

1 **Role of favipiravir in the treatment of adult patients with moderate to severe COVID-**
2 **19: a single-center, prospective, observational, sequential cohort study from Hungary**

3 Balint Gergely SZABO^{1,2,*}, Katalin Szidonia LENART^{1,*}, Borisz PETRIK³, Zsofia
4 GASPAR³, Zsofia BALOGH¹, Zsuzsanna BANYAI¹, Emese BANYASZ¹, Jozsef BUDAI¹,
5 Eszter CZEL¹, Katalin FRIED¹, Adrienn HANUSKA¹, Noemi KISS-DALA¹, Csaba
6 LORINCZI¹, Krisztina NEMESI¹, Janos KADAR¹, Eva Livia NAGY¹, Akos OSVALD¹,
7 Edina PETROVICZ¹, Alexandra RICZU¹, Judit SZANKA¹, Beata SZATHMARY¹, Andrea
8 SZOMBATI¹, Szilvia TOTH¹, Zsuzsanna VARNAI¹, Orsolya WOLLER¹, Janos SZLAVIK¹,
9 Botond LAKATOS¹

10 ¹ South Pest Central Hospital, National Institute of Hematology and Infectious Diseases, Saint
11 Ladislaus Campus (H-1097 Albert Florian ut 5-7., Budapest, Hungary)

12 ² Semmelweis University, School of PhD Studies (H-1085 Ulloi ut 26., Budapest, Hungary)

13 ³ Semmelweis University, Faculty of Medicine (H-1085 Ulloi ut 26., Budapest,
14 Hungary)

15 * The authors contributed equally to the manuscript (*in equo loco*).

16 **ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE**

17 **Corresponding author:** Balint Gergely SZABO; szabo.balint.gergely@gmail.com; +36-
18 30/644-5976.

19 **Postal address:** H-1097 Albert Florian ut 5-7., Budapest, Hungary.

20 **Keywords:** COVID-19, favipiravir, antiviral, cohort study

21 **Running title:** Favipiravir treatment of adult COVID-19 patients

22 **Abstract word count:** 250

23 **Abstract character count:** 1807

24 **Article word count:** 2500

25 **Article character count:** 19700

26 **Number of tables:** 3

27 **Number of references:** 19

28 **ABBREVIATIONS**

29 ARDS – acute respiratory distress syndrome

30 BAL – bronchoalveolar lavage

31 COVID-19 – coronavirus disease-19

32 CRP – C-reactive protein

33 CS – cytokine storm

34 CT – computed tomography

35 ECDC – European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control

36 EUCAST – European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing

37 FVP – favipiravir

38 ICU – intensive care unit

39 IQR – interquartile region

40 LDH – lactate dehydrogenase

41 LOS – length of stay

42 PCR – polymerase chain reaction

43 RCT – randomized clinical trials

44 SARS-CoV-2 – severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2

45 SOC – standard of care

46 STROBE – Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology

47 **ABSTRACT**

48 **Background:** Preliminary data suggests that favipiravir might have a role in COVID-19
49 treatment. Our aim was to assess the role of favipiravir in the treatment of COVID-19.

50 **Methods:** A single-center, prospective, observational, sequential cohort study was performed
51 among consecutive adults hospitalized with PCR-confirmed COVID-19 between March–
52 July, 2020. Patients were screened for inclusion by *a priori* criteria, and were included in the
53 favipiravir cohort if SOC+FVP, or the non-favipiravir group if SOC±other antiviral
54 medications without FVP were administered for >48 hours. Treatment allocation was done
55 per national guidelines. For COVID-19 diagnosis and severity, ECDC and WHO definitions
56 were utilized, and daily *per protocol* hospital follow-up was done. Primary composite end-
57 point was disease progression (14-day all-cause death, need for mechanical ventilation, or
58 immunomodulatory therapy). For statistical comparison, Fisher's exact test and Mann–
59 Whitney U-test were used.

60 **Results:** In all, 75 patients were included per cohort. In the FVP cohort, chronic heart disease
61 (36/75, 48.0% vs. 16/75, 21.3%, $p<0.01$) and diabetes mellitus (23/75, 30.7% vs. 10/75,
62 13.3%, $p<0.01$) were more prevalent, hospital LOS (18.5 ± 15.5 days vs. 13.0 ± 8.5 days,
63 $p<0.01$) was higher. Disease progression (17/75, 22.7% vs. 10/75, 13.3%, $p=0.13$), 14-day all-
64 cause death (9/75, 12.0% vs. 10/75, 13.3%, $p=0.8$) and need for mechanical ventilation (8/75,
65 10.7% vs. 4/75, 5.3%, $p=0.22$) were similar between groups. Immunomodulatory therapies
66 were administered frequently among patients receiving FVP (10/75, 13.3% vs. 1/75, 1.3%,
67 $p<0.01$).

68 **Conclusions:** In this study, favipiravir did not seem to affect disease progression. Further data
69 are needed to position this drug among the anti-SARS-CoV-2 armamentarium.

70 1. INTRODUCTION

71 As the pandemic caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-
72 CoV-2) is ongoing, investigators are searching for therapeutic strategies to cure coronavirus
73 disease-19 (COVID-19). As of September 2020, the number antiviral drugs proven to
74 effectively inhibit viral replication is low [1]. Furthermore, it is not known which antivirals
75 are unequivocally able to attenuate the pathological progression of COVID-19 in most
76 patients with different severity. Favipiravir (FVP) is an antiviral pyrazinecarboxamide
77 derivative, licensed for influenza in Japan. Data from the literature suggested that favipiravir
78 might also be useful in COVID-19 treatment [2, 3]. Therefore, our goal was to assess the
79 effect of favipiravir in the treatment of adult patients hospitalized at our centre with moderate
80 to severe COVID-19.

81 2. METHODS

82 2.1 Study design and settings

83 A single-center, prospective, observational, sequential cohort study was performed
84 among adults diagnosed and hospitalized with COVID-19 at our centre between March 15 –
85 July 15, 2020 (first COVID-19 case was confirmed on March 4 in Hungary). Our centre is a
86 national-level referral institution, and the main COVID-19 centers of the country with >150
87 dedicated beds. The study was in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration, as well as
88 national ethical standards. The institutional review board approved the study protocol, and
89 informed consent was obtained from every patient.

90 2.2 Patient eligibility and inclusion

91 Consecutive adult (≥ 18 years of age) patients hospitalized at our centre during the
92 study period with respiratory SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) confirmed
93 COVID-19 cases, irrespective of COVID-19 disease severity, were eligible for inclusion. To
94 overcome selectional bias, all patients were prospectively screened for inclusion by our
95 COVID-19 team (composed of attending physicians), by daily real-time visits at the ward and
96 intensive care unit (ICU), and case assessment using hospital electronic records. Selection
97 was done by using *a priori* inclusion/exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria were: 1) PCR based
98 confirmation of COVID-19 diagnosis in a clinically compatible case, with any disease
99 severity; 2) received standard of care (SOC) or any of the exposure treatments for >48 hours
100 after diagnosis. Exclusion criteria were: 1) the patient was intubated, died or discharged
101 within ≤ 48 hours after diagnosis; 2) received SOC or any of the exposure treatments for ≤ 48

102 hours after diagnosis; 3) received any antiviral medication before diagnosis 4) patient data
103 was not accessible through hospital electronic database.

104 Included patients were grouped into two sequential cohorts in 1:1 fashion, according
105 to treatment exposures: favipiravir (FVP) cohort consisted of patients receiving SOC+FVP,
106 non-favipiravir (non-FVP) cohort included patients who were administered SOC±other
107 antiviral medications. Other possible antiviral medications were chloroquine,
108 hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, remdesivir and oseltamivir (please refer to the
109 adequate section for details).

110 **2.3 Data collection**

111 A dedicated database was established for the study aim by manual extraction of data
112 from hospital electronic records and written charts. Data was transferred anonymously to an *a*
113 *priori* standardized case report form. Data collected: 1) age and gender; 2) comorbidities; 3)
114 intensive care unit (ICU) admission during hospitalization; 4) length of stay (LOS) and ICU
115 LOS; 4) clinical parameters at COVID-19 diagnosis (symptom onset, COVID-19 severity,
116 supplementary oxygen demand, peripheral oxygen saturation, acute respiratory distress
117 syndrome [ARDS], cytokine storm [CS], acute respiratory failure); 5) laboratory parameters
118 at diagnosis (blood leucocyte, absolute neutrophil granulocyte, lymphocyte and platelet
119 counts, hemoglobin, CRP, procalcitonin, serum ferritin, high sensitivity cardiac Troponin-I,
120 serum interleukin-6, serum creatinine, LDH and D-dimer); 6) microbiological and
121 radiological parameters at diagnosis (blood cultures and chest computed tomography [CT]);
122 7) characteristics of antimicrobial therapies and supportive care; 8) characteristics of
123 immunomodulatory therapies; 9) study outcomes. Variables with $\geq 5\%$ of missing
124 measurements were omitted from final analysis, no imputation was sought.

125 **2.4 Diagnostic and therapeutic strategies at our centre during the pandemic**

126 At our centre, we follow the *European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control*
127 (ECDC) COVID-19 case definition for diagnosis ascertainment [4]. A clinically suspicious
128 case presentation (cardinal symptoms: fever, dyspnea, cough) is confirmed if a respiratory
129 specimen is positive for SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid by PCR. Respiratory specimens are taken
130 by a team of trained nurses with oro-/nasopharyngeal sampling in spontaneously breathing
131 patients, or by mini-BAL in ventilated patients. Disease severity is determined by *World*
132 *Health Organization* (WHO) criteria [5]. Disease onset is the first day of symptom appearance
133 as reported by the patient, or day of first PCR positivity if symptom appearance could not be

134 reported. The day of first SARS-CoV-2 PCR positivity is given as COVID-19 diagnosis day.
135 Acute respiratory failure and ARDS were defined following the 2012 Berlin criteria, CS is
136 diagnosed by trends of clinical and laboratory parameters and HScore, as proposed by *Mehta*
137 *et al.* [6, 7].

138 At our centre, COVID-19 patient care is facilitated by standardized in-house
139 diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, composed of written protocols and check-lists updated
140 since March 2020 according to literature evidence. Physical examination, laboratory studies,
141 arterial blood gas analyses are done daily. Imaging studies (chest X-ray and/or chest CT) are
142 done on the day of COVID-19 diagnosis, and days +7, +14, and if disease progression
143 (persistent fevers for ≥ 72 hours, deteriorating hypoxaemia) or clinical instability (newly onset
144 dyspnea, chest pain, hypotension, altered mentation) is documented. Every febrile (tympanal
145 temperature $\geq 37.8^\circ\text{C}$) patient has 2 sets of blood cultures taken. Testing for SARS-CoV-2
146 PCR negativity is initiated 24 hours after defervescence and clinical stability. Respiratory
147 samples for SARS-CoV-2 PCR are collected every 48 hours, PCR negativity is documented
148 on the day when two consecutive samples are proven to be negative. Daily follow-up of
149 patients is done until death or hospital discharge, post-discharge follow-up is not routinely
150 arranged. Microbiological diagnostics are performed at the Microbiology Laboratory of our
151 centre.

152 COVID-19 antiviral therapies are allocated *per protocol*, in an open-label and non-
153 randomized fashion (excluding patients in randomized clinical trials), but allocation is
154 affected by drug availability on a national level. At our centre, treatment allocation is done in
155 accordance with the "Hungarian Coronavirus Handbook" [8]. Before favipiravir introduction
156 to Hungary (May 15, 2020), all patients received other antiviral medications: chloroquine (1g
157 loading dose, 1x500mg maintenance thereafter, minimum of 7 days) or hydroxychloroquine
158 (2x400mg loading dose, 2x200mg maintenance thereafter, min. of 5 days) or
159 lopinavir/ritonavir (200/50mg in 2x2 capsules, min. of 7 days), depending on patient
160 contraindications and drug availability. As the influenza season was overlapping with the first
161 month of the epidemic in Hungary, oseltamivir (2x75mg) was also administered to patients,
162 pending influenza A/B respiratory PCR results. Remdesivir was not available in Hungary
163 during the study period. After favipiravir distribution, all patients received it *per protocol* in
164 monotherapy at our centre (2x1600mg loading dose, 2x600mg maintenance thereafter, min. of
165 10 days). Patients are routinely receiving SOC (on-demand oxygen therapy, respiratory
166 support, intravenous fluid replenishment, antipyretics, antitussive and bronchodilator drugs).

167 Empirical antibiotics per *Infectious Diseases Society of America* (IDSA) community-acquired
168 pneumonia guideline are administered if disease progression or clinical instability is
169 documented, immunomodulatory agents are administered in a clinical study to patients with
170 CS or critical COVID-19, per COVID-19 team initiation [9].

171 **2.5 Outcomes**

172 The primary endpoint was disease progression, a negative composite of any of the
173 following: 1) 14-day all-cause death, 2) need for mechanical ventilation, 3) need for
174 immunomodulatory therapy for COVID-19 at ward or ICU. 14-day all-cause death was
175 defined as exitus within 14 days from COVID-19 diagnosis during hospital stay. Need for
176 mechanical ventilation was defined as a completed endotracheal intubation in relation to
177 COVID-19, per decision of an ICU crash team. Need for immunomodulatory therapy was
178 defined if any immunomodulatory drug was initiated at any dose, suggested by the
179 "Hungarian Coronavirus Handbook" (at our centre, depending on availability: tocilizumab,
180 ruxolitinib, baricitinib, intravenous immunoglobulin, reconvalescent plasma or systemic
181 corticosteroids), excluding systemic corticosteroids started for alternative causes.

182 Secondary endpoints were 14-day all-cause mortality, need for mechanical ventilation,
183 need for immunomodulatory therapy, rate of PCR negativity (at the end of hospitalization or
184 sooner). Time analyses were done between cohorts by comparing time intervals from
185 diagnosis day to disease progression, to all-cause mortality, to mechanical ventilation, to
186 immunomodulatory therapy, to PCR negativity.

187 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

188 Continuous variables are expressed as median±interquartile range (IQR). Normality
189 was checked with the *Shapiro–Wilks*-test. Categorical variables are expressed as absolute
190 numbers (n) with relative percentages (%). Statistical comparisons were done with *Mann–*
191 *Whitney* U-test or *Fisher’s* exact test. For identification of independent risk factors associating
192 with disease progression, uni- and multivariate binomial logistic regression was performed.
193 All plausible parameters and those with a *p*-value of ≤ 0.1 in univariate analysis were entered
194 into a forward stepwise multivariate logistic regression (entry criterion: $p=0.05$, removal
195 criterion: $p=0.1$). Maximal number of predictors was estimated with the common 1:10 rule-of-
196 thumb, goodness-of-fit was tested by the *Hosmer–Lemeshow* test. For all tests, a two-tailed *p*-
197 value of < 0.05 determined statistical significance. Data collection was completed with
198 Microsoft Office Excel 2016, tests were calculated using IBM SPSS Statistics 23. For

199 reporting, we adhere to the *Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in*
200 *Epidemiology* (STROBE) Statement [10].

201 **3. RESULTS**

202 **3.1 Baseline and clinical characteristics**

203 In all, 150 patients were enrolled during the study period, 75 in both cohorts. Baseline
204 and clinical characteristics are described in *Table 1*. Median age was 66.0 ± 12.4 years, with
205 representation of older patients in the FVP group (71.5 ± 15.1 vs. 61.0 ± 21.5 years, $p < 0.01$).
206 Genders and most comorbidities were equally distributed between cohorts, essential
207 hypertension (57/75, 76.0% vs. 38/75, 50.7%, $p < 0.01$) chronic heart disease (36/75, 48.0% vs.
208 16/75, 21.3%, $p < 0.01$), diabetes mellitus (18/75, 24.0% vs. 6/75, 8.0%, $p = 0.01$) and chronic
209 cerebral disease (23/75, 30.7% vs. 10/75, 13.3%, $p < 0.01$) were more prevalent in the FVP
210 cohort. At diagnosis, 35/75 (53.3%) and 41/75 (54.7%) patients had severe disease in the FVP
211 and non-FVP cohorts, respectively ($p = 0.41$), and ARDS or CS was not documented. Need for
212 oxygen supportation was needed in similar rates (27/75, 36.0% vs. 21/75, 28.5%, $p = 0.29$).
213 Documented bloodstream-infections were rare (1/75, 0.7%). Patients in the FVP group had
214 higher white blood cell ($6.5 \pm 4.2 \times 10^9/L$ vs. $5.5 \pm 3.3 \times 10^9/L$, $p = 0.04$), platelet counts
215 ($225 \pm 117 \times 10^9/L$ vs. $191 \pm 108 \times 10^9/L$, $p = 0.03$), serum creatinine ($86.0 \pm 49.3 \mu\text{mol/L}$ vs.
216 $71.0 \pm 37.5 \mu\text{mol/L}$, $p = 0.03$) and D-dimer ($1163 \pm 2038 \text{ ng/mL}$ vs. $850 \pm 479 \text{ ng/mL}$, $p = 0.03$),
217 lower hemoglobin levels ($117 \pm 24 \text{ g/l}$ vs. $131 \pm 20 \text{ g/L}$, $p < 0.01$). The rate of chest CT positivity
218 did not differ between cohorts (54 / 64, 84.4% vs. 13 / 14, 92.8%, $p = 0.67$).

219 **3.2 Outcomes, therapeutic approaches**

220 Outcomes and therapeutic approaches are detailed in *Table 2*. Disease progression
221 showed no statistically significant difference (17/75, 22.7% vs. 10/75, 13.3%, $p = 0.13$)
222 between cohorts. Rates of 14-day all-cause mortality (9/75, 12.0% vs. 10/75, 13.3%, $p = 0.8$)
223 and need for mechanical ventilation (8/75, 10.7% vs. 4/75, 5.3%, $p = 0.22$) were also similar,
224 need for immunomodulatory therapies was higher among patients receiving FVP (10/75,
225 13.3% vs. 1/75, 1.3%, $p < 0.01$). FVP exposure was not retained as an independent covariate
226 in multivariate logistic regression modelling disease progression (*Table 3*). Although there
227 was a statistically non-significant tendency for higher PCR negativity rate (55/75, 73.0% vs.
228 43/75, 57.3%, $p = 0.05$), median time to PCR negativity was significantly longer (22.0 ± 15.5
229 days vs. 13.0 ± 12.0 days, $p < 0.01$) in the FVP cohort. Median time from diagnosis to disease

230 progression (8.0±9.0 days vs. 4.5±9.8, p=0.08) and time to exitus (16.0±14.0 days vs.
231 8.5±10.3 days, p=0.03) were both longer among patients receiving FVP.

232 Although supportive therapies were needed in equivalent rates (43/75, 57.3% vs.
233 46/75, 61.3%, p=0.73), hospital LOS (18.5±16.0 vs. 13.0±9.0 days, <0.01) was higher with
234 similar ICU admissions (12/75, 16.0% vs. 5/75, 6.7%, p=0.07). In the non-FVP cohort,
235 patients mostly received chloroquin or hydroxychloroquin (5/75, 6.7% vs. 61/75, 81.3%,
236 p<0.01). Preferred antibiotics were azithromycin (19/75, 25.3% vs. 44/75, 58.7%, p<0.01) and
237 ceftriaxon (13/75, 17.3% vs. 28/75, 37.3%, p<0.01). Tocilizumab was given frequently to
238 patients with cytokine storm (9/75, 12.0% vs. 1/75, 1.3%, p=0.01).

239 **4. DISCUSSION**

240 **4.1 Present study**

241 We performed a single-center, prospective observational, sequential cohort study by
242 enrolling 150 hospitalized adult patients with moderate to severe COVID-19, receiving either
243 favipiravir or other antiviral medications with standard of care during the first 4 months of
244 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Hungary. There was no statistically significant differences in time
245 to antiviral therapy initiation from PCR positivity, COVID-19 disease severity, need for
246 oxygen supportation and ICU admittance rates between cohorts. Disease progression, 14-day
247 all-cause mortality, need for invasive mechanical ventilation and PCR negativity rate seemed
248 to be unaffected by favipiravir exposure compared to other antivirals, and there was higher
249 demand for immunomodulatory therapy administration among patients in the favipiravir
250 cohort.

251 **4.2 Previous studies**

252 Pharmacological approaches, as well as clinical studies describing favipiravir
253 treatment strategies for COVID-19 patients were reported in the literature. Although
254 favipiravir demonstrated good *in vitro* inhibitory activity against SARS-CoV-2, the optimal
255 pharmacological dose for COVID-19 treatment has yet to be determined, as the dose
256 recommendations (as used in our study) based on pharmacokinetic experiments and clinical
257 trials. Data of studies involving patients with other severe viral infections (influenzavirus,
258 Ebolavirus) might be insufficient to maintain an adequate serum concentration, especially in
259 critically ill patients [2, 11, 12]. Although a review found that favipiravir has a favourable
260 safety profile concerning serious adverse events, the main side effects are hyperuricaemia,

261 teratogenicity and QTc prolongation. Establishment of long-term safety profile among
262 COVID-19 patients needs more pharmacovigilance data [13].

263 According to data from the literature, clinical usefulness of favipiravir in COVID-19
264 may somewhat be limited. A prospective clinical trial randomizing 240 adult patients in an
265 1:1 fashion with clinically confirmed COVID-19 to conventional therapy and umifenovir or
266 favipiravir reported that although favipiravir administration associated with shorter time to
267 defervescence and diminishment of cough, the drug could not significantly improve 7-day
268 clinical recovery rate as a primary endpoint. Furthermore, rates of noninvasive mechanical
269 ventilation, supplementary oxygen demand or all-cause mortality did not show differences
270 between groups [14]. An open-labeled non-randomized study conducted by matching 35
271 microbiologically confirmed COVID-19 patients treated with favipiravir and 45 patients
272 receiving lopinavir/ritonavir (all with additional interferon-alpha inhalation), within one week
273 after onset of symptoms. Authors documented statistically higher improvement rates in chest
274 imaging and faster viral clearance among patients receiving favipiravir, but effect of
275 favipiravir on disease progression or mortality rates were not reported [15]. A recently
276 published multicenter phase II/III randomized trial enrolled patients with moderate COVID-
277 19 within a median of 6.7 days from start of symptoms. The primary efficacy endpoint was
278 the elimination of SARS-CoV-2 by Day 10. On day 5, viral clearance was significantly more
279 prevalent in the favipiravir arm ($p=0.018$), but on day 10 the difference was statistically non-
280 significant ($p=0.155$). Authors conclude that in their pilot study, favipiravir appeared
281 beneficial among moderately ill patients [16]. In small case series studies, favipiravir was
282 administered with nafamostat mesylate or methylprednisolone for COVID-19 patients in
283 different disease stages, but due to the lack of control groups and antiviral combination usage,
284 the extent favipiravir effect on clinical cure remains ambiguous [17-19]. In all, we think that
285 our findings could be reflected by data from current literature, and the role for favipiravir
286 should not be overestimated in the treatment of adults with moderate to severe COVID-19.

287 **4.3 Limitations**

288 Our study had several limitations. As the pandemic is still ongoing, knowledge about
289 COVID-19 is changing fast, and despite best efforts, *per protocol* treatment allocation might
290 have been lagging behind literature evidence. National drug availability might have biased
291 treatment allocation. The initiation of alternative antiviral medications might have been biased
292 by (contra)indication. Age and comorbidity differences between our cohorts could represent
293 the temporal progression of the epidemic in Hungary: younger people were affected sooner in

294 larger numbers, and this might have confounded some baseline characteristics due to the
295 sequential cohort design. The number of included patients is relatively low, however, an exact
296 *a priori* study size calculation was not feasible due to study design and enrollment. Chest CT
297 was not readily obtainable from some patients due to technical reasons.

298 **5. CONCLUSION**

299 Among adult patients hospitalized with COVID-19, an overall beneficial effect of
300 favipiravir on disease progression could not be proven in this study. Due to limitations,
301 further prospective trial data are needed to elucidate the role of favipiravir in COVID-19
302 treatment.

303 TABLES

PARAMETER	Total (n=150)	FVP cohort (n=75)	Non-FVP cohort (n=75)	p value
Age (years, median±IQR, min–max)	66.0±12.4 (20.0–93.0)	71.5±15.1 (24.0–93.0)	61.0±21.5 (20.0–91.0)	<0.01
Male gender (n, %)	76 (50.7)	37 (49.3)	39 (52.0)	0.74
ICU admission during hospitalization (n, %)	17 (11.3)	12 (16.0)	5 (6.7)	0.07
Time from disease onset to antiviral therapy (days, median±IQR, min–max)	3.0±6.0 (1–34)	2.0±3.0 (1–34)	7.5±9.0 (1–21)	<0.01
Time from positive PCR to antiviral therapy ^a (days, median±IQR, min–max)	1.0±2.0 (1–31)	1.0±2.0 (1–31)	1.0±2.0 (1–6)	0.88
Comorbidities (n, %):				
- Essential hypertension	95 (63.3)	57 (76.0)	38 (50.7)	<0.01
- Chronic heart disease	52 (34.7)	36 (48.0)	16 (21.3)	<0.01
- Chronic vascular disease	14 (9.3)	10 (13.3)	4 (5.3)	0.1
- Chronic pulmonary disease	20 (13.3)	11 (14.7)	9 (12.0)	0.6
- Chronic renal disease	9 (6.0)	7 (9.3)	2 (2.7)	0.09
- Chronic hepatic disease	5 (3.3)	4 (5.3)	1 (1.3)	0.18
- Chronic cerebral disease	24 (16.0)	18 (24.0)	6 (8.0)	0.01
- Diabetes mellitus	33 (22.0)	23 (30.7)	10 (13.3)	<0.01
- Active oncological malignancy	21 (14.0)	15 (20.0)	6 (8.0)	0.05
- Active hematological malignancy	13 (8.7)	9 (12.0)	4 (5.3)	0.16
- Systemic autoimmune disease	7 (4.7)	2 (2.7)	5 (6.7)	0.16
- Chronic systemic corticosteroid treatment	2 (1.3)	2 (2.7)	0	0.14
- Chronic systemic immunosuppressive treatment	2 (1.3)	0	2 (2.7)	0.23
- Smoking	2 (1.3)	2 (2.7)	0	0.16
Clinical characteristics at COVID-19 diagnosis:				
- Peripheral oxygen saturation (%; median±IQR, min–max)	95±7 (51–99)	94±7 (51–99)	95±7 (78–99)	0.94
- Need for oxygen supportation (n, %)	48 (32.0)	27 (36.0)	21 (28.0)	0.29
- ARDS (n, %)	0	0	0	n.a.
- Acute respiratory failure (n, %)	1 (0.7)	0	1 (1.3)	n.a.
- CS (n, %)	0	0	0	n.a.
Severity of COVID-19 ^b (n, %):				
- Non-severe disease	74 (49.3)	40 (53.3)	34 (45.3)	0.41
- Severe disease	76 (50.7)	35 (46.7)	41 (54.7)	
Laboratory characteristics at COVID-19 diagnosis (median±IQR, min–max):				
- White blood cell count (x10 ⁹ /L)	6.2±3.7 (2.3–21.7)	6.5±4.2 (2.7–21.7)	5.5±3.3 (2.3–16.4)	0.04
- Neutrophil granulocyte count (x10 ⁹ /L)	4.0±2.9 (0.4–20.1)	4.2±2.9 (0.4–20.1)	3.8±3.6 (1.6–14.9)	0.09
- Lymphocyte count (x10 ⁹ /L)	1.2±0.7 (0.3–3.7)	1.2±0.8 (0.3–3.7)	1.1±0.7 (0.3–2.6)	0.07
- Platelet count (x10 ⁹ /L)	203±93 (12–743)	225±117 (12–743)	191±108 (78–414)	0.03
- Hemoglobin level (g/L)	124±32 (67–163)	117±24 (67–152)	131±20 (89–163)	<0.01
- C-reactive protein (mg/L)	41±94 (1–316)	37±90 (1–229)	44.7±91.9 (1–316)	0.52
- Procalcitonin (µg/L)	0.0±0.1 (0–92.8)	0.1±0.1 (0–92.8)	0.0±0.1 (0–14.4)	0.08
- Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	16.1±20.0 (2.7–76.9)	13.9±22.3 (2.7–76.9)	20.0±10.6 (15.6–46.0)	1.0
- Serum ferritin (µg/L)	397±520 (37–6001)	403±555 (37–6001)	364±219 (84–1268)	0.72
- Cardiac Troponin-I (ng/mL)	0.012±0.026 (0.001–2.171)	0.012±0.025 (0.001–2.171)	0.008±0.02 (0.002–0.056)	0.37
- Serum creatinine (µmol/L)	75.0±35.5 (36.0–470.0)	86.0±49.3 (36.0–446.0)	71.0±37.5 (37.0–470.0)	0.03
- Serum LDH (IU/L)	512±242 (214–2240)	491±232 (214–2240)	534±275 (241–1370)	0.51
- Serum D-dimer (ng/mL)	1111±1405 (160–49937)	1163±2038 (160–49937)	850±479 (316–1319)	0.03
Blood cultures taken per patient (n, %)	76 (50.7)	36 (48.0)	40 (53.3)	0.46
Detected bloodstream-infections (n, %)	1 (0.7)	1 (1.3)	0	0.31
Chest CT positive for COVID-19 / chest CT obtained	67 / 78 (85.9)	54 / 64 (84.4)	13 / 14 (92.8)	0.67

304 ^a From first positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR, sampled from the respiratory tract

305 ^b Per *World Health Organization* criteria

306 n.a. Not applicable.

307 **Table 1.** Baseline and clinical characteristics of adult COVID-19 patients included in the study,
308 grouped by favipiravir administration.

309

310

PARAMETER	Total (n=150)	FVP cohort (n=75)	Non-FVP cohort (n=75)	p value
Disease progression (n, %)	27 (18.0)	17 (22.7)	10 (13.3)	0.13
14-day all-cause mortality (n, %)	19 (12.7)	9 (12.0)	10 (13.3)	0.8
Need for invasive mechanical ventilation (n, %)	12 (8.0)	8 (10.7)	4 (5.3)	0.22
Need for immunomodulatory therapy (n, %)	13 (8.7)	10 (13.3)	1 (1.3)	<0.01
Rate of PCR negativity (n, %)	99 (66.0)	55 (73.0)	43 (57.3)	0.05
Time from diagnosis to disease progression (days, median±IQR, min–max)	7.0±7.0 (1.0–14.0)	8.0±9.0 (3.0–14.0)	4.5±9.8 (1.0–12.0)	0.08
Time from diagnosis to exitus (days, median±IQR, min–max)	12.0±7.5 (1.0–50.0)	16.0±14.0 (6.0–50.0)	8.5±10.3 (2.0–14.0)	0.03
Time from diagnosis to mechanical ventilation (days, median±IQR, min–max)	4.5±5.3 (1.0–12.0)	5.5±5.3 (3.0–12.0)	4.5±3.5 (1.0–12.0)	0.79
Time from diagnosis to immunomodulatory therapy (days, median±IQR, min–max)	7.0±5.5 (3.0–14.0)	7.0±6.0 (3.0–14.0)	4.0±0 (4.0–4.0)	1.0
Time from positive PCR to PCR negativity (days, median±IQR, min–max)	18.5±10.5 (3.0–55.0)	22.0±15.5 (3.0–55.0)	13.0±12.0 (3.0–32.0)	<0.01
LOS (days, median±IQR, min–max)	15.0±10.8 (2.0–49.0)	18.5±15.5 (3.0–49.0)	13.0±8.5 (2.0–46.0)	<0.01
ICU LOS (days, median±IQR, min–max)	5.0±2.0 (1.0–25.0)	5.0±2.0 (2.0–12.0)	5.0±5.0 (1.0–25.0)	0.79
Supportive therapies needed ^a (n, %):				
- Nasal cannula	79 (52.7)	38 (50.7)	41 (54.7)	0.62
- Venturi mask	41 (27.3)	18 (24.0)	23 (30.7)	0.35
- Non-invasive ventilation	4 (2.7)	4 (5.3)	0	0.12
- Vasopressor therapy	11 (7.3)	8 (10.7)	3 (4.0)	0.11
- Renal replacement therapy	1 (0.7)	1 (1.3)	0	0.31
- Parenteral nutrition	1 (0.7)	1 (1.3)	0	0.31
- Prone positioning	3 (2.0)	0	3 (4.0)	0.24
- Any	89 (59.3)	43 (57.3)	46 (61.3)	0.73
Antiviral therapies given (n, %):				
- Favipiravir	75 (50.0)	75 (100.0)	0	<0.01
- Chloroquin/hydroxychloroquin	66 (44.0)	5 (6.7)	61 (81.3)	<0.01
- Oseltamivir	34 (22.7)	0	34 (45.3)	<0.01
- Lopinavir/ritonavir	7 (4.7)	0	7 (9.3)	0.01
- Remdesivir	0	0	0	n.a.
- Any ^b	139 (92.7)	75 (100.0)	64 (85.3)	<0.01
Antibacterial therapies given (n, %):				
- Ampicillin	1 (0.7)	1 (1.3)	0	0.31
- Amoxicillin/clavulanate	5 (3.3)	1 (1.3)	4 (5.3)	0.17
- Cefazolin	3 (2.0)	3 (4.0)	0	0.24
- Ceftriaxon	41 (27.3)	13 (17.3)	28 (37.3)	<0.01
- Cefepim	2 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	n.a.
- Piperacillin/tazobactam	20 (13.3)	13 (17.3)	7 (9.3)	0.14
- Meropenem	9 (6.0)	7 (9.3)	2 (2.7)	0.85
- Imipenem/cilastatin	15 (10.0)	12 (16.0)	3 (4.0)	0.01
- Vancomycin	3 (2.0)	3 (4.0)	0	0.08
- Linezolid	2 (1.3)	2 (2.7)	0	0.15
- Azithromycin	63 (42.0)	19 (25.3)	44 (58.7)	<0.01
- Clarithromycin	1 (0.7)	1 (1.3)	0	0.31
- Levofloxacin	13 (8.7)	1 (1.3)	12 (16.0)	<0.01
- Doxycyclin	10 (6.7)	0	10 (13.3)	<0.01
- Gentamicin	4.0 (2.7)	4 (5.3)	0	0.04
- Any ^b	108 (72.0)	47 (62.7)	61 (81.3)	0.01
Immunomodulatory therapies given (n, %):				
- Tocilizumab	10 (6.7)	9 (12.0)	1 (1.3)	0.01
- Ruxolitinib	0	0	0	n.a.
- Baricitinib	0	0	0	n.a.
- Intravenous immunoglobulin	2 (1.3)	2 (2.7)	0	0.49
- Reconvalescent plasma	0	0	0	n.a.
- Systemic corticosteroid	3 (2.0)	3 (4.0)	0	0.24

311 ^a Excluding invasive mechanical ventilation.

312 ^b Alone or in combination.

313 n.a. Not applicable.

314 **Table 2.** Outcomes and therapeutic approaches to adult COVID-19 patients included in the study,
315 grouped by favipiravir administration.

316

317

	Disease progression (n=27)	No disease progression (n=123)	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
			OR (95% CI)	p value	OR (95% CI)	p value
Age	74.0±23.1 (41.0–91.0)	66.0±12.9 (20.0–93.0)	1.04 (1.01–10.9)	0.01	–	–
Male gender	12 (44.0)	64 (52.0)	0.74 (0.32–1.72)	0.47	–	–
Time from disease onset to antiviral therapy	3.3±7.8 (1–34)	3.5±7.8 (1–34)	0.91 (0.81–1.01)	0.07*	n.a.	–
Essential hypertension	19 (70.4)	76 (61.8)	1.64 (0.64–4.17)	0.3	–	–
Chronic heart disease	18 (66.7)	34 (27.6)	5.81 (2.32–14.70)	<0.01	4.27 (1.41–12.98)	0.01
Chronic cerebral disease	5 (18.5)	19 (15.4)	1.29 (0.43–3.84)	0.64	–	–
Diabetes mellitus	10 (37.0)	23 (18.7)	2.69 (1.08–6.71)	0.03	–	–
Need for oxygen supportation	16 (59.3)	32 (26.0)	4.13 (1.74–9.80)	0.01	–	–
Severe COVID-19	26 (96.3)	50 (27.0)	38.5 (5.0–333.30)	<0.01	21.28 (2.32–200.0)	<0.01
Any supportive therapy needed	26 (96.3)	63 (51.2)	5.10 (1.82–14.30)	<0.01	–	–
Any antibacterial therapy needed	22 (81.5)	86 (69.9)	1.89 (0.67–5.37)	0.23	–	–
Any antiviral therapy needed	25 (92.6)	114 (92.7)	1.01 (0.21–4.98)	0.98	–	–
Treatment with favipiravir	17 (63.0)	58 (47.2)	1.91 (0.81–4.48)	0.14	–	–

318 *The parameter was not included in the final model as co-linearity was not proven by the *Box–Tidwell*
319 test with *Bonferroni's post hoc* correction ($p < 0.01$)

320 Table 3. Independent predictors of disease progression among adult COVID-19 patients

321 included in the study, grouped by progression occurrence

322 **TRANSPARENCY DECLARATION**

323 **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding this article. The
324 ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest was completed by the
325 corresponding author on behalf of all co-authors.

326 **Funding:** The article itself did not receive any external funding. BGSz received the *EFOP-*
327 *3.6.3-VEKOP-16-2017-00009* Doctorate Grant, and was supported by the *ÚNKP-19-3-I-SE-*
328 *74* New National Excellence Program of the Ministry of Innovation and Technology of
329 Hungary. The funding sources had no involvement in the preparation, writing, interpretation,
330 or submission of this article.

331 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the healthcare workers of our centre for
332 their sacrifice during these times. Together, we are stronger. Preliminary results of the study
333 were presented at ECCVID 2020 (September 23–25, 2020).

334 **Access to data:** Anonymised data of patients are available from the corresponding author on
335 reasonable request.

336 **Authors' contributions:** BGSZ and LKSZ contributed equally to the manuscript (*in equo*
337 *loco*). BGSZ: management of patients, data collection, data analysis, preparation of study
338 protocol, preparation of the manuscript; LKSZ: management of patients, data collection, data
339 analysis, preparation of study protocol, preparation of the manuscript; BP: data collection,
340 data analysis; ZSG: data collection, data analysis; ZSB: management of patients, review of the
341 manuscript; ZSB: management of patients, review of the manuscript; EB: management of
342 patients, review of the manuscript; JB: management of patients, review of the manuscript; EC:
343 management of patients, review of the manuscript; KF: management of patients, review of the
344 manuscript; AH: management of patients, review of the manuscript; NKD: management of
345 patients, review of the manuscript; CSL: management of patients, review of the manuscript;
346 KN: management of patients, review of the manuscript; JK: management of patients, review
347 of the manuscript; ELN: management of patients, review of the manuscript; AO: management
348 of patients, review of the manuscript; EP: management of patients, review of the manuscript;
349 AR: management of patients, review of the manuscript; JSZ: management of patients, review
350 of the manuscript; BSZ: management of patients, review of the manuscript; ASZ:
351 management of patients, review of the manuscript; SZT: management of patients, review of
352 the manuscript; ZSV: management of patients, review of the manuscript; OW: management of
353 patients, review of the manuscript; JSZ: management of patients, review of the manuscript,

354 COVID-19 Team Leader; BL: management of patients, preparation of study protocol,
355 preparation and review of the manuscript.

356 **Ethics approval:** The Institutional Review Board of South Pest Central Hospital, National
357 Institute of Hematology and Infectious Diseases (Budapest, Hungary) approved the study
358 protocol. Approval for the use of off-label investigational drugs was granted by our
359 institutional review board, as well as the National Institute of Pharmacy and Nutrition in
360 relation to the COVID-19 surge in Hungary
361 (*ogyei.gov.hu/tajekoztato_a_veszelyhelyzet_megszunesevel_kapcsolatos_a_covid_19_jarvany*
362 *_idejen_kulonos_meltanylast_erdemlo_betegellatasi_erdekhez_kotheto_gyogyszeralkalmazas*
363 *ok_bejelenteserol*).

364 **REFERENCES**

- 365 [1] National Institutes of Health. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines. 2020.
366 <https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/whats-new/>. (Accessed 2020.09.01).
- 367 [2] Shannon A, Selisko B, Le N, Huchting J, Touret F, Piorkowski G, et al. Favipiravir strikes
368 the SARS-CoV-2 at its Achilles heel, the RNA polymerase. bioRxiv 2020.
- 369 [3] Coomes EA, Haghbayan H. Favipiravir, an antiviral for COVID-19? J Antimicrob
370 Chemother 2020;75:2013-4.
- 371 [4] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Case definition for coronavirus
372 disease 2019 (COVID-19), as of 29 May 2020. 2020. [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/surveillance/case-definition)
373 [19/surveillance/case-definition](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/surveillance/case-definition). (Accessed 2020.09.01).
- 374 [5] World Health Organization. Clinical management of COVID-19. 2020.
375 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/clinical-management-of-covid-19>. (Accessed
376 2020.09.01.).
- 377 [6] Force ADT, Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT, Ferguson ND, Caldwell E, et al.
378 Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. JAMA 2012;307:2526-33.
- 379 [7] Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, Sanchez E, Tattersall RS, Manson JJ. COVID-19:
380 consider cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. Lancet 2020;395:1033-4.
- 381 [8] Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma. A 2020. évben azonosított új koronavírus (SARS-
382 CoV-2) okozta fertőzések (COVID-19) megelőzésének és terápiájának kézikönyve. 2020.
383 [https://koronavirus.gov.hu/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/imce/magyar_koronavirus_kezi](https://koronavirus.gov.hu/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/imce/magyar_koronavirus_kezi_konyv_2020.06.25.pdf)
384 [konyv_2020.06.25.pdf](https://koronavirus.gov.hu/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/imce/magyar_koronavirus_kezi_konyv_2020.06.25.pdf). (Accessed 2020.09.01.) [In Hungarian].
- 385 [9] Metlay JP, Waterer GW, Long AC, Anzueto A, Brozek J, Crothers K, et al. Diagnosis and
386 Treatment of Adults with Community-acquired Pneumonia. An Official Clinical Practice
387 Guideline of the American Thoracic Society and Infectious Diseases Society of America. Am
388 J Respir Crit Care Med 2019;200:e45-e67.
- 389 [10] von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
390 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
391 guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet 2007;370:1453-7.
- 392 [11] Irie K, Nakagawa A, Fujita H, Tamura R, Eto M, Ikesue H, et al. Pharmacokinetics of
393 Favipiravir in Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19. Clin Transl Sci 2020;13:880-5.
- 394 [12] Du YX, Chen XP. Favipiravir: Pharmacokinetics and Concerns About Clinical Trials for
395 2019-nCoV Infection. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2020;108:242-7.

- 396 [13] Pilkington V, Pepperrell T, Hill A. A review of the safety of favipiravir – a potential
397 treatment in the COVID-19 pandemic? *J Virus Erad* 2020;6:45-51.
- 398 [14] Chen C, Zhang Y, Huang J, Yin P, Cheng Z, Wu J, et al. Favipiravir versus Arbidol for
399 COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. medRxiv 2020.
- 400 [15] Cai Q, Yang M, Liu D, Chen J, Shu D, Xia J, et al. Experimental Treatment with
401 Favipiravir for COVID-19: An Open-Label Control Study. *Engineering (Beijing)* 2020.
- 402 [16] Ivashchenko AA, Dmitriev KA, Vostokova NV, Azarova VN, Blinow AA, Egorova AN,
403 et al. AVIFAVIR for Treatment of Patients with Moderate COVID-19: Interim Results of a
404 Phase II/III Multicenter Randomized Clinical Trial. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 405 [17] Murohashi K, Hagiwara E, Kitayama T, Yamaya T, Higa K, Sato Y, et al. Outcome of
406 early-stage combination treatment with favipiravir and methylprednisolone for severe
407 COVID-19 pneumonia: A report of 11 cases. *Respir Investig* 2020.
- 408 [18] Doi K, Ikeda M, Hayase N, Moriya K, Morimura N, Group C-US. Nafamostat mesylate
409 treatment in combination with favipiravir for patients critically ill with Covid-19: a case
410 series. *Crit Care* 2020;24:392.
- 411 [19] Yamamura H, Matsuura H, Nakagawa J, Fukuoka H, Domi H, Chujoh S. Effect of
412 favipiravir and an anti-inflammatory strategy for COVID-19. *Crit Care* 2020;24:413.

413