medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Effective post-exposure prophylaxis of Covid-19 is associated with use of hydroxychloroquine: Prospective re-analysis of a public dataset incorporating novel data.

David M. Wiseman, PhD, MRPharmS;[1] Pierre Kory, MD, MPA;[2] Samir A Saidi, PhD, MB ChB;[3] Dan Mazzucco, PhD.[4]

[1] Synechion, Inc., Dallas, TX, USA
[2] Aurora St. Luke's Medical Center, Milwaukee, WI, USA
[3] Central Clinic School, University of Sydney, Australia
[4] Third Eye Associates, Cherry Hill, NJ, USA

Address for correspondence:
Dr. David Wiseman, Synechion, Inc., 18208 Preston Road, Suite D9-405, Dallas, 75252
synechion@aol.com

Version 2 12/11/20
Abstract 297 words
Plain language summary 393
Text 3172 words
40 References
5 Tables

Supplement
12 Tables
31 References

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Plain Language Summary

A recent clinical trial examined the ability of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) to prevent Covid-19 just after an exposure to a person confirmed to have Covid-19. There was an HCQ-associated reduction of Covid-19 by an overall 17%; 36% in younger subjects, and 49% in subjects given HCQ within one day of being exposed. Likely because the study had too few patients to find what may have been a medically and economically meaningful, reduction, this effect was not statistically significant.

Studying the trial data, we discovered an unintended and variable delay in the delivery of study drug which may have masked any drug effect. The investigators provided further information at our request that confirmed our theory. About half of the participants received drugs one or two days later than intended, about a fifth beyond the four days the investigators thought the drug might work.

When we factored in this new information, we found that if HCQ was given early (up to three days after exposure), it was associated with a statistically significant 42% reduction of Covid-19. Giving HCQ later had no effect. There was a greater effect in younger (less than 45 years) rather than older subjects (47% vs. 25%). Gender did not seem to affect the results, but there was a greater HCQ-associated reduction (65%) when it was given early to people exposed to Covid-19 in a household environment rather than to health care workers (26%). The effects associated with HCQ were better in people without co-existing conditions.

These re-calculations are important because the study, as originally analyzed, was the only randomized study that dealt with preventing Covid-19 cited by FDA to support a key public health decision made in June 2020 regarding HCQ. Although other studies have shown that the drug is not effective to treat established cases of Covid-19, our research suggests that that it is effective for prevention. Other prevention studies have failed to show a benefit of HCQ, possibly because they have used lower doses or have estimated the timing of dosing differently. Our research paves the way for our result to be confirmed under clinical trial conditions and for a re-examination of public health policy regarding this drug. Even with the introduction of vaccination, there remains a need for approaches like this to prevent Covid-19 while individual and community immunity develops, especially in subjects given a lower priority for vaccination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Abstract

BACKGROUND: A recent trial (NCT04308668) found that post-exposure prophylaxis with hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) was associated with a reduced incidence of Covid-19 by 17% overall; 36% in younger subjects, 31% in household contacts and 49% given within one day. To understand these trends, we re-analyzed the released dataset.

METHODS: Our protocol conformed to the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT). We compared the incidence of Covid-19 after HCQ or placebo, stratifying by intervention lag, age, and gender.

RESULTS: Requesting additional data, we found that 52% of subjects received medication 1-2 days after the intended overnight delivery; 19% of them outside the intended four-day intervention lag. After re-analysis, there was a reduced incidence of Covid-19 associated with HCQ compared with placebo (9.6% vs. 16.5%) when received Early (up to 3 days) after exposure (RR 0.58, 95%CI 0.35 - 0.97; *p*=0.044; NNT 14.5) but not Late (RR 1.22, 95%CI 0.72 - 2.04).

We found a significant HCQ-associated Covid-19 reduction in subjects 18 to 45 years old with Early (RR 0.54, 95%CI 0.29-0.97; *p*=0.0448, NNT 11.5) but not Late (RR 1.02, 95%CI 0.55-1.89) prophylaxis, attenuated in older subjects (RR 0.75, 95%CI 0-27-2.05) and by co-morbidities. There were reductions associated with Early prophylaxis in household contacts (RR 0.35, 95%CI 0.13-0.89; p=0.025, NNT 5.7) and Health Care Workers (RR 0.74, 95%CI 0.4-1.38). We did not detect effects of gender, folate, zinc, or ascorbic acid.

CONCLUSIONS: Using novel data with a prospective *post hoc* re-analysis, hydroxychloroquine, in an age-dependent manner, was associated with reduced illness compatible with Covid-19 or confirmed infection when supplied for post-exposure prophylaxis between 1 and 3 days after high-risk or moderate-risk exposure, at higher loading and maintenance doses than in similar studies. This finding warrants prospective confirmation.

Registered with the Open Science Framework (last revised September 27, 2020, osf.io/fqtnw).

Short Summary

A prospective re-analysis of a public dataset integrated with novel data found an HCQ-associated reduction of illness compatible with Covid-19 when received between 1 and 3 days after a high-risk or moderate-risk exposure (RR 0.58, 95% CI 0.35-0.97, p=0.044, NNT14.5).

Keywords

COVID-19, Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), Re-analysis, SARS-Cov2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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

There have been (as of December 11, 2020) over 69.1 million cases of Covid-19 and over 1.57 million deaths worldwide,[1] about one fifth of them within the USA.[2] With early interest in deploying hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) in March 2020.[3] Lacking randomized clinical trial (RCT) data, emerging observational reports (with exceptions[4]) disfavored HCQ.[5] With safety concerns, FDA cautioned[6] against using HCQ outside hospital or trial settings on April 24.

HCQ became highly controversial, with suggestions that *"to some extent the media and social forces — rather than medical evidence — are driving clinical decisions and the global Covid-19 research agenda."*[7] Against this background, on June 15, FDA revoked[3] HCQ's EUA, citing only two just-published RCTs. The RECOVERY Trial[8] was cited as offering "*persuasive evidence of a lack of benefit of HCQ in the treatment of hospitalized patients.*"

The second and only study[9] addressing prevention examined post-exposure prophylaxis (the "PEP" study) with HCQ in 821 asymptomatic adults with a household or occupational exposure to Covid-19. Subjects received HCQ (1.4g first day, then 600 mg daily for 4 more days) or placebo (folate - USA; lactose - Canada). The study concluded that *"…HCQ did not prevent illness* […] *when initiated within 4 days after* […] *exposure"* (HCQ 11.8% vs. placebo 14.3%; RR 0.83, 95%CI 0.58-1.18, p=0.35).

We[10] and others have criticized the study's interpretation. Since this was a pragmatic trial, with typically greater heterogeneity and smaller effect sizes than in an explanatory trial,[11] powering the study to detect a 50% reduction in Covid-19 may have been over-ambitious, especially given its early termination.[12] A reduction of 17% is arguably[13] clinically meaningful.[14] Rather than targeting specific clinical goals, the authors suggested[15] that the study was primarily powered to collect data quickly under pandemic conditions.

Non-statistically significant signals of HCQ-associated efficacy included an a 31% reduction among household cohabitees. There were age-dependent reductions found in other analyses[16] to be statistically significant. The folate placebo and ex-protocol use of zinc and ascorbate may have been confounding (Supplement). With a reduction of 49% associated with early ("Day 1") HCQ prophylaxis, we[10] and others[17] found a negative association between intervention lag and reduction of Covid-19.

We conjectured that *post hoc* exploratory re-analysis of the PEP study would inform a time- and age- nuanced approach to Covid-19 using HCQ, testable prospectively. Our objectives were to define: (a) any time- or (b) age-dependent effects associated with HCQ and, (c) any influence of gender, exposure type, use of zinc, ascorbate or folate on outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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

Dataset and Protocol Revisions

One protocol (NCT04308668) described separately reported PEP[9] or early post-exposure treatment (PET)[18] cohorts. The de-identified PEP dataset was released (covidpep.umn.edu/data) with revisions: September 9 ("9/9"), October 6 ("10/6") and October 30 ("10/30") 2020.

Using the Open Science Framework (OSF) protocol template (osf.io/jea94/), we conformed to the SPIRIT checklist (Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Trials[19]) integrating the WHO Trial Registration Data Set.[20] Our protocol was registered on August 13, 2020 with revisions (Supplement), most recently September 27, 2020 (osf.io/vz8a7/[10]) prior to receiving data regarding the time to drug receipt in the 10/6 revision.

Four main areas required clarification (Supplement) related to: (i) exposure risk definition; (ii) study medication adherence; (iii) "intervention lag" (time from exposure to receipt of medication, resolved by the 10/6 revision); (iv) nomenclature for timing study events. Counting the date of highest reported exposure to Covid-19 as "Day 1," this adopted clarification yields some inconsistencies with the original paper indicating the occurrence of study events to be one day later.

Analysis Plan

We re-stratified data by intervention lag and then by age, gender, exposure type, risk level, or use of zinc or ascorbate. An Intent-to-Treat (ITT) analysis was employed as in the original study. We analyzed data according to adherence to taking study medication, provision of outcome data, use of the folate placebo, and presence of co-morbidities (Supplement).

We retained the original primary outcome variable: *"incidence of either laboratory-confirmed Covid-19 or illness compatible with Covid-19 within 14 days,"* comparing treatment arms using Fisher's Exact test. We examined the severity of symptoms at 14 days according to a visual analogue scale originally described as a secondary outcome (Kruskal-Wallis test).

We mirrored the original use of two-tailed tests without adjustment for multiple comparisons. This is further justified by the exploratory nature of our analyses. p- values $\leq$ 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Larger values are presented to identify trends. Microsoft Excel was used for data processing. Vassar Stats (vassarstats.net/) was used for verification. The original authors provided two calculations from which we verified our primary time stratification (Supplement).

Ethics Committee Approval

No ethics committee approval was required as we used a de-identified, publicly released dataset.

Results

Considering shipping schedules, we estimated[10] that within each of the reported[9] strata for "Time from exposure to enrollment" (1 to 4 days), there were overlapping variations in intervention lag. For example, some "Day 1" (range 1.4-4.4 days) and "Day 4" (range 4.4-7.4 days) subjects may have received drug after the same interval.

New data (9/9 revision) provided at our request broadly confirmed these estimates revealing a reduction in Covid-19 associated with HCQ given within 2 days of exposure (RR 0.35, 95%CI 0.13 – 0.93; p=0.0438) but not later (RR 0.98, 95%CI 0.67 – 1.45).[10] Recognizing limitations (Supplement) to these estimates, further detail was requested and provided (10/6 revision). The PEP study protocol had intended to enroll only those receiving drug within 4 days from exposure, assuming overnight shipping. We found that 332 and 95 subjects (52% of all subjects) received medication one or two days later than this respectively, with 152/821 (19%) subjects receiving drug outside the intended 4-day window (Table S 3).

We stratified subjects according to the intervention lag, in keeping with the declared aim of the original protocol. We found an HCQ-associated reduction in Covid-19 when received "Early" between 1 and 3 days after exposure from 16.5% to 9.6% (RR 0.58, 95%CI 0.35 – 0.97; p=0.044; NNT 14.5) but not later ("Late") (RR 1.22, 95%CI 0.72 – 2.04) (Table 1). We did not detect differences in symptom severity scores for either time strata (Supplement). A comparison

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

of the demographic and clinical characteristics of the two groups shows a largely conserved balance between the Early and Late cohorts (Table 2, Table S 1).

Adopting the same age strata as the PEP study, we found in the Early cohort non statistically significant Risk Ratios of 0.53 (18-35 years), 0.52 (36-50 years), and 2.80 (> 50 years). With no *a priori* reason for selecting these strata, the data are less subjectively supportive of two age strata. Conservatively (Supplement), we set the boundary at 45 years. We found HCQ-associated reductions of Covid-19 when given Early in both younger (18-45 years) (RR 0.54, 95%CI 0.29-0.97; p=0.0448, NNT 11.5) and older (>45 years) (RR 0.75, 95%CI 0-27-2.05) subjects. Within the Early and Late cohorts, further stratification revealed no obvious gender-dependent effects (Table S 4).

Considering only subjects reporting no co-morbidities (particularly excluding asthma and co-morbidities classified as "other"), suggested stronger effects associated with HCQ within time- or age-related strata (Supplement).

Numerical differences in HCQ-associated effects of Early prophylaxis in the whole cohort between Household (RR 0.69) and HCW (0.92) contacts reached statistical significance after time-stratification with a reduction of Covid-19 in household contacts (RR 0.35, 95%CI 0.13-0.89; p=0.025, NNT 5.7, Table 4). Differences in the baseline incidence of Covid-19 and the relationship between contact type, risk level and changes in risk definitions are described in the Supplement.

Directionally similar results were obtained after excluding subjects not contributing outcome data and subjects who did not take study medication. Stratifying into Early and Late prophylaxis cohorts revealed no discernible effect associated with folate (Supplement). With poorly detailed observational data, there did not appear to be an effect associated with zinc or ascorbate (Supplement). The use of zinc and ascorbate appears balanced between the groups both for the whole cohort and the Early and Late time strata (Table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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

In tackling our primary objective of defining any temporal effect of HCQ, we understood that HCQ prophylaxis had been "*initiated within 4 days after* […] *exposure*."[9] Although others,[13,16,17] including the authors of NIH[21] guidelines and the editorial[7] accompanying the paper, shared this understanding, it requires revision for two main reasons.

Firstly, many participants received medication after the intended overnight delivery or after four days from exposure. A similar issue likely pertains to the companion PET study.[18] Secondly, inconsistent terminology led to an overestimate by one day of the time from exposure to enrollment or to drug receipt.

Correcting these understandings yields a statistically significant reduction of Covid-19 by 42% associated with HCQ received between 1 and 3 days after exposure, but not later. The early use of HCQ is supported by estimates for an incubation period of 3-8 days.[22]

We found an age-dependent, statistically significant reduction of Covid-19 associated with Early prophylaxis. Re-analyzing the same PEP dataset without time stratification, we confirmed (Supplement) Luco's[16] report of HCQ-associated reductions in Covid-19 in subjects younger than 50 years reaching statistical significance in the high-risk exposure cohort. Interpretation of age-related effects is limited by a poorly understood relationship between age and susceptibility to Covid-19, increases in incubation period with age[23] and a low representation of older subjects with a low baseline incidence of Covid-19.

Small population sizes within the co-morbidity subgroups prompt cautious interpretation. However, the presence of co-morbidities attenuated age- and time- dependent HCQ-associated effects. Although age-related responses associated with HCQ may be related to co-morbidity,[16] excluding co-morbid patients did not yield equivalent effects in age strata. Asthma and co-morbidities classified as "other" contributed most to attenuating the HCQ-associated response. This finding is supported by the application of Multiple Correspondence Analysis and the Mantel test to the same dataset by Luco[16] who described confounding clinical differences between arms particularly regarding asthma and "other" co-morbidities.

Mirroring the original data, we found a significant HCQ-associated effect in household contacts. This result may reflect differences in access to advanced PPE, hygiene training, likely multiple exposures, and the ability to quarantine after exposure. Thus, household contacts in this study may share much with first responders in the companion PrEP study,[24] where a 64% reduction in Covid-19 associated with HCQ was observed (combined dose groups). Further, the changing risk definitions and their apparently inconsistent application between contact types may confound understanding of how contact type and risk level affect Covid-19 development. Whether the apparent lack of an HCQ-associated effect in moderate-risk exposures is a statistical aberration or is biologically meaningful is unclear.

With a small "no folate" cohort, we did not detect an effect of folate. Due a paucity of data, we could not determine whether there was an effect of zinc or ascorbate other than noting no differences associated with HCQ in subjects taking neither agent and the entire ITT cohort. Based on the apparently balanced use of zinc and ascorbate in the stratified cohorts, confounding due to these agents seems unlikely.

Our findings are made in the climate of concern[25] for the reliability of publications related to Covid-19 and the controversy surrounding HCQ.[26,27] This is partly fueled by a widening understanding of Covid-19 pathogenesis and the multiple, sometimes stage-dependent, mechanisms proposed for HCQ.[28]

In hospitalized patients RCT findings[29] evincing HCQ's ineffectiveness are supported by observational studies, notably two[4,30] that report significant HCQ-associated reductions in mortality only with the use of zinc. The possibly synergistic use of steroids[31] may further confound some studies. At earlier stages, any HCQ-associated effect appears independent of zinc, evinced (weakly) by the lack of synergy we observed. Further, using zinc may be futile in otherwise healthy, especially younger subjects with no zinc deficiency or dysregulation.

For prophylaxis, understanding differences in the ability to quarantine, testing methods, co-morbidities, and the possibility of multiple rather than single "index" exposures, appear important in reconciling apparently conflicting studies. Relying on different pharmacokinetic models, differences in dosing and intervention lag may be particularly significant (Table 5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Our findings are consistent with those of an Indian study[32] in which subjects mostly exposed to laboratory confirmed COVID-19 cases could opt to receive standard care alone or HCQ prophylaxis. With lower loading and maintenance doses than in the PEP study (Table 5), there was an HCQ-associated 45% reduction of Covid-19 at 4 weeks. A single "index" exposure could not be identified. Subjects enrolled after the primary case positive report and prophylaxis began at the earliest within 48 hours of knowing about the high-risk contact (D. Dhibar personal communication).

A well-executed cluster-randomized trial[33] from Spain reported a small HCQ-associated reduction of Covid-19 (aRR 0.86, 95%CI 0.52-1.42), with the same loading dose as the Indian[32] study but more frequent dosing over a shorter period (Table 5). The mean age was higher (48.6 years) than in the PEP study (41.6 years) where we have described possible age-dependent effects. There were poor HCQ-associated effects with an intervention lag of <= 3 days (RR 0.89), 4-6 days (RR 0.93) and later (RR 4.09). Notably, there were differences according to PCR testing status at baseline. In PCR-positive subjects there was no HCQ-associated effect (aRR 1.02; 95%CI 0.64–1.63), whereas for PCR-negative patients there was an effect signal (aRR 0.68, 95%CI 0.34–1.34). A change in PCR status is likely to be a function of the moment beyond which a drug is unlikely to be effective, possibly more accurately than an estimate of intervention lag. Accordingly, this study supports our findings suggesting a beneficial effect of early intervention.

Another well-executed household-randomized trial[34] examined the effect of HCQ given to subjects (PCR negative at baseline) exposed to an infected person. Daily, subjects self-collected nasal swabs for PCR testing. By day 14, no difference in infection rate was associated with HCQ even for intervention lags under 72hrs. Underestimation of intervention lag using the time to dosing from last contact, rather than from first contact, may mask the ability to observe any time-dependent effect. As the authors acknowledge, the dosing, which is the lowest among comparable studies (Table 5), may have been insufficient. The substantive lack of a loading dose may have extended the intervention lag beyond an effective range. The possibly anti-viral effect of the ascorbate[35] placebo may have confounded the results. Although data were not age-stratified, the populations was of a similar age to the PEP study, but with a higher representation of Hispanic subjects.

Differences in HCQ-associated responses between "Early" and "Late" PEP illustrate the poorly defined position that PEP occupies on a continuum between PrEP and PET. The variable possibility of other exposures occurring before and after a single "index" exposure means that the Early PEP cohort has much in common with the population of the companion PrEP study.[24] Although the PrEP study was hampered by poor recruitment, once or twice weekly use of HCQ (after a loading dose) in HCW was associated with reduced development of Covid-19 by 27%, compared with folate placebo (HR 0.73, CI 0.48-1.09, p=0.12, combined groups). Age related HCQ-associated effects were of a similar order of magnitude (34-45%) in the PEP and PrEP studies (Supplement Table S 6), consistent with the findings of an observational study involving mainly younger HCW.[36] Comparison with another PrEP RCT[37] in HCW, with a very small population (n=132), early termination, and a low incidence of Covid-19, lacks meaning.

Limitations

Given the enormity of the pandemic, we adopted a drug-development approach to glean efficacy signals possibly lost in the original study due to Type II errors related to underpowering, early termination and an environment of poorly understood pathogenesis. This could well justify shifting the threshold of toleration for Type I errors and other statistical challenges related to sub-group analysis.[38] These are partially offset by our use of two-sided tests, when directionality in the original data may have justified otherwise. Our primary time stratification based on newly-acquired data essentially represents the *a priori* analysis intended by the original authors. Nonetheless, this does remain a *post hoc* study; results should be interpreted cautiously, and hypotheses should be tested in prospective studies sufficiently powered to accommodate multiple comparisons in sub-groups.

Our study retains the limitations acknowledged by its original authors related to the availability and access to testing, the use of a clinical case definition of Covid-19, the reliance on self-reported data and the generally young population studied. There are other limitations. The study poorly represents African-American and Hispanic or Latino populations. The rapidly executed study overcame several logistical challenges to allow the collection of real-world data, having both advantages and disadvantages of a pragmatic design.[11,39] Self-selection bias inherent in this type of study may have been compounded by FDA cautions regarding HCQ.[6] Unlike similar studies,[33,34] the PEP study was not cluster-randomized.[39]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Limitations not already discussed relate to the estimation of the interval between exposure and treatment with 24-hour windows of uncertainty on either side. The earlier window is due to subjects providing only the date of their highest risk exposure. The later window is due to de-identification of shipping data, and the unknown interval before ingesting the first dose. The original authors (personal communication) attempted to minimized this by delivering medication to where the participant knew they would be at its expected arrival time.

Time-related or other biases may be associated with the exclusion of 100 randomized subjects who became symptomatic before medication was received and aggregated into the companion treatment study.[18] Lastly, analysis of the effect of risk level is confounded by an inability to discriminate between nuances within the risk categories

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Conclusions

Analysis[40] of the PEP,[9] companion[24,18] and other[33,34] studies raise no significant safety concerns for using HCQ in the populations studied. Integrating a public dataset with new unpublished data, we found that, especially in younger subjects, hydroxychloroquine was associated with significantly reduced illness compatible with Covid-19 when initiated between 1 and 3 days after a high-risk or moderate-risk exposure at higher loading and maintenance doses than in similar studies. With relevance to pre-exposure prophylaxis, these findings warrant prospective confirmation until individual and community immunity is achieved with widespread availability of vaccination.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. David Boulware and his colleagues for clarifying our questions, providing insight into their study, collecting additional data at our request related to shipping times and providing confirmatory calculations for our analysis. We also thank Drs. Marcio Watanabe, Juan Luco and Philip Lavin for their valuable comments. This acknowledgment does not imply endorsement of our work.

Funding and Conflicts of Interest

There is no external support for this study and the sponsor is entirely responsible for its design and conduct. The sponsor and principal investigator have no financial or other conflicts of interest in the subject matter of this study. DMW is the president of Synechion, Inc. and KevMed, LLC, providing services for the medical industry and marketing medical products, respectively, outside of the area of this work. See ICMJE forms for further details. DM is the president of ZSX Medical, LLC. developing surgical devices and a Principal at Third Eye Associates, a technical consulting company. PK and SAS report no conflicts.

Data Sharing

Microsoft Excel files will be available on reasonable request up to one year after publication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020. (Accessed Dec 11, at https://covid19.who.int/.)
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC COVID Data Tracker. 2020. (Accessed Dec 11, at covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/.)
3. Hinton D. Food and Drug Administration. Letter to Dr. GL Disbrow (BARDA), revoking EUA for hydroxychlroquine, June 15. 2020. (Accessed Nov 11, 2020, at https://www.fda.gov/media/138945/download.)
4. Carlucci P, Ahuja T, Petrilli CM, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin plus zinc vs hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin alone: outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. medRxiv 2020:2020.05.02.20080036. Epub May 8 http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.02.20080036
5. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational Study of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub May 8 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2012410
6. FDA. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA cautions against use of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine for COVID-19 outside of the hospital setting or a clinical trial due to risk of heart rhythm problems 2020 April 24. (Accessed July 16, 2020, at https://www.fda.gov/media/137250/download.)
7. Cohen MS. Hydroxychloroquine for the Prevention of Covid-19 - Searching for Evidence. N Engl J Med 2020 June 4. Epub June 4 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMe2020388
8. Randomised Evaluation of COVid-19 thERapY (RECOVERY) Trial. No clinical benefit from use of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalised patients with COVID-19. June 5 2020. (Accessed June 16, 2020, at https://www.recoverytrial.net/files/hcq-recovery-statement-050620-final-002.pdf.)
9. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub 2020 June 4 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2016638
10. Wiseman DM, Kory P, Mazzucco D, Ramesh MS, Zervos M. Treatment and prevention of early disease before and after exposure to COVID-19 using hydroxychloroquine: A protocol for exploratory re-analysis of age and time-nuanced effects: Update based on initial dataset review. medRxiv 2020:2020.08.19.20178376. Epub Oct 9 http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.19.20178376
11. Shortreed SM, Rutter CM, Cook AJ, Simon GE. Improving pragmatic clinical trial design using real-world data. Clinical trials (London, England) 2019; 16:273-82. Epub Mar 15 http://doi.org/10.1177/1740774519833679
12. Quintó L, Miguel Morales-Asencio, J, González, R, Menéndez, C. Is there sufficient scientific evidence to rule out the use of hydroxychloroquine for postexposure prophylaxis of COVID-19? OSF Preprints 2020. Epub Oct 19 http://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/d9prq
13. Avidan MS, Dehbi HM, Delany-Moretlwe S. Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 383. Epub Jul 15 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2023617
14. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 - Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub Jul 17 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436
15. Okafor EC, Pastick KA, Rajasingham R. Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. Reply. N Engl J Med 2020; 383. Epub Jul 15 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2023617
16. Luco J. Hydroxychloroquine as Post-Exposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19: Why simple data analysis can lead to the wrong conclusions from well-designed studies. ResearchGate 2020. Epub Sep http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.24214.98880
17. Watanabe M. Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine as Prophylaxis for Covid-19. Arxiv 2020:arxiv.org/abs/2007.09477v2. Epub Jul 18
18. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19: A Randomized Trial. Ann Intern Med 2020. Epub Jul 16 http://doi.org/10.7326/M20-4207
19. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gotzsche PC, et al. SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. BMJ 2013; 346:e7586. Epub 2013/01/11 http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e7586
20. World Health Organization. WHO Trial Registration Data Set (Version 1.3.1). (Accessed August 4, 2020, at https://www.who.int/ictrp/network/trds/en/.)
21. National Institutes of Health. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. 072420. 2020 July 24. (Accessed 2020 July 27, at https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/.)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

22. Ejima K, Kim KS, Ludema C, et al. Estimation of the incubation period of COVID-19 using viral load data. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.16.20132985. Epub June 19 http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132985
23. Tan WYT, Wong LY, Leo YS, Toh M. Does incubation period of COVID-19 vary with age? A study of epidemiologically linked cases in Singapore. Epidemiol Infect 2020; 148:e197. Epub Sep 3 http://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268820001995
24. Rajasingham R, Bangdiwala AS, Nicol MR, et al. Hydroxychloroquine as pre-exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19 in healthcare workers: a randomized trial. Clin Infect Dis 2020. Epub Oct 18 http://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1571
25. Guzman-Prado Y. Retraction of Studies on Potential Drug Therapies for COVID-19: A Call for Reliability and Scientific Integrity. Am J Cardiol 2020. Epub Jun 30 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2020.06.061
26. Karunajeewa H. Hydroxychloroquine for coronavirus: how not to repurpose a drug during a pandemic. Internal medicine journal 2020. Epub Oct 31 http://doi.org/10.1111/imj.15064
27. Saag MS. Misguided Use of Hydroxychloroquine for COVID-19: The Infusion of Politics Into Science. JAMA 2020. Epub Nov 9 http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.22389
28. White NJ, Watson JA, Hoglund RM, et al. COVID-19 prevention and treatment: A critical analysis of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine clinical pharmacology. PLoS Med 2020; 17:e1003252. Epub Sept 4 http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003252
29. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020. Epub Oct 9 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2022926
30. Frontera JA, Rahimian JO, Yaghi S, et al. Treatment with Zinc is Associated with Reduced In-Hospital Mortality Among COVID-19 Patients: A Multi-Center Cohort Study. Research square 2020. Epub Nov 4 http://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-94509/v1
31. Wiseman DM. Possible synergistic effects of hydroxychloroquine and steroids in COVID-19, time for a nuanced approach. Comment on Arshad et al. Int J Infect Dis 2020; 99:344-5. Epub Aug 10 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.064
32. Dhibar DDP, Arora DN, Kakkar DA, et al. Post Exposure Prophylaxis with Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) for the Prevention of COVID-19, a Myth or a Reality? The PEP-CQ Study. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020:106224. Epub Nov 10 http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.106224
33. Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Ubals M, et al. A Cluster-Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine for Prevention of Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine 2020. Epub Nov 24 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021801
34. Barnabas RV, Brown ER, Bershteyn A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure Prophylaxis to Prevent Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection : A Randomized Trial. Ann Intern Med 2020. Epub Dec 8 http://doi.org/10.7326/m20-6519
35. Holford P, Carr AC, Jovic TH, et al. Vitamin C-An Adjunctive Therapy for Respiratory Infection, Sepsis and COVID-19. Nutrients 2020; 12. Epub Dec 11 http://doi.org/10.3390/nu12123760
36. Bhattacharya R, Chowdhury S, Mukherjee R, et al. Pre exposure Hydroxychloroquine use is associated with reduced COVID19 risk in healthcare workers. medRxiv 2020:2020.06.09.20116806. Epub June 12 http://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20116806
37. Abella BS, Jolkovsky EL, Biney BT, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Hydroxychloroquine vs Placebo for Pre-exposure SARS-CoV-2 Prophylaxis Among Health Care Workers: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Internal Medicine 2020. Epub Sep 30 http://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.6319
38. Wang R, Lagakos SW, Ware JH, Hunter DJ, Drazen JM. Statistics in medicine--reporting of subgroup analyses in clinical trials. N Engl J Med 2007; 357:2189-94. Epub Nov 23 http://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr077003
39. Cook AJ, Delong E, Murray DM, Vollmer WM, Heagerty PJ. Statistical lessons learned for designing cluster randomized pragmatic clinical trials from the NIH Health Care Systems Collaboratory Biostatistics and Design Core. Clinical trials 2016; 13:504-12. Epub May 15 http://doi.org/10.1177/1740774516646578
40. Lofgren SM, Nicol MR, Bangdiwala AS, et al. Safety of Hydroxychloroquine Among Outpatient Clinical Trial Participants for COVID-19. Open Forum Infect Dis 2020; 7:ofaa500. Epub Nov 19 http://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofaa500

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Table 1: Stratification of effect associated with hydroxychloroquine based on time from exposure to drug receipt (ITT population)

From		Hydroxychloroquine			Placebo			95% CI		p
Day	**To**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**n Pos**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**RR**	**Lower**	**Upper**	
1	0	0		0	0					
2	2	32	6.3%	2	20	10.0%	0.625	0.09	4.09	
3	8	91	8.8%	14	92	15.2%	0.58	0.25	1.31	
4	10	85	11.8%	20	106	18.9%	0.62	0.31	1.26	
5	17	123	13.8%	14	119	11.8%	1.17	0.61	2.28	
6	7	62	11.3%	8	62	12.9%	0.88	0.34	2.27	
7	5	20	25.0%	0	8	0.0%				
Early prophylaxis 1-3 days post exposure										
>=2 to <= 4	20	208	9.6%	36	218	16.5%	0.58	0.35	0.97	0.0441
Late prophylaxis 4-6 days post-exposure										
> 4 to <=8	29	205	14.1%	22	189	11.6%	1.22	0.72	2.04	0.558

The number (and percent) of subjects with a Covid-19 positive outcome are shown for each group along with the total number of subjects for that group, stratified by time from exposure to drug receipt. The Days shown are days on which study drug was received, with Day 1 = day of reported high risk exposure.

Table 2: Demographic and clinical characteristics, stratified into Early and Late Cohorts

The data for the original cohort recreates data from the original paper, for comparison and quality control purposes. Several variables have been added. The data are stratified into Early (1-3 days) and Late (4-6 days) post exposure prophylaxis cohorts.
(I/S/%) - Shown in parentheses are interquartile ranges (1st and 3rd quartile), or standard deviations where indicated. All other values within parentheses indicate the percent contribution to the cohort total. See Table S 1 for full list of demographic and clinical characteristics.

	Original Cohort				**Early (<= 3 days from exposure)**				**Late Cohort (4-6 days from exposure)**			
Characteristic	**HCQ**		**Placebo**		**HCQ**		**Placebo**		**HCQ**		**Placebo**	
n	**414**		**407**		**208**		**218**		**205**		**189**	
Age		**(I/S/%)**		**(I/S/%)**		**(I/S/%)**		**(I/S/%)**		**(I/S/%)**		**(I/S/%)**
Median Age (IQR)	41	(33-51)	40	(32-50)	40	(33-49)	39	(32-49)	42	(32-52)	41	(33-51)
Median weight (kg)	75	(64-86)	76	(64-91)	75	(64-89)	77	(64-93)	75	(63-84)	74	(62-86)
Female sex	218	(52.7%)	206	(50.6%)	102	(49.0%)	106	(48.6%)	116	(56.6%)	100	(52.9%)
Current Smoker	15	(3.6%)	12	(2.9%)	6	(2.9%)	9	(4.1%)	8	(3.9%)	3	(1.6%)
Taking zinc	100	(24.2%)	85	(20.9%)	47	(22.6%)	46	(21.1%)	53	(25.9%)	39	(20.6%)
Taking Vitamin C	140	(33.8%)	130	(31.9%)	68	(32.7.0%)	71	(32.6%)	71	(34.6%)	59	(31.2%)
HCW contact	275	(66.4%)	270	(66.3%)	147	(70.7%)	152	(69.7%)	128	(62.4%)	118	(62.4%)
Household contact	125	(30.2%)	120	(29.5%)	54	(26.08%)	56	(25.7%)	71	(34.6%)	64	(33.9%)
High-risk exposure	365	(88.2%)	354	(87.0%)	186	(89.4%)	180	(82.6%)	179	(87.3%)	174	(92.1%)
No PPE worn	258	(62.3%)	237	(58.2%)	126	(60.6%)	116	(53.2%)	132	(64.4%)	121	(64.0%)
Days from exposure to receipt of study drug (Day 1 = exposure. as %) of cohort												
1	0		0		0		0					
2	32	(7.7%)	20	(4.9%)	32	(15.4%)	20	(9.2%)				
3	91	(22.0%)	92	(22.6%)	91	(43.8%)	92	(42.2%)				
4	85	(20.6%)	106	(26.0%)	85	(40.9%)	106	(48.6%)				
5	123	(29.8%)	119	(29.2%)					123	(60.0%)	119	(63.0%)
6	62	(15.0%)	62	(15.2%)					62	(30.2%)	62	(32.8%)
7	20	(4.8%)	8	(2.0%)					20	(9.8%)	8	(4.2%)
Coexisting conditions/ Chronic health conditions (all that apply)												
None	306	(73.9%)	290	(71.3%)	159	(76.4%)	156	(71.6%)	146	(71.2%)	134	(70.9%)
High blood pressure	51	(12.3%)	48	(11.8%)	25	(12.0%)	28	(12.8%)	26	(12.7%)	20	(10.6%)
Asthma	31	(7.5%)	31	(7.6%)	15	(7.2%)	15	(6.9%)	16	(7.8%)	16	(8.5%)
Diabetes	12	(2.9%)	16	(3.9%)	6	(2.9%)	7	(3.2%)	6	(2.9%)	9	(4.8%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Table 3: Stratification of effect associated with hydroxychloroquine by age based on time from exposure to drug receipt (ITT population)

Age Range		Hydroxychloroquine			Placebo				95% CI		
From	**To**	**n Pos**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**n Pos**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**RR**	**Lower**	**Upper**	**p**
Early prophylaxis 1-3 days post exposure											
>18	**<=45**	14	140	10.0%	28	150	18.7%	0.54	0.29	0.97	0.0448
>45	**<=90**	6	68	8.8%	8	68	11.8%	0.75	0.27	2.05	0.7799
Late prophylaxis 4-6 days post-exposure											
>18	**<=45**	18	124	14.5%	17	120	14.2%	1.02	0.55	1.89	1
>45	**<=90**	11	81	13.6%	5	69	7.2%	1.87	0.68	5.13	0.2901

The number (and percent) of subjects with a Covid-19 positive outcome are shown for each group along with the total number of subjects for that group, stratified by time from exposure to drug receipt. The elapsed time range in days is shown for Early and Late cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Table 4: Stratification of effect associated with hydroxychloroquine by exposure type based on time from exposure to drug receipt (ITT population)

	Hydroxychloroquine			**Placebo**							
Exposure type	**n Pos**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**n Pos**	**N Total**	**%Pos**	**RR**	**CI Low**	**CI Up**	**NNT**	**p**
Household	**18**	**125**	**14.4**	**25**	**120**	**20.8**	**0.69**	**0.4**	**1.2**	15.5	0.24
HCW	**31**	**275**	**11.3**	**33**	**270**	**12.2**	**0.92**	**0.58**	**1.46**	105	0.791
Early prophylaxis 1-3 days post exposure											
Household	5	54	9.3%	15	56	26.8%	0.35	0.13	0.89	5.71	0.025
HCW	15	147	10.2%	21	152	13.8%	0.74	0.40	1.38	27.2	0.377
Late prophylaxis 4-6 days post-exposure											
Household	13	71	18.3%	10	64	15.6%	1.17	0.55	2.49		0.891
HCW	16	128	12.5%	12	118	10.2%	1.23	0.61	2.49		0.689

The number (and percent) of subjects with a Covid-19 positive outcome are shown for each group along with the total number of subjects for that group, stratified by time from exposure to drug receipt. The elapsed time range in days is shown for Early and Late cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.29.20235218; this version posted December 12, 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 .

Table 5: Comparison of HCQ-associated effects after early prophylaxis in similar PEP studies

	Barnabas et al.[34]	**Mitja et al.[33]**	**Dhibar et al.[32]**	**Boulware et al.[9] (re-analysis)**
Type	RCT, cluster	RCT, cluster	Non-randomized, prospective	RCT, non-cluster
Loading Dose	400mg/d x 3 days	800mg day 1	800mg day 1	1.4g day 1
Maintenance Dose	200mg/d x 11 days	400mg/d x 6 days	400mg weekly x 3 weeks	600mg/d x 4 days
Placebo	Ascorbate	None	None	Folate
RR/HR (95%CI) for Early cohort[a]	aHR ~1.06	PCR- at baseline: aHR 0.68 (0.34-1.34) Mixed Early aHR 0.89 (0.46-1.71)	RR 0.55 (0.31-0.97)*	RR 0.58 (0.35-0.97)
p[a]	NS (≥ 0.05)	NS (≥ 0.05)	0.042*	0.044
Early cohort	≤ 72 hrs last contact to first dose	PCR -ve at baseline ≤3 days from exposure	At earliest < 48 hrs after knowing about high-risk contact	≤ 3 days highest risk exposure to drug receipt
Outcome	14d PCR confirmed Covid-19	14d PCR confirmed symptomatic Covid-19	4w Covid-19 incidence	PCR+ or Covid-19 compatible illness at 14d
Age, years[b, e]	39 (27 - 51)	HCQ 48.6 (18.7) Control 48.7 (19.3)	37.2 (13.9)	41.6 (12) (Early)
% Female[b]	60%	73%	45.1	48.8% (Early)
Participants	HCW & Household, PCR-ve	HCW & Household, PCR-ve at baseline	Non-HCW asymptomatic	HCW & Household. asymptomatic
N (HCQ/Control) [c]	353/336 (mITT)	958/1042 for PCR- 440/411 for ≤3d mixed[d]	132/185	208/218
Location	USA	Spain	India	USA, Canada
Registry	NCT04328961	NCT04304053	NCT04408456	NCT04308668

[a] Value from report, using adjusted values if reported. Otherwise, values are our calculations as noted by an asterisk (*).

[b] for entire study population, unless noted.

[c] for Early cohort population if stated, otherwise, as noted

[d] Mixed early cohort includes subjects who were either PCR+ or PCR- at baseline

[e] Age given as Mean (SD) or Median (Interquartile range).

NS Not stated or not calculable from provided data. Assumed p value ≥ 0.05 based on confidence intervals.