1 Current Evidence of the Pharmacological Treatments for Novel Coronavirus

2 Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Scoping Review

3

4 Noyuri Yamaji M.N.Sc., R.N.^{1,2}, Sachiko Ohde PhD, EdM^{1,3}, Kimi Estela

5 Kobayashi-Cuya PhD¹, Shota Saito PhD¹, Osamu Takahashi MD MPH PhD^{1,3,4*}

6

7 ¹ Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Health Technology Assessment, St. Luke's

8 International University, Chuo-ku, Japan

9 ² Global Health Nursing, St. Luke's International University, Chuo-ku, Japan

10 ³ St. Luke's International University Graduate School of Public Health, Chuo-ku,

11 Japan

12 ⁴ Department of General Internal Medicine, St. Luke's International Hospital,

13 Chuo-ku, Japan

14

15 Noyuri Yamaji: yamajino@slcn.ac.jp

16 Sachiko Ohde: saohde@slcn.ac.jp

17 Kimi Estela Kobayashi-Cuya: seikimi@slcn.ac.jp

18 Shota Saito: ssaito@slcn.ac.jp

19 Osamu Takahashi: otakahas@slcn.ac.jp

20

21 ***Corresponding author:**

22 Osamu Takahashi

23 OMURA Susumu & Mieko Memorial

24 St. Luke's Center for Clinical Academia, 5th Floor

25 3-6-2, Tsukiji, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 104-0045, Japan

26 Telephone: +81-3-5550-4101, E-mail: otakahas@slcn.ac.jp

27

28 **Main text word count:** 2958 words

29 **Number of data elements:** one table, three figures

30 **Abstract:** 326 words

31

32 **Abstract**

33 **Background:** As of May 2 2020, 3,267,184 confirmed cases of COVID-19 and

34 229,971 COVID-19-caused deaths have been reported worldwide. Currently, there is

35 limited clarity on the pharmacological treatments available for the novel coronavirus.

36 We systematically identified the current evidence and ongoing research on the
37 pharmacological treatments for COVID-19.

38 **Methods:** We conducted a scoping review using PRISMA-ScR. Observational
39 studies, including cohort studies and case series, as well as experimental studies,
40 including randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and non-RCTs were searched
41 electronically on April 7, 2020 and by hand on May 1, 2020. PubMed, EMBASE,
42 and Cochrane library databases were searched along with seven trial registries. The
43 inclusion criteria were patients with confirmed COVID-19 who received
44 pharmacological therapies, including hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine,
45 lopinavir/ritonavir, remdesivir, tocilizumab, and favipiravir.

46 **Results:** We identified 222 studies on pharmacological treatment of the novel
47 coronavirus. We included 11 of these studies in this review, including the ones on
48 hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine (one cohort), lopinavir/ritonavir (one RCT,
49 three cohorts, and two case series), remdesivir (one RCT and one case series),
50 tocilizumab (one case series), and favipiravir (one RCT). In the three RCTs carried
51 out in China, both lopinavir/ritonavir and remdesivir did not show any significant
52 earlier clinical improvement in case of severe infection [Hazard ratio (HR): 1.31,
53 $p=0.09$ and HR: 1.24, $p=0.24$, respectively], The clinical recovery rate on day seven

54 was not significantly different between the favipiravir and arbidol groups ($p=0.14$)
 55 for moderate patients, although the duration of pyrexia and cough in the favipiravir
 56 group was significantly shorter as compared to the arbidol group ($p<0.01$). There are
 57 135 ongoing RCTs, including 72 for hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine, 29 for
 58 lopinavir/ritonavir, 14 for remdesivir, 16 for tocilizumab, and 4 for favipiravir.

59 **Conclusion:** The clinical effectiveness and safety of these drugs for the treatment of
 60 COVID-19 remains unclear owing to the lack of large, high-quality RCTs. However,
 61 in the event of emerging infectious diseases, we need to repeatedly and
 62 systematically update the best available evidence to avoid misleading information.

63

64 **Keywords:**

65 COVID-19, emerging infectious disease, pharmacological treatments, scoping
 66 review

67

68

69 **Background**

70 The novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), first identified in Wuhan, China,
 71 in December 2019, is a zoonotic disease caused by the family of single-stranded

72 RNA coronaviruses. There are six recognized types of coronaviruses that can cause
73 infections in humans, including the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome and Severe
74 Acute Respiratory Syndrome [1]. The Coronavirus Research Group of the
75 International Commission on Virus Taxonomy has proposed that the novel
76 coronavirus be referred to as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
77 (SARS-CoV-2) [2].

78 COVID-19 is spreading exponentially around the world and has been declared
79 as a global pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11, 2020
80 [3]. As of May 2, 2020, 3,267,184 COVID-19 cases have been confirmed and
81 229,971 people have died all over the world owing to the disease [4]. COVID-19
82 produces an acute viral infection and causes Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
83 [5,6]. Older adults, men, smokers, and people with other comorbidities are more
84 likely to suffer from the COVID-19 infection [7].

85 Currently, there is no specific approved treatment for COVID-19. Various
86 potential drugs, such as hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) and chloroquine (CQ),
87 lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r), remdesivir, tocilizumab (TCZ), and favipiravir are being
88 tested as pharmacological treatments for COVID-19 [8-10]. However, there is

89 limited and inconclusive evidence of the clinical effectiveness of these
90 pharmacological therapeutics [11].

91

92

93 **Methods**

94

95 **Aim**

96 We aimed to systematically review the positive as well as adverse effects of
97 pharmacological treatments for COVID-19 infection, based on the current published
98 evidence and ongoing studies.

99

100 **Study design**

101 We performed a scoping review of pharmacological treatments for COVID-19
102 infection and synthesized the positive and adverse effects using PRISMA-ScR [12].

103

104 **Eligibility criteria**

105 We included research articles on the use of five therapeutic medications of our
106 interest for the treatment of COVID-19 infection, including HCQ and CQ, LPV/r,

107 remdesivir, TCZ, and favipiravir. The studies consisted of randomized controlled
108 trials (RCTs), non-RCTs, cohort studies, case control studies, and case series studies,
109 with at least five patients each. Our search included only human studies and
110 peer-reviewed studies published until April 7, 2020. We excluded any reviews,
111 letters, expert opinions or research reports with incomplete information.

112

113 **Search strategy**

114 We searched 3 databases, including PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane library, and
115 also performed hand-searching; the keywords used were ‘COVID-19’ and ‘drug
116 names’ (Appendix). We also searched seven clinical trial registries, including U.S.
117 National Library of Medicine, ClinicalTrials.gov, International Clinical Trials
118 Registry Platform, EU Clinical Trials Register, Australian New Zealand Clinical
119 Trials Registry, International Standard Randomized Controlled Trial Number
120 Registry, Netherlands Trial Register, University Hospital Medical Information
121 Network while restricting our search to only intervention studies. Articles with the
122 status ‘withdrawn’ or ‘unknown’ were excluded.

123

124 **Reference selection and data extraction**

125 After removing duplications, two reviewers (N.Y. and S.O.) selected relevant articles
126 by reading full-texts; one reviewer (N.Y. or K.K.) synthesized the information and
127 constructed a summary table of the findings; and the other three reviewers (N.Y.,
128 K.K., and S.O.) confirmed all data. Two reviewers (N.Y. or S.O.) confirmed the data
129 after being extracted by one reviewer (S.S.).

130

131 **Evaluation of study design and data synthesis**

132 We assessed the study design of each study included in this review following the
133 2009 Oxford CEBM Levels of Evidence [13].

134

135 **Patient and Public Involvement**

136 Patients and the public were not involved in this research.

137

138

139 **Results**

140 We found 5,936 studies on COVID-19 and of these, 222 studies that were focused on
141 the use of the five drugs of our interest were identified through database searching.
142 Cochrane library had only clinical trials; thus, we included other relevant studies

143 from PubMed and Embase as well (Figure 1). The final selection of studies included
144 three RCTs [14-16], four cohort studies [17-20], and four case series [21-24] that
145 were carried out in China (eight studies), Singapore (one study), France (one study)
146 along with an international study. Drug-wise distribution of the studies was as
147 follows: HCQ and CQ (one cohort)¹⁷, LPV/r (one RCT, three cohort, and two case
148 series) [15,18-22], remdesivir (one RCT and one case series) [16,24], TCZ (one case
149 series) [23], and favipiravir (one RCT) [14], while two of the studies were pre-proof
150 articles (Table 1) [14,17]. We also identified 135 ongoing RCTs: 72 for HCQ and
151 CQ, 29 for LPV/r, 14 for remdesivir, 16 for TCZ, and four for favipiravir (Figure 2).
152 The highest number of ongoing RCTs was being carried out internationally (20),
153 followed by Spain (18), France (17), China (15), Iran (10), and the United States (9)
154 (Figure 3).

155 **(Table 1 near here)**

156

157 **Hydroxychloroquine and Chloroquine**

158 HCQ and CQ are used for treating malaria and autoimmune diseases. Of the two, CQ
159 was the first to be used for prevention and treatment of malaria, while HCQ has
160 fewer side effects as compared to CQ [25]. We screened 61 articles after removing

161 duplicates. Of the 61 articles, one cohort study was identified [17]. Gautret *et al.*
 162 conducted a prospective cohort study on 42 patients with COVID-19. Patients were
 163 allocated to the HCQ group or to the standard care group. On day 6, the proportion of
 164 viral clearance was higher in the HCQ group, as compared to the control group
 165 (HCQ group: 14/20, control group: 2/16, $p < 0.001$) [17].

166

167 Lopinavir/Ritonavir

168 LPV/r are anti-retroviral protease inhibitors that are used in combination to suppress
 169 the production and proliferation of human immunodeficiency virus [26]. We
 170 screened 65 articles after removing duplicates. Of the 65 articles, 59 studies were
 171 excluded and 1 RCT, 3 cohort studies, and 2 case series were included for this
 172 review [15,18-22]. Cao *et al.* conducted an open-label RCT with 199 hospitalized
 173 COVID-19 patients. Patients were randomly assigned to receive LPV/r along with
 174 standard care (99 patients) or standard care alone (100 patients) for 14 days. LPV/r
 175 treatment did not show any significant earlier clinical improvement (LPV/r group:
 176 median 16 days, control group: median 16 days, hazard ratio [95% CI]: 1.31
 177 [0.95-1.85], $p = 0.09$). The 28-day mortality in the LPV/r group was also not
 178 significantly lower than in the control group (LPV/r group: 19.2%, control group:

179 25.0%, rate differences [95% CI]: -5.8 [-17.3 to 5.7]). 46 (48.4%) patients in the
180 LPV/r group and 49 (49.5%) in the control group had adverse events, while 19 (19%)
181 in the LPV/r group and 32 (32%) in the control group had severe adverse events [15].

182 Ye *et al.* conducted a prospective cohort study of 47 hospitalized patients
183 infected with COVID-19. The individuals were divided into LPV/r (LPV/r combined
184 with pneumonia-associated adjuvant drugs) and control (only adjuvant drugs) groups.
185 Those in the LPV/r group showed a faster decrease in body temperature, reduced
186 levels of white blood cells, lymphocytes, and C-reactive protein (CRP) as well as
187 quicker nCoV-RNA clearance, as compared to the control group [19].

188 Deng *et al.* conducted a retrospective cohort study. It included two groups, a
189 combination group that received oral arbidol and LPV/r and a monotherapy group
190 that received only oral LPV/r after diagnosis. After two weeks of treatment, 94% and
191 53% patients in the combination and monotherapy groups, respectively, tested
192 negative for SARS-CoV-2. Moreover, after one week of treatment, 69% and 29%
193 patients in the combination and monotherapy groups, respectively, showed a
194 significant improvement in chest CT scans [18].

195 Yuan *et al.* conducted a retrospective cohort study with 94 discharged patients
196 who displayed mild, moderate, and severe symptoms of COVID-19 infection.

197 COVID-19 mRNA clearance ratio, as detected by PCR, was found to be significantly
198 correlated with the length of hospitalization in patients treated with IFN- α +LPV/r or
199 IFN- α +LPV/r+ribavirin [20].

200 Wan *et al.* conducted a case series of 135 hospitalized COVID-19 patients. All
201 patients received LPV/r and interferon as anti-viral therapy. A total of 15 patients
202 (11%) were discharged, while one patient died [21]. Young *et al.* conducted a case
203 series on 18 hospitalized patients diagnosed with COVID-19. LPV/r was prescribed
204 to five patients who suffered from oxygen desaturation and required supplemental
205 oxygen. Of these, three patients showed a reduction in their oxygen requirements
206 within three days of taking the drug, while the viral shedding from the
207 nasopharyngeal swabs of two patients disappeared within two days. Contrarily, two
208 of the five patients showed continued viral shedding and progressive respiratory
209 failure, with one of them requiring invasive mechanical ventilation [21].

210

211 **Remdesivir**

212 Remdesivir is a novel anti-viral drug developed by Gilead Sciences that is used for
213 the treatment of Ebola virus disease. It is not yet licensed or approved anywhere
214 globally for the potential treatment of COVID-19 [27]. We screened 61 articles after

215 removing duplicates. Of the 61 articles, one RCT and one case series were included
216 in this study [16,24].

217 Wang *et al.* conducted a double-blind RCT with 237 COVID-19 patients. All
218 the patients had an oxygen saturation of 94% or less and confirmed pneumonia. They
219 were randomly assigned to either the remdesivir group or the placebo group and
220 received the treatment for 10 days. No significant differences in terms of clinical
221 improvement, hospitalization length, and 28-day mortality were observed between
222 the two groups. Furthermore, due to adverse events, more patients in the remdesivir
223 group (12%) discontinued the study as compared to the placebo group (5%) [16].

224 Grein *et al.* conducted a case series of 53 hospitalized patients (from 9 different
225 countries) diagnosed with COVID-19 using reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain
226 reaction (RT-PCR) assay. Patients who were receiving oxygen support or who had
227 an oxygen saturation of 94% or less received remdesivir for 10 days. After receiving
228 the first dose of remdesivir, 36 of the 53 patients showed an improvement in the need
229 for oxygen support. During a median follow-up of 18 days, 17 of the 30 patients who
230 were receiving mechanical ventilation were extubated, while extracorporeal
231 membrane oxygenation was stopped for three of the four patients who were receiving

232 it. A total of 25 patients were discharged, and eight patients got worse, of which,
233 seven died at least 28 days after taking remdesivir [24].

234

235 **Tocilizumab (TCZ)**

236 TCZ is a recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody that acts as an interleukin
237 (IL)-6 receptor antagonist and is used in the treatment of rheumatism [28]. We
238 screened 18 articles after removing duplicate studies. Of the 18 articles, one case
239 series was included [23]. Luo *et al.* conducted a case series on 15 hospitalized
240 patients diagnosed with COVID-19. Patients received 80-600 mg TCZ each time; 8
241 of them received TCZ with methylprednisolone. The CRP levels of 11 patients
242 returned to the normal range within one week, while three of the four critically ill
243 patients who received a single dose of TCZ died; one of them did not return to
244 normal CRP levels within a week [23].

245

246 **Favipiravir**

247 Favipiravir is a novel anti-viral agent that selectively inhibits RNA-dependent RNA
248 polymerase of RNA viruses. It is prescribed for patients only when other
249 anti-influenza virus drugs are ineffective or are insufficiently effective in the event of

250 re-occurrence of the influenza virus infection or when there is no known cure for an
251 RNA virus infection [29]. We screened four articles after removing duplicates and
252 one pre-proof RCT met our inclusion criteria [14].

253 Chen *et al.* conducted an open-label multicenter RCT on 240 hospitalized
254 patients diagnosed with COVID-19 pneumonia. Patients were randomly assigned to
255 either the umifenovir (arbidol) or favipiravir groups. Clinical recovery rate (recovery
256 of body temperature, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, and cough relief) on day 7
257 was not significantly different between both the groups (favipiravir group: 71/116,
258 arbidol group: 61/120, $p=0.14$, Difference of recovery rate: 0.0954 [95% confidence
259 interval: -0.0305-0.2213]). The duration of pyrexia and cough in the favipiravir
260 group was significantly shorter than in the arbidol group (pyrexia, difference: 1.70
261 days ($p<0.01$) and cough, difference: 1.75 days ($p<0.01$), respectively). A post-hoc
262 analysis showed that the incidence of *de novo* dyspnea in the favipiravir group was
263 significantly lesser than in the arbidol group (favipiravir group: 4/116, arbidol group:
264 14/120, $p<0.0174$). 37 patients in the favipiravir group and 28 patients in the arbidol
265 group had level 1 adverse effects [14].

266

267

268 **Discussion**

269 In this scoping review that aimed to systematically clarify the evidence for the
270 use of five potential drug treatments for COVID-19. Based on the 11 studies
271 analyzed (including only three RCTs carried out in China), we found that the clinical
272 effectiveness and safety of these pharmacological drugs remains controversial.

273 One cohort study showed that the HCQ-administered group displayed a higher
274 proportion of efficacy for viral clearance, as compared to the group not administered
275 HCQ [17]. Among the six studies related to LPV/r [15,18-22], four studies reported
276 that LPV/r may be effective in viral shedding [18-20,22] and two studies reported
277 that it may improve clinical conditions, such as CT results and body temperature
278 [19,21]. However, the RCT by Cao *et al.*, which included the largest population of
279 all the included studies and set a clear comparison group, concluded that compared to
280 the standard treatment, no apparent benefit of LPV/r was observed in patients
281 hospitalized with severe COVID-19. Since adverse events of this medication have
282 not been fully reported, the effectiveness of LPV/r is still debatable [15]. This
283 suggests that the use of this medication for the treatment of COVID-19 should be

284 handled with special care. In a case series study on remdesivir that included patients
 285 from multiple countries, although 84% of the patients showed clinical improvement,
 286 there was a high adverse event rate (32/53); these events included increased hepatic
 287 enzymes, diarrhea, rash, renal impairment, and hypotension [24]. On the contrary,
 288 one RCT carried out in China showed no significant difference between the
 289 remdesivir group and the placebo group in terms of clinical improvement,
 290 hospitalization length, and mortality. Furthermore, more patients in the remdesivir
 291 group (12%) discontinued the medication due to its adverse effects [16]. To confirm
 292 its effectiveness, further high-quality RCTs need to be conducted. Furthermore, in a
 293 case series study using TCZ on 15 patients, an improvement was observed in the
 294 levels of CRP and interleukin-6 receptor (IL-6R). Moreover, neither clinical
 295 conditions nor deaths were reported following this medication [23]. When favipiravir
 296 was compared with arbidol, no clear difference in the clinical recovery rate was
 297 observed between the two groups on day 7, although the duration of pyrexia and
 298 cough in the favipiravir group was found to be significantly shorter than in the
 299 arbidol group [14]. Considering that we identified only a limited number of studies
 300 reporting on the effectiveness of pharmacological treatments during the course of
 301 conducting this review, the results presented here should be treated with caution.

302 Although the primary endpoints for most of the studies included were within
303 two weeks of dosage, symptoms were found to persist beyond this time period as
304 well. For instance, three studies were followed up for at least 28 days [15-16,24], but
305 further trials should have been conducted for a longer time. Also, in two open-label
306 RCTs, personal and outcome assessments should have been blinded to avoid
307 performance and detection biases [30]. It is essential for a systematic review to be
308 conducted by collecting data from high-quality RCTs in order to provide the best
309 evidence [13]. Moreover, it needs to be free of heterogeneity in the direction and
310 degree of the results between RCTs [13]. In this regard, to meet the optimal
311 information size criteria, RCTs require to be conducted with larger sample sizes (at
312 least between 2,000-4,000 patients) to yield low imprecision results with a narrow
313 95% confidence interval [31]. In addition, large, high-quality RCTs are needed to
314 determine the potential positive as well as adverse effects of pharmacological
315 treatments for COVID-19.

316 In total, we found 135 ongoing RCTs, including 72 for HCQ and CQ, 29 for
317 LPV/r, 14 for remdesivir, 16 for TCZ, and four for favipiravir. While these RCTs
318 would help improve the certainty of the evidence, interpretation of their findings

319 need to be handled with care, especially when these are sponsored by pharmaceutical
320 companies, as such studies may have a higher possibility of substantial bias [32].

321 In addition to the drugs that we searched for in this study, some institutions
322 have announced the development of new drugs for COVID-19. For example, Biotest,
323 BPL, LFB, and Octapharma have joined an alliance formed by CSL Behring
324 (ASX:CSL/USOTC:CSLLY) and are collaborating with Takeda Pharmaceutical
325 Company to develop a potential plasma-derived therapy for treating COVID-19 [33].
326 REGENERON is developing a new cocktail drug of two antibodies [34]; however,
327 the development is still in its early stage. Also, WHO reported that it is hard for
328 people to find accurate guidance regarding the 2019-nCoV outbreak and response
329 because of an ‘infodemic’, defined as an over-abundance of information [35]. For
330 this reason, it is extremely important to update and provide the current best evidence
331 of pharmacological treatments for COVID-19 and make a medical decision without
332 being misled by inappropriate information.

333

334 **Limitations**

335 This review has some limitations. First, we included data studies published until
336 April 7, 2020; however, since COVID-19 is a rapidly emerging infectious disease,

337 new research on it is being published on a daily basis. There are several RCTs that
 338 are currently in progress, which will help improve our limited knowledge and clarify
 339 the effects of these treatments. A systematic review of the pharmacological
 340 treatments for COVID-19 infection, including RCT results, would clarify their
 341 effects. Tricco *et al.* suggest that a scoping review protocol is necessary to ensure
 342 transparency and reduce duplication of effort [12]. Although we were not able to
 343 submit the research protocol, it is important to note that in case of public health
 344 emergencies such as COVID-19, it is crucial to provide the current
 345 related-information as soon as possible. In the future, we need to register and carry
 346 out the protocol according to the research plan when conducting a systematic review
 347 for each of these drugs.

348

349 **Conclusions**

350 This scoping review identified that the clinical effectiveness and safety of the
 351 currently available pharmacological treatments for COVID-19 remain unclear due to
 352 the lack of large, high-quality RCTs. In the event of emerging infectious diseases
 353 such as COVID-19, we need to systematically update the best available evidence
 354 being generated by ongoing international RCTs to avoid misleading information.

355

356 **List of abbreviations**

357 RCT: randomized control trial

358 WHO: World Health Organization

359 HCQ: hydroxychloroquine

360 CQ: chloroquine

361 LPV/r: lopinavir/ritonavir

362 TCZ: tocilizumab

363 HR: hazard ratio

364 CRP: C-reactive protein

365

366 **Declarations**

367 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

368 Not applicable.

369

370 **Consent for publication**

371 Not applicable.

372

373 **Availability of data and materials**

374 Not applicable.

375

376 **Competing interests**

377 No declaration.

378

379 **Funding**

380 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,

381 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

382

383 **Author contributions**

384 NY and OT were responsible for the conception and design of the study. NY, SO,

385 KK, and SS were responsible for the acquisition of data and analysis. NY, SO, and

386 KK wrote the manuscript. All the authors participated in the critical revision of the

387 manuscript for important intellectual content. All the authors had full access to all the

388 data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the data

389 synthesis. SO and OT supervised the conduction of this review

390

391 **Acknowledgements**

392 Prof. Erika Ota, PhD (Representative Director of Japan Branch of the Cochrane

393 Collaboration and St. Luke's International University) provided important insights to

394 the methodology of this manuscript. We would like to thank Editage

395 (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

396

397 **Authors' information**

398 **Affiliations**

399 *Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Health Technology Assessment, St. Luke's*

400 *International University, Chuo-ku, Japan*

401 Noyuri Yamaji, Sachiko Ohde, Kimi Estela Kobayashi-Cuya, Shota Saito, & Osamu

402 Takahashi

403 *Global Health Nursing, St. Luke's International University, Chuo-ku, Japan*

404 Noyuri Yamaji

405 *St. Luke's International University Graduate School of Public Health, Chuo-ku,*

406 *Japan*

407 Sachiko Ohde, & Osamu Takahashi

408 *Department of General Internal Medicine, St. Luke's International Hospital,*

409 *Chuo-ku, Japan*

410 Osamu Takahashi

411

412 ***Corresponding author:**

413 Osamu Takahashi

414

415 **References**

416 1. Yin Y, Wunderink RG. MERS, SARS and other coronaviruses as causes of

417 pneumonia. *Respirology*. 2018;23(2):130-37. doi: 10.1111/resp.13196.

418 2. Gorbalenya AE, Baker SC, Baric RS, de Groot PJ, Drosten C, Gulyaeva AA, *et*

419 *al.* Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: The species and its

420 viruses – a statement of the Coronavirus Study Group. 2020;

421 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.07.937862v1>. (Accessed at

422 20200512)

423 3. World Health Organization. COVID—19 Situation, 2020.

424 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-re>

425 [ports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-re). (Accessed at 20200512)

- 426 4. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation
427 Report – 103, 2020.
428 https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200502-covid-19-sitrep-103.pdf?sfvrsn=d95e76d8_6. (Accessed at 20200512)
429
430 5. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, *et al*. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of
431 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive
432 study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):507-13. doi:
433 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(2\)302111-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(2)302111-7). (Accessed at 20200512)
434 6. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, *et al*. A novel coronavirus from patients with
435 pneumonia in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-33. doi:
436 10.1056/NEJMoa2001017.
437 7. Zhao X, Zhang B, Li P, *et al*. Incidence, clinical characteristics and prognostic
438 factor of patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
439 2020; <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037572v1>.
440 (Accessed at 20200512)
441 8. Du Y-X, Chen X-P. Favipiravir: pharmacokinetics and concerns about clinical
442 trials for 2019-nCoV infection. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2020; doi:
443 10.1002/cpt.1844.

- 444 9. Gao J, Tian Z, Yang X. Breakthrough: Chloroquine phosphate has shown
445 apparent efficacy in treatment of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical
446 studies. Biosci Trends. 2020;14(1):72-73. doi: 10.5582/bst.2020.01047.
- 447 10. Lu CC, Chen MY, Chang YL. Potential therapeutic agents against COVID-19:
448 What we know so far. J Chin Med Assoc. 2020; doi:
449 10.1097/jcma.0000000000000318.
- 450 11. Sanders JM, Monogue ML, Jodlowski TZ, *et al.* Pharmacologic treatments for
451 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a review. JAMA. 2020; doi:
452 10.1001/jama.2020.6019.
- 453 12. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, *et al.* PRISMA extension for scoping reviews
454 (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. Ann Intern Med.
455 2018;169(7):467-73. doi: 10.7326/m18-0850.
- 456 13. The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine develops padbefh. Oxford Centre for
457 Evidence-based Medicine – Levels of Evidence (March 2009);
458 [https://www.cebm.net/2009/06/oxford-centre-evidence-based-medicine-levels-](https://www.cebm.net/2009/06/oxford-centre-evidence-based-medicine-levels-evidence-march-2009/)
459 [evidence-march-2009/](https://www.cebm.net/2009/06/oxford-centre-evidence-based-medicine-levels-evidence-march-2009/). (Accessed at 20200512)
- 460 14. Chen C, Zhang Y, Huang J, *et al.* Favipiravir versus Arbidol for COVID-19: a
461 randomized clinical trial. 2020;

- 462 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037432v4>. (Accessed
463 at 20200512)
- 464 15. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, *et al.* A trial of lopinavir-ritonavir in adults
465 hospitalized with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:1787-1799. doi:
466 10.1056/NEJMoa2001282.
- 467 16. Wang Y, Zhang D, Du G, *et al.* Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a
468 randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. Lancet. 2020;
469 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31022-9.
- 470 17. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, *et al.* Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as
471 a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical
472 trial. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2020;105949. doi:
473 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949. Pre-proof.
- 474 18. Deng L, Li C, Zeng Q, *et al.* Arbidol combined with LPV/r versus LPV/r alone
475 against corona virus disease 2019: a retrospective cohort study. J Infect. 2020;
476 doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.002.
- 477 19. Ye XT, Luo YL, Xia SC, *et al.* Clinical efficacy of lopinavir/ritonavir in the
478 treatment of coronavirus disease 2019. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol.
479 2020;24(6):3390-96. doi: 10.26355/eurev_202003_20706.

- 480 20. Yuan J, Zou R, Zeng L, *et al.* The correlation between viral clearance and
481 biochemical outcomes of 94 COVID-19 infected discharged patients. *Inflamm*
482 *Res.* 2020;69(6):599-606 doi: 10.1007/s00011-020-01342-0.
- 483 21. Wan S, Xiang Y, Fang W, *et al.* Clinical features and treatment of COVID-19
484 patients in northeast Chongqing. *J Med Virol.* 2020; doi: 10.1002/jmv.25783.
- 485 22. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, *et al.* Epidemiologic features and
486 clinical course of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA.*
487 2020; doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.3204.
- 488 23. Luo P, Liu Y, Qiu L, *et al.* Tocilizumab treatment in COVID-19: a single
489 center experience. *J Med Virol.* 2020; doi: 10.1002/jmv.25801.
- 490 24. Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D, *et al.* Compassionate use of remdesivir for
491 patients with severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020; doi:
492 10.1056/NEJMoa2007016.
- 493 25. Sahraei Z, Shabani M, Shokouhi S, *et al.* Aminoquinolines against coronavirus
494 disease 2019 (COVID-19): chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine. *Int J*
495 *Antimicrob Agents.* 2020; doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105945

- 496 26. Oldfield V, Plosker GL. Lopinavir/ritonavir: a review of its use in the
497 management of HIV infection. *Drugs*. 2006;66(9):1275-99. doi:
498 10.2165/00003495-200666090-00012
- 499 27. Gilead. COVID-19 Gilead Sciences update on the company's ongoing
500 response to COVID-19, 2020.
501 <https://www.gilead.com/purpose/advancing-global-health/covid-19>. (Accessed
502 at 20200512).
- 503 28. Oldfield V, Dhillon S, Plosker GL. Tocilizumab: a review of its use in the
504 management of rheumatoid arthritis. *Drugs*. 2009;69(5):609-32. doi:
505 10.2165/00003495-200969050-00007.
- 506 29. Furuta Y. Favipiravir (T-705) - viral RNA dependent RNA polymerase
507 inhibitor. *The Journal of the Japanese Society for Clinical Microbiology*
508 2019;29(2):6-14.
- 509 30. Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8:
510 Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J,
511 Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA. *Cochrane Handbook for*
512 *Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.0 (updated July 2019):
513 Cochrane, 2019.

- 514 31. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, *et al.* GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the
515 quality of evidence--imprecision. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(12):1283-93. doi:
516 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.01.012.
- 517 32. Lundh A, Lexchin J, Mintzes B, *et al.* Industry sponsorship and research
518 outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;2:Mr000033. doi:
519 10.1002/14651858.MR000033.pub3
- 520 33. Takeda company. Global Plasma Leaders Collaborate to Accelerate
521 Development of Potential COVID-19 Hyperimmune Therapy. 2020;
522 [https://www.takeda.com/newsroom/newsreleases/2020/global-plasma-leaders-](https://www.takeda.com/newsroom/newsreleases/2020/global-plasma-leaders-collaborate-to-accelerate-development-of-potential-covid-19-hyperimmune-therapy/)
523 [collaborate-to-accelerate-development-of-potential-covid-19-hyperimmune-the-](https://www.takeda.com/newsroom/newsreleases/2020/global-plasma-leaders-collaborate-to-accelerate-development-of-potential-covid-19-hyperimmune-therapy/)
524 [rapy/](https://www.takeda.com/newsroom/newsreleases/2020/global-plasma-leaders-collaborate-to-accelerate-development-of-potential-covid-19-hyperimmune-therapy/). Accessed on 14 April 2020.
- 525 34. Regeneron. Regeneron's COVID-19 Response Efforts. 2020;
526 <https://www.regeneron.com/covid19>. Accessed on 15 April 2020.
- 527 35. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation
528 Report – 13, 2020.
529 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200512-sitrep-13-ncov-v3.pdf?sfvrsn=195f4010_6)
530 [512-sitrep-13-ncov-v3.pdf?sfvrsn=195f4010_6](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200512-sitrep-13-ncov-v3.pdf?sfvrsn=195f4010_6). (Accessed at 20200512).
- 531

532

533 **Figure legends**

534 Figure 1. Process of screening eligible studies

535 Figure 2. Number of worldwide registered randomized controlled trials on

536 pharmacological treatments available for COVID-19, segregated by drug

537 Figure 3. Number of worldwide registered randomized controlled trials on

538 pharmacological treatments available for COVID-19, segregated by country

Hydroxychloroquine

Lopinavir / Ritonavir

Tocilizumab

Remdesivir

Favipiravir

Number of ongoing randomized controlled trials (trials)