original authors, but this has not yet been accessed. The raw dataset for the second study[16] has not been released. Accordingly, this protocol is being registered prior to accessing the data: As of the date of submission, the data exist, but have not been accessed by the sponsor or principal investigator.

3.2 Explanation of existing data

Once this protocol has been registered, the raw dataset will be downloaded and inspected. Other than the analyses already published by the original authors, further data patterns are unknown. Moreover, since there are a number of methods that may be used to de-identify data[23] and the level of data granularity is unknown, the type of analyses possible cannot yet be determined.

3.3 Data collection procedures

Details of data collection procedures including inclusion and exclusion criteria are found in the publicly-released documentation for the original studies. No further data collection will be employed for the purposes of this exploratory re-analysis.

3.4 Sample size

Details of sample size are found in the publicly-released documentation for the original studies. The first study[1] had 414 and 407 subjects in the HCQ-treated and placebo arms respectively. The second study[16] had 1116 and 1198 subjects in the HCQ and no-treatment arms respectively.

3.5 Sample size rationale

Sample size rationales are provided in the original studies. This exploratory study will examine smaller subgroups and without control over their size. The statistical challenges of performing sub-group analyses are well-known.[24,25]

3.6 Stopping rule

Not applicable

4 VARIABLES

4.1 Manipulated variables

The manipulated variable (treatment arm) employed in the original studies is:

Treatment for post-exposure prophylaxis of COVID-19 with levels as:

- Treatment with HCQ
- No (or placebo) treatment

Data will be stratified and sub- stratified by:

- Subject age
- Time between exposure to COVID-19 and treatment
- Type of exposure (household vs. health worker contact)
- Level of exposure risk
- Treatment with zinc or ascorbic acid

4.2 Measured variables

The primary outcomes defined in the original studies were:

- Presence of COVID-19, based on symptom-based criteria with expert review.[1]
- Presence of PCR-confirmed, symptomatic Covid-19[16]

Secondary endpoints were:

- Prevention of transmission of COVID-19[16]

4.3 Indices

The presence of symptom- or test- based COVID-19 will be expressed a percentage of the number of subjects for each subgroup and Odds or Risk Ratios computed with 95% confidence intervals. Risk ratios may also be expressed as its complement, the reduction of risk.

5 ANALYSIS PLAN

5.1 Statistical models

Fisher's Exact test will be used to compare the incidence of COVID-19 in HCQ- and control groups, for each sub-group stratification described above. Since it is as yet unknown how the raw data have been de-identified[23] and the level of data granularity is unknown, other possible analyses cannot yet be determined. Where sufficient data granularity exists, univariate regression analyses will be conducted to examine the effect of age- and time lag on any effect of HCQ. The possibility will be explored of conducting multivariate Cox regression analyses with propensity score matching to examine observational data relating to the use of zinc and ascorbic acid. See also comments received after version 1.0 of this protocol was registered from Dr. Boulware (section 5.6).

Should the dataset become available for the second study, it may be possible to aggregate data with those from the first study. As this is an exploratory analysis, no adjustment will be made for the clustering used in the second study.

5.2 Transformations

Since it is as yet unknown how the raw data have been de-identified[23] and the level of data granularity is unknown, other possible analyses and the need for data transformation cannot yet be determined.

5.3 Inference criteria

Since all analyses performed in this protocol are exploratory in nature, p- values from two-tailed tests will be reported if $\leq$ 0.1 without adjustment for multiple comparisons.[25]

5.4 Data exclusion

The ability to conduct the planned analyses will depend on the methods used to de-identify data and the level of granularity present in the raw data set: For example:

- Subject age: age in years vs. age in year categories (e.g. 18-35)
- Time lag between exposure and treatment: days/hours vs. time categories (<1 day, 2, days, <3 days etc.)
- Exposure level – distance and time vs. exposure categories (> 10 minutes)

Data that are no more granular than is provided in the published studies will not be eligible for further analysis.

5.5 Missing data

As per the original studies, missing or incomplete data will not be included in the analyses. As this protocol is exploratory in nature, sensitivity analyses will not be conducted.

5.6 Exploratory analysis

Since it is as yet unknown how the raw data have been de-identified[23] and the level of data granularity is unknown, further exploratory analyses cannot yet be determined. However, the relationships between the primary outcomes and demographic variables, as well as exposure type and level will be explored.

Subsequent to the registration (https://osf.io/4akug) of version 1.0 of this protocol, we received the following unsolicited but welcome suggestions from Dr. Boulware, the principal author of the first[1] of the studies considered in this protocol.

a. *"Along with doing the incorrect Watanabe linear regression analysis, consider doing the actual proper analysis for categorical data, which would be a logistic regression model with an interaction term for treatment group * exposure time group."*
   Response: The ability to conduct this type of analysis will depend on the level of data granularity which is as of this protocol version (1.1) unknown to us.

b. *"Look at the actual percentages by each of the subgroup days of exposure. There are some minor variation in the event rate between 12.7% to 17.9% between days in the placebo. As these are small subgroups, this creates artifact when looking at the difference. Consider, pooling the placebo event rate across the Day 1-4 exposure groups. If you can say why the Day 2 placebo group incidence rate would be higher than Day 1 or 3 or 4, sure keep it as is. If you pool the placebo together, the nice perfectly linear line is much less linear. For example, the day 2-3 HCQ incidence is 12% vs 12.2%, respectively. The placebo day 2-3 incidence is 16.9% vs. 14.5%, respectively. If you want to say day 2 works great but not day 3, that's a bit of a stretch. Yes, the difference is 4.9% vs 2.3% -- but this is an over-interpretation of the subgroup analysis – when the incidence of disease at day 2 and 3 is virtually the same with HCQ."*
Response: The suggestion to pool the placebo data may be reasonable as there really should not be any difference by time and all we are seeing there is noise. However, there is still the possibility that folate has some activity [see 1.3], in which case pooling may not be appropriate.

6 OTHER

6.1 Trial identifiers and Registration

This protocol has been registered with the Open Science Framework (OSF, Center for Open Science).
This study has the internal identifier of SYN2001SYN.

6.2 Protocol Version and Revision History

Version	Date	Registration	DOI/ file	Changes from previous
1.0	8/13/20	OSF osf.io/hyp8k	doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/4AKUG https://osf.io/fgd53/	
1.1				• Registration details for v1.0 • Co-authors (MR, PK, DM) added (1.2) • Minor typos and grammatical errors • Suggestions from Dr. Boulware (5.6)

6.3 Sponsor and Contact Information

Contact for public and scientific queries:

Principal Investigator: Dr. David Wiseman
Synechion, Inc., 18208 Preston Road, Suite D9-405, Dallas, 75252
synechion@aol.com 972 931 5596

There are no secondary sponsors

6.4 Study Schedule

The original studies have been completed and their data published.[1,16]

6.5 Funding, role of sponsor and funders, declaration of interests

There is no external support for this study. The sponsor is entirely responsible for the design and conduct of this study. The sponsor and principal investigator have no financial or other conflicts of interest in the subject matter of this protocol.

6.6 Ethics, Consent and Confidentiality

Analyses will be performed on a de-identified, publicly released dataset obtained from studies conducted under ethics committee supervision. No further Ethics Committee, IRB approval, informed consent or confidentiality provisions are required.

6.7 Roles of committees

Not applicable

6.8 Harms, ancillary and post-trial-care

Not applicable

6.9 Data management and access

No data entry is required. Microsoft Excel will be used for primary data manipulation. Vassar Stats (vassarstats.net/) will be used for confirmation of calculations. A study report will be complied and submitted for publication. Microsoft Excel files will be made available on request.to other investigators.

6.10 Summary Results

Data will be summarized as part of the study publication.

6.11 Appendix

Consent materials: Not applicable
Biological specimens: Not applicable

6.12 SPIRIT CHECKLIST of PROTOCOL ITEMS

The checklist for the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) [20,21] was used to construct this protocol. As the SPIRIT checklist references (Item 2b) the WHO Trial Registration Data Set[22], a cross reference is provided below for the 24-item WHO Data Set. Where there is no corresponding SPIRIT item, it is listed under SPIRIT Item 2b. Section numbers for the required item are indicated. Non-applicable items are marked “NA.”

SPIRIT

STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Addressed on page number
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	1.1
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	6.11.1
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	6.1, 6.4, 6.10
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	6.2
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	6.5
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	1.2
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	6.3
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	6.5
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	6.7, NA
Introduction			
Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	1.3
	6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	1.3
Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	1.4
Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	2.1
Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes			

Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	**Error! Reference source not found.**2.1
Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	3.3
Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	2.4, 4
	11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	3.6, NA
	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	3.3
	11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	2.4, NA
Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	4.2
Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	6.4, NA
Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	3.4
Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	3.3, NA
Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)			
Allocation:			
Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enroll participants or assign interventions	2.5
Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	2.3
Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enroll participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	2.3, NA
Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	2.2, NA

	17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	2.3, NA
Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis			
Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	3.3, NA
	18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	3.3, NA
Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	**Error! Reference source not found.**6.9
Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	4.3, 5.1, 5.2
	20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.6
	20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	5.4,5.5
Methods: Monitoring			
Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed	**Error! Reference source not found.**6.7, NA
	21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	3.6, NA
Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	**Error! Reference source not found.**6.8, NA
Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	6.7, NA
Ethics and dissemination			
Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	6.6

Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	6.2
Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	6.6, NA
	26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	6.6, NA
Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	6.6, NA
Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	6.66.5
Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	6.9
Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	6.8 NA
Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions.	6.9
	31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	1.2
	31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code.	6.9
Appendices			
Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	6.11, NA
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	6.11, NA

*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported" license.

Cross Reference of SPIRIT Checklist and WHO Data Set

SPIRIT ITEM	WHO Item	WHO Description
1	10	Scientific Title
1	9	Public Title
1	12	Health Condition(s) or Problem(s) Studied
2a	3	Secondary Identifying Numbers
2a	1	Primary Registry and Trial Identifying Number
2b (additional items)	2	Date of Registration in Primary Registry
2b	18	Recruitment Status
2b	23	Summary Results
4	4	Funding
4	5	Secondary Sponsor(s)
5b	5	Sponsor
5b	6	Contact for Public Queries
5b	7	Contact for Scientific Queries
5b	8	Contact information
8	15	Description
9	11	Setting, counties
10	14	Eligibility
11a	13	Interventions
12	19	Primary Outcomes
12	20	Secondary Outcomes
13	16	Date of First Enrollment
13	22	Completion date
14	17	Sample Size
24	21	Ethics review
31c	24	IPD sharing statement

6.13 References

1. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub 2020 June 4 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2016638
2. Okafor EC, Pastick KA, Rajasingham R. Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. Reply. N Engl J Med 2020; 383. Epub http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2023617
3. Shortreed SM, Rutter CM, Cook AJ, Simon GE. Improving pragmatic clinical trial design using real-world data. Clinical trials (London, England) 2019; 16:273-82. Epub 2019/03/15 http://doi.org/10.1177/1740774519833679
4. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 - Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub 2020/07/18 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436
5. Bhattacharya R, Chowdhury S, Mukherjee R, et al. Pre exposure Hydroxychloroquine use is associated with reduced COVID19 risk in healthcare workers. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.09.20116806. Epub http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20116806
6. Watanabe M. Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine as Prophylaxis for Covid-19. Arxiv 2020:09477. Epub Jul 18
7. Tarek M, Savarino A. Pharmacokinetic Basis of the Hydroxychloroquine Response in COVID-19: Implications for Therapy and Prevention. European journal of drug metabolism and pharmacokinetics 2020:1-9. Epub 2020/08/12 http://doi.org/10.1007/s13318-020-00640-6
8. Eyre DW, Lumley SF, Donnell D, et al. Differential occupational risks to healthcare workers from SARS-CoV-2: A prospective observational study. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.24.20135038. Epub http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.24.20135038

9. Serseg T, Benarous K, Yousfi M. Hispidin and Lepidine E: two Natural Compounds and Folic acid as Potential Inhibitors of 2019-novel coronavirus Main Protease (2019-nCoVMpro), molecular docking and SAR study. Current computer-aided drug design 2020 Apr 24. Epub Apr 24 http://doi.org/10.2174/1573409916666200422075440
10. Micholas S, Jeremy C. S. Repurposing Therapeutics for COVID-19: Supercomputer-Based Docking to the SARS-CoV-2 Viral Spike Protein and Viral Spike Protein-Human ACE2 Interface. ChemRxiv 2020; 2020:11871402. Epub http://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv.11871402.v3
11. Itelman E, Wasserstrum Y, Segev A, et al. Clinical Characterization of 162 COVID-19 patients in Israel: Preliminary Report from a Large Tertiary Center. Isr Med Assoc J 2020; 22:271-4. Epub 2020/05/08
12. Simanjuntak Y, Ko HY, Lee YL, Yu GY, Lin YL. Preventive effects of folic acid on Zika virus-associated poor pregnancy outcomes in immunocompromised mice. PLoS Pathog 2020; 16:e1008521. Epub 2020/05/12 http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1008521
13. Yang J, Yang A, Wang Z, et al. Interactions between serum folate and human papillomavirus with cervical intraepithelial neoplasia risk in a Chinese population-based study. Am J Clin Nutr 2018; 108:1034-42. Epub 2018/09/25 http://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqy160
14. Xiao S, Tang YS, Kusumanchi P, et al. Folate Deficiency Facilitates Genomic Integration of Human Papillomavirus Type 16 DNA In Vivo in a Novel Mouse Model for Rapid Oncogenic Transformation of Human Keratinocytes. J Nutr 2018; 148:389-400. Epub 2018/03/17 http://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxx060
15. Fletcher H, Figueroa P, Brathwaite A, Hylton-Kong T. Poverty, folate deficiency, human immunodeficiency virus and ulcerated vulval sexually transmitted diseases in Jamaica. The West Indian medical journal 2011; 60:137-40. Epub Sep 29
16. Mitja O, Ubals M, Corbacho M, et al. A Cluster-Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Prevention of Covid-19 Transmission and Disease. medRxiv 2020:2020.07.20.20157651. Epub http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.20.20157651
17. Ejima K, Kim KS, Ludema C, et al. Estimation of the incubation period of COVID-19 using viral load data. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.16.20132985. Epub http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132985
18. Xue J, Moyer A, Peng B, et al. Chloroquine is a zinc ionophore. PLoS One 2014; 9:e109180. Epub 2014/10/02 http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0109180
19. Carlucci P, Ahuja T, Petrilli CM, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin plus zinc vs hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin alone: outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. medRxiv 2020:2020.05.02.20080036. Epub http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.02.20080036
20. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, et al. SPIRIT 2013 statement: defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern Med 2013; 158:200-7. Epub 2013/01/09 http://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583
21. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gotzsche PC, et al. SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. BMJ 2013; 346:e7586. Epub 2013/01/11 http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e7586
22. World Health Organization. WHO Trial Registration Data Set (Version 1.3.1). (Accessed August 4, 2020, at https://www.who.int/ictrp/network/trds/en/.)
23. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. Guidance Regarding Methods for De-identification of Protected Health Information in Accordance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rule 2012 Nov 26. (Accessed August 10, 2020, at https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ocr/privacy/hipaa/understanding/coveredentities/De-identification/hhs_deid_guidance.pdf.)
24. Wang R, Lagakos SW, Ware JH, Hunter DJ, Drazen JM. Statistics in medicine--reporting of subgroup analyses in clinical trials. N Engl J Med 2007; 357:2189-94. Epub 2007/11/23 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr077003
25. Lagakos SW. The challenge of subgroup analyses--reporting without distorting. N Engl J Med 2006; 354:1667-9. Epub 2006/04/21 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp068070