Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin as a Treatment of COVID-19: Results of an Open-Label Non-Randomized Clinical Trial: Response to criticisms

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Didier Raoult[1,2], Matthieu Million[1,2], Jean-Christophe Lagier[1,2], Philippe Colson[1,2], Philippe Parola[1,3], and Jean-Marc Rolain[1,2], Philippe Gautret[1,3]

Supplementary Methods

We conducted a meta-analysis of studies evaluating the effects of chloroquine derivatives against SARS-CoV-2 in groups of COVID-19 patients as compared to control groups of patients who did not receive chloroquine derivatives. In these studies, groups were expected to be similar with respect to demographics, chronic conditions, clinical presentation at enrolment and use of other antiviral drugs during the course of the disease. The keywords "hydroxychloroquine", "chloroquine", "coronavirus", "COVID-19" and "SARS-Cov-2" were used in the PubMed, Google Scholar and Google search engines without any restrictions as to date (research updated on September, 9, 2020) or language. Preprints were also included. Open reviews and reviewer's recommendations regarding preprints are available in the supplementary data. Articles published in peer-reviewed journals, pre-prints and articles available on the internet, even when not published on official websites, were included. An overview of most of the screened studies can be accessed at https://c19study.com/. The following outcomes were considered: death and persistent viral shedding as assessed by PCR.

Only studies comparing a group of COVID19 patients, mandatorily confirmed by PCR, treated with a chloroquine derivative to a control group without chloroquine derivatives were included. Studies must provide the number of treated and untreated individuals. Non-comparative (single arm) studies and studies comparing two groups treated with chloroquine derivatives at different dosages or with different delay of treatment were excluded. Studies

analyzing safety, efficacy as a prevention, data provided as a webpage without an article format (such as a tweet), were also excluded. Studies without confirmation of the diagnosis by RT-PCR were excluded. For the “mortality” outcome, studies without any death were excluded. For the “viral shedding” outcome, only studies reporting at least the proportion of positive PCR were included. Studies assessing only viral load without data on the proportion of positive samples were excluded.

Studies were classified as “big data” studies when conducted on electronic medical records extracted by public health specialists and epidemiologists who did not care COVID-19 patients themselves. Conversely, studies were classified as “clinical studies” when mentioning details of treatments (dosages, duration, contraindications, monitoring…) and conducted by authors physicians (infectious diseases and internal medicine specialists, and pulmonologists) who cared COVID-19 patients themselves.

The meta-analysis was performed with a randomized model using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis v3 (Biostat, Englewood, NJ, USA) as recommended by Borenstein *et al.* (1). This software made it possible to include dichotomous outcomes (number of events out of the total) and quantitative outcomes (mean in each group, sample size, p-value). The most adjusted effect size reflecting the greatest control for potential confounding factors was extracted. Heterogeneity was considered substantial when $I^2 > 50\%$. A p-value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Supplementary Table 1. Studies assessing the death outcome (at least one death) but excluded and reason for exclusion

Study	Reason
Ahmad, MedRxiv, 2020 (2) https://www.medrxiv.org/content/ 10.1101/2020.05.18.20066902v1	Number of treated and untreated patients not provided
Ayerbe, J Thromb Thrombolysis, 2020 (3) https://link.springer.com/article/ 10.1007%2Fs11239-020-02162-z	Possible duplicate with Mateos Gonzales, MedRxiv, 2020
Calik Basaran, Turk J Med Sci, 2020 (4) https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32718127/	Diagnosis not confirmed by PCR
Chowdhury, Researchsquare, 2020 (5) https://www.researchsquare.com/ article/rs-38896/v1	Control group treated by doxycycline and ivermectin
Fried, Clin Infect Dis, 2020 (6) https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1268/5898276	Confounding by indication "Patients treated with hydroxychloroquine were more likely to be on mechanical ventilation compared to those who did not receive hydroxychloroquine (24.9% vs 12.2%)." (1054/4232 vs 913/7489, bilateral khi square test, $p < 0.0001$)
Horby et al., MedRxiv, 2020 (7) https://www.medrxiv.org/content/ 10.1101/2020.07.15.20151852v1	Toxic doses (2400 mg fir the first 24 hours), PCR confirmation was not mandatory

Kelly, Br Pharmcol Soc, 2020 (8) https://bpspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bcp.14482	Confounding by indication : No approach to control for confounding and treated group with higher CRP (81.5 vs 28, p < .0001), higher FiO2 requirement median day 0 (24% vs 21%, p < .0001).
Magagnoli, Med, 2020 (9,10) https://www.cell.com/med/pdf/S2666-6340(20)30006-4.pdf	Lymphopenia more frequent in the treated group / HCQ started after intubation / Azithromycin given to 30% of control group
McGrail, MedRxiv, 2020 (11) https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.17.20156521v1	Confounding by indication “The latter two groups were significantly more ill than the untreated group”
Peters, MedRxiv, 2020 (12) https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.14.20173369v1	HCQ initiation when patients deteriorated
Rivera, Cancer Discovery, 2020 (13) https://cancerdiscovery.aacrjournals.org/content/early/2020/07/21/2159-8290.CD-20-0941	Confounding by indication
Sanchez Alvarez, Nefrologia, 2020 (14) https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S201325142030050X	Number of treated and untreated patients not provided

Skipper, Annals of Internal Medicine, 2020 (15) https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-4207	Only 58% of participants received SARS-CoV-2 testing because of severe U.S. testing shortages.
Synolaki, MedRxiv, 2020 (16) https://www.medrxiv.org/content/ 10.1101/2020.09.05.20184655v1	Number of treated and untreated patients not provided for the different groups of severity

Supplementary Table 2. Chloroquine derivatives and COVID19 mortality – Data extracted (as of September 2020, 21)

	Country	N treated	N untreated	Data in the manuscript	Data entered in the software
CLINICAL STUDIES (POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST) (Reference)					
Abd-Elsalam, Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2020 (No) (17)	**Egypt**	**97**	**97**	Table 4. Univariate regression Hydroxychloroquine treatment OR 0.824 (0.243 - 2.797) P = 0.757	**Positive direction P = 0.757**
Alamdari, Tohoku J Exp Med, 2020 (No) (18)	**Iran**	**427**	**32**	Table 4. Therapies and outcomes. P = 0.028	**Negative direction P = 0.028**
Alberici, Kidney International, 2020 (No) (19)	**Italy**	**72**	**22**	Table 3 | Univariate analyses of the association between clinical characteristics and the risk of ARDS or death in hemodialysis patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Hydroxychloroquine: outcome death OR 0.44 (0.16–1.24) p = 0.12	**Negative direction P = 0.12**
Arshad, Int J Infect Dis, 2020 (I.B. received speakers' bureau honoraria from Gilead) (20)	**USA**	**190 (propensity score matched patients)**	**190 (propensity score matched patients)**	Table 4. Propensity Matched Cox Regression Result for Mortality Prediction	**Negative direction P = 0.009**

				Given HCQ p-value = 0.009 **, Hazard Ratio 0.487 – (0.285 0.832)	
Cavalcanti, N Eng J Med, 2020 – HCQ alone (No) (21)	**Brazil**	**159**	**173**	Table 2. Primary and Secondary Outcomes (Modified Intention-to-Treat Population).* Death 5/159 vs 5/173	**5/159 vs 5/173**
Cavalcanti, N Eng J Med, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (21)	**Brazil**	**172**	**173**	Table 2. Primary and Secondary Outcomes (Modified Intention-to-Treat Population).* Death 3/172 vs 5/173	**3/172 vs 5/173**
D'arminio Monforte, IJID, 2020 – HCQ alone (No) (22)	**Italy**	**197**	**92**	Table 1 Unadjusted and adjusted marginal relative hazards of in-hospital mortality Adjusted HR 0.66 (0.39, 1.11), p = 0.118	**Negative direction p = 0.118**
D'arminio Monforte, IJID, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (22)	**Italy**	**94**	**92**	Table 1 Unadjusted and adjusted marginal relative hazards of in-hospital mortality Ajusted HR 0.44 (0.24, 0.82), p = 0.009	**Negative direction P = 0.009**
Goldman, N Eng J Med, 2020 (Funded by Gilead Sciences) (23)	**Multinational**	**109**	**288**	Table S3. Baseline Predictors of Time to Clinical Improvement (with p-values <0.2) / Patients who Died Before Achieving Clinical Improvement (Competing Risks)	**10/109 vs 34 / 288**

				N (%) / Received hydroxychloroquine yes 10 / 109 vs no 34 / 288	
Guerin, Asian J Med Health, 2020 (No) (24)	**France**	**20**	**34**	"One patient, a man of 82-year-old without comorbidities in the NST group died suddenly;"	**0/20 vs 1/34**
Heras, Researchsquare, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (25)	**Andorra**	**70**	**21**	Table 3 Risk factors associated with COVID-19 mortality on multivariate analysis Treatment H+A OR 0.044 p = 0.004	**Negative direction** **P = 0.004**
Heras, Researchsquare, 2020 – HCQ alone (No) (25)	**Andorra**	**9**	**21**	Table 3 Risk factors associated with COVID-19 mortality on multivariate analysis Treatment H OR 0.32 p = 0.369	**Negative direction** **P = 0.369**
Lagier, Trav Med Infect Dis, 2020 (No) (26)	**France**	**503**	**199**	Table 5 Age stratified multivariable analyses adjusted on comorbidities and severity of the disease addressing associations between treatment (HCQ-AZ ≥ 3 days) and clinical outcomes/viral shedding clearance (n = 3,737). Weighted Cox regression on	**Negative direction** **P = 0.003**

				Unmatched sample (n = 702) Hazard ratio 0.49 (0.31–0.79), p = 0.0030	
Lauriola, Clinical Transl Sci, 2020 – HCQ alone (No) (27)	**Italy**	**17**	**63**	Table 2. Multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression analysis of factors associated with in-hospital death. HCQ (vs. no treatment) 1.108 (0.536-2.293) p = 0.782	**Positive direction** **P = 0.782**
Lauriola, Clinical Transl Sci, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (27)	**Italy**	**297**	**63**	Table 2. Multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression analysis of factors associated with in-hospital death. HCQ + azithromycin (vs. no treatment) HR 0.265, 95%CI 0.171-0.412, p<0.001	Exact p-value calculated* : **p = 6.67924E-09**
Lecronier, Critical care, 2020 (No) (28)	**France**	**38**	**22**	Table 2 Primary and secondary outcomes - 28-day mortality, n (%) standard of care 9/22 vs Lopinavir/ritonavir 7/20 vs hydroxychloroquine 9/38, p = 0.35	**9/38 vs 9/22**
Ly, IHU preprints, 2020 (No) (29)	**France**	**116**	**110**	Table 3. Associations between multiple factors and SARS-CoV-2 death among 226 infected elderly	**Negative direction** **P = 0.026**

				residents (univariate and multivariate analysis) / HCQ/AZ treatment for at least 3 days (226) / Multivariate 0.39 [0.17-0.89] 0.026	
Mahevas, MedRxiv, 2020 (in the final corrected version of the MS published in BMJ : SG reports personal fees and non-financial support from Gilead Sciences / FXL has received personal fees from Gilead / RL reports non-financial support from Eumedica SA, non-financial support from Gilead Sciences / CO reports non-financial support from MSD, non-financial support from Janssen, non-financial support from CSL Behring, non-financial support from Gilead / JMP reports personal fees from Abbvie, personal fees from Gilead / FS reports personal fees from Gilead Sciences /) (30)	**France**	**92**	**89**	Supplementary data 4: Sensitivity analyses* Trimmed sample that was truncated at 10% of the extreme weights.	Events were recalculated and this is explaine in : https://www.mediterranee-infection.com/correction-scientifique/ **3/92 vs 4/89**
Membrillo de Novales, Preprints, 2020 (No) (31)	**Spain**	**123**	**43**	Table 4. Significant outcomes of the multi-variant analysis of survival - HCQ treatment P = 0,003 - Exp(B) 0,070 (0,012-0,402)	**Negative direction P = 0.003**

Paccoud, Clin Infect Dis, 2020 (eurosfordocs reported several authors with conflict of interests particularly Vincent Calvez, Marc Antoine Valantin, Romain Palich – each of them received more than 10,000 euros from Gilead) (32)	**France**	**43**	**46**	Supplementary Data table 2: Results of sensivity analyses - Other sensivity analyses: results on the Secondary population - Time-to-event outcomes evaluated from admission – Death - IPTW-weighted analysis HR 0.52 [0.12; 2.29], p = 0.38	**Negative direction** **P = 0.38**
Pinato, Cancer Research, 2020 (MP has declared consulting/advisory role for Gilead and Bayer /) (33)	**Multinational**	**182**	**446**	Table 3. Model-adjusted risk of mortality complemented by restricted mean survival time analysis according to type of anti-Covid-19 therapy in patients with cancer and SARS-Cov-2 infection – Therapy Antimalarials only (n=182) vs no drug (n=446) / Restricted mean survival time (RMST) analyses: Cox proportional model : HR 0.41 (0.26-0.66) p<0.0001	**Negative direction** **P = 0.0001**
Scholz, Preprints, 2020 (No) (34)	**USA**	**141**	**377**	Table 7. Clinical Outcome in the Treated Patient Group versus the Untreated Patient Group / All-cause death 1/141 vs 13/377	**1/141 vs 13/377**

Yu, Sci China Life Sci, 2020 (No) (35)	**China**	**48**	**502**	Table 3 Univariable and multivariable cox proportional hazards model for 60-day fatality after HCQ treatment Adjusted HR (95% CI), 0.36 (0.18–0.75), p = 0.006	**Negative direction** **P = 0.006**
BIG DATA STUDIES					
Bernaola, MedRxiv, 2020 (No) (36)	**Spain**	**1498**	**147**	Table 2: Hazard ratio with 95% confidence intervals and Cohen's d for various treatments before and after propensity-score matching, for their effects on mortality rate. Propensity score matching Hazard ratios HCQ 0.84 ± 0.08	**Negative direction** **P = 0.00037 (*calculated from the ratio 0.84 and confidence interval 0.76-0.92)**
Catteau, Int J Antimicrob Agents, 2020 (No) (37)	**Belgium**	**4542**	**3533**	« Treatment with HCQ alone was in contrast independently associated with decreased risk of in-hospital mortality (Adjusted hazard ratio [HR] 0.684, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.617–0.758) compared to the no-HCQ group »	**Negative direction** **P* = 1.96xE-12**
Di Castelnuovo, Eur J Intern Med, 2020 (No) (38)	**Italy**	**2634**	**817**	Table 2 Incidence rates and hazard ratios for death in COVID-19 patients, according to hydroxychloroquine use	**Negative direction** **P* = 8.66xE-05**

				Propensity score analysis, inverse probability weighting** (primary analysis) HR 0.70 (0.59 to 0.84)	
Gonzalez, MedRxiv, 2020 (No) (39)	**Spain**	**8448**	**1169**	Table 4. Multivariate analysis of mortality. The effect of each factor is expressed as an Adjusted Odds Ratios (CI 95%). Hydroxychloroquine Adjusted OR 0.662 (0.432 to 1.013) p = 0.057	**Negative direction** **P = 0.057**
Ip, MedRxiv, 2020 – Inpatients (No) (40)	**USA**	**1914**	**598**	"This retrospective observational cohort study of 2512 hospitalized COVID-19 patients within a 13- hospital network did not find the empirical use of hydroxychloroquine with or without co-treatment with azithromycin to be associated with a reduction in mortality (adjusted HR, 0.99 for any hydroxychloroquine during hospitalization [95% CI, 0.80-1.22])."	**Negative direction** **P* = 0.93**
Ip, MedRxiv, 2020 – Outpatients (AHG reports being a study investigator for Genentech-Hoffman La Roche, during	**USA**	**97 (propensity score**	**970 (propensity score**	Table 1 Baseline characteristics and outcomes / Propensity-score-Matched patients (N=1077) / Death	**Negative direction** **p-value = 0.427**

the conduct of the study; research funding as study investigator from Acerta, AstraZeneca, Celgene, Kite Pharma, Elsevier's PracticeUpdate Oncology, Gilead) (41)		**matched patients)**	**matched patients)**	p-value = 0.427	
Mikami, J Gen Intern Med, 2020 (No) (42)	**USA**	**2077**	**743**	Table 3 Risk Factors Associated with In-Hospital Death Hydroxychloroquine use HR 0.53 (0.41–0.67), p < 0.001	**Negative direction** **P* = 6.6xE-07**
Roomi, J Med Internet Res, 2020 (No) (43)	**USA**	**144**	**32**	Table 3: HCQ regression analysis with the outcome Adjusted OR (95%CI) 1.6 (0.33-7.9) p = 0.54	**Positive direction** **P = 0.54**
Rosenberg, JAMA, 2020 – HCQ alone (Dr Dufort reported that her spouse has a Gilead Foundation-Focus HIV/HCV testing research grant.) (44)	**USA**	**271**	**221**	Table 3. Model-Adjusted Risk of In-Hospital Death, Cardiac Arrest, Arrhythmia / In-hospital death (hazard ratio) / Hydroxychloroquine alone vs neither drug HR 1.08 (0.63-1.85)	**Positive direction** **P* = 0.79**
Rosenberg, JAMA, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (Dr Dufort reported that her spouse has a Gilead Foundation-Focus HIV/HCV testing research grant.) (44)	**USA**	**735**	**221**	Table 3. Model-Adjusted Risk of In-Hospital Death, Cardiac Arrest, Arrhythmia / In-hospital death (hazard ratio) / Hydroxychloroquine + azithromycin vs neither drug HR 1.35 (0.76-2.40)	**Positive direction** **P* = 0.31**

Sbidian, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ alone (No) (45)	**France**	**623**	**3792**	Table 3. Primary and secondary outcomes according to study population and treatment group / HCQ alone vs. neither drug / AIPTW Estimate* (95%CI) / Whole population / Ratio in average treatment effect / 1.05 (0.77 to 1.33)	**Positive direction P* = 0.73**
Sbidian, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (45)	**France**	**227**	**3792**	Table 3. Primary and secondary outcomes according to study population and treatment group / HCQ plus AZI vs. neither drug / AIPTW Estimate* (95%CI) / Whole population / Ratio in average treatment effect / 1.40 (0.98 to 1.81)	**Positive direction P* = 0.031**
Singh, MedRxiv, 2020 (No) (46)	**USA**	**910 (propensity score matched patients)**	**910 (propensity score matched patients)**	Table 1: Comparison of patient characteristics and outcomes among hospitalized COVID-19 Hydroxychloroquine Treatment group and Control Group / Treatment Hydroxychloroquine vs Control (Matched Cohorts) / Mortality 30-Day / Relative risk (95%CI)	**Negative direction P = 0.72**

				0.95 (0.74-1.23) p = 0.72	
Sulaiman, MedRxiv, 2020 (No) (47)	**Saudi Arabia**	**1817**	**3724**	Adjusted OR “0.36 (0.16 - 0.8) 0.012”	**P = 0.012**

CQ: Chloroquine, HCQ: hydroxychloroquine, (H)CQ: chloroquine derivative (HCQ or CQ), OR: Odds ratio, HR: Hazard ratio, Positive direction : Ratio > 1 ((H)CQ associated with higher mortality, Negative direction : ratio < 1 : (H)CQ associated with lower mortality. In the software, the data entered were the number of patients with treatment, without treatment and the effect size data. *Altman DG, Bland JM. How to obtain the P value from a confidence interval. BMJ. 2011;343:d2304. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2304. Bold: data entered in the CMA software

Supplementary Table 3. Studies assessing the viral shedding outcome but excluded and reason for exclusion

Study	Reason
Gautret, Int J Antimicrob Agents, 2020 (48)	Included in Lagier, 2020
Mitja, Clin Infect Dis, 2020 (49)	"The viral load was provided in logarithmic scale; specimens with undetectable viral load at a given follow-up assessment were assigned a value of 3 log10 copies per mL (i.e., lower limit of detection) for the purpose of statistical analysis." As mentioned in our methods, we excluded studies that did not mention the proportion of positive. To our opinion, a negative PCR cannot be confused with a positive PCR with 3 log 10 copies DNA/mL.

Supplementary Table 4. Chloroquine derivatives and COVID19 Viral shedding – Data extracted (as of September 2020, 21)

Study (conflict of interest)	Country	N treated	N untreated	Data in the manuscript	Data entered in the software
BIG DATA STUDIES					
An, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ (No) (50)	South Korea	**20 (matched patients)**	**20 (matched patients)**	Table 3. Associations between hydroxychloroquine use and time to viral clearance and symptom duration in crude analysis, multivariable analysis, and propensity-score matching compare to standard supportive therapy. (Conservative therapy is the reference) / Time to viral clearance / Cox regression with matched population (n=20) ** HR 1.53 (0.83-2.94) p = 0.184	**Positive direction P = 0.184**
CLINICAL STUDIES					
Chen CP, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ – RCT (No) (51)	Taiwan	**21**	**12**	Table 2. Proportions of negative rRT-PCR assessments on day 14 and median times to negative rRT-PCR results after randomization in the multicenter, open-label, randomized controlled trial / Median time to negative# (Days, 95% CI) P-value*2	**Negative direction P = 0.40**

				#Time to negative = Event date or censored date – start day / *2 Log-rank test stratified by clinical syndromes 5 (1,9) vs 10 (2,12), p = 0.40	
Chen CP, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ – Retrospective study (No) (51)	Taiwan	**16**	**28**	"The median times (ranges) to undetected virus were 15 (6–31) days for the HCQ group and 14 (7–22) days for the control group (p = 0.37)"	**Positive direction** **P = 0.37**
Chen L, MedRxiv, 2020 – CQ (No) (52)	**China**	**18**	**12**	"Compared with the control group [median day: 7.0 (IQR: 3.0-10.0) days], the chloroquine group [median day: 2.5 (IQR: 2.0-3.8) days] (…) had significant decreases in the number of days required to reach RT-PCR negativity (P=0.006 (…) by Logrank (Mantel-Cox) test, respectively) (Figure 2b)."	**Negative direction** **P = 0.006**
Chen L, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ (No) (52)	**China**	**18**	**12**	"Compared with the control group [median day: 7.0 (IQR: 3.0-10.0) days], (…) the hydroxychloroquine group [median day: 2.0 (IQR: 2.0-3.5) days] had significant decreases in the number of days required to reach	**Negative direction** **P = 0.010**

				RT-PCR negativity ((…) P=0.010 by Logrank (Mantel-Cox) test, respectively) (Figure 2b)."	
Chen J, J Zheijang U, 2020 – HCQ – RCT (No) (53)	**China**	**15**	**15**	"On day 7, nucleic acid of throat swab was negative in 13 (86.7%) cases in the HCQ group and 14 (93.3%) cases in the control group (p > 0.05)."	**2/15 vs 1/15**
Huang, J Mol Cell Biol, 2020 – HCQ – RCT (No) (54)	**China**	**10**	**12**	"There were then steady increases in the number of patients turning negative, cumulating at Day 13 when all of the Chloroquine-treated patients became negative (Figure 1B, left panel; Supplementary Table S2). In comparison, patients in the Lopinavir/Ritonavir group only became SARS-CoV-2 negative after 3 days of dosing, and 11 out of 12 turned negative at Day 14."	**0/10 vs 1/12**
Huang, MedRxiv, 2020 – CQ – Prospective observational study (No) (55)	**China**	**197**	**176**	Table 2. Outcomes in the overall population with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection§. Patients with undetectable viral RNA by Day 10, N (%) 180/197 vs 101/176	**Proportion of positive (17/197 vs 75/176)**

Kamran, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ – RCT (No) (56)	**Pakistan**	**151**	**349**	Table-2. Assessment of Effect of HCQ on RT-PCR status of study population RT-PCR at day 7 / TREATMENT / 167/349 vs 97/151, p = 0.001 (NB: difference in PCR is most important around day 7, see Fig. 3 Lagier, TMAID, 2020)	**(proportion of positive PCR at day 7) 167/349 vs 97/151**
Kim, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ+AZ+Cefixime (No) (57)	**South Korea**	**22**	**40**	"The length of time to viral clearance, which was indicated by negative conversion on PCR after initiation of treatment, was significantly shorter with HQ plus antibiotics than with (…) conservative treatments (HR, 0.44; 95% CI, 0.25 to 0.78)."	**Negative direction** **P* = 0.0047**
Lagier, Travel Med Infect Dis, 2020 – HCQ+AZ (No) (26)	**France**	**3119**	**618**	Table 5 Age stratified multivariable analyses adjusted on comorbidities and severity of the disease addressing associations between treatment (HCQ-AZ ≥ 3 days) and clinical outcomes/viral shedding clearance (n = 3,737). Viral shedding persistence ≥ 10 daysf / All patients (n =	**Negative direction** **P* = 3.9E-07**

				3,737) / 10.6% vs 20.6%, HR 1.29 (1.17–1.42) p <0.0001	
Lecronier, Crit Care, 2020 – HCQ (No) (28)	**France**	**38**	**22**	Table 4 Virological findings on admission and on day 7 / Respiratory RT-PCR at day 7 / Positive RT-PCR, n (%) 19/26 vs 12/14 (positive / samples analyzed)	**19/26 vs 12/14**
Shabrawishi, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ/CQ (No) (58)	**Saudi Arabia**	**45**	**48**	"The primary endpoint of the study is achieving negative SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal PCR within five days or less from the start of the intervention. Secondary endpoint was achieving negative sample within 12 days or less from the first positive PCR result." "In group A 73.3% (n= 33) achieved the primary endpoint and 84.4% (n= 38) achieved the secondary endpoint. Smaller percentage of patients 68.8 (n= 33) and 79.2% (n= 38) achieved the primary and secondary endpoints in group B."	**HCQ 33/45 vs 33/48**
Tang, MedRxiv, 2020 – HCQ – RCT (No) (59)	**China**	**75**	**75**	"The median time to negative	**Positive direction P = 0.34**

				conversion was also similar in the SOC plus HCQ group (8 days, 95%CI 5 to 10 days) with that in the SOC group (7 days, 95%CI 5 to 8 days) (Hazard ratio, 0.846; 95%CI, 0.58 to 1.23; p=0.34 by log–rank test) (Figure 2)	

CQ: Chloroquine, HCQ: hydroxychloroquine, (H)CQ: chloroquine derivative (HCQ or CQ), OR: Odds ratio, HR: Hazard ratio, Positive direction : Ratio > 1 ((H)CQ associated with higher mortality, Negative direction : ratio < 1 : (H)CQ associated with lower mortality. In the software, the data entered were the number of patients with treatment, without treatment and the effect size data. *Altman DG, Bland JM. How to obtain the P value from a confidence interval. BMJ. 2011;343:d2304. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2304. Bold: data entered in the CMA software.

References

1. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. Introduction to Meta-Analysis. 2009. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 2009. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386.
2. Ahmad I, Alam M, Saadi R, et al. Doxycycline and Hydroxychloroquine as Treatment for High-Risk COVID-19 Patients: Experience from Case Series of 54 Patients in Long-Term Care Facilities. medRxiv 202 0.05.18.20066902; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.18.20066902
3. Ayerbe L, Risco C, Ayis S. The association between treatment with heparin and survival in patients with Covid-19. J Thromb Thrombolysis. 2020 Aug;50(2):298-301. doi: 10.1007/s11239-020-02162-z. PMID: 32476080; PMCID: PMC7261349.
4. Çalik BaŞaran CN, Uyaroğlu OA, Telli Dizman G, et al. Outcome of Non-Critical COVID-19 Patients with Early Hospitalization and Early Antiviral Treatment Outside the ICU [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 28]. Turk J Med Sci. 2020;10.3906/sag-2006-173. doi:10.3906/sag-2006-173
5. Chowdhury ATMM, Shahbaz M, Karim MR, et al. A Randomized Trial of Ivermectin-Doxycycline andHydroxychloroquine-Azithromycin therapy onCOVID19 patients, Researchsquare, 2020. Posted 14 Jul, 2020. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-38896/v1
6. Fried MW, Crawford JM, Mospan AR, et al. Patient Characteristics and Outcomes of 11,721 Patients with COVID19 Hospitalized Across the United States [published online ahead of print, 2020 Aug 28]. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;ciaa1268. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1268
7. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, et al. Effect of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: Preliminary results from a multi-centre, randomized, controlled trial. medRxiv 2020.07.15.20151852; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20151852

8. Kelly M, O'Connor R, Townsend L, et al. Clinical outcomes and adverse events in patients hospitalised with COVID-19, treated with off-label hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 20]. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2020;10.1111/bcp.14482.
9. Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with Covid-19. medRxiv 2020.04.16.20065920; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20065920
10. Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, et al. Outcomes of Hydroxychloroquine Usage in United States Veterans Hospitalized with COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 5]. Med (N Y). 2020;10.1016/j.medj.2020.06.001. doi:10.1016/j.medj.2020.06.001
11. McGrail DE, Dianna Edwards D. COVID-19 Case Series at UnityPoint Health St. Lukes Hospital in Cedar Rapids, IA medRxiv 2020.07.17.20156521; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.17.20156521
12. Peters EJG, Collard D, Sander van Assen S, et al. Outcomes of Persons With COVID-19 in Hospitals With and Without Standard Treatment With (Hydroxy)chloroquine. medRxiv 2020.08.14.20173369; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.14.20173369
13. Rivera DR, Peters S, Panagiotou OA, et al. Utilization of COVID-19 Treatments and Clinical Outcomes among Patients with Cancer: A COVID-19 and Cancer Consortium (CCC19) Cohort Study [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 22]. Cancer Discov. 2020;10.1158/2159-8290.CD-20-0941. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-20-0941
14. Sánchez-Álvarez JE, Pérez Fontán M, Jiménez Martín C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients on renal replacement therapy. Report of the COVID-19 Registry of the Spanish Society of Nephrology (SEN). Situación de la infección por SARS-CoV-2 en pacientes en tratamiento renal sustitutivo. Informe del Registro COVID-19 de la

Sociedad Española de Nefrología (SEN). Nefrologia. 2020;40(3):272-278. doi:10.1016/j.nefro.2020.04.002

15. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19: A Randomized Trial [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 16]. Ann Intern Med. 2020;M20-4207. doi:10.7326/M20-4207
16. Synolaki E, Papadopoulos V, Divolis G, et al. Activin/Follistatin-axis deregulation is independently associated with COVID-19 in-hospital mortality. medRxiv 2020.09.05.20184655; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.05.20184655
17. Abd-Elsalam S, Esmail ES, Khalaf M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in the Treatment of COVID-19: A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Study [published online ahead of print, 2020 Aug 14]. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020;10.4269/ajtmh.20-0873. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0873
18. Alamdari NM, Afaghi S, Rahimi FS, et al. Mortality Risk Factors among Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients in a Major Referral Center in Iran. Tohoku J Exp Med. 2020;252(1):73-84. doi:10.1620/tjem.252.73
19. Alberici F, Delbarba E, Manenti C, et al. A report from the Brescia Renal COVID Task Force on the clinical characteristics and short-term outcome of hemodialysis patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Kidney Int. 2020;98(1):20-26. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2020.04.030
20. Arshad S, Kilgore P, Chaudhry ZS, et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;97:396-403. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.099
21. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 23]. N Engl J Med. 2020;NEJMoa2019014. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2019014

22. d'Arminio Monforte A, Tavelli A, Bai F, Marchetti G, Cozzi-Lepri A. Effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine in COVID-19 disease: A done and dusted deal? [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 29]. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;99:75-76. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.056
23. Goldman JD, Lye DCB, Hui DS, et al. Remdesivir for 5 or 10 Days in Patients with Severe Covid-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 27]. N Engl J Med. 2020;NEJMoa2015301. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2015301
24. Guérin V, Lévy P, Thomas, J, Lardenois T, et al. Azithromycin and Hydroxychloroquine Accelerate Recovery of Outpatients with Mild/Moderate COVID-19. Preprints 2020; 2020050486 doi: 10.20944/preprints202005.0486.v1
25. Heras E, Garibaldi P, Boix M. COVID-19 mortality risk factors in older people in a long-term care center. Researchquare (preprint) 09/02/2020. Doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-70219/v1
26. Lagier JC, Million M, Gautret P, et al. Outcomes of 3,737 COVID-19 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin and other regimens in Marseille, France: A retrospective analysis. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020 Jul-Aug;36:101791. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101791.
27. Lauriola M, Pani A, Ippoliti G, et al. Effect of combination therapy of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on mortality in COVID-19 patients [published online ahead of print, 2020 Sep 14]. Clin Transl Sci. 2020;10.1111/cts.12860. doi:10.1111/cts.12860
28. Lecronier M, Beurton A, Burrel S, et al. Comparison of hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, and standard of care in critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia: an opportunistic retrospective analysis. Crit Care. 2020;24(1):418. Published 2020 Jul 11. doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03117-9

29. Ly TDA, Didier Zanini D, Vincent Laforge V, et al. Pattern of SARS-CoV-2 infection among dependant elderly residents living in retirement homes in Marseille, France, March-June 2020. IHU Preprint. Version 2 du 21 août 2020. IHU Méditerranée Infection #27.https://www.mediterranee-infection.com/pre-prints-ihu/#1593517752065-972df972-bc07
30. Mahévas M, Tran VT, Roumier M, et al. Clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with covid-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational comparative study using routine care data [published correction appears in BMJ. 2020 Jun 18;369:m2328]. BMJ. 2020;369:m1844. Published 2020 May 14. doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1844
31. Membrillo de Novales FJ, Ramírez-Olivencia G, et al.Early Hydroxychloroquine Is Associated with an Increase of Survival in COVID-19 Patients: An Observational Study. Preprints. 2020; 2020050057. doi: 10.20944/preprints202005.0057.v1.
32. Paccoud O, Tubach F, Baptiste A, et al. Compassionate use of hydroxychloroquine in clinical practice for patients with mild to severe Covid-19 in a French university hospital [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 18]. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;ciaa791. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa791
33. Pinato DJ, Zambelli A, Aguilar-Company J, et al. Clinical portrait of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in European cancer patients [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 31]. Cancer Discov. 2020;CD-20-0773. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-20-0773
34. Scholz, M. Derwand, R. Zelenko, V. COVID-19 Outpatients – Early Risk-Stratified Treatment with Zinc Plus Low Dose Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin: A Retrospective Case Series Study. Preprints 2020 ; 2020070025. doi : 10.20944/preprints202007.0025.v1.

35. Yu B, Li C, Chen P, et al. Low dose of hydroxychloroquine reduces fatality of critically ill patients with COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 15] [published correction appears in Sci China Life Sci. 2020 Jun 18;:]. Sci China Life Sci. 2020;1-7. doi:10.1007/s11427-020-1732-2

36. Bernaola N, Mena R, Bernaola A, et al. Observational Study of the Efficiency of Treatments in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19 in Madrid. medRxiv 2020.07.17.20155960; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.17.20155960

37. Catteau L, Dauby N, Montourcy M, et al. Low-dose hydroxychloroquine therapy and mortality in hospitalised patients with COVID-19: a nationwide observational study of 8075 participants. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2020;56(4):106144. doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.106144

38. Di Castelnuovo et al. COVID-19 RISK and Treatments (CORIST) Collaboration members:. Use of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalised COVID-19 patients is associated with reduced mortality: Findings from the observational multicentre Italian CORIST study [published online ahead of print, 2020 Aug 25]. Eur J Intern Med. 2020;S0953-6205(20)30335-6. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2020.08.019

39. Gonzalez MM, Gonzalo ES, Lopez IC et al. The Prognostic Value of Eosinophil Recovery in COVID-19: A Multicentre, Retrospective Cohort Study on Patients Hospitalised in Spanish Hospitals. medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.18.20172874. posted August 21, 2020

40. Ip A, Berry DA, Hansen E, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and Tocilizumab Therapy in COVID-19 Patients - An Observational Study. MedRxiv 2020.05.21.20109207; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.21.20109207

41. Ip A, Ahn J, Zhou Y, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in the treatment of outpatients with mildly symptomatic COVID-19: A multi-center observational study. medRxiv 2020.08.20.20178772; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.20.20178772
42. Mikami T, Miyashita H, Yamada T, et al. Risk Factors for Mortality in Patients with COVID-19 in New York City [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 30]. J Gen Intern Med. 2020;1-10. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-05983-z
43. Roomi S, Ullah W, Ahmed F, et al. Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine and Tocilizumab in Patients With COVID-19: Single-Center Retrospective Chart Review. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(9):e21758. Published 2020 Sep 1. doi:10.2196/21758
44. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Azithromycin With In-Hospital Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State. JAMA. 2020;323(24):2493-2502. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8630
45. Sbidian E, Josse J, Lemaitre G, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin and in-hospital mortality or discharge in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 infection: a cohort study of 4,642 in-patients in France. medRxiv 2020;06.16.20132597; doi: 10.1101/2020.06.16.20132597
46. Singh S, Khan A, Chowdhry M, Chatterjee A. Outcomes of Hydroxychloroquine Treatment Among Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients in the United States- Real-World Evidence From a Federated Electronic Medical Record Network. medRxiv. 2020.05.12;20099028; doi: 10.1101/2020.05.12.20099028
47. Sulaiman T, Mohana A, Alawdah L, et al. The Effect of Early Hydroxychloroquine-based Therapy in COVID-19 Patients in Ambulatory Care Settings: A Nationwide Prospective Cohort Study. medRxiv 2020.09.09.20184143; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.09.20184143

48. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2020;56(1):105949. doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949

49. Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Ubals M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for Early Treatment of Adults with Mild Covid-19: A Randomized-Controlled Trial [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 16]. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;ciaa1009. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1009

50. An MH, Kim MS, Park Y, Bong-Ok Kim, et al. Treatment Response to Hydroxychloroquine and Antibiotics for mild to moderate COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study from South Korea. medRxiv 2020.07.04.20146548; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.04.20146548

51. Chen CP, Lin YC, Chen TC, et al. A Multicenter, randomized, open-label, controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of hydroxychloroquine and a retrospective study in adult patients with mild to moderate Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.08.20148841 posted July 10, 2020

52. Chen L, Zhang ZY, Fu JG. et al. Efficacy and safety of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine in moderate type of COVID-19: a prospective open-label randomized controlled study medRxiv 2020.06.19.20136093. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.19.20136093

53. Chen J, Liu D, Liu L, Liu P, Xu Q, Xia L, et al. A pilot study of hydroxychloroquine in treatment of patients with common coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19). J Zhejiang Unniv. Med Sci. 2020;49:0.

54. Huang M, Tang T, Pang P, et al. Treating COVID-19 with Chloroquine. J Mol Cell Biol. 2020;12(4):322-325. doi:10.1093/jmcb/mjaa014

55. Huang M, Li M, Xiao F, Liang J, et al. Preliminary evidence from a multicenter prospective observational study of the safety and efficacy of chloroquine for the treatment of COVID-19. medRxiv 2020.04.26.20081059. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.26.20081059
56. Kamran SM, Mirza ZEH, Naseem A, et al. Clearing the fog: Is HCQ effective in reducing COVID-19 progression: A randomized controlled trial. medRxiv 2020.07.30.20165365; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.30.20165365
57. Kim MS, Jang SW, Park YK et al, Treatment Response to Hydroxychloroquine, Lopinavir/Ritonavir, and Antibiotics for Moderate COVID 19: A First Report on the Pharmacological Outcomes from South Korea. medRxiv. 2020.05.13;20094193. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.13.20094193.
58. Shabrawishi MH, Naser AY, Aldobyany AM, Negative nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 PCR conversion in Response to different therapeutic interventions. medRxiv. Posted May 11, 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.08.20095679
59. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial. medRxiv . 2020.04.10;20060558. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.10.20060558 (version 1).