medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TITLE PAGE

Title:
Beneficial and Harmful Outcomes of Tocilizumab in Severe COVID-19:
A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Running title:
Meta-analysis of Tocilizumab in COVID-19

Author list:
Manuel Rubio-Rivas [a,*], Jose María Mora-Luján [a], Abelardo Montero [a], Narcís A. Homs [a], Jordi Rello [b,c,d], Xavier Corbella [a,d]

Affiliations:

[a] Department of Internal Medicine, Bellvitge University Hospital, Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute-IDIBELL, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
[b] Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red (CIBERES), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain
[c] CRIPS, Vall d'Hebrón Institute of Research, Barcelona, Spain.
[d] School of Medicine, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.

***Corresponding author:** Dr Manuel Rubio-Rivas, Internal Medicine Department, Bellvitge University Hospital, 08907 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain.

E-mail addresses: mrubio@bellvitgehospital.cat (M. Rubio-Rivas), jmora@bellvitgehospital.cat (J.M. Mora-Luján), asaez@bellvitgehospital.cat (A. Montero), nhoms@bellvitgehospital.cat (N.A. Homs), jrello@crips.es (J. Rello), xcorbella@bellvitgehospital.cat (X. Corbella)

J. Rello and X. Corbella contributed equally as last authors

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

SUMMARY

Background: Pending for randomized control trials, the use of tocilizumab (TCZ) in COVID-19 is based on observational studies and remains controversial.

Purpose: To summarize evidence about the effect of TCZ to treat severe COVID-19.

Data sources: PubMed (via MEDLINE), Scopus, and medRxiv repository databases from 1 January to 21 August 2020.

Study Selection: Observational studies in any language reporting efficacy and safety outcomes of TCZ use in hospitalized adults with COVID-19.

Data Extraction: Independent, dually performed data extraction and quality assessments.

Data synthesis: Of 57 eligible studies, 27 were controlled and 30 were not. The overall included patients were 8,128: 4,021 treated with TCZ, in addition to standard of care (SOC), and 4,107 only receiving SOC. The pooled mortality was lower in the TCZ-group vs. the control group, with a relative risk (RR) of 0.73 (95%CI 0.57-0.93; p=0.010). The overall NNT to avoid one death was 20. In hospital wards, patients in the TCZ-group were transferred to intensive care unit (ICU) in a higher proportion than those in the control group; however, ICU mortality of the TCZ-group was lower than in the control group. Secondary infections occurred in a higher proportion in TCZ-treated patients. Among survivors, the length of stay was similar in both groups.

Limitations: Conclusions should be considered as weak evidence since they are based on observational studies, most of them retrospective. A variety of factors influencing the indication and effect of TCZ could not be evaluated in-depth.

Conclusions: TCZ seems beneficial in preventing in-hospital mortality in severe, non-critically ill COVID-19 patients. Conversely, patients receiving TCZ appear to be at higher risk for secondary infections, especially those admitted to ICU.

Funding source: No funding or sponsorship was received for this study or publication of this article.

The protocol was published in the National Institute for Health Research international register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO); registration number CRD42020204934.

Keywords: Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Tocilizumab, Meta-analysis

Abstract Word count: 272
Text Word count: 3807

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Since early 2020, when the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic hit the world, a variety of treatments have been suggested as potentially useful for COVID-19 (1-5). However, to date, only remdesivir (4) and dexamethasone (5) have demonstrated evidence-based efficacy on randomized, controlled clinical trials (RCTs). This double strategy combining antiviral and immunomodulatory therapy is in accordance with the two different pathological mechanisms that appear to coexist in the COVID-19 disease; the first triggered by the virus itself and the second by the cytokine storm and systemic dysregulated host-immune hyperinflammatory response (6).

While the pandemic continues to spread globally, a worrying 15% of patients will continue to transit into the most severe stage of the disease, requiring hospitalization or intensive care unit (ICU) admission. This advanced clinical stage presents as severe pulmonary injury and multi-organ failure, causing fatality in nearly half of cases, resembling complications from CAR T cell therapy (7).

Among other pro-inflammatory cytokines, IL-6 plays a part in innate immunity, but excessive production by the host facing SARS-CoV-2 is detrimental (8-10). Accordingly, the use of immunomodulatory agents such as tocilizumab (TCZ), a monoclonal antibody to the recombinant human IL-6 receptor, was initially reported as successful among 21 patients in China in February 2020 (11). Since then, an emerging number of observational studies from America and Europe have been published or registered assessing the effect of TCZ on clinical practice in severe COVID-19 (12-67). In most of them, the authors report an association between earlier use of TCZ and reduced mortality; however, interpretation of these results is limited because several of them did not describe a comparison group or specify an a priori comparison.

Conversely, in view of preliminary results from the industry-sponsored Phase 3 COVACTA trial (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier NCT04320615), the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel by the National Institute of Health, has taken a position against the use of TCZ in COVID-19 (68). This randomized clinical trial (RCT) is the first global, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial investigating TCZ in hospitalised patients with severe COVID-19, but it failed to improve clinical status, as primary endpoint, or several key secondary outcomes such as 4-week mortality (69).

In the current emergency, while waiting for additional data from ongoing RCTs, most institutions and physicians worldwide are still tackling COVID-19 based only on real-world reported data. Our study aimed to summarize the updated results from available observational studies on the effect of TCZ on clinical outcomes in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

METHODS

This report describes the results of a systematic review and meta-analysis following the guidance of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement (70). The protocol was published in the National Institute for Health Research international register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO); registration number CRD42020204934. A clinical question under the PICO framework format (Population-Intervention-Comparison-Outcome) was created (Appendix Table 1).

Data Sources and Searches

The search strategy was developed by three investigators (M.R-R., J.R., X.C.), which was revised and approved by the other investigators (J.M.M-L., A.M, N.A.H.). We searched the following databases from 1 January to 21 August 2020 (date of the last search): MEDLINE database through the PubMed search engine, Scopus, and the medRxiv repository (www.medrxiv.org), using the terms "COVID-19" [MesH]) AND "Tocilizumab" [MesH].

Study Selection

Full-text observational studies in any language reporting beneficial or harmful outcomes from the use of TCZ in adults hospitalized with COVID-19 were included. Two investigators (M.R-R., J.M.M-L.) independently screened each record title and abstract for potential inclusion. Restriction of publication type was manually applied: secondary analyses of previously reported trials, protocols, abstracts-only and experimental studies were excluded. Potentially relevant articles were retrieved for full-text review. Two investigators (M.R-R., A.M.) then read the full text of the records the abstracts of which had been selected by at least 1 investigator. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion or by a third investigator (X.C.).

Publications were included if they met all the following criteria: 1) the study reported data on adults with COVID-19, diagnosed by polymerase chain reaction (PCR), admitted hospital-wide or in ICUs; 2) the study design was an observational investigation providing real-world original data on TCZ use in COVID-19, either intravenous or subcutaneous, at recommended doses of 400-800 mg or 162-324 mg, respectively; 3) the study data collection finished after 1 January 2020; and 4) the study provided data related to all-cause in-hospital mortality as pre-specified primary clinical outcome.

Those studies reported to be "case-control studies", in which subjects from the control group also presented COVID-19, just as those from the TCZ group, were also included in the present review. Studies focusing on a sole subgroup of patients (e.g. renal transplant recipients) were excluded. Furthermore, those studies with overlapping data (e.g. the same series reported in different studies) were rejected to avoid bias due to data overexpression. In such cases, the latest and largest study was selected. For this purpose, a careful revision was performed of patients' origins included in studies from the same country. The search was completed by the bibliography review of every paper selected for full-text examination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two investigators (M.R-R., J.M.M-L.) independently abstracted the following details: study characteristics, including setting; intervention or exposure characteristics, including medication dose and duration; patient characteristics, including severity of disease; and outcomes, including mortality, admission to ICU, adverse events such as secondary infections, and length of hospital stay. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion in consultation with a third investigator (X.C.).

Quality assessment was performed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for observational studies (71). Risk of bias was assessed for each included study independently by two investigators (M.R-R., N.A.H). This assessment was based on the Cochrane Handbook of SR of interventions (72), and using the Cochrane Review Manager 5.3 risk of bias tool which takes account of allocation sequence generation, incomplete outcome reporting, concealment of allocation, masking of participants and investigators, selective outcome reporting or other sources of bias. Each potential source of bias was graded to determine whether studies were considered at high, low, or moderate risk of bias. In case of disagreement, a third author (J.R.) independently determined the quality assessments.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Categorical variables were described as absolute numbers and percentages. When the number of events and sample size was small (and followed a Poisson distribution), confidence intervals were estimated using Wilson's method (73-75). We carried out meta-analysis of the pooled mortality ratio by including all included studies in the analysis. Those studies with a control group were also meta-analysed to assess the relative risk (RR) of mortality in TCZ-treated patients vs. those non-TCZ treated (RR of 1).

The inverse variance-weighted method was initially performed using a fixed-effects model. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the Q statistic. The percentage of variability between studies by the Higgins I^2 parameter and between-study variability was measured by Tau^2 parameter and, when confirmed ($p \leq 0.05$), the analysis was completed by using the random-effects model. A random-effects model assumes that there is an underlying effect for each study which varies randomly across studies, with the resulting overall effect an average of these (76). Studies with 0 events were not included in the meta-analysis. Forest plots were depicted accordingly. Publication bias was assessed using the Egger method (77). Statistical analysis was performed by IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Funding Source

No funding or sponsorship was received for this study or publication of this article.

RESULTS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A total of 781 articles were identified in our search. Of these, 81 qualified for full-text review following title and abstract screening, of which 57 (11-67) were included in the analysis. The PRISMA flow diagram is detailed in Figure 1. The risk of bias of all the studies included is shown in Figure 2.

Study characteristics

The majority of included studies were carried out in different hospitals in high-income countries in America and Europe, such as the US (13, 18, 22, 28, 31, 34, 35, 48, 49, 53-60, 66), Italy (14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 41, 44-47, 50, 51, 63, 65), Spain (21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 39, 40, 42, 43), and France (25, 29, 30, 61, 62, 64). A lesser number were conducted in China (11, 12). The distribution of the studies worldwide is shown in Appendix Figure 1.

Of the studies carried out in Spain, the study by Rodríguez-Baño et al. (40) partially overlaps with others since it is a multicentre study on a national level. For this reason, we did not include it in the sub-analyses when the other Spanish studies were also included. Of the two studies by Quartuccio et al. (14, 41), we have included the second and more extensive one. Of the six French studies, those by Lohse et al., Conrozier et al., and Klopfenstein et al. (29, 30, 64) belong to the same cohort. Only the most extensive one by Conrozier et al. (30) were included for the crude mortality meta-analysis and the one by Klopfenstein et al. (64) for the RR meta-analysis, as this is the only study providing data on a control group too.

Search results

Of the total of 57 studies included, 12 were prospective and 45, retrospective. In 30 of these cohort investigations, a control group was not described (10-38) and 27 added a comparison group (40-67). The overall results provided data from 8,128 hospitalized patients with COVID-19: 4,021 TCZ-treated, in addition to standard of care (SOC) (including 711 patients admitted to ICU), and 4,107 only receiving SOC (including 694 patients admitted to ICU). A comparison between the TCZ-group and the control group is detailed in Appendix Tables 2-7. Of the TCZ group, 2,645 (65.8%) were men with a mean age of 61.8 (SD 6.1) and median age 62.6 [range 59-65], according to the data provided. TCZ was given as a single dose in 2,030/2,952 patients (68.8%), and in 922 (31.2%), as two or more doses.

Concomitantly to TCZ use, additional treatment with steroids was given in 1,560/3,073 patients in the TCZ-group (50.8%) vs. 592/2,733 (21.7%) in the control group ($p<0.001$). Comparing both groups, remdesivir was used in 37/3,511 (1.05%) vs. 23/3,945 (0.58%) ($p=0.023$) patients. Finally, administration of TCZ was prescribed a median of 10 days [range 9-11] after the onset of COVID-19 symptoms, in those studies in which this data was provided. Median follow-up of the overall cohort was 10.3 days [range 12-19].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mortality

Hospital-wide (including ICUs) pooled mortality of patients with COVID-19 treated with TCZ was 19.2% (95%CI 16.4-22.5) (I^2=83.6 Q=305.3 tau^2=0.23 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.354 p<0.001 (Figure 3). In the control group, overall mortality was 27.4% (95%CI 21.1-35.6%) (I^2=95.9 Q=569.1 tau^2=0.38 p<0.001). These differences between the TCZ-group and the control group achieved statistical significance (p<0.001). The RR of mortality in the TCZ-group was 0.73 (95%CI 0.57-0.93; p=0.010) (I^2=77.7 Q=107.4 tau^2=0.24 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-0.712 p=0.380 (Figure 4). The NNT to avoid one death was 20.

Overall Mortality in high-quality observational studies. More restrictive analysis excluding studies with <20 included patients, NOS <7 and studies with important risk of bias, showed pooled mortality in the TCZ-group to be 18.9% (95%CI 15.8-22.7) (I^2=84.9 Q=238 tau^2=0.225 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.687 p<0.001. The RR of death in the TCZ-group vs. the control group was 0.58 (95%CI 0.40-0.85) (I^2=79.7 Q=108.3 tau^2=0.60 p=0.004). Egger's method A=-1.511 p=0.153.

Overall Mortality in hospital wards. The pooled mortality of COVID-19 patients receiving TCZ in conventional wards was 17% (95%CI 13.9-20.8) (I2=58.5 Q=50.6 tau2=0.108 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-2.082 p<0.001. In contrast, mortality in the control group after being admitted for COVID-19 in conventional wards was 23.8% (95%CI 14.8-38.4) (I2=90.3 Q=51.8 tau2=0.314 p<0.001). Egger's method A=5.433 p=0.044. These differences did not achieve statistical significance (p=0.261). The RR of mortality in hospital wards in the TCZ-group vs. the control group was 0.64 (95%CI 0.26-1.54; p=0.314) (I2=80.8 Q=26 tau2=0.91 p=0.314). Egger's method A=-3.576 p=0.005.

Overall Mortality in ICUs. The pooled mortality of COVID-19 patients receiving TCZ once admitted to ICU was 31.7% (95%CI 24.7-40.8) (I2=82.6 Q=97.6 tau2=0.185 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-2.995 p<0.001. When compared, mortality of ICU control group patients was 39.1% (95%CI 29.1-52-4) (I2=91.6 Q=59.4 tau2=0.101 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-1.766 p=0.290. These differences achieved statistical significance (p<0.001). The RR for mortality in those ICU patients receiving TCZ vs. SOC was 0.78 (95%CI 0.44-1.35; p=0.369) (I2=65.4 Q=14.4 tau2=0.29 p=0.639). Egger's method A=0.693 p=0.727. The NNT at ICU to avoid one death was 9.

Mortality in the TCZ-group receiving additional corticosteroids. In those studies in which low average (<10%) of TCZ-treated patients received concomitant corticosteroids as part of SOC, TCZ-treated patients showed an overall mortality of 12.3% (95%CI 7.1-21). (I^2=90.4 Q=114.6 tau^2=0.727 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.717 p=0.021. Those studies in which medium average (10-50%) of concomitant corticosteroids were given in addition to TCZ, overall mortality in TCZ-treated patients was 19.1% (95%CI 13.4-27.2). (I^2=79.5 Q=53.6 tau^2=0.270 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.095 p=0.013. Finally, those TCZ-treated patients receiving additional high average (>50%) of concomitant corticosteroids showed an overall mortality of 21.2% (95%CI 17-26.6). (I^2=81.4 Q=96.8 tau^2=0.171 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.568 p<0.001. Pearson's correlation coefficient was 0.195 (p=0.211).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mortality in the TCZ-group receiving early vs. late TCZ administration. Hospital-wide (including ICUs) pooled mortality in TCZ-treated patients in whom TCZ was early administered (<10 days from symptoms onset) was 15.9% (95%CI 10.9-23) (I^2=74.9 Q=31.9 tau^2=0.222 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-2.306 p=0.239. Hospital-wide (including ICUs) pooled mortality in patients with COVID-19 illness in whom TCZ was administered later (≥10 days) was 23.3% (95%CI 17.9-30.3) (I^2=75.5 Q=36.8 tau^2=0.115 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-2.983 p=0.021. Differences between groups did not achieve statistical significance (p=0.252).

Risk of ICU admission

In patients with COVID-19 initially admitted to hospital wards, pooled ICU admission rate after TCZ administration was 17.1% (95%CI 11.5-25.5) (I^2=90 Q=149.5 tau^2=0.51 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.272 p=0.015. Conversely, the risk for ICU admission in the control group, initially admitted outside the ICUs, was 9.5% (95%CI 2.9-31.2) (I^2=96.2 Q=78.8 tau^2=1.37 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-1.315 p=0.886. These differences achieved statistical significance (p<0.001). Accordingly, in the subset of patients initially admitted outside the ICUs, those receiving TCZ showed a RR of ICU admission of 1.49 (95%CI 0.30-7.34; p=0.621) (I^2=93 Q=43 tau^2=2.35 p=0.62). Egger's method A=-4.026 p=0.435.

Safety

The pooled rate of reported secondary viral, bacterial or opportunistic fungal infections in those patients with COVID-19 treated with TCZ was 18.9% (95%CI 14.5-24.8) (I^2=88.1 Q=218.8 tau^2=0.391 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-3.852 p=0.001. In the control group, secondary infections were reported to occur in 14.2% (95%CI 9.5-21.3) (I^2=90.3 Q=113.3 tau^2=0.414 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-2.595 p=0.216. These differences achieved statistical significance (p<0.001). The RR of secondary infections in TCZ-treated vs. the control group was 1.47 (95%CI 0.99-2.19; p=0.058) (I^2=66.1 Q=38.3 tau^2=0.34 p=0.058). Egger's method A=0.039 p=0.977. In a subgroup analysis restricted to prospective studies, the TCZ-group showed secondary infectious complications in 18.5% (95%CI 9.9-34.8%) (I^2=93.8 Q=97 tau^2=0.611 p<0.001). Egger's method A=-5.435 p=0.085. In such prospective studies, the RR of secondary infection occurrence in the TCZ-group was 2.65 (95%CI 1.48-4.76; p=0.001).

Length of hospital stay

Among survivors, the length of hospital stay in the TCZ-group was a median of 15.3 days [range 12.4-19.4] vs. 14 days [range 9-20] in the control group. These differences were not statistically significant (p=0.953).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

Pending published evidence from RCTs, this systematic review and meta-analysis (SRMA) focused on available real-world observational studies, revealing a beneficial effect of TCZ use in preventing mortality in hospitalized adults with COVID-19. However, the present results also showed a higher relative risk for ICU admission and occurrence of secondary infections in such patients receiving TCZ.

To date, two existing SRMA have summarized current evidence on the beneficial and harmful effects of TCZ in COVID-19. The first by Lan SH Zhang et al., included 7 studies, with no conclusive evidence that TCZ would provide any additional benefit to patients with severe COVID-19 (78). The second, registered in the medRxiv repository by Boregowda et al., included 16 studies, concluding that the addition of TCZ to SOC might reduce mortality in COVID-19 patients requiring hospitalization (79).

The present SRMA updated and expanded the revision to 57 observational studies. As expected, most included studies emerged recently and were performed in hospitals from high-income European countries and the US. The finding that most of the included patients were men in their 6-8th decades of life was consistent with what has already been described in the general population requiring hospital admission due to COVID-19 (80). It is precisely this subgroup of elderly patients who have been identified to be at higher risk of transition to the most serious stage of COVID-19. This manifests by moderate-severe lung injury and systemic hyperinflammatory state.

Although no standard doses have specifically been established for TCZ to be used in COVID-19, a vast majority of included studies used a single dose of 400-800 mg iv or 162-324 mg sc, and a few of them, allowed a second or even a third dose in case of worsening. Interestingly, the present SRMA showed that TCZ was mainly prescribed as second step to treat those patients at risk of transition to a more severe condition, after showing poor response to antiviral agents. Accordingly, in a notable proportion of included studies, TCZ was indicated in combination with other different drugs, mostly corticosteroids. In this respect, in view of the RECOVERY trial (5) which reported significant benefit from the use of steroids in severe COVID-19, it is difficult to distinguish in depth the contribution of TCZ on the final outcomes in such included patients receiving TCZ and steroids. On the other hand, in addition to TCZ, a very small proportion (<1%) of included patients from more recently studies also received remdesivir, as a proven antiviral against SARS-Cov-2.

In addition to concomitant drugs, other relevant factors should be taken into account when considering the impact of TCZ use on clinical outcomes in COVID-19. At has been proposed, the disease displays three stages of increasing severity: stage I (incubation and early infection), stage II (pulmonary involvement), and stage III (systemic hyperinflammation and multi-organ dysfunction), which correspond to distinct clinical findings and outcomes (6). In this respect, in addition to the age and underlying comorbidities of included patients, one of the most important factors to be considered at clinical level is the severity of the clinical stage when indicating TCZ to treat the illness (80).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Unfortunately, the severity of included patients could not be accurately inferred from clinical, laboratory, or radiological parameters documented in the included studies of the present SRMA. Therefore, mortality was compared between those patients admitted to hospital wards and ICUs, in those studies in which the hospital site from where TCZ was administered was specified. Logically, patients in whom TCZ was indicated during ICU admission showed higher mortality in comparison to those treated in hospital wards. However, since the COVID-19 pandemic induced an unprecedented influx of patients into the ICUs, the particular emergency situation and resource availability of each hospital involved in the included studies most likely conditioned either the criteria when transferring patients from hospital wards to ICUs, or the ethical decisions related to the withdrawal of life support decisions.

Outside of RCTs, observational data from the included studies only reflected the clinical practice of physicians when indicating TCZ use. Consequently, the present results show that TCZ was mostly prescribed in those more seriously-ill patients presenting at a more advanced stage of COVID-19, with severe lung injury and systemic hyperinflammatory multi-organ failure. In this regard, it would be unfair to infer that the higher the use of TCZ and average of concomitant corticosteroids, the higher the risk of ICU admission or death. Therefore, further RCTs on TCZ use in COVID-19 should clarify the interaction of confounding variables, it being crucial to know which patients are the best candidates to eventually receive TCZ as immunomodulatory agent, as well as the beneficial and harmful effects of its use in the absence of or in combination with steroids.

Moreover, in the particular case of the ICU setting, most of the included studies showed insufficient data to appropriately assess the effects when TCZ was prescribed in critically-ill patients. However, since a majority of such seriously-ill patients with COVID-19 admitted to ICUs are submitted to mechanical ventilation and other multiple invasive procedures, and receive concomitant wide-spectrum antibiotics or steroid treatment, there is a great concern regarding the well-known risk of TCZ favoring the occurrence of life-threatening secondary bacterial, viral or fungal opportunistic infections, as it has also been documented in the present SRMA in up to one-fifth of cases in the TCZ-group (53,81,82).

As mentioned, the first and major limitation of this SRMA on TCZ use in COVID-19 is the lack of data from RCTs. In their absence, the present revision is based on observational studies; therefore, conclusions should be considered as founded on weak evidence. Moreover, a second limitation is the fact that most of the included studies were retrospective in nature. A third limitation is the heterogeneity regarding the study population (I2 index) and the potential risk of detected bias. Fourth, variations in criteria for prescribing TCZ may not be ruled out in the included studies, although most of them indicated TCZ use to treat those patients with severe COVID-19 with systemic hyperinflammatory state. Fifth, important factors influencing the effect of TCZ on clinical outcomes such as the baseline characteristics of the patients included, the average time from symptoms onset to TCZ administration, the clinical severity of the disease at the time of TCZ administration, the doses and the form of administration used, the hospital site from where TCZ was indicated, or the use of concomitant drug regimens could not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

be evaluated in-depth, since they were not uniformly provided by the included studies. Sixth, in the vast majority of included studies, there is a lack of subgroup analyses according to age, sex or underlying conditions, concomitant treatments, requirement of mechanical ventilation or ICU admission, and comparisons between ventilated and non-ventilated patients. Finally, there is a wide range in the median time of follow-up after TCZ administration, which hinders assessment of consistent improvement, late-onset adverse events and real in-hospital mortality in those patients with prolonged evolution. Thus, some patients considered "survivors" in some included studies may have ended up dying.

In conclusion, this systematic review and meta-analysis provides updated and extended data on the use of TCZ in COVID-19. Pending evidence from RCTs, this investigation was restricted to current available data from observational studies. The present results showed TCZ to be beneficial in reducing overall in-hospital mortality in adults with COVID-19, with a NNT to save one life of 20. These findings were more apparent in those non-critically-ill COVID-19 patients admitted to hospital wards, receiving TCZ at early stage of the hyperinflammatory response syndrome. By contrast, the TCZ-group appears to be at higher risk for secondary infections, especially in those critically-ill patients admitted to ICU. Notwithstanding these results, conclusions should be considered as weak evidence since they are based on observational studies, most of them retrospective. However, these findings may help physicians and researchers to optimize strategies towards precision medicine when designing further RCTs focused on the use of TCZ.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We dedicate this work to the memory of those patients worldwide who have not survived COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Azoulay E, de Waele J, Ferrer R, et al. International variation in the management of severe COVID-19 patients. Crit Care 2020;24(1):486. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-020-03194-w. Accessed 12 August 2020.
2. Gautret P, Cagier JC, Parola P, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020:105949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949. Accessed 25 March 2020.
3. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir-Ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 382:1787-99.
4. Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D, et al. Compassionate Use of Remdesivir for Patients with Severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:2327-36.
5. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. Preliminary report. N Engl J Med 2020. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436. Accessed 25 August 2020
6. Siddiqi HK, Mehra MR. COVID-19 illness in native and immunosuppressed states: A clinical-therapeutic staging proposal. J Heart Lung Transplant 2020;39(5):405-7.
7. Azoulay E, Darmon M, Valade S. Acute life-threatening toxicity from CAR T-cell therapy. Intensive Care Med 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-020-06193-1. Accessed 25 August 2020
8. Jamilloux Y, Henry T, Belot A, et al. Should we stimulate or suppress immune responses in COVID-19? Cytokine and anti-cytokine interventions. Autoimmun Rev 2020;19:102567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autrev.2020.102567. Accessed 25 August 2020
9. Aziz M, Fatima R, Assaly R. Elevated Interleukin-6 and Severe COVID-19: A Meta-Analysis. J Med Virol. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25948. Accessed 21 August 2020.
10. Zhang C, Wu Z, Li JW, et al. The cytokine release syndrome (CRS) of severe COVID-19 and Interleukin-6 receptor (IL-6R) antagonist Tocilizumab may be the key to reduce the mortality. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020;55:105954.
11. Xu X, Han M, Li T, et al. Effective treatment of severe COVID-19 patients with tocilizumab. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2020;117:10970-5.
12. Luo P, Liu Y, Qiu L, et al. Tocilizumab treatment in COVID-19: a single center experience. J Med Virol 2020;92:814-8.
13. Antony SJ, Davis MA, Davis MG, et al. Early use of tocilizumab in the prevention of adult respiratory failure in SARS - CoV - 2 infections and the utilization of interleukin - 6 levels in the management. IDCases. 2020; 21: e00888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idcr.2020.e00888. Accessed 25 August 2020
14. Quartuccio L, Sonaglia A, Pecori D, et al. Higher levels of IL-6 early after tocilizumab distinguish survivors from non-survivors in COVID-19 pneumonia: a possible indication for deeper targeting IL-6. J Med Virol. 2020:10.1002/jmv.26149. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26149. Accessed 25 August 2020
15. Toniati P, Piva S, Cattalini M, et al. Tocilizumab for the treatment of severe COVID-19 pneumonia with hyperinflammatory syndrome and acute respiratory failure: a single center study of 100 patients in Brescia, Italy. Autoimmun Rev 2020; 19:102568. Accessed 25 August 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

16. Alattar R, Ibrahim TBH, Shaar SH, et al. Tocilizumab for the treatment of severe COVID-19. J Med Virol 2020: 10.1002/jmv.25964. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25964. Accessed 25 August 2020
17. Sciascia S, Aprà F, Baffa A, et al. Pilot prospective open, single-arm multicentre study on off-label use of tocilizumab in patients with severe COVID-19. Clin Exp Rheumatol 2020;38:529-32.
18. Morrison AR, Johnson JM, Griebe KM, et al. Clinical characteristics and predictors of survival in adults with coronavirus disease 2019 receiving tocilizumab. J Autoimmun 2020:102512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaut.2020.102512. Accessed 25 August 2020
19. Morena V, Milazzo L, Oreni L, et al. Off-label use of tocilizumab for the treatment of SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Milan, Italy. Eur J Intern Med 2020;76:36-42.
20. Marfella R, Paolisso P, Sardu C, et al. Negative impact of hyperglycaemia on tocilizumab therapy in Covid-19 patients. Diabetes Metab 2020: S1262-3636(20)30082-3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabet.2020.05.005. Accessed 25 August 2020
21. Sanchez-Montalvà A, Selares-Nadal J, Espinosa-Pereiro J, et al. Early outcomes of tocilizumab in adults hospitalized with severe COVID19. An initial report from the Vall d'Hebron COVID19 prospective cohort study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.07.20094599v2. Accessed 31 July 2020
22. Jordan SC, Zakowski P, Tran HP, et al. Compassionate Use of Tocilizumab for Treatment of SARS-CoV-2 Pneumonia. Clin Infect Dis 2020: ciaa812. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa812. Accessed 25 August 2020
23. Nasir N, Syed Faisal M, Kiren H, et al. Treatment of ARDS and hyperinflammation in COVID-19 with IL-6 antagonist Tocilizumab: a tertiary care experience from Pakistan. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.23.20134072v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
24. Borku Uysal B, Ikitimur H, Yavuzer S, et al. Tocilizumab challenge: A series of cytokine storm therapy experiences in hospitalized COVID-19 pneumonia patients. J Med Virol 2020 Jun 2:10.1002/jmv.26111. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26111. Accessed 25 August 2020
25. Issa N, Dumery M, Guisset O, et al. Feasibility of Tocilizumab in ICU patients with COVID-19. J Med Virol 2020:10.1002/jmv.26110. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26110. Accessed 25 August 2020
26. Campins L, Boixeda R, Perez-Cordon L, et al. Early tocilizumab treatment could improve survival among COVID-19 patients. Clin Exp Rheumatol 2020;38:578. Accessed 25 August 2020
27. Sanz Herrero F, Puchades Gimeno F, Ortega García P, et al. Methylprednisolone added to tocilizumab reduces mortality in SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia: An observational study. J Intern Med 2020; 10.1111/joim.13145. https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13145. Accessed 25 August 2020
28. Knorr JP, Colomy V, Mauriello CM, et al. Tocilizumab in patients with severe COVID-19: a single-center observational analysis. J Med Virol. 2020 Jun 17:10.1002/jmv.26191. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26191. Accessed 25 August 2020
29. Lohse A, Klopfenstein T, Balblanc JC, et al. Predictive factors of mortality in patients treated with tocilizumab for acute respiratory distress syndrome related to coronavirus

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

disease 2019 (COVID-19). Microbes Infect 2020: S1286-4579(20)30123-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2020.06.005. Accessed 25 August 2020

30. Conrozier T, Lohse A, Balblanc JC, et al. Biomarker variation in patients successfully treated with tocilizumab for severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): results of a multidisciplinary collaboration. Clin Exp Rheumatol 2020; 38:742-7.
31. Petrak R, Skorodin N, Van Hise N, et al. Tocilizumab as a Therapeutic Agent for Critically Ill Patients Infected with SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.05.20122622v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
32. Górgolas M, Cabello A, Prieto Perez L, et al. Compassionate Use of Tocilizumab in Severe SARS-CoV2 Pneumonia. When late administration is too late. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.13.20130088v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
33. Jiménez-Brítez G, Ruiz P, Soler X. Tocilizumab plus glucocorticoids in severe and critically COVID-19 patients. A single center experience. Med Clin 2020:S0025-7753(20)30441-3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medcli.2020.07.001. Accessed 25 August 2020
34. Rimland CA, Morgan CE, Bell GJ, et al. Clinical characteristics and early outcomes in patients with COVID-19 treated with tocilizumab at a United States academic center. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.13.20100404v2 Accessed 25 August 2020
35. Sinha P, Mostaghim A, Bielick CG. Early administration of Interleukin-6 inhibitors for patients with severe Covid-19 disease is associated with decreased intubation, reduced mortality, and increased discharge. Int J Infect Dis 2020:S1201-9712(20)30568-3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.023. Accessed 25 August 2020
36. Patel A, Shah K, Dharsandiya M, et al. Safety and efficacy of tocilizumab in the treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 pneumonia: A retrospective cohort study. Indian J Med Microbiol 2020; 38:117-23.
37. Hashimoto S, Kitajima H, Arai T, et al. A retrospective study evaluating efficacy and safety of compassionate use of tocilizumab in 13 patients with severe-to-critically ill COVID-19: analysis of well-responding cases and rapidly-worsening cases after tocilizumab administration. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.24.20134288v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
38. Formina DS, Lysenko MA, Beloglazova IP, et al. Temporal clinical and laboratory response to interleukin-6 receptor blockade with Tocilizumab in 89 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.12.20122374v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
39. Rubio-Rivas M, Ronda M, Padulles A, et al. Beneficial Effect of Corticosteroids in Preventing Mortality in Patients Receiving Tocilizumab to Treat Severe COVID-19 Illness. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.31.20182428v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
40. Rodríguez-Baño J, Pachón J, Carratalà J, et al. Treatment with tocilizumab or corticosteroids for COVID-19 patients with hyperinflammatory state: a multicentre

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cohort study (SAM-COVID-19). Clin MIcrobiol Infect 2020 Aug 26:S1198-743X(20)30492-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.08.010. Accessed 25 August 2020

41. Quartuccio L, Sonaglia A, Mcgonagle D, et al. Profiling COVID-19 pneumonia progressing into the cytokine storm syndrome: Results from a single Italian Centre study on tocilizumab versus standard of care. J Clin Virol 2020;129:104444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104444. Accessed 25 August 2020
42. Martínez-Sanz J, Muriel A, Ron R, et al. Effects of Tocilizumab on Mortality in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: A Multicenter Cohort Study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.08.20125245v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
43. Moreno-García E., Rico V, Albiach L, et al. Tocilizumab is associated with reduced risk of ICU admission and mortality in 1 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.05.20113738v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
44. Guaraldi G, Meschiari M, Cozzi-lepri A, et al. Tocilizumab in patients with severe COVID-19 : a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet Rheumatology 2020;9913(20):1-11.
45. Campochiaro C, Della-Torre E, Cavalli G, et al. Efficacy and safety of tocilizumab in severe COVID-19 patients: a single-center retrospective cohort study. Eur J Intern Med 2020;76:43-9.
46. Mikulska M, Nicolini LA, Signori A. Tocilizumab and steroid treatment in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.22.20133413v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
47. Colaneri M, Bogliolo L, Valsecchi P, et al.; COVID IRCCS San Matteo Pavia Task Force. Tocilizumab for treatment of severe COVID-19 patients: preliminary results from SMAtteo COvid19 REgistry (SMACORE). Microorganisms 2020; 8: 695.
48. Price CC, Altice FL, Shyr Y, et al. Tocilizumab Treatment for Cytokine Release Syndrome in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients: Survival and Clinical Outcomes. Chest 2020:S0012-3692(20)31670-6.
49. Maeda T, Obata R, Rizk D, et al. The Association of Interleukin-6 value, Interleukin inhibitors and Outcomes of Patients with COVID-19 in New York City. J Med Virol 2020; https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26365 Accessed 31 August 2020
50. Capra R, De Rossi N, Mattioli F, et al. Impact of low dose tocilizumab on mortality rate in patients with COVID-19 related pneumonia. Eur J Intern Med 2020;76:31-5.
51. Rossotti R, Travi G, Ughi N, et al. Safety and efficacy of anti-il6-receptor tocilizumab use in severe and critical patients affected by coronavirus disease 2019: a comparative analysis. J Infect. 2020:S0163-4453(20)30467-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.008. Accessed 31 August 2020
52. Eimer J, Vesterbacka J, Svensson AK, et al. Tocilizumab shortens time on mechanical ventilation and length of hospital stay in patients with severe COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. J Int Med 2020; https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13162 Accessed 31 August 2020
53. Kimmig LM, Wu D, Gold M, et al. IL6 inhibition in critically ill COVID-19 patients is associated with increased secondaryInfections. medRxiv preprint at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.15.20103531v2 Accessed 31 August 2020

54. Somers EC, Eschenauer GA, Troost JP, et al. Tocilizumab for treatment of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.29.20117358v1 Accessed 25 August 2020
55. Tsai A, Diawara O, Nahass RG, et al. Impact of tocilizumab administration on mortality in severe COVID-19. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.30.20114959v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
56. Kewan T, Covut F, Al-Jaghbeer MJ, et al. Tocilizumab for treatment of patients with severe COVID19: A retrospective cohort study. EClinicalMedicine 24 (2020) 100418
57. Patel K, Gooley TA, Bailey N, et al. Use of the IL-6R Antagonist Tocilizumab in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. J Inter Med 03 Aug 2020, https://doi.org/10.1111/joim.13163 Accessed 31 August 2020
58. Wadud N, Ahmed N, Shergil M, et al. Improved survival outcome in SARs-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome patients with Tocilizumab administration. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.13.20100081v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
59. Ramaswamy M, Mannam P, Comer R, et al. Off-Label Real World Experience Using Tocilizumab for Patients Hospitalized with COVID-19 Disease in a Regional Community Health System: A Case-Control Study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.14.20099234v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
60. Rojas-Marte GR, Khalid M, Mukhtar O, et al. Outcomes in Patients with Severe COVID-19 Disease Treated with Tocilizumab - A Case- Controlled Study. QJM. 2020: hcaa206. https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcaa206 Accessed 31 August 2020
61. Roumier M, Paule R, Groh M, et al. Interleukin-6 blockade for severe COVID-19. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.20.20061861v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
62. Rossi B, Nguyen LS, Zimmermann P, et al. Effect of tocilizumab in hospitalized patients with severe pneumonia COVID-19: a cohort study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.06.20122341v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
63. Potere N, Di Nisio M, Cibelli D, et al. Interleukin-6 receptor blockade with subcutaneous tocilizumab in severe COVID-19 pneumonia and hyperinflammation: a case-control study. Ann Rheum Dis. 2020:218243. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-218243. Accessed 31 August 2020
64. Klopfenstein T, Zayet S, Lohse A, et al. Tocilizumab 300 therapy reduced intensive care unit admissions and/or mortality in COVID-19 patients. Med Mal Infect 2020:S0399-077X(20)30129-3.
65. Canziani LM, Trovati S, Brunetta E, et al. Interleukin-6 receptor blocking with intravenous tocilizumab in COVID-19 severe acute respiratory distress syndrome: A retrospective case-control survival analysis of 128 patients. J Autoimmun 2020 Jul 8;102511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaut.2020.102511 Accessed 31 August 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

66. Ip A, Berry DA, Hansen E, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and Tocilizumab Therapy in COVID-19 Patients – An Observational Study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.21.20109207v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
67. Carvalho V, Turon R, Gonçalves B, et al. Effects of Tocilizumab in Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Quasi-Experimental Study. medRxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.13.20149328v1 Accessed 31 August 2020
68. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed 25 August 2020.
69. Roche. Roche provides an update on the Phase III COVACTA trial of Actemra/RoActemra in hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 associated pneumonia. 2020. Available at: https://www.roche.com/investors/updates/inv-update-2020-07-29.htm. Accessed 10 August 2020.
70. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. BMJ 2009 Jul 21;339:b2700. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2700 Accessed 30 July 2020
71. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analysis. Available at http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed 29 August 2020
72. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.0 (updated July 2019). Cochrane, 2019. Available at https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current Accessed 30 July 2020
73. Wilson EB. *Probable inference, the law of* succession, and statistical inference. J Am Stat Assoc 1927;22:209-12.
74. Garwood F. Fiducial Limits for the Poisson Distribution. Biometrika 1936,28:437-42.
75. Kahn HA, Sempos CT. Statistical Q14 methods in epidemiology. Oxford University Press; 1989.
76. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557-60.
77. Begg CB, Berlin JA. Publication bias and dissemination of clinical research. J Natl Cancer Inst 1989;81:107-15.
78. Lan SH, Lai CC, Huang HT, et al. Tocilizumab for severe COVID-19: a systematic review and metaanalysis. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.106103 Accessed 30 July 2020
79. Boregowda U, Perisetti A, Nanjappa A, Gajendran M, Goyal H. Addition of Tocilizumab to the standard of care reduces mortality in severe COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. medrxiv preprint at https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150680v3 Accessed 30 July 2020
80. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020;395(10229):1054-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3. Accessed 30 July 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

81. Antinori S, Bonazzetti C, Gubertini G, et al. Tocilizumab for cytokine storm syndrome in COVID-19 pneumonia: an increased risk for candidemia? Autoimmun Rev. 2020;19:102564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autrev.2020.102564. Accessed 30 July 2020
82. Han W, Quan B, Guo Y, et al. The course of clinical diagnosis and treatment of a case infected with coronavirus disease 2019. J Med Virol. 2020;92:461-3. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25711 Accessed 31 August 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Risk of Bias



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. Mortality (percentage) in the TCZ-group. Forest plot.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4. Mortality (RR) in the TCZ-group vs. the control group. Forest plot.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20188912; this version posted September 8, 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.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix Table 1. PICO framework format

Patient Problem or Population	Hospitalized adults with severe COVID-19 —*Observational studies*
Intervention or Exposure	Tocilizumab (TCZ) administration ("TCZ-group")
Comparison or Control	Standard of care ("Control group")
Outcome Measures	• All-cause in-hospital mortality • Overall mortality restricted to high-quality observational studies • Mortality at hospitalization ward vs. ICU • Mortality in the TCZ-group receiving steroids • Mortality in the TCZ-group receiving early vs. late administration • Risk of ICU admission • Safety: Rate of secondary infections • Length of hospital stay

Appendix Table 2. Non-controlled studies. General data.

Author	Country	Type of study	NOS	N TCZ/Control	Study period	TCZ criteria
Xu et al .[11]	CHI	Retrospective cohort	6	21/0	FEB 5-FEB 14	≥30bpm or SpO2≤93% or PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg or MV or ICU
Luo et al.[12]	CHI	Retrospective cohort	6	15/0	JAN 27-MAR 5	High IL-6 and/or CRP
Antony et al.[13]	US	Prospective cohort	6	80/0	FEB 1-MAR 31	O2 >3L+ PSI score ≤130
Quartuccio et al.[14]	ITA	Prospective cohort	6	24/0	FEB 29*-NA	High CRP and IL-6
Toniati et al.[15]	ITA	Prospective cohort	7	100/0	MAR 9-MAR 20	BCRSS≥3
Alattar et al.[16]	QAT	Retrospective cohort	7	25/0	MAR*	≥30bpm or SpO2≤93% or PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg +ICU+ high CRP
Sciascia et al.[17]	ITA	Prospective cohort	6	63/0	MAR*	SpO2<93%+PaO2/FiO2<300mmHg + 3 out of: CRPx10; ferritin>1,000ng/ml; D-dimerx10; LDHx2
Morrison et al.[18]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	81/0	MAR 1-APR 3	Persistent fever+ PaO2/FiO2<200mmHg+ 1 out of:ferritin>1,000µg/l,D-dimer>5mg/ml+LDH≥500U/l, IL6x5
Morena et al.[19]	ITA	Prospective cohort	7	51/0	MAR 10-MAR 23	≥30bpm+SpO2<93%+PaO2/FiO2<250mmHg+IL-6>40pg/ml
Marfella et al.[20]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	6	78/0	MAR 1-APR 10*	Moderate-to-severe respiratory illness
Sánchez-Montalvá et al. [21]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	8	82/0	MAR 13 -MAR 18	PaO2/FiO2<300mmHg+ IL6>40pg/ml or D-dimer>1,500ng/ml
Jordan et al.[22]	US	Prospective cohort	7	27/0	MAR 13-APR 1	SpO2<90% on 4l O2 + 2 out of: IL-6>10 pg/ml; CRP>35mg/l; Ferritin>600ng/ml; D-dimer>1mcg/l; Neutrophil-Lymphocyte Ratio>4; LDH>200U/l
Nasir et al.[23]	PAK	Retrospective cohort	6	30/0	FEB 26-MAY 15	PaO2/FiO2<300 +CRP≥100mg/l or ferritin≥900ng/ml
Borku et al.[24]	TUR	Prospective cohort	7	12/0	MAR 18-APR 8	increased acute phase reactants, persistent fever, decreased SpO2 and deepened respiratory distress progress
Issa et al.[25]	FR	Retrospective cohort	6	10/0	MAR 15-APR 30	Persistent fever or PaO2/FiO2<300 + 2 out of: fibrinogen>8g/l, ferritin>1,000ng/ml, D-dimer>3,000ng/ml, CRP>150mg/l
Campins et al.[26]	SPA	Prospective cohort	6	58/0	MAR 21-APR 27	NA
Sanz et al.[27]	SPA	Prospective cohort	7	72/0	MAR 15-APR 8*	1 out of: PaO2/FiO2<300, SpO2<92, tachypnea or high ferritin levels
Knorr et al.[28]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	66/0	MAR 25-APR 24	D-dimer > 1.5 mg/l
Lohse et al.[29]	FR	Retrospective cohort	7	34/0	APR 1-MAY 11	≥5l/min O2 + ≥2 out of: high ferritin/CRP/D-dimer/LDH and lymphopenia
Conrozier et al.[30]	FR	Retrospective cohort	7	40/0	APR 1-MAY 11	≥5l/min O2 + ≥2 out of: high ferritin/CRP/D-dimer/LDH and lymphopenia
Petrak et al.[31]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	145/0	MAR 13-APR 16	NA
Górgolas et al.[32]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	7	186/0	MAR 8-APR 19	SpO2<93% on FiO2 >24%
Jiménez et al.[33]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	6	25/0	MAR 26-APR 17	≥30bpm+SpO2≤93%+PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg+cytokine storm
Rimland et al.[34]	US	Retrospective cohort	6	11/0	MAR 21-APR 25	NA
Sinha et al.[35]	US	Prospective cohort	7	255/0	MAR 17-APR 30	FiO2>45% + CRP>100mg/l, LDH>450 U/l or ferritin>700 ng/ml
Patel A et al.[36]	IND	Retrospective cohort	6	20/0	MAR 21-MAY 20	SpO2<94% or CRPx10 or D-dimer>2,500ng/ml
Hashimoto et al. [37]	JAP	Retrospective cohort	6	13/0	NA-MAY 31	CRP>5mg/dl or ferritin>1000ng/ml
Formina et al. [38]	RUS	Retrospective cohort	6	89/0	NA	NA
Rubio-Rivas et al. [39]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	7	186/0	MAR 17-APR 7	PaO2/FiO2<300mmHg or SpO2/FiO2<315 + 2 out of: ferritin>1,000 ng/ml, CRP>100 mg/l, IL-6>70 ng/l, D-dimer>1,000 mcg/l, LDH>400 U/l

*Estimate. ALT: alanine aminotransferase. BCRSS: Brescia COVID-19 Respiratory Severity Scale. CRP: C-reactive protein. HFNC: high flow nasal cannula. ICU: intensive care unit. IL-6:interleukin 6. LDH: lactate deshydrogenase. MV: mechanical ventilation. NA: not applicable/available. NOS: Newcastle-Ottawa scale. PSI: pneumonia severity index. TCZ: tocilizumab

Appendix Table 3. Controlled studies. General data.

Author	Country	Type of study	NOS	N TCZ/Control	Study period	TCZ criteria
Rodríguez-Baño et al. [40]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	8	88/344 151/344	FEB 2-MAR 31	≥38ºC + increase in oxygen support to maintain SpO2>92%+ 1 out of: ferritin>2,000ng/ml, D-dimer>1,500mcg/ml, IL-6>50pg/ml
Quartuccio et al.[41]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	42/69	FEB 29-APR 6	High CRP and IL-6
Martínez-Sanz et al.[42]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	7	260/969	JAN 31-APR 23	NA
Moreno-García et al.[43]	SPA	Retrospective cohort	8	77/94	FEB 19-APR 16	CRP≥8mg/dl, ferritin≥800ng/ml or lymphocyte count<800cells/mm^3
Guaraldi et al.[44]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	179/365	FEB 21-APR 30	≥30bpm+SpO2<93%+PaO2/FiO2<300mmHg
Campochiaro et al.[45]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	32/33	MAR 13-MAR 19	SpO2≤92% + PaO2/FiO2 ≤300 mmHg + LDH>220 U/l + CRP≥100mg/l or ferritin ≥900 ng/ml
Mikulska et al.[46]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	7	85/66	MAR 11-MAR 24	≥30bpm+SpO2≤93%+PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg+cytokine storm
Colaneri et al.[47]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	21/91	MAR 14-MAR 27	CRP>5 mg/dl+Procalcitonin<0.5 ng/mL+PaO2/FiO2<300mmHg+ALT<500 U/L.
Price et al.[48]	US	Retrospective cohort	8	153/86	MAR 10-MAR 31	O2 ≥ 3 l to maintain SpO2>93% or MV
Maeda et al.[49]	US	Retrospective cohort	6	23/201	MAR 13-MAR 31	NA
Capra et al.[50]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	62/23	MAR 13-APR 2	1 out of:≥30bpm+SpO2≤93%+PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg
Rossotti et al.[51]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	8	74/148	MAR 13-APR 3	≥30bpm+SpO2≤93%+PaO2/FiO2≤300mmHg or ICU + CRP>1 mg/dl or IL-6>40 pg/ml or D-dimer >1.5 mcg/ml or ferritin >500 ng/ml
Eimer et al.[52]	SWE	Retrospective cohort	8	29/58	MAR 11-APR 15	SpO2<94 on 5l O2 + 1 out of: CRP>100mg/L, LDH>8 µkat/L, IL-6>40 ng/L, D-Dimer>2mg/L, troponin T>15 ng/L,ferritin>500 µg/L
Kimmig et al.[53]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	48/63	MAR 1-APR 27	Progressive clinical deterioration + inflammation markers
Somers et al.[54]	US	Prospective cohort	7	78/76	MAR 9-APR 20	MV
Tsai et al.[55]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	66/66	MAR 1-MAY 5	SpO2≤94%+ferritin>300 mcg/ml
Kewan et al.[56]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	28/23	MAR 13-APR 19	CRP≥3g/dl or ferritin>400ng/ml
Patel K et al.[57]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	42/41	MAR 16-APR 17	NA
Wadud et al.[58]	US	Retrospective cohort	6	44/50	MAR 15-APR 20	NA
Ramaswamy et al.[59]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	21/65	MAR 16-APR 22	SpO2≤88%+CRP≥7mg/dl
Rojas-Marte et al.[60]	US	Retrospective cohort	8	96/97	MAR 8-APR 25	O2 mask/HFNC up to 10l to maintain SpO2≥95% or MV
Roumier et al.[61]	FR	Retrospective cohort	8	30/29	MAR 21-APR 2	>6l O2 + high CRP
Rossi et al.[62]	FR	Retrospective cohort	7	106/140	MAR 23-NA	SpO2≤96%+on 6l O2
Potere et al.[63]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	7	40/40	MAR 28-APR 21	Pneumonia+CRP≥20mg/dl+SpO2<90%
Klopfenstein et al.[64]	FR	Retrospective cohort	8	20/25	APR 1-APR 13	≥5l/min O2 + ≥2 out of: high ferritin/CRP/D-dimer/LDH and lymphopenia
Canziani et al.[65]	ITA	Retrospective cohort	7	64/64	FEB 23-MAY 9	Respiratory worsening + High CRP, ferritin, CK, ALT, D-dimer or lymphopenia
Ip et al.[66]	US	Retrospective cohort	7	134/413	APR 22-MAY 5	NA
Carvalho et al.[67]	BRA	Prospective cohort	7	29/24	MAR 21-MAY 31	ICU + fever + High CRP≥5mg/dl

ALT: alanine aminotransferase. BCRSS: Brescia COVID-19 Respiratory Severity Scale. CRP: C-reactive protein. HFNC: high flow nasal cannula. ICU: intensive care unit. IL-6:interleukin 6. LDH: lactate deshydrogenase. MV: mechanical ventilation. NA: not applicable/available. NOS: Newcastle-Ottawa scale. PSI: pneumonia severity index. TCZ: tocilizumab

Appendix Table 4. Non-controlled studies. Drugs and outcomes.

Author	Age Mean (SD or range) or median [IQR]	Gender, males n (%)	Days from onset to TCZ infusion, Mean (SD) or median [IQR]	TCZ doses	TCZ Infusion 1/ ≥2	CS n (%)	Remdesivir n (%)	Follow-up, days Mean (SD) or median [IQR]	Mortality TCZ n (%)
Xu et al.[11]	56.8 (16.5)	18 (85.7)	NA	4-8 mg/kg/d iv	18/3	NA	0	15.1 (5.8)	0
Luo et al.[12]	73 [62-80]	12 (80)	NA	80-600 mg iv	10/5	8 (53.3)	0	7 (NA)	3 (20)
Antony et al.[13]	63 [51-72]	45 (56.9)	NA	4 mg/kg/d q12h x 72h	0/80	80 (100)	0	NA	7 (8.8)
Quartuccio et al.[14]	66 (NA)*	19 (79.2)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	23/1	0	0	30 (NA)	6 (25)
Toniati et al.[15]	62 [57-71]	88 (88)	12 [9-14]	8 mg/kg/d iv	0/100	100 (100)	NA	10 (NA)	20 (20)
Alattar et al.[16]	58 [50-63]	23(92)	6 [6-8]	400-600 mg iv	16/9	0	0	14 (NA)	3 (12)
Sciascia et al.[17]	62.6 (12.5)	56 (88)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv or 325 mg sc	11/52	0	NA	14 (NA)	7 (11)
Morrison et al.[18]	64 [58-71]	56 (69.1)	10 [8-13]	8 mg/kg/d iv	62/19	57 (70.4)	2 (2.5)	28 (NA)	35 (43.2)
Morena et al.[19]	60 [50-70]	40 (78.4)	12 [10-16]	400 mg-8 mg/kg/d iv	0/51	0	0	34 [32-37]	14 (27)
Marfella et al.[20]	66 (NA)*	NA	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	66/12	0	0	20 (NA)*	39 (50)
Sánchez-Montalvá et al.[21]	59.1 (19.8)	52 (63.5)	9 [6-11]	400-600 mg iv	0/82	NA	0	7 (NA)	22 (26.8)
Jordan et al.[22]	63 [51-75]	24 (85)	NA	400 mg iv	27/0	0	7 (26)	12 (NA)*	2 (7.4)
Nasir et al.[23]	62.5 (13.5)	25 (83)	NA	600 mg iv median (range 320-680 mg)	30/0	21 (70)	0	12 (6.7)	7 (23)
Borku et al.[24]	65.8 (11.3)	6 (50)	NA	400 mg iv	0/12	0	0	14 (NA)*	0
Issa et al.[25]	66 [NA]	10 (100)	10 [NA]	8 mg/kg/d iv	10/0	3 (30)	0	11 [NA]	1 (10)
Campins et al.[26]	60.6 (NA)	42 (72.4)	NA	NA	NA	57 (98.3)	NA	NA	8 (13.8)
Sanz et al.[27]	67.5 [61-76.7]	45 (62.5)	9.2 [6-11]	400 mg iv	72/0	56 (77.8)	0	30 (NA)	21(29.2)
Knorr et al.[28]	61 [54.5-67]	41(62.1)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	57/9	44 (66.7)	0	14 (NA)	6 (9.1)
Lohse et al.[29]	75.3 [52-93]	24 (70.6)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	0/34	16 (47.1)	0	45 (NA)*	10 (29.4)
Conrozier et al.[30]	75 [65-89]*	NA	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	0/40	NA	0	6 (NA)	10 (25)
Petrak et al.[31]	58.1 (NA)	93 (64.6)	NA	4-8 mg/kg/d iv	123/22	87 (60)	0	15.3 (NA)	41 (28.3)
Górgolas et al.[32]	65 (11.4)	126 (67.7)	11 [8-13]	400-600 mg iv	169/17	178 (95.7)	0	10 [7-15]	36 (19.4)
Jiménez et al.[33]	62 (9)	14 (56)	NA	NA	21/4	25 (100)	NA	25 [15-38]	5 (20)
Rimland et al.[34]	59 [48-65]	9 (82)	9 [7-14]	NA	10/1	3 (27)	0	18 [15-25]	3 (27)
Sinha et al.[35]	59 [47-70]	161 (63.1)	NA	400-8 mg/kg/d iv	255/0	0	0	12.9 (NA)	28 (10.9)
Patel A et al.[36]	54 [NA]	17 (85)	9.5 [8-10]	8 mg/kg/d iv	NA	13 (65)	0	12 (NA)	4 (20)
Hashimoto et al.[37]	63 (NA)	10 (76.9)	NA	400 mg iv	13/0	1 (7.7)	0	19 [14-25]	1 (7.7)
Formina et al.[38]	NA	53 (60)	10 [7-11]	400 mg iv	89/0	NA	0	NA	11 (12.4)
Rubio-Rivas et al. [39]	64.3 (13)	129 (69.4)	12 (4.3)	400-600 mg iv	172/14	155 (83.3)	4 (2.2)	60 (NA)	62 (33.3)

*Estimate. CS: corticosteroids. NA: not applicable/available. TCZ: tocilizumab

Appendix Table 5. Controlled studies. Drugs and outcomes.

Author	Age TCZ patients Mean (SD or range) or median [IQR]	Males TCZ n (%)	Days from onset to TCZ infusion, Mean (SD) or median [IQR]	TCZ doses	TCZ Infusion 1/ ≥2	CS TCZ vs. the control group n (%)	Remdesivir TCZ vs. the control group n (%)	Follow-up, days Mean (SD) or median [IQR]	Mortality TCZ vs. the control group n (%)
Rodríguez-Baño et al. [40]	66 [56-72] 65 [58-74]	64 (72.7) 109 (71.9)	10 [8-13] 11 [8-13]	NA	NA	0 vs. 0 88 (100) vs. 0	0 0	21 [16-21] 20 [11-21]	2 (2.3) vs. 41 (11.9) 19 (12.6) vs. 41 (11.9)
Quartuccio et al.[41]	62.4 (11.8)	33 (78.6)	8.4 (3.7)	8 mg/kg/d iv	42/0	16 (38.1) vs. 0	3 (7.1)/0	NA	4 (9.5) vs. 0
Martínez-Sanz et al.[42]	65 [55-76]	191 (73)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	61 (23) vs. 120 (12)
Moreno-García et al.[43]	40 (52)	53 (68.8)	NA	400-600 mg iv	NA	39(50.6) vs.26(27.7)	0	11.2 (6.2)	8 (10.3) vs. 17 (18)
Guaraldi et al.[44]	64 [54-72]	127 (71)	7 [4-10]	8 mg/kg/d iv or 162 mg sc	0/179	0 vs. 0	0	12 [6-17]	13 (7) vs. 73 (20)
Campochiaro et al.[45]	64 [53-75]	29 (91)	11 [8-14]	400 mg iv	23/9	0 vs. 0	0	28 (NA)	5 (16) vs. 11 (33)
Mikulska et al.[46]	NA	NA	NA	400 mg-8 mg/kg/d iv or 162 mg sc	85/0	56 (65.9) vs. 0	0	30 (NA)	9 (10.6) vs. 23 (34.8)
Colaneri et al.[47]	62.3 [18-68]	19 (90.5)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	21/0	21 (100) vs. 91(100)	0	7 (NA)	5 (23.8) vs. 19 (20.9)
Price et al.[48]	65 [NA]	88 (58)	7 [4.5-10]	8 mg/kg/d iv	NA	47 (31) vs. 1 (1.2)	0	12 [8-22]	23 (15) vs. 10 (11.6)
Maeda et al.[49]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	8 (33.3) vs. 33 (16.4)
Capra et al.[50]	63 [54-73]	45 (73)	NA	400 mg iv	62/0	0 vs. 0	0	9 [5-19]	2 (3.2) vs. 11 (47.8)
Rossotti et al.[51]	59 [51-71]	61 (82.4)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	NA	0 vs. 0	7(9.5)/12(8.1)	7 (NA)	8 (11.8) vs. NA
Eimer et al.[52]	58 [49-63]	28 (96.6)	11 [8-14]	8 mg/kg/d iv	NA	8(27.6) vs. 23 (39.7)	0	30 (NA)	5 (17.2) vs. 19 (32.8)
Kimmig et al.[53]	64.4 (14.2)	34 (70.8)	NA	400-800 mg iv	45/3	NA	0	NA	19 (39.6) vs. 11 (17.4)
Somers et al.[54]	55 (14.9)	53 (68)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	78/0	23 (29) vs. 15 (19.7)	2 (3)/2 (3)	28 (NA)	14 (18) vs. 27 (36)
Tsai et al. [55]	62.4 (13.5)	46 (69.7)	NA	400-800 mg iv	62/4	NA	0	NA	18 (27.3) vs. 18 (27.3)
Kewan et al.[56]	62 [53-71]	20 (71)	NA	4-8 mg/kg/d iv	28/0	20 (71) vs. 11 (47.8)	0	11 [6-22]	3 (11) vs. 2 (9)
Patel K et al.[57]	68 [NA]	21 (50)	NA	1800 mg median [IQR 910] iv	NA	12 (29) vs. 14 (34.1)	NA	19 [14-25]	11 (26.2) vs. 11 (26.8)
Wadud et al.[58]	55.5 [NA]	37 (84.1)	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	17.9 (NA)	17 (38.4) vs. 31 (62)
Ramaswamy et al.[59]	63.2 (15.6)	13 (61.9)	NA	400-800 mg iv	21/0	9 (42.9) vs. 9 (13.8)	0	NA	3 (14.3) vs. 8 (12.3)
Rojas-Marte et al.[60]	58.8 (13.6)	74 (77.1)	NA	NA	96/0	41(42.7) vs. 32 (33)	12(12.5)/9(9.3)	NA	43 (44.8) vs. 55 (56.7)
Roumier et al.[61]	58.8 (12.4)	24 (80)	NA	8 mg/kg/d iv	NA	0 vs. 2 (6.7)	0	8 [6-9.8]	3 (10) vs. 9 (31)
Rossi et al.[62]	64.3 (13)	70 (66)	8.3 (4.2)	400 mg iv	106/0	43(40.6) vs 47(33.6)	0	28 (NA)	36 (34) vs. 80 (57.1)
Potere et al.[63]	56 [50-73]	26 (65)	NA	324 mg sc	0/40	26(65) vs. 23(57.5)	0	35 (NA)	2 (5) vs. 11 (27.5)
Klopfenstein et al.[64]	76.8 (11)	NA	13 [4-21]	NA	NA	NA	0	13 (7)	5 (25) vs. 12 (48)
Canziani et al.[65]	63 (10)	47 (73)	13 (5)	8 mg/kg/d iv	3/61	31 (48) vs. 26 (40.6)	0	30 (NA)	17 (27) vs. 24 (38)
Ip et al.[66]	62 [53-70]	99 (74)	NA	400 mg-8mg/kg/d iv	104/30	89(66) vs. 263(63.7)	0	30 (NA)	62 (46) vs. 280 (67.8)
Carvalho et al.[67]	55 [44-65]	18 (62)	NA	400 mg iv	0/29	24 (83) vs. 9 (37.5)	0	NA	5 (17) vs. 4 (17)

CS: corticosteroids. NA: not applicable/available. TCZ: tocilizumab

Appendix Table 6. Non-controlled studies. Secondary outcomes: Length of hospital stay, Mortality ICU vs. ward and secondary infections..

Author	Length of stay Days, mean (SD) or median [IQR]	ICU admission TCZ n/N (%)	TCZ prescribed at ICU mortality n/N (%)	TCZ prescribed at the ward mortality n/N (%)	Infections n/N (%)
Xu et al .[11]	15.1 (5.8)	2/20 (10)	NA	0/20 (0)	Overall 0/20 (0)
Luo et al.[12]	NA	NA	3/7 (42.9)	0/8 (0)	NA
Antony et al.[13]	NA (range 5-10)	9/80 (11.3)	NA	7/80 (8.7)	Overall 12/80 (15) Bacterial 12/80 (15)
Quartuccio et al.[14]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Toniati et al.[15]	NA	3/57 (5.3)	10/43 (24)	10/57 (17.5)	Overall 2/100 (2) Bacterial 2/100 (2)
Alattar et al.[16]	NA	NA	3/25 (12)	NA	Overall 8/25 (32) Fungal 8/25 (32)
Sciascia et al.[17]	NA	NA	1/5 (20)	6/58 (10.3)	NA
Morrison et al.[18]	18 [13-29]	NA	32/70 (45.7)	3/11 (27.3)	Overall 20/81 (24.7) Bacterial 17/81 (21) Fungal 3/81 (3.7)
Morena et al.[19]	NA	NA	5/6 (83)	9/45 (20)	Overall 14/51 (27) Bacterial 14/51 (27)
Marfella et al.[20]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sánchez-Montalvá et al. [21]	NA	14/82 (17.1)	NA	22/82 (26.8)	Overall 0/82 (0)
Jordan et al.[22]	NA	1/27 (3.7)	2/21 (9.5)	0/6 (0)	Overall 2/27 (7.4) Bacterial 2/27 (7.4)
Nasir et al.[23]	12 (6.7)	0/20 (0)	NA	NA	Overall 16/30 (54) Bacterial 9/30 (30) Fungal 7/30 (24)
Borku et al.[24]	NA	2/12 (16.7)	NA	0/12 (0)	NA
Issa et al.[25]	NA	0	1/10 (10)	NA	Overall 2/10 (20) Bacterial 1/10 (10) Fungal 1/10 (10)
Campins et al.[26]	NA	19/58 (32.4)	NA	8/58 (13.8)	NA
Sanz et al.[27]	16.4 [11-20]	43/72 (59.7)	NA	21/72 (29.2)	NA
Knorr et al.[28]	16.4 [8.8-23]	16/48 (33.3)	1/18 (5.6)	3/48 (6.25)	NA
Lohse et al.[29]	NA	NA	NA	10/34 (29.4)	NA
Conrozier et al.[30]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Petrak et al.[31]	15.3 (NA)	NA	35/81 (43.2)	6/64 (9.4)	Overall 0/145 (0)
Górgolas et al.[32]	NA	19/186 (10.2)	NA	36/186 (19.4)	Overall 13/186 (6.3) Bacterial 6/186 (3.2) Fungal 9/186 (4.8)
Jiménez et al.[33]	25 [15-38]	NA	NA	NA	Overall 8/25 (32) Bacterial 8/25 (32)
Rimland et al.[34]	NA	5/7 (71.4)	NA	NA	Overall 2/11 (18.2) Bacterial 2/11 (18.2)
Sinha et al.[35]	12.9 (NA)	NA	NA	NA	Overall 34/255 (13.3) Bacterial 34/255 (13.3)
Patel A et al.[36]	NA	2/20 (10)	NA	4/20 (20)	Overall 1/20 (5) Bacterial 1/20 (5)
Hashimoto et al. [37]	17 (range 12-27)	4/11 (36.4)	0/2 (0)	1/11 (9.1)	NA
Formina et al. [38]	NA	NA	10/17 (58.8)	1/72 (1.4)	NA
Rubio-Rivas et al. [39]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

ICU: intensive care unit. NA: Not available/applicable. TCZ: tocilizumab

Appendix Table 7. Controlled studies..Secondary outcomes: Length of hospital stay, Mortality ICU vs. ward and secondary infections.

Author	Length of stay TCZ vs. the control group days, mean (SD) or median [IQR]	ICU admission TCZ vs. the control group n/N (%)	TCZ prescribed at ICU mortality TCZ vs. the control group n/N (%)	TCZ prescribed at the ward mortality TCZ vs. the control group n/N (%)	Infections TCZ vs. the control group n/N (%)
Rodriguez-Baño et al.[40]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 11/88 (12.5) vs. 36/339 (10.3) Bacterial 11/88 (12.5) vs. 36/339 (10.3) Overall 18/150 (12) vs. 36/339 (10.3) Bacterial 18/150 (12) vs. 36/339 (10.3)
Quartuccio et al.[41]	NA	0/15 (0) vs. 0/69 (0)	3/27 (11.1) vs. 0/0 (0)	1/15 (6.7) vs. 0/69 (0)	Overall 18/27 (16.2) vs. 0 (0) Bacterial 18/27 (16.2) vs. 0 (0)
Martínez-Sanz et al.[42]	19 [NA] vs. 10 [NA]*	50/260 (19) vs. 32/969 (3)	NA	61/260 (23) vs. 120/969 (12)	NA
Moreno-García et al.[43]	NA	8/77 (10.3) vs. 26/94 (27.6)	NA	8/77 (10.3) vs. 17/94 (18)	NA
Guaraldi et al.[44]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 24/132 (14.4) vs. 14/222 (6) Bacterial 12/132 (9.1) vs.11/222 (4.6) Fungal 7/132 (5.3) vs. 3/222 (1.4)
Campochiaro et al.[45]	13.5[10-16.7] vs. 14 [12-15.5]	4/32 (13) vs. 2/33 (6)	NA	5/32 (16) vs. 11/33 (33)	Overall 5/32 (16.1) vs. 4/33 (12) Bacterial 4/32 (13) vs. 4/33 (12) Fungal 1/32 (3.1) vs. 0/33 (0)
Mikulska et al.[46]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Colaneri et al.[47]	2[6] vs. 14 [4]	3/21 (14.3) vs. 12/91 (13.2)	NA	5/21 (23.8) vs. 19/91 (20.9)	Overall 0/21 (0) vs. 0/91 (0)
Price et al.[48]	12[8-22] vs. NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 4/153 (2.6) vs.NA Bacterial 4/153 (2.6) vs.NA
Maeda et al.[49]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 3/23 (13) vs. 2/201 (1.1) Fungal 3/23 (13) vs. 2/201 (1.1)
Capra et al.[50]	12.5 [4-18] vs. 8 [7-15]	NA	NA	NA	Overall 0/62 (0) vs. NA
Rossotti et al.[51]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 24/74 (32.4) vs. NA
Eimer et al.[52]	20.5 [16.5-30] vs. 30[21.5-30]	NA	5/29 (17.2) vs. 19/58 (32.8)	NA	Overall 5/29 (17.2) vs. 14/58 (24.1) Bacterial 5/29 (17.2) vs. 14/58 (24.1)
Kimmig et al.[53]	NA	NA	19/48 (39.6) vs. 11/63 (17.4)	NA	Overall 27/48 (56.3) vs. 18/63 (28.6) Bacterial 24/48 (50) vs. 18/63 (28.6) Fungal 3/48 (6.3) vs. 0/63 (0)
Somers et al.[54]	20.4 [13.8-35.8] vs. 22.9[16.3-28.5]	NA	14/78 (18) vs. 27/76 (36)	NA	Overall 41/78 (52.5) vs. 22/76 (28.9) Bacterial 38/78 (48.7) vs. 21/76 (27.6) Fungal 3/78 (3.8) vs. 1/76 (1.3)
Tsai et al.[55]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kewan et al.[56]	11[6-22.3] vs. 7 [5-13.5]	NA	NA	NA	Overall 5/28 (18) vs. 5/51 (22)
Patel K et al.[57]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wadud et al.[58]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ramaswamy et al.[59]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rojas-Marte et al.[60]	14.5 (8.8) vs. 16.5 (10.8)	NA	41/61 (67.2) vs. 45/60 (75)*	2/33(6.1) vs. 9/34 (26.5)*	Overall 16/61 (16.7) vs. 26/60 (26.8) Bacterial 12/61 (12.5) vs. 23/60 (23.7) Fungal 4/61 (4.2) vs.3/60 (3.1)
Roumier et al.[61]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rossi et al.[62]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Potere et al.[63]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 1/40 (2.5) vs. 3/40 (7.5) Bacterial 1/40 (2.5) vs. 3/40 (7.5)
Klopfenstein et al.[64]	13 [4-32] vs. 17 [5-41]	0/20 (0) vs. 11/25 (44)	NA	5/20 (25) vs. 12/25 (48)	NA
Canziani et al.[65]	NA	NA	NA	NA	Overall 20/64 (31) vs. 25/64 (39)
Ip et al.[66]	NA	NA	62/134 (46) vs. 231/413 (56)	NA	Overall 30/134 (22) vs. 69/413 (17) Bacterial 30/134 (22) vs. 69/413 (17)
Carvalho et al.[67]	NA	NA	5/29 (17) vs. 4/24 (17)	NA	Overall 16/29 (55) vs. 4/24 (16) Bacterial 10/29 (34) vs. 3/24 (12) Fungal 6/29 (21) vs. 1/24 (4)

*Estimate. ICU: intensive care unit. NA: Not available/applicable. TCZ: tocilizumab.

Appendix Figure 1. Worldwide Distribution of the Included Studies.