Tocilizumab and sarilumab alone or in combination with corticosteroids for COVID-19: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Dena Zeraatkar, methodologist

Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Ellen Cusano, internist

Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary

Juan Pablo Díaz Martinez, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Anila Qasim, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Sophia O. Mangala, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Elena Kum, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Jessica J. Bartoszko, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Tahira Devji, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Thomas Agoritsas, internist, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Division of General Internal Medicine & Division of Clinical Epidemiology, University Hospitals of

Geneva, Geneva

MAGIC Evidence Ecosystem Foundation, Oslo

Francois Lamontagne, critical care physician, methodologist

Department of Medicine, University of Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec

Centre de recherche du CHU University of Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec

Bram Rochweg, critical care physician, methodologist

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Department of Medicine, McMaster University

Per O Vandvik, internist, methodologist

MAGIC Evidence Ecosystem Foundation, Oslo
Department of Health Economics and Health Management, Institute for Health and Society,
University of Oslo, Oslo

Romina Brignardello-Petersen, methodologist
Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

Reed Siemieniuk*, internist, methodologist
Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University

*Corresponding author: Reed Siemieniuk (reed.siemieniuk@medportal.ca)

Disclaimers: None

Funding: This project is supported by two CIHR Operating Grants (VR4- 172738; MM1- 174897).

Data: Data is available in the supplementary materials.

Authors' Contributions: DZ, BR, FL, TA, POV, RBP, and RS conceived the study. JB identified studies. DZ, EC, and EK collected the data. AQ and JPDM analyzed the data. TD and RBP assessed the certainty of evidence. DZ drafted the first version of this manuscript.

Word count: 2,580

Abstract

Objective: To compare the effects of interleukin-6 (IL-6) receptor blockers, with or without corticosteroids, on mortality in patients with COVID-19.

Design: Systematic review and network meta-analysis

Data sources: WHO COVID-19 database, a comprehensive multilingual source of global covid-19 literature, and two prospective meta-analyses

Study selection: Trials in which people with suspected, probable, or confirmed COVID-19 were randomized to IL-6 receptor blockers (with or without corticosteroids), corticosteroids, placebo, or standard care.

Results: We assessed the risk of bias of included trials using a modification of the Cochrane risk of bias 2.0 tool. We performed a Bayesian fixed effect network meta-analysis and assessed the certainty of evidence using the GRADE approach.

We identified 45 eligible trials (20,650 patients), 36 (19,350 patients) of which could be included in the network meta-analysis. 27 of 36 trials were rated at high risk of bias, primarily due to lack of blinding. Tocilizumab (20 more per 1000, 15 fewer to 59 more; low certainty) and sarilumab (11 more per 1000, 38 fewer to 55 more; low certainty) alone may not reduce the risk of death. Tocilizumab, in combination with corticosteroids, probably reduces the risk of death compared to corticosteroids alone (35 fewer per 1000, 52 fewer to 18 more; moderate certainty) and sarilumab, in combination with corticosteroids, may reduce the risk of death compared to corticosteroids alone (43 fewer, 73 fewer to 12 more; low certainty). Tocilizumab and sarilumab, both in combination with corticosteroids, may have similar effects (8 more per 1000, 20 fewer to 35 more; low certainty).

Conclusion: IL-6 receptor blockers, when added to standard care that includes corticosteroids, in patients with severe or critical COVID-19, probably reduce mortality. Tocilizumab and sarilumab may have similar effectiveness.

Systematic review registration: NA

What is already known on this topic?

- IL-6 receptor blockers have immunosuppressive effects that may be important in COVID-19 patients with immune system dysfunction and inflammation
- Corticosteroids reduce the risk of death in patients with severe or critical COVID-19

What this study adds

- Our systematic review and network meta-analysis provides a comprehensive review of the evidence addressing the effects of IL-6 receptor blockers, alone or in combination with corticosteroids, in COVID-19
- IL-6 receptor blockers when added to a standard care that includes corticosteroids, in patients with severe or critical COVID-19, probably reduce mortality.
- Tocilizumab and sarilumab in combination with corticosteroids may have similar effectiveness for reducing mortality.

Background

As of June 2021, there have been more than 180 million cumulative cases of coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19) worldwide and nearly four million deaths (1). In an attempt to improve outcomes for patients with COVID-19, several drugs have been repurposed with varying results (2). Corticosteroids are the only medication so far to have reduced mortality in patients with severe and critical disease (2). Tocilizumab, an interleukin-6 (IL-6) receptor blocker may also reduce mortality, but whether sarilumab (another IL-6 receptor blocker) reduces mortality is uncertain.

IL-6 receptor blockers have immunosuppressive effects that may be important in COVID-19 patients with immune system dysfunction and inflammation (3-5). The RECOVERY trial found that tocilizumab reduces mortality and ventilation, particularly among patients receiving corticosteroids (6) and REMAP-CAP showed tocilizumab and sarilumab to reduce mortality and improve organ-support free days (7). Results across other trials, however, have not been consistent (8-10). A prospective meta-analysis also found that tocilizumab reduces mortality (11), but whether sarilumab reduces mortality compared to no IL-6 receptor blocker, and its effect relative to tocilizumab is unclear.

Tocilizumab is an expensive drug to which patients with COVID-19 currently have access—in settings where it is available, tocilizumab is often used in only a minority of patients who might benefit from it (12). If sarilumab is a comparable alternative to tocilizumab, it would increase availability for patients with COVID-19 who would not have otherwise have access to IL-6 receptor blocker.

Here we report a systematic review and network meta-analysis addressing the effectiveness of IL-6 receptor blockers, alone or in combination with corticosteroids, for COVID-19. This review capitalizes on the methods and data of our living systematic review and network meta-analysis of drug therapies for COVID-19 (2). This evidence synthesis is part of the BMJ Rapid Recommendations project, to inform World Health Organization (WHO) Living Guidelines on drugs for treatment of COVID-19 (13).

Methods

A protocol of our methods is contained as a supplement to our living systematic review and network meta-analysis (SRNMA) of drug therapies for COVID-19 (2).

Search

Our study uses the search strategy of our living SRNMA that includes daily searches in the World Health Organization (WHO) COVID-19 database—a comprehensive multilingual source of global published and preprint literature on COVID-19 (<https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019->

ncov/). Prior to its merge with the WHO COVID-19 database on 9 October 2020, we searched the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) COVID-19 Research Articles Downloadable Database. The database includes, but is not limited to the following bibliographic and grey literature sources: Medline (Ovid and PubMed), PubMed Central, Embase, CAB Abstracts, Global Health, PsycInfo, Cochrane Library, Scopus, Academic Search Complete, Africa Wide Information, CINAHL, ProQuest Central, SciFinder, the Virtual Health Library, LitCovid, WHO covid-19 website, CDC covid-19 website, Eurosurveillance, China CDC Weekly, Homeland Security Digital Library, ClinicalTrials.gov, bioRxiv (preprints), medRxiv (preprints), chemRxiv (preprints), and SSRN (preprints). Our search also includes six Chinese databases: Wanfang, Chinese Biomedical Literature, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, VIP, Chinese Medical Journal Net (preprints), and ChinaXiv (preprints). A validated machine learning model facilitates efficient identification of randomized trials (14). We searched WHO information sources from 1 December 2019 to 9 June 2021 and the Chinese literature from conception of the databases to 20 February 2021.

Our search is supplemented by ongoing surveillance of living evidence retrieval services, including the Living Overview of the Evidence (L-OVE) COVID-19 platform by the Epistemonikos Foundation (<https://app.iloveevidence.com/loves/5e6fdb9669c00e4ac072701d>) and the Systematic and Living Map on COVID-19 Evidence by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health (<https://www.fhi.no/en/qk/systematic-reviews-hta/map/>).

In addition, we include data directly from trialists via two WHO-sponsored prospective meta-analyses (11, 15). We report our full strategy as a supplement to our drug therapy publication (2).

Study selection

As part of the living SRNMA, pairs of reviewers, following calibration exercises, worked independently and in duplicate to screen titles and abstracts of search records and subsequently the full texts of records determined potentially eligible at the title and abstract screening stage and to link preprint reports with their subsequent publications based on trial registration numbers, authors, and other trial characteristics. Reviewers resolved discrepancies by discussion, and when necessary, by adjudication with a third-party reviewer.

We included preprint and peer reviewed reports of trials that compared IL-6 receptor blockers with standard care, placebo, or corticosteroids or that compared corticosteroids with standard care or placebo in patients with suspected, probable, or confirmed COVID-19. There were no restrictions on severity of illness, setting, or language of publication.

Data collection

As part of the living SRNMA, for each eligible trial, pairs of reviewers, following training and calibration exercises, independently extracted trial characteristics (trial registration, publication status, study design), patient characteristics (country, age, sex, type of care, severity of COVID-19 symptoms), and outcomes of interest (means or medians and measures of variability for continuous outcomes and the number of participants analyzed and the number of participants who experienced an event for dichotomous outcomes) using a standardized, pilot tested data extraction form. Reviewers resolved discrepancies by discussion and, when necessary, with adjudication by a third party. We updated our data when a study preprint becomes available as a peer reviewed publication. For this review, we focus on all-cause mortality closest to 90 days.

To assess risk of bias, reviewers, following training and calibration exercises, use a revision of the Cochrane tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials (RoB 2.0) (16). We present our modified risk of bias tool as a supplement to our drug therapy publication (2). Reviewers resolved discrepancies by discussion and, when necessary, by adjudication with a third party.

Analysis

We performed network meta-analysis using a Bayesian framework to compare tocilizumab with and without corticosteroids, sarilumab with and without corticosteroids, corticosteroids without IL-6 receptor blockers, and standard care or placebo. We used a plausible prior for the variance parameter and a uniform prior for the effect parameter (17). We used three Markov chains with 100,000 iterations after an initial burn-in of 10,000 and a thinning of 10. We used node splitting models to assess local incoherence and to obtain indirect estimates. All network meta-analyses were performed using the gemtc package of R version 3.6.3 (RStudio, Boston, MA) and all pairwise meta-analyses using the bayesmeta package. We produced network plots using the network map command of Stata version 17.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) with nodes weighted by the number of studies evaluating each treatment and edges weighted by the inverse variance of the direct estimate (18).

We present fixed-effect meta-analyses as the primary analysis and random-effects meta-analyses as sensitivity analysis because we found the estimates from random-effects to have credible intervals that were implausibly wide due to the uncertainty around the heterogeneity estimate.

We summarized the effect of interventions on mortality using odds ratios and corresponding 95% credible interval.

Certainty of evidence

To facilitate interpretation of the results, we calculated absolute effects for mortality using data from the CDC on patients who were hospitalized for COVID-19 (19, 20). For duration of ventilation, we used baseline risks from the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection COVID-19 database (21).

We assessed the certainty of evidence using GRADE approach for network meta-analysis, using a minimally contextualized approach, with a null effect as the threshold of importance (22-25). The minimally contextualized approach considers only whether credible intervals include the null effect and thus does not consider whether plausible effects, captured by credible intervals, include both important and trivial effects. To evaluate certainty of no benefit (or no effect), we used a 1% risk difference threshold of the 95% credible interval for mortality. We decided on this preliminary threshold based on a survey of the authors.

Two reviewers with experience in applying the GRADE approach rated each domain for each comparison separately and resolved discrepancies by consensus. We rated the certainty for each comparison and outcome as high, moderate, low, or very low, based on considerations of risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, publication bias, intransitivity, incoherence (difference between direct and indirect effects), and imprecision. We rated down for risk of bias if the interpretation of the effect would change if only studies at low risk of bias would have been considered. For example, if the credible interval of the pooled effect from studies at low risk of bias would have crossed the threshold for imprecision, we rated down for risk of bias.

Patient and public involvement

Patients were involved in outcome selection, interpretation of results, and the generation of parallel recommendations, as part of the WHO Rapid Recommendations initiative, in partnership with The BMJ and MAGIC Evidence Ecosystem Foundation.

Results

Study characteristics

We screened 45,854 titles and abstracts and 884 full-texts and identified 45 eligible trials, including 20,650 patients (6, 26-48). Figure 1 presents details about study selection. Twenty-one of these trials were published, four were available as preprints, and 20 were unpublished and were retrieved from two prospective meta-analyses (11, 49).

Table 1 presents trial characteristics. Twenty trials (7,608 patients) compared tocilizumab with standard care or placebo, (6, 26-34) seven trials (2,756 patients) sarilumab with standard care or placebo with or without corticosteroids,(35, 36) three trials (366 patients) compared IL-6 receptor blockers with corticosteroids (48), and 14 trials (8,102 patients) corticosteroids with standard care or placebo (37-47).

One trial, REMAP-CAP (7), randomized patients to tocilizumab or standard care (among centres with access to tocilizumab) or to sarilumab or standard care (among centres with access to sarilumab). Randomization to standard care was halted midway through the trial when an interim analysis showed efficacy of tocilizumab and sarilumab after which patients were randomized to either tocilizumab or sarilumab, with both groups receiving corticosteroids. We treated REMAP-CAP as three separate trials in our analyses (i.e., tocilizumab versus standard care; sarilumab versus standard care; tocilizumab versus sarilumab). We used 90-day mortality for the comparisons of tocilizumab and sarilumab with standard care and obtained data on in-hospital mortality from the investigators of the trial on the comparison of tocilizumab and sarilumab.

Another trial, Sarilumab-COVID-19, was conducted in two phases (35). Phase three underwent two protocol amendments involving patient eligibility and dose. The trial was thus treated as four separate trials.

Patient characteristics

Table 1 presents characteristics of patients included in the trial. Trials included a median of 129 [IQR: 47 to 354] participants. The mean age of patients in trials ranged between 42.1 to 69.8. About half of all patients were recruited from the United Kingdom. All but one trial reported on inpatients. Almost all trials reported on patients with severe to critical disease and most patients were receiving some form of supplementary oxygen.

Risk of bias

Figure 3 presents risk of bias assessments for the trials that were included in the analysis. Nine trials (including 3801 participants) were rated as low risk of bias the remainder (27 trials; 15,549 participants) were at high risk of bias—primarily due to lack of blinding.

Mortality

We included 36 trials, with 19,350 patients and 5,269 deaths, in our network comparing tocilizumab and sarilumab, with or without corticosteroids, and corticosteroids in comparison with standard care or placebo (6, 26-28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37-40, 42-46, 48). Nine trials could not be included in the analysis because they did not report outcome data, or, for trials that compared IL-6 receptor blockers with standard care

or placebo, we could not retrieve subgroup data based on concomitant treatment with corticosteroids (29, 32, 33, 36, 41, 47). Figure 2 presents the network plot. Supplementary 1 contains data for the network meta-analysis.

Table 2 presents results from the network meta-analysis. Tocilizumab and sarilumab alone may not reduce mortality compared to standard care and corticosteroids probably reduce the risk of death. Compared to corticosteroids alone, tocilizumab in combination with corticosteroids probably reduces mortality and sarilumab in combination with corticosteroids may reduce mortality. In combination with corticosteroids, sarilumab may have similar effects to tocilizumab in reducing mortality. Supplementary 2 presents all direct and indirect comparisons and their certainty of evidence.

Supplementary 3 presents results from the random-effects model. Results from the random-effects model were largely consistent with results from the fixed-effects model—though the random-effects model produced effect estimates that were more imprecise due to incorporation of an additional heterogeneity parameter in the model.

Discussion

Main findings

This systematic review and network meta-analysis provides a comprehensive overview of the evidence for IL-6 receptor blockers, alone or in combination with corticosteroids. We show that IL-6 receptor blockers, when added to a standard care that includes corticosteroids, in patients with severe or critical COVID-19, probably reduce mortality. Whether or not IL-6 receptor blockers have any impact on mortality without concomitant use of corticosteroids remains uncertain. Sarilumab appears to have similar effectiveness as tocilizumab.

Findings in context

Our findings are consistent with a prospective meta-analysis (11), and the largest trials on IL-6 receptor blockers, RECOVERY and REMAP-CAP (6, 7). Though several smaller trials did not find a benefit with tocilizumab, the totality of the evidence suggests that this is probably because smaller individual trials were underpowered to detect such a modest reduction in mortality.

Our study adds to the evidence base by showing that IL-6 receptor blockers may reduce mortality when added to a standard care regimen that includes corticosteroids and that sarilumab may have a similar effect on mortality as tocilizumab. This result is largely driven by the component of the REMAP-CAP trial that directly compared sarilumab to tocilizumab.

Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this review include the comprehensive search and screening strategy. In addition to trials that we identified as part of our own search, we also included trials from two prospective meta-analyses that included an inception cohort of registered trials thereby minimizing the effects of publication bias (11, 15).

Our findings are limited by the risk of bias of the trials, the majority of which were at high risk of bias due to lack of blinding. Lack of blinding may introduce bias through differences in co-interventions between randomized groups. We took a conservative approach and rated down the certainty of evidence for risk of bias. Some, including the linked WHO guideline panel, did not consider lack of blinding to be a serious concern for mortality, because it is an objective outcome (13).

We only considered corticosteroid use at the time of randomization and some patients probably received corticosteroids after randomization, but were considered in this review not to have received concomitant corticosteroids. Whether or not IL-6 receptor blockers reduce mortality when not co-administered with corticosteroids remains uncertain.

Four trials that we included in our systematic review were only available as preprint publications. Including preprints in meta-analyses may increase the precision of estimates, allow timely dissemination, and may minimize the effects of publication bias. It may, however, reduce the credibility of evidence syntheses and risk serious errors if important differences appear in later published reports. As part of our living systematic review and network meta-analysis, we have been maintaining a comprehensive comparison of differences in key methods and results between preprints and publications. Differences between preprints and peer reviewed publications have mostly been limited to baseline patient characteristics and any changes we have observed so far would not have resulted in a meaningful change to the pooled effect estimates or certainty of evidence (2).

Conclusion

Evidence from this systematic review and network meta-analysis shows that IL-6 receptor blockers when added to a standard care that includes corticosteroids, in patients with severe or critical COVID-19, probably reduce mortality. The available evidence suggests that tocilizumab and sarilumab may be similarly effective. Our findings support linked WHO guidelines on IL-6 receptor blockers, which recommends using either tocilizumab or sarilumab for patients with severe or critical COVID-19 (13).

Table 1: Trial Characteristics									
Study	Publication status Registration	Number of participants	Country	Mean age	% Male	Type of care	Severity	Detailed ventilation (%)	Treatments (dose and duration)
IL-6 Receptor Blocker: Tocilizumab									
ARCHITECTS	Data from meta-analysis NCT04412772	21	United States	61.5	57.1	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab placebo
CORIMUNO-TOCI-ICU	Data from meta-analysis NCT04331808	92	France	64.2	71.7	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	High-flow, NIV, or IV (100.0%)	tocilizumab standard care
COV-AID	Data from meta-analysis NCT04330638	230	Belgium	63.6	77.4	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab siltuximab standard care
COVIDOSE2-SSA	Data from meta-analysis NCT04479358	28	United States	65	67.9	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	tocilizumab tocilizumab standard care
COVIDSTORM	Data from meta-analysis NCT04577534	39	Finland	65.7	53.9	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab standard care
COVIT0Z	Data from meta-analysis NCT04435717	26	Spain	57.5	65.4	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (100%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab tocilizumab standard care
Hermine, 2021 (26) CORIMUNO-TOCI 1	Published NCT04331808	131	France	64	67.7	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Supplemental oxygen (100.0%) NIV or IV (0.0%)	tocilizumab standard care
HMO-020-0224	Data from meta-analysis NCT04377750	54	Israel	63.1	68.5	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab placebo

Horby, 2021 (6) RECOVERY	Published NCT04381936	4116	United Kingdom	63.6	67.3	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Supplemental oxygen (45.4%) High-flow or NIV (41.0%) IV (13.7%)	tocilizumab standard care
ImmCoVA	Data from meta-analysis NCT04412291	49	Sweden	NR	NR	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	IV (0.0%)	tocilizumab standard care
REMDACTA	Data from meta-analysis NCT04409262	640	Spain, United States, Brazil, Russia	60.3	63.3	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab placebo
Rosas, 2021 (27) COVACTA	Published NCT04320615	452	Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, United States	60.8	69.9	Inpatient Intensive care (56.4%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	NIV or IV (37.7%)	tocilizumab placebo
Rutgers, 2021 (28) PreToVid	Pre-print NL8504	354	Netherlands	66.5	67	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Supplemental oxygen (96.6%)	tocilizumab standard care

Soin, 2021 (29) COVINTOC	Published CTRI/2020/05/02 5369	180	India	55	84.9	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (49.2%) Severe (50.8%)	Supplemental oxygen (89.9%) NIV (26.8%) IV (5.0%)	tocilizumab standard care
Stone, 2020 (30) BACC BAY	Published NCT04356937	243	United States	59.9	58	Inpatient Intensive care (4.5%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Supplemental oxygen (79.8%) High-flow or NIV (4.1%) IV (0.4%)	tocilizumab placebo
Salama, 2021 (31) EMPACTA	Published NCT04372186	388	United States, Peru, Brazil, Kenya, South Africa, Mexico	55.9	59.1	Inpatient Intensive care (15.4%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	tocilizumab placebo
Salvarani, 2020 (32) RCT-TCZ-COVID-19	Published NCT04346355	126	Italy	60	61.1	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	NIV or IV (0.0%)	tocilizumab standard care
TOCOVID	Data from meta-analysis EudraCT2020-001442-19	270	Spain	53	63.7	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	tocilizumab standard care
Talaschian, 2021 (33)	Pre-print IRCT20081027001411N4	40	Iran	61.7	52.8	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Nasal cannula (50.0%) Simple mask (30.6%) Reservoir mask	tocilizumab standard care

								(11.1%) Niv (8.3%) Iv (0.0%)	
Veiga, 2021 (34) TOCIBRAS	Published NCT04403685	129	Brazil	57.5	68.2	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Supplemental oxygen (51.9%) High-flow or NIV (31.8%) IV (16.3%)	tocilizumab standard care
IL-6 Receptor Blocker: Sarilumab									
CORIMUNO-SARI-1	Data from meta-analysis NCT04324073	144	France	62.3	75	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	sarilumab standard care
CORIMUNO-SARI-ICU	Data from meta-analysis NCT04324073	81	France	61.6	76.5	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	sarilumab standard care
SARCOVID	Data from meta-analysis NCT04357808	30	Spain	61.7	66.7	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	sarilumab standard care
SARICOR	Data from meta-analysis EudraCT2020-001531-27	80	Spain	59.4	71.2	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	sarilumab sarilumab standard care
SARTRE	Data from meta-analysis EudraCT2020-002037-15	140	Spain	58.4	72.9	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	sarilumab standard care
Sivapalasingam, 2021 (35) (Phase 2)	Pre-print NCT04315298	457	United States	58.7	72.4	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (50.5%) Critical (49.5%)	Supplemental oxygen (27.6%) High-flow,	sarilumab (200 mg) sarilumab (400 mg) placebo

Sarilumab-COVID-19								NIV, or IV (49.5%)	
Sivapalasingam, 2021 (35) (Phase 3, cohort 1) Sarilumab-COVID-19	Pre-print NCT04315298	1365	United States	61.7	64.5	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (45%) Critical (55%)	Supplemental oxygen (27.0%) IV (21.8%)	sarilumab (200 mg) sarilumab (400 mg) placebo
Sivapalasingam, 2021 (35) (Phase 3, cohort 2) Sarilumab-COVID-19	Pre-print NCT04315298	31	United States	48.7	71	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	IV (100.0%)	sarilumab (800 mg) placebo
Sivapalasingam, 2021 (35) (Phase 3, cohort 3) Sarilumab-COVID-19	Pre-print NCT04315298	8	United States	60.8	62.5	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	High-flow or NIV (100.0%) IV (0.0%)	sarilumab (800 mg) placebo
Lescure, 2021 (36)	Published NCT04327388; Eudra CT (2020-001162-12), WHO (U1111-1249-6021)	420	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain	59	62.7	Inpatient Intensive care (35.6%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (60.6%) Critical (38.9%)	Nasal cannula (42.1%) Face mask (26.7%) Nonrebreather face mask (10.5%) High-flow (6.2%) NIV (1.7%) IV (11.5%) Other (1.2%)	sarilumab (400 mg) sarilumab (200 mg) placebo
IL-6 Receptor Blockers: Tocilizumab/Sarilumab									

Gordon, 2021 (50) REMAP-CAP	Published NCT02735707	798	United Kingdom, Netherlands, Austria, New Zealand, Ireland, Saudi Arabia	61.4	72.6	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	High-flow (28.8%) NIV (41.5%) IV (29.4%)	tocilizumab standard care (for tocilizumab) sarilumab standard care (for sarilumab)
Gordon, 2021 (50) REMAP-CAP	Data from authors NCT02735707	1020	United Kingdom, Netherlands, Austria, New Zealand, Ireland, Saudi Arabia	NR	NR	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	NR	tocilizumab sarilumab
IL-6 Receptor Blockers versus Corticosteroids									
Rashad, 2021 (48)	Published CT04519385 (19/08/2020)	149	Egypt	62.5	56.9	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (100%)	NIV (64.2%) IV (35.8%)	tocilizumab dexamethasone
SILCOR	Data from meta- analysis EudraCT2020- 001413-20	158	Spain	62	65.2	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	NR	siltuximab corticosteroids
STORM	Data from meta- analysis NCT04345445	59	Malaysia	53.2	76.3	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (100%) Severe (0%) Critical (0%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	tocilizumab dexamethasone
Corticosteroids									

Angus, 2020 (37) REMAP-CAP	Published NCT02735707	403	Australia, Canada, Ireland, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States	59.9	71.1	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	High-flow (14.6%) NIV (29.7%) IV (55.5%) ECMO (0.8%)	hydrocortisone (fixed- dose) hydrocortisone (shock- dependent) standard care
Corral-Gudino, 2021 (38) GLUCOCOVID	Published 2020-001934-37	64	Spain	69.8	60.9	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Mechanical ventilation (0.0%)	methylprednisolone standard care
Dequin, 2020 (39) CAPECOVID	Published NCT02517489	149	France	62.2	69.8	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	Nonrebreath ing mask with a reservoir bag (6.0%) High-flow (12.8%) NIV or IV (81.2%)	hydrocortisone placebo
Edalatifard, 2020 (40)	Published IRCT20200404046 947N1	68	Iran	58.5	62.9	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%) Critical (0%)	Nasal cannula (21.0%) Simple mask (11.3%) Reserve mask (29.0%) NIV (37.1%)	methylprednisolone standard care

Farahani, 2020 (41)	Pre-print IRCT20200406046 963N1	29	Iran	64	65.5	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	methylprednisolone, prednisolone standard care
Horby, 2021 (42) RECOVERY	Published NCT04381936	6425	United Kingdom	66.2	63.6	Inpatient	NR	Supplemental oxygen or NIV (60.4%) IV or ECMO (15.7%)	dexamethasone standard care
Jamaati, 2021 (43)	Published IRCT20151227025 726N17	50	Iran	62	72	Inpatient	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	NR	dexamethasone standard care
Jeronimo, 2020 (44) Metcovid	Published NCT04343729	416	Brazil	55	65.3	Inpatient Intensive care (35.4%)	NR	Non-invasive oxygen (47.5%) Invasive mechanical ventilation (33.9%)	methylprednisolone placebo
Steroids-SARI	Data from meta- analysis NCT04244591	47	China	64.5	74.5	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (57.5%)	methylprednisolone standard care
DEXA-COVID 19	Data from meta- analysis NCT04325061	19	Spain	60.7	68.4	NR	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	IV (100.0%)	dexamethasone standard care
COVID STEROID	Data from meta- analysis NCT04348305	29	Denmark	59.4	79.3	NR	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	Mechanical ventilation (51.7%)	hydrocortisone placebo

Tang, 2021 (45)	Published NCT04273321	86	China	56	47.7	Inpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (100%)	Nasal cannula (70.9%)	methylprednisolone standard care
Tomazini, 2020 (46) CoDEX	Published NCT04327401	299	Brazil	61.4	62.5	Inpatient Intensive care (100.0%)	Mild/Moderate (0%) Severe (0%) Critical (100%)	Pressure control ventilation (44.5%) Volume control ventilation (46.5%) Other (9.0%)	dexamethasone standard care
Vaira, 2020 (47)	Published	18	Italy	42.1	38.9	Outpatient Intensive care (0.0%)	Mild/Moderate (100%) Severe (0%) Critical (0%)	NR	corticosteroids standard care

318

319

Table 2: Summary of findings for network meta-analysis comparing tocilizumab and sarilumab, alone or in combination with corticosteroids

Comparison	OR (95% CI)	Absolute effect estimates		Certainty of the Evidence (Quality of evidence)	Plain text summary
		Intervention 1	Intervention 2		
Tocilizumab vs Standard care	1.12 (95% CI: 0.91 – 1.38)	150 per 1,000	130 per 1,000	Low (risk of bias, imprecision)	Tocilizumab may increase mortality compared to standard care.
Sarilumab vs Standard care	1.07 (95% CI: 0.81 – 0.40)	141 per 1,000	130 per 1,000	Low (risk of bias, imprecision)	Sarilumab may increase mortality compared to standard care.
Corticosteroids vs Standard care	0.84 (95% CI: 0.75 – 0.93)	101 per 1,000	130 per 1,000	Moderate (risk of bias)	Corticosteroids probably reduce mortality compared to standard care.
Sarilumab vs. Tocilizumab	0.95 (95% CI: 0.68 – 1.35)	141 per 1,000	150 per 1,000	Very Low (risk of bias, imprecision)	We are uncertain of the effects of sarilumab compared to tocilizumab.
Tocilizumab and Corticosteroids vs Corticosteroids alone	0.79 (95% CI: 0.70 – 0.88)	66 per 1,000	101 per 1,000	Moderate (risk of bias)	Tocilizumab, in combination with corticosteroids, probably reduces

		(95% CI: -51.80 to -18.23)		mortality compared to corticosteroids alone.
Sarilumab and Corticosteroids vs Corticosteroids alone	0.73 (95% CI: 0.58 – 0.92)	58 per 1,000 101 per 1,000 Difference: 42.73 fewer per 1,000 (95% CI: -72.61 to -12.00)	Low (risk of bias, imprecision)	Sarilumab, in combination with corticosteroids, may reduce mortality compared to corticosteroids alone
Tocilizumab and Corticosteroids vs Sarilumab and Corticosteroids	1.07 (95% CI: 0.86 – 1.34)	66 per 1,000 58 per 1,000 Difference: 8.19 more per 1,000 (95% CI: -20.49 to 34.96)	Low (risk of bias, imprecision)	Tocilizumab, in combination with corticosteroids, may have similar effects to reduce mortality compared with sarilumab in combination with corticosteroids.

320

Figure 1: PRISMA diagram

324

325

326 **Figure 2: Network diagram** (nodes are weighted according to the number of studies evaluating each
327 treatment and edges weighted according to the precision (inverse variance) of the direct estimate for
328 each pairwise comparison).

329

330 **Figure 3: Risk of bias of trials included in the network meta-analysis**

Author (if published)	Trial (trial registration)	Randomization	Deviations from the intended intervention	Missing outcome data	Measurement of outcome	Selection of the reported results
Tocilizumab						
	ARCHITECTS (NCT04412772)	●	●	●	●	●
	CORIMUNO-TOCI-ICU (NCT04331808)	●	●	●	●	●
	COV-AID (NCT04330638)	●	●	●	●	●
	COVIDOSE2-SSA (NCT04479358)	●	●	●	●	●
	COVIDSTORM (NCT04577534)	●	●	●	●	●
	COVITOX (NCT04435717)	●	●	●	●	●
Hermine, 2020	CORIMUNO-TOCI-1 (NCT04331808)	●	●	●	●	●
	HMO-020-0224 (NCT04377750)	●	●	●	●	●
Horby, 2021	RECOVERY (NCT04381936)	●	●	●	●	●
	ImmCoVA (NCT04412291)	●	●	●	●	●
	REMDACTA (NCT04409262)	●	●	●	●	●
Rosas, 2021	COVACTA (NCT04320615)	●	●	●	●	●
Rutgers, 2021	PreToVid (NL8504)	●	●	●	●	●
Stone, 2020	BACC Bay (NCT04356937)	●	●	●	●	●
Salama, 2020	EMPACTA (NCT04372186)	●	●	●	●	●
Veiga, 2021	TOCIBRAS (NCT04403685)	●	●	●	●	●
Sarilumab						
	CORIMUNO-SARI-1 (NCT04324073)	●	●	●	●	●
	CORIMUNO-SARI-ICU (NCT04324073)	●	●	●	●	●
	SARCOVID (NCT04357808)	●	●	●	●	●
	SARICOR (EudraCT2020-001531-27)	●	●	●	●	●
	SARTRE (EudraCT2020-002037-15)	●	●	●	●	●
Sivapalasingam, 2021	Sarilumab-COVID-19 (NCT04315298)	●	●	●	●	●
Tocilizumab/Sarilumab						
Gordon, 2021	REMAP-CAP (NCT02735707)	●	●	●	●	●
Tocilizumab/Corticosteroids						
Rashad, 2021	(CT04519385 (19/08/2020))	●	●	●	●	●
Corticosteroids						
Angus, 2020	REMAP-CAP (NCT02735707)	●	●	●	●	●
Corral-Gudino, 2020	GLUCCOCVID (2020-001934-37)	●	●	●	●	●
Dequin, 2020	CAPECOVID (NCT02517489)	●	●	●	●	●
Edaltifard, 2020	(IRCT20200404046947N1)	●	●	●	●	●
Horby, 2020	RECOVERY (NCT04381936)	●	●	●	●	●
Jamaati, 2021	(IRCT20151227025726N17)	●	●	●	●	●
Jeronimo, 2020	Metcovid (NCT04343729)	●	●	●	●	●
	DEXA-COVID 19 (NCT04325061)	●	●	●	●	●
	COVID STEROID (NCT04348305)	●	●	●	●	●
	Steroids-SARI (NCT04244591)	●	●	●	●	●
Tang, 2021	Tang_2 (NCT04273321)	●	●	●	●	●
Tomazini, 2020	CoDEX (NCT04327401)	●	●	●	●	●

Low risk of bias	●
Probably low risk of bias	●
Probably high risk of bias	●
High risk of bias	●

References

1. COVID-19 Worldometer [Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>].
2. Siemieniuk RA, Bartoszko JJ, Ge L, et al. Drug treatments for covid-19: living systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Bmj*. 2020;370:m2980.
3. Pitre T, Jones A, Su J, et al. Inflammatory biomarkers as independent prognosticators of 28-day mortality for COVID-19 patients admitted to general medicine or ICU wards: a retrospective cohort study. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2021:1-10.
4. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):507-13.
5. Del Valle DM, Kim-Schulze S, Huang HH, et al. An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts COVID-19 severity and survival. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(10):1636-43.
6. Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10285):1637-45.
7. Gordon AC, Mouncey PR, Al-Beidh F, et al. Interleukin-6 Receptor Antagonists in Critically Ill Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(16):1491-502.
8. Stone JH, Frigault MJ, Serling-Boyd NJ, et al. Efficacy of Tocilizumab in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(24):2333-44.
9. Hermine O, Mariette X, Tharaux PL, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Usual Care in Adults Hospitalized With COVID-19 and Moderate or Severe Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2021;181(1):32-40.
10. Salvarani C, Dolci G, Massari M, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Standard Care on Clinical Worsening in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2021;181(1):24-31.
11. Shankar-Hari M, Vale C, Godolphin P, et al. Association of administration of interleukin-6 antagonists with mortality and other outcomes among hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a prospective meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2021.
12. Verma AA, Pai M, Saha S, et al. Managing drug shortages during a pandemic: tocilizumab and COVID-19. *Cmaj*. 2021;193(21):E771-e6.
13. Rochwerg B, Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, et al. A living WHO guideline on drugs for covid-19. *Bmj*. 2020;370:m3379.
14. Marshall IJ, Noel-Storr A, Kuiper J, et al. Machine learning for identifying Randomized Controlled Trials: An evaluation and practitioner's guide. *Res Synth Methods*. 2018;9(4):602-14.
15. Sterne JAC, Murthy S, Diaz JV, et al. Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *Jama*. 2020;324(13):1330-41.
16. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj*. 2019;366:l4898.
17. Turner RM, Jackson D, Wei Y, et al. Predictive distributions for between-study heterogeneity and simple methods for their application in Bayesian meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2015;34(6):984-98.
18. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, et al. Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(10):e76654.
19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVIDView. A weekly surveillance summary of U.S COVID-19 activity 2020 [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/index.html>].
20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Daily updates of totals by week and state: provisional death counts for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) 2020 [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/COVID19/index.htm>].
21. ISARIC (International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infections Consortium). COVID-19 Report: 08 June 2020. medRxiv 2020.

22. Hultcrantz M, Rind D, Akl EA, et al. The GRADE Working Group clarifies the construct of certainty of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2017;87:4-13.
23. Puhan MA, Schünemann HJ, Murad MH, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *Bmj.* 2014;349:g5630.
24. Brignardello-Petersen R, Mustafa RA, Siemieniuk RAC, et al. GRADE approach to rate the certainty from a network meta-analysis: addressing incoherence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2019;108:77-85.
25. Brignardello-Petersen R, Bonner A, Alexander PE, et al. Advances in the GRADE approach to rate the certainty in estimates from a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2018;93:36-44.
26. Hermine O, Mariette X, Tharaux P-L, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Usual Care in Adults Hospitalized With COVID-19 and Moderate or Severe Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020.
27. Rosas IO, Bräu N, Waters M, et al. Tocilizumab in Hospitalized Patients with Severe Covid-19 Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 2021.
28. Rutgers AaW, Peter E. and van der Holt, Bronno and Postma, Simone and van Vonderen, Marit G.A. and Piersma, Djura P. and Postma, Douwe and van den Berge, Maarten and Jong, Eefje and de Vries, Marten and van der Burg, Leonie and Huugen, Dennis and van der Poel, Marjolein and Kampschreur, Linda M. and Nijland, Marcel and Strijbos, Jaap H. and Tamminga, Menno and Mutsaers, Pim G. N. J. and Schol-Gelok, Suzanne and Dijkstra-Tiekstra, Margriet and Sidorenkov, Grigory and Vincenten, Julien and van Geffen, Wouter H. and Knoester, Marjolein and Kosterink, Jos and Gans, Reinold and Stegeman, Coen and Huls, Gerwin and van Meerten, Tom, . Timely Administration of Tocilizumab Improves Survival of Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. . Available at SSRN: <https://ssrncom/abstract=3834311> or <http://dxdoiorg/102139/ssrn3834311>. 2021.
29. Soin AS, Kumar K, Choudhary NS, et al. Tocilizumab plus standard care versus standard care in patients in India with moderate to severe COVID-19-associated cytokine release syndrome (COVINTOC): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. (2213-2619 (Electronic)).
30. Stone JH, Frigault MJ, Serling-Boyd NJ, et al. Efficacy of Tocilizumab in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2020.
31. Salama C, Han J, Yau L, et al. Tocilizumab in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19 Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(1):20-30.
32. Salvarani C, Dolci G, Massari M, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Standard Care on Clinical Worsening in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020.
33. Talaschian M, Akhtari M, Mahmoudi M, et al. Tocilizumab Failed to Reduce Mortality in Severe COVID-19 Patients: Results From a Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. *Respiratory Research.* 2021.
34. Veiga VC, Prats J, Farias DLC, et al. Effect of tocilizumab on clinical outcomes at 15 days in patients with severe or critical coronavirus disease 2019: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2021;372:n84.
35. Sivapalasingam S, Lederer DJ, Bhore R, et al. A Randomized Placebo-Controlled Trial of Sarilumab in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *medRxiv.* 2021:2021.05.13.21256973.
36. Lescure FX, Honda H, Fowler RA, et al. Sarilumab in patients admitted to hospital with severe or critical COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet Respiratory medicine.* 2021;9(5):522-32.
37. The Writing Committee for the REMAP-CAP Investigators. Effect of Hydrocortisone on Mortality and Organ Support in Patients With Severe COVID-19: The REMAP-CAP COVID-19 Corticosteroid Domain Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama.* 2020;02:02.
38. Corral-Gudino L, Bahamonde A, Arnaiz-Revillas F, et al. Methylprednisolone in adults hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia : An open-label randomized trial (GLUCOCOVID). *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift.* 2021:1-9.

39. Dequin PF, Heming N, Meziani F, et al. Effect of Hydrocortisone on 21-Day Mortality or Respiratory Support Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*. 2020;02:02.
40. Edalatfard M, Akhtari M, Salehi M, et al. Intravenous methylprednisolone pulse as a treatment for hospitalised severe COVID-19 patients: results from a randomised controlled clinical trial. *The European respiratory journal*. 2020.
41. Farahani RH MR, Nezami-Asl A et al. . Evaluation of the Efficacy of Methylprednisolone Pulse Therapy in Treatment of Covid-19 Adult Patients with Severe Respiratory Failure: Randomized, Clinical Trial,. 09 September 2020, PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square [<https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-66909/v1>]. 2020.
42. The RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(8):693-704.
43. Jamaati H, Hashemian SM, Farzanegan B, et al. No clinical benefit of high dose corticosteroid administration in patients with COVID-19: A preliminary report of a randomized clinical trial. *Eur J Pharmacol*. 2021;897:173947.
44. Jeronimo CMP, Farias MEL, Val FFA, et al. Methylprednisolone as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 (Metcovid): A Randomised, Double-Blind, Phase IIb, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2020.
45. Tang X, Feng YM, Ni JX, et al. Early Use of Corticosteroid May Prolong SARS-CoV-2 Shedding in Non-Intensive Care Unit Patients with COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Multicenter, Single-Blind, Randomized Control Trial. *Respiration; international review of thoracic diseases*. 2021:1-11.
46. Tomazini BM, Maia IS, Cavalcanti AB, et al. Effect of Dexamethasone on Days Alive and Ventilator-Free in Patients With Moderate or Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and COVID-19: The CoDEX Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*. 2020;02:02.
47. Vaira LA, Hopkins C, Petrocelli M, et al. Efficacy of corticosteroid therapy in the treatment of long-lasting olfactory disorders in COVID-19 patients. *Rhinology*. 2021;59(1):21-5.
48. Rashad A, Mousa S, Nafady-Hego H, et al. Short term survival of critically ill COVID-19 Egyptian patients on assisted ventilation treated by either Dexamethasone or Tocilizumab. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):8816.
49. The WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) Working Group. Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *Jama*. 2020;02:02.
50. Gordon AC, Mouncey PR, Al-Beidh F, et al. Interleukin-6 Receptor Antagonists in Critically Ill Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021.