medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

The efficacy of *Andrographis paniculata* (Burm.f.) Wall. ex Nees crude extract in hospitalised mild COVID-19 patients: a retrospective cohort study

Authors

Jeeranan Tanwettiyanont[a-b], Napacha Piriyachananusorn[c], Lilit Sangsoi[c], Benjawan Boonsong[c], Chamlong Sunpapoa[d], Patcharawan Tanamatayarat[e-f], Sukrit Kanchanasurakit[a, c, g-i*], and Nat Na-Ek[j-k,*]

Affiliations

[a] Division of Clinical Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[b] Division of Pharmacy Practice, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Burapha, Chonburi, 20131 Thailand.

[c] Division of Pharmaceutical Care, Department of Pharmacy, Phrae Hospital, Phrae, 54000 Thailand

[d] Division of Internal Medicine, Department of Nurse, Phrae Hospital, Phrae, 54000 Thailand

[e] Division of Pharmacy and Technology, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[f] Unit of Excellence Technologies for Natural Products and Herbs, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[g] Center of Health Outcomes Research and Therapeutic Safety (Cohorts), School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[h] Unit of Excellence on Clinical Outcomes Research and IntegratioN (UNICORN), School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[i] Unit of Excellence on Herbal Medicine, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[j] Pharmacoepidemiology, Social and Administrative Pharmacy (P-SAP) research unit, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

[k] Division of Social and Administration Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000 Thailand

Corresponding author*

Nat Na-Ek, PharmD MSc PhD

Division of Social and Administration Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000, Thailand

Tel: (+66)5446 6666; fax: (+66)5446 6661

Email: nat.na@up.ac.th

AND

Sukrit Kanchanasurakit, PharmD

Assistant Professor

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/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Division of Clinical Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Care, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Phayao, Phayao, 56000, Thailand

Tel: (+66)5446 6666; fax: (+66)5446 6661

Email address: sukrit.ka@up.ac.th

Word count and format

Abstract:	286 words
Main text:	3,392 words
Total text	4,950 words (Key points + main text + references + tables and figures)
Keywords:	5 words
Main figures:	2
Main tables:	2
References:	16

ORCID

Name	E-mail	ORCID
Jeeranan Tanwettiyanont	jeeranan.benz@gmail.com	0000-0002-4714-3960
Napacha Piriyachananusorn	napacha.piriya@gmail.com	0000-0001-5125-309X
Lilit Sangsoi	lilitsasa@gmail.com	0000-0003-2475-2410
Benjawan Boonsong	icenoon_noobird@hotmail.com	0000-0002-7697-013X
Chamlong Sunpapoa	chamlong-sunpa@hotmail.com	0000-0003-1897-5001
Patcharawan Tanamatayarat	patcharawan.ta@up.ac.th	0000-0002-4432-7369
Sukrit Kanchanasurakit	sukrit.ka@up.ac.th	0000-0002-1268-2665
Nat Na-Ek	nat.na@up.ac.th	0000-0003-1330-4399

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: *Andrographis paniculata* (AP) crude extract has been widely used in Thailand to treat mild COVID-19 infections since early 2020; however, supporting evidence is lacking.

Purpose: To evaluate the efficacy of AP compared with standard treatment among hospitalised mild COVID-19 patients.

Study design: Single-centre retrospective cohort study

Methods: We collected data between March 2020 and August 2021 from COVID-19 patients admitted to one hospital in Thailand. Patients whose infection was confirmed by real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT–PCR) and had normal chest radiography were included, whereas those receiving favipiravir or who had unclear chest X-rays at admission were excluded. Participants were categorised as either AP or standard of care and followed for pneumonia confirmed by chest radiography. Multiple logistic regression was used to analyse the main results controlling for age, sex, history of diabetes, hypertension, statin use, and antihypertensive drug use.

Results: A total of 605 out of 1,054 patients were included in the analysis. Of these, 59 patients (9.8%) developed pneumonia during the median follow-up of 7 days. The incidence rates of pneumonia were 13.93 (95% CI 10.09, 19.23) and 12.47 (95% CI 8.21, 18.94) per 1,000 person-days in the AP and standard of care groups, respectively. Compared to the standard of care group, the odds ratios of having pneumonia in the AP group were 1.24 (95% CI 0.71, 2.16; unadjusted model) and 1.42 (95% CI 0.79, 2.55; fully adjusted model). All sensitivity analyses produced consistent findings with the main results.

Conclusion: We do not have sufficient evidence to show the efficacy of AP in mild COVID-19 infections. Interestingly, we observed the potentially harmful signal of using AP. While waiting for insights from ongoing trials, AP's use in this condition should be done with caution.

Keywords: COVID-19, hospitalisation, *Andrographis paniculata*, andrographolide, pneumonia

Key points

What is already known about this subject?

- *Andrographis paniculata* (AP) has been used to treat COVID-19 in Thailand since early 2020.
- Clinical evidence supporting the use of AP in COVID-19 infections is still lacking.

What does this study add?

- We had insufficient evidence to show the efficacy of using AP in mild COVID-19 cases.
- AP might be potentially associated with an increased risk of pneumonia.

How might this impact clinical practice?

- While waiting for ongoing trials, the use of APs in COVID-19 patients should be suspended.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

List of Abbreviations

ACEIs	angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors
ALP	alkaline phosphatase
ALT	alanine transaminase
aOR	adjusted odds ratio
AP	*Andrographis paniculata*
ARBs	angiotensin II receptor blockers
AST	aspartate transaminase
BMI	body mass index
BUN	blood urea nitrogen
CI	confidence interval
COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
CRP	c-reactive protein
CXR	chest-X rays
DAGs	directed acyclic graphs
eGFR	estimated glomerular filtration rate
HR	hazard ratio
ICD-10	the 10th revision of the International Classification of Diseases
IQR	interquartile range
LDH	lactate dehydrogenase
MAR	missing at random
MICE	multiple imputation by chained equations
OR	odds ratio
SARS-CoV-2	severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
Scr	serum creatinine
SD	standard deviation
Std of care	standard of care
STROBE	Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
T2DM	type 2 diabetes mellitus
RT–PCR	Real-time polymerase chain reaction
WBC	white blood cell

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Andrographis paniculata (Burm.f.) Wall. ex Nees (AP), also known as 'Fa Thalai Chon' or 'Fa Thalai', has been widely used in Thailand for treating upper respiratory tract infections and noninfectious diarrhoea after being on the National List of Herbal Medicines of Thailand in 1999 [1]. The main phytochemical constituent of the aerial parts of AP is a diterpenoid lactone compound called 'andrographolide', which has shown antiviral and immunomodulatory properties in preclinical and clinical studies [2]. Recently, an *in silico* study showed the potential effect of andrographolide on SARS-CoV-2, as the compound can bind and inhibit the viral protease enzyme and viral spike glycoprotein [3,4]. Moreover, *in vivo* and *in vitro* studies consistently supported the effect of AP extract on COVID-19 infections [5,6].

In addition to preclinical studies, two small clinical trials using a high dose of AP crude extract to treat mild COVID-19 infections have shown its efficacy in terms of reducing COVID-19 symptoms [7] and C-reactive protein (CRP) levels [8]. However, its efficacy on important clinical outcomes, such as pneumonia, is unclear. This is because the results from the trial of 57 patients showed no significant decrease in the incidence of pneumonia in the AP group compared to placebo after five days of treatment (p-value = 0.11) [8]. Currently, five ongoing trials are investigating the efficacy of AP in terms of pneumonia for treating mild COVID-19 cases. Additionally, one randomised controlled trial (RCT) of Xiyanping injection (andrographolide derivatives) showed promising results; however, it was administered as an intravenous route. Therefore, the efficacy of oral administration of AP cannot be extrapolated [9].

Although AP's efficacy on the major clinical endpoint is still ambiguous, its widespread use has been encouraged. This is due to the situation in which Thailand experienced a shortage of favipiravir and COVID-19 vaccines at the start of a new pandemic wave in early 2020. Therefore, the data on the efficacy and safety of AP from a pharmacovigilance study is necessary to support the decision of clinicians and policymakers on whether AP's use in COVID-19 should be further supported.

In this study, we primarily aimed to use real-world data to investigate the efficacy of AP crude extract for the treatment of hospitalised mild COVID-19 patients. We also examined the course of COVID-19 and the incidence of pneumonia due to COVID-19 in a country-specific context. Our ultimate goal is to make the best use of available data to inform the public and improve patient care.

Methods

The report of this study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidance for reporting cohort studies [10] (Table S1).

Design, setting, and study population

This is a single-centre retrospective cohort study in which the data were collected from medical records of patients diagnosed with COVID-19 infection. We used the 10th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) code U07.1 to identify potential participants from 1st March 2020 to 31st August 2021. The ethical committee for clinical research of Phrae Hospital approved this study (no. 70/2564).

The setting of our study is Phrae Hospital, a 500-bed secondary hospital located in northern Thailand. Eligible participants were at least 18 years old and diagnosed with COVID-19 infection by real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT–PCR). According to the definition of mild COVID-19 used in previous work [9,11], we included only patients who had normal chest radiography by the time of hospital admission. In contrast, individuals who did not have chest radiography results, received antiviral drugs (i.e., favipiravir), or received systemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

corticosteroids on the first day of admission were excluded. In addition, we also excluded those who recently received AP prior to hospital admission, had a history of allergy to AP, had elevated liver enzymes, or were pregnant or breastfeeding from the analysis. Since the preliminary data suggested that AP's efficacy was shown if it was given to patients as soon as they were diagnosed, we additionally excluded patients who received AP after five days of admission from our analysis. [12]

Exposure

Included participants who received AP crude extract within five days of admission in addition to supportive treatment were categorised as an exposed group. AP crude extract was given as a capsule of 500 mg of crude extract (dried herb) containing an andrographolide content of approximately 4% w/w (~20 mg/capsule). According to a previous trial, [8] the AP product was given three capsules thrice daily after a meal to reach a total dose of andrographolide 180 mg/day for five consecutive days. Song Hospital, Phrae, Thailand, produced the AP product used in this setting. The quality of the AP product was tested and certified by the Medicinal Plant Research Institute and the regional Medical Sciences Centre, Chiang Rai, Thailand (details can be found in the supplementary appendices). Supportive treatment, including antipyretics, mucolytics, expectorants, antihistamines, oral rehydration salts, and anxiolytics, was given to patients who did not receive AP (unexposed group).

Outcomes

The primary outcome was developing pneumonia based on chest radiography during hospital admission. The diagnosis of pneumonia was based solely on chest X-rays (CXR) of category four or above according to the Modified Rama-Co-RADS for the first CXR in confirmed COVID-19 patients (Supplementary appendices). The categorisation was made mainly by infectious disease physicians or radiologists. Patients with ambiguous CXR results were excluded from the analysis. All patients were followed until being discharged alive, died, or transferred to the intensive care unit, whichever occurred first.

In addition, we analysed the association between receiving AP and a secondary outcome, which was a composite of receiving favipiravir, systemic corticosteroids, or ventilator support; having oxygen saturation drop along with worsening signs and symptoms; or presenting regressive CXR findings (i.e., category three or above) after admission. The CXR results, all clinical data, and relevant medications were collected from electronic medical records.

Covariates

We collected all covariates for the admission date from medical records. These covariates included age, sex, weight, height, comorbidity, current medications, and laboratory parameters. According to our proposed directed acyclic graphs (DAGs, Figure S1), age, body mass index, hypertension, type 2 diabetes (T2DM), ACEIs/ARBs, statins, and COVID-19 severity were associated with both receiving AP (from discussion with a health care team) and developing pneumonia (Table S5) [13,14] and did not lie in a causal pathway between these two variables and were thus considered confounders. Admittedly, during the data collection period, there were only two patients who had received a COVID-19 vaccine before diagnosis and hospital admission. Consequently, we did not include vaccination profiles in our analysis.

Statistical methods

In this study, we included all eligible COVID-19 patients in the analysis. Therefore, sample size calculation was unnecessary, and we planned to calculate statistical power afterwards. Descriptive and inferential statistics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

were used to compare participants' characteristics at hospital admission according to their exposed groups. In addition to the calculated incidence rate of pneumonia (per 1,000 person-days) according to exposed groups, a Kaplan–Meier plot for the probability of a pneumonia-free event between groups was also created and statistically compared using a log-rank test.

The main analysis was performed using a multivariable logistic regression based on a complete-case approach. The justification for using a logistic model is that each participant had a relatively similar follow-up time: a median of 7 days (interquartile range of 6 to 9 days). To investigate the association between receiving AP and incident pneumonia, we performed serial adjustment as follows: 1) unadjusted model, 2) age-adjusted model, and 3) full adjustment (i.e., adjusting for age, hypertension, T2DM, ACEIs/ARBs, and statins). Regarding BMI, we further performed multiple imputations by chained equations (MICE) to impute missing values. In addition to all variables in the main analysis, the following auxiliary variables were added to the imputation model: follow-up time, age^2, Nelson–Aalen cumulative hazard function, the use of proton pump inhibitors at baseline, weight, height, and alkaline phosphatase (logarithmic scale). BMI was then included in a model as part of a sensitivity analysis since we assumed that the missing BMI values were unlikely to be under a missing at random (MAR) mechanism (i.e., there are other variables significantly affecting BMI that were not recorded and collected, such as daily caloric intake, physical activity, and smoking status), and using MICE might bias the results. We performed 100 imputations, and the results were combined using Rubin's rule.

Moreover, for the sensitivity analysis, we analysed the data using Cox's proportional hazards model, in which a fully adjusted model was stratified by diabetes. The Schoenfeld residuals test and log-minus-log plots were checked accordingly to ensure the satisfaction of the proportional hazards assumption. The severity of COVID-19 was conditioned by restricting the analysis to a mild case only. Furthermore, we performed subgroup analyses according to sex, age group (i.e., <60, ≥60), hypertension, T2DM, ACEIs/ARBs, and statins to examine effect modifiers. Last, to minimise a cohort effect due to differences in admission period, since some patients in an unexposed group were admitted a few months before an exposed group (Figure S3) and guidelines for COVID-19 treatment and coverage of immunisation can improve drastically over a short period, we excluded individuals admitted before the 1st of July 2021 and then reanalysed the main group of patients.

All analyses were performed using STATA version 16.1 MP (StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas) and R version 3.3 with a two-sided alpha error of 5%. As we did not adjust for multiplicity, findings of the secondary outcome, sensitivity analyses, and subgroup analyses should be used for exploratory purposes only.

Results

Among 1,054 COVID-19 patients admitted to the hospital between March 2020 and August 2021, 605 were included in the final analysis (Figure 1). Of these, 351 individuals (58%) received AP within five days of admission. Regarding the characteristics of the included participants at hospital admission (Table 1), the majority of the participants were male (50.4%), with a mean age of 35.41 years old and a mean BMI of 24.2 kg/m^2. Only a small proportion of individuals had hypertension (7.3%), T2DM (2.2%), and cardiovascular disease (0.8%). In addition, 3.8% and 2.6% of the patients received ACEIs/ARBs and statins, respectively. Comparing between groups, most of the characteristics were relatively similar, except for alkaline phosphatase (ALP) levels, as the levels in the AP group were slightly higher than those in the standard of care group. However, all laboratory parameters were within the normal range (Table 1).

During a median follow-up time of 7 days (IQR 6, 9 days) and a median hospital stay of 8 days (IQR 6, 10 days), 59 out of 605 participants (9.8%) developed pneumonia – an overall incidence rate of 13.35 (95% CI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

10.34, 17.23) per 1,000 person-days. Comparing between groups, 37 out of 351 individuals (10.5%) in the AP group developed pneumonia, whereas 22 out of 254 patients (8.7%) in the standard of care group developed pneumonia. This corresponded to a slightly higher (but not statistically significant) incidence rate of pneumonia in the AP group (13.93 [95% CI 10.09, 19.23] per 1,000 person-days) than in the standard of care group (12.47 [95% CI 8.21, 18.94] per 1,000 person-days) (log-rank *p*-value = 0.69, Table S3 and Figure S2). According to Table S3-S4, it is worth noting that, regardless of exposure group, 1) the incidence rate of pneumonia before seven days of follow-up was higher than that afterwards, and 2) the incidence rate of pneumonia among patients aged over 60 years was drastically higher than that among younger individuals.

According to Table 2, compared to a standard of care, receiving AP was associated with increased but not statistically significant odds of having pneumonia: odds ratios (ORs) of 1.24 (95% CI 0.71, 2.16), 1.42 (95% CI 0.80, 2.54), and 1.42 (95% CI 0.79, 2.55) in an unadjusted, age-adjusted, and fully adjusted model, respectively. Furthermore, considering follow-up time and censoring yielded slightly attenuated but consistent results: hazard ratios of 1.11 (95% CI 0.66, 1.89), 1.26 (95% CI 0.74, 2.15), and 1.26 (95% CI 0.74, 2.17) in the unadjusted, age-adjusted, and fully adjusted models, respectively. Additionally, receiving AP was also associated with a slight but not significant increase in the odds of worsening symptoms. Further adjusting for BMI did not change the direction of the association (Table S6).

Interestingly, excluding participants admitted before the 1st of July 2021 (most were from the standard of care group) further strengthened the association of receiving AP with the increased odds of having outcomes. The ORs of having pneumonia in an unadjusted, age-adjusted, fully adjusted model and a model additionally adjusted for BMI were 1.83 (95% CI 0.93, 3.61), 1.94 (95% CI 0.97, 3.92), 1.88 (95% CI 0.92, 3.81), and 1.72 (95% CI 0.78, 3.79), respectively (Table S6).

The results from subgroup analyses are shown in Figure 2. It can be observed that sex was not an effect modifier of the association between receiving AP and pneumonia. However, the association seems stronger among the elderly (i.e., >60 years). Although AP might be related to the increased risk of pneumonia in overall populations and all p values for interaction >0.05, we found the opposite direction of the associations among individuals with hypertension, receiving ACEIs/ARBs, and receiving statins.

Discussion

Summary of the main findings

In this retrospective cohort study of 605 hospitalised COVID-19 patients who had normal chest radiography at the time of admission, 9.8% of them developed pneumonia after a median follow-up time of 7 days. However, we did not have sufficient evidence to show the efficacy of AP crude extract in decreasing the risk of pneumonia or worsening clinical symptoms. Interestingly, individuals, mainly the elderly, receiving AP were associated with an increased, but not statistically significant, risk of pneumonia and worsening clinical symptoms. Moreover, all sensitivity analyses provided consistent findings, ensuring the robustness of the main results.

Comparison *with previous studies*

To date, clinical evidence of using AP to treat COVID-19 is still lacking. After performing a systematic search on three databases (i.e., PubMed, Google Scholar, and Thai Clinical Trial Registry), we found only two complete trials [7,8] and five ongoing trials relevant to this subject, with the largest trial of 736 patients expected to end in October 2022 (Table S2). One trial investigated the efficacy of AP in improving clinical symptoms and duration of disease in 62 mild COVID-19 patients [7]. All COVID-19 symptoms in the AP group had disappeared by day 7 (i.e., two days after completing an AP course). Compared with our observation, the median length of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

hospital stay before being discharged alive in the AP group and the standard of care group was eight days (IQR 6, 10 days) and seven days (IQR 6, 9 days), respectively. Therefore, the course of the disease in our study was comparable to the previous one. Another trial reported the incidence of pneumonia in the AP group (0%) and the placebo group (10.7%) after five days of treatment [8]. The figure was similar to the incidence of pneumonia in our study's standard of care group (8.7%), confirming the validity of our collected data. Furthermore, we found that increased age, having hypertension and diabetes, and receiving ACEIs/ARBs and statins were associated with an increased risk of pneumonia (Table S5). This is consistent with previous reports [13,14] and can further ensure the validity of the data used in our analyses.

Strengths and limitations

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first cohort study of AP's use in treating mild COVID-19. Admittedly, Thailand was confronted with favipiravir and vaccine shortages at the beginning of the second wave of the pandemic crisis, leading to the unproven AP's use for this condition. Consequently, a pharmacovigilance study is required since real-world data from using AP are already available so that its efficacy and safety can be clinically ensured. Additionally, since all patients in this study were hospitalised, treatment compliance and actual consumption of AP and supportive treatment can be assured.

However, there are some limitations worth noting. First, we cannot avoid residual confounders embedded in an observational study design. For instance, smoking status and mental disorders (e.g., depression) were suggested to be risk factors for developing severe COVID-19 [13,14], and this can be prevalent in people in their 30s and 40s. In addition, patients receiving AP may have a higher risk of developing pneumonia than those who do not (i.e., confounding by indication). Therefore, the observed association might result from residual confounders instead, and causality cannot be inferred. However, baseline characteristics between groups were mostly similar in terms of statistical (i.e., p values) and nonstatistical (i.e., eyeballing) considerations. Furthermore, since our study populations were relatively young, many medical conditions that can increase the risk of severe COVID-19, such as cancer, chronic lung disease, and chronic kidney disease, were rare and should not be major concerns. Additionally, the results were less likely to be confounded by favipiravir, as the proportions of patients receiving favipiravir during admission were similar between groups (i.e., 9.7% in the standard of care group versus 10.6% in the AP group).

Second, our results suffered from being underpowered. With a sample size of 605, we had only 11% power to detect the difference in the incidence of pneumonia between the exposed (10.5%) and unexposed groups (8.7%). A total of 9,000 participants would be required to achieve at least 80% power to detect such a slight difference. However, when one carefully examines the effect size and the lower and upper limits of the confidence interval (e.g., OR 1.42 [95% CI 0.79, 2.55]), increasing the sample size is prone to strengthen the harmful signal of the association.

Third, our primary outcome was evaluated solely based on chest radiography by each physician, leading to potential misclassification bias. Nevertheless, it is likely to be a nondifferential misclassification, since the same data source was used to evaluate the outcome throughout, and this would bias our results toward the null. Accordingly, the actual association should be more potent than our observation. Nevertheless, the results from the secondary outcome were consistent with the primary outcome, suggesting the robustness of our findings.

Fourth, due to limitations of using retrospective medical records, we could not investigate the impact of AP on COVID-19 symptoms, such as fatigue, cough, sputum production, anorexia, sore throat, and nasal congestion.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Nonetheless, the outcome used in this study was based on WHO guidelines [11] and had been successfully implemented in previous RCTs [8,9].

Last, data on viral strains were lacking, which might affect the external validity of our study. The most prevalent variants initially found in Thailand were B.1.1.7 (Alpha), B.1.351 (Beta), and P.1 (Gamma), whereas the first report of B.1.617.2 (Delta) in Thailand was published in May 2021. Hence, all four strains can be found in study patients during data collection. Nonetheless, since the incidence of pneumonia in the standard of care group in our study was similar to that in a previous trial [8] and no deaths occurred, it can be assumed that the viral strains in our study were comparable to those in the previous trial. Additionally, the generalisability of our findings may be limited to unvaccinated patients. However, since the efficacy of the COVID-19 vaccine in reducing the severity of symptoms and pneumonia has been proven and widely accepted [15], the role of AP in COVID-19 may, unfortunately, become less prominent over time.

Implications

For the clinical implications, while waiting for the results from ongoing trials together with improved availability of favipiravir and the COVID-19 vaccine, we suggested that physicians should suspend the use of AP to treat COVID-19. This is because we observed potentially harmful effects without proof of efficacy, even though causality cannot be established. For the research implications, a multicentre collaboration is required to achieve a sufficient sample size and confirm our findings. In addition, the safety parameters of using AP were rarely monitored. We noticed that less than one-fourth of patients receiving AP underwent liver function (e.g., AST, ALT, ALP) and renal function tests (e.g., Scr and eGFR) at baseline and were rarely measured afterwards. Although a previous study has shown the safety of AP used in other indications [16], the safety of using such a high dose of AP in COVID-19 is still unclear and needs further investigation.

Conclusion

In summary, there is insufficient evidence to show the effectiveness of AP crude extract for the treatment of mild COVID-19 in our study. Moreover, we observed the signal that AP might potentially harm. The results from ongoing randomised controlled trials should provide insight into this issue. In the meantime, using AP in this condition should be cautious or suspended.

Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fund and the University of Phayao (Grant No. UoE62010). However, the funding body did not involve the study design, data collection, data analysis, or study interpretation. Additionally, we thank members of the staff at Phrae Hospital for facilitating the data collection process of this study.

Authors' contribution

JT, SK, and NN conceptualised the study objectives and designed and collected the data. JT, SK, and NN contributed to the literature review, data cleaning, data analyses, and interpretation of the findings. JT prepared an initial manuscript, and NN further developed subsequent manuscripts. SK, PT, NP, LS, BB, and CS critically revised the initial manuscript, and all authors participated in further revisions. The final manuscript was read and approved by all authors before submission.

Disclaimers

The funding body and authors' affiliations bear no responsibility for analysing and interpreting this study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

References

[1] Karbwang J, Na-Bangchang K. Repurposed drugs for COVID-19 treatment. J Thai Trad Alt Med 2021;19:285–302.

[2] Dai Y, Chen S-R, Chai L, Zhao J, Wang Y, Wang Y. Overview of pharmacological activities of Andrographis paniculata and its major compound andrographolide. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 2019;59:S17–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2018.1501657.

[3] Rajagopal K, Varakumar P, Baliwada A, Byran G. Activity of phytochemical constituents of Curcuma longa (turmeric) and Andrographis paniculata against coronavirus (COVID-19): an in silico approach. Futur J Pharm Sci 2020;6:104. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43094-020-00126-x.

[4] Enmozhi SK, Raja K, Sebastine I, Joseph J. Andrographolide as a potential inhibitor of SARS-CoV-2 main protease: an in silico approach. J Biomol Struct Dyn 2021;39:3092–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2020.1760136.

[5] Phumiamorn S, Sapsutthipas S, Pruksakorn P, Trisiriwanich S. In vitro study on antiviral activity of Andrographis paniculata against COVID-19 2020. https://www3.dmsc.moph.go.th/en/ (accessed December 21, 2021).

[6] Sa-ngiamsuntorn K, Suksatu A, Pewkliang Y, Thongsri P, Kanjanasirirat P, Manopwisedjaroen S, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 activity of Andrographis paniculata extract and its major component andrographolide in human lung epithelial cells and cytotoxicity evaluation in major organ cell representatives. J Nat Prod 2021;84:1261–70. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jnatprod.0c01324.

[7] Rattanaraksa D, Khempetch R, Poolwiwatchaikool U, Nimitvilai S, Loatrakul O, Srimanee P. The efficacy and safety of Andrographis paniculata extract for treatment of COVID-19 patients with mild symptoms, Nakhonpathom hospital. Reg 4-5 Med J 2021;40:269–81.

[8] Wanaratna K, Leethong P, Inchai N, Chueawiang W, Sriraksa P, Tabmee A, et al. Efficacy and safety of Andrographis paniculata extract in patients with mild COVID-19: a randomized controlled trial (version 3). MedRxiv 2021. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.08.21259912.

[9] Zhang X, Lv L, Zhou Y, Xie L, Xu Q, Zou X, et al. Efficacy and safety of Xiyanping injection in the treatment of COVID‐19: a multicenter, prospective, open‐label and randomized controlled trial. Phytother Res 2021;35:4401–10. https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.7141.

[10] Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. PLoS Med 2007;4:e297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.014.

[11] World Health Organization. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection (SARI) when COVID-19 disease is suspected: interim guidance 2020. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331446 (accessed December 18, 2021).

[12] Thai Clinical Trials Registry. Identifier TCTR20210809004 - Comparison efficacy and safety of Andrographis paniculata extract capsules and placebo in COVID-19 patients: double blind randomized control trial. Med Res Found 2009. https://www.thaiclinicaltrials.org/show/TCTR20210809004 (accessed December 16, 2021).

[13] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Underlying medical conditions associated with higher risk

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

for severe COVID-19: information for healthcare providers 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html (accessed December 18, 2021).

[14] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Science brief: evidence used to update the list of underlying medical conditions that increase a person's risk of severe illness from COVID-19 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/underlying-evidence-table.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhcp%2Fclinical-care%2Funderlying-evidence-table.html (accessed December 18, 2021).

[15] Jara A, Undurraga EA, González C, Paredes F, Fontecilla T, Jara G, et al. Effectiveness of an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in Chile. N Engl J Med 2021;385:875–84. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2107715.

[16] Worakunphanich W, Thavorncharoensap M, Youngkong S, Thadanipon K, Thakkinstian A. Safety of Andrographis paniculata: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2021;30:727–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.5190.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of the study populations

Baseline characteristics	**AP group (n=351)**	**Standard of care group (n=254)**	**Total (n=605)**	***p*-value**
Male	172 (49.0)	133 (52.4)	305 (50.4)	0.42[a]
Age (years)	34.84 ± 11.56	36.19 ± 12.13	35.41 ± 11.81	0.17[b]
Body mass index (kg/m^2)[†]	24.75 ± 5.08	23.62 ± 5.27	24.2 ± 5.17	0.32[b]
Comorbidity				
Hypertension	24 (6.9)	20 (7.9)	44 (7.3)	0.63[a]
Diabetes	8 (2.3)	5 (2.0)	13 (2.2)	0.80[a]
Cardiovascular disease	4 (1.1)	1 (0.4)	5 (0.8)	0.41[c]
Current medications				
ACEIs/ARBs	14 (4.0)	9 (3.5)	23 (3.8)	0.78[a]
Statins	9 (2.6)	7 (2.8)	16 (2.6)	0.88[a]
Antiplatelets	2 (0.6)	3 (1.2)	5 (0.8)	0.65[c]
Laboratory parameters[†]				
WBC (10^3/mm^3)	6.33 ± 2.16	6.43 ± 1.96	6.38 ± 2.05	0.75[b]
Lymphocyte (%)	33.01 ± 10.22	30.25 ± 10.42	31.57 ± 10.39	0.09[b]
Neutrophil (%)	56.64 ± 11.45	58.82 ± 11.10	57.77 ± 11.29	0.21[b]
Platelet (10^3/mm^3)	228.78 ± 69.02	221.62 ± 70.46	225.07 ± 69.65	0.51[b]
BUN (mg/dL)	10.79 ± 3.20	11.58 ± 3.84	11.21 ± 3.56	0.15[b]
Scr (mg/dL)	0.84 ± 0.22	0.82 ± 0.18	0.83 ± 0.20	0.50[b]
eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m^2)	101.38 ± 18.85	102.12 ± 17.29	101.77 ± 17.99	0.79[b]
LDH (units/L), median (IQR)	197 (156, 231)	192 (164, 226)	192.5 (158, 230)	0.69[d]
AST (units/L), median (IQR)	26 (20, 37.5)	25 (19, 35)	26 (20, 36)	0.44[d]
ALT (units/L), median (IQR)	34 (22.5, 50.5)	35 (23,52)	34 (23, 51)	0.92[d]
ALP (units/L), median (IQR)	77.5 (63, 88)	66 (58, 77)	70 (60, 83)	0.004[d]

Notes: Figures represent the mean ± SD and frequency (%) unless specified elsewhere, [a]Chi-squared test, [b]Student's t test with equal variance, [c]Fisher's exact test, [d]Wilcoxon rank-sum test, [†]Missing values of each covariate were as follows: 83.6% (BMI), 72.4% (WBCs), 72.4% (Lymphocyte), 72.4% (Neutrophil), 72.6% (Platelet), 71.9% (BUN), 71.9% (Scr), 72.1% (eGFR), 79.2% (LDH), 72.7% (AST), 72.7% (ALT), and 72.7% (ALP), **Abbreviations:** AP; *Andrographis paniculata*, SD; standard deviation, ACEIs/ARBs; angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors/angiotensin II receptor blockers, BUN; blood urea nitrogen, Scr; serum creatinine, eGFR; estimated glomerular filtration rate, LDH; lactate dehydrogenase, AST; aspartate transaminase, ALT; alanine transaminase, ALP; alkaline phosphatase, WBC; white blood cell

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Table 2 Efficacy of AP use in mild COVID-19 patients

Outcomes	Events (%)		Effect size (95% CI)*, *p*-value (n=605)		
	AP (n=351)	**Standard of care (n=254)**	**Unadjusted model**	**Age-adjusted model**	**Fully adjusted model†**
Primary outcome: pneumonia					
Odds ratio	37 (10.5)	22 (8.7)	1.24 (0.71, 2.16), 0.44	1.42 (0.80, 2.54), 0.23	1.42 (0.79, 2.55), 0.24
Hazard ratio‡	13.93§ (10.09, 19.23)	12.47§ (8.21, 18.94)	1.11 (0.66, 1.89)‡, 0.69	1.26 (0.74, 2.15)‡, 0.39	1.26 (0.74, 2.17)‡, 0.40
Secondary outcome: worsening symptoms¶					
Odds ratio	59 (16.8)	39 (15.4)	1.11 (0.72, 1.73), 0.63	1.23 (0.78, 1.94), 0.38	1.22 (0.77, 1.94), 0.39

Notes: *Effect size of outcome in the AP group, compared to the standard of care group, †Adjusting for age, diabetes, hypertension, receiving statins, and receiving ACEIs/ARBs, §Incidence rate of pneumonia per 1,000 person-days (95% confidence interval), ‡Analysis using a Cox's proportional hazards model in which the fully adjusted model was additionally stratified by diabetes, ¶Worsening symptoms were the composite of receiving antiviral drugs, systemic corticosteroids, or ventilator support; having oxygen saturation drop along with worsening signs and symptoms; or presenting regressive chest X-ray findings (i.e., category three or above).
Abbreviations: AP; *Andrographis paniculata*, CI; confidence interval

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 1 Patient flow diagram

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.01.22268609; this version posted April 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Analyses	AP Events II Total	Std of care Events II Total	aOR (95% CI)	P–value for interaction
Overall findings	37 II 351	22 II 254	1.42 (0.79, 2.55)	–
Subgroup analyses				
Age group				
<60 years	31 II 338	20 II 245	1.35 (0.73, 2.49)	0.45
60+ years	6 II 13	2 II 9	3.23 (0.29, 35.68)	
Sex				
Male	20 II 172	11 II 133	1.62 (0.71, 3.67)	0.72
Female	17 II 179	11 II 121	1.24 (0.53, 2.92)	
Hypertension				
YES	5 II 24	6 II 20	0.39 (0.08, 1.99)	0.17
NO	32 II 327	16 II 234	1.62 (0.85, 3.11)	
Diabetes Mellitus				
YES	3 II 8	2 II 5	not converged	–
NO	34 II 343	20 II 249	1.46 (0.80, 2.66)	
ACEIs/ARBs				
YES	4 II 14	3 II 9	0.56 (0.06, 5.16)	0.35
NO	33 II 337	19 II 245	1.55 (0.83, 2.89)	
Statins				
YES	3 II 9	3 II 7	0.05 (<0.01, 3.28)	0.72
NO	34 II 342	19 II 247	1.47 (0.79, 2.71)	



Figure 2 Subgroup analysis of *Andrographis paniculata* and the occurrence of pneumonia

Notes: Odds ratios were adjusted for age, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, previous ACEIs/ARBs therapy, and previous statin therapy. **Abbreviations:** ACEIs/ARBs; angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors/angiotensin II receptor blockers, aOR; adjusted odds ratio, AP; *Andrographis paniculata*, CI; confidence interval, Std of care; standard of care