

1 **Bromhexine Hydrochloride Prophylaxis of COVID-19 for Medical Personnel:**
2 **A Randomized Open-Label Study**

3 Evgeny N. Mikhaylov, MD, PhD¹, Tamara A. Lyubimtseva, MD, PhD¹, Aleksandr D.
4 Vakhrushev, MD¹, Dmitry Stepanov, MD, DESA², Dmitry S. Lebedev, MD, PhD¹, Elena Yu.
5 Vasilieva, MD¹, Alexandra O. Konradi, MD, PhD¹, Evgeny V. Shlyakhto, MD, PhD¹

6
7 ¹ Almazov National Medical Research Centre, Saint-Petersburg, Russia;

8 ² Department of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care, Pain Management and Palliative Care,
9 Marienkrankenhaus Soest, Soest, Germany;

10

11 Authors ENM and TAL contributed equally to this work.

12

13 **Short title:** COVID-19 prophylaxis

14 **Conflicts of interest:** the authors declare no conflicts of interest in the scope of the present work

15

16 A preprint of the manuscript has been previously posted on medRxiv:

17 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252855v1>

18

19 **Address for correspondence:**

20 Assoc. prof. Dr. Evgeny N. Mikhaylov, MD, PhD

21 Institute of Heart and vessels, Almazov National Medical Research Centre, 197341 Saint-
22 Petersburg, Russian Federation;

23 Tel.: 007(812) 7023706

24 e-mail: e.mikhaylov@almazovcentre.ru

25

26

ABSTRACT

27 **Background:** Bromhexine hydrochloride has been suggested as a TMPRSS2 protease blocker
28 that precludes the penetration of SARS-CoV-2 into cells. We aimed to assess the preventive
29 potential of regular bromhexine hydrochloride intake for COVID-19 risk reduction in medical
30 staff actively involved in the evaluation and treatment of patients with confirmed or suspected
31 SARS-CoV-2 infection.

32 **Methods:** In a single-center randomized open-label study, medical staff managing patients with
33 suspected and confirmed COVID-19 were enrolled and followed up for 8 weeks. The study
34 began at the initiation of COVID-19 management in the clinic. The study was prematurely
35 terminated after the enrollment of 50 participants without a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection: 25
36 were assigned to bromhexine hydrochloride treatment (8 mg 3 times per day), and 25 were
37 controls. The composite primary endpoint was a positive nasopharyngeal swab polymerase chain
38 reaction (PCR) test for SARS-CoV-2 or signs of clinical infection within 28 days and at week 8.
39 Secondary endpoints included: time from the first contact with a person with COVID-19 to the
40 appearance of respiratory infection symptoms; the number of days before a first positive SARS-
41 CoV-2 test; the number of asymptomatic participants with a positive nasopharyngeal swab test;
42 the number of symptomatic COVID-19 cases; adverse events.

43 **Results:** The rate of the combined primary endpoint did not differ significantly between the
44 active treatment group (2/25 [8%]) and control group (7/25 [28%]); $P=0.07$. A fewer number of
45 participants developed symptomatic COVID-19 in the treatment group compared to controls
46 (0/25 vs 5/25; $P = 0.02$).

47 **Conclusion:** Although the study was underpowered, it showed that Bromhexine hydrochloride
48 prophylaxis was associated with a reduced rate of symptomatic COVID-19. The prophylactic
49 treatment was not associated with a lower combined primary endpoint rate, a positive swab PCR
50 test, or COVID-19. (ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT04405999)

51 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; prophylaxis; bromhexine hydrochloride; medical staff

52

INTRODUCTION

53 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the cause of respiratory
54 disease, COVID-19 [1]. The fast SARS-CoV-2 distribution resulted in the pandemic, and the
55 number of infected subjects keeps growing [2]. Current strategies for threat reduction include
56 non-pharmacologic prophylactic measures, such as social distancing, masks and hand sanitizers,²
57 as well as antiviral and anti-cytokine agents [3, 4]. In recent trials, pharmacologic preventive
58 drugs, such as anti-malaria and antibiotic medications, have failed to prevent infection, while
59 effective prevention is urgently required [5, 6].

60 The SARS-CoV has been shown to utilize the endosomal cysteine proteases cathepsin B
61 and L (CatB/L) and the transmembrane protease serine type 2 (TMPRSS2) for binding of the S-
62 protein [7]. It has been suggested that SARS-CoV-2 penetrates alveolar cells using the same
63 mechanism [8]. The viral S-protein is attached to angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) of
64 pneumocytes. Then it adheres to TMPRSS2 in S1 and S2-subunits [2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].
65 providing the possibility for the virus to enter the cell. According to this mechanistic perspective,
66 the protease TMPRSS2 can be targeted for preventing the penetration of SARS-CoV-2 into cells
67 [7, 13, 14]. Two medications that have been shown to block TMPRSS2 *in vitro*, camostat
68 mesylate and bromhexine hydrochloride; both block the ability of the protease to activate a
69 zymogen precursor of tissue plasminogen activator. Importantly, previous studies have
70 demonstrated that TMPRSS2 is blocked by a significantly lower concentration of bromhexine
71 hydrochloride than required to inactivate other proteases in cell culture [8, 13].

72 Therefore, bromhexine hydrochloride is thought to prevent the penetration of SARS-
73 CoV-2 into cells. If this would be confirmed in clinical settings, the drug might be used as a
74 prophylactic medication in subjects with a high risk of infection, including medical staff.
75 Medical staff working with COVID-19 patients are at higher risk of infection, and preventive
76 measures, including vaccination and possible pharmacologic prevention, are of paramount
77 importance.

78 We aimed to assess the preventive potential of regular bromhexine hydrochloride intake
79 for reduction of the risk of COVID-19 in medical staff actively involved in the evaluation and
80 treatment of patients with confirmed or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection. The study was
81 conducted in the period before any vaccine against COVID-19 became available.

82 **METHODS**

83 *Study design*

84 We conducted a single-centre randomized, open-label study to evaluate 8-week prophylaxis with
85 bromhexine hydrochloride during the period of regular exposure to Covid-19 (ClinicalTrials.gov
86 number, NCT04405999). We randomly assigned health care providers in a 1:1 ratio either to
87 bromhexine hydrochloride or to a control group.

88 Study enrollment started on May 13, 2020, when the Almazov Centre began the COVID-
89 19 treatment program. After starting the enrollment, a subsequent Federal order shortened the
90 period of hospital repurposing, and the period for healthcare providers' enrollment was shortened
91 to two weeks, accordingly. Therefore, the number of enrolled subjects reached only 50 (25
92 subjects per group), which accounted for 42.4% of the initially estimated number. The admission
93 of COVID-19 patients was performed between May 13, 2020 and July 25, 2020. The follow-up
94 of the study subjects consisted was 8 weeks. The study was terminated on August 9, 2020 after
95 reaching the end of follow-up.

96 The study was approved by the Almazov National Medical Research Centre ethics
97 committee (protocol #0105-20-02C from May 12, 2020) and conducted in accordance with the
98 Declaration of Helsinki. The study protocol is provided in the English language in **Supplements**.

99 *Participants*

100 We included participants over 18 years who were employed within the emergency departments,
101 intensive care units, and clinical departments where patients with confirmed/suspected COVID-
102 19 were admitted. All participants were obliged to wear personal protective equipment (PPE) as
103 prescribed by WHO recommendations and local instructions. The PPE included respirators class

104 FFP2 or FFP3, full skin covering, and protective eyeglasses. Blood tests for SARS-CoV-2
105 antibodies were taken at baseline before randomization (serologic qualitative assessment of IgM
106 and IgG, ELISA-BEST, Vektor-Best, Novosibirsk, Russia).

107 Participants were excluded if they had symptoms of respiratory infection within the last 2
108 months or a history of COVID-19, or a positive nasopharyngeal swab polymerase chain reaction
109 (PCR) test to SARS-CoV-2 before the day of randomization, confirmed direct contact to a
110 subject positive for SARS-CoV-2 within the last 14 days or had a positive serologic test (either
111 IgM or IgG). The additional exclusion criteria were a history of gastric ulcer or other
112 contraindications to bromhexine hydrochloride, pregnancy, and any severe chronic disease.

113 *Setting*

114 Recruitment was performed via the institution's electronic communication system and via
115 personal contacts with healthcare providers. The participants provided a scanned copy of the
116 signed consent. We performed follow-up phone calls and sent e-mail surveys on days 7, 14, 21,
117 28, and at week 8. The survey asked about any follow-up testing, illness, or hospitalizations.
118 Participants who did not respond to follow-up surveys were actively contacted by text messages
119 and telephone calls.

120 *Interventions*

121 The study statisticians adjusted a software for randomization using the minimization method
122 weighing the following factors: age (categories: 18-45, 45-64, 65-74, 75-79 years), the type of
123 anticipated contacts with SARS-CoV-2 (confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection cases within the
124 "red" zone, working closely with colleagues who had proven contacts with SARS-CoV-2
125 patients). A study coordinator sequentially assigned participants. The assignments were open to
126 investigators and participants.

127 Bromhexine hydrochloride was dispensed and shipped to participants by the study
128 coordinator. The dosing regimen for bromhexine hydrochloride was 8 mg 3 times per day

129 starting from the day before the first contact with COVID-19 (first day of work in a repurposed
130 department). The dosing regimen was based on previous reports [8, 15].

131 The control group was not prescribed any additional drug or placebo.

132 ***Outcomes***

133 The composite primary endpoint was prespecified as a positive nasopharyngeal swab SARS-
134 CoV-2 PCR test or the presence of clinical symptoms of infection within 8 weeks after starting
135 contacts with COVID-19 subjects. COVID-19–related symptoms were assessed based on the
136 U.S. Council for State and Territorial Epidemiologists Criteria for confirmed cases (positive
137 nasopharyngeal swab PCR test), probable cases (presence of cough, shortness of breath, or
138 difficult breathing, or the presence of two or more symptoms of fever, chills, rigors, myalgia,
139 headache, sore throat, and new olfactory and taste disorders), and possible cases (the presence of
140 one or more compatible symptoms, which could include diarrhea) [16].

141 Secondary endpoints included: time from the first contact with a person with
142 suspected/confirmed COVID-19 to the appearance of respiratory infection symptoms; the
143 number of days before the first positive SARS-CoV-2 test; the number of asymptomatic
144 participants with a positive nasopharyngeal swab test; the number of mild, moderate and severe
145 COVID-19 cases; adverse events possibly related to bromhexine hydrochloride.

146 According to the study protocol, nasopharyngeal swab SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests were
147 performed every 7 days, and additional tests were performed in case of infection. The PCR test
148 was performed by qualitative analysis (DNA-technology, Moscow, Russia).

149 Outcomes were measured at 7, 14, and 28 days after study enrollment, and then at 8
150 weeks. Outcome data including PCR, COVID-19–related symptoms, adherence to the study
151 drug, and side effects, as well as not taking the study drug by the control group subjects were
152 collected through participants' reports.

153 ***Sample size***

154 Initially, we estimated that 59 subjects would need to be enrolled in each group (140 subjects in
155 total, with an assumed 15% drop-out rate), when calculated using an alpha of 0.05 and 80%
156 power, assuming a primary endpoint achievement in 10% of treatment group subjects, and 30%
157 in the control arm. These numbers were derived from previous reports on the incidence of
158 COVID-19 positivity in first-line health care workers, and reports demonstrating a higher
159 proportion of COVID-19 positive Russian physicians [17-19]. However, as described in the
160 Methods section, the enrollment was ceased when 50 subjects (25 per group), were included. The
161 number of included subjects was amended by the study committee and updated on the
162 clinicaltrials.gov website after study completion on September 3, 2020.

163 *Statistical analysis*

164 The primary and secondary endpoints were assessed with the Mann-Whitney U test. Statistical
165 analysis was performed using STATISTICA software 13.0 (StatSoft, USA), according to the
166 intention-to-treat principle, with a P-value suggesting a statistically significant difference when
167 <0.05 .

168 **RESULTS**

169 *Participants*

170 Following a general notification via an institutional electronic system, one hundred and
171 fifty healthcare providers were contacted personally, and 62 positive responses were obtained.
172 Among 62 subjects who agreed to participate, 50 persons fulfilled the inclusion criteria (80.6%)
173 **(Figure 1)**.

174 The demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants are presented in **Table 1**.
175 Three (6%) of the participants were hypertensive, 2 participants had hypercholesterolemia.
176 Physicians comprised 88% of the population, and nurses 12%. The median exposure time to
177 patients with confirmed/suspected COVID-19 was 7.5 hours per week.

178 Overall, 80% (40 out of 50) participants had a very high-risk exposure (contacting with
179 aerosols from intubated COVID-19 patients) and 20% (10 out of 50) - a relatively lower risk

180 exposure (contacting with suspected/confirmed COVID-19 patients). All the participants had 6-
181 hour duration shifts working with COVID-19 patients, used FFE respirators, eyeglasses, and skin
182 coverings, and had direct contact with staff outside the “red zone” without PPE.

183 Seven (14%) participants used vitamins D, C as an intention to prevent infection: 3
184 participants in the bromhexine group (3/25, 12%) and 4 participants in the control group (4/25,
185 16%; $P>0.05$). None of the participants reported any unprotected contact with COVID-19
186 patients outside the hospital.

187 There were no subject losses nor dropouts after randomization.

188 *Primary endpoint*

189 All participants completed all scheduled surveys. The primary endpoint, a positive swab test
190 and/or infection symptoms, was documented in 9/50 (18%) participants during the follow-up
191 period: in 8 - by day 28, and in 1 - by week 8 (**Tables 1 and 2**). The primary outcome rate did
192 not differ significantly between the treatment and control groups (2/25 (8%) vs 7/25 (28%),
193 respectively) ($P=0.07$). Two hospitalizations for COVID-19 pneumonia were reported in the
194 control group (2/25, 8%), and none – in the bromhexine group (0/25, $P=0.16$). No severe cases
195 with intensive care unit admission or death occurred.

196 *Secondary endpoints*

197 There was no difference between the groups in the time between the first contact with a
198 suspected/confirmed COVID-19 person and infection symptoms, or an asymptomatic positive
199 PCR test. The first positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests in the treatment group appeared at 2 and 3
200 weeks, and in the control group the positive tests were obtained at 2, 3, 4 weeks, and during
201 weeks 5-8 (**Table 3**). Both SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive participants in the bromhexine treatment
202 group continued the intake of the drug until two consecutive negative tests.

203 Among 9 persons with a positive PCR test, 4 were asymptomatic (2/25 – in the treatment
204 group and 2/25 – in the control group; $P>0.05$). Five participants from the control group had
205 infection symptoms: only respiratory virus infection symptoms - in 3 persons; pneumonia – in 2.

206 All participants with respiratory symptoms were positive for SARS-Cov-2 and were compatible
207 with confirmed COVID-19 per the U.S. case definition.

208 Taking together, symptomatic COVID-19 was diagnosed in the control group only: no
209 cases in the treatment group (0/25) vs 5/25 cases in the control group, $P=0.02$.

210 *Adherence and safety*

211 Missed days of bromhexine intake were reported by 4 participants, the duration of skipped
212 treatment was 1-4 days. One participant who missed two days of drug intake had a positive
213 SARS-CoV-2 PCR test (asymptomatic case). It was impossible to assess whether missed drug
214 intake and infection occurred on the same day.

215 Two participants reported adverse events possibly related to bromhexine hydrochloride
216 treatment: a short period of hot flashes at treatment initiation and transient cough. No cases of
217 treatment termination or interruption due to adverse events were reported. There were no adverse
218 events in the control group. No statistically significant difference was found in the rates of
219 adverse events between the groups.

220 No subjects in the control group reported the intake of the study medication.

221 **DISCUSSION**

222 Although generally underpowered, the present study has several important findings. The
223 primary combined endpoint, the rate of positive nasopharyngeal swab PCR tests for SARS-CoV-
224 2 or symptomatic COVID-19, was similar in both groups. However, there was a trend towards a
225 lower rate of the positive swab PCR test in the bromhexine hydrochloride treatment group.
226 Importantly, the rate of clinically significant SARS-CoV-2 infection was statistically lower in the
227 treatment group (0/25 participants) compared with the control group (5/25 participants).

228 Even though the enrollment was terminated prematurely, it should be acknowledged that
229 the rates of the primary outcome in the active treatment and control groups were equal to the
230 estimated initially (8% vs 10%, and 28% vs 30%, respectively). This suggests that the primary
231 hypothesis of a 20% reduction in the outcome might be possible with the prevention treatment.

232 Indeed, the main outcome presents an important numerical difference but without reaching
233 statistical significance, and should be interpreted with consideration of the limited sample size.

234 The risk of symptomatic and severe COVID-19 depends on age and comorbidity [20].
235 Our study population was generally younger and healthier than in the majority of COVID-19
236 studies. However, in a study of post-exposure COVID-19 prophylaxis by hydroxychloroquine,
237 the mean age and average health status of the participants were comparable [5]. Thus, for
238 prevention efficacy assessment, our group can be informative. Moreover, the fact that the safe
239 and cheap drug showed the risk reduction of symptomatic infection can be important for future
240 larger studies and practical use.

241 We used a thorough approach for detecting asymptomatic cases performing
242 nasopharyngeal swab PCR tests every week of follow-up using the approved methodology [21].

243 Two factors increase the value of our study: good adherence, which is significantly
244 higher, compared to generally published prevention studies, and the high survey response rate.
245 This can be explained by the high motivation and high awareness of the medical staff.

246 It should be mentioned that a small number of participants used additional medications,
247 including ACE2 inhibitors/ARA, or vitamin C, D. No statistical difference in the use of
248 additional pharmacological treatment was documented between the groups, and the number of
249 subjects with additional medications was very small, thus we can conclude that this aspect had
250 no impact on the study results. It is plausible that the results may be more robust with a placebo-
251 controlled group. Due to the organizational difficulties during a limited period of study
252 preparation, the provision of placebo was impossible.

253 Although all healthcare workers were instructed to wear protective masks and medical
254 gloves outside the hospital, we cannot exclude that some of the participants might have been
255 infected outside the hospital or during direct communication within the community during rest
256 and meals. However, if bromhexine hydrochloride prevention is effective, it should be effective
257 anywhere.

258 It is generally believed that the risk of infection is lower when the staff uses PPE as
259 appropriate. Thus, further reduction of clinically significant cases can be an argument for the
260 implementation of this approach into clinical practice, even before obtaining better evidence.

261 In a recently published randomized study of bromhexine hydrochloride treatment in
262 patients hospitalized with COVID-19, the authors have shown that the early administration of
263 oral bromhexine reduces the intensive care unit transfer, intubation, and mortality rate [15]. In
264 another small open-label randomized study, where 18 patients with COVID-19 were included,
265 bromhexine hydrochloride treatment has been shown associated with a trend towards the
266 improvement in the need for oxygen therapy, and discharge rate within 20 days [22]. Although
267 hypothesis regarding the positive effects of bromhexine on viral penetration into cells in
268 noninfected subjects differs from the background presented in the two latter studies, these
269 investigations support the assumption of positive effects of the drug against SARS-CoV-2.

270 Whether the prophylactic use of bromhexine hydrochloride against SARS-CoV-2
271 infection in the general population is effective is a separate question that should be answered in
272 larger-scale randomized trials.

273 **Study limitations**

274 The major limitation of the present study is the small number of participants. The initial
275 estimation of the sample size was higher, but the enrollment was ceased earlier due to the
276 reasons declared in the Methods section. On the other hand, the sample size was sufficient to
277 demonstrate the significant difference in secondary outcomes between the groups.

278 Another limitation is the lack of sequential serologic testing, which we considered less
279 informative due to a very short study period.

280 It should be mentioned that safety and side effects data from self-reports is probably
281 limited. Theoretically, there was a risk of crossover between the groups; however, no evidence
282 of at least one crossover was found.

- 309 - Bromhexine hydrochloride is a TMPRSS2 protease blocker that is thought to preclude the
310 penetration of SARS-CoV-2 into cells;
- 311 - Prophylactic treatment with bromhexine hydrochloride reduces the rate of clinical
312 infection among medical workers who manage patients with COVID-19
- 313
- 314

315

REFEREFENCES

- 316 1. Helmy YA, Fawzy M, Elasad A, Sobieh A, Kenney SP, Shehata AA. The COVID-19
317 pandemic: a comprehensive review of taxonomy, genetics, epidemiology, diagnosis,
318 treatment, and control. *J Clin Med* 2020;9(4):E1225-E1225.
- 319 2. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology,
320 transmission, diagnosis, and treatment of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a
321 review. *JAMA* 2020 [in press].
- 322 3. Gandhi RT, Lynch JB, Del Rio C. Mild or moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020 [in
323 press].
- 324 4. Berlin DA, Gulick RM, Martinez FJ. Severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020[in press].
- 325 5. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Lofgren SM, Okafor EC et al. A
326 Randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N*
327 *Engl J Med* 2020;383(6):517-525.
- 328 6. Qaseem A, Yost J, Etzeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, Miller MC, Abraham GM, Obley AJ et al.
329 (2020) Update alert: should clinicians use chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine alone or in
330 combination with azithromycin for the prophylaxis or treatment of COVID-19? Living
331 practice points from the American College of Physicians. *Annals of internal medicine* [in
332 press].
- 333 7. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S et al.
334 SARS-CoV-2 cell entry depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and is blocked by a clinically
335 proven protease inhibitor. *Cell* 2020;181:271–280.
- 336 8. Glowacka I, Bertram S, Müller MA, Allen P, Soilleux E, Pfefferle S et al. Evidence that
337 TMPRSS2 activates the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus spike protein for
338 membrane fusion and reduces viral control by the humoral immune response. *J Virol*
339 2011;85:4122-4134.

- 340 9. Stepanov D, Lierz P. Bromhexine hydrochloride: potential approach to prevent or treat
341 early stage COVID-19. *J Infect Dis Epidemiol* 2020;6:135.
- 342 10. Matsuyama S, Nagata N, Shirato K, Kawase M, Takeda M, Taguchi F. Efficient
343 activation of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus spike protein by the
344 transmembrane protease TMPRSS2. *J Virol* 2010;84:12658-64.
- 345 11. Shulla A, Heald-Sargent T, Subramanya G, Zhao J, Perlman S, Gallagher T. A
346 transmembrane serine protease is linked to the severe acute respiratory syndrome
347 coronavirus receptor and activates virus entry. *J Virol* 2011;85:873-82.
- 348 12. Simmons G, Gosalia DN, Rennekamp AJ, Reeves JD, Diamond SL, Bates P. Inhibitors
349 of cathepsin L prevent severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus entry. *Proc Natl*
350 *Acad Sci USA* 2005;102:11876-81.
- 351 13. Lucas JM, Heinlein C, Kim T, Lucas JM, Heinlein C, Kim T et al. The androgen-
352 regulated protease TMPRSS2 activates a proteolytic cascade involving components of
353 the tumor microenvironment and promotes prostate cancer metastasis. *Cancer Discovery*
354 2014;4:1310-25.
- 355 14. Habtemariam S, Nabavi SF, Ghavami S, Cismaru CA, Berindan-Neagoe I, Nabavi SM.
356 Possible use of the mucolytic drug, bromhexine hydrochloride, as a prophylactic agent
357 against SARS-CoV-2 infection based on its action on the transmembrane serine protease
358 2. *Pharmacol Res* 2020;157:104853.
- 359 15. Ansarin K, Tolouian R, Ardalan M, Taghizadieh A, Varshochi M, Teimouri S et al.
360 Effect of bromhexine on clinical outcomes and mortality in COVID-19 patients: a
361 randomized clinical trial. *BioImpacts* 2020;10(4):209-215.
- 362 16. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists. Interim-20-ID-01: standardized
363 surveillance case definition and national notification for 2019 novel coronavirus disease
364 (COVID-19). Available at: [https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-](https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-01_COVID-19.pdf)
365 [01_COVID-19.pdf](https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-01_COVID-19.pdf). Accessed 05 September 2020.

- 366 17. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo CG, Ma W et al. Risk of COVID-19
367 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort
368 study. *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(9):e475-e483.
- 369 18. Dyer O. Covid-19: cases rise in Russia as health workers pay the price for PPE shortage.
370 *BMJ* 2020; m1975. Available at: <https://www.bmj.com/content/369/bmj.m1975>. Accessed
371 05 September 2020.
- 372 19. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-
373 19 — United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020, April 17; 69(15):
374 477-481. Available at:
375 https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6915e6.htm?deliveryName=USCDC_42_5-DM25898. Accessed 05 September 2020.
- 376
377 20. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, Pogosjans S, Kay M, Schwartz NG et al.
378 Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a long-term care facility in King County, Washington. *N*
379 *Engl J Med* 2020;382(21):2005-2011.
- 380 21. Marty FM, Chen K, Verrill KA. How to obtain a nasopharyngeal swab specimen. *N Engl*
381 *J Med* 2020;382(22): e76.
- 382 22. Li T, Sun L, Zhang W, Zheng C, Jiang C, Chen M et al. Bromhexine hydrochloride
383 tablets for the treatment of moderate COVID-19: an open-label randomized controlled
384 pilot study. *Clin Transl Sci* 2020; 13(6):1096-1102.
- 385

386
387
388

TABLES

Table 1. Demographic, clinical and work characteristics of study participants

	Bromhexine treatment group	Control group	Overall	P
n	25	25	50	1.00
Age, years	41.7±6.9	39.5±8.2	40.6±7.6	0.43
Sex, n (%) of males)	11 (44%)	10 (40%)		0.78
BMI	25.1±3.9	23.9±4.1	24.6±4.0	0.76
Work within the “red zone”, n (%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	25 (50%)	0.41
Co-morbidity, n	2	1	3	0.82
ACEi2 inhibitors/ARA treatment, n	1	1	2	1.00
Additional pharmacological drugs, n	Vitamin D/C 1	4	5	0.16
Negative serologic test for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG at baseline	100%	100%	100%	1.00
Time spent in the “red zone”, mean±SD; Median [IQR], hours	64.1±69.5; 40 [2; 144]	66.6±78.2; 20 [3; 160]	66.1±72.6 ; 30.0 [2; 144]	0.97
Time spent in the hospital, hours	145.1±44.5	143.2±40.6	144.2±42.2	0.66
Participants who worked in intensive care units, n	6	6	12	1.00
Participants who worked in re-purposed infectious wards or COVID-19 admission departments, n	12	14	28	0.58
Participants who worked in invasive cardiology/electrophysiology departments, n	6	4	10	0.49

389
390
391
392
393

n, number of participants; BMI, body mass index; ACEi2, angiotensin 2 converting enzyme inhibitors; ARA, angiotensine receptor antagonists; SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range; PCR, polymerase chain reaction

394 **Table 2. Study outcomes: positive PCR tests and COVID-19**

395

	Bromhexine treatment group	Control group	Overall	P
n	25	25	50	1.00
Primary outcome (Positive PCR test or COVID-19)	2	7	9	0.07
Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test, n	2	7	9	0.07
Asymptomatic	2	2	4	1.00
Symptomatic	0	5	5	0.02
COVID-19 moderate, n	0	3	3	0.08
COVID-19 severe with hospitalization, n	0	2	2	0.16
Drug non-adherence				
Missed doses of bromhexine, n	4	-	-	-
Number of missed bromhexine doses, Median [IQR]	6 [5.25; 7.5]	-	-	-
Adverse events, n	2	0	2	0.16

396

397 n, number of participants; IQR, interquartile range; PCR, polymerase chain reaction

398

399 **Table 3. Timeline of positive SARS-CoV-2 tests in both groups.**

		Days 1-7	Days 8-14	Days 15-21	Days 22-28	Weeks 5-8	Total
Number of participants with a positive PCR test	Treatment group	0/25	1/25	1/24	0/23	0/23	2/25
	Control group	0/25	2/25	3/23	1/20	1/19	7/25
Number of participants with clinical symptoms of respiratory infection	Treatment group	0/25	0/25	0/25	0/25	0/25	0/25
	Control group	0/25	0/25	2/25	3/23	0/20	5/25

400


401 Numbers of subjects with an outcome are divided by the number of subjects at risk. Three
 402 patients developed clinical symptoms after positive PCR test in the previous period (days 8-14
 403 and days 15-21). $P > 0.05$ for each period of follow-up.

404

405

406

FIGURES



407

408

409

Figure 1. Study flowchart.