

The efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine in COVID19 patients : a multicenter national retrospective cohort

Abdulkarim Abdulrahman^{1,2}, Islam AlSayed³, Marwa AlMadhi⁴, Jumana AlArayed⁵, Sara Jaafar Mohammed³, Aesha Khalid Sharif⁵, Khadija Alansari³, Abdulla I AlAwadhi^{1,6}, Manaf AlQahtani^{1,6,7*}

¹ National Taskforce for Combating the Coronavirus (COVID-19), Bahrain

² Mohammed Bin Khalifa Cardiac Centre, Bahrain

³ King Hamad University Hospital, Bahrain

⁴ School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁵ Ministry of Health, Bahrain

⁶ Bahrain Defence Force hospital, Bahrain

⁷ Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Bahrain

*Corresponding author: Manaf AlQahtani.

Email: mqahtani@rcsi-mub.com

Phone: +973 39766000

25 ABSTRACT

26 **Background**

27 Hydroxychloroquine is an antimalarial drug that received worldwide news and media
28 attention in the treatment of COVID-19 patients. This drug was used based on its
29 antimicrobial and antiviral properties despite lack of definite evidence of clinical
30 efficacy. In this study, we aim to assess the efficacy and safety of using
31 Hydroxychloroquine in treatment of COVID-19 patients who are admitted in acute
32 care hospitals in Bahrain.

34 **Methodology**

35 We conducted retrospective cohort study on a random sample of admitted COVID19
36 patients between 24 February and 31 July 2020. The study was conducted in four
37 acute care COVID19 hospitals in Bahrain. Data was extracted from the medical
38 records. The primary endpoint was the requirement of non-invasive ventilation,
39 intubation or death. Secondary endpoint was length of hospitalization for survivors.
40 Three methods of analysis were used to control for confounding factors: logistic
41 multivariate regression, propensity score adjusted regression and matched
42 propensity score analysis.

44 **Results**

45 A random sample of 1571 patients were included, 440 of which received HCQ
46 (treatment group) and 1131 did not receive it (control group). Our results showed
47 that HCQ did not have a significant effect on primary outcomes due to COVID-19
48 infection when compared to controls after adjusting for confounders (OR 1.43 95%
49 CI 0.85 to 2.37, P value=0.17). Co-administration of azithromycin had no effect on
50 primary outcomes (OR 2.7 95% CI 0.82 to 8.85 P value =0.10). HCQ was found to
51 be associated with increased risk of hypoglycemia (OR 10.9 95% CI 1.72 - 69.49, P
52 value =0.011) and diarrhea (OR 2.8, 95% CI 1.4-5.5, P value =0.003), but not QT
53 prolongation (OR=1.92, 95% CI 0.95-3.9, P value =0.06) or cardiac
54 arrhythmia. (OR=1.06, 95% CI 0.55-2.05, P value =0.85).

56 **Conclusion**

57 Our results showed no significant beneficial effect of using hydroxychloroquine on
58 the outcome of COVID-19 patients. Moreover, the risk of hypoglycemia due to
59 hydroxychloroquine would possess a significant risk for out of hospital use.

61
62 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2 ; COVID19 ; Hydroxychloroquine ; safety; efficacy;
63 azithromycin; respiratory failure
64

65 BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

66 An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2),
67 causing the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID19) started in December 2019, and
68 almost a year later, we seem to be at the brink of an imminent second wave. Since it
69 was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation (WHO) in March 2020 (1),
70 it infected more than 52 million people and lead to the death of 1.3 million others (2).
71 With no cure or vaccine identified yet, the health sector moved to repurposing available
72 drugs.

73 One of the first and most rapidly identified was Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), which was
74 considered due to its antiviral activity. It was initially developed as an antimalarial drug,
75 and is currently widely used to treat autoimmune diseases like systemic lupus
76 erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis (3). The efficacy of HCQ against SARS-CoV-
77 2 was first confirmed *in vitro* and was reported to mediate its inhibition through the
78 blockage of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) II receptors which facilitate SARS-
79 CoV-2 entry into cells (4). In addition, HCQ reportedly also disrupted the transport of
80 SARS-CoV-2 from endosomes to endolysosomes, which is necessary for viral release
81 (4, 5). HCQ also has immunomodulatory effects such as inhibition of antigen-
82 presenting cell activity, in turn blocking the activation of T cells (6). This prevents the
83 release of inflammatory cytokines, which causes the “cytokine storm” observed in
84 COVID19 patients (6-8). The Food and Drug Administration issued an “emergency
85 use authorization” for the use of HCQ for COVID19 patients, based on these limited
86 results (9), which lead to an increase in HCQ use. The first clinical trial studying the
87 use of HCQ to treat COVID19 was an open-label, non-randomized trial conducted in
88 France. A total of 36 patients received HCQ and 16 controls, with results showing a
89 drop in viral load amongst the HCQ group compared to the controls by day 6 of the
90 trial (10). Observational studies that followed failed to report a therapeutic advantage
91 of the magnitude seen in the French study, instead showing that HCQ has no effect
92 on intubation or mortality amongst COVID19 patients (11, 12).

93 Soon after, studies showing adverse effects of HCQ use started appearing. Concerns
94 regarding safety and efficacy increased after the infamous, and not retracted, study

was published in the Lancet claiming patients treated with HCQ were at a greater risk of dying at the hospital (13). A retrospective cohort study of 1438 patients hospitalized in metropolitan New York published in JAMA showed that patients who received HCQ (along with azithromycin) were at increased risk of cardiac arrest (11). The WHO discontinued the SOLIDARITY trial for HCQ after recommendation from the trial steering committee, based on evidence that HCQ produced little or no reduction in the mortality of hospitalized COVID-19 patients when compared to standard care (14). Results from the Randomized Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy (RECOVERY) trial, showed that HCQ was not effective in reducing mortality and increasing length of hospital stay (15).

Results from HCQ trials and observational studies have yielded inconsistent results, making the confirmation of its efficacy difficult. This inevitably lead to a widespread confusion within the medical community and patients, with some halting its use and others continuing its administration regardless.

An increasing number of studies also reported enhanced HCQ activity when coupled with other drugs. Azithromycin, a macrolide antibiotic commonly used to treat chest infections, was reported to accelerate virus elimination (10, 16, 17). It was also used in the first HCQ clinical trial on 6 patients who, by day 6, tested negative (10). However, this was a very small sample size, and one of the patients tested positive again on day 8. The results regarding the combinations of drugs have also been inconsistent and there is no definitive proof of efficacy.

Although HCQ has a better safety clinical profile compared to chloroquine (18), the drug it is derived from, there are many reported risks and side effects of HCQ usage. Along with the common side effects, including nausea and headaches, the most common side effect of HCQ use is QT interval prolongation and subsequent risk of arrhythmia (19, 20). The mechanism by which HCQ initiates arrhythmias is yet unknown, however its electrophysiological effects include blocking several currents – funny current, L-type calcium current and rectifier potassium currents (21). These lead to sinus bradycardia and repolarization abnormalities, the later leading to the observed QT prolongation (20). A clinical trial studying the effects of different chloroquine doses

involving 81 COVID19 patients in Brazil was prematurely stopped after patients receiving the higher dose (600mg, twice daily) developed arrhythmia within 2-3 days of starting the trial (22). Although chloroquine is known to be more toxic than HCQ, the study suggested that both drugs HCQ has also been associated with liver and renal impairment (8), both of which have also been reported in COVID19 patients (23). With suggestions that hepatic malfunctioning incidences increase with COVID-19 infection (24), this side effect of HCQ use could be detrimental. This, and the lack of conclusive evidence for the efficacy of HCQ in treating COVID19, creates a reluctance amongst the public and the healthcare sector to using it. This is a retrospective observational study that aims to investigate HCQ efficacy on clinical and safety outcomes amongst COVID19 patients

METHODS

Study design and setting

A retrospective cohort study was done on COVID19 patients in Bahrain. Cases that were admitted at Ministry of Health COVID19 treatment facilities were included. The 4 hospitals included were: Ebrahim bin Khalil Kanoo COVID19 Centre, SMC 6th floor COVID19 Centre, Hereditary Blood Disorder Centre (HBDC) COVID19 Centre and Jidhafs COVID19 Centre. All cases who were admitted to these facilities were confirmed to be infected by SARS-CoV-2 by a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test of a nasopharyngeal sample. Cases admitted between 24 February to 31 July were included.

A random sample of cases who received HCQ and a random sample of cases who did not receive HCQ within the study time period were included. Patients who were started on NIV, intubated, died, or transferred to a different facility within 24 hours from admission were excluded from the analysis.

Hydroxychloroquine exposure

Labeling patients as “receiving HCQ” depended on whether they were received the drug at our study baseline - defined as within 72hrs of admission. The National Bahrain treatment protocol, developed by the national task force medical team, was issued to all COVID19 facilities as guidance to health care workers for the management of COVID19. HCQ was suggested for patients with COVID19 as a therapeutic option. The suggested HCQ regimen was a loading dose of 600 mg twice on day 1, followed by 400 mg daily for 4 additional days. Azithromycin at a dose of 500 mg on day 1 and then 250 mg daily for 4 more days in combination with HCQ was an additional suggested therapeutic option. However, the suggestion of HCQ and/or Azithromycin was removed in April after several manuscripts showed lack of benefit from HCQ and a potential risk. Prescribing either or both medications was a decision left to the judgment of the treating team based on individualization of the patient care.

Data sources and variables assessed

We obtained data from the “I-SEHA” electronic medical records. The I-SEHA is a doctor station which provides access to patient records and has all the clinical details of the hospital stay as text files. Data was manually extracted from the electronic records. 5 physicians who were assisted by 10 senior medical students reviewed all the cases and filled in an electronic form developed to collect data for this study. The data gathered included patients’ demographic details, vital signs, laboratory test results, medication lists, past medical history, clinical severity scale (as seen in the supplementary table attached in the appendix), oxygenation requirement on admission, the ratio of the oxygen saturation to the fraction of inspired oxygen (SpO₂:FiO₂) at admission, requirement of ICU care, ventilator use and outcomes. A complete list of variables collected is attached in Appendix A.

Outcomes

Primary outcome: The primary end point was the requirement of non-invasive ventilation, intubation or death. When a patient died after ventilator requirement, the timing of the primary end point was defined as the time of the first use of ventilator.

Safety outcomes: the development of any of the adverse events during hospital stay, after the prescription of medications. Adverse event included were cardiac arrhythmia, QT prolongation (>500ms), diarrhea and hypoglycemia (defined as glucose levels less than 3.6 mmol/L)

Secondary outcome was length of stay in days for survivors.

Statistical analysis

The distribution of treatment groups was summarized. Bivariate associations between the treatment group and the measured patient characteristics were analyzed using Chi-squared (χ^2) tests for categorical variables and t-test for continuous variables. We also assessed endpoint and adverse events and their associations with the treatment group.

Logistic regression model was used to estimate the relationship between HCQ use and the composite end point. A primary multivariable logistic regression model involved demographic factors, clinical factors and medications.

Propensity-score methods were used as well to reduce the effects of confounding and to account for the non-randomized treatment administration of HCQ. The individual propensities for receipt of HCQ treatment were estimated with the use of a multivariable logistic-regression model that included pre-treatment variables and predictors and risk for the outcome. Variables used were demographic factors, clinical factors and chronic diseases status.

An estimation of the association between HCQ use and the primary outcome were assessed by a multivariable logistic regression models and the use of two propensity-score methods: Propensity-score matching & the use of the propensity score as an additional covariate in the multivariate logistic regression model for the outcome.

Effect modification was examined for the primary outcome for two variables; (1) HCQ and the baseline severity of disease (whether or not patient was hypoxic), and (2) The co-prescription of azithromycin.

207 Estimation of the safety and secondary outcome were conducted through the use of
208 the primary analysis, using multivariate regression models.

209 The STATA software, version 15.1, was used to execute the statistical analyses,
210 (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX:
211 StataCorp LLC.).

212 **Ethical approval**

213 The protocol and manuscript for this study were reviewed and approved by the
214 National COVID-19 Research Committee in Bahrain (Approval Code: CRT-
215 COVID2020-061). The National COVID-19 Research and Ethics Committee has
216 been jointly established by the Ministry of Health and Bahrain Defence Force
217 Hospital research committees in response to the pandemic, to facilitate and monitor
218 COVID-19 research in Bahrain. All methods and retrospective analysis of data was
219 approved by the National COVID-19 Research and Ethics Committee, and carried
220 out in accordance with the local guideline and ethical guidelines of the Declaration of
221 Helsinki 1975. All data used in this study was collected as part of normal medical
222 procedures. Informed consent was waived by the National COVID-19 Research and
223 Ethics Committee for this study due to its retrospective and observational nature and
224 the absence of any patient identifying information.

225 **RESULTS**

226 Sample Characteristics

227 A total of 1849 cases were reviewed. Of those, 278 were excluded; 57 due to
228 duplicates, 79 due to age less than 18 years, and 34 cases were excluded due to
229 insufficient information. A further 56 patients were excluded due to endpoint (of
230 ventilatory support or death) being achieved within 1 day, 7 were excluded due to
231 transfer/discharge within 1 day, and 45 were excluded as they received HCQ out of
232 study baseline. 1571 cases were included in the study.

233

234 Out of 1571 patients affected with COVID-19 selected in this study, 440 patients
235 received HCQ and 1131 patients did not.

Among the patients who received HCQ. The median time to start HCQ was 1 day from admission (IQR 0-2).

Patients' baseline characteristics (demographic and clinical) according to HCQ exposure is shown in Table 1 and 2. A propensity matched analysis was conducted to balance the two groups and their characteristics are also shown in Table 1 and 2.

In the unmatched sample, patients who received HCQ had a significantly higher mean age (43.4 years), were more likely to be Bahraini and had more comorbidities. Diabetes and hypertension were more common in patients receiving HCQ. The HCQ-receiving patients were more likely to be symptomatic (68.9% compared to 61.8%). Symptoms of fever, cough, body ache, nausea and vomiting were more predominant in patients who received HCQ. The HCQ-receiving patients were also more severely ill on admission, as 12.3% received supplemental oxygen on admission (through nasal cannula, face mask and Nonrebreather mask).

The Propensity score

The distribution of the estimated propensity scores for receiving HCQ among patients who did and did not receive HCQ is shown in Appendix B. The C-statistic of the propensity-score model was 0.83. In the matched analytic sample, 223 patients were exposed to HCQ and 223 were not exposed. The differences between HCQ and pretreatment variables were attenuated in the propensity-score-matched samples as compared with the unmatched samples.

Primary outcome

During the period of their admission, patients who received HCQ were more likely to develop the composite outcome. 24 of 440 patients (5.45%) receiving HCQ developed the primary outcome of requiring ventilatory support (invasive and non-invasive) or death in comparison to the 44 of 1131 patients (3.89%) who were not treated with HCQ. Table 3 summarizes outcomes in each treatment group.

The difference between the two groups was not significant across the different methods used to control confounders. The primary analysis using multivariate model showed an odds ratio of 1.43 with a 95% CI 0.85 to 2.37, P value=0.17. Other methods

of confounding adjustment showed similar and non-significant results. Table 4 summarizes the analysis results.

There was a significant effect modification in COVID-19 patients receiving HCQ and requiring supplemental oxygen on admission. Significant effect modification was also noted on in cases exposed to azithromycin. Appendix C shows the detailed effect modification analysis.

179 patients required supplemental oxygen on admission (nasal cannula, face mask or nonrebreather face mask). 75 patients received HCQ and 104 did not. Patients who were treated by HCQ were less likely to develop the outcome if they required oxygen on baseline. 15 patients in the HCQ group developed the primary outcome (20%), compared to 30 in the control group (28.85%). The difference was non-significant in the primary analysis (OR 1.09 95% CI 0.38 – 3.07).

1392 patients were admitted on room air and did not require supplemental oxygen. Of those, 365 received HCQ and 1027 did not. 9 patient who received HCQ developed the primary outcome (2.47%), while 14 patients in the control group developed the outcome (1.36%). Treatment with HCQ showed a non-significant increase in odds ratio to develop the primary outcome (OR 2.79 95% CI 0.92 to 8.43). Table 5 summarizes the results stratified by oxygen requirement at baseline.

The analysis showed insignificant results when stratified by azithromycin exposure. It was noted that patients who received HCQ and azithromycin had an Odds ratio of 2.7 to develop the primary outcome (95% CI 0.82 to 8.85). Patients who were treated by HCQ and did not receive azithromycin had an Odds ratio of 1.3 to develop the primary outcome (95% CI 0.44 to 3.75). Results are summarized in Table 6.

Safety outcome

Patients who received HCQ had significantly increased odds ratio to develop hypoglycemia (OR=10.9, 95% CI 1.72-69.49, P value =0.011) and diarrhea (OR=2.8, 95% CI 1.4-5.5, P value =0.003). Patient treated with HCQ had more patients developing QT prolongation (OR=1.92, 95% CI 0.95-3.9, P value =0.06) and cardiac

arrhythmias (OR=1.06, 95% CI 0.55-2.05, P value =0.85) however these findings were non-significant. Table 7 summarizes the safety endpoints.

Secondary outcome: Length of stay in survived cases

The mean length of stay of discharged patients in the study cohort was 10.0 days (+/- 5.54 days). The minimum stay was 2 days, and the maximum was 57. Patients who received HCQ had a mean stay of 11.3 days (5.65 days) while patients in the control group had mean stay of 9.5 days (5.41 days). The difference was statistically significant in a two-sided t-test ($p < 0.001$). After adjustment for confounders using a multivariate model, HCQ had a higher length of stay by 0.63 days, however this difference was non-significant (95% CI ranged from -0.02 to 1.29). Table 8 summarizes these findings.

Regression models results and details are attached in Appendix C

DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that, for our studied sample and models used, HCQ did not have a significant effect on primary outcomes (requirement for ventilation or death) due to COVID-19 infection.

Analysis of the demographics of our studied sample showed that patients who received HCQ were significantly of older age, which could be associated with a more severe HCQ-requiring presentation. Although this is an extrapolation from our data, age has reportedly been associated with a more severe progression of the disease (25-28). However, a recent study quantifying the isolated effect of age on severity of COVID-19 outcomes concluded a minimal influence of age after adjusting for important age-dependent risk factors (eg: diabetes, hypertension, cardiovascular disease (CVD) etc.) (29). Indeed, this was observed in our HCQ-receiving cohort, which showed a higher number of associated comorbidities namely diabetes mellitus, hypertension and COPD compared to the control cohort. A meta-analysis of 34 studies conducted by *Zhou et al.* showed that chronic comorbidities increase the risk of severe

course and progression of the disease, with strong correlations with hypertension, diabetes and CVD (30). However, there was no difference in rates of CVD presentation between the HCQ-receiving and control groups, which may be due to increased prevalence of CVD in the country (31). The HCQ receiving group had significantly less G6PD deficiency, stemming from management guidelines contraindicating HCQ in patients with G6PD deficiency due to increased risk of hemolytic crisis (32, 33).

Patients who received HCQ had a higher presentation of symptoms on admission and scored significantly higher on baseline clinical severity scale. Creatinine levels were significantly elevated amongst patients who received HCQ, indicating COVID-19-mediated acute kidney injury (34). A significantly higher proportion of HCQ receiving patients presented with chest x-ray findings of pneumonia compared to control patients. All these presentations on admission indicate a more severe progression of the disease that is a risk of poor prognosis (28, 34, 35), increasing risk of developing composite outcome and hence indicating HCQ requirement. This may also explain the higher incidence of composite outcomes seen amongst patients receiving HCQ.

Interestingly we found no difference in requirement of oxygenation on admission between the HCQ and control groups in our studied sample. This was not expected as requirement of supplemental oxygenation on admission has been associated with increased risk of severe illness (36), and hence expected to be prescribed HCQ. However, this could be interpreted alongside the increased G6PD deficiency amongst the control groups. With a high prevalence of G6PD in Bahrain (37), it may be that many severe COVID-19 admission, that potentially required oxygen on admission, were contraindicated to receive HCQ. Yet, more patients required oxygenation on baseline in the hydroxychloroquine group. This indicates that physicians tends to prescribe HCQ in the sicker patients.

Almost all factors were insignificant after propensity score matching analysis. However, it is important to note that to conduct matched analysis, the sample size was reduced significantly. The effect of HCQ on the development of the primary outcome remained insignificant using the various ways mentioned to control for confounders.

There was no significant difference in the clinical outcome between HCQ and control groups of patients with mild to moderate disease who did not require oxygen at baseline. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to suggest benefit of using HCQ to treat patients with low risk of developing severe disease. This finding was consistent across several reports (38, 39).

Patients in our study who received HCQ while on oxygen therapy had lower rates of developing the primary outcome, yet this was still non-significant.

Our study showed no clinical benefit from using HCQ in COVID19 patients. Moreover, the effect remained non-significant across different subgroups: room air/oxygen therapy and with and without azithromycin cotreatment.

Our study showed no benefit from combination of azithromycin with HCQ. Other studies done in France (10) and Brazil (38) also supported our outcome, and showed no clinical benefit in using the combination of HCQ and azithromycin in the treatment of COVID-19 patients.

Our study showed that HCQ does not affect the length of hospitalization. The raw analysis showed a significantly higher length of stay compared to patients not receiving HCQ, consistent with several reports (15, 40). This is explained by the more severe presentation, higher comorbidities, and risk of lower prognosis leading to the administration of HCQ. Hence, patients who received HCQ would be expected to require a longer stay. Indeed, when these factors were adjusted for in the analysis, the difference was non-significant, which is consistent with other reported data (41). These findings were also reported in a randomized clinical trial conducted in China on 150 COVID19 patients. The findings in the trial did not provide evidence to support an increase in the probability of negative conversion of SARS-CoV-2 conferred by the addition of HCQ to the standard of care in patients admitted to the hospital with COVID19.(39)

With the use of HCQ there was a significant risk of developing adverse effects, specifically hypoglycemia and diarrhea. Due to their mechanism of action, it has been well known that antimalarials cause hypoglycemia. A few studies showed the role of

HCQ in diabetic patients and showed a decreased requirement in insulin (42, 43). As for diarrhea, it is a known adverse effect of HCQ as well (44). The increased risk of hypoglycemia is alarming, as it would potentially be of a significant risk if patients prone to hypoglycemia or are receiving HCQ outside hospital setting.

The surprising result was the insignificant association between QT interval prolongation and the use of HCQ. It was difficult to find a study that supported our result, as most studies showed frequent prolongation of the QT segment (45). Our result can be explained by the local protocol used in our hospitals. As daily ECG was done for all patients on HCQ. The local protocol suggests withholding HCQ once QT exceed 470ms and can then be restarted once QT has decreased. Moreover patients with a baseline QT >470msec or those who are at risk for developing cardiac arrhythmia or QT prolongation are seldomly prescribed HCQ.

The findings in our study are supported by findings from multiple clinical trials and observational studies. The RECOVERY trail which randomized 4716 patients across 176 hospitals in the United Kingdom. This trial showed that HCQ had no benefit in decreasing mortality nor invasive ventilation. The findings were consistent across different subgroups includes those who received and didn't receive oxygen at baseline(15) . Another trail conducted in the US which randomized 479 patients to determine if HCQ improved clinical outcomes at 14 days also supported our results. The trail was multicentered, double blinded, placebo-controlled study. The study concluded that HCQ didn't improve clinical outcomes in patient with COVID19 respiratory illness. These findings were consistent in all subgroups and for all outcomes evaluated, including an ordinal scale of clinical status, mortality, organ failures, duration of oxygen use, and hospital length of stay (46). A randomized clinical trial in Brazil was conducted on 667 mild-moderate COVID19 patients to measure the effect of HCQ with or without azithromycin on the clinical status at 15 days. The trial concluded that the use of HCQ, alone or with azithromycin, did not improve clinical status at 15 days as compared with standard care (38). A large observational study was conducted on 1438 hospitalized patients in COVID19 patients in New York State to measure the effect of HCQ, with or without azithromycin on the mortality rates. The study concluded that HCQ, azithromycin, or

both, compared with neither treatment, was not significantly associated with differences in in-hospital mortality in COVID19 patients (11).

Interpreted along with these prior studies, the results of this study provide additional evidence that HCQ is not beneficial for adults hospitalized with COVID-19. Admitted and on Oxygen support

STRENGTHS

The study has several strengths. It involved majority of hospitals which provide acute care for hospitalized COVID19 cases. Moreover, our study included all hospitals that use HCQ as part of the treatment regimen. The data collection process was done manually and hence all patients files were reviewed carefully and all documented details were collected. The outcomes and adverse were collected after the medication starting date, any event occurring within 24hour of admission or prior to starting the study drug were excluded.

LIMITATIONS

The study main limitation is its design, being a retrospective observational study. Secondly, given the retrospective design, information that wasn't documented weren't available for analysis, and these can be potential confounders. These included : time from symptom onset, inflammatory markers. It is also likely that there is still unmeasured residual confounding due to factors not included in the analysis.

CONCLUSION

Our results showed no significant beneficial effect of using HCQ on the outcome of COVID-19 patients. Moreover, the risk of hypoglycemia due to HCQ would possess a significant risk for out of hospital use.

440 REFERENCES

- 441 1. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.*
442 2020;91(1):157-60.
- 443 2. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard 2020 [7 October 2020].
444 Available from: <https://covid19.who.int>.
- 445 3. Silva JC, Mariz HA, Rocha LF, Oliveira PS, Dantas AT, Duarte AL, et al.
446 Hydroxychloroquine decreases Th17-related cytokines in systemic lupus erythematosus and
447 rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2013;68(6):766-71.
- 448 4. Liu J, Cao R, Xu M, Wang X, Zhang H, Hu H, et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic
449 derivative of chloroquine, is effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. *Cell Discov.*
450 2020;6:16.
- 451 5. Mingo RM, Simmons JA, Shoemaker CJ, Nelson EA, Schornberg KL, D'Souza RS, et al.
452 Ebola virus and severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus display late cell entry
453 kinetics: evidence that transport to NPC1+ endolysosomes is a rate-defining step. *J Virol.*
454 2015;89(5):2931-43.
- 455 6. Zhou D, Dai SM, Tong Q. COVID-19: a recommendation to examine the effect of
456 hydroxychloroquine in preventing infection and progression. *J Antimicrob Chemother.*
457 2020;75(7):1667-70.
- 458 7. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected
459 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 460 8. Schrezenmeier E, Dörner T. Mechanisms of action of hydroxychloroquine and
461 chloroquine: implications for rheumatology. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2020;16(3):155-66.
- 462 9. Lenzer J. Covid-19: US gives emergency approval to hydroxychloroquine despite lack
463 of evidence. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1335.
- 464 10. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al.
465 Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label
466 non-randomized clinical trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020;56(1):105949.
- 467 11. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, Wilberschied LA, Kumar J, Tesoriero J, et al.
468 Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Azithromycin With In-Hospital
469 Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State. *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2493-502.
- 470 12. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, Zucker J, Baldwin M, Hripcsak G, et al. Observational Study of
471 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*.
472 2020;382(25):2411-8.
- 473 13. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. RETRACTED: Hydroxychloroquine or
474 chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry
475 analysis. *Lancet*. 2020.
- 476 14. WHO. "Solidarity" clinical trial for COVID-19 treatments [9 November 2020].
477 Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-
478 2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-
479 treatments](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-treatments).
- 480 15. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, Bell JL, Staplin N, Emberson JR, et al. Effect of
481 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 482 16. Bacharier LB, Guilbert TW, Mauger DT, Boehmer S, Beigelman A, Fitzpatrick AM, et
483 al. Early Administration of Azithromycin and Prevention of Severe Lower Respiratory Tract
484 Illnesses in Preschool Children With a History of Such Illnesses: A Randomized Clinical Trial.
485 *JAMA*. 2015;314(19):2034-44.

17. Andreani J, Le Bideau M, Duflot I, Jardot P, Rolland C, Boxberger M, et al. In vitro testing of combined hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic effect. *Microb Pathog.* 2020;145:104228.
18. Marmor MF, Kellner U, Lai TY, Melles RB, Mieler WF, Ophthalmology AAO. Recommendations on Screening for Chloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine Retinopathy (2016 Revision). *Ophthalmology.* 2016;123(6):1386-94.
19. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Hulot JS, Amoura Z, Leroux G, Lechat P, Funck-Brentano C, et al. Heart conduction disorders related to antimalarials toxicity: an analysis of electrocardiograms in 85 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine for connective tissue diseases. *Rheumatology (Oxford).* 2007;46(5):808-10.
20. Uzelac I, Iravanian S, Ashikaga H, Bhatia NK, Herndon C, Kaboudian A, et al. Fatal arrhythmias: Another reason why doctors remain cautious about chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine for treating COVID-19. *Heart Rhythm.* 2020;17(9):1445-51.
21. Capel RA, Herring N, Kalla M, Yavari A, Mirams GR, Douglas G, et al. Hydroxychloroquine reduces heart rate by modulating the hyperpolarization-activated current If: Novel electrophysiological insights and therapeutic potential. *Heart Rhythm.* 2015;12(10):2186-94.
22. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Effect of High vs Low Doses of Chloroquine Diphosphate as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients Hospitalized With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(4):e208857.
23. Rismanbaf A, Zarei S. Liver and Kidney Injuries in COVID-19 and Their Effects on Drug Therapy; a Letter to Editor. *Arch Acad Emerg Med.* 2020;8(1):e17.
24. Zhang C, Shi L, Wang FS. Liver injury in COVID-19: management and challenges. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2020;5(5):428-30.
25. Liu Y, Mao B, Liang S, Yang JW, Lu HW, Chai YH, et al. Association between age and clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19. *Eur Respir J.* 2020;55(5).
26. Chen T, Dai Z, Mo P, Li X, Ma Z, Song S, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of Older Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: A Single-Centered, Retrospective Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2020;75(9):1788-95.
27. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, Yan W, Yang D, Chen G, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. *BMJ.* 2020;368:m1091.
28. Feng Z, Yu Q, Yao S, Luo L, Zhou W, Mao X, et al. Early prediction of disease progression in COVID-19 pneumonia patients with chest CT and clinical characteristics. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):4968.
29. Romero Starke K, Petereit-Haack G, Schubert M, Kämpf D, Schliebner A, Hegewald J, et al. The Age-Related Risk of Severe Outcomes Due to COVID-19 Infection: A Rapid Review, Meta-Analysis, and Meta-Regression. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(16).
30. Zhou Y, Yang Q, Chi J, Dong B, Lv W, Shen L, et al. Comorbidities and the risk of severe or fatal outcomes associated with coronavirus disease 2019: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;99:47-56.
31. WHO. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018 [2 November 2020]. Available from: https://www.who.int/nmh/countries/2018/bhr_en.pdf?ua=1.
32. Beauverd Y, Adam Y, Assouline B, Samii K. COVID-19 infection and treatment with hydroxychloroquine cause severe haemolysis crisis in a patient with glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency. *Eur J Haematol.* 2020;105(3):357-9.

33. Nabil A, Uto K, Elshemy MM, Soliman R, Hassan AA, Ebara M, et al. Current coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) epidemiological, diagnostic and therapeutic approaches: An updated review until June 2020. EXCLI J. 2020;19:992-1016.
34. Cheng Y, Luo R, Wang K, Zhang M, Wang Z, Dong L, et al. Kidney disease is associated with in-hospital death of patients with COVID-19. Kidney Int. 2020;97(5):829-38.
35. Li J, Chen Z, Nie Y, Ma Y, Guo Q, Dai X. Identification of Symptoms Prognostic of COVID-19 Severity: Multivariate Data Analysis of a Case Series in Henan Province. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(6):e19636.
36. Bhargava A, Fukushima EA, Levine M, Zhao W, Tanveer F, Szpunar SM, et al. Predictors for Severe COVID-19 Infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.
37. Al Arrayed S. Campaign to control genetic blood diseases in Bahrain. Community Genet. 2005;8(1):52-5.
38. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, Azevedo LCP, Veiga VC, Avezum A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020.
39. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, Wang Z, Chen J, Sun W, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2020;369:m1849.
40. Almazrou SH, Almalki ZS, Alanazi AS, Alqahtani AM, AlGhamd SM. Comparing the impact of Hydroxychloroquine based regimens and standard treatment on COVID-19 patient outcomes: A retrospective cohort study. Saudi Pharm J. 2020.
41. Kalligeros M, Shehadeh F, Atalla E, Mylona EK, Aung S, Pandita A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine use in hospitalised patients with COVID-19: An observational matched cohort study. J Glob Antimicrob Resist. 2020;22:842-4.
42. Rees RG, Smith MJ. Effect of chloroquine on insulin and glucose homeostasis in normal subjects and patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus. Br Med J (Clin Res Ed). 1987;294(6576):900-1.
43. Blazar BR, Whitley CB, Kitabchi AE, Tsai MY, Santiago J, White N, et al. In vivo chloroquine-induced inhibition of insulin degradation in a diabetic patient with severe insulin resistance. Diabetes. 1984;33(12):1133-7.
44. Lofgren SMM, Nicol MR, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Okafor EC, Skipper CP, et al. Safety of Hydroxychloroquine among Outpatient Clinical Trial Participants for COVID-19. medRxiv. 2020.
45. Agstam S, Yadav A, Praveen Kumar M, Gupta A. Hydroxychloroquine and QTc prolongation in patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Indian Pacing Electrophysiol J. 2020.
46. Self WH, Semler MW, Leither LM, Casey JD, Angus DC, Brower RG, et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine on Clinical Status at 14 Days in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2020.

Declarations

Conflict of interest: The authors have declared that no conflict of interest exists.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: The study was approved by the National COVID- 19 Research and Ethics Committee.

Consent for publication: All authors gave their consent for publication.

Availability of data and materials: All the data for this study will be made available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Funding: No funding was received to perform this study.

Author contributions: IS, JA, KA, SJ, AKS, MA gathered the data and supervised the data collection team. AA and AIA analyzed the data. AA, MA, JA, SJ wrote the manuscript. AA and MQ interpreted data and edited the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript. Manaf Alqahtani is the guarantor of this work.

Corresponding author:

Manaf AlQahtani

Email: mqahtani@rcsi-mub.com

Phone: +973 39766000

Acknowledgements:

We would like to express our gratitude towards our colleagues: Ammar Kheyami, Mujtaba Mal Alla, Abdulla AlMuharraqi, Zeyad Mahmood, Narjis Ali AlSheala, Ola Husain AlHalwachi, Maryam Ghazi Alarayedh, and Amna Mohamed Buheiji who played an essential role in the data collection process related to this paper. Our thanks and appreciation goes to them for their hard, dedicated work. Wishing them all the best in the future. We would also like to extend our appreciation to Dr Simone Perna who dedicated time and effort to review and help us improve the manuscript.

TABLES

		Unmatched			Matched		
Factor	Level	Control	HCQ	p-value	Control	HCQ	p-value
N		1131	440		223	223	
Age, mean (SD)		44.6 (15.0)	53.4 (14.1)	<0.001	52.7 (14.4)	50.5 (13.8)	0.096
male		688 (60.8%)	245 (55.7%)	0.062	131 (58.7%)	122 (54.7%)	0.39
Bahraini		579 (51.2%)	290 (65.9%)	<0.001	107 (48.0%)	152 (68.2%)	<0.001
Number of comorbidities	0	100 (8.8%)	40 (9.1%)	<0.001	17 (7.6%)	25 (11.2%)	0.008
	1	41 (3.6%)	43 (9.8%)		10 (4.5%)	25 (11.2%)	
	2	17 (1.5%)	27 (6.1%)		7 (3.1%)	15 (6.7%)	
	3	522 (46.2%)	135 (30.7%)		83 (37.2%)	66 (29.6%)	
	4+	451 (39.9%)	195 (44.3%)		106 (47.5%)	92 (41.3%)	
Sickle Cell Disease		26 (2.3%)	6 (1.4%)	0.24	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	0.25
G6PD Deficiency		134 (11.8%)	29 (6.6%)	0.002	18 (8.1%)	22 (9.9%)	0.51
Diabetes Mellitus		273 (24.1%)	174 (39.5%)	<0.001	72 (32.3%)	74 (33.2%)	0.84
Cardiovascular Disease (CVD)		105 (9.3%)	53 (12.0%)	0.10	23 (10.3%)	27 (12.1%)	0.55
Hypertension		285 (25.2%)	176 (40.0%)	<0.001	79 (35.4%)	78 (35.0%)	0.92
Asthma		42 (3.7%)	23 (5.2%)	0.18	9 (4.0%)	12 (5.4%)	0.50
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)		2 (0.2%)	4 (0.9%)	0.035	0	0	
Obesity (BMI >=30)		33 (2.9%)	20 (4.5%)	0.11	7 (3.1%)	13 (5.8%)	0.17
Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD)		37 (3.3%)	22 (5.0%)	0.11	12 (5.4%)	13 (5.8%)	0.84
Other Chronic Lung Disease (Not asthma nor COPD)		4 (0.4%)	2 (0.5%)	0.77	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	0.56
Smoker	Current	18 (1.9%)	11 (2.6%)	0.52	3 (1.6%)	7 (3.3%)	0.30
	Exsmoker	14 (1.5%)	4 (0.9%)		3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	
	Never	921 (96.6%)	414 (96.5%)		182 (96.8%)	207 (96.3%)	

Table 1 : Unmatched and matched patient characteristics

Unmatched		Matched		
Factor	Level	Control	HCQ	p-value
N		1131	440	
Symptoms on admission:		699 (61.8%)	303 (68.9%)	0.009
Fever (>38C)		230 (20.3%)	118 (26.8%)	0.005
Cough		450 (39.8%)	218 (49.5%)	<0.001
Chest Pain		91 (8.0%)	49 (11.1%)	0.054
Shortness of Breath		210 (18.6%)	85 (19.3%)	0.73
Loss of smell		30 (2.7%)	18 (4.1%)	0.14
Loss of taste		30 (2.7%)	17 (3.9%)	0.21
Diarrhea		61 (5.4%)	30 (6.8%)	0.28
Nausea or Vomiting		46 (4.1%)	34 (7.7%)	0.003
Body pain		167 (14.8%)	89 (20.2%)	0.008
Heart Rate on admission: bpm, mean (SD)		85.8 (13.7)	86.4 (13.6)	0.44
SBP on admission: mmHg, mean (SD)		129.6 (18.4)	133.7 (18.3)	<0.001
DBP on admission: mmHg, mean (SD)		77.9 (11.5)	76.8 (11.3)	0.080
Requirement of Oxygen support on admission		104 (9.2%)	54 (12.3%)	0.069
Oxygenation device on admission	Nasal Canula	43 (41.0%)	36 (66.7%)	0.008
	Face Mask	45 (42.9%)	14 (25.9%)	
	Nonrebreather Face mask	17 (16.2%)	4 (7.4%)	
SpO2:FiO2 ratio, mean (SD)		445.08 (71.63)	439.82 (71.32)	0.19
Presence of an elevated ALT>40U/L on admission		249 (23.6%)	114 (26.8%)	0.19
Presence of an elevated Creatinine on admission		78 (6.9%)	52 (11.8%)	0.001
Chest Xray findings on admission	Pneumonia	291 (31.0%)	167 (39.5%)	0.002
	Normal	648 (69.0%)	256 (60.5%)	
Hypotension (SBP<90mmHg or DBP<60mmHg) on admission		43 (3.8%)	14 (3.2%)	0.56
Tachypnea (RR>22) on admission		20 (1.8%)	11 (2.5%)	0.35
Baseline clinical severity scale	Isolated and asymptomatic	5 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)	<0.001
	Isolated Mild symptomatic	4 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)	
	Admitted on Room Air	1018 (90.0%)	363 (82.5%)	
	Admitted and on Oxygen support	104 (9.2%)	75 (17.0%)	
	Admitted and on NIV/HFNC	0	0	
	Admitted and on Mechanical ventilation/ECMO	0	0	
Azithromycin during hospital stay:		150 (13.3%)	236 (53.6%)	<0.001
Kaletra during the hospital stay		186 (16.4%)	82 (18.6%)	0.30
Ribavirin during the hospital stay		180 (15.9%)	45 (10.2%)	0.004
Steroids during hospital stay		98 (8.7%)	66 (15.0%)	<0.001
Tocilizumab during hospital stay		31 (2.7%)	29 (6.6%)	<0.001
Received Convalescent Plasma				
Transfusion during hospital stay		19 (1.7%)	33 (7.5%)	<0.001

Table 2: Unmatched and matched patient clinical characteristics

	Unmatched			Matched		
Factor	Control	HCQ	p-value	Control	HCQ	p-value
N	1131	440		223	223	
Primary outcome : Ventilation or Death	44 (3.9%)	24 (5.5%)	0.17	7 (3.1%)	12 (5.4%)	0.24
Ventilation	41 (3.6%)	24 (5.5%)	0.10	7 (3.1%)	12 (5.4%)	0.24
Invasive ventilation	18 (1.6%)	9 (2.0%)	0.53	3 (1.3%)	6 (2.7%)	0.31
Death	26 (2.3%)	8 (1.8%)	0.56	6 (2.7%)	5 (2.24%)	0.76
Cardiac Arrhythmia:	38 (3.4%)	19 (4.3%)	0.36	10 (4.5%)	9 (4.0%)	0.81
QT prolongation of more than 500msec	33 (2.9%)	22 (5.0%)	0.044	5 (2.2%)	13 (5.8%)	0.054
Adverse events: Hypoglycemia <3.9 / 70	2 (0.2%)	7 (1.6%)	<0.001	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.8%)	0.18
Adverse events: Diarrhea	23 (2.0%)	27 (6.1%)	<0.001	5 (2.2%)	14 (6.3%)	0.035

Table 3: Outcomes within the unmatched and matched samples

614
615

Analysis	Ventilation or Death	P Value
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	68/1571(4.3%)	-
Hydroxychloroquine	24/440 (5.45%)	-
No Hydroxychloroquine	44/1131(3.89%)	-
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.43 (0.85 – 2.37)	0.17
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.65 (0.81 – 3.32)	0.16
Propensity score Analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)		
With Matching	1.75 (0.68 – 4.54)	0.24
With Adjusted for Propensity score	0.87 (0.47 – 1.64)	0.67

616
617 Table 4: Risks for developing the primary outcome
618
619

620
621
622
623
624
625

Analysis	Requiring Oxygen at Baseline	Not Requiring Oxygen at Baseline
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	45/179 (25.14%)	23/1392 (1.65%)
Hydroxychloroquine	15/75 (20.00%)	9/365 (2.47%)
No Hydroxychloroquine	30/104 (28.85%)	14/1027 (1.36%)
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.09 (0.38 – 3.07)	2.79 (0.92 – 8.43)

626
627 Table 5: Risks for developing the primary outcome, in cases who required and did not require
628 supplemental oxygen at baseline
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637

638
639
640
641
642

Analysis	Received Azithromycin	Did not Received Azithromycin
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	36/386 (9.3%)	32/1185 (2.7%)
Hydroxychloroquine	15/236 (6.36%)	9/204 (4.41%)
No Hydroxychloroquine	21/150 (14.0%)	23/981 (2.34%)
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	0.42 (0.21 – 0.84)	1.92 (0.87 – 4.21)
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	2.71 (0.82 – 8.85)	1.3 (0.44 – 3.75)
Propensity score Analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)		
With Matching	1.24 (0.26 – 5.8)	2.12 (0.62 – 7.18)
With Adjusted for Propensity score	0.59 (0.27 – 1.31)	1.38 (0.59 – 3.24)

643
644 Table 6: Risks for developing the primary outcome, in cases who received and did not receive
645 azithromycin
646

647
648
649
650

Multivariable Analysis	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Hypoglycemia	10.9 (1.72 – 69.49)	0.011
Diarrhoea	2.8 (1.4 – 5.5)	0.003
QT Prolongation	1.92 (0.95 – 3.9)	0.06
Cardiac Arrhythmia	1.06 (0.55 – 2.05)	0.85

651
652 Table 7: Safety outcomes and adverse events
653
654

655
656
657

Analysis	Value	
Overall Mean length of stay for survivors (+/- SD)	10.0 (5.54)	-
Length of stay in survivor in Hydroxychloroquine group - mean in days (SD)	11.3 (5.65)	-
Length of stay in survivor in the control group - mean in days (SD)	9.5 (5.41)	-
Two Sample T test: Difference	- 1.77	P<0.001
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	0.63 (95% Ci : -0.02 to 1.3)	P=0.058

658
659 Table 8 : Length of stay analysis
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667