medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

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*], Margitich V. [8,*], Goy A. [8,*]

[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] 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.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

SUMMARY

Background

Enisamium (trade name Amizon® MAX) is an orally available therapeutic that inhibits influenza A virus and SARS-CoV-2 replication and improves influenza patient recovery. We aimed to evaluate 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. This trial was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov under NCT04682873.

Methods

The study was a phase three, multi-center, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial conducted in 14 clinical centers. Hospitalized patients aged ≥18 years with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were eligible. Patients were randomly assigned to receive either enisamium (500 mg per dose, 4 times a day) or a placebo. The treatment lasted ≤7 days in case of early discharge from the hospital, or loss of the patient's ability to swallow due to the need for ventilation. All patients received standard of care as deemed necessary by the investigator and the health status of each patient. All patients received standard of care as deemed necessary by the investigator and each patient's health status. 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. The primary and safety outcomes were analyzed in accordance to the intention-to-treat (ITT) principle.

Findings

A total of 592 patients were enrolled and randomized between May 2020 and March 2021. Only patients with a baseline SR of 4 (285 subjects or 48.1%) were included in the ITT analysis. Patients with a baseline SR of 5 were excluded as the interim analysis did not show relevant differences between the enisamium group and placebo in this sub-group. The 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 ITT population showed that if patients were treated within 4 days of the onset of COVID-19 symptoms, the median time to improvement was 8 for the enisamium group and 13 days for the placebo group ($p = 0.0051$). For patients treated within 7 days of the onset of COVID-19 symptoms, the median time to improvement was 10 days

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

for the enisamium group and 11 days for the placebo group (p = 0.0035). 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).

Interpretation

Enisamium is safe to use in COVID-19 patients. In COVID-19 patients that did not require supplementary oxygen (SR = 5), standard treatment was sufficient to aid recovery and enisamium did not offer significant clinical benefits. However, we found that standard care combined with enisamium offers a significant clinical benefit when given to patients with moderate COVID-19 requiring supplementary oxygen (SR = 4), if enisamium is given within 7 days of the onset of symptoms. These data suggest that enisamium therapy can be used as therapy against SARS-CoV-2 infection in these patients.

Funding

Farmak JSC, Wellcome Trust, and Royal Society.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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.[2,3] To date, only the antivirals remdesivir (Veklury) and a combination of nirmatrelvir with ritonavir (Paxlovid) 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 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 use in 11 countries, including Ukraine and Russia for the treatment of influenza.[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] In addition to these reports, a recent in vitro study demonstrated that enisamium can also inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication in cell culture and in vitro, while molecular dynamics simulation suggested that the active compound can bind in the catalytic site of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA polymerase non-structural protein 12.[9,10]

To evaluate the efficacy and safety of enisamium in patients hospitalised with COVID-19, we conducted a phase 3 clinical trial in 14 clinical centers. We find 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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 organisation (CRO), the investigator him- / herself or close relatives of the investigator.

Randomisation

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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. Patients were divided in 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

confidence intervals were used. For assessing the superiority of enisamium relative to placebo, we performed one-sided statistical hypothesis testing and 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 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.

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 randomize approximate 700 patients, in order to ensure we could include at least 398 patients in the ITT population (199 for each treatment group). In addition, we scheduled an interim analysis based on the prospective approach of Mehta & Pocock and Broberg to assess whether the ongoing study was sufficiently promising to justify increasing the sample size of either the SR 4 or 5 group or both.[11,12] The interim 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 interim 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 advantage of enisamium compared to placebo in the primary endpoint. Based on these interim results, recruitment of patients with a baseline of SR = 5 was stopped and the study was continued, and the sample size increased for COVID-19 patients who had a baseline of SR = 4 only. 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

In accordance with the revised protocol, 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 the first interim analysis, a one-sided p-value lower than the Bauer-Köhne cut-off of p = 0.0131 has to be reached in order to show significant superiority in favor of enisamium. We concluded that the clinical trial could be terminated after this second interim analysis since a significant difference between the enisamium and placebo populations could be shown.

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 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, and consisted overall of 582 patients, with 289 patients in the placebo group and 293 in the enisamium group. 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 has 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. These patients were considered in the efficacy evaluation for the time they were in the study. The deviations from the original protocol as well as patient exclusions are indicated 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

<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 coexisting conditions 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 (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)
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 Endpoints

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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). 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; 32 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	
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	Placebo	18	13	2.11	8.87	17.13	0.005
	Enisamium	15	8	0.69	6.64	9.36	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

onset	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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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 group compared to the placebo group (5.65% vs. 14.29%; one-sided p = 0.018) (Fig. 3 and Table 6). On day 22, there were no non-discharged patients in the enisamium group compared to 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 (SR = 3 points), as patients in this 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. The differences between the groups were statistically significant in favor of a smaller proportion of subjects with deterioration by 1 point in the group enisamium compared with placebo (p = 0.016; one-sided). If we evaluate the ratio of the chances of preventing the deterioration of the patient's condition in the group enisamium compared with the placebo group, we get – OR = 4.244 (95% CI: 1.171 – 15.380). Thus, we state 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).

Table 6. Results for secondary endpoints.

Variable	Category	Placebo		Enisamium		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
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
Deterioration by 1 SR point	Patients with deterioration of 1 point by SR scale	12	8.4	3	2.1	0.016
RT-qPCR test results on day 15	SARS-CoV-2 positive on day 15	8	9.2	5	5.6	0.289
Mortality	Diseased patients	3	2.1	0	0.0	0.125

Coughing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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, 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.

Table 7. Summary results for cough severity.

Variable	Category	Placebo		Enisamium		P-value (one-sided)
		n	%	n	%	
Cough severity on day 3	Reduced cough severity	15	10.5	31	21.8	0.007
Cough severity on day 4	Reduced cough severity	30	21.0	48	33.8	0.011
Cough severity on day 5	Reduced cough severity	46	32.2	68	47.8	0.005

Safety Outcomes

The SA population included 582 randomized patients who had each received at least one dose of the study drug. 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 8). 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 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 general blood test (leukocytes, erythrocytes, hemoglobin, hematocrit, lymphocytes, monocytes, neutrophils, eosinophils, basophils, platelets, MCH, MCV and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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 the placebo and enisamium 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

Table 8. 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. We previously investigated the effect of enisamium on influenza patients and found that enisamium improved patient recovery relative to a placebo control.[8] Here, we observed that enisamium improves the recovery of patients with a modified WHO baseline score of SR = 4, which are hospitalized patients receiving oxygen support, relative to patients receiving placebo. 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 group receiving placebo 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.

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 enrolment solely on clinical diagnosis. 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. However, secondary infections have been rare among COVID-19 patients and we do not expect these to have impacted the observations. The median age of our ITT population was 59, which is relatively young, but this median is a fair reflection of COVID-19 patients with moderate disease. Severe COVID-19 is typically observed in the elderly and the reported age distribution is not a limitation of our study. In our interim

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

analysis, no effect 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. In addition, we observed that enisamium 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 is well tolerated.

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Stefano Elli, Alexander Walker, Haitian Fan, Jeremy Keown, Denisa Bojkova, Marco Bechtel, David Boltz, Miguel Muzzio, Xinjian Peng, Federico Sala, Cesare Costentino, Marco Guerrini, Jindrich Cinatl, Jonathan Grimes and Ervin Fodor for contributions to in vitro and in silico work reported elsewhere that was invaluable to make this study possible.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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.)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .



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, B) patients in the age category "< 40 years", C) patients in the age category "40 – < 65 years", D) patients in the age category "40 – ≥ 65 years", E) patients aged ≥ 50 years randomized within <5 days of symptom onset, and F) patients aged >= 50 years randomized within <10 days of symptom onset.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Patients testing positive or showing deterioration in their SR score. A) Percentage of patients on day 15. B) Percentage of patients with a change in SR from 4 to 3 after randomization. C) Percentage of patients testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-qPCR on day 15.



Figure 4. Proportion of patients with decreased cough on days 3 to 5. A) Proportion of patients with decreased cough on day 3, B); day 4, and C) day 5.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.21.22279036; this version posted August 23, 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 4.0 International license .

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.