medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Early treatment with nitazoxanide prevents worsening of mild and moderate COVID-19 and subsequent hospitalization

[1]Jean-François Rossignol, MD, PhD, [1]Matthew, C. Bardin, PharmD, BCPS, [2]Joshua B. Oaks, MD, [3]B. Gregory Bostick, MD, [4]Kishor N. Vora, MD, [1]Jessica Fulgencio, MBA, [1]Dena Mogelnicki, and [1,5,6]Christian Bréchot, MD, PhD, for the Vanguard Study Group*

[1]Romark Institute of Medical Research, Tampa, Florida; [2]Progressive Clinical Research, Bountiful, Utah; [3]Cullman Clinical Trials, Cullman, Alabama; [4]Research Integrity, LLC, Owensboro, Kentucky; [5]University of South Florida, College of Medicine, Tampa, Florida; [6]Global Virus Network *Members of the study group are listed in the Appendix

Abstract

Background: There is an urgent need for treatments to prevent the progression to severe COVID-19 and hospitalization.

Methods: This is a double-blind randomized multicenter study in 36 centers in the U.S. and Puerto Rico investigating the potential of a five-day treatment with nitazoxanide 300 mg extended release tablets in 379 outpatients with mild or moderate laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 with an onset of symptoms no more than 72 hours before inclusion. Key objectives were reduction of duration of symptoms (primary), progression to severe illness (key secondary), hospitalization and viral load.

Results: Time to sustained response was not reduced by nitazoxanide (median: 13.28 and 12.35 days for nitazoxanide and placebo). Nitazoxanide treatment provided an 85% reduction in the progression to severe COVID-19 (1/184, [0.5%] nitazoxanide vs. 7/195, [3.6%] placebo). In subjects at high-risk according to CDC criteria, 1/112 (0.9%) of nitazoxanide-treated subjects and 7/126 (5.6%) of placebo-treated subjects experienced progression to severe COVID-19. Treatment led to a 79% reduction in the rate of hospitalization (1/184 [0.5%] nitazoxanide vs. 5/195 [2.6%] placebo). The proportions positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA and viral load at days 4 and 10 were not reduced. Nitazoxanide was safe and well tolerated.

Conclusions: Treatment of mild or moderate COVID-19 with a five-day course of oral nitazoxanide was safe and well tolerated and was associated with an 85% reduction in the progression to severe illness.

INTRODUCTION

The progress in developing effective vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 infection has been remarkable. Yet, coupling effective therapies with vaccination programs is going to be critical to controlling the pandemic.[1]

Effective treatments must be adapted to the natural course of COVID-19 which is characterized by a first phase of viral multiplication, which triggers secondary pulmonary and systemic

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/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

inflammation driven by an immune burst and, in particular, the innate response to the virus ("cytokine storm")[2]. However, the outcome of significant efforts to develop novel therapies – mostly based on the repurposing of existing drugs – has so far been limited. Effective treatments for early COVID-19 in outpatients have been particularly elusive. Promising results have been achieved with monoclonal antibodies, yet these treatments are costly, prone to viral resistance, and can only be administered in a clinic setting[3-5]. Hence, there is still a need for medications which can be distributed broadly to prevent the worsening of mild or moderate COVID-19 symptoms and subsequent hospitalization.

Nitazoxanide is approved for use in the United States for the treatment of diarrhea caused by *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia intestinalis* infections and has been used throughout Latin America and Asia for the treatment of intestinal parasitic infections. In the 25 years since nitazoxanide was first introduced, the drug has demonstrated an excellent safety record in both adults and children. Nitazoxanide has been previously shown to be active *in vitro* against a broad range of viruses including MERS and certain animal coronaviruses[6-8]. Recently, nitazoxanide was identified as a candidate drug for SARS-COV-2 infection based on high throughput screening and *in vitro* virus culture[9-13].

The antiviral activity of nitazoxanide is attributed to a host-directed mechanism, ultimately targeting the formation of key viral proteins at a post-translational level[14,15]. Due to this mechanism, studies with other viruses suggest nitazoxanide has a low potential to develop resistance[16,17]. Furthermore, multiple studies indicate nitazoxanide has a synergistic effect when combined with other drugs active against SARS-COV-2[11,13,18].

A recent study has demonstrated *in vitro* that nitazoxanide blocks the spike maturation of the B1117 and P1 mutants with the same efficacy as for the reference ¨Wuhan¨ strain and D614G mutations[10].

The present multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, provides evidence nitazoxanide prevents the progression to severe respiratory symptoms and hospitalization when administered to patients in the early stages of SARS-COV-2 infection.

METHODS

Study design and subjects

This was a multicenter randomized controlled trial conducted in 36 centers in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Each participant or his/her guardian was provided written informed consent prior to the initiation of any study procedures. Participants younger than 18 years of age provided written assent.

Subjects at least 12 years of age presenting within 72 hours of onset of symptoms of mild or moderate COVID-19 were eligible to participate in the trial. Minimum symptom requirements were: at least two respiratory symptom domains (head, throat, nose, chest, cough) with a score of ≥2 as determined by scoring the InFLUenza Patient-Reported Outcomes (FLU-PRO©) questionnaire administered at screening (only one domain score required to be ≥2 if pulse rate ≥90 beats per minute or respiratory rate ≥16 breaths per minute), with no improvement in overall symptom severity from the prior day. Key exclusion criteria were: (i) signs or symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

suggestive of severe COVID-19 including shortness of breath at rest, resting pulse rate ≥125 beats per minute, resting respiratory rate ≥30 breaths per minute, or SpO2 ≤ 93% on room air at sea level; (ii) previous COVID-19 infection or any symptom suggestive of COVID-19, (iii) recent episodes (two weeks) of acute upper respiratory tract infection, otitis, bronchitis or sinusitis; (iv) immunodeficiency, such as in subjects undergoing chemotherapy, transplant recipients receiving immunosuppressive therapy, and HIV patients with a CD4 count below 350 cells/mm^3 in the last six months. In addition, females of childbearing potential who were either pregnant or sexually active and not using birth control were excluded. A full listing of the inclusion and exclusion criteria can be found in the supplementary materials. The following medications were not allowed during the study: topical or systemic decongestants, nasal corticosteroids, and any prescription or non-prescription medications classified as (i) expectorants and cough preparations, (ii) analgesics and antipyretics, (iii) antihistamines or (iv) medications considered major CYP2C8 substrates. Acetaminophen and/or dextromethorphan were allowed if necessary for disabling symptoms. Subjects were also prohibited from taking hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, remdesivir, azithromycin or lopinavir/ritonavir except as standard-of-care rescue medication.

The central institutional review board (IRB) or a local IRB at each center approved the protocol. The trial (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04486313) was completed under an investigational new drug application with the FDA and done in accordance with guidelines set by the World Medical Assembly (Declaration of Helsinki, last amendment in Fortaleza, Brazil, 2013).

Randomization and masking

Eligible subjects were randomly assigned 1:1 to receive treatment with two nitazoxanide 300 mg extended release tablets (600 mg per dose) or matching placebo tablets orally with food twice daily for five days. The 600 mg twice daily dose was selected based upon a dose-range-finding study in patients with influenza[19]. In addition to study medication, all subjects received a vitamin B complex supplement (Super B-Complex™, Igennus Healthcare Nutrition, Cambridge, UK) twice daily to mask any potential chromaturia attributed to nitazoxanide.

Randomization was managed centrally by a contracted third-party using electronic interactive randomization technology. The randomization list was masked to study participants, the sponsor, investigators, study monitors, and laboratory personnel until the database was locked.

Randomization was stratified according to the severity of COVID-19 illness at baseline (mild or moderate), time from onset of symptoms (<36 hours or ≥36 hours), and whether subjects had risk factors that caused them to be "at risk" or "may be at risk" of severe illness based on CDC criteria (see Supplementary Material for CDC criteria). Mild illness was defined based upon FLU-PRO symptom assessments and vital signs as: (i) at least one FLU-PRO respiratory domain with a baseline score ≥2, (ii) resting pulse <90 beats per minute and (iii) resting respiratory rate <20 breaths per minute. Moderate illness was defined as baseline assessments of at least one respiratory domain with a baseline score ≥2 and either (a) resting pulse ≥90 beats per minute or (b) resting respiratory rate ≥20 breaths per minute.

Study procedures

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

After randomization, eligible subjects underwent a physical examination, collection of nasopharyngeal swabs, and blood and urine samples for laboratory safety testing and assessment of SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers. Study drug was dispensed, and subjects were followed for 28 days. Subjects were instructed to complete electronic diaries recording oral temperature twice daily and symptom severity once daily in the evening for 21 days and were contacted daily by telephone by site staff on study days 2-7 and 28 to verify compliance and screen for progression to severe illness or other complications. Repeat nasopharyngeal swabs were collected on study days 4 and 10. Follow up blood and urine samples for laboratory safety testing and assessment of SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers were collected on study day 22.

In the absence of any patient-reported outcomes instrument validated specifically for collecting data to measure symptoms of COVID-19, symptom data was collected using the InFLUenza Patient-Reported Outcome Questionnaire (FLU-PRO©). The FLU-PRO instrument has been validated for use in subjects with influenza and influenza-like illnesses[20]. The FLU-PRO Plus version used for this trial was modified to include items, loss of taste and loss of smell. The questionnaire was completed using an electronic diary app downloaded to each subject's smart phone or a provisioned electronic device so that diary entries were time stamped to ensure timely recording, thereby mitigating risks of recall bias.

Nasopharyngeal swab samples collected at baseline, day 4 and day 10 were tested using the Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 assay (Hologic, Inc, San Diego, CA) and ePlex® Respiratory Pathogen Panel ("ePlex RPP", GenMark, Carlsbad, California). Baseline, day 4 and day 10 nasopharyngeal swab samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 by the Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 assay for subjects positive for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline were subjected to RT-PCR for analysis of quantitative changes in viral load. Blood samples collected at baseline and day 22 were tested for quantitative anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.

Treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) and serious adverse events (SAEs) were collected and monitored continuously, from baseline through the day 28 study exit (or early termination). All TEAEs and SAEs were followed until the events subsided, until values returned to within the acceptable range, the investigator determined that follow-up was no longer necessary, or the subjects were referred to their primary care physician. TEAEs could be reported by the subject in person at a clinic visit, over the phone during the day 2-7 telephone monitoring calls, or by calling the clinic at any time during the study. Subjects were asked to come in to the clinic or referred for immediate care as needed for any TEAEs reported outside of a clinic visit.

Outcomes

The primary endpoint was time from the first dose to sustained response (TSR), a measure of meaningful within-subject change in symptoms. Subjects were considered to have reached sustained response when they experienced (i) a decrease in total FLU-PRO score from the previous diary entry, (ii) with a corresponding patient assessment that symptoms were at least "somewhat better than yesterday," (iii) no oral temperature ≥100.4°F during the past 24 hours, and (iv) no future increase in any of the FLU-PRO domain or subdomain scores through study day 21 except to the below pre-defined background levels that were considered not meaningful to patients. The pre-defined background levels for each domain were: Body/Systemic = 0.56, Throat = 0.67, Eyes = 0.67, Gastrointestinal = 2.0, Head = 2.0, Nose = greater of score at time of response or 0.75, Chest = greater of score at time of response or 0.0, Cough = greater of score at time of response or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

1.75. This methodology was developed using FLU-PRO data collected from prior trials in subjects infected with influenza viruses, rhinoviruses and endemic coronaviruses. The performance characteristics of the FLU-PRO instrument and appropriateness of background levels in subjects with SARS-CoV-2 infection were confirmed by blinded analysis of diary data for this study after database lock and prior to unblinding.

The key secondary endpoint was the rate of progression to severe COVID-19 illness (shortness of breath at rest and $SpO_2 \leq 93\%$ on room air or $PaO_2/FiO_2 < 300$). This definition was selected over a definition including hospitalization due to variability in physician decisions regarding hospital admission. Exploratory endpoints included proportion of subjects positive for SARS-CoV-2 by days 4 and 10, change from baseline in quantitative SARS-CoV-2 RNA by days 4 and 10, proportion of subjects hospitalized due to COVID-19 or COVID-19 complications, and proportion of subjects with mortality due to COVID-19 or COVID-19 complications.

Statistical analysis

Efficacy analyses were based on a modified intention to treat (mITT) population of subjects testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 by the Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 assay. All subjects receiving at least one dose of study medication were included in the safety analyses, with the exception of subjects testing positive for enterovirus/rhinovirus and negative for SARS-CoV-2 infection at baseline. Data for these subjects are to be analyzed as part of a separate study targeting enterovirus/rhinovirus infection.

In the primary analysis, TSR for the nitazoxanide treatment group was compared to that of the placebo treatment group using a stratified Gehan-Wilcoxon test (α=0.05) where stratification followed that used for randomization. Subjects without a sustained response recorded were treated as censored as of the last diary completed, except for subjects who were hospitalized or died during the study, who were censored at Day 21.

In the absence of prior experience in subjects with COVID-19, the sample size was determined based upon data from two prior clinical trials of nitazoxanide in subjects with viral respiratory illnesses caused by influenza or rhinoviruses. A sample size of 312 subjects (156 per group) was calculated to provide 90% power to detect a statistically significant difference in the survival distributions between the nitazoxanide and placebo groups (two-sided α =0.05). These calculations were performed for the Gehan rank test using SAS PROC POWER (SAS 9.4) with Kaplan-Meier curves generated from previous studies.

In the key secondary analysis, proportions of subjects progressing to severe COVID-19 illness were compared between the treatment groups using a Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) test stratified by the randomization strata. In the exploratory analyses, proportions were compared using a CMH test stratified by the randomization strata, and means were compared using a t-test.

RESULTS

From August 18, 2020 through January 8, 2021, 1,390 subjects aged 12 years and older with acute respiratory symptoms were screened at 36 sites in the U.S. and Puerto Rico for study enrollment. From this population, 935 subjects (nitazoxanide n=472, placebo n=463) were included in the safety evaluation and 379 subjects (nitazoxanide n=184, placebo n=195) with SARS-CoV-2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

infection were included in the efficacy analysis (mITT population). One hundred and fifty-six (156) subjects positive for rhinovirus/enterovirus and negative for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline were not included in the analysis as they are to be analyzed later as part of a separate study targeting enterovirus/ rhinovirus infection. **Figure 1** provides a full disposition of all subjects screened and **Table 1** provides the demographics of the mITT population.

Ninety-two percent (92%) of all possible daily FLU-PRO questionnaires were completed, and only 22 (5.8%) subjects were censored in the primary analysis due to missing diary data prior to the day 22 visit. Treatment with nitazoxanide was not associated with reduction of TSR. Median (IQR) TSR were 13.28 (6.26 - >21) and 12.35 (7.18 - >21) days for the nitazoxanide and placebo groups, respectively (p=0.88). A post-hoc subgroup analysis of subjects with mild illness at baseline showed improvement in TSR associated with nitazoxanide treatment compared to placebo that began early in the treatment period and continued throughout the study (median [IQR] = 10.3 days [6.2->21] for nitazoxanide [n=116] compared to 13.4 days [7.4->21] for the placebo group [n=129], p= 0.10 unadjusted for multiplicity, Supplementary Material Figure 1).

Eight subjects met the criteria for progression to severe COVID-19, **Table 2**. Notably, each of these subjects also met the protocol-defined criteria for "at increased risk of progression to severe COVID-19" at baseline. Treatment with nitazoxanide was associated with an 85% reduction of progression to severe illness compared to placebo (1/184 [0.5%] for the nitazoxanide group compared to 7/195 [3.6%] for the placebo group, p= 0.07 unadjusted for multiplicity), **Table 3**. In the subgroup of subjects at high risk according to CDC criteria, 7/126 (5.6%) of placebo-treated subjects experienced severe illness compared to 1/112 (0.9%) of nitazoxanide-treated subjects, p= 0.07 unadjusted for multiplicity. Severe illnesses and hospitalizations were associated with high viral load in nasopharyngeal swabs collected at baseline or study day 4. Finally, treatment with nitazoxanide was associated with a 79% reduction in the rate of hospitalization (5/195 [2.6%] in the placebo group compared to 1/184 [0.5%] in the nitazoxanide-treated group, p= 0.18 unadjusted for multiplicity).

Ninety four percent (94%) and 70% of subjects tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in nasopharyngeal swabs collected at study days 4 and 10, respectively. Qualitative and quantitative tests to detect SARS-CoV-2 were not significantly different between the treatment groups at these time points.

The safety analysis included 935 subjects, 472 treated with nitazoxanide and 463 with placebo. Overall nitazoxanide was safe and well tolerated by the subjects participating in the trial. One hundred thirty-eight (138) subjects (n=63 [13.3%] in the nitazoxanide group and n=75 [16.2%] in the placebo group) reported at least TEAE. Adverse events were predominately classified as mild or moderate in severity and unrelated or possibly related to study drug. Only diarrhea was reported in ≥2% in any treatment group (n=16 [3.4%] in the nitazoxanide group and n=10 [2.2%] in the placebo group). Frequency, severity and assessment of relationship to study drug of adverse events were similar across treatment groups. Nine subjects (n=2 nitazoxanide, n=7 placebo) reported SAEs, all determined to be not related to the study drug. Two subjects (both in the nitazoxanide treatment group) died during the study – one due to severe COVID-19 and the other (SARS-CoV-2 negative) secondary to aspiration, 19 days after completing therapy. Neither event was considered related to study medication in the judgment of the Investigator, Sponsor, Medical Monitor and Independent Data Monitoring Committee. Five subjects (2 nitazoxanide and 3 placebo) discontinued study medication due to adverse events.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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

The COVID-19 pandemic is raging with surges caused by SARS-CoV-2 variants, and the rate of hospitalization poses a major threat to health care systems in many countries. Despite the development of vaccines which are now being distributed, widespread vaccination will need time to be implemented worldwide and will not fully prevent infection. Thus, there is a critical need for a safe, easy-to-administer antiviral therapeutic that can be distributed through pharmacies and administered early for treatment of mild or moderate COVID-19 – ideally a host-directed antiviral that could provide a line of defense against emerging variants.

We report a multicenter randomized trial conducted at 36 outpatient centers in the United States between August 2020 and February 2021. The study employed a concurrent placebo control and enrolled a very broad range of subjects at least 12 years of age, 63% of whom had risk factors placing them at higher risk of severe COVID-19. Subjects were enrolled based upon symptoms to ensure early treatment, avoiding limitations associated with the availability and delays in diagnostic testing, and 379 subjects with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were analyzed for effectiveness. The trial was appropriately blinded, and subjects were closely followed for 28 days. Endpoints developed early during the course of the pandemic were objective and well-defined, and rigorous data collection procedures were employed.

Treatment with nitazoxanide 600 mg orally twice daily for five days was associated with an 85% reduction in the rate of progression to severe illness (the key secondary endpoint). All severe illnesses occurred in the subgroup of subjects at high risk of severe illness according to CDC criteria, and all occurred between study days 3 and 10. Treatment with nitazoxanide was also associated with a 79% reduction in the rate of hospitalization. While the overall number of events is low, the number are consistent with and compare favorably to those used to support approval of monoclonal antibodies for use under Emergency Use Authorization in the United States[3,4,21,22]. Notably, severe illnesses were associated with high viral loads in nasopharyngeal swabs collected at either the baseline visit or day 4. Similar observations have been reported by others[21,23].

In the analysis of the primary endpoint, treatment with nitazoxanide was not associated with a reduction of TSR (a measure of the duration of meaningful symptoms) compared to the placebo. The duration of COVID-19 symptoms (median 13 days) was considerably longer than observed in earlier data for subjects infected with other respiratory viruses. A post-hoc analysis of the subgroup with mild illness at baseline showed a median reduction of TSR of 3.1 days. In view of the long duration of COVID-19 symptoms and viral shedding observed in this trial, it is possible a longer duration of treatment and follow up may be required to observe an effect on the duration of COVID-19 symptoms, particularly in subjects with moderate illness.

Treatment was not associated with an effect on viral load on study day 4 or 10. Others have reported moderate reductions of viral load at different points after the end of treatment with nitazoxanide[24,25]. The quantitative assay we used had an upper limit of quantitation of 4.4 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL, and at the baseline visit, 32% of subjects had quantitative viral loads above that value, which in turn required imputation of the baseline value for these subjects at the upper limit of quantitation and may have affected the analysis of change in viral loads from baseline. In any event, analysis of nasopharyngeal swabs by RT-PCR has not been validated as a means of predicting clinical improvement.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

In this study, nitazoxanide was safe and well tolerated, consistent with its well-established safety profile. Safety will be an important attribute for a therapeutic for mild or moderate COVID-19.

Reducing the hospitalization rate is a key factor for controlling the pandemic. Only monoclonal antibodies directed to the viral spike protein have shown promise when used at the early stage of infection and have received FDA Emergency Use Authorization for the treatment of mild to moderate COVID-19. Yet the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 resistance to these antibodies has already been noted and it is necessary to combine several of them to avoid escape mutants[3-5]. Furthermore, monoclonal antibodies are costly, have an unproven safety record, require refrigeration, and must be administered at a hospital or clinic. In this study, nitazoxanide reduced the progression to severe COVID-19 and hospitalization in a manner similar to that of the monoclonal antibodies.

These results should be confirmed with larger trials. The availability of a safe, oral, scalable, host-directed antiviral for the early treatment of COVID-19 in persons at high risk of severe illness could play an important role in reducing the number of severe illnesses and hospitalizations during this ongoing major public health crisis.

Acknowledgments: We thank the clinical centers which have contributed to this study.

Disclosures: Jean-Francois Rossignol is an employee of and owns equity interest in Romark, L.C. Mathew Bardin, Jessica Fulgencio and Dena Mogelnicki are employees of Romark, L.C.; Christian Brechot is a senior adviser for Romark, L.C., an adviser for the Theravectys, Shanghai Vivo Biosciences and the chairman of The Healthy Aging company. This study was funded by the Romark Institute of Medical Research.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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. Kim PS, Read SW, Fauci AS. Therapy for early COVID-19, a critical need. JAMA 2020; 324:2149-50.

2. Sa Ribero M, Jouvenet N, Dreux M, Nisole S. Interplay between SARS-CoV-2 and the type I interferon response. PLOS Pathogens 2020;16:e1008737.

3. Bamlanivimab and Etesevimab Fact Sheet for Health Care Providers Emergency Use Authorization. Eli Lilly, Indianapolis, IN. Revised 03/2021. Available at: http://pi.lilly.com/eua/bam-and-ete-eua-factsheet-hcp.pdf. Accessed April 9, 2021.

4. REGEN-COV Fact Sheet for Health Care Providers Emergency Use Authorization. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Tarrytown, NY. Revised 03/2021. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/145611/download. Accessed April 9, 2021.

5. Chen RE, Zhang X, Case JB, Winkler ES, Liu Y, et al. Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 variants to neutralization by monoclonal and serum-derived polyclonal antibodies. Nat Med 2021; in press.

6. Rossignol JF. Nitazoxanide: a first-in-class broad-spectrum antiviral agent. Antiviral Res 2014;110:94-103.

7. Cao J, Forrest JC, Zhang X. A screen of the NIH Clinical Collection small molecule library identifies potential anti-coronavirus drugs. Antiviral Res 2015;114:1-10.

8. Rossignol JF. Nitazoxanide, a new drug candidate for the treatment of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. J Infect Public Health 2016;9:227-30.

9. Wang M, Cao R, Zhang L, Yang X, Liu J, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. Cell Res 2020;30:269-71.

10. Riccio A, Santopolo S, Rossi A, Piacentini S, Rossignol JF, Santoro MG. Impairment of SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein maturation and fusion activity by the broad-spectrum anti-infective drug nitazoxanide [Preprint]. bioRxiv 2021 Apr 12: 04.12.439201.

11. Bobrowski T, Chen L, Eastman RT, Itkin Z, Shinn P, et al. Synergistic and antagonistic drug combinations against SARS-CoV-2. Mol Ther 2021 Feb 3;29(2):873-85.

12. Mostafa A, Kandeil A, A M M Elshaier Y, Kutkat O, Moatasim Y, et al. FDA-approved drugs with potent in vitro antiviral activity against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2020 Dec 4;13(12):443.

13. Lian E, McAlister C, Ramirez G, Chernoff DN, Went G, et al. Triple combination nitazoxanide, ribavirin, and hydroxychloroquine results in the multiplicative reduction of in vitro SARS-CoV-2 viral replication [Preprint]. bioRxiv 2020 Nov 26: 11.25.399055.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

14. Rossignol JF, La Frazia S, Chiappa L, Ciucci A, Santoro MG. Thiazolides, a new class of anti-influenza molecules targeting viral hemagglutinin at the post-translational level. J Biol Chem 2009;284:29798-808.

15. Piacentini S, La Frazia S, Riccio A, Pedersen JZ, Topai A, et al. Nitazoxanide inhibits paramyxovirus replication by targeting the fusion protein folding: role of glycoprotein-specific thiol oxidoreductase ERp57. Sci Rep 2018;8:10425.

16. Korba BE, Elazar M, Lui P, Rossignol JF, Glenn JS. Potential for hepatitis C virus resistance to nitazoxanide or tizoxanide. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2008;52:4069-71.

17. Landolt G, Bentsen L, Moezzi D, Bardin M, Rossignol JF. In vitro and in vivo resistance potential to circulating influenza viruses of tizoxanide and oseltamivir carboxylate [Abstract]. Open Forum Infect Dis, 2016; 3(S1):S136.

18. Risner KH, Tieu KV, Wang Y, Bakovic A, Alem F, et al. Maraviroc inhibits SARS-CoV-2 multiplication and s-protein mediated cell fusion in cell culture [Preprint]. bioRxiv 2020 Aug 13: 2020.08.12.246389.

19. Haffizulla J, Hartman A, Hoppers M, Resnick H, Samudrala S, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled clinical trial of nitazoxanide in adults and adolescents with acute uncomplicated influenza. Lancet Infect Dis 2014;14:609-18.

20. Powers JH, Bacci ED, Leidy NK, Poon JL, Stringer S, et al. Performance of the inFLUenza Patient-Reported Outcome (FLU-PRO) diary in patients with influenza-like illness (ILI). PLoS One 2018;13:e0194180.

21. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, Gottlieb RL, Boscia J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing antibody LY-CoV555 in outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021;384:229-37.

22. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, Ali S, Gao H, et al. REGN-COV2, a neutralizing antibody cocktail, in outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021;384:238-51.

23. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. BMJ 2020;369:m1443.

24. Rocco PRM, Silva PL, Cruz FF, Junior MACM, Tierno PFGMM, et al. Early use of nitazoxanide in mild Covid-19 disease: randomised, placebo-controlled trial. Eur Respir J. 2021 14;2003725.

25. Silva M, Espejo AL, Pereyra M, Lynch M, Thompson M, et al. Efficacy of nitazoxanide in reducing the viral load in COVID-19 patients. Randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blinded, parallel group, pilot study [Preprint]. medRxiv 2021 Mar 5: 03.03.21252509.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1 Subject Disposition



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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: Summary of Baseline Demographic and Disease-Related Characteristics, ITTI Population

	Nitazoxanide (N=184)	Placebo (N=195)	All mITT Subjects (N=379)
Male, N (%)	83 (45.1%)	82 (42.1%)	165 (43.5%)
Age (years)			
Mean (SD)	39.5 (15.62)	41.0 (15.22)	40.3 (15.41)
Median (1st Quartile, 3rd Quartile)	38.0 (26.0, 50.5)	42.0 (29.0, 51.0)	40.0 (27.0, 51.0)
Min, Max	12, 83	13, 81	12, 83
Race, N (%)			
Asian	2 (1.1%)	4 (2.1%)	6 (1.6%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
Black or African American	4 (2.2%)	9 (4.6%)	13 (3.4%)
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5 (2.7%)	4 (2.1%)	9 (2.4%)
White	163 (88.6%)	169 (86.7%)	332 (87.6%)
Unknown	2 (1.1%)	2 (1.0%)	4 (1.1%)
Other	7 (3.8%)	7 (3.6%)	14 (3.7%)
Ethnicity, N (%)			
Hispanic or Latino	59 (32.1%)	71 (36.4%)	130 (34.3%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	123 (66.8%)	124 (63.6%)	247 (65.2%)
Unknown	2 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.5%)
Height (cm)			
Mean (SD)	170.0 (10.79)	168.6 (10.20)	169.3 (10.50)
Median (1st Quartile, 3rd Quartile)	170.2 (162.6, 177.9)	168.4 (160.0, 175.3)	170.2 (161.5, 176.8)
Min, Max	140.2, 193.0	149.1, 194.0	140.2, 194.0
Weight (kg)			
Mean (SD)	87.1 (23.72)	87.2 (22.34)	87.2 (23.00)
Median (1st Quartile, 3rd Quartile)	83.9 (68.5, 98.3)	85.0 (70.8, 100.3)	84.0 (70.4, 99.4)
Min, Max	45.4, 181.4	41.8, 168.0	41.8, 181.6
BMI (kg/m^2)			
Mean (SD)	30.0 (6.76)	30.5 (7.12)	30.3 (6.95)
Median (1st Quartile, 3rd Quartile)	28.7 (25.3, 33.5)	29.1 (25.7, 33.6)	28.9 (25.5, 33.5)
Min, Max	19.4, 52.8	16.8, 55.2	16.8, 55.2
Time from Onset of Symptoms to Randomization (hrs)			
Mean (SD)	42.7 (15.25)	44.6 (15.83)	43.6 (15.56)
Median (1st Quartile, 3rd Quartile)	43.9 (30.5, 53.3)	46.5 (30.8, 55.7)	45.9 (30.5, 53.9)
Min, Max	4.2, 71.2	2.3, 72.1	2.3, 72.1
Tobacco Use, N (%)			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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 .

	Nitazoxanide (N=184)	Placebo (N=195)	All mITT Subjects (N=379)
Current User	24 (13.0%)	26 (13.3%)	150 (39.6%)
Past User	24 (13.0%)	22 (11.3%)	138 (36.4%)
Never Used	136 (73.9%)	147 (75.4%)	283 (74.9%)
Severity of Disease, N (%)			
Mild	115 (62.5%)	130 (66.7%)	245 (64.8%)
Moderate	68 (37.0%)	65 (33.3%)	133 (35.2%)
At Risk of Severe Illness per CDC Guidelines, N (%)	112 (60.9%)	126 (64.6%)	238 (62.8%)

Table 2: Subjects Progressing to Severe COVID-19 Illness

Treatment Group	Age Group	Sex	BMI	Viral Load[1] Day 1/Day 4	Study Day	Medical Attention Required	Secondary Diagnosis	SpO_2
Placebo	70-80	M	31.7	3.18 / ≥4.40	7	Hospitalized	COVID-19 pneumonia	88%
NTZ	70-80	M	25.5	4.39 / 1.79	5	Hospitalized	COVID-19 pneumonia	91%
Placebo	50-60	F	22.8	2.96 / ≥4.40	3	Hospitalized	Syncope	93%
Placebo	60-70	F	36.4	3.54 / 4.06	10	Emergency room	COVID-19 pneumonia	93%
Placebo	60-70	M	33.0	ND / ND	7	Hospitalized	Dyspnea	88%
Placebo	50-60	M	26.8	≥4.40 / NC	9	Hospitalized	COVID-19 pneumonia	84%
Placebo	30-40	M	35.4	≥4.40 / IND	5	Clinic visit	Asthma (exacerbation)	93%
Placebo	50-60	M	34.9	3.47 / ND	7	Hospitalized	COVID-19 pneumonia	90%

[1]$\log_{10}$ RNA copies/mL, upper limit of quantitation of the assay was 4.40 $\log_{10}$ RNA copies/mL
[2]ND = Not Done due to insufficient sample; NC = Sample Not Collected (visit missed), IND = Indeterminate result by RT-PCR

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. 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: Subgroup Analyses of the Subjects Progressing to Severe COVID-19

Subgroup	NTZ	Placebo
All SARS-CoV-2-Positive Subjects	1/184 (0.5%)	7/195 (3.6%)
"May Be" or "At Increased Risk" for Severe COVID-19 Illness per CDC (protocol-defined stratification factor)	1/112 (0.9%)	7/126 (5.6%)
At Increased Risk for Severe COVID-19 Illness per CDC	1/104 (1.0%)	7/121 (5.8%)
At High Risk of Progressing to Severe COVID-19 and/or Hospitalization (per EUA documents for monoclonal antibodies)[1]	1/60 (1.7%)	6/69 (8.7%)

[1] ≥65 years of age, BMI ≥35 kg/m2, chronic kidney disease, diabetes, immunosuppressive disease, current receipt of immunosuppressive treatment, or ≥55 years of age with at least one of cardiovascular disease, hypertension, or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or another chronic respiratory disease

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441; this version posted April 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix

Vanguard Study Team (RM08-3008)

1. Maher Agha, MD (OnSite Clinical Solutions – Charlotte, Charlotte, NC)
2. Ayoade Akere, MD (Eagle Clinical Research, Chicago, IL)
3. Ali Bajwa, MD (Centex Studies – Westfield, Houston, TX)
4. Greg Bostick, MD (Cullman Clinical Trials, Cullman, AL)
5. Jose F. Cardona, MD (Indago Research & Health Center, Inc., Hialeah, FL)
6. Ivan Carreras, MD (Clintex Research Group, Inc, Coral Gables, FL)
7. Jorge Diaz, DO (Doral Medical Research, Inc., Hialeah, FL)
8. Dina Doolin, DO (Riverside Clinical Research, Edgewater, FL)
9. Timothy Elder, MD (SIMEDHealth, LLC, Gainesville, FL)
10. Almena L. Free, MD (Pinnacle Research Group, LLC, Anniston, AL)
11. Bernard Garcia, MD (Invesclinic U.S., Ft. Lauderdale, FL)
12. Hiram Garcia, MD (Rio Grande Valley Clinical Research Institute, Pharr, TX)
13. Darin M. Gregory, MD (Pioneer Clinical Research, Bellevue, NE)
14. Barry Heller, MD (Long Beach Clinical Trials, Long Beach, CA)
15. Rubaba Hussain, MD (Prime Global Research, Bronx, NY)
16. Talal Khader, MD (Vida Clinical Studies, Dearborn, MI)
17. Rogelio Machuca, MD (Machuca Family Medicine, Las Vegas, NV)
18. Eric J. Melvin, MD (Clinical Trials of America, LLC, Mt. Airy, NC)
19. Randall P. Miller, MD (Horizon Research Group of Opelousas, LLC, Eunice, LA)
20. Nidal Morrar, MD (G & L Research, Foley, AL)
21. Joshua B. Oaks, MD (Progressive Clinical Research, Bountiful, UT)
22. Arin Piramzadian, DO (OnSite Clinical Solutions, Charlotte, NC)
23. Joe E. Pouzar Jr., MD (Centex Studies- Houston, Houston, TX)
24. Michael J. Rankin, MD (Worthington Urgent Care, Worthington, OH)
25. Ramon Reyes, MD (BFHC Research, San Antonio, TX)
26. Patricia D. Salvato, MD (Diversified Medical Practices, Houston, TX)
27. Jodi Sanson, MD (HealthStar Research, Hot Springs, AR)
28. Pantea Shoja, MD (Pearl City Urgent Care, Pearl City, HI)
29. Javier Sosa, MD (Hospital San Cristobal, Ponce, PR)
30. Alan Tannenbaum, MD (Vanguard Clinical Research, LLC, Fort Myers, FL)
31. Rafaelito Victoria, MD (Atella Clinical Research, La Palma, CA)
32. Kishor Vora, MD (Research Integrity, LLC, Owensboro, KY)
33. George S. Walker, MD (Best Clinical Trials, New Orleans, LA)
34. David Wever, MD (Cahaba Research- Pelham, Pelham, AL)
35. Michael Yuryev, DO (Integrative Clinical Trials, LLC, Brooklyn, NY)
36. Jeffrey Zacher, MD (West Valley Research Clinic, Phoenix, AZ)