RNA polymerase inhibitor enisamium for treatment of moderate COVID-19 patients: a randomized, placebo-controlled, multicenter, double-blind phase 3 clinical trial

Holubovska O.[1,$], Babich P.[2,$], Mironenko A.[3], Milde J.[4], Lebed Y.[5], Stammer H.[4], Mueller L.[6], te Velthuis A.J.W.[7,8,*], Margitich V. [9,*], Goy A. [9,*]

[1] O.O. Bogomolets National Medical University, T. Shevchenko blvd., 13, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[2] State Expert Center, Smolenska str., 10, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[3] L.V. Gromashevsky Institute of Epidemiology and Infectious Diseases of the NAMS of Ukraine, Department of respiratory and other viral infections, Amosova str 5a, 03083, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[4] Pharmalog Institut für klinische Forschung GmbH, Ismaning, Germany.
[5] Pharmaxi LLC, Filatova Str., 10A, office 3/20, 01042, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[6] Regenold GmbH, Zöllinplatz 4, D-79410 Badenweiler, Germany.
[7] Department of Molecular Biology, Princeton University, Washington Road, 08544 NJ, United States.
[8] Division of Virology, Department of Pathology, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Hills Road, CB2 2QQ, UK.
[9] Farmak Joint Stock Company, Kyrylivska Street, 04080, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, clinical trial, RNA polymerase, antiviral, FAV00A, Amizon

[$] contributed equally
[*] corresponding authors: aj.te.velthuis@princeton.edu, v.margitich@farmak.ua, a.goy@farmak.ua.

ABSTRACT

Enisamium (trade name Amizon® MAX) is an orally available therapeutic that inhibits influenza A virus and SARS-CoV-2 replication *in vitro* and improves influenza patient recovery. We evaluated the clinical efficacy of enisamium treatment combined with standard care compared to standard care plus treatment with a placebo control in adult, hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 requiring external oxygen. Hospitalized patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were randomly assigned to receive either enisamium (500 mg per dose, 4 times a day) or a placebo. All patients received standard of care as deemed necessary by the investigator and the health status of each patient. The primary outcome was an improvement of at least two points on an 8-point, modified WHO severity rating (SR) scale within 29 days of randomization. A total of 592 patients were enrolled and randomized between May 2020 and March 2021. Patients with a baseline SR of 4 were divided into two groups: 142 (49.8%) were assigned to the enisamium group and 143 (50.2%) to the placebo group. No differences were observed between the safety or patient tolerability profiles of the enisamium and placebo treatment. Analysis of the population showed that if patients were treated within 4 days of the onset of COVID-19 symptoms (n = 33), the median time to improvement was 8 days for the enisamium group and 13 days for the placebo group (p = 0.0051). For patients treated within 10 days of the onset of COVID-19 symptoms (n = 154), the median time to improvement was 10 days for the enisamium group and 12 days for the placebo group (p = 0.002). Comparison of groups using a stratified one-sided Logrank criterion (adjustment using stratification by age categories: "<40 years", "40-<65 years" and "≥65 years") showed statistically significant differences between the groups (p = 0.00945, one-sided). Our findings suggest that enisamium is safe to use in COVID-19 patients, and that enisamium treatment offers a clinical benefit when given to patients with moderate COVID-19 requiring supplementary oxygen, if enisamium is given within 10 days of the onset of symptoms. This trial was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04682873.

INTRODUCTION

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was identified in December 2019 as the cause of a respiratory illness designated coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).[1] Various new and repurposed antiviral drugs have been considered as treatment for COVID-19 and evaluated in clinical trials, including remdesivir, favipiravir, azithromycin, hydroxychloroquine, and ritonavir among others.[2,3] To date, only the antivirals remdesivir (Veklury), a combination of nirmatrelvir with ritonavir (Paxlovid), and molnupiraivir (the prodrug of beta-D-N4-hydroxycytidine) have received emergency use approval (EUA) for COVID-19 treatment by the FDA and EMA and few repurposed drugs have shown clinical efficacy in reducing mortality, the need for mechanical ventilation or improving the clinical status of COVID-19 patients admitted to a hospital.[4-6]

Early in the COVID-19 pandemic, the World Health Organization (WHO) identified enisamium (4-(benzylcarbamoyl)-1-methylpyridinium, trade name Amizon® MAX) as a candidate drug for the treatment of COVID-19. Enisamium is licensed for the treatment of influenza in 11 countries, and for the treatment of COVID-19 (in hospitalized patients with moderate disease) in Ukraine.[7] A recent study found that enisamium is efficiently hydroxylated in humans and human lung cells to an active compound, called VR17-04, that inhibits the activity of the influenza virus RNA polymerase.[8] A phase 3 clinical trial provided evidence that enisamium treatment reduces viral shedding and improves patient recovery in influenza patients.[8] Toxicology studies found no genotoxic effects of enisamium in an Ames test, no clastogenic activity in human peripheral lymphocytes with and without metabolic activation, no effect on the incidence of chromosome aberrations at any concentration, and no clinical signs of toxicity or cytotoxicity in bone marrow or micronuclei in Wistar rats at any dose. In addition to these reports, a recent *in vitro* study demonstrated that enisamium can also inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication in cell culture, while molecular dynamics simulation suggested that the active compound can bind to the catalytic site of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA polymerase non-structural protein 12.[9,10]

Here, we report the evaluation of the efficacy and safety of enisamium in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. We describe a phase 3 clinical trial that was performed in 14 clinical centers and the data which led to the approval to use enisamium for the treatment of COVID-19 (in hospitalized patients with moderate disease) in Ukraine and several other countries. The data reported here indicate that standard care in combination with enisamium treatment outweighs the effectiveness of standard care in combination with placebo treatment in patients with moderate COVID-19 requiring additional oxygen.

METHODS

Study design

This multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized, comparative, parallel study was conducted from 15 May 2020 to 26 March 2021 in 14 clinical centers across Ukraine. The protocol and materials of the clinical trial were approved by the CEB (Ministry of Health [MOH] of Ukraine; approval number 2949, December 18, 2020) and the Ethics Commissions at the treatment and prevention facilities where the study was conducted. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, the International Principles for Clinical Trials (ICH GCP), the current legislation of Ukraine, and the approved study protocol. All patients gave written informed consent to participate in the study.

Criteria for inclusion or exclusion

A total of 592 patients were assessed based on the Modified WHO Ordinal Scale for Clinical Status Patient state (Table 1). For inclusion in the study, each patient had to meet the inclusion criteria listed in Table 2. Patients were excluded from participation in the study if they met any of the criteria listed in Table 3.

Table 1. The modified WHO severity rating (SR) scale was used for this study:

Modified SR	WHO SR	Definition
1	8	Death
2	7	Hospitalized, on invasive mechanical ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO)
3	6	Hospitalized, on non-invasive ventilation or high flow oxygen devices
4	5	Hospitalized, requiring supplemental oxygen
5	4	Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen – requiring ongoing medical care (Covid-19 related or otherwise)
6	3	Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen – no longer requires ongoing medical care
7	2	Not hospitalized, limitation on activities and/or requiring home oxygen
8	1	Not hospitalized, no limitations on activities

Table 2: Patient inclusion criteria

Number	Inclusion criterion
1	Willing and able to provide written informed consent
2	Aged ≥ 18 years

3	SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by PCR ≤ 4 days before randomization (test should be performed in laboratories qualified for this purpose by MOH of Ukraine; confirmation of the already established diagnosis in the central laboratory is not required)
4	Currently hospitalized due to SARS-CoV-2 infection with fever defined as body temperature ≥ 37.8 °C
5	Modified WHO Ordinal Scale for Clinical Status Patient state in Covid-19: score 4 (See Table 1). Note: changed after 1st interim analysis (before also score 5 was allowed)

Table 3: Patient exclusion criteria

Number	Exclusion criterion
1	Concurrent treatment with other medicine with actual or possible direct-acting antiviral activity against SARS-CoV-2 is prohibited <24 hours prior to the start of enisamium or placebo treatment.
2	Requiring mechanical ventilation at screening or it is expected within 24 hours after inclusion.
3	Expected survival time <72 hours for any reason.
4	Positive pregnancy test.
5	Breastfeeding.
6	Presence of renal dysfunction defined as eGFR <60 mL/min, total bilirubin ≥2.0 mg/dL, TSH outside normal range and / or ASAT / ALAT above threefold upper limit of normal range (known from patient´s medical history; after results from safety laboratory at visit 1 are available and this exclusion criterion would apply, this patient discontinues the clinical trial).
7	Known hypersensitivity to the trial drug, the metabolites, or formulation excipient.
8	History or presence of drug or alcohol abuse.
9	History or presence of diseases of thyroid gland.
10	Parallel participation in another clinical trial with an investigational product, participation in a clinical trial within less than 6 weeks prior to visit 1.
11	Known to be or suspected of being unable to comply with the trial protocol (e.g., no permanent address, history of drug abuse, known to be non-compliant or presenting an unstable psychiatric history).
12	Legal incapacity and / or other circumstances render the subject unable to understand the trial's nature, scope, and possible impact.
13	Subject in custody by juridical or official order.
14	Subject who has difficulties in understanding the language (Ukrainian) in which the subject information (informed consent form) is given.
15	Subjects who are members of the staff of the trial center, staff of the sponsor or the clinical research organization (CRO), the investigator him- / herself or close relatives of the investigator.

Randomization

At the screening stage, SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by RT-qPCR in hospitalized patients with a diagnosis of COVID-19. Patients who met the criteria for inclusion and did not meet the criteria for exclusion were randomized 1:1 into a group receiving oral administration of enisamium and a group receiving oral administration of placebo. In addition, all patients received any other treatment deemed necessary by the investigator depending on the patient health status ("standard of care"). The first dose of enisamium or placebo was administered after the randomization procedure on visit 1 (day 1). Patients subsequently received enisamium or placebo 4 times a day (4x1 capsules) every 6 hours. The total treatment duration was 168 hours (7 or 8 days).

Procedures

On day 1, patients were screened, randomized, and started on the treatment. On days 2 to 7 (or days 2 to 8, if the 168 hours of treatment ended on day 8), patients were treated, monitored, and evaluated, provided the patient had not been discharged from the hospital. Treatment with enisamium or placebo could be stopped if a patient was transferred to mechanical ventilation. On days 8 to 29, no treatment was given, but patients continued to be observed and evaluated for clinical symptoms if they had not yet been discharged from the hospital. For patients discharged before day 29, a follow-up visit was conducted on day 29 for final evaluation.

Throat swabs or sputum tests were taken for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection by RT-qPCR on day 1, and if the patient remained hospitalized, on day 8 (+/- 1 day), day 15 (+/- 1 day), day 22 (+/- 1 day) and day 29 (+/- 1 day), or on the day of discharge from the hospital, if discharge occurred earlier than the planned RT-qPCR analysis points. During the study, routine throat swabs and sputum collections were performed for qualitative SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection by RT-qPCR according to the standard COVID-19 management protocols approved by the Ministry of Health of Ukraine. The samples were analyzed in laboratories accredited by the Ministry of Health of Ukraine. The RT-qPCR results were used to determine patient inclusion in the study, evaluate a patient's clinical status during hospitalization, and decide the end point of hospitalization.

Outcomes

The primary endpoint of this study was the time to improvement of the patient's condition by 2 points (from 4 to 6) on the modified WHO scale (Table 1), as measured by assessment of the patient's condition.

Statistical analysis

All primary and safety analyses were based on the intention-to-treat (ITT) principle. The primary endpoint analysis was performed using Kaplan-Maier curves, Hazard function curves, medians of time to event, and logrank test. An analysis by patient age was not defined in the protocol when this was submitted early in the COVID-19 pandemic. However, as evidence for a correlation between age and COVID-19 severity accumulated over the course of the pandemic, we considered it prudent to consider age in our analysis and divided patients into age groups ("<40 years", "40-<65 years" and "≥65 years"). For analysis of secondary endpoints descriptive statistics, graphics methods, exact Fisher test, logrank test, Cox regression and confidence intervals were used. For assessing the superiority of enisamium relative to placebo, we performed one-sided statistical hypothesis testing and set a significance level of 0.0131 for primary endpoints. A significance level of 0.025 was used to perform one-sided statistical hypotheses for secondary endpoints. Student's t-tests were used to compare independent samples, while the Mann-Whitney test or Fisher's exact test was used to test the initial homogeneity of the patient group, depending on the nature of the data and distribution. In the analysis of the initial homogeneity of the groups, a significance level of 0.05 (bilateral) was used. All statistical calculations were performed according to the principles of applied adaptive research design, and inflation of the level of significance was taken into account during the analysis.

Interim analyses and protocol adjustments

To understand the effect of enisamium on the recovery of COVID-19 patients, a phase 3 clinical trial was started in 14 hospitals across the Ukraine in the summer of 2020. Since COVID-19 was insufficiently studied at the start of our study, it was difficult to predict the effect of enisamium on COVID-19 patients. We initially set out to study the effect of enisamium on patients with a baseline severity score (SR) of 4 or 5 on the modified WHO scale (Table 1) and randomized approximate 700 patients, to ensure we could include at least 398 patients in the ITT population (199 for each treatment group). In addition, we scheduled an conditional power (or interim) analysis based on the prospective approach of Mehta and Pocock, and Broberg to assess whether the ongoing study was sufficiently promising to reach the primary endpoint either the SR 4 or 5 group, or both, and whether

more patients could be recruited for either group or whether the study should be terminated for one or both groups.[11,12] The conditional power analysis was conducted by an independent data monitoring committee.

When over 50% of the patients for the initial protocol design had been recruited (77 patients with a baseline of SR = 4 and 298 patients with a baseline of SR = 5 on the modified WHO scale), the preplanned conditional power analysis was performed. The interim analysis showed no promising result for the whole analysis population in the primary endpoint. Further subgroup investigations of interim data revealed that no relevant treatment difference could be observed in patients with a baseline of SR = 5. However, patients with a baseline of SR = 4, i.e., patients suffering from a higher degree of COVID-19 at baseline, showed a very promising benefit of enisamium treatment compared to placebo in the primary endpoint. Based on these interim results, recruitment of COVID-19 patients with a baseline of SR = 4 was continued to increase the sample size, whereas recruitment of COVID-19 patients who had a baseline of SR = 5 was stopped. This change was approved by the CEB and the Ethics Commissions at the treatment and prevention facilities where the study was conducted. We will refer to this latter group as the ITT population from here on.

In order to confirm that the observed trend would continue for the ITT group (and thereby protect the COVID-19 patients), a second interim analysis was planned after approximately 50% of the preplanned ITT population (i.e., 200 subjects with a baseline of SR = 4) had completed the study. This interim analysis was performed according to the two-step approach described by Bauer and Köhne.[13] Following data clearance and adjustment of the statistical model based on the results of conditional power analysis, a one-sided p-value lower than the Bauer-Köhne cut-off of $p = 0.0131$ in the primary endpoint was needed to show a significant benefit of enisamium treatment. Since we found that $p < 0.0131$ between the enisamium and placebo populations in the second analysis, the clinical trial could be terminated.

Changes in clinical status are summarized on a continuous scale using means, standard deviations (SD), medians, interquartile ranges (IQR), and ranges. This trial was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04682873.

Role of funding source

The funders of the study had no role in data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation. VM and AG of Farmak JSC were involved in the study design and writing of the manuscript.

RESULTS

Patients

A total of 592 patients were tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and randomized, of whom 296 were assigned to the placebo group and 296 to the enisamium group (Fig. 1). The safety and tolerability analysis (SA) population included all patients who received a dose of enisamium or placebo at least once, with 289 patients in the placebo group and 293 in the enisamium group, and thus a total of 582 patients. Given that after the first interim analysis, we decided to focus on subjects whose baseline score was SR = 4 and those who received at least one dose of enisamium in combination with standard care or placebo in combination with standard care (see Methods), the ITT population included 285 subjects, of which 143 subjects had been assigned to the placebo group and 142 subjects to the enisamium group. Some patients included in the ITT population met exclusion criterion 6 (Table 3) during the study and were subsequently excluded from further participation for safety reasons. These patients were included in the efficacy evaluation for the time they were in the study and received the study drug. The deviations from the original protocol as well as patient exclusions are illustrated in Fig. 1.

The ITT population was 47.0% male and 53.0% female (Table 4). The median age of the ITT population was 59 years (IQR 47–65), and across the three age groups 11.2 % were <40 years, 61,1 % were 40 –<65 years and 27.7 % were ≥65 years. All patients were from Ukraine, 99.6 % - Caucasian (white). Most patients had either one (36.5%), two or more (26.7%) of the prespecified coexisting conditions at enrollment. The most common comorbidities were hypertension (49.1%), BMI ≥30 kg/m^2 (33.0%), and type 2 diabetes mellitus (9.1%). The median number of days between symptom onset and randomization was 8 days (IQR 6–12).

Table 4. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics at Baseline for ITT set*

Characteristic	All N=285	Enisamium N=142	Placebo N=143
Age, years — Median (IQR)	59 (47 – 65)	59 (47 – 65)	59 (47.5 – 65)
Age category — no. (%)			
— <40 year	32 (11.2)	15 (10.6)	17 (11.9)
— 40 –<65 years	174 (61.1)	89 (62.7)	85 (59.4)
— ≥65 years	79 (27.7)	38 (26.8)	41 (28.7)
Sex — no. (%)			
— male	134 (47.0)	64 (45.1)	70 (49.0)
— female	151 (53.0)	78 (54.9)	73 (51.0)

Characteristic	All N=285	Enisamium N=142	Placebo N=143
Race or ethnic group — no. (%)**			
— Caucasian (white)	284 (99.6)	141 (99.3)	143 (100.0)
— Asian	1 (0.4)	1 (0.7)	0 (0.0)
Median time (IQR) from symptom onset to randomization, days	8 (6 – 12)	8 (5 – 10)	7 (5 – 9)
No. of coexisting conditions — no. (%)			
None	105 (36.8)	55 (38.7)	50 (35.0)
One	104 (36.5)	52 (36.6)	52 (36.4)
Two or more	76 (26.7)	35 (24.6)	41 (28.7)
Coexisting conditions — no. (%)			
Hypertension	140 (49.1)	67 (47.2)	73 (51.5)
BMI ≥30 kg/m^2	94 (33.0)	47 (33.1)	47 (32.9)
Type 2 diabetes	26 (9.1)	10 (7.0)	16 (11.2)
* Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding. ** Race and ethnic group were reported by the patients.			

Primary Endpoint

The ITT population consisted of 285 COVID-19 patients with a baseline SR of 4 points on the modified WHO scale (Table 1). The point of clinical improvement was set at an SR of 6 points. When estimating the number of days before reaching the moment of clinical improvement, all days were counted, including the 1st day of the patient's stay in the study. The day on which the patient's condition reached an SR of 6 points was not included. Patients who died (1 point on the modified WHO scale) were considered in the analysis as those who did not achieve clinical improvement during the entire observation period (29 days). Similarly, patients who did not achieve clinical improvement (i.e., remained in a stable condition, improved in their condition by only 1 point, or declined in their condition) within 28 days were considered as patients who remained in the study for 29 days. Over the course of the study, the patients in the enisamium group all survived, while in the placebo group 3 patients died and 1 patient remained in SR = 4 on day 29 of the study.

Overall, patients in the enisamium group reached the primary endpoint after a median of 10 days compared to a median of 11 days for patients in the placebo group (Fig. 2 and Table 5). Because the differences between the enisamium and placebo group were significant ($p<0.0131$), the study was stopped in accordance with the protocol. These differences were also present and significant in the stratified age categories (one-sided logrank $p = 0.00945$). Patients <40 years reached the primary endpoint with a median of 8 days in the enisamium group and 9 days in the placebo group. In the 40-<65 years group,

the medians were 10 and 11 days, respectively, and in the ≥65 years group 10 and 12 days, respectively.

Among patients who were randomized <5 days after symptom onset, the enisamium group reached the primary endpoint after a median of 8 days compared to a median of 13 days for patients in the placebo group (p = 0.0051; 33 patients (Fig. 2 and Table 5). Among patients aged ≥50 years who had been randomized within <10 days of symptom onset, the enisamium group needed a median of 10 days to reach the primary endpoint whereas patients in the placebo group required a median of 12 days (one-sided p = 0.002; 154 patients) (Fig. 2 and Table 5).

Table 5. Median time to reach primary endpoints for all patients and patient subgroups

Population		Group	n	Median				P-value (one-sided)
				Estimate	Std. Error	95% CI		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
All ITT patients (SR = 4 at baseline) with age stratification	Patients <40 years	Placebo	17	9	0.65	7.73	10.27	0.009*
		Enisamium	15	8	0.90	6.24	9.76	
		Total	32	9	0.52	7.98	10.02	
	Patients 40-<65 years	Placebo	85	11	0.33	10.36	11.64	
		Enisamium	89	10	0.40	9.22	10.78	
		Total	174	11	0.27	10.46	11.54	
	Patients ≥65 years	Placebo	41	12	0.72	10.58	13.42	
		Enisamium	38	10	0.58	8.87	11.13	
		Total	79	11	0.65	9.73	12.27	
All patients randomized within <5 days of symptom onset		Placebo	18	13	2.11	8.87	17.13	0.005
		Enisamium	15	8	0.69	6.64	9.36	
		Total	33	10	1.10	7.85	12.15	
Patients aged ≥50 years randomized within <10 days of symptom onset		Placebo	81	12	0.52	10.98	13.02	0.002
		Enisamium	73	10	0.54	8.95	11.05	
		Total	154	11	0.30	10.41	11.59	

* obtained using a logrank test that was stratified by age category

Secondary endpoints

During the trial, we recorded secondary endpoints including “discharge from hospital on day 15”, “discharge from hospital on day 22”, and “prevention of deterioration after randomization”. We observed that on day 15, significantly fewer patients remained in the hospital in the enisamium-treated group compared to the placebo group (5.65% vs. 14.29%; one-sided p = 0.018) (Table 6). On day 22, there were 0% hospitalized patients in the enisamium group compared to 6.3% the placebo group (0.0% vs. 6.3%; one-sided p = 0.004).

We also kept track of the need for oxygen support. The need for stronger oxygen support was assessed by calculating the frequency and time to deterioration of the patient by 1 point on the modified WHO scale (i.e., from SR = 4 to SR = 3 points), as patients with the deteriorated condition had to receive non-invasive or high-flow oxygen therapy. The proportion of patients who deteriorated was 8.4% in the placebo group and 2.1% in the enisamium group, which is significant better in the enisamium group compared to the placebo group (p = 0.016; one-sided). If we evaluate the ratio of the chances of preventing the deterioration of the patient's condition in the enisamium group compared with the placebo group, we obtain an – OR = 4.244 (95% CI: 1.171 – 15.380). Thus, we conclude that the use of enisamium increases the chances of preventing deterioration of patients by about 4 times compared with placebo. Finally, we observed fewer SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR results in the enisamium group compared to the placebo group at day 15, but this difference was not statistically significant (5.6 % vs. 9.2 %; one-sided p = 0.269). The results for abovementioned secondary endpoints end other secondary endpoints are listed in Tables 6 – 8.

Table 6. Results for secondary endpoints by category.

Variable	Category	Placebo		Amizon® MAX		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Patients discharged on day 8	Patient not discharged	92	73,0	81	65,3	0.119
Patients discharged on day 15	Patient not discharged	18	14.3	7	5.6	0.018
Patients discharged on day 22	Patient not discharged	8	6.3	0	0.0	0.004
Patients discharged on day 29	Patient not discharged	4	3,2	0	0,0	0.063
Deterioration by 1 SR point	Patients with deterioration of 1 point by SR scale	12	8.4	3	2.1	0.016

Variable	Category	Placebo		Amizon® MAX		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
RT-qPCR test results on day 8	SARS-CoV-2 positive on day 8	60	51.3	52	45.6	0.233
RT-qPCR test results on day 15	SARS-CoV-2 positive on day 15	8	9.2	5	5.6	0.289
RT-qPCR test results on day 22	SARS-CoV-2 positive on day 22	2	2.4	0	0.0	0.289
RT-qPCR test results on day 29	SARS-CoV-2 positive on day 29	1	1.2	0	0.0	0.494
Mortality	Diseased patients	3	2.1	0	0.0	0.125

Table 7. Results for the secondary endpoints by study group.

Variable	Group	Statistics						P-value (one-sided)
		n	M	Me	SD	MIN	MAX	
The sum of the scores of the subject's condition from the 2nd to the 15th day (SSR-15), points	Placebo	143	70,80	72	11,98	22	90	0,079
	Amizon® MAX	142	72,94	75,5	11,09	47	91	
The sum of the scores of the subject's condition from the 2nd to the 29th day (SSR-29), points	Placebo	143	170,35	181	31,88	36	206	0,037
	Amizon® MAX	142	175,85	186	26,71	112	203	
Assessment of the subject's condition on the 15th day (SR-15), points	Placebo	143	6,64	7	1,651	1	8	0,137
	Amizon® MAX	142	6,85	8	1,48	4	8	
Assessment of the condition of the subject on the 29th day (SR-29), points	Placebo	143	7,27	8	1,589	1	8	0,109
	Amizon® MAX	142	7,46	8	1,303	4	8	
Days alive and out of Hospital until Day 15 (DAOH-14), days	Placebo	143	2,85	3	2,551	0	9	0,112
	Amizon® MAX	142	3,25	3	2,740	0	10	
Estimate of global efficacy by investigator, scores	Placebo	124	0,99	1	0,393	0	3	0,168
	Amizon® MAX	123	0,93	1	0,248	0	1	
Estimate of global efficacy by subjects, scores	Placebo	124	0,90	1	0,484	0	3	0,374
	Amizon® MAX	123	0,86	1	0,347	0	1	

Table 8. Results for secondary endpoints by time to event.

Variable	Group	n	Median				P-value (one-sided)
			Estimate	Std. Error	95% CI		
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Time from first symptoms to	Placebo	143	18	0,30	17,41	18,59	0.230

discharge, days	Amizon® MAX	142	18	0,52	16,98	19,02	
	Total	285	18	0,27	17,47	18,53	
The time from the randomization to the negative RT-qPCR test results, days	Placebo	143	10	1,50	7,07	12,93	0.190
	Amizon® MAX	142	8	0,91	6,23	9,77	
	Total	285	10	0,84	8,35	11,65	
Time to Clinical Recovery (TTCR), days	Placebo	143	10	0,29	9,44	10,56	0.039
	Amizon® MAX	142	9	0,41	8,20	9,80	
	Total	285	10	0,28	9,45	10,55	
Time to Recovery (TTR), days	Placebo	143	11	0,32	10,37	11,63	0.009
	Amizon® MAX	142	10	0,34	9,33	10,67	
	Total	285	10	0,25	9,52	10,48	
Time to discontinuation of oxygen therapy, days	Placebo	143	6	0,34	5,34	6,66	0.092
	Amizon® MAX	142	6	0,30	5,41	6,59	
	Total	285	6	0,23	5,56	6,44	

Symptom dynamics

At the start of the study, 98.4% of subjects in the placebo group and 97.2% of subjects in the enisamium group had a cough of varying severity (mild, moderate, or severe). On days 3, 4, and 5 after initiation of treatment, the proportion of patients who demonstrated decreased cough severity was statistically significantly higher in the enisamium group compared to the placebo group (day 3: 21.8% vs. 10.6%, p = 0.007; day 4: 33.8% vs. 21.1%, p = 0.011; day 5: 47.9% vs. 32.4%, p = 0.005). No statistically significant differences were observed on the other study days. In addition, we observed no statistically significant differences for other recorded symptoms, which included rhinorrhea, sore throat, headache, shortness of breath, diarrhea, myalgia, and fatigue (Table 9).

Table 9. Summary results for symptoms severity.

Variable	Category	Placebo (N = 142)		Amizon®MAX (N = 142)		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Cough severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	10	7,0	12	8,5	0,412
Cough severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	15	10.5	31	21.8	0.008
Cough severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	30	21.0	48	33.8	0.012
Cough severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	46	32.2	68	47.8	0.005
Cough severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	69	48,6	76	53,5	0.238
Cough severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	78	54,9	85	59,9	0.236
Cough severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	83	58,5	95	66,9	0.089
Cough severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	89	62,7	97	68,3	0.191
Cough severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	92	64,8	99	69,7	0.224
Cough severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	95	66,9	98	69,0	0.400

Variable	Category	Placebo (N = 142)		Amizon®MAX (N = 142)		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Cough severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	96	67,6	101	71,1	0.303
Cough severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	97	68,3	105	73,9	0.180
Cough severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	98	69,0	108	76,1	0.116
Cough severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	101	71,1	108	76,1	0.210
Shortness of breath severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	14	9,9	12	8,5	0,419
Shortness of breath severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	36	25,4	34	23,9	0,445
Shortness of breath severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	69	48,6	62	43,7	0,238
Shortness of breath severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	82	57,7	86	60,6	0,359
Shortness of breath severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	95	66,9	97	68,3	0,450
Shortness of breath severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	98	69,0	104	73,2	0,256
Shortness of breath severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	104	73,2	113	79,6	0,132
Shortness of breath severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	107	75,4	114	80,3	0,196
Shortness of breath severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	111	78,2	115	81,0	0,330
Shortness of breath severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	114	80,3	117	82,4	0,380
Shortness of breath severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	113	79,6	121	85,2	0,138
Shortness of breath severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	117	82,4	125	88,0	0,121
Shortness of breath severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	117	82,4	126	88,7	0,088
Shortness of breath severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	117	82,4	127	89,4	0,062
Fatigue severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	17	12,0	13	9,2	0,282
Fatigue severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	29	20,4	37	26,1	0,163
Fatigue severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	51	35,9	58	40,8	0,232
Fatigue severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	64	45,1	74	52,1	0,143
Fatigue severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	84	59,2	85	59,9	0,500
Fatigue severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	94	66,2	96	67,6	0,450
Fatigue severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	101	71,1	105	73,9	0,345
Fatigue severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	107	75,4	109	76,8	0,445
Fatigue severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	114	80,3	109	76,8	0,282
Fatigue severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	117	82,4	110	77,5	0,277
Fatigue severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	117	82,4	114	80,3	0,380

Variable	Category	Placebo (N = 142)		Amizon®MAX (N = 142)		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Fatigue severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	120	84,5	117	82,4	0,375
Fatigue severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	122	85,9	119	83,8	0,370
Fatigue severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	122	85,9	120	84,5	0,434
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	8	5,6	5	3,5	0,286
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	13	9,2	10	7,0	0,332
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	15	10,6	13	9,2	0,421
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	17	12,0	13	9,2	0,282
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	18	12,7	12	8,5	0,167
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	18	12,7	14	9,9	0,287
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	18	12,7	14	9,9	0,287
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Rhinorrhea severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	19	13,4	14	9,9	0,230
Headache severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	21	14,8	31	21,8	0,083
Headache severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	38	26,8	50	35,2	0,079
Headache severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	57	40,1	65	45,8	0,201
Headache severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	63	44,4	69	48,6	0,276
Headache severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	69	48,6	72	50,7	0,406
Headache severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	68	47,9	75	52,8	0,238
Headache severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	75	52,8	80	56,3	0,317

Variable	Category	Placebo (N = 142)		Amizon®MAX (N = 142)		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Headache severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	76	53,5	80	56,3	0,360
Headache severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	73	51,4	83	58,5	0,142
Headache severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	78	54,9	83	58,5	0,316
Headache severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	78	54,9	84	59,2	0,275
Headache severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	80	56,3	87	61,3	0,235
Headache severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	80	56,3	89	62,7	0,167
Headache severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	80	56,3	89	62,7	0,167
Sore throat severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	15	10,6	12	8,5	0,343
Sore throat severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	31	21,8	27	19,0	0,330
Sore throat severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	42	29,6	35	24,6	0,212
Sore throat severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	42	29,6	42	29,6	0,552
Sore throat severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	44	31,0	45	31,7	0,500
Sore throat severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	49	34,5	49	34,5	0,550
Sore throat severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	52	36,6	49	34,5	0,402
Sore throat severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	52	36,6	50	35,2	0,451
Sore throat severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	54	38,0	53	37,3	0,500
Sore throat severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	55	38,7	53	37,3	0,451
Sore throat severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	55	38,7	55	38,7	0,548
Sore throat severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	55	38,7	56	39,4	0,500
Sore throat severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	55	38,7	57	40,1	0,452
Sore throat severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	56	39,4	57	40,1	0,500
Diarrhoea severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	10	7,0	8	5,6	0,404
Diarrhoea severity on the day	Reduced severity	15	10,6	15	10,6	0,578

Variable	Category	Placebo (N = 142)		Amizon®MAX (N = 142)		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
3						
Diarrhoea severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	16	11,3	16	11,3	0,574
Diarrhoea severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	18	12,7	13	9,2	0,224
Diarrhoea severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	20	14,1	18	12,7	0,431
Diarrhoea severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	19	13,4	17	12,0	0,429
Diarrhoea severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	19	13,4	17	12,0	0,429
Diarrhoea severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	19	13,4	20	14,1	0,500
Diarrhoea severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	19	13,4	19	13,4	0,569
Diarrhoea severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	19	13,4	19	13,4	0,569
Diarrhoea severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	20	14,1	19	13,4	0,500
Diarrhoea severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	21	14,8	19	13,4	0,432
Diarrhoea severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	22	15,5	19	13,4	0,368
Diarrhoea severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	22	15,5	19	13,4	0,368
Myalgia severity on the day 2	Reduced severity	29	20,4	25	17,6	0,325
Myalgia severity on the day 3	Reduced severity	52	36,6	51	35,9	0,500
Myalgia severity on the day 4	Reduced severity	80	56,3	69	48,6	0,117
Myalgia severity on the day 5	Reduced severity	85	59,9	82	57,7	0,405
Myalgia severity on the day 6	Reduced severity	92	64,8	85	59,9	0,231
Myalgia severity on the day 7	Reduced severity	95	66,9	90	63,4	0,309
Myalgia severity on the day 8	Reduced severity	96	67,6	92	64,8	0,353
Myalgia severity on the day 9	Reduced severity	97	68,3	93	65,5	0,353
Myalgia severity on the day 10	Reduced severity	96	67,6	94	66,2	0,450
Myalgia severity on the day 11	Reduced severity	98	69,0	97	68,3	0,500
Myalgia severity on the day 12	Reduced severity	97	68,3	97	68,3	0,551
Myalgia severity on the day 13	Reduced severity	97	68,3	98	69,0	0,500
Myalgia severity on the day 14	Reduced severity	98	69,0	98	69,0	0,551
Myalgia severity on the day 15	Reduced severity	98	69,0	98	69,0	0,551

Safety Outcomes

The SA population (289 patients in the placebo group and 293 in the enisamium group) included 582 randomized patients who had each received at least one dose of the study drug or placebo control. A total of 28 doses were taken by 80.6% of the patients in the placebo group and 80.2% of the patients in the enisamium group. The study found 172 adverse reactions/adverse events (AR/AE) in 87 placebo subjects and 229 AR/AE in 105 patients in the enisamium group (Table 10). Most AR/AE were mild and moderate in both the placebo and enisamium groups. The physician classified causation as “related” for 24.4% of AR/AE in the placebo group and for 48.9% of AR/AE in the enisamium group. The AR/AE in the enisamium group that were associated with the study drug were mild or moderate and did not require additional treatment, and therefore, the safety of enisamium can be considered good. The investigators rated the overall tolerability of enisamium as very good (45.3%), good (49.1%), and moderate (5.6%) in the randomized patients. Differences in tolerability estimates between the placebo and enisamium groups were not statistically significant ($p = 0.289$; two-sided). Patients rated the overall tolerability of enisamium as very good (50.6%), good (43.4%), and moderate (5.6%). Differences in tolerability estimates between the two groups were not statistically significant ($p = 0.260$; two-sided).

The study did not reveal negative clinically significant dynamics of laboratory parameters of the complete blood count (CBC) and other blood parameters (leukocytes, erythrocytes, hemoglobin, hematocrit, lymphocytes, monocytes, neutrophils, eosinophils, basophils, platelets, mean corpuscal hemoglobin (MCH), mean corpuscal volume (MCV) and mean corpuscal hemoglobin concentration (MCHC)) in both groups. In addition, the study did not reveal clinically significant dynamics of laboratory parameters of the general analysis of urine and did not reveal clinically significant changes in laboratory parameters of biochemical blood tests (ALT, AST, glucose, total bilirubin, creatinine, cholesterol, LDL, GGT, potassium, sodium, calcium, triglycerides, free thyroxine, free thyroxine, free tridecin-reactive protein) in both groups. Changes in these indicators during the study were random, and statistically and clinically insignificant. Normalization of the laboratory parameters was also observed and attributed to improvement in the clinical condition.

Table 10. Summary results for the safety and tolerability endpoints.

Parameter	Placebo group (N=289) n (%)	Enisamium (N=293) n (%)
Subjects evaluated for AR/AE analysis	289	293
Number of AR/AE	172	229
Patients with AR/AE	87 (30.1)	105 (35.8)
Number of SAE	5 (2.9)	4 (1.7)
Patients with SAE	3 (1.04)	4 (1.37)
Patients are excluded due to AR/AE	15 (5.2)	15 (5.1)

N = the number of patients in the total analyzed; n = the number of patients who had events; In each line, patients were included only once.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate the clinical efficacy and safety of enisamium compared to placebo when administered orally in combination with standard care in hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 disease. No other studies have assessed the clinical efficacy of enisamium for treatment of COVID-19 so far. We previously investigated the effect of enisamium on influenza patients and found that enisamium treatment improved patient recovery when compared to a placebo control.[8] Here, we observed that enisamium significantly improves the recovery of patients with a modified WHO baseline score of SR = 4, i.e. hospitalized patients receiving oxygen support, relative to patients receiving placebo. While we observed an effect that was significant for this specific group, further research is needed to confirm that treatment of COVID-19 patients will result in a clinical impact. Other treatments, including molnupiravir and paxlovid, are available in several countries. Enisamium has received approval for clinical use in Ukraine.

During our study, all patients had access to standard of care. No fatalities were observed among the enisamium group in the ITT population and all patients in the enisamium group reached the primary endpoint within 21 days. By contrast, 3 fatalities were recorded in the placebo group and some patients in the placebo group took longer to reach the primary endpoint. The best patient improvement to the primary endpoint was observed when enisamium was administered within 5 days, which is in line with observations for other antivirals, such remdesivir, which are also most efficacious when given early in infection.

Our study was double-blinded and conducted at 14 centers, limiting bias in the observed outcomes. In addition, care was taken to confirm SARS-CoV-2 infection in hospitalized patients using RT-qPCR before randomization. This ensured that our study tested the effect of enisamium on the clinical aspects of COVID-19 and that it was not limited by deciding patient enrollment solely on clinical diagnosis. However, we did not test for the presence of other respiratory viruses and microbes, and cannot rule out that some patients

may have had secondary infections. Secondary infections have been rare among COVID-19 patients, and we do not expect these to have impacted the described observations. The median age of our ITT population was 59, which is relatively young, but a fair reflection of COVID-19 patients with moderate disease. Severe COVID-19 is typically observed in senior people and the reported age distribution is, therefore, not a limitation of our study. In addition, we observed that enisamium treatment is safe to use in COVID-19 patients with moderate disease and that an orally administered treatment in capsules of 0.5 g four times a day for 8 days is well tolerated.

In our interim analysis, no significant effect of enisamium treatment was observed among patients with a modified SR of 5 (hospitalized but no additional oxygen support), suggesting that the effect of enisamium may be linked to a specific group of hospitalized patients who needs non-invasive oxygen support. Due to the rapidly changing medical landscape in 2020-2021 and best protect patient health, we stopped recruitment of patients with a modified SR of 5, and focused on recruitment of patients with a modified SR of 4. Subsequent analyses and statistical calculations were performed according to the principles of applied adaptive research design, and inflation of the level of significance was performed to correct for interim analysis. Extended

In summary, our data suggest that for COVID-19 patients that do not require supplementary oxygen (SR = 5), standard care is sufficient to aid recovery and enisamium does not offer significant clinical benefits. However, standard care in combination with enisamium treatment is significantly more effective than standard care in combination with placebo treatment in patients with moderate COVID-19 requiring additional oxygen (SR = 4), suggesting that enisamium treatment is a safe and useful addition to the current antivirals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Stefano Elli, Federico Sala, Cesare Costentino, and Marco Guerrini for the docking and molecular dynamics simulations and for contributions to structural analysis and in silico analyses reported elsewhere, which were invaluable for the design of this study. In addition, the authors would like to thank Alexander Walker, Haitian Fan, Jeremy Keown, Denisa Bojkova, Marco Bechtel, Xinjian Peng, Jindrich Cinatl, Jonathan Grimes and Ervin Fodor for contributions to in vitro experiments reported elsewhere, which were invaluable for making this study possible. The authors would also like to thank Bill Johnson, Miguel Muzzio, David Boltz for valuable results and discussions regarding toxicology studies performed at their facllity, and for Dr. Juergen Richt for helpful discussions regarding the antiviral efficacy of the test compound.

Author contributions

O.H., L.M., V.M., and A.G. designed study. O.H., A.M., Y.L, L.M. and V.M. coordinated study. H.S., J.M., P.B., A.T.V performed data analysis and data presentation. P.B., A.T.V, and V.M. wrote manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Funding

The clinical trial and medical analysis was funded by Farmak. A.T.V. is supported by joint Wellcome Trust and Royal Society grant 206579/Z/17/Z. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Declaration of interests

A.T.V. has received grants from the National Institutes of Health, the Wellcome Trust, and the Royal Society. V.M. and A.G. are employees of Farmak JSC. J.M., H.S. received personal fees from Pharmalog Institut für klinische Forschung GmbH as subcontracted service CRO. L.M. received personal fees from Regenold GmbH as subcontracted consultant. A.T.V. was previously employed by the University of Cambridge. The University of Cambridge received consulting fees for the experiments and analyses performed by A.T.V.

Data availability

The data analyzed and presented in this study are available from P.B. and V.M. on reasonable request, providing the request meets local ethical and research criteria. Patient data will be anonymized, and study documents will be redacted to protect the privacy of trial participants. The study protocol is available upon request. The trial was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04682873.

FIGURES AND FIGURE LEGENDS



Figure 1. Schematic overview of patient recruitment, randomization, and treatment. *According to protocol amendment ITT set were defined as: "The ITT includes all randomized and IMP-treated subjects who had a Covid-19 subject severity rating (SR) of score 4 on Day 1 at time of randomization, and have valid post-baseline efficacy data". **Presence of renal dysfunction defined as eGFR <60 mL/min, total bilirubin ≥2.0 mg/dL, TSH outside normal range and / or ASAT / ALAT above threefold upper limit of normal range (known from patient´s medical history; after results from safety laboratory at visit 1 are available (the results of the analysis could be known in a few days) and this exclusion criterion would apply, this patient discontinues the clinical trial.)



Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier plots. Kaplan-Meier estimates of the cumulative proportion of patients that achieved the primary endpoint in A) the overall patient population (n = 258), B) patients in the age category "< 40 years" (n = 32), C) patients in the age category "40 – < 65 years" (n = 174), D) patients in the age category "≥ 65 years" (n = 79), E) patients aged ≥ 50 years randomized within <5 days of symptom onset (n = 33), and F) patients aged >= 50 years randomized within <10 days of symptom onset (n = 154).

REFERENCES

1. Zhou M, Zhang X, Qu J. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a clinical update. *Front Med* 2020; **14**(2): 126-35.
2. Kato Y, Nishiyama K, Nishimura A, et al. Drug repurposing for the treatment of COVID-19. *J Pharmacol Sci* 2022; **149**(3): 108-14.
3. Magro P, Zanella I, Pescarolo M, Castelli F, Quiros-Roldan E. Lopinavir/ritonavir: Repurposing an old drug for HIV infection in COVID-19 treatment. *Biomed J* 2021; **44**(1): 43-53.
4. Rubin D, Chan-Tack K, Farley J, Sherwat A. FDA Approval of Remdesivir - A Step in the Right Direction. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**(27): 2598-600.
5. Islam T, Hasan M, Rahman MS, Islam MR. Comparative evaluation of authorized drugs for treating Covid-19 patients. *Health Sci Rep* 2022; **5**(4): e671.
6. Liu Q, Chi S, Dmytruk K, Dmytruk O, Tan S. Coronaviral Infection and Interferon Response: The Virus-Host Arms Race and COVID-19. *Viruses* 2022; **14**(7).
7. Boltz D, Peng X, Muzzio M, Dash P, Thomas PG, Margitich V. Activity of enisamium, an isonicotinic acid derivative, against influenza viruses in differentiated normal human bronchial epithelial cells. *Antivir Chem Chemother* 2018; **26**: 2040206618811416.
8. Te Velthuis AJW, Zubkova TG, Shaw M, et al. Enisamium Reduces Influenza Virus Shedding and Improves Patient Recovery by Inhibiting Viral RNA Polymerase Activity. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2021; **65**(4).
9. Elli S, Bojkova D, Bechtel M, et al. Enisamium Inhibits SARS-CoV-2 RNA Synthesis. *Biomedicines* 2021; **9**(9).
10. Walker AP, Fan H, Keown JR, et al. Enisamium is a small molecule inhibitor of the influenza A virus and SARS-CoV-2 RNA polymerases. *bioRxiv* 2020.
11. Mehta CR, Pocock SJ. Adaptive increase in sample size when interim results are promising: a practical guide with examples. *Stat Med* 2011; **30**(28): 3267-84.
12. Broberg P. Sample size re-assessment leading to a raised sample size does not inflate type I error rate under mild conditions. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2013; **13**(94).
13. Bauer P, Köhne K. Evaluation of experiments with adaptive interim analyses. *Biometrics* 1994; **50**(4): 1029-41.