

1       **2-Deoxy-D-Glucose as an Adjunct to Standard of Care in the Medical Management of**  
2       **COVID-19: A Proof-of-Concept & Dose-Ranging Randomised Clinical Trial**

3       Anant Narayan Bhatt<sup>1</sup>, Srinivas Shenoy<sup>2</sup>, Sagar Munjal<sup>2</sup>, Vijayakumar Chinnadurai<sup>1</sup>, Apurva  
4       Agarwal<sup>3</sup>, A. Vinod Kumar<sup>4</sup>, A Shanavas<sup>2</sup>, Ratnesh Kanwar<sup>1</sup>, Sudhir Chandna<sup>1</sup>

5

6       **Author Affiliations:**

- 7       1. Institute of Nuclear Medicine and Allied Sciences, Defence Research and Development  
8       Organization, Timarpur, Delhi – 110054, India.  
9       2. Dr Reddy's Laboratories Limited, 8-2-337, Road No.3, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad-500  
10      034, India.  
11      3. Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, RMC, Jalaun, Department  
12      of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Management, GSVM Medical College, Kanpur,  
13      India.  
14      4. Department of Pharmacology, Chengalpattu Medical College, Chengalpattu - 603001,  
15      India.

16      **Corresponding Authors:**

17      1. Anant Narayan Bhatt  
18      Institute of Nuclear Medicine and Allied Sciences, Defence Research and Development  
19      Organization, Timarpur, Delhi – 110054, India  
20      Email: [anant@inmas.drdo.in](mailto:anant@inmas.drdo.in); [anbhatt@yahoo.com](mailto:anbhatt@yahoo.com)

21      2. Srinivas Shenoy  
22      Dr Reddy's Laboratories Limited, 8-2-337, Road No.3, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad-500 034,  
23      India  
24      Email: [srinivasshenoyb@drreddys.com](mailto:srinivasshenoyb@drreddys.com); [srinivass@rediffmail.com](mailto:srinivass@rediffmail.com)

25

26      **Keywords:**

27      COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, 2-deoxy-D-glucose, Randomised Clinical Trial

28           **ABSTRACT**

29           **Objective:** To evaluate the efficacy and safety of 2-deoxy-D-glucose (2-DG) in the treatment  
30           of COVID-19.

31           **Participants:** 110 adults aged 18 to 65 years with moderate to severe COVID-19.

32           **Interventions:** 63, 90, and 126 mg/kg/day 2-DG plus standard of care (SOC) versus SOC  
33           only.

34           **Main Outcome Measures:** Times to maintaining  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  on room air discharge, clinical  
35           recovery, vital signs normalisation, improvement by 1 and 2 points on WHO 10-point ordinal  
36           scale, negative conversion on RT-PCR, intensive care, and mortality.

37           **Results:** Patients treated with 90 mg/kg/day 2-DG plus SOC showed better outcomes. Time  
38           to maintaining  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  was significantly shorter in the 2-DG 90 mg compared to SOC  
39           (median 2.5 days vs 5 days, Hazard ratio [95% confidence interval]=2.3 [1.14, 4.64],  
40            $p=0.0201$ ). Times to discharge from isolation ward, to clinical recovery, and to vital signs  
41           normalisation were significantly shorter for the 2-DG 90 mg group.

42           All three doses of 2-DG were well tolerated. Thirty-three (30.3%) patients reported 65  
43           adverse events and were mostly (86%) mild.

44           **Conclusion:** 2-DG 90 mg/kg/day as adjunct to SOC showed clinical benefits over SOC alone  
45           in the treatment of moderate to severe COVID-19. The promising trends observed in current  
46           phase-II study encourage confirmatory evaluation of the efficacy and safety of 2-DG in a  
47           larger phase-III trial.

48

49

50           **INTRODUCTION**

51       Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is currently a major global public health crisis. While  
52       remarkable progress has been made in vaccine development, there are limited therapeutic  
53       interventions available. Although several treatment modalities have been tried, no curative  
54       treatment has been found to date for COVID-19, and it is increasingly apparent that a  
55       multimodal approach is necessary for acute COVID-19 management [1].

56       The synthetic glucose analogue 2-deoxy-D-glucose (2-DG) has been identified as a potential  
57       treatment for COVID-19. It inhibits glycolysis in host cells infected by the severe acute  
58       respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [2 - 4].

59       Upon infecting host cells, viruses reprogram host cell metabolism for their own rapid  
60       replication [5]. New virion assembly requires high levels and turnover of nucleotides and  
61       lipids, which are achieved by elevated levels of glucose transporters and enhanced aerobic  
62       glycolysis (i.e., Warburg effect) [6]. Administration of 2-DG leads to its preferential  
63       accumulation within virally infected host cells, on account of the higher number of glucose  
64       transporters on the membranes of these virally infected cells, as compared to uninfected cells.  
65       Subsequently, 2-DG blocks glycolysis, resulting in the depletion of adenosine triphosphate  
66       (ATP) and anabolic intermediates required for viral replication and packaging. In addition to  
67       this direct effect, 2-DG may also cause mis-glycosylation of nascent viral proteins to form  
68       defective progeny virions with low potential to secondarily infect neighbouring cells [2, 7].  
69       Moreover, 2-DG also exerts anti-inflammatory effects and was shown to inhibit viral  
70       infection and inflammation in lungs in a murine model [8].

71       The antiviral activity of 2-DG was demonstrated in a study in 36 women with herpes simplex  
72       infection, when applied topically [9]. Furthermore, in vitro studies have shown significant  
73       inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 replication by 2-DG [2 - 4].

74 Recent studies using Positron Emission Tomography (PET) with the radiotracer, <sup>18</sup>FDG  
75 (fluorodeoxyglucose, an analogue of 2-DG) demonstrates substantial accumulation of the  
76 radiolabeled FDG in the inflamed lungs of COVID-19 patients [10,11]. This indicates that 2-  
77 DG could also preferentially and disproportionately accumulate in the inflamed lungs of  
78 COVID-19 patients. Furthermore, 2-DG has been studied in several clinical trials for  
79 treatment of various cancers globally and has demonstrated acceptable tolerability in humans  
80 [12].

81 This phase-II clinical trial was conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of 2-DG as  
82 adjunctive therapy in the treatment of moderate to severe COVID-19. The starting daily dose  
83 of 2-DG, 63 mg/kg was chosen based on tolerability data from previous clinical studies in  
84 patients with solid tumours [13,14]. Dose escalation to 90 mg/kg/day (nearly 1.5x) and 126  
85 mg/kg/day (2x) were planned if no safety concerns were observed at the starting dose. It  
86 should be noted that tolerability up to 250 mg/kg was established in a previous clinical study  
87 in glioblastoma multiforme [15].

## 88 METHODS

89 This was a phase-II, multicentre, randomised, open-label, parallel-group clinical trial to  
90 evaluate the efficacy, safety, and tolerability of 2-DG administered adjunctly to standard of  
91 care (SOC), in comparison with SOC alone, in patients with moderate or severe COVID-19.  
92 SOC was based on the national guideline [16].

93 The trial was conducted under the supervision of Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI)  
94 and approved by appropriate ethics committees (EC). The sample size (110 patients, 22  
95 subjects in each arm) for this proof-of-concept study was mutually decided upon between the  
96 sponsor and DCGI based on the novelty of the drug and with limited efficacy and safety

97 information available in non-cancer patients. The trial was prospectively registered on  
98 Clinical Trials Registry – India [CTRI/2020/06/025664 (Registered on: 05/06/2020)].

99 **Participating Patients**

100 The trial enrolled male or female patients aged 18 to 65 years, who were admitted to isolation  
101 wards at 12 COVID-19 management hospitals in India. Critically ill patients as defined in the  
102 guidance were excluded from the study [16]. The diagnosis of COVID-19 was confirmed by  
103 real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) assay of each patient's  
104 nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swab specimen.

105 COVID-19 severity in each patient was assessed according to the guidance [16]. Moderate  
106 disease was defined as the presence of dyspnoea and/or hypoxia, fever, cough, including an  
107 oxygen saturation level ( $\text{SpO}_2$ ) of 90% to 94% on room air, and a respiratory rate of  $\geq 24$  per  
108 minute. Severe disease was defined as the presence of clinical signs of pneumonia plus one of  
109 the following: respiratory rate  $> 30$  per minute, severe respiratory distress,  $\text{SpO}_2 < 90\%$  on  
110 room air, but not critically ill, i.e., no acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS),  
111 multiorgan failure, or septic shock. Since, 2-DG has previously been reported to cause QT  
112 prolongation, patients with cardiac conduction delay ( $QT_c > 500$  msec) or patients taking any  
113 medications known to prolong QT interval (including hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin),  
114 were not included in the study. Patients with malabsorption/gastrointestinal abnormalities that  
115 may affect drug absorption, and patients with body weight  $< 45$  kg or  $> 130$  kg were  
116 excluded from the study.

117 **Trial Design**

118 The trial was conducted in two parts, Part A for proof-of-concept (clinical), and Part B for  
119 dose ranging. Powder form of 2-DG was dissolved in 100 mL of potable water and an

120 individualised volume of the solution was dosed orally to patients based on body weight. In  
121 Part A, 44 patients were randomised in a 1:1 ratio to receive treatment with either 2-DG 63  
122 mg/kg/day plus SoC (the 2-DG 63 mg group) or SOC only (the SOC1 group). The centralized  
123 randomisation was carried out manually using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS, version  
124 9.4), throughout the study. 2-DG was given in two split doses totaling 63 mg/kg/day, viz., 45  
125 mg/kg in the morning and 18 mg/kg in the evening, along with SOC, until the patient was  
126 discharged or up to 28 days after the initiation of study treatment (i.e., Day 1), whichever  
127 occurred first. In the SOC1 group, SOC was provided as long as required. The dose-ranging  
128 Part B was conducted after the safety results from Part A had been reviewed and deemed  
129 acceptable. A total of 66 patients were randomised in a 1:1:1 ratio to receive 2-DG 90  
130 mg/kg/day plus SOC (the 2-DG 90 mg group), 2-DG 126 mg/kg/day plus SOC (the 2-DG  
131 126 mg group), and SOC only (SOC2 group). 2-DG was administered in two equally divided  
132 doses in the morning and evening, viz., 45mg/kg for 90mg group, and 63 mg/kg for 126mg  
133 group. In the two active treatment groups, 2-DG was administered along with SOC for 10  
134 days or until discharge, whichever occurred earlier. In the SOC2 group, SOC was provided as  
135 long as required.

136 For both parts of the study, data were collected through 28 days of study or until a patient  
137 was discharged from isolation ward of the hospital, whichever occurred earlier. A patient's  
138 clinical status was evaluated every day by the treating physician using the World Health  
139 Organization (WHO) 10-point ordinal scale [17]. The following assessments were done daily;  
140 the severity of COVID-19-associated symptoms, vital signs, peripheral blood oxygen  
141 saturation ( $\text{SpO}_2$ ), partial physical examination, 12-lead ECG, random blood glucose, adverse  
142 events, and concomitant medication. Real-time RT-PCR assay was carried out on  
143 nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swab samples on Days 3, 7, 10, 14, and 28 (or day of  
144 discharge if earlier) during Part A of the study and on Days 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 28 (or

145 day of discharge if earlier) during Part B. Clinical laboratory tests (haematology, serum  
146 biochemistry, and urinalysis) were performed on Days 7, 14, and 28 (or discharge if earlier).  
147 The severity of COVID-19-associated symptoms of cough, fever, nasal congestion, fatigue,  
148 body aches, sore throat, breathlessness, and diarrhea were self-scored by the patient every day  
149 using a 5-point Likert-type scale (0= absent, 1= mild, 2=moderate, 3= severe, 4= very  
150 severe/critical) for each symptom.

151 A Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) was instituted to review the safety data throughout  
152 the trial, as per the DSMB charter.

153 **Statistical Methods**

154 Continuous data were summarised using descriptive statistics. Categorical data were  
155 summarised using counts and percentage. ‘Time-to-event’ analyses compared between  
156 treatment and control (2-DG plus SOC versus SOC) groups using the Cox proportional  
157 hazard (CPH) model, with baseline clinical status scores as covariates. Age and sex were  
158 considered as additional covariates wherever relevant. Median estimates, hazard ratio (HR)  
159 and its corresponding two-sided 95% confidence interval (CI), and two-sided *p* values at 5%  
160 level of significance are reported. Statistical comparisons were done using log-rank test and  
161 Kaplan-Meier plot wherever applicable. Proportions were compared using Chi-square or  
162 Fisher exact test.

163 There were no statistical power calculations for sample size. Efficacy data were collected  
164 based on several clinically meaningful measures, and no particular parameter was designated  
165 as the primary endpoint.

166 The 2-DG plus SOC treatment groups were compared with their contemporaneous SOC  
167 groups as well as with the pooled SOC (SOC1 + SOC2).

168 **RESULTS**

169 A total of 110 patients were randomised, between June 2019 and September 2020, with 22  
170 patients in each of the five treatment groups: the 2-DG 63 mg and SOC1 groups in Part A and  
171 the 2-DG 90 mg, 2-DG 126 mg, and SOC2 group in Part B. 109 were dosed, and 1 patient in  
172 the 2-DG 126 mg group was discontinued before receiving any dose, due to an adverse event  
173 (Figure 1).

174 The demographic and baseline characteristics were similar across the treatment groups (Table  
175 1). The mean (standard deviation [SD]) age was 44.9 (10.90) years, and the mean (SD)  
176 weight was 68.6 (11.39) kg for all randomised patients. A majority of the patients (88  
177 [80.7%]) were male. There were differences in certain baseline disease characteristics  
178 between patients enrolled in Parts A and B of the study. The mean (SD) number of days since  
179 the onset of initial COVID-19 symptoms in patients enrolled in Part A were 7.2 (2.58) days  
180 for the SOC1 group and 6.6 (2.26) days for the 2-DG 63 mg group, and for those enrolled in  
181 Part B were 4.5 (1.41) days, 4.3 (1.46) days, and 4.4 (1.40) days for the 2-DG 90 mg, 2-DG  
182 126 mg, and SOC2 groups, respectively. All enrolled patients were assessed to have moderate  
183 COVID-19 as defined by the guidance, except 3 patients with missing severity data [one  
184 (4.5%) patient each from 2-DG 63 mg, SOC1, and SOC2 groups].

185 **Efficacy**

186 The median time to achieve and maintain  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  on room air at sea level was the  
187 shortest in 2-DG 90 mg group (2.5 days), followed closely by the 2-DG 126 mg group (3.0  
188 days). The median time to achieving  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  was 5.0 days across all the other three  
189 groups, viz., 63 mg, SOC1 and SOC2. The hazard ratio (95% CI) for the 2-DG 90 mg group  
190 was 2.3 (1.14, 4.64) ( $p=0.0201$ ) compared with the SOC2 group and 2.6 (1.49, 4.70)

191 (p=0.0009) compared with the pooled SOC group. The comparisons between 2-DG 63 mg  
192 and SOC1 and between 2-DG 126 mg and SOC2 were not statistically significant.

193 The median time to discharge from isolation ward was 8.0 days in the 2-DG 90 mg group  
194 (Figure 2), which was the shortest among all groups (Table 2). The hazard ratio (95% CI) for  
195 the 2-DG 90 mg group was 2.2 (1.07, 4.70) (p=0.0336) compared with the SOC2 group and  
196 2.2 (1.21, 4.04) (p=0.01) compared with the pooled SOC group. Other two dose groups (2-  
197 DG 63 mg and 2-DG 126 mg groups) were not statistically significant, when compared with  
198 their respective SOC groups.

199 Time to clinical recovery is a composite endpoint of number of days to achieving and  
200 maintaining SpO<sub>2</sub> of ≥ 94% on room air and the number of days to achieve symptom severity  
201 score (self-assessed by patient) of ≤1 on a 5-point Likert-type scale, for all COVID-19  
202 associated symptoms. The median time to clinical recovery was 4.5 days, 3 days, and 4 days  
203 in the 2-DG 63 mg, 2-DG 90 mg, and 2-DG 126 mg groups, respectively, and 5 days in  
204 SOC1 and 6 days in SOC2 groups. The hazard ratio (95% CI) for 2-DG 90 mg group was 3.8  
205 (1.85, 7.94) (p=0.0003) compared with the SOC2 group and 3.4 (1.90, 6.01) (p<0.0001)  
206 compared with the pooled SOC group.

207 Similarly, time to vital signs normalisation was seen to be significantly better in the 2-DG 90  
208 mg group as compared to SOC2 group. Median time to vital signs normalisation was 5 days  
209 in the 2-DG 90 mg group as compared to 8 days in the contemporaneous SOC2 group,  
210 Hazard ratio (95% CI) from the CPH model= 4.3 (1.67, 11.29) (p=0.0026).

211 The median time to improvement in clinical status score by 2 points over baseline was 5 days  
212 in both 2-DG 90 mg group and 2-DG 126 mg group, even though the median time to  
213 improvement by 1 point was shortest in 2-DG 126 mg group (3 days) followed by 2-DG 90  
214 mg group (4 days). The comparisons of these two groups with SOC2 group were not

215 statistically significant. Hazard ratio (95% CI) from CPH model was 1.8 (0.92, 3.36)  
216 ( $p=0.0852$ ) for 2-DG 90 mg vs SOC2 group, and 1.18 (0.63, 2.22) ( $p=0.6021$ ) for 2-DG  
217 126 mg vs SOC2 group, for the time to achieve 2 points improvement over baseline in the  
218 clinical status score. Only the comparison between the 2-DG 90 mg group and the pooled  
219 SOC group in terms of median time to 2 points improvement (HR=2.364; 95% CI: 1.33, 4.18;  
220  $p=0.0032$ ) was found significant.

221 Median time to first conversion to negative RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 RNA was the  
222 shortest in the SOC1 group (3.5 days), followed by the 2-DG 90 mg group with 5.0 days as  
223 per CPH model (4.0 days from descriptive statistics) and the 2-DG 63 mg group with 7.0  
224 days as per CPH model (6.0 days from descriptive statistics). The median time was 7.0 days  
225 for both the 2-DG 126 mg and SOC2 groups. None of the 2-DG groups was statistically  
226 significant compared with the corresponding SOC groups. However, 2-DG 90 mg group  
227 showed numerically superior trend with HR= 2.0 (0.94, 4.25;  $p=0.0702$ ).

228 One patient each in 2-DG 90 mg group and the SOC2 group required ICU admission during  
229 the study. One mortality was reported in 2-DG 90 mg group. No meaningful comparison on  
230 ICU admission or mortality rates among treatment groups could be made due to the  
231 negligible number of events.

## 232 **Safety**

233 All three dose levels of 2-DG were well tolerated. A total of 65 treatment-emergent adverse  
234 events were reported in 33 (30.3%) patients. One serious adverse event was reported in a  
235 patient in the 2-DG 90 mg group who died of ARDS, which was considered not related to the  
236 study drug by the sponsor as well as the investigator. Fifty-six of the 65 adverse events (86%)  
237 were mild. Hyperglycaemia was the most commonly reported adverse event overall, with 14  
238 events occurring in 10 patients (9.2%) across five groups (Table 3). This included 4 (18.2%)

239 patients in the SOC 2 group, 2 patients each in SOC1 group (9.1%) and 2-DG 126 mg group  
240 (9.5%), and 1( 4.5%) patient each in 2-DG 63 mg group and 2-DG 90 mg group. Other  
241 common adverse events were palpitations in 4 (3.7%) patients, dizziness in 4 (3.7%) patients,  
242 and diarrhoea in 3 (2.8%) patients out of 109 patients, all of which were observed in the 2-  
243 DG 63 mg and 90 mg groups with incidence ranging 4.5% to 9.1%.

244 No clinically significant prolongations of the cardiac QT interval were reported in 2-DG  
245 treatment arm. The greatest change in mean QT<sub>c</sub> intervals from baseline and the highest mean  
246 and median values were observed on Day 7 in the 2-DG 126 mg group, with a mean increase  
247 of 23.8 msec from baseline (data on file), mean value of 446.7 ms, and median value of 444.0  
248 ms (Table 4).

249 **Discussion**

250 Experience suggests that no single agent is sufficient to treat all COVID-19 cases, and a  
251 multimodal approach is imperative. In this context, we evaluated 2-DG as a potential  
252 therapeutic option for COVID-19 as an adjunct to standard of care. To the best of our  
253 knowledge, this is the first clinical study of 2-DG in COVID-19 patients. This study was  
254 based on extensive safety evidence for 2-DG from prior clinical studies, anti-viral efficacy of  
255 topically applied 2-DG in a herpes simplex study, and in vitro inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 by  
256 2-DG [2-4, 9, 13-15].

257 The starting dose used in this study, 63 mg/kg/day, was about 4 times lower than the  
258 maximum tolerated dose of 250 mg/kg reported in a previous trial of glioblastoma  
259 multiforme patients [15]. As COVID-19 management has evolved rapidly, some differences  
260 in SOC medications were seen between Parts A and B of the study; however, the SOC was  
261 comparable between each active treatment group and the corresponding SOC group during  
262 each part of the study.

263 On several key efficacy endpoints, the most favourable outcomes were observed in the 2-DG  
264 90 mg group as compared with SOC. Statistically significant outcomes were seen with 2-DG  
265 90 mg group in times to achieving and maintaining blood oxygen saturation  $\geq 94\%$ , clinical  
266 recovery, vital signs normalization and discharge as compared to respective SOC. Few  
267 favourable numerical trends were also seen in the 2-DG 126 mg group with regards to  
268 achieving blood oxygen saturation  $\geq 94\%$ , 1 point and 2 points improvement on the WHO  
269 10-point score, and clinical recovery. However, these were not statistically significant when  
270 compared with either contemporaneous SOC or the pooled SOC. Although the  
271 pharmacological plausibility of drugs being less effective at higher doses exists, the exact  
272 reason cannot be concluded in this case given the small sample size of the study.

273 The time to achieving and maintaining  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  is a clinically meaningful endpoint for  
274 COVID-19 drug development [18]. Therefore, the results of this study have established  
275 proof-of-concept for 2-DG and justify the evaluation of the 90 mg/kg/day dose of 2-DG in a  
276 pivotal phase 3 study. These results also have important implications for the management of  
277 moderate to severe COVID-19 patients in the current pandemic context. In an earlier  
278 observational study of hospitalised COVID-19 patients in regular hospital ward (i.e., outside  
279 of ICU), the average duration on supplemental oxygen was 8 days [19]. In another  
280 observational study of severe COVID-19 patients, the median time to getting off  
281 supplemental oxygen was 6 days [20]. These data are comparable to what we observed in  
282 patients in the SOC groups in our current study, with median time to achieving and  
283 maintaining  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  on room air of 5 days. Importantly, the time to  $\text{SpO}_2 \geq 94\%$  on  
284 room air was significantly shorter in patients treated with 2-DG 90 mg/kg/day, with median  
285 time of 2.5 days (50% reduction). During the massive second wave of COVID-19 in India,  
286 shortages in hospital beds with medical-grade oxygen have been experienced at numerous  
287 locations. If any therapeutic can help in substantial reduction in supplemental oxygen

288 requirement and hospital bed occupancy in COVID-19 patients, it can go a long way to ease  
289 the burden on a country's healthcare resources.

290 The postulated biochemical mechanism of action of 2-DG can explain its efficacy in  
291 achieving and maintaining blood oxygen saturation. SARS-CoV-2 infects the respiratory tract  
292 epithelial cells, which leads to inflammation and impedes the transfer of oxygen in the lungs.  
293 As these infected cells have high metabolic demand, 2-DG may accumulate within the  
294 infected cells, leading to energy starvation and dearth of anabolic intermediates, which could  
295 potentially lead to inhibition of viral replication and host inflammatory response, ultimately  
296 translating to clinically meaningful benefits, such as improvement in oxygenation and early  
297 recovery. Also, this underlying biochemical mechanism of action would be agnostic to  
298 SARS-CoV-2 variants as 2-DG acts on host cell metabolism and does not target the fast-  
299 mutating viral proteins [2].

300 For the 90 mg/kg/day dose of 2-DG, benefits were observed for other efficacy endpoints,  
301 including time to discharge from isolation ward, time to clinical recovery, time to vital signs  
302 normalisation.

303 All three dose levels studied were well tolerated and were found to be reasonably safe. The  
304 overall incidence of adverse events was low, and the majority of adverse events were mild in  
305 intensity. One patient died of ARDS, which was considered not related to 2-DG treatment.  
306 Changes in blood glucose levels were evaluated in this study. As observed in previous  
307 oncology studies, glycolytic inhibition and competition between glucose and 2-DG for  
308 cellular uptake can result in transient hyperglycaemia at higher doses [13] . In this study, the  
309 incidence of hyperglycaemia was comparable between the active 2-DG and SOC groups.  
310 Moreover, these events of hyperglycaemia were mild and did not lead to study treatment  
311 discontinuation in any patients. There was no confirmed adverse event of hypoglycaemia in

312 our study. Maximum plasma concentration achieved with a 45 mg/kg dose of 2-DG was  
313 found to be approximately 0.5 mM in an earlier study [14], which is only one-ninth of the  
314 plasma glucose concentration (80 mg/dL or 4.5 mM under fasting conditions). Therefore,  
315 theoretically the availability of glucose to normal cells, particularly glucose-hungry brain  
316 cells, is 9 times higher than 2-DG. It is noteworthy that due to limited mitochondrial function,  
317 SARS-CoV-2 infected cells use glycolysis to meet the high bioenergetic and anabolic  
318 demand, unlike the uninfected cells that use both glycolysis and mitochondrial respiration to  
319 fulfil normal cellular energy demands. 2-DG primarily inhibits glycolysis and its effect on  
320 ATP generation from mitochondrial oxidation in normal uninfected cells (without Warburg  
321 shift) would be negligible.

322 Another important safety consideration with 2-DG was its potential for cardiac QT  
323 prolongation. While QT prolongation have been reported in previous oncology studies,  
324 mostly at higher doses of 2-DG, these effects were transient and asymptomatic [13,14]. In  
325 this study, the changes from baseline for mean and median QT<sub>c</sub> values for 2-DG arm were  
326 within acceptable ranges.

327 A limitation of this phase 2 study is that it was not adequately powered. A subsequent  
328 adequately powered (80%) phase 3 clinical study has been initiated with prespecified primary  
329 and secondary endpoints. The results from the phase 3 study are expected to be published in  
330 the near future.

331 For several patients in the current phase 2 study, a clinical status score of 4 ('hospitalised, no  
332 oxygen therapy') was recorded on the WHO 10-point ordinal scale at baseline, despite their  
333 requiring oxygen treatment. 21 out of 22 patients had SpO<sub>2</sub> < 95% at baseline. Due to  
334 shortage of oxygen supply, many eligible patients did not receive oxygen supplementation in  
335 their respective hospitals. It is possible that these patients were assigned a score of 4

336 Another limitation was that meaningful comparison between the 2-DG groups and control  
337 groups on ICU admission and death was not possible due to small number of such events. In  
338 addition, the study was not placebo controlled or blinded.

339 **Conclusion**

340 Results of the current phase II study suggest 2-DG holds promise as adjunctive treatment to  
341 standard of care, in the management of moderate to severe COVID-19 and have encouraged  
342 confirmatory evaluation of its efficacy and safety in a larger phase-III clinical trial. If  
343 confirmed, 2-DG may provide healthcare practitioners with another option to treat moderate  
344 to severe COVID-19 patients.

345

346 **Acknowledgements:**

347 The authors wish to thank Dr DM Rao and his team from Dr Reddy's Laboratories Ltd. for  
348 his contributions to all regulatory activities related to 2 DG. The study was conducted by  
349 Navitas Life Sciences. The authors would also like to thank all the members of the project  
350 team without whom the successful completion of the project would not have been possible.

351 **Conflict of Interest:**

352 Drs Anant Narayan Bhatt, Vijayakumar Chinnadurai, Ratnesh Kanwar and Sudhir Chandra:  
353 The authors (from INMAS-DRDO) have no conflict of interest or financial relationships  
354 relevant to the submitted work to disclose. None of the INMAS-DRDO authors accepted any  
355 honoraria or consultancy fees directly or indirectly from industry.

356 Drs Srinivas Shenoy, Sagar Munjal and A Shanavas: The authors are paid employees of Dr  
357 Reddy's Laboratories Limited. None of the authors received any separate compensation for  
358 the 2 DG project directly or indirectly.

359 Dr Apurva Agarwal and Dr A Vinod Kumar hereby certify that there is no actual or potential  
360 conflict of interest in relation to this article / publication of 2 DG study.

361 **Funding:**

362 This work was supported by Institute of Nuclear Medicine and Allied Sciences, Defence  
363 Research and Development Organization, Ministry of Defence, Brig. S K Mazumdar Marg,  
364 Timarpur, Delhi, India and Dr Reddy's Laboratories Limited, 8-2-337, Road No.3, Banjara  
365 Hills, Hyderabad, India.

366

## References

- 367 1. Cao B, Hayden FG. Antiviral monotherapy for hospitalised patients with COVID-19  
368 is not enough. Lancet 2020; 396:1310-1311.
- 369 2. Bhatt AN, Kumar A, Rai Y, Kumari N, Vedagiri D, Harshan KH, Chandna S.  
370 Glycolytic inhibitor 2-Deoxy-D-glucose attenuates SARS-CoV-2 multiplication in  
371 host cells and weakens the infective potential of progeny virions. bioRxiv 2021.  
372 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.12.448175>
- 373 3. Codo AC, Davanzo GG, de Brito Monteiro L, de Souza GF, Muraro SP, Virgilio-da-  
374 Silva JV, et al. Elevated glucose levels favor SARS-CoV-2 infection and monocyte  
375 response through a HIF-1 $\alpha$ /glycolysis-dependent axis. Cell Metab. 2020; 32:437–46.
- 376 4. Bojkova D, Klann K, Koch B, Widera M, Krause D, Ciesek S, et al. Proteomics of  
377 SARS-CoV-2-infected host cells reveals therapy targets. Nature 2020; 583:469–72.
- 378 5. Ardestani A, Azizi Z. Targeting glucose metabolism for treatment of COVID-19.  
379 Signal Transduct Target Ther 2021; 6:112.
- 380 6. Liberti MV, Locasale JW. The Warburg Effect: How Does it Benefit Cancer Cells?  
381 Trends Biochem Sci 2016; 41:211-218.
- 382 7. Kang HT, Hwang ES. 2-Deoxyglucose: an anticancer and antiviral therapeutic, but  
383 not anymore, a low glucose mimetic. Life Sci 2006; 78:1392–9.
- 384 8. Hu K, Yang Y, Lin L, et al. Caloric Restriction Mimetic 2-Deoxyglucose Alleviated  
385 Inflammatory Lung Injury via Suppressing Nuclear Pyruvate Kinase M2-Signal  
386 Transducer and Activator of Transcription 3 Pathway. Front Immunol 2018; 9:426.
- 387 9. Blough HA, Giuntoli RL. Successful treatment of human genital herpes infections  
388 with 2-deoxy-D-glucose JAMA 1979; 241:2798-2801.

- 389 10. Liu C, Zhou J, Xia L, Cheng X, Lu D. 18F-FDG PET/CT and Serial Chest CT  
390 Findings in a COVID-19 Patient with Dynamic Clinical Characteristics in Different  
391 Period. Clin Nucl Med 2020; 45:495-496.
- 392 11. Qin C, Liu F, Yen TC, Lan X. 18F-FDG PET/CT findings of COVID-19: a series of  
393 four highly suspected cases. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2020; 47:1281-1286.
- 394 12. Pajak B, Siwiak E, Sołtyka M, et al. 2-Deoxy-d-Glucose and Its Analogs: From  
395 Diagnostic to Therapeutic Agents. Int J Mol Sci 2019; 21:234.
- 396 13. Raez LE, Papadopoulos K, Ricart AD, et al. A phase I dose-escalation trial of 2-  
397 deoxy-D-glucose alone or combined with docetaxel in patients with advanced solid  
398 tumors. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 2013; 71:523-30.
- 399 14. Stein M, Lin H, Jeyamohan C, et al. Targeting tumor metabolism with 2-  
400 deoxyglucose in patients with castrate-resistant prostate cancer and advanced  
401 malignancies. Prostate 2010; 70:1388-94.
- 402 15. Singh D, Banerji AK, Dwarakanath BS, et al. Optimizing cancer radiotherapy with 2-  
403 deoxy-d-glucose dose escalation studies in patients with glioblastoma multiforme.  
404 Strahlenther Onkol 2005; 181:507-14.
- 405 16. Government of India. Clinical Management Protocol for COVID - 19. Ministry of  
406 Health and Family Welfare Directorate General of Health Services 2020. Available at  
407 <https://www.mohfw.gov.in/pdf/ClinicalManagementProtocolforCOVID19dated27062020.pdf> (accessed 17 Jun 2021)
- 409 17. Marshall JC, Murthy S, Diaz J, Adhikari N, Angus DC, Arabi YM, Blackwood  
410 B.WHO Working Group on the Clinical Characterisation and Management of  
411 COVID-19 infection. A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19  
412 clinical research. Lancet Infect Dis 2020; 20: e192-e197.
- 413 18. USFDA. COVID-19: Developing Drugs and Biological Products for Treatment or  
414 Prevention, Guidance for Industry. US Department of Health and Human Services

415 Food and Drug Administration 2021. <https://www.fda.gov/media/137926/download>  
416 (accessed June 6, 2021).

417 19. Daher A, Balfanz P, Aetou M, et al. Clinical course of COVID-19 patients needing  
418 supplemental oxygen outside the intensive care unit. Sci Rep 2021; 11:2256.

419 20. Leulseged TW, Hassen IS, Edo MG, Abebe DS, Maru EH, Zewde WC, Jagema TB.  
420 Duration of Oxygen Requirement and Predictors in Severe COVID-19 Patients in

421 Ethiopia: A Survival Analysis. medRxiv 2020; 10.  
422 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.08.20209122>

423

424

**Table 1: Patient Demographic and Baseline Characteristics**

	2-DG N=22	63mg+ SOC n (%)	SOC1 N=22	2-DG N=22	90mg SOC n (%)	2-DG N=21	126mg SOC N=22	SOC2 n (%)
Age (years)	Mean (SD)	44.2 (12.71)	44.4 (9.59)	46.3 (11.00)	42.7 (9.33)	46.6 (11.96)		
Weight (kg)	Mean (SD)	61.3 (9.35)	67.9 (9.76)	69.4 (10.52)	74.2 (12.23)	70.6 (11.77)		
Gender [n (%)]	Female	7 (31.8)	6 (27.3)	1 (4.5)	5 (23.8)	2 (9.1)		
	Male	15 (68.2)	16 (72.7)	21 (95.5)	16 (76.2)	20 (90.9)		
Number of days since onset of first symptom of COVID-19	Mean (SD)	6.6 (2.26)	7.2 (2.58)	4.5 (1.41)	4.3 (1.46)	4.4 (1.40)		
Clinical severity status as defined by MoH&FW [n (%)]	Group 1 (Mild) Group 2 Group 3 (Severe)	0 21 (95.5%) <sup>a</sup> 0	0 21 (95.5%) <sup>a</sup> 0	0 22 (100.0%) 0	0 21 (100.0%) 0	0 21 (95.5%) <sup>a</sup> 0		
Oxygen saturation (SpO <sub>2</sub> %)	N Mean (SD) Median	22 93.1 (2.39) 92.0	21 93.0 (1.82) 93.0	22 92.7 (1.55) 93.0	21 92.5 (1.47) 93.0	21 93.0 (2.07) 93.0		

	<b>2-DG 63mg+ SOC</b>	<b>SOC1</b>		<b>2-DG</b>	<b>90mg</b>	<b>2-DG</b>		<b>126mg</b>	<b>SOC2</b>
	<b>N=22</b>		<b>N=22</b>		<b>+</b>	<b>SOC</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>SOC</b>	<b>N=22</b>
	<b>n (%)</b>		<b>n (%)</b>		<b>N=22</b>		<b>N=21</b>		<b>n (%)</b>
Heart rate (beats per minute)	N	22	21	22	22	21	21	21	
	Mean (SD)	85.0 (11.32)	86.3 (15.17)	81.3 (10.39)	84.9 (11.57)	89.6 (8.48)			
	Median	80.0	84.0	80.0	88.0	89.0			
Respiratory rate (per minute)	N	22	21	22	22	21	21	21	
	Mean (SD)	22.1 (3.04)	21.4 (3.20)	23.9 (2.41)	24.4 (2.09)	24.7± 2.61			
	Median	24.0	22.0	25.0	25.0	25.0			
WHO 10-point ordinal scale	N	22	22	22	22	21	21	22	
	Mean (SD)	5.1 (0.35)	5.0 (0.21)	4.3 (0.48)	4.3 (0.46)	4.3 (0.48)			
	Median	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0			

Abbreviations: 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, SOC=standard of care, SOC1=SOC in Part A of the study, SOC2=SOC in Part B of the study

N: Total number of patients in the specified treatment group.

n: Total number of patients in a given category.

Percentages are based on the total number of patients in the specified treatment group.

MoH&FW: Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India

<sup>a</sup>Severity assessment was missing for 1 patient each in these three groups.

**Table 2: Efficacy endpoint comparisons between active (2-DG) and standard-of-care groups**

	2-DG	63 mg + SOC1	2-DG	90 mg + SOC2	2-DG	126 mg + SOC2	Pooled SOC
	SOC		SOC		SOC		(SOC1 + SOC2)
Time (days) to achieve SpO <sub>2</sub> ≥ N	22	22	22	21	22	22	44
94% (on two consecutive assessments on room air, at sea level)	Median (days) HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	5 1.277 (0.658, 2.477)	5 -	2.5 2.3 (1.14, 4.642)	3 0.975 (0.494, 1.925)	5 -	5 -
	P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.4698	-	0.0201	0.9415	-	-
Time (days) to discharge	Median (days) HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	12 0.791 (0.416, 1.504)	11 -	8 2.238 (1.065, 4.703)	11 0.679 (0.334, 1.38)	10 -	10 -
	P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.4746	-	0.0336	0.2847	-	-
Time (days) to clinical recovery <sup>b</sup>	Median (days) HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	4.5 0.985 (0.526, 1.846)	5 -	3 3.837 (1.853, 7.944)	4 1.881 (0.922, 3.838)	6 -	5 -
	P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.9629	-	0.0003	0.0824	-	-
Time (days) to vital signs normalisation <sup>c</sup>	Median (days) HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	7 0.889 (0.472, 1.674)	7 -	5 4.341 (1.669, 11.294)	10 1.024 (0.418, 2.511)	8 -	7 -

	2-DG	63 mg	+	SOC1	2-DG	90 mg	+	2-DG	126 mg	+	SOC2	Pooled SOC
	SOC			SOC			SOC			(SOC1 + SOC2)		
	P-value			0.7162			0.0026			0.958		-
Time (days) to achieve 2 points improvement on WHO 10-point scale	Median (days)	11		10.5	5		5		6	8		
	HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	0.624 (0.318, 1.224)		-	1.763	(0.924, 3.363)		1.183	(0.63, 2.221)	-	-	
	P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.1702		-	0.0852		0.6021		-	-		
Time (days) to achieve 1 point improvement on WHO 10-point scale	Median (days)	5.5		6	4		3		5	5		
	HR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	1.414 (0.71, 2.818)		-	1.483 (0.78, 2.822)		1.301	(0.697, 2.427)	-	-		
	P-value <sup>a</sup>	0.3247		-	0.2297		0.409		-	-		

Abbreviations: CI=confidence interval, 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, HR=hazard ratio, SOC=standard of care, SOC1=SOC in Part A of the study, SOC2=SOC in Part B of the study, WHO=World Health Organization

<sup>a</sup>Each 2-DG+SOC group was compared with its respective SOC group, in Parts A and B of the study. The 63 mg group was compared with SOC1, and the 90 mg and 126 mg groups were compared with SOC2.

<sup>b</sup>Time to clinical recovery is a composite endpoint of number of days to achieving and maintaining blood oxygen saturation of  $\geq 94\%$  on room air and the number of days to achieving symptom severity score of  $\leq 1$  (on a 5-point Likert-type scale) for all COVID-19 associated symptoms, after start of study treatment.

<sup>c</sup>Time to vital signs normalisation was defined as the earliest date when all the following vital signs parameters were satisfied: body temperature  $< 98.9^\circ\text{F}$ , respiratory rate  $< 20$  breaths per minute, blood oxygen saturation ( $\text{SpO}_2$ )  $> 95\%$  on room air and heart rate  $< 90$  bpm after start of study treatment.

**Table 3: Incidence of treatment-emergent adverse events occurring in >2% of patients**

Preferred Term	2-DG 63 mg + SOC1	2-DG 90 mg + SOC	2-DG 126 mg + SOC	SOC	Total	
	SOC N=22	SOC N=22	SOC N=21	(SOC1+SOC2) N=44	N=109	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Hyperglycaemia	1 (4.5)	2 (9.1)	1 (4.5)	2 (9.5)	6 (13.6)	10 (9.2)
Palpitations	2 (9.1)	0	2 (9.1)	0	0	4 (3.7)
Dizziness	2 (9.1)	0	2 (9.1)	0	0	4 (3.7)
Diarrhea	1 (4.5)	0	2 (9.1)	0	0	3 (2.8)
Hyperhidrosis	2 (9.1)	0	0	1 (4.8)	0	3 (2.8)

Abbreviations: 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, SOC=standard of care, SOC1=SOC in Part A of the study, SOC2=SOC in Part B of the study


N: Total number of patients in the specified treatment group

n: Number of patients with the adverse events of the preferred term.

**Table 4: Summary of QTcB (milliseconds) during the study period**

		2-DG 63 mg + SOC	SOC1	2-DG 90 mg + SOC	2-DG 126 mg + SOC	SOC2
Baseline	N	22	21	22	21	18
	Mean (SD)	407.0 (32.79)	412.5 (29.45)	429.0 (27.15)	428.6 (21.21)	418.9 (33.06)
	Median	409.5	413.0	430.0	423.0	431.5
Day 3	N	22	22	20	21	21
	Mean (SD)	419.1 (24.46)	412.5 (24.19)	425.7 (32.72)	427.5 (29.36)	427.0 (22.31)
	Median	413.0	406.5	423.0	427.0	421.0
Day 7	N	19	19	10	15	12
	Mean (SD)	415.7 (21.86)	412.0 (31.39)	433.5 (30.25)	446.7 (61.33)	411.8 (28.40)
	Median	422.0	408.0	423.0	444.0	411.5
End of Treatment	N	22	22	19	21	19
	Mean (SD)	413.1 (24.69)	410.4 (20.61)	433.9 (37.82)	435.2 (36.59)	422.4 (23.20)
	Median	417.0	411.0	423.0	440.0	422.0

Abbreviations: 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, SOC=standard of care, SOC1=SOC in Part A of the study, SOC2=SOC in Part B of the study



\*One participant in the 126 mg 2-DG + SOC group was randomised but was discontinued due to adverse event before the initiation of dosing.

**Figure 1: Study flow chart displaying patient counts in each treatment group**

Abbreviations: 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, SOC=standard of care, SOC1=SOC in Part A of the study

<< FIGURE 2 to be placed here>>

**Figure 2: Median time (days) to clinical endpoints compared between patients receiving 2-DG 90 mg/kg/day plus SOC and patients receiving standard of care only**

Abbreviations: 2-DG=2-deoxy-D-glucose, SOC=standard of care, WHO=World Health Organization, SOC2=SOC in Part B of the study

