

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2

3 **Title:** Hydroxychloroquine/Chloroquine in COVID-19 With Focus on
4 Hospitalized Patients – A Systematic Review

5 **Authors/Affiliations:** Daniel Freilich (Bassett Medical Center), Jennifer Victory (Bassett
6 Research Institute), Anne Gadomski (Bassett Research Institute)

7 **Corresponding Author:** Daniel Freilich, MD

8 **CI Statement:** None of the authors have any Competing Interests to declare

9 **Authorship Role:** All authors collaborated in the writing/editing of the manuscript

10 **Article Type:** Review

11 **Keywords:** Hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2,
12 clinical trials, in vitro, animal studies

13 **Running Head:** Hydroxychloroquine/Chloroquine for COVID-19

14 **Key Summary Points:** Preclinical hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine *in vitro* studies found
15 inconsistent activity against coronaviruses including SARS-CoV-2.

16 Preclinical hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine animals studies found
17 inconsistent efficacy for coronaviruses in general and none for
18 SARS-CoV-2.

19 The overwhelming majority of RCTs and retrospective-
20 observational trials found no benefit for
21 hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine in hospitalized COVID-19
22 patients, and many found concerning safety signals.

23 The majority of RCTs and retrospective-observational trials found
24 no benefit for hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine in COVID-19
25 outpatients or for pre- or post-exposure prophylaxis, and some found
26 concerning safety signals.

33 **Abstract**

34

35 **Background**

36 In the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, many hospitalized patients received empiric
37 hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine (HC/CQ). Although some retrospective-observational trials
38 suggested potential benefit, all subsequent randomized clinical trials (RCTs) failed to show benefit
39 and use generally ceased. Herein, we summarize key studies that clinicians advising patients on
40 HC/CQ's efficacy:safety calculus in hospitalized COVID-19 patients would want to know about
41 in a practical one-stop-shopping source.

42

43 **Methods**

44 Pubmed and Google were searched on November 4, 2021. Search words included: COVID-19,
45 hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, *in vitro*, animal studies, clinical trials, and meta-analyses.
46 Studies were assessed for import and included if considered impactful for benefit:risk assessment.

47

48 **Results**

49 These searches led to inclusion of 12 *in vitro* and animal reports; 12 retrospective-observational
50 trials, 19 interventional clinical trials (17 RCTs, 1 single-arm, 1 controlled but unblinded), and 51
51 meta-analyses in hospitalized patients.

52 Inconsistent efficacy was seen *in vitro* and in animal studies for coronaviruses and nil in SARS-
53 CoV-2 animal models specifically. Most retrospective-observational studies in hospitalized
54 COVID-19 patients found no efficacy; QT prolongation and increased adverse events and
55 mortality were reported in some. All RCTs and almost all meta-analyses provided robust data
56 showing no benefit in overall populations and subgroups, yet concerning safety issues in many.

57

58 **Conclusions**

59 HC/CQ have inconsistent anti-coronavirus efficacy *in vitro* and in animal models, and no
60 convincing efficacy yet substantial safety issues in the overwhelming majority of retrospective-

61 observational trials, RCTs, and meta-analyses in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. HC/CQ should
62 not be prescribed for hospitalized COVID-19 patients outside of clinical trials.

63

64 **Introduction**

65 More than 770,000 Americans have died of COVID-19, and U.S. deaths continue at 1,000-2,000
66 daily. Thus, it is imperative that we confirm the beneficial efficacy:safety calculus of effective
67 medications (positive studies) but also the absence of beneficial efficacy:safety calculus of
68 purportedly effective medications (negative studies), so we refrain from prescribing them
69 potentially causing harm. Lessons should be learned from the successes and failures in response
70 to the pandemic. The story of the medical community's empiric prescribing of hydroxychloroquine
71 (HC) and chloroquine (CQ) despite weak *a priori* data and a progressively negative preclinical
72 and clinical database during the pandemic should be instructive to avoid repetition in this latter
73 phase of the pandemic.

74 HC received early pandemic attention for use in COVID-19 in part because then President Trump
75 recommended and took it for post-exposure prophylaxis. HC was frequently administered
76 empirically (peaking at a whopping 42% prevalence for hospitalized COVID-19 patients early in
77 the pandemic [1]) and recommended in some expert reviews and guidelines (e.g., [2]). Supportive
78 data were shaky, relying on inconsistent *in vitro* and animal studies mainly for other coronaviruses
79 [3-4], and small flawed uncontrolled trials not confirming benefit [5-6]). Notwithstanding, the
80 FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) in March 2020 for HC/CQ use in
81 hospitalized COVID-19 patients who could not be enrolled in clinical trials [7].

82 Retrospective observational studies were subsequently published with the overwhelming majority
83 finding no benefit and some finding higher mortality and toxicities (e.g., QTc prolongation) [6, 8-
84 25], but they were fraught with potential bias, in part because HC/CQ patients were usually sicker.
85 Most American guidelines recommended use in COVID-19 only in trials.

86
87 In late spring/early summer, 2020, results of at least 5 RCTs became available [26-30], with all
88 showing no primary outcome benefit in hospitalized COVID-19 patients (and safety concerns in
89 most). Most trialists studying treatments for hospitalized COVID-19 patients discontinued
90 enrollment in their HC/CQ study arms by the summer of 2020. Twelve additional RCTs later in
91 2020, and in 2021, found similar results [31-42]. Numerous meta-analyses were completed
92 assessing HC/CQ in hospitalized COVID-19 patients – almost all found ineffectiveness, and many
93 found adverse safety signals (e.g., [43-45]).

94 This review summarizes the evolved benefits:risks database for HC/CQ in the COVID-19
95 pandemic, aiming to assist clinicians in easily summarizing the evidence basis for their
96 benefits:risk assessment to their patients, some of whom (as well as other experts) continue to
97 believe in possible effectiveness of these medications in some indications (e.g., [46]).

98

99 **Methods**

100 Pubmed and Google searches were conducted, with the latest repeated November 4, 2021. Initial
101 search words included “COVID-19”, “hydroxychloroquine”, and “chloroquine”, found 3,123
102 publications.

103 Adding search words, “clinical trials”, reduced this list to 78 publications – 15 RCTs and 5
104 retrospective-observational trials in hospitalized patients, 4 RCTs in outpatients, 6 RCTs
105 evaluating prophylaxis, and 48 other studies (not evaluating HC/CQ, not trials, unable to
106 categorize). For hospitalized COVID-19 patients, the primary focus of this review, the Google
107 search, as well as findings from the other Pubmed searches below (e.g., *in vitro* studies), led to
108 inclusion of 4 additional studies (2 RCTs, 1 single-arm trial, and 1 prospective controlled
109 observational trial) and 7 additional retrospective-observational trials yielding 19 interventional
110 trials (17 of which were RCTs) and 12 retrospective-observational trials. Of the 17 RCTs, 5
111 published earlier in the pandemic were evaluated in detail systematically because they impacted
112 evolving FDA recommendations and guidelines more than latter RCTs which tended to be
113 confirmatory and additive to established literature (summarized but not detailed herein); all 5
114 included hard primary outcomes (i.e., mortality, ordinal scores, and viral clearance) with most
115 comparing primary outcome risk, rate, and odds ratios; standard baseline patient characteristics
116 were collected in all; 4 vs. 1 were assessed as having moderate and mild risk of bias, respectively
117 (Table S1).

118 Adding “meta-analysis” to the Pubmed search led to 62 publications, 12 of whom were not
119 focusing on hospitalized COVID-19 patients were excluded yielding a total of 50 meta-analyses;
120 our unpublished IPD meta-analysis was added yielding a total of 51 meta-analyses in hospitalized
121 patients (3 examples were detailed).

122 The Pubmed search led to the finding of 4 outpatient RCTs; the Google search found two additional
123 studies (1 retrospective-observational study and 1 RCT) yielding a total of 6 outpatient studies.

124 The Pubmed search led to finding 6 prophylaxis studies; the Google search found an additional 3
125 studies (1 RCT, 2 observational cohort) yielding a total of 9 prophylaxis studies.

126 Adding the key words, “in vitro”, to our Pubmed search, resulted in 277 publications of which
127 only 6 were in fact *in vitro* studies and thus included in our preclinical review. Our Google and
128 other Pubmed searches found 2 additional studies, yielding 8 *in vitro* studies. Adding key words,
129 “animal studies”, resulted in 89 publications of which only 4 were in fact animal studies and thus
130 included in our preclinical summary; no additional studies were found with the Google or other
131 Pubmed searches. In total, 12 preclinical studies were included in this review (8 *in vitro*, 4 animal).

132 See Figure 1.

133 We prioritized detailing of RCTs, larger retrospective-observational studies, and larger (especially
134 IPD) meta-analyses as these were considered ‘more impactful’. Uncontrolled trials, smaller
135 retrospective-observational studies, and smaller aggregate data meta-analyses (and as noted, later
136 confirmatory RCTs) were considered ‘less impactful’.

137 This systematic review was not based on a written protocol nor was it registered.

138

139 **Results and Discussion**

140

141 **Preclinical *In vitro* Studies**

142 The anti-inflammatory and antimalarial medications, HC and CQ, demonstrated antiviral activity
143 against SARS-CoV and MERS Co-V *in vitro*, including primate cells – although inconsistently as
144 no activity was seen in SARS-CoV mouse cell culture [47].

145 A handful of reports showed SARS-CoV-2 growth inhibition *in vitro* by HC/CQ [48-50] including
146 synergy with azithromycin at clinically realistic concentrations [51] – albeit similarly
147 inconsistently as only two of three studies found viral growth inhibition in Vero E6 cell (African
148 green monkey kidney cells) and one found no growth inhibition in a human airway epithelial model

149 [52-54]. One study found that growth inhibition by quinine exceeds that by HC or CQ in Vero
150 cells, human Caco-2 colon epithelial cells, lung A549 cells, and Calu-3 lung epithelial cells [55].

151 The mechanism of action of HC/CQ's antiviral activity is purported to be via enhancement of
152 endosomal pH leading to decreased viral-cell fusion and inhibition of glycosylation of SARS-CoV
153 cellular receptors (both leading to decreased cell entry) [56]; immune modulation and anti-
154 thrombotic characteristics may also be important. CQ EC50s of 0.77-6.9 microM have been
155 reported, levels reached in patients receiving HC for rheumatoid arthritis [48, 12, 57]. One study
156 reported an EC50 5.47 microM for CQ vs. 0.72 for HC for SARS-CoV-2 [58].

157 Overall, HC/CQ have *in vitro* activity against coronaviruses including SARS-CoV-2 albeit
158 inconsistently and not as potently as some other antivirals [59].

159

160 **Preclinical *In Vivo* Animal Studies**

161 Animal studies evaluating HC/CQ for coronaviruses have been inconsistent. In mice, HC activity
162 was found against the human coronavirus HCoV-OC43 [60] but none against SARS-CoV [47].

163

164 The limited database of animal studies with SARS-CoV-2 has been relatively 'negative.' Neither
165 standard nor high dosing of prophylactic or therapeutic HC was efficacious in hamsters; standard
166 prophylactic and therapeutic dosing was similarly ineffective in rhesus macaques [3]. Clinical
167 parameters, viral shedding/load, and lung pathologic changes were similar in treatment and control
168 groups. Another hamster study also showed no treatment or prophylaxis efficacy for HC [61]. In
169 a ferret SARS-CoV-2 model, HC marginally decreased clinical scores at some time points but had
170 no effect on symptoms duration or viral shedding or load [4]. In a macaque SARS-CoV-2 model,
171 treatment dosing with HC with or without azithromycin had no effect on viral clearance, and
172 prophylactic dosing did not decrease infection [54].

173

174 Notably, in other viral infections (e.g., influenza), CQ failed to replicate promising *in vitro* findings
175 in *in vivo* animal and human studies [62].

176

177 The *in vitro* data for SARS viruses and relative safety of these medications in malaria and
178 rheumatoid arthritis in part prompted recommendations by some expert groups and guidelines

179 early in the pandemic to administer these drugs empirically (ideally in RCTs) in COVID-19 [2,
180 63).

181

182 **Retrospective-Observational Clinical Studies in Hospitalized Patients**

183 Early in the pandemic, a small open-label non-randomized French trial was published, reporting
184 results for HC treatment of hospitalized COVID-19 patients [8]. This pilot study received undue
185 attention beyond its scientific and clinical significance, being referenced by then President Trump.
186 Patients were given HC with or without azithromycin; patients from other hospitals and those
187 refusing participation served as negative controls. The primary outcome measurement, day-6
188 virologic clearance by nasopharyngeal swab PCR, occurred in 70% of HC vs. 12.5% of control
189 patients ($p=0.001$) (100% in HC/azithromycin patients and 57.1% in HC patients [$p<0.001$]); Six
190 of 42 enrolled patients were lost to follow-up in the HC group. Mean serum HC concentration was
191 $0.46 \text{ mcg/ml} \pm 0.2$, akin to EC50s published for CQ for SARS-CoV viruses. The trial was limited
192 by small size, open-label design without true controls, short follow-up, and high dropout. The
193 authors concluded their results were “*promising*” and recommended HC with azithromycin in
194 COVID-19. In a follow-up reanalysis, the authors found that their results for HC/azithromycin were
195 similar even after addressing critiques about excluded patients and outcome adjudication [8].
196 These results, however, could not be replicated in a subsequent study by other investigators [6].

197 Another small Chinese study early in the pandemic found improved clinical outcomes with HC in
198 hospitalized COVID-19 patients [9]. The study randomized 62 patients to standard care with or
199 without HC for 5 days in a double-blinded fashion. Time to Clinical Recovery, the primary
200 outcome, was significantly shorter with HC. Improvement in pneumonia by CT imaging was
201 higher with HC (80.6% vs. 54.8%).

202 In another early pandemic uncontrolled retrospective-observational study focused on hospitalized
203 mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients, also from China, mortality was 9/48 (18.8%) with
204 HC vs. 238/502 (47.4%) without HC ($p<0.0001$) [10].

205 These small studies suggested that HC might have efficacy in COVID-19. Additional Chinese
206 RCTs early in the pandemic led to the inclusion of recommendation in some Chinese guidelines
207 to treat hospitalized COVID-19 patients with HC/CQ [11] after data from more than 100 patient

208 also showed less pulmonary complication and more rapid viral shedding and clinical improvement
209 [12].

210 Based mainly on the limited preclinical data and these small early RCTs, in part, the FDA issued
211 an EUA for HC/CQ for treatment of hospitalized COVID-19 patients for whom enrollment in trials
212 was impractical on March 28, 2020 [7].

213 A small Brazilian trial was then published [13-14] demonstrating higher QTc prolongation rates
214 (18.9% vs. 11.1%) and higher mortality (39% vs. 15% [OR, 3.6; 95% CI, 1.2-10.6]) with higher
215 vs. lower CQ dosing for 81 hospitalized COVID-19 patients. There was no difference in viral
216 shedding clearance. Prolonged QTc was not associated with death and no torsades de pointes
217 occurred. Limitations included absence of placebo control and published mitigation strategies to
218 reduce QTc prolongation (e.g., excluding baseline QTc prolongation and co-administration of
219 additional QTc prolonging medications [100% received azithromycin]), single-center design,
220 small sample size, and baseline imbalance.

221 Prolonged QTc was also reported in two additional retrospective case series of hospitalized
222 COVID-19 patients treated with HC with or without azithromycin. In the small French series of
223 40 patients, baseline QTc>460 msec was an exclusion. 93% developed some QTc prolongation;
224 36% developed more severe QTc prolongation (more commonly with concomitant azithromycin
225 [33% vs. 5%, p=0.03]). No ventricular arrhythmias including torsades de pointes occurred. Seven
226 patients (17.5%) stopped medication due to adverse events, ECG changes, or acute renal failure
227 [15]. In the Boston series in 90 patients, combined therapy was associated with a larger median
228 increase in the QT interval than HC monotherapy (23 vs. 5.5 msec, p=0.03), resulting in 13% vs.
229 3% of patients, respectively, having QTc change \geq 60 msec. The risk of QTc prolongation to
230 \geq 500 msec was similar (21% vs. 19%). The authors implied a baseline QTc prolongation
231 exclusion. Ten patients (11%) discontinued medication because of adverse events (nausea,
232 hypoglycemia, and one case of delayed torsades de pointes) [16].

233 None of these series had control arms, so the relative risk of QTc prolongation remained elusive.
234 Yet, it appeared that higher dosing and co-administration of QTc prolonging medications resulted
235 in more frequent and severe QTc prolongation. Torsades de pointes, the feared QTc prolongation
236 complication, appeared rare (occurring in only 1 of 211 patients in the series [0.5%]). An
237 accompanying *JAMA* editorial concluded, the studies “*underscore the potential risk ... of*

238 *hydroxychloroquine ... It is also true that ... the QTc can be safely monitored in most patients”*
239 [64].

240 Based in part on these safety issues, the FDA issued a *Drug Safety Communication* on 24 April
241 2020 reminding providers about HC/CQ risks in COVID-19, mitigation strategies, and warning
242 against use in outpatients and outside trials [65]. NIH COVID-19 guidelines in April 2020
243 concluded there remained equipoise for these drugs, and risk mitigation strategies should be
244 employed if used. Some experts disagreed with the FDA’s allowance for continued empiric use
245 despite emerging efficacy lapse yet concerning safety issues.

246
247 A retrospective study on 368 Wisconsin VA hospitalized COVID-19 patients compared mortality
248 and mechanical ventilation with HC with or without azithromycin or neither. The study found
249 higher mortality with HC vs. no HC (27.8% vs. 11.4%: adjusted HR, 2.61; 95% CI, 1.1-6.17,
250 $p=0.03$) but no mechanical ventilation difference [17]. The study was small,
251 retrospective/observational, and without randomization; HC patients were sicker.

252
253 Effects on mortality and intubation were equivocal in two large New York retrospective
254 observational studies published in May 2020 [18-19] The Columbia University study compared a
255 composite outcome of intubation and death in 1,376 hospitalized COVID-19 patients treated with
256 HC or not and found no significant associations in crude, multivariable, and propensity-score
257 analyses [18]. The second study was in 1,438 hospitalized COVID-19 patients from 25 hospitals
258 in NY State treated with HC with or without azithromycin or azithromycin alone [19]. In-hospital
259 mortality was not statistically different, 25.7%, and 19.9% for HC with and without azithromycin,
260 respectively, and 10% for azithromycin. More frequent cardiac arrest was found in patients
261 receiving both drugs. No ECG abnormalities differences were found. HC patients were sicker in
262 both studies.

263 After the NY studies, *Lancet* published the largest retrospective observational study to date,
264 comparing in-hospital mortality and arrhythmias in 96,032 hospitalized COVID-19 patients
265 treated with HC (or CQ) with or without azithromycin vs. neither [20]. In-hospital mortality and
266 arrhythmias occurred significantly more frequently with HC/CQ, especially with azithromycin, in
267 all analyses. Although larger, this study was limited by the same observational/retrospective

268 confounding as the prior studies. Although the authors reported similar between-group baseline
269 characteristics, others found HC/CQ patients to be sicker. The publication was retracted. WHO
270 temporarily halted HC arm enrollment in its *Solidarity* Trial after this publication.

271 Another French study in hospitalized COVID-19 patients (focusing on those requiring oxygen)
272 compared mortality in 84 HC vs. 89 control patients. 21-day survival without ICU transfer was 76
273 vs. 75%, respectively (weighted hazard ratio 0.9, 95% CI 0.4 to 2.1). Eight HC patients (10%)
274 developed arrhythmias of which 7 were QTc prolongation (vs. 0 in control patients) [21].

275 In May 2020, the FDA published *Pharmacovigilance Memorandum Safety* data from its *Adverse*
276 *Event Reporting System (FAERS)* and other sources [66]. QT prolongation was the most common
277 cardiac SAE, with co-administration of other QT-prolonging medications occurring in most cases;
278 other cardiac SAEs included torsades de pointes in 4%, ventricular arrhythmia in 13%, and death
279 in 23%. The most common non-cardiac SAE was increased LFTs. Four unexpected
280 methemoglobinemia SAEs occurred.

281 A Weill Cornell Medicine (New York City) single-arm HC study in 153 patients found
282 improvement in hypoxia scores in 52%, no ventricular arrhythmias, and QTc prolongation leading
283 to drug discontinuation in 2% [23].

284 A Henry Ford Health System (southeast Michigan) study was reported [22], comparing in-hospital
285 mortality in 2,541 hospitalized COVID-19 patients treated with HC (13.5% [95% CI: 11.6-
286 15.5%]), HC with azithromycin (20.1% [95% CI: 17.3%-23.0%]), azithromycin 22.4% [95% CI:
287 16.0%-30.1%], and standard care 26.4% [95% CI: 22.2%-31.0%]. HC with or without
288 azithromycin led to hazard ratio mortality reduction of 66-71%. Of all the larger retrospective
289 trials, this study stands out as a positive one; however, it too was observational, without
290 randomization or blinding, and confounded (e.g., steroids were given to 74.3-78.9% of HC vs.
291 35.7-38.8% of non-HC patients).

292 Two additional relatively small retrospective-observational studies reported decreased mortality
293 with HC monotherapy and with co-administration with azithromycin [24-25]. In a single-site
294 retrospective cohort study hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia, deaths occurred in
295 102/297 HC + azithromycin patients (34.3%) vs. 7/17 HC alone patients (41.2%) vs. 35/63 patients
296 receiving neither due to ‘contraindications’ (55.6%). Use of HCQ + azithromycin (vs. no

297 treatment) was inversely associated with inpatient mortality HR 0.265 (95% CI 0.171-0.412,
298 $P < 0.001$) [24]. A preprint of an observational study from early in the pandemic in 255 hospitalized
299 mechanically ventilated patients at a single New Jersey site reported a logistics regression survival
300 odds ratio of 14.18 (95% CI, 4.05-55.61, $p < 0.0001$) in patients receiving HC and azithromycin
301 [25].

302 These studies were observational, without randomization or blinding, and with baseline
303 imbalances and other potential sources of confounding.

304

305 **RCTs in Hospitalized Patients**

306 At last, results from at least five RCTs became available in the spring/summer of 2020 [26-30].
307 These are detailed below because they significantly impacted ensuing FDA and guidelines
308 changes.

309 The first was a Chinese multicenter open-label RCT in 150 hospitalized laboratory-confirmed
310 COVID-19 patients, 148 of whom had mild (negative chest x-ray) to moderate disease (positive
311 chest x-ray) [26]. The mean interval from symptoms onset was 16.6 days. There was no significant
312 difference in the main outcome measurement, intention-to-treat analysis of nasopharyngeal swab
313 (SARS-CoV-2 PCR) negative conversion, which occurred in 85.4% of HC vs. 81.3% of standard
314 care patients (difference 4.1%; 95% CI -10.3% to 18.5%). Adverse events (AEs) occurred in 30%
315 vs. 9% (diarrhea most commonly), and SAEs occurred in 2 vs. 0 patients, respectively. No
316 arrhythmias or QTc prolongation were reported. Study limitations included small size, delayed
317 administration, early termination, open-label, other COVID-19 treatments, mild-moderate severity
318 focus, and high dosing.

319 The second RCT was the *Recovery Trial* June 5, 2020, press release and eventual publication in
320 *NEJM* on October 8, 2020 [27]. The pragmatic platform design included randomization but open-
321 label, and standard care control without placebo – in 176 United Kingdom centers.⁽³⁶⁾ The mean
322 interval from symptoms onset was 9 days. The trial included 17% of patients with severe disease
323 (requiring mechanical ventilation or ECMO), 60% with moderate disease (requiring oxygen or
324 noninvasive ventilation), and 24% with mild disease (requiring neither). The study's primary
325 outcome measurement, 28-day mortality, was reached in 418/1,561 (26.8%) of HC vs. 788/3,155

326 (25%) of standard care patients (RR 1.09; 95% CI 0.96 to 1.23; p=0.18). Secondary outcomes
327 included higher hospital length of stay (16 vs. 13 days, respectively), a higher composite endpoint
328 of mechanical ventilation requirement and death (29.8% vs. 26.5%, respectively; RR 1.12; 95%
329 CI 1.01-1.25), and higher stratified 28-day mortality trend in HC patients. Trial strengths included
330 large size, randomization, control, and similar steroid use in both groups; limitations were open-
331 label, absence of placebo, the inclusion of suspected (10%) and laboratory-confirmed (90%) cases
332 (post-hoc analysis in confirmed cases yielded similar results), and absent multiple testing
333 adjustment, block randomization, and pre-specification rules. Arrhythmias were not different
334 (44.7% vs. 43%); one spontaneously resolved torsades des pointes SAE occurred with HC.

335 The FDA revoked its March 2020 EUA for HC/CQ for hospitalized patients with COVID-19
336 (outside trials) on June 15, 2020, based on results of the *Recovery Trial* and other emerging data
337 [7].

338 An NIH press release on June 20, 2020, announced the final permanent cessation of enrollment in
339 its *ORCHID* trial for futility after a fourth interim analysis showed no mortality benefit (albeit
340 minimal safety issues). This (third) RCT provided the first robust, blinded, and placebo-controlled
341 (not open-labeled) data for HC in hospitalized patients. Eventually published in JAMA on
342 November 9, 2020, 479 patients were enrolled from 34 U.S. sites with a median interval from
343 symptoms onset of 5 days (relatively early) [28]. Corticosteroids and azithromycin use was similar
344 in the two treatment groups. The primary outcome measurement, the WHO 14-day ordinal score
345 was similar in HC vs. placebo patients (median [IQR] score, 6 [4-7] vs 6 [4-7]; aOR, 1.02 [95%
346 CI, 0.73 to 1.42]). No differences in secondary outcomes (including mechanical ventilation) – or
347 mortality were found (10.4% vs. 10.6%, respectively) (absolute difference, -0.2% [95% CI, -5.7%
348 to 5.3%]; aOR, 1.07 [95% CI, 0.54 to 2.09]). QTc prolongation was more common with HC (5.9%
349 vs 3.3%) but SAE rates were similar (5.8% vs. 4.6%).

350 A WHO press release on July 4, 2020, announced final permanent discontinuation of enrollment
351 in its *Solidarity* Trial HC arm after interim analysis similarly showed no mortality benefit but
352 concerning safety signals (fourth RCT).⁽³⁸⁾ Results were eventually published in NEJM on
353 December 2, 2020 [29]. The primary outcome, intention-to-treat in-hospital mortality, in this large
354 open-labeled RCT at 405 hospitals in 30 countries, occurred in 104 of 947 (11.0%) HC vs. 84 of
355 906 (9.3%) control patients (rate ratio, 1.19; 95% CI, 0.89-1.59, p=0.23); neither need for

356 mechanical ventilation nor hospital length of stay were significantly reduced by HC. The trial's
357 open-label design without placebo is an obvious limitation but is unlikely to have biased mortality
358 results.

359 The fifth spring/summer 2020 RCT, the *Coalition Covid-19 Brazil I* study [30] was multicenter,
360 randomized, open-label, and controlled, comparing HC with or without azithromycin and standard
361 care in 504 laboratory confirmed mild-moderate (requiring ≤ 4 L oxygen) hospitalized COVID-
362 19 patients. The median interval from symptoms onset was 7 days. No differences were found for
363 the primary outcome, clinical assessment at 15 days (seven-level ordinal score), comparing the
364 treatment groups vs. the standard care group in a modified ITT analysis (confirmed cases only)
365 (HC vs. standard care, OR 1.21; 95% CI, 0.69-2.11; $p=1.00$; HC with azithromycin vs. standard
366 care, OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.57-1.73; $p=1.00$). QTc prolongation and LFTs elevation were more
367 frequent with HC. Trial limitations consisted of open-design without placebo, smaller size, and
368 restriction to mild-moderate severity.

369 Updated NIH and Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) COVID-19 guidelines in June
370 2020 recommended HC/CQ use in hospitalized COVID-19 patients only in clinical trials; NIH (27
371 August 2020) and IDSA (20 August 2020) guidelines were then extended to an emphatic
372 recommendation against HC/CQ use in hospitalized COVID-19 patients [67-68].

373 At least 12 additional RCTs were published evaluating HC/CQ in hospitalized COVID-19
374 patients published later on in the pandemic (winter of 2020, and in 2021). All showed similar
375 absence of convincing evidence of benefit, and some worse primary outcome measurements
376 (including clinical ordinal scales, mortality, composites, and viral shedding); some
377 showed concerning safety signals including higher QTc prolongation, renal injury, and AE/SAE
378 rates [31-42]. Outcomes from these RCTs are briefly summarized below.

379
380 A small RCT in 53 patients showed no difference in viral clearance between HC and HC/SOC
381 treated patients [31]. An Egyptian RCT in 194 patients showed no difference in need for
382 mechanical ventilation or mortality between HC and HC/SOC patient [32]. In New York
383 University's TEACH double-blinded RCT in 128 patients comparing HC and placebo, there was
384 no difference in the study's primary outcome, severe disease progression composite end point;
385 viral clearance and AE rates were similar in the two treatment groups [33]. In Intermountain's

386 HAHPS RCT comparing 85 patients treated with HC vs. azithromycin with a Bayesian analysis,
387 no convincing difference was found for the primary outcome, the 14-day ordinal score [34]; AE
388 rates, QTc prolongation were similar but the AKI rate was numerically higher with HC. In a
389 combined report of a Taiwanese small open-labeled RCT (n=34) and small retrospective study
390 (n=37), 14-day viral clearance was similar with or without HC [35]. In a Brazilian open-labeled
391 RCT in 105 patients, addition of HC or CQ to SOC resulted in significant worsening of the
392 primary outcome, a 14-day 9-point clinical ordinal score, as well as need for mechanical
393 ventilation and severe AKI (but not arrhythmias) [36]. In another Brazilian RCT in 168 patients
394 randomized to receive HC, CQ, or ivermectin, there were no significant differences in the
395 primary endpoints, need for oxygen or mechanical ventilation, ICU admission, or mortality [37].
396 In the REMAP-CAP trial in patients were treated with lopinavir-ritonavir (n=255), HC (n=50),
397 combination therapy (n=27) or control (n=362), a Bayesian analysis of its primary endpoint of an
398 ordinal scale of organ support-free days (as well as mortality) showed significantly worse
399 outcome with all 3 treatments vs. control [38]. In HYCOVID, a double-blinded RCT in 247
400 patients with milder disease in France and Monaco comparing HC and placebo, neither the
401 primary outcome of a 14-day composite of death and need for mechanical ventilation, nor viral
402 clearance, were different [39]. In a Mexican double-blinded RCT in 214 patients comparing HC
403 and placebo, neither the primary outcome, 30-day mortality, nor any secondary outcomes
404 differed [40]. in NOR-Solidarity, a Norwegian add-on study to WHO's *SOLIDARITY* trial, viral
405 clearance, respiratory failure severity, and inflammatory variables were compared (and in-
406 hospital mortality) in 185 patients receiving remdesivir, HC, or SOC. There were no group
407 differences for any of these variables [41]. In a Danish double-blinded, placebo-controlled RCT
408 in 117 patients, the primary outcome, days alive and discharged from hospital by 14 days, did
409 not differ between HC/azithromycin vs. placebo/placebo [42]. See Table 1.

410

411 A prospective controlled but unrandomized trial in 66 patients in Brazil also failed to show a
412 difference in viral clearance [69].

413

414 An interesting and telling study from Israel found, for therapeutics in COVID-19, low
415 concordance between published observational studies (often 'positive') and RCTs (usually
416 'negative), akin to findings in this HC/CQ review [70].

417

418 Key limitations of these 17 RCTs include moderate risk of bias in 13 (majority) and optimal
419 double-blinded placebo-controlled design in only 5 (minority).

420

421 **Meta-analyses in Hospitalized Patients**

422 In the overwhelming majority of 50 published aggregate data meta-analyses (AD-MAs) and in our
423 IPD-MA [45] assessing HC/CQ in hospitalized COVID-19 patients, no convincing efficacy was
424 found, and in many adverse safety signals were noted. Ten of these reported limited patient level
425 subgroup analyses with a pattern of subgroup results paralleling overall results. Three AD-MA
426 examples follow:

427 A large *Open Society Foundation* AD-MA from 14 published and 14 unpublished HC (26 trials)
428 and CQ (4 trials) studies was published; 67% of the sample size of 10,319 patients was derived
429 from the *RECOVERY* and *SOLIDARITY* trials [43]. Mortality was found to be higher with HC (OR
430 1.11 [95% CI: 1.02-1.20; 26 trials; 10,012 patients) and equivocal for CQ (OR 1.77 [95% CI:
431 0.15-21.13, 4 trials; 307 patients). Patient level subgroup analysis was restricted to disease
432 severity.

433 A Cochrane AD-MA from 12 RCTs with 8,569 COVID-19 patients [44]. No differences were
434 found for HC/CQ vs. control treatment for mortality (RR 1.09, 95% CI 0.99-1.19), mechanical
435 ventilation (RR 1.11, 95% CI 0.91-1.37), or conversion to negative nasopharyngeal swabs (RR
436 1.00, 95% CI 0.91-1.10); AEs were more frequent with treatment (RR 2.90, 95% CI 1.49-5.6) but
437 not SAEs (RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.37-1.79). Subgroup analyses were planned but not completed due to
438 inability to secure necessary data.

439 Results of an IPD-MA of 8 U.S. RCTs evaluating HC/CQ in hospitalized COVID-19 patients also
440 showing no credible efficacy in hospitalized COVID-19 patients in the overall population (OR
441 0.95; 95% credible interval 0.77 to 1.22) and in a comprehensive analysis of multiple patient level
442 subgroups (NCOSS (a disease severity surrogate), age, gender, number of comorbidities, BMI, and
443 estimated baseline risk) was recently submitted for publication [45]. Overall AE, SAE, and
444 elevated LFTs AE rates were numerically higher with HC/CQ but not QTc prolongation or
445 arrhythmias.

446

447 **Clinical Studies in Other Indications**

448 *Outpatients*

449 A retrospective-observational trial from New Jersey comparing outcome in 1274 HC treated
450 outpatients with COVID-19 and 1067 patient propensity-matched cohort, hospitalization
451 occurred in 21.6% vs. 31.4%, respectively (OR 0.53; 95% CI, 0.29-0.95) [71].

452 Akin to results in inpatients (above), RCTs failed to show HC/CQ efficacy in outpatients:

453 A double-blinded and placebo-controlled RCT was published evaluating HC in 423 COVID-19
454 outpatients (81% laboratory-confirmed or exposed to a laboratory-confirmed individual) with mild
455 disease [72]. Change in a symptom severity score over 14 days, the study's primary outcome
456 measurement, was not statistically different, nor were hospitalization rates. Mild adverse events
457 were more common with HC.

458 Another RCT in COVID-19 outpatients, Q-PROTECT, randomized patients with mild-moderate
459 symptoms to placebo or HC with or without azithromycin. In the 456 patients enrolled, viral cure
460 (PCR negativity at day 6), the primary outcome measurement, was similar in all three groups
461 (12.2%, 10.5%, and 12.8%, respectively; $p=0.821$) [73].

462 In another RCT in COVID-19 outpatients (all were laboratory-confirmed) in Alberta, HC and
463 placebo were compared. Treatment occurred at a mean of 12 days after symptoms onset. The
464 primary outcome, a composite of 30-day hospitalization/mechanical ventilation/death occurred in
465 4 of 111 randomized HC patients (4 hospitalizations) vs. 0 of 37 placebo patients. Symptoms
466 duration was not decreased either. The study was terminated prematurely due to slow recruitment
467 [74].

468 A RCT from Brazil compared outcome in 685 COVID-19 outpatients randomized to receive HC,
469 lopinavir/ritonavir, or placebo. The primary outcome, hospitalizations, occurred in 3.7% vs. 5.7%
470 vs. 4.8%, respectively (HR 0.76, 95% CI, 0.30-1.88). There were no secondary outcomes group
471 differences either (mortality, viral shedding) [75].

472 A small placebo-controlled RCT in 84 outpatients found no difference in 9-day viral clearance
473 between HC and placebo [76].

474 In summary, HC/CQ has not been found to have significant efficacy in outpatients with COVID-
475 19 yet increased AEs in some studies, however the published database is more limited than for
476 hospitalized patients.

477

478 *Post exposure prophylaxis*

479 A post-exposure prophylaxis study was reported in which 821 subjects with moderate- or high-
480 risk household or occupation exposure were randomized to receive HC or placebo within 4 days
481 of exposure [77-78]. The primary outcome, “*incidence of new illness compatible with Covid-19*”
482 (fewer than 3% were laboratory confirmed) was not different (11.8% vs. 14.3%, $p=0.35$). None-
483 serious AEs were more common with HC.

484 Another post-exposure prophylaxis study in 2,314 with an open-label cluster-randomization
485 design found the primary outcome of PCR-confirmed symptomatic COVID-19 infection to be
486 similar in HC vs. usual care patients (5.7% and 6.2%, respectively; risk ratio, 0.86 [95% confidence
487 interval, 0.52 to 1.42]); non-serious adverse events were much more common with HC (56.1% vs.
488 5.9%) but no ‘related’ SAEs occurred [79].

489 In another post-exposure prophylaxis study, household exposures within 96 hours were
490 randomized to receive HC (n=407) or vitamin C placebo (n=334). Among 689 participants who
491 were PCR swab at baseline, conversion to positive PCR (the primary outcome) occurred 53 vs. 45
492 subjects (adjusted HR, 1.10, 95% CI, 0.73-1.66; $p>0.2$). The AE rate was significantly higher with
493 HC (16.2 vs. 10.9%, $p=0.026$) [80].

494 In summary, HC/CQ has not been found to have significant efficacy for pre-exposure prophylaxis
495 against COVID-19 yet increased AEs, however the published database is more limited than for
496 hospitalized patients.

497

498 *Pre-exposure prophylaxis*

499 Four pre-exposure prophylaxis studies (two double-blind placebo-controlled RCTs in healthcare
500 workers and two large observational retrospective population-based studies in rheumatoid arthritis
501 and lupus patients) showed no differences in COVID-19 infection rates [81-83] or mortality [84].

502 A descriptive safety analysis from three of these outpatient RCTs (1 non-hospitalized mild-
503 moderate disease RCT, 1 post-exposure prophylaxis RCT, and 1 pre-exposure prophylaxis RCT)
504 in 2,795 subjects found increased AE rates with HC (36-40%) vs. placebo (19%) but rare SAEs;
505 GI upset was the most common AE. Co-administration of other QT prolonging medications was
506 an exclusion in these RCTs [85].

507 An open-label cluster study in migrants in Singapore showed higher viral clearance with HC vs.
508 vitamin C control [86]. An Indian open-labeled, controlled study in 317 exposed or presumed
509 exposed subjects showed significantly decreased infection rates with HC post-exposure
510 prophylaxis vs. SOC [87].

511 A potential critique of some of the post-exposure prophylaxis studies has been that HC/CQ was
512 sometimes administered late after symptoms onset leading to decreased efficacy – as occurs with
513 delayed neuraminidase inhibitor treatment for influenza and in some experimental SARS-CoV-2
514 mouse models [88]. Higher dosing than necessary based on predicted pharmacokinetics, leading
515 to more adverse events, has also been a critique.

516 An unpublished medRxiv aggregate data meta-analysis including five pre- and post-exposure
517 prophylaxis RCTs reported possible benefit for HC [89].

518 In summary, HC/CQ has not been found to have significant efficacy for pre-exposure prophylaxis
519 against COVID-19 in most but not all studies and increased AEs in some, however the published
520 database is much more limited than for hospitalized patients.

521

522 **Study limitations**

523 The key limitation of this review is that systematic adherence to PRISMA checklist [90]
524 components was high for HC/CQ studies in hospitalized patients (the focus of this review) but
525 lower for the other studies (e.g., no risk of bias assessment in the latter).

526

527 **Conclusions**

528 This systematic review of preclinical *in vitro* and animal studies, retrospective-observational trials,
529 RCTs, and meta-analyses strongly suggests that HC/CQ are ineffective in hospitalized patients

530 with COVID-19, both in overall populations and in subpopulations, and should not be administered
531 outside of RCTs with robust informed consent about unlikely benefit and probable harm. We
532 believe that the preclinical and clinical database was never sufficient to support empiric use.

533 The published clinical trials database for HC/CQ in outpatients and post-exposure and pre-
534 exposure prophylaxis also shows lack of convincing efficacy despite increased adverse events, but
535 it is more limited than for hospitalized patients, particularly for pre-exposure prophylaxis. Our
536 review was less robust for these indications.

537 Empiricism, particularly when based mainly on retrospective-observational studies rather than
538 RCTs, is fraught with danger for patients. Cognizance of the story of HC/CQ’s failure during the
539 COVID-19 pandemic should lead to refraining on the part of the medical community from
540 repeating the same errors for other experimental therapeutics. Dr. Kalil’s wise admonition in his
541 May 2020 *JAMA* viewpoint bears repeating: “*The administration of any unproven drug as a ‘last*
542 *resort’ wrongly assumes that benefit will be more likely than harm*” [91].

543

544 **Acknowledgments**

545 We thank Dr. Kunjal Luhadia, MD, for her helpful manuscript edits.

546

547 **Funding Source**

548 None.

549

550

551 References

- 552 1. Mehta HB, An H, Andersen KM et al. Use of Hydroxychloroquine, Remdesivir, and
553 Dexamethasone Among Adults Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the United States. A
554 Retrospective Cohort Study. *Ann Int Med.* 2021;174(10):1395-1403.
- 555 2. Wilson K, Chotirmall SH, Bai C, Rello J. Interim Guidance on Management Pending Empirical
556 Evidence. From an American Thoracic Society-led International Task Force: From an
557 American Thoracic Society-led International Task Force; 2020 [Available from:
558 <https://www.thoracic.org/covid/covid-19-guidance.pdf>.
- 559 3. Rosenke K, Jarvis MA, Feldmann F, et al. Hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis and treatment is
560 ineffective in macaque and hamster SARS-CoV-2 disease models. *JCI Insight.*
561 2020;5(23):e143174.
- 562 4. Park SJ, Yu KM, Kim YI, et al. Antiviral efficacies of FDA-approved drugs against SARS-
563 CoV-2 infection in ferrets. *mBio.* 2020;11(3):e01114-20.
- 564 5. Gautret P, Lagier J-C, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine
565 and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19 results of an open-label non-randomized
566 clinical. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2020;56(1):105949.
- 567 6. Molina JM, et al. No evidence of rapid antiviral clearance or clinical benefit with the
568 combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in patients with severe COVID-19
569 infection. *Med Mal Infect.* 2020;50(4):384.
- 570 7. Request for Emergency Use Authorization For Use of Chloroquine Phosphate or
571 Hydroxychloroquine Sulfate Supplied From the Strategic National Stockpile for Treatment of
572 2019 Coronavirus Disease. March 28, 2021. Revoked, June 15, 2021.
573 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136534/download>.
- 574 8. Gautret, P, Hoang VT, Lagier, J-C, Raoult D. Effect of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin
575 as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial, an update
576 with an intention-to-treat analysis and clinical outcomes. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2021;57(1):
577 106239.
- 578 9. Chen Z, Hu J, Zhang Z, et al. Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19:
579 results of a randomized clinical trial. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.03.22.20040758.
- 580 10. Yu B, et al. Low dose of hydroxychloroquine reduces fatality of critically ill patients with
581 COVID-19. *Sci China Life Sci.* 2020;63(10):1515-1521.
- 582 11. Qiu T, Liang S, Dabbous M, Wang Y, Han R, Toumi M. Chinese Guidelines Related to Novel
583 Coronavirus Pneumonia. *J Mark Access Health Policy.* 2020;8(1):1818446.
- 584 12. Gao J, Tian Z, Yang X. Breakthrough: Chloroquine phosphate has shown apparent efficacy in
585 treatment of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical studies. *Biosci Trends.*
586 2020;14(1):72-3.
- 587 13. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, et al. Effect of High vs Low Doses of Chloroquine
588 Diphosphate as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients Hospitalized With Severe Acute Respiratory
589 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection. *JAMA Network Open.*
590 2020;3(4):e208857.
- 591 14. Fihn SD, Perencevich E, Bradley SM. Caution Needed on the Use of Chloroquine and
592 Hydroxychloroquine for Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Network Open.*
593 2020;3(4):e209035.
- 594 15. Bessière F, Rocchia H, Delinière A, Charrière R, Chevalier P, Argaud L, et al. Assessment of
595 QT Intervals in a Case Series of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)

- 596 Infection Treated With Hydroxychloroquine Alone or in Combination With Azithromycin in
597 an Intensive Care Unit. *JAMA Cardiology*. 2020;5(9):1067-1069.
- 598 16. Mercurio NJ, Yen CF, Shim DJ, et al. Risk of QT Interval Prolongation Associated With Use
599 of Hydroxychloroquine With or Without Concomitant Azithromycin Among Hospitalized
600 Patients Testing Positive for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Cardiology*.
601 2020;5(9):1036-1041.
- 602 17. Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, Cummings TH, Hardin JW, Sutton SS, et al. Outcomes
603 of Hydroxychloroquine Usage in United States Veterans Hospitalized with COVID-19. *Med*.
604 2020;1(1):114-127.e3.
- 605 18. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational Study of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized
606 Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(25):2411-8.
- 607 19. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine
608 or Azithromycin With In-Hospital Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State.
609 *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2493.
- 610 20. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. RETRACTED: Hydroxychloroquine or
611 chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry
612 analysis. *The Lancet*. 2020;S0140-6736(20)31180-6.
- 613 21. Mahevas M, Tran V, Roumier M, et al. Clinical Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients
614 with covid-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational comparative study using routine
615 care data. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1844.
- 616 22. Arshad S, Kilgore P, Chaudhry ZS, et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin,
617 and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *International Journal of Infectious*
618 *Diseases*. 2020;97:396-403.
- 619 23. Satlin MJ, Goyal P, Magleby R, et al. Safety, tolerability, and clinical outcomes of
620 hydroxychloroquine for hospitalized patients with coronavirus 2019 disease. *PLoS One*.
621 2020;15(7):e0236778.
- 622 24. Lauriola M, Pani A, Ippoliti G, et al. Effect of Combination Therapy of Hydroxychloroquine
623 and Azithromycin on Mortality in Patients With COVID-19. *Clin Transl*
624 *Sci*. 2020;13(6):1071-76.
- 625 25. Smith LG, et al. Observational Study on 255 Mechanically Ventilated Covid Patients at
626 the Beginning of the USA
627 Pandemic. *Medrxiv preprint*. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.28.21258012v1.full.pdf>.
- 628
629 26. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with mainly mild to moderate
630 coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1849.
- 631 27. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients
632 with Covid-19. The RECOVERY Collaborative Group. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383:2030-40.
- 633 28. Self W, Semler MW, Lindsay LM, et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine on Clinical Status at
634 14 Days in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*.
635 2020;324(21):2165-76.
- 636 29. Pan H, Peto R, Henao-Restrepo AM, et al. Repurposed Antiviral Drugs for Covid-19 —
637 Interim WHO Solidarity Trial Results. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. *N Engl J Med*.
638 2021;384:497-511.
- 639 30. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without
640 Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383:2041-52.

- 641 31. Lyngbakken MN, Berdal JE, Eskesen A, et al. A pragmatic randomized controlled trial reports
642 lack of efficacy of hydroxychloroquine on coronavirus disease 2019 viral kinetics. *Nature*
643 *Communications*. 2020;11(1):5284.
- 644 32. Abd-Elsalam S, Esmail ES, Khalaf M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in the treatment of COVID-
645 19: a multicenter randomized controlled study. *Am J Trop Med and Hyg*. 2020;103(4):1635-
646 39.
- 647 33. Ulrich RJ, Troxel AB, Carmody E, et al. Treating COVID-19 with hydroxychloroquine
648 (TEACH): a multicenter, double-blind randomized controlled trial in hospitalized patients.
649 *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2020;7(10):ofaa446.
- 650 34. Brown SM, Peltan I, Kumar N, et al. Hydroxychloroquine vs. Azithromycin for Hospitalized
651 Patients with COVID-19 (HAHPS): Results of a Randomized, Active Comparator Trial. *Ann*
652 *Am Thorac Soc*. 2020;9;18(4):590-7.
- 653 35. Chen CP, Lin YC, Chen TC, et al. A multicenter, randomized, open-label, controlled trial to
654 evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of hydroxychloroquine and a retrospective study in adult
655 patients with mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *PloS One*.
656 2020;15(12):e0242763.
- 657 36. Réa-Neto Á, Bernardelli RS, Câmara BMD, Reese FB, Queiroga MVO, Oliveira MC. An
658 open-label randomized controlled trial evaluating the efficacy of
659 chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine in severe COVID-19 patients. *Scientific Reports*.
660 2021;11(1):9023.
- 661 37. Galan LEB, Santos NM dos, Asato MS, et al. Phase 2 randomized study on chloroquine,
662 hydroxychloroquine or ivermectin in hospitalized patients with severe manifestations of
663 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Pathogens and Global Health*. 2021;115(4):235-42.
- 664 38. Arabi YM, Gordon AC, Derde LPG, et al. Lopinavir-ritonavir and hydroxychloroquine for
665 critically ill patients with COVID-19: REMAP-CAP randomized controlled trial. *Intensive*
666 *Care Med*. 2021;47(8):867-86.
- 667 39. Dubée V, Roy PM, Vielle B, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in mild-to-moderate coronavirus
668 disease 2019: a placebo-controlled double blind trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021;27(8):1124-
669 30.
- 670 40. Hernandez-Cardenas C, Thirion-Romero I, Rodríguez-Llamazares S, et al.
671 Hydroxychloroquine for the treatment of severe respiratory infection by COVID-19: a
672 randomized controlled trial. *PloS One*. 2021;16(9):e0257238.
- 673 41. Barratt-Due A, Olsen IC, Nezvalova-Henriksen K, et al. Evaluation of the effects of remdesivir
674 and hydroxychloroquine on viral clearance in COVID-19: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*.
675 2021;174(9):1261-69.
- 676 42. Sivapalan P, Ulrik CS, Lapperre TS, et al. Azithromycin and hydroxychloroquine in
677 hospitalised patients with confirmed COVID-19-a randomised double-blinded placebo-
678 controlled trial. *Eur Respir J*. 2021:2100752.
- 679 43. Axfors C, Schmitt AM, Janiaud P, et al. Mortality outcomes with hydroxychloroquine and
680 chloroquine in COVID-19 from an international collaborative meta-analysis of randomized
681 trials. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):2349.
- 682 44. Singh B, Ryan H, Kredo T, Chaplin M, Fletcher T. Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine for
683 prevention and treatment of COVID-19. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2021;2(2):CD013587.
- 684 45. Di Stefano L, et al. Hydroxychloroquine or Chloroquine for the Treatment of Hospitalized
685 Patients with COVID-19. An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. Manuscript
686 submitted.

- 687 46. Hernan M. Causal inference in a time of coronavirus: tenofovir, tocilizumab,
688 hydroxychloroquine. Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health.
689 [https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/newsevents/events/causal-inference-time-coronavirus-tenofovir-](https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/newsevents/events/causal-inference-time-coronavirus-tenofovir-tocilizumab-hydroxychloroquine)
690 [tocilizumab-hydroxychloroquine](https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/newsevents/events/causal-inference-time-coronavirus-tenofovir-tocilizumab-hydroxychloroquine) and <https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/media/44276>.
- 691 47. Barnard DL, Day CW, Bailey K, et al. Evaluation of Immunomodulators, Interferons and
692 Known in Vitro SARS-CoV Inhibitors for Inhibition of SARS-Cov Replication in BALB/c
693 Mice. *Antiviral Chemistry and Chemotherapy*. 2006;17(5):275-84.
- 694 48. Wang M, Cao R, Zhang L, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently
695 emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell Res*. 2020;30(3):269-71.
- 696 49. Liu J, Cao R, Xu M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic derivative of chloroquine, is
697 effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. *Cell Discov*. 2020;6(1).
- 698 50. Vincent MJ, Bergeron E, Benjannet S, et al. Chloroquine is a potent inhibitor of SARS
699 coronavirus infection and spread. *Virology*. 2005;2:69.
- 700 51. Andreani J, Le Bideau M, Dufloy I, et al. In vitro testing of combined hydroxychloroquine and
701 azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic effect. *Microb Pathog*. 2020;145:104228.
- 702 52. Kang CK, Seong MW, Choi SJ, et al. In vitro activity of lopinavir/ritonavir and
703 hydroxychloroquine against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 at concentrations
704 achievable by usual doses. *Korean J Intern Med*. 2020;35(4):782-87.
- 705 53. Gendrot M, Andreani J, Boxberger M, et al. Antimalarial drugs inhibit the replication of
706 SARS-CoV-2: An in vitro evaluation. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020;37:101873.
- 707 54. Maisonnasse P, Guedj J, Contreras V, et al. Hydroxychloroquine use against SARS-CoV-2
708 infection in non-human primates. *Nature*. 2020;585(7826):584-87.
- 709 55. Große M, Ruetalo N, Lauer M, et al. Quinine Inhibits Infection of Human Cell Lines with
710 SARS-CoV-2. *Viruses*. 2021;13(4):647.
- 711 56. Morrisette T, Lodise TP, Scheetz MH, Goswami S, Pogue JM, Rybak MJ. The
712 pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of hydroxychloroquine and dose selection
713 for COVID-19: putting the cart before the horse. *Infect Dis Ther* 2020;9:561-72.
- 714 57. Colson P, Rolain J-M, Lagier J-C, Brouqui P, Raoult D. Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine
715 as available weapons to fight COVID-19. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020;55(4):105932.
- 716 58. Yao X, Ye F, Zhang M, et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of Optimized Dosing
717 Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
718 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(15):732-39.
- 719 59. White NJ, Watson JA, Hoglund RM, Chan XHS, Cheah PY, Tarning J. COVID-19 prevention
720 and treatment: A critical analysis of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine clinical
721 pharmacology. *PLOS Medicine*. 2020;17(9):e1003252.
- 722 60. Keyaerts E, Li S, Vijgen L, et al. Antiviral activity of chloroquine against human coronavirus
723 OC43 infection in newborn mice. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2009;53(8):3416-21.
- 724 61. Kaptein SJF, Jacobs S, Langendries L, et al. Favipiravir at high doses has potent antiviral
725 activity in SARS-CoV-2-infected hamsters, whereas hydroxychloroquine lacks activity. *Proc*
726 *Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2020;117(43):26955-65.
- 727 62. Vigerust DJ, McCullers JA. Chloroquine is effective against influenza A virus in vitro but not
728 in vivo. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*. 2007;1(5-6):189-92.
- 729 63. Zhonghua J, He H, Hu X, Za Z. Expert consensus on chloroquine phosphate for the treatment
730 of novel coronavirus pneumonia. *Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi*. 2020;43(3):185-8.
- 731 64. Bonow RO, Hernandez AF, Turakhia M. Hydroxychloroquine, Coronavirus Disease 2019, and
732 QT Prolongation. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2020;5(9):986-87.

- 733 65. FDA cautions against use of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine for COVID-19 outside of the
734 hospital setting or a clinical trial due to risk of heart rhythm problems.
735 [https://www.fda.gov/drugs/fda-drug-safety-podcasts/fda-cautions-against-use-](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/fda-drug-safety-podcasts/fda-cautions-against-use-hydroxychloroquine-or-chloroquine-covid-19-outside-hospital-setting-or)
736 [hydroxychloroquine-or-chloroquine-covid-19-outside-hospital-setting-or](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/fda-drug-safety-podcasts/fda-cautions-against-use-hydroxychloroquine-or-chloroquine-covid-19-outside-hospital-setting-or).
- 737 66. Food and Drug Administration. Pharmacovigilance Memorandum. Hydroxychloroquine and
738 chloroquine [updated May 19, 2020. Available from:
739 [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/OSE%20Review_Hydroxychloro](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/OSE%20Review_Hydroxychloroquine-Cholorquine%20-%2019May2020_Redacted.pdf)
740 [quine-Cholorquine%20-%2019May2020_Redacted.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/OSE%20Review_Hydroxychloroquine-Cholorquine%20-%2019May2020_Redacted.pdf).
- 741 67. National Institute of Health. Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine With or Without
742 Azithromycin 2020 [updated August 27, 2020; cited 2020 September 19, 2020]. Available
743 from: [https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/antiviral-therapy/chloroquine-or-](https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/antiviral-therapy/chloroquine-or-hydroxychloroquine/)
744 [hydroxychloroquine/](https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/antiviral-therapy/chloroquine-or-hydroxychloroquine/).
- 745 68. Infectious Diseases Society of America. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on
746 the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19 2020 [September 19, 2020].
747 Available from: [https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-](https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/)
748 [and-management/](https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/).
- 749 69. Faíco-Filho KS, Conte DD, de Souza Luna LK, Carvalho JMA, Perosa AHS, Bellei N. No
750 benefit of hydroxychloroquine on SARS-CoV-2 viral load reduction in non-critical
751 hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *Braz J Microbiol.* 2020;51(4):1765-69.
- 752 70. Shepshelovich D, Yahav D, Ben Ami R, Goldvaser H, Tau N. Concordance between the results
753 of randomized and non-randomized interventional clinical trials assessing the efficacy of drugs
754 for COVID-19: a cross-sectional study. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2021;76(9):2415-18.
- 755 71. Ip A, Ahn J, Zhou Y, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in the treatment of outpatients with mildly
756 symptomatic COVID-19: a multi-center observational study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2021;72(2021).
- 757 72. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults
758 With Early COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;173(8):623-31.
- 759 73. Omrani AS, Pathan SA, Thomase SA, et al. Randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled
760 trial of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for virologic cure of non-severe
761 Covid-19. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;29:100645.
- 762 74. Schwartz I, Boesen ME, Cerchiaro G, et al. Assessing the efficacy and safety of
763 hydroxychloroquine as outpatient treatment of COVID-19: a randomized controlled trial.
764 *CMAJ Open.* 2021 Jun 18;9(2):E693-E702.
- 765 75. Reis G, dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of Early Treatment With
766 Hydroxychloroquine or Lopinavir and Ritonavir on Risk of Hospitalization Among Patients
767 With COVID-19. The TOGETHER Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.*
768 2021;4(4):e216468.
- 769 76. Rodrigues C, et al. Hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin early treatment of mild COVID-19
770 in an outpatient setting: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial
771 evaluating viral clearance. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2021;58(5):106428.
- 772 77. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, et al. A Randomized Trial of Hydroxychloroquine
773 as Postexposure Prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383(6):517-25.
- 774 78. Cohen MS. Hydroxychloroquine for the Prevention of Covid-19 - Searching for Evidence. *N*
775 *Engl J Med.* 2020;383(6):585-6.
- 776 79. Mitja O, Corbacho-Monné, Ubals M, et al. A Cluster-Randomized Trial of
777 Hydroxychloroquine for Prevention of Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 384(5):417-27.

- 778 80. Barnabas RV, Brown ER, Bershteyn A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine as Postexposure
779 Prophylaxis to Prevent Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection: A
780 Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;174(3):344-52.
- 781 81. Abella BS, Jolkovsky EL, BA; Biney BT, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Hydroxychloroquine vs
782 Placebo for Pre-Exposure SARS-CoV-2 Prophylaxis Among Health Care Workers. *JAMA*
783 *Intern Med.* 2021;181(2):195-202.
- 784 82. Rajasingham R, Bangdiwala AS, Nicol MR, et al. Hydroxychloroquine as pre-exposure
785 prophylaxis for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in healthcare workers: a randomized
786 trial. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2021;72(11):e835-e843.
- 787 83. Jung S-Y, Kim M-S, Kim M-C et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine pre-exposure on infection
788 with SARS-CoV-2 in rheumatic disease patients: a population-based cohort study. *Clin*
789 *Microbiol Infect.* 2021;27(4):611-617.
- 790 84. Rentsch CT, DeVito NJ, MacKenna B, et al. Effect of pre-exposure use of hydroxychloroquine
791 on COVID-19 mortality: a population-based cohort study in patients with rheumatoid arthritis
792 or systemic lupus erythematosus using the OpenSAFELY platform. *Lancet Rheumatol.*
793 2021;3(1) E19-E27.
- 794 85. Lofgren SM, Nicol MR, Bangdiwala AS, et al. Safety of Hydroxychloroquine Among
795 Outpatient Clinical Trial Participants for COVID-19. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2020;7(11):
796 ofaa500.
- 797 86. Seet RCS, Quek AML, Ooi DSQ, et al. Positive impact of oral hydroxychloroquine and
798 povidone-iodine throat spray for COVID-19 prophylaxis: An open-label randomized trial. *Int*
799 *J Infect Dis.* 2021;106:314-22.
- 800 87. Dhibar DP, Arora N, Kakkar A, et al. Post-exposure prophylaxis with hydroxychloroquine for
801 the prevention of COVID-19, a myth or a reality? The PEP-CQ Study. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.*
802 2020;56(6):106224.
- 803 88. Sheahan TP, Sims AC, Zhou S, et al. An orally bioavailable broad-spectrum antiviral inhibits
804 SARS-CoV-2 in human airway epithelial cell cultures and multiple coronaviruses in mice. *Sci*
805 *Transl Med.* 2020;12(541):eabb5883.
- 806 89. García-Albéniz X, del Amo J, Polo R, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of
807 randomized trials of hydroxychloroquine for the prevention of COVID-19.
808 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203869v4>.
- 809 90. Kalil AC. Treating COVID-19—Off-Label Drug Use, Compassionate Use, and Randomized
810 Clinical Trials During Pandemics. *JAMA.* 2020;323(19):1897-98.
- 811 91. PRISMA. Transparent Reporting of Systematic Reviews and meta-analyses. [http://prisma-](http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist)
812 [statement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist](http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist).
- 813 92. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing
814 risk of bias in randomized trials. *BMJ.* 2011;343:d5928.
- 815

816 **Table 1. RCTs evaluating HC/CQ in hospitalized patients with COVID-19**

Reference	N	Design	Comparators	Primary outcome	Primary results	Other results
Tang W [26]	150	Open-label	HC+SOC vs. SOC	Viral clearance	No significant difference	Numerically more AEs with HC but no arrhythmias or QTc prolongation.
Horby PW [27] <i>RECOVERY</i>	4,716	Open-label, platform	HC+SOC vs. SOC	28-day mortality	No significant difference	Higher composite endpoint of mechanical ventilation requirement & death with HC. Arrhythmias were similar.
Self W [28] <i>ORCHID</i>	479	Double-blinded, placebo-controlled	HC+SOC vs. Placebo+SOC	WHO 14-day ordinal score	No significant difference	Mortality and mechanical ventilation need were similar. QTc prolongation was numerically higher with HC but SAEs were similar.
Pan H [29] <i>SOLIDARITY</i>	1,853	Open-label, platform	HC+SOC vs. SOC	In-hospital mortality	No significant difference	Mechanical ventilation need & LOS were similar.
Cavalcanti AB [30] <i>Coalition Covid-19 Brazil I</i>	504	Open-label, mild-moderate severity	HC+SOC vs. SOC & HC+AZ+SOC vs. SOC	15-day ordinal score	No significant differences	QTc prolongation & elevated LFTs were numerically higher with HC.
Lyngbakken MN [31]	53	Open-label	HC+SOC vs. SOC	Viral clearance	No significant difference	Mortality, ordinal score, & LOS were similar.
Abd-Elsalam S [32]	194	Open-label	HC+SOC vs. SOC	Need for mechanical ventilation or death	No significant differences	
Ulrich RJ [33] <i>TEACH</i>	128	Double-blinded, placebo-controlled	HC+SOC vs. Placebo+SOC	Composite of severe disease progression	No significant difference	Viral clearance & AEs were similar.
Brown SM [34] <i>HAHPS</i>	85	Open-label, AZ control, Bayesian analysis	HC vs. AZ	14-day ordinal score	No significant difference	AEs & QTc prolongation were similar but AKIs were numerically higher with HC.
Chen CP [35]	34	Open-label	HC+SOC vs. SOC	Viral clearance	No significant difference	
Rea-Neto A [36]	105	Open-label	HC/CQ+SOC vs. SOC	14-day ordinal score	Significantly worse with HC	Mechanical ventilation need and severe AKIs were significantly higher with HC. Arrhythmias were similar.
Galan LEB [37]	168	Double-blinded, ivermectin-controlled	HC vs. CQ. vs. ivermectin	Need for O2 or mechanical ventilation, ICU admission, or mortality	No significant differences	SAEs were similar.
Arabi YM [38] <i>REMAP-CAP</i>	694 L-R(N=255) HC (N=50) L-R & HC (N=27) SOC (N=362)	Open-label, platform, Bayesian analysis	Lopinavir-ritonavir+SOC vs. HC+SOC vs. lopinavir-ritonavir & HC+SOC vs. SOC	Ordinal scale of organ support-free days	Significantly worse with all 3 treatments	Significantly worse mortality with all 3 treatments.
Dubee V [39] <i>HYCOVID</i>	247	Double-blinded, placebo-controlled	HC+SOC vs. Placebo+SOC	14-day composite of death & need for mechanical ventilation	No significant difference	Viral clearance, ordinal scores, & AEs & SAEs were similar.
Hernandez-Cardenas C [40]	214	Double-blinded, placebo-controlled	HC+SOC vs. Placebo+SOC	30- day mortality	No significant difference	Need for mechanical ventilation, LOS, & SAEs were similar.
Barratt-Due A [41] <i>NOR-Solidarity</i>	185	Open-label, platform, add-on to <i>SOLIDARITY</i>	HC+SOC vs. remdesivir+SOC vs. SOC	Viral clearance	No significant difference	Respiratory failure severity, inflammatory variables, & in-hospital mortality were similar.
Sivapalan P [42]	117	Double-blinded, placebo-controlled	HC/AZ+SOC vs. Placebo/Placebo+SOC	Days alive & discharged from hospital by 14 days	No significant difference	Diarrhea was numerically higher with HC/AZ but QTc prolongation and SAEs were numerically higher with Placebo.

817 **Figure legends**

818

819 **Figure 1**

820 Pubmed and Google searches were used to query the published preclinical and clinical literature
821 for hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine use for treatment and prophylaxis in COVID-19

