

SUMMARY

This summary highlights the recommendations made by the Infection Management Advisory Committee on the antiviral treatment of COVID-19. These recommendations are based on an extensive literature review and collaboration with various experts and clinicians. The full document follows this page.

IMAC will be monitoring new evidence as it emerges and updating the recommendations as needed.

The full document also provides recommendations on management of bacterial infections and addresses recent controversies related to the use of steroids, NSAIDs and ACE Inhibitors in the context of COVID-19.

1. **Lopinavir/ritonavir:** We recommend against the routine use of lopinavir/ritonavir outside a randomized-controlled trial (e.g. CATCO).
2. **Ribavirin and interferon:** In light of insufficient evidence and potential adverse-effects, we advise against the use of ribavirin and interferon.
3. **Remdesivir:** While treatment with remdesivir remains promising, obtaining the drug for compassionate use does not produce the drug in a timely manner. We recommend against further attempts to obtain remdesivir. We recommend enrollment in a randomized-controlled trial of remdesivir if it becomes an option at VIHA.
4. **Hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine:** Based on the lack of clinically convincing outcomes, safety concerns and the fragility of the supply chain, we recommend against routine use of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine. IMAC is committed to evaluating this particular therapy very closely. IMAC members recommended a temporary restriction of the drug to ensure it is used for approved indications.
5. **Tocilizumab:** We were unable to evaluate any convincing evidence published in English that supports the use of tocilizumab. Although limited Chinese literature uses promising language, we currently cannot recommend routine its administration for COVID-19. We support the participation in a clinical trial if it becomes feasible.
6. **Convalescent Plasma/Intravenous Immunoglobulin G:** Due to insufficient evidence and potential risks and costs of blood products, we recommend against routine use of convalescent plasma.
7. **Other agents:** We recommend against treatment with any other investigational agent, including ASC09, azvudine, baloxavir marboxil/favipiravir, camostat mesylate, darunavir/cobicistat, camrelizumab and thymosin due to lack of data, lack of availability, or both.



Date: April 2, 2020_Verison 3

PREPARED FOR:	Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
TOPIC:	Therapies for COVID-19
Prepared by:	Jolanta Piszczek, Clinical Pharmacy Specialist, Infectious Diseases and Antimicrobial Stewardship on behalf of the Infection Management Advisory Committee (IMAC)

Situation

SARS-CoV-2 (aka 2019-nCoV), the virus that causes the clinical illness COVID-19, is a novel RNA virus belonging to the coronavirus family. With hundreds of thousands of cases worldwide, various treatments are being used clinically or undergoing evaluation. In preparation for in-patient treatment of COVID-19 at Island Health facilities, the Infection Management Advisory Committee (IMAC) has reviewed the evidence for these therapies and made recommendations concerning their use in consultation with various VIHA groups such as Intensive Care, Internal Medicine, Hospitalists and Pharmacy. IMAC has also provided general treatment guidelines for anti-infective use in the setting of viral pneumonia in in-patients. In this rapidly evolving situation, as emerging information becomes available, IMAC will make the necessary amendments to this SBAR along with up-to-date recommendations regularly. As this document has also become the reference for the BCCDC position statement on COVID-19 therapies, this SBAR will be updated each Wednesday, and updates will be sent and harmonized with the BCCDC within 48 hours.

Background

Coronaviruses (CoV) are a large family of viruses that cause illness ranging from the common cold to more severe diseases such as Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS-CoV) and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV-1). SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for the COVID-19 pandemic is a non-segmented, positive sense RNA virus most closely related to SARS-CoV-1, with 82% nucleotide identity. There are currently no approved therapies for COVID-19, and no therapies have been robustly evaluated. The majority of published evidence that suggests treatments for COVID-19 is extrapolated from experience with SARS, MERS or limited to case-series. Randomized-controlled trials are ongoing, most notably with three agents, an antiretroviral lopinavir/ritonavir (Kaletra) used for treatment of HIV, a novel investigational antiviral remdesivir and the monoclonal antibody tocilizumab used for rheumatoid arthritis. Non-randomized smaller studies, mainly from China, have included a variety of drugs, with

Chinese Medicine research comprising over half of the studies. One larger RCT of lopinavir/ritonavir in 199 patients in China was published on March 18, 2020 (Cao et al. 2020) showing no benefit; however, experts speculate that this trial will not put an end to other RCTs. In vitro data and animal studies of various agents, mainly for the treatment of SARS, have also been published. A large proportion of the discussion regarding potential treatment for COVID-19 within the medical community has been occurring through non-academic channels such as social media, blogs or the news.

A scientific literature search of potential non-vaccine therapies for COVID-19 and other coronaviruses (search strategy below) resulted in over 200 publications citing the following potential pharmaceutical agents in order of frequency of appearance:

- lopinavir/ritonavir
- chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine
- ribavirin
- remdesivir
- oseltamivir and other neuraminidase inhibitors
- tocilizumab
- convalescent plasma/IVIG
- steroids
- antibiotic therapy

Non-medical sources have also listed a dozen of other agents, including ASC09, azvudine baloxavir marboxil/favipiravir, camostat mesylate, darunavir/cobicistat, camrelizumab and thymosin, among others. These agents were not found using a search of PubMed, Medline or Embase for the treatment of coronaviruses, but limited information was available online through, for example, study protocols.

Articles commenting on safety of other agents, for example ACE-inhibitors and NSAIDs in the context of COVID-19 have also been published.

Expert bodies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the Society of Critical Care Medicine's

(SCCM) Surviving Sepsis Campaign, the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society (ANZICS) and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) have made recommendations for treatment of COVID-19 but they are limited to supportive care. Both support the enrollment of patients in clinical trials for currently unproven therapies. The WHO updated their guideline document regarding clinical management of severe COVID-19 on March 13, 2020, with a main recommendation of ***“Investigational anti-COVID-19 therapeutics should be used only in approved, randomized, controlled trials.”***

Locally, in British Columbia, there is consensus between groups regarding treatment of COVID-19 with unapproved therapies through the BCCDC’s Clinical Reference Group, Provincial Antimicrobial Committee of Experts (PACE) and the clinical community. The March 24, 2020 BCCDC statement is representative of the consensus in the province:

“There are no proven therapies for the prevention or treatment of COVID-19. All agents have the possibility of associated harm, and pharmaceutical supplies province-wide and nationally for many of the possible agents are severely limited. It is recognized that compassionate use of drugs will be pursued for ill patients with no known therapy. Ideally, use of these agents would be through a controlled clinical trial so as to better inform practice; in the absence of research studies, patients should be aware of the risks and benefits of novel therapies, and safety data collected to inform the larger community.”

“Within British Columbia the use of specific antivirals outside of clinical trials is NOT recommended.”

Many Health Authorities have committed to enrolling in an RCT of lopinavir/ritonavir (Kaletra) called CATCO - A Multi-centre, Adaptive, Randomized, Open-label, Controlled Clinical Trial of the Safety and Efficacy of Investigational Therapeutics for the Treatment of COVID-19 in Hospitalized Patients. This RCT, led by Shrin Murthy from BC Women’s and Children’s and funded through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, is currently undergoing Operational Approval after Harmonized Ethics Approval in the province was granted. Currently, Abbvie, the maker of Kaletra would be supplying the study medication. At VIHA, Dr. Daniel Ovakim (Intensivist; VIHA PI), Dr. Gordon Wood (Intensivist, co-investigator) and Dr. Eric Partlow, (Infectious Disease Physician; co-investigator) have volunteered to be the local investigators for CATCO. The clinical trials support team from Intensive Care has been engaged and is awaiting

operational approval after obtaining a harmonized ethics approval of the protocol. Enrolling patients at other sites across the Island is being explored and based on operational ability (e.g. having enough clinicians with necessary training to give consent), but is unlikely to occur at this time.

A second trial of tocilizumab may be underway shortly. Roche, the manufacturer has reached out to Island Health in the process of site identification for a planned clinical trial “A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of tocilizumab in patients with severe covid-19 pneumonia”, aka the COVACTA trial. The study will aim evaluate the safety and efficacy of intravenous tocilizumab added to standard of care in adult patients hospitalized with severe COVID-19 pneumonia compared to placebo plus standard of care. Conversations about the feasibility of adding a VIHA site to this study is currently ongoing.

Assessment

Lopinavir/Ritonavir (Kaletra) with/without Ribavirin

Lopinavir/ritonavir is a combination of antiviral agents used in treatment of HIV. Lopinavir is the effective agent that inhibits the protease activity of coronavirus; ritonavir increases the half-life of lopinavir. Lopinavir/ritonavir has the advantage that it is available in Canada, and has an established toxicity profile. In BC, the agent is non-formulary and mostly obtained through the Centre for Excellence for the treatment of HIV. At this time, it is listed as a “No Stock Available” item from wholesale due to countrywide allocation, but it could potentially be obtained through other channels. Ribavirin may be synergistic when added to lopinavir/ritonavir, especially in other coronaviruses. However, most clinical data for COVID-19 does not support the routine addition of ribavirin. Oral ribavirin is available in Canada, and is currently non-formulary. Inhaled ribavirin is restricted to the treatment of RSV, but has not been evaluated for the treatment of coronaviruses.

Human Clinical Data

Cao at al. 2020: Randomized Controlled Trial of 199 patients with COVID-19 treated in Wubei, China at the peak of the outbreak

- 100 patients were randomized to receive lopinavir/ritonavir for 14 days and 99 to receive standard of care
- Patients included were those who had difficulty maintaining O₂ saturations of >94% on room air; many patients were severely ill and received treatment late as evidenced by the nearly 25% mortality.
- The primary outcome was clinical improvement by 2 points measured by a 7-point ordinal scale, or discharge from hospital, whichever came first.
- The trial did not find a difference between the two groups in the primary outcome. Viral shedding was no different between groups. Mortality was slightly lower in the treatment arm but was not clinically or statistically significant.
- 13.8% of patients in the treatment arm had to stop the drug because of adverse-effects such as gastrointestinal intolerance and laboratory abnormalities.

Young et al. 2020 Cohort study describing 16 COVID-19 patients in Singapore.

- Among 6 patients with hypoxemia, five were treated with lopinavir/ritonavir (200 mg/100 mg BID, which is half of the usual dose of lopinavir).
- Among the 5 patients, 2 patients deteriorated and had persistent nasopharyngeal virus carriage.
- The authors of the study suggested that perhaps ribavirin should have been used in addition

Lopinavir/ritonavir has been used to successfully treat one patient with COVID-19 (Kim 2020).

Small Case-series for COVID-19 (Wang 2020)

- Four patients with COVID-19 were given antiviral treatment including lopinavir/ritonavir.
- After treatment, three patients showed significant improvement in pneumonia-associated symptoms, two of whom were confirmed to be COVID-19 negative and discharged, and one of whom was negative for the virus at the first test.

Larger Retrospective Study for COVID-19 (Chen 2020)

- A retrospective study enrolled 134 patients revealed that there is no significant difference between LPV/r-treated group (n=52), Abidol-treated group (n=34), and control group (n=48) in improving symptom or in reducing viral loads.
- The negative rate of COVID-19 nucleic acid on the 7 day was 71.8%, 82.6%, and 77.1%, respectively (P=.79).

Chu et al. 2004: Open-label before/after study on SARS

- 41 patients treated with lopinavir/ritonavir plus ribavirin were compared to 111 historical control patients treated with ribavirin alone. Poor clinical outcomes (ARDS or death) were lower in treatment group (2.4% vs. 29%). These differences persisted in multivariable models, which attempted to correct for baseline imbalances between the groups.
- Use of lopinavir/ritonavir use correlated with a dramatic reduction in viral load.
- All patients received concomitant ribavirin.
- One patient discontinued the medications due to doubling of liver enzymes

Chan et al. 2003: Retrospective matched multi-center cohort study on SARS

- 75 patients treated with lopinavir/ritonavir were compared with matched controls.
- Up-front treatment with lopinavir/ritonavir combined with ribavirin correlated with reduced mortality (2.3% versus 16%). However, rescue therapy with lopinavir/ritonavir (often without concomitant ribavirin) showed no effect.
- Study reported that the drug was “well tolerated” and side effects were minimal.

Park et al. 2019: Retrospective cohort study on post-exposure prophylaxis against MERS

- This is a retrospective cohort study involving 22 patients with high-risk exposure to a single MERS patient). As a control group, four hospitals with outbreaks of MERS were selected. Post-exposure prophylaxis consisted of a combination of lopinavir/ritonavir (400 mg / 100 mg BID for 11-13 days) plus ribavirin (2000 mg loading dose, then 1200 mg q8hr for four days, then 600 mg q8hr for 6-8 days).

- MERS infections did not occur in anyone treated with post-exposure prophylaxis. However, the manner in which the control group was selected likely biased the study in favor of showing a benefit of post-exposure prophylaxis.
- Post-exposure therapy was generally well tolerated, although most patients reported some side effects (most commonly nausea, diarrhea, stomatitis, or fever). Laboratory evaluation shows frequent occurrence of anemia (45%), leukopenia (40%), and hyperbilirubinemia (100%).

Nine randomized controlled trials of lopinavir/ritonavir in patients with COVID-19 have been registered in China up to February 22, 2020, and two trials in North America, including the Canadian CATCO trial in which VIHA is participating. Currently, the combination of lopinavir/ritonavir is a recommended antiviral regimen in the latest version of the Diagnosis and Treatment of Pneumonia Caused by COVID-19 issued by the National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China.

In-vitro Data

In-vitro activity against SARS

- Lopinavir showed in vitro antiviral activity against SARS at concentration of 4 ug/ml. However, when combined with ribavirin, lopinavir appears considerably more effective (with an inhibitory concentration of 1 ug/mL) (Chu et al. 2004).
- For reference, the peak and trough serum concentrations of lopinavir are 10 and 5.5 ug/ml
- An analysis of molecular dynamics simulations showed that the SARS-CoV 3CLpro enzyme could be inhibited by the combination of lopinavir and ritonavir. (Nukoolkarn 2008).
- A binding analysis of the main coronavirus proteinase with lopinavir showed that half of lopinavir is left outside the catalytic site, and the efficacy of lopinavir may be poor (Zhang 2004).
- Another study showed that neither lopinavir nor ritonavir has an effect on the replication of SARS-CoV (Yamamoto 2004).

There are no reported in vitro studies of COVID-19.

Animal Data

Lopinavir/ritonavir was effective against MERS-CoV in a primate animal model (Chan 2015).

Safety

Diarrhea, nausea, and asthenia are the most frequently reported reactions in patients receiving lopinavir therapy for treatment of coronaviruses (Hurst 2000). Elevated total bilirubin, triglyceride, and hepatic enzyme levels have also been reported. A retrospective study of MERS showed that the most common symptoms and laboratory tests of lopinavir/ritonavir were diarrhea (40.9%), nausea (40.9%), stomatitis (18.2%), fever (13.6%), anemia (45.0%), leukopenia (40.0%), and hyperbilirubinemia (100%) (Park 2019). However, the symptoms and laboratory tests returned to normal after lopinavir therapy ceased. In the 2020 RCT by Cao et al. 13.8% of patients needed to stop lopinavir/ritonavir due to adverse effects, but no ADR was considered serious. Drug interactions with protease-inhibitors are well known and limit their use somewhat. Patients receiving interacting therapies such as amiodarone, certain statins and benzodiazepines, rifampin and many others are generally not candidates for treatment with lopinavir/ritonavir.

From experience in treatment of hepatitis C, ribavirin is well known to be a poorly tolerated drug. Flu-like symptoms and nausea develop in nearly 50% of patients and lead to premature discontinuation of hepatitis C treatment. Regular monitoring of CBC for hemolytic anemia, leukopenia and dose adjustment may be required for toxicity as ribavirin causes bone marrow suppression in many after 2-4 weeks of treatment. Ribavirin may also cause liver toxicity and transaminitis.

Remdesivir

Remdesivir is an investigational nucleotide analog with broad-spectrum antiviral activity. It was initially developed and evaluated for the treatment of Ebola. It inhibits RNA-dependent RNA polymerase, which is 96% identical in sequence between MERS, SARS and COVID-19. Remdesivir has demonstrated in vitro and in vivo activity in animal models against the viral pathogens MERS and SARS (Sheahan 2020 and others).

Unfortunately, remdesivir is not commercially available and not approved by the FDA yet. Remdesivir was used on the basis of Compassionate Use for one of the first patients with COVID-19 in the United States (Holshue 2020). The patient improved rapidly with 7 days of treatment and no adverse effects. Viral PCR was negative for the virus after one day of therapy.

Remdesivir is being used in several stage 3 trials in the United States being sponsored by NIAID. Enrollment in this trial seems like a desirable approach to antiviral therapy but is not feasible in Canada at this time. There are four other trials registered world-wide.

The process of obtaining remdesivir in Canada for Compassionate Use (CU) outside of the abovementioned RCT has been verified with the company (Gilead) and Health Canada. It consists of a multi-step process that includes an application on the Gilead website, as well as a Special Access Program (SAP) application to Health Canada. At VIHA, an application was filed for CU for the first patient admitted to the RJH ICU on March 20, 2020. While approval was granted the same day by Gilead and Health Canada, the drug never arrived. Personal communication confirmed that one group in Edmonton attempted to get remdesivir for compassionate use four times with the same result. The inclusion criteria for the use of remdesivir seem prohibitive; patients need to be diagnosed with severe, virologically confirmed disease failing supportive care, on ventilator support but not receiving vasopressor support or experiencing organ failure. Gilead states on their website that stock is limited and we were unable to verify if the drug would be provided free of charge. At this time, further applications for CU and SAP are unlikely to produce the drug in a timely manner and should not be attempted.

Chloroquine/Hydroxychloroquine

Chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine are generally used for treatment of malaria, amebiasis and certain inflammatory conditions like rheumatoid arthritis. It has anti-viral activity in vitro, but no established clinical efficacy in treatment of viral disease. Chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine appear to work via multiple mechanisms, including interference with cellular receptor ACE2 (potentially making it particularly effective against SARS and COVID-19) and impairment of acidification of endosomes, which interferes with virus trafficking within cells. It also has immunomodulatory effects which may attenuate cytokine

storm reactions in severe disease. However, it should be noted that immunosuppressive actions may be harmful in viral disease.

Chloroquine is currently unavailable for order in Canada. Hydroxychloroquine is currently available in Canada and is on the BC provincial formulary. However, due to strong global demand of hydroxychloroquine after President Trump’s press release on March 19, 2020 describing the drug as a “game-changer”, supply chain issues of hydroxychloroquine should be regarded as unstable. Various professional groups including the FDA, Ontario Medical Association and Ontario Pharmacists Association have released statements discouraging the off-label use of hydroxychloroquine and imploring the medical community to reserve the supply for those who take it for evidence-based indications.

Disconcerting safety reports have emerged since Trump’s press release. A couple from Arizona have ingested an aquarium-cleaning agent containing chloroquine for prophylaxis leading to one death and one serious hospitalization. There have also been reports of severe overdoses leading to cardiac toxicity in Africa, where the agent is routinely used for malaria. The safety of hydroxychloroquine has not been assessed in the treatment of coronavirus infections. In general, hydroxychloroquine that is prescribed and monitored by health care provider is well tolerated based on experience with its use in patients with lupus and rheumatoid arthritis. Common side effects include gastrointestinal intolerance. Less common side effects to monitor include hypoglycemia and skin reactions. Other reported toxicities that are rarely encountered clinically include QT prolongation, bone marrow suppression, and hepatotoxicity. Retinal toxicities are a known adverse effect of hydroxychloroquine but typically described after years of prolonged use.

Human Data

One small case series of 22 hospitalized patients in France (Gautret et al. 2020)

- 22 patients received 200mg of hydroxychloroquine three times per day for 10 days; 6 patients received azithromycin.
- The primary endpoint was virological clearance on day 6.

- The trial compared the primary outcome to 16 controls who refused to participate or were treated at another center. Some patients were asymptomatic.
- The study reported that COVID-19 PCR was negative on 100% of patients on day 6 who took both drugs, 57.1% in those who received hydroxychloroquine alone and 12.5% of those who did not receive treatment.
- No clinical endpoints were reported. Due to these factors, any meaningful clinical conclusions from this study cannot be derived.

-

A Chinese report states that chloroquine use in 100 patients “is superior to the control treatment in inhibiting the exacerbation of pneumonia, improving lung imaging findings, promoting a virus negative conversion, and shortening the disease course” but patient data was not reported (Gao 2020). No other publication providing patient data pertaining to this study has been found. The article is not available in English and this data could not be assessed. A news report stated that the study investigator cited that “120 patients treated with chloroquine phosphate developed critical illness, and 81 patients have been discharged so far.” The study’s author was emailed for detailed patient data and the group is awaiting response.

An expert consensus group in Guangdong China is recommending chloroquine phosphate 500 mg bid x 10 days for all patients with COVID-19 without contraindications to chloroquine (Jiang Shanping 2020). No clinical evidence was provided to support this recommendation. There are multiple trials listed on the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry regarding chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine; no data from these trials has been published in peer-reviewed journals. As of March 22, 2020, there are at least 5 clinical trials of hydroxychloroquine in various stages of development.

In-vitro Data

In vitro data using cell lines shows that chloroquine can inhibit COVID-19 with a 50% inhibitory concentration of 1 μM , implying that therapeutic levels could be achieved in humans (Wang 2020). The 50% inhibitory concentration of chloroquine for SARS is closer to 9 μM , suggesting that chloroquine could be more effective against COVID-19 than SARS (Al-Bari 2017).

A study published in Clinical Infectious Diseases suggested that hydroxychloroquine might be more potent for COVID-19 than chloroquine. The EC₅₀=0.72 μM for hydroxychloroquine was found to be more potent than chloroquine (EC₅₀=5.47 μM) in vitro. The study cited that “based on PK models results, a loading dose of 400 mg twice daily of hydroxychloroquine sulfate given orally, followed by a maintenance dose of 200 mg given twice daily for 4 days is recommended for SARS-CoV-2 infection, as it reached three times the potency of chloroquine phosphate when given 500 mg twice daily 5 days in advance” (Yao 2020).

Animal Data

Chloroquine failed to work in mice infected with SARS (Bernard 2006).

Convalescent Plasma/Intravenous Immunoglobulin G (IVIG)

Convalescent plasma treatment refers to the process of drawing plasma, containing lymphocytes and antibodies (mainly Ig-G) from patients who have recovered from a viral illness and administering that plasma to a patient infected with the illness. Also referred to as passive immunization, convalescent plasma has been used for over a century as attempted treatment for variety of infectious diseases including the Spanish Flu of 1918, Ebola and SARS.

Human Data

There is little evidence for the use of convalescent plasma in the treatment of COVID-19. Currently there are two case reports, a retrospective case series (n=5), and a prospective cohort study (n=20). Generally, authors report that patients treated with convalescent plasma appeared to experience improvement in clinical status and oxygen requirements, and successful weaning from mechanical ventilation. Due to the nature of the studies, there is high potential for selection bias and higher-quality data is needed.

Shen et al 2020: Case series of five critically ill patients in China requiring mechanical ventilation (one requiring ECMO).

- Patients received convalescent plasma from 5 recovered patients with Ig-G binding titers > 1:1000 on day 10 (N=1) or 20 (N=4) of their hospitalization
- All showed significant clinical improvements 2-4 weeks after receiving therapy in temperature, SOFA score, PaO₂/FiO₂, viral loads, neutralizing antibody titers and imaging findings
- ARDS resolved in 4/5 patients
- 3/5 patients weaned from mechanical ventilation within 2-weeks
- 1 patient on ECMO was weaned on day 5 post-transfusion
- As of Mar 25: 3/5 patients discharged; 2/5 patients in hospital in stable condition

Roback and Guarner followed the Shen et al. study by an editorial discussing the feasibility and limitations of using convalescent plasma. Some important limitations noted included the lack of a control group, use of multiple other therapies like steroids and antivirals and lack of clarity regarding optimal timing for plasma administration. The editorial also proposed several considerations that would need to be addressed to enable scaling convalescent plasma therapy to meet demand: These included strategies for donor recruitment, sample retrieval and storage, patient transfusion logistics and use of predictive modeling to manage donors and recipients. While useful, this editorial highlights the practical challenges of routine administration of convalescent plasma.

Duan et al 2020: Prospective feasibility pilot of 20 patients in 3 Wuhan hospitals; 10 treated with convalescent plasma (200ml with neutralizing antibody titer > 1:640) and 10 matched controls

- Study reports significantly improved clinical and radiographical markers with all 10 treated patients having de-escalation or cessation of respiratory support therapy.
- Cases were compared to a control group of 10 randomly selected patients from the same hospitals and matched by age, gender and disease severity.
- All patients also received maximal supportive therapy and antiviral therapies.
- Compared with the control group, the group treated with convalescent plasma had significantly higher oxygen saturation (median 93% vs 96%) and a higher number of improved/discharge patients. Due to the small sample, the differences were not statistically significant.

- There were no significant morbidities and mortalities associated with convalescent plasma.
- Limitations include use of concomitant therapies, lack of details regarding clinical outcomes, and the lack of power.

Finally, two news articles discussed individual critically ill patients (a 69 year-old female and 74 year-old female) from China who experienced clinical improvement after receiving convalescent plasma therapy.

Other viral illnesses

There is low-quality evidence, primarily observational/retrospective uncontrolled case series with small sample sizes reporting benefit for convalescent plasma use in severe viral respiratory illnesses. The majority of the evidence is derived from treatment of SARS, with a two studies in H1N1 influenza. Some data suggests that early administration of convalescent plasma confers more benefit than delayed administration, possible due to suppression of viremia and avoidance of the immune hyper-activation. Overall, little meaningful conclusions can be drawn from these studies due to their limitations.

Soo et al 2004: A small retrospective cohort of convalescent plasma compared to increased doses of corticosteroid for 40 patients infected with SARS who deteriorated despite ribavirin and lower-dose steroids showed that those who received convalescent plasma group had a lower chance of death (N=0 vs. 5, NS)

Cheng et al 2004: 80 patients with SARS who had deteriorated despite standard treatment which included antibiotics, ribavirin and corticosteroids were given convalescent plasma. The study found that the mortality rate in these patients was 12.5% compared to historically documented SARS mortality of 17% in Hong Kong. The study noted that administration of plasma earlier in disease course, particularly prior to day 14 had more impact in mortality vs. later administration (6.3% mortality vs. 21.9%).

Yeh et al 2005: Three health-care worker with SARS in China all received convalescent plasma and all survived. A similar 3-person case series of MERS patients by Ko et al, 2018, also administered convalescent plasma and reported treatment success.

Two studies by the same authors, Hung et al. of H1N1 patients comprise the most robust support for convalescent plasma; however must be interpreted with caution as generalizability to COVID-19 may be limited. In 2011, 93 pts w H1N1 who required ICU-level care, were given convalescent plasma vs. supportive care in a non-randomized fashion. Supportive care was not defined. Plasma group had lower mortality (20% vs 55%) which was stated to be statistically and clinically significant. A follow-up study two years later in 2013 with improved methodology was conducted. This multicenter prospective double-blind RCT evaluated IVIG donated by 2009 H1N1 survivors vs. IVIG from patients not previously infected. While viral load were lower in the treatment group, a subgroup analysis found a mortality benefit only for patients who received the IVIG with H1N1 antibodies within 5 days of symptom onset.

Summarizing the above-mentioned data, two systematic reviews and meta-analyses concluded that while studies are promising, no definitive recommendations can be made due to lack of properly conducted clinical trials (Mustafa et al 2018, Mo et al 2016). A systematic review that combined 8 observational trials of SARS and H1N1 patients by Mair-Jenkins 2015 et al. showed improved mortality after convalescent plasma but is flawed by the low quality of included studies.

There are several additional studies that are less relevant in this assessment, for example those evaluating treatment in conditions such as Ebola, rubella, hepatitis A and viral myocarditis which were not reviewed or considered.

In addition to the inherent risks associated with blood product utilization there are theoretical risks specific to convalescent plasma therapy. Antibody dependent enhancement (ADE) results in the enhancement of the target disease in the presence of the antibodies given. There is also the possibility of attenuation of the natural immune response. The most common side effects of treatment with convalescent plasma are minor transfusion related reactions (urticaria, febrile non-hemolytic transfusion reaction and pruritis). Reported rates for these minor complications range from 10-70%. One RCT investigating high vs. low-titre influenza plasma reported 34% of patients experiencing a serious adverse event including ARDS and respiratory distress.

Overall, convalescent plasma poses an attractive treatment option that warrants further investigation for the treatment of COVID-19. A careful consideration regarding the feasibility of large-scale treatment with blood products for this disease in conjunction with risks and costs needs to be undertaken.

Other Therapies

Tocilizumab –Tocilizumab is an anti-interleukin 6 monoclonal antibody used as immunotherapy for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. While the maker of the drug, Sanofi is currently in discussion with the FDA and Health Canada to initiate trials for treatment of COVID-19, evidence for the use of this medication is limited to unpublished case-reports. For example, according to a blog post on the IDSA website, there is anecdotal evidence that the drug has been used in cases in China. Through google-translation, the blog stated that tocilizimab was used in cases of severe inflammatory response to COVID-19 with laboratory-proven high levels of IL6 (test only available via the Mayo Clinic at present). The Chinese medical community appears to support the drug to “control the cytokine storm” and “purify the blood” according to the IDSA blog.

No medical journal has published a case or case series as of March 25, 2020. The theory behind this therapy is that this may treat a small select group of severe COVID-19 patients who develop features of hyperinflammation such as cytokine release syndrome (Mehta 2020). Additionally, a group retrospectively explored T-Cell levels in 522 COVID-19 patients. Given T-Cells are important for fighting viral infections, and the correlation between increasing levels of IL-6 and lower T-Cell counts, this group suggests exploring this pathway blockade in hopes of preventing further patient deterioration (Diao 2020). There exists early reports of its use in Italy as well. Several clinical trials are underway (NCT04317092 , NCT04306705 , NCT04310228). One is an RCT but the other are single arm intervention or parallel assignment without a placebo comparator. Other IL-6 antibody therapies are also being considered for clinical study (e.g. sarilumab; NCT04315298).

Oseltamivir - Neuraminidase inhibitors do not seem to have activity against COVID-19 (Tan et al 2004). Initial empiric therapy with neuraminidase inhibitors could be reasonable during influenza season in critically ill patients, if there is concern that the patient might have influenza pneumonia. Such patients

can have confirmatory nasopharyngeal swabs for influenza. Currently, in many locations, patients presenting with viral pneumonia are much more likely to have influenza than COVID-19. Otherwise, the role for oseltamivir specifically for COVID-19 is limited.

Steroids - Steroid use outside of the Surviving Sepsis Campaign is not recommended. Steroids have not demonstrated benefit in prior SARS or MERS epidemics. Steroids may increase viral shedding (Lee 2004) and impair immune function. However, steroids may be used if there is another clear-cut indication (e.g. coronavirus plus asthma exacerbation, refractory septic shock). WHO guidelines for the supportive treatment of COVID-19 echo this statement. There are no controlled clinical trials on the use of corticosteroids in COVID-19 patients or other coronaviruses (Alhazzani 2020). Surviving Sepsis Campaign Guidelines on the Management of Critically Ill Adults with COVID19 conducted a comprehensive review and concluded that routine use of steroids solely for the indication of viral pneumonia cannot be supported.

Antibiotic Therapies

Initial Therapy - As with any viral pneumonia, COVID-19 itself is not an indication for antibiotics. However, patients who present with respiratory symptoms and pulmonary infiltrates on imaging may meet the diagnostic criteria for pneumonia. Co-infection with a bacteria pathogen can be possible, and as per standard CAP therapy, antibiotics are indicated. At Island Health, the standard therapy for in-patient treatment for community acquired pneumonia is ceftriaxone 1-2 g IV daily with a macrolide, usually azithromycin 500mg IV x 3 days or azithromycin 500mg PO x1 day followed by 250mg PO x 4 days. While patients infected with COVID-19 may have travel history or have come in contact with travelers, extending the spectrum of antimicrobials is not warranted unless the patient has significant risk factors for drug-resistant organisms. This is generally limited to health-care exposure in an area with high rates of antibiotic resistance in the last 90 days. Such patients should obtain an Infectious Disease consult for tailored antibiotic therapy.

De-escalating antimicrobials is usually possible in confirmed COVID-19 infection. Procalcitonin is a useful marker and is usually negative. This can be combined with other clinical features like lymphopenia,

normal neutrophil count and lack of positive bacterial cultures. Based on these tests, antibiotics might be discontinued in <48 hours.

Delayed Bacterial Infection – Hospital and ventilator-associated pneumonia can emerge during the hospital stay. Among patients who died from COVID-19, one series found that 11/68 (16%) had secondary infections (Ruan 2020). Hospital-acquired infection may be investigated and treated according to current VAP/HAP guidelines. At VIHA, piperacillin/tazobactam or a carbapenem is the standard of treatment, with added vancomycin if the patient has MRSA risk factors.

NSAIDs – On March 17, the World Health Organization recommended NSAIDs should be avoided for treatment of COVID-19 symptoms avoid taking ibuprofen, after French officials warned that anti-inflammatory drugs could worsen effects of the virus. The warning by French Health Minister Olivier Veran followed a recent study in The Lancet medical journal that hypothesised that an enzyme boosted by anti-inflammatory drugs such as ibuprofen could facilitate and worsen COVID-19 infections. After two days of contemplation, the WHO reissued a statement on Twitter stating that there is no specific reason to avoid NSAIDs based on this data.

ACE-I and ARBs – COVID-19 uses the ACE2 enzyme to gain entry into human cells, and some reports state that those taking ACE-inhibitors or ARBs may experience an up-regulation of these enzymes. Theoretically, patients taking these medications may have increased susceptibility to the various; however this has not been shown clinically. Various expert groups such as the Canadian Cardiovascular Society and Hypertension Canada issued statements that uncontrolled hypertension or heart failure for which these medications are used would put patients at increased risk of poor outcomes due to COVID-19 and recommended that these agents not be discontinued.

Recommendations on April 2, 2020

IMAC recommends the following regarding therapies for COVID-19 and associated infections:

1. **Lopinavir/ritonavir:** We recommend against the routine use of lopinavir/ritonavir outside a randomized-controlled trial (e.g. CATCO).

2. **Ribavirin and interferon:** In light of insufficient evidence and potential adverse-effects, we advise against the use of ribavirin and interferon.
3. **Remdesivir:** While treatment with remdesivir remains promising, obtaining the drug for compassionate use does not produce the drug in a timely manner. We recommend against further attempts to obtain remdesivir. We recommend enrollment in a randomized-controlled trial of remdesivir if it becomes an option at VIHA.
4. **Hydroxychloroquine/chloroquine:** Based on the lack of clinically convincing outcomes, safety concerns and the fragility of the supply chain, we recommend against routine use of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine. IMAC is committed to evaluating this particular therapy very closely. IMAC members are recommending a temporary restriction of the drug to ensure it is used for approved indications.
5. **Tocilizumab:** We were unable to evaluate any convincing evidence published in English that supports the use of tocilizumab. Although limited Chinese literature uses promising language, we currently cannot recommend routine its administration for COVID-19. We support the participation in a clinical trial if it becomes feasible.
6. **Convalescent Plasma/Intravenous Immunoglobulin G:** Due to insufficient evidence and potential risks and costs of blood products, we recommend against routine use of convalescent plasma.
7. **Other agents:** We recommend against treatment with any other investigational agent, including ASC09, azvudine, baloxavir marboxil/favipiravir, camostat mesylate, darunavir/cobicistat, camrelizumab and thymosin due to lack of data, lack of availability, or both.
8. We acknowledge that there will be some patients in whom salvage efforts may be appropriate. We leave those decisions to individual prescribers and encourage them to contact Infectious Disease Specialists, Medical Microbiologists and/or ID&AMS pharmacist for discussion about appropriateness, safety and operational details.
9. IMAC supports practicing evidence-based medicine and recommends against exceptionalism. We encourage clinicians to obtain best-practice information from reputable sources such as medical literature of acceptable quality, World Health Organization, BC Center for Disease Control and not from blogs, news articles, press interviews, social media and politicians.
10. We recommend that VIHA become a partner site for any randomized controlled trials (e.g. CATCO) that would allow ethical and appropriate evaluation of investigational use of therapies.

This option is also favourable as it would not deplete the sensitive supply chain of drugs for those who require it for approved indications.

- 11.** We recommend against the use of natural health products or Chinese medicines for treating COVID-19 due to lack of data or an inability to evaluate the data in English.
- 12.** We recommend against the use of oseltamivir outside its current indication for suspected and confirmed influenza.
- 13.** We recommend that patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who meet diagnostic criteria for CAP be started on ceftriaxone and azithromycin for concomitant bacterial infection until such infection is ruled out.
- 14.** We recommend against broad-spectrum antibiotic treatments based on travel history alone and reserve these agents for patients with significant risk factors for drug-resistant bacteria (e.g. exposure to health-care in an endemic area). Infectious Diseases Specialists should be consulted in these circumstances.
- 15.** We recommend standard therapy of piperacillin/tazobactam or a carbapenem with or without vancomycin for the treatment of health-care associated infection such as hospital or ventilator associated pneumonia.
- 16.** We recommend that patients on ACE-I and ARBs continue these agents as indicated and not cease therapy solely on the basis of COVID-19.
- 17.** We recommend that acetaminophen be used preferentially for symptomatic management of COVID-19 but do not recommend against the use of NSAIDs such as ibuprofen.
- 18.** We recommend that the summary articulating these points be posted on the VIHA COVID-19 website, the Medical Affairs website and circulated internally as a reference for best practices. Evidence would be reviewed regularly by IMAC and this reference would be regularly updated. We have published a concordant SPECTRUM pathway and recommend that it is promoted.

Search Terms: ("COVID-19"[All Fields] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2"[Supplementary Concept] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2"[All Fields] OR "2019-nCoV"[All Fields] OR "SARS-CoV-2"[All Fields] OR "2019nCoV"[All Fields] OR ("Wuhan"[All Fields] AND ("coronavirus"[MeSH Terms] OR "coronavirus"[All Fields])) AND 2019/12[PDAT] : 2030[PDAT])) AND ("therapy"[Subheading] OR "therapy"[All Fields] OR "treatment"[All Fields] OR "therapeutics"[MeSH Terms] OR "therapeutics"[All Fields])
Search Databases: PubMed, Medline, Ovid
Search Date: March 19, 2020

References:

1. Alhazzani W, Møller MH, Arabi YM, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign : Guidelines on the Management of Critically Ill Adults with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2019. <https://www.sccm.org/getattachment/Disaster/SSC-COVID19-Critical-Care-Guidelines.pdf>
2. COVID-19 Guidelines Version 1. The Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society (ANZICS). 2020. http://cec.health.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/572512/ANZICS-COVID-19-Guidelines-Version-1.pdf
3. Management of Patients with Confirmed 2019-nCoV. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html>. March 7, 2020.
4. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A trial of lopinavir–ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001282.
5. Chan KS et. al. Treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome with lopinavir/ritonavir: a multicentre retrospective matched cohort study. *Hong Kong Med J* 2003;9:399-406 | Number 6, December 2003
6. Sheahan, T.P., Sims, A.C., Leist, S.R. et al. Comparative therapeutic efficacy of remdesivir and combination lopinavir, ritonavir, and interferon beta against MERS-CoV. *Nat Commun* 11, 222 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13940-6>
7. Holshue ML et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:929-936. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001191
8. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, et al. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA*. Published online March 03, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3204
9. Chu CM, Cheng VCC, Hung IFN, et al. Role of lopinavir/ritonavir in the treatment of SARS: initial virological and clinical findings. *Thorax* 2004;59:252-256.
10. Chan JF et. al. Treatment With Lopinavir/Ritonavir or Interferon-β1b Improves Outcome of MERS-CoV Infection in a Nonhuman Primate Model of Common Marmoset. *J Infect Dis*. 2015 Dec 15;212(12):1904-13. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiv392. Epub 2015 Jul 21.
11. Park SY et. al. Post-exposure prophylaxis for Middle East respiratory syndrome in healthcare workers. *J Hosp Infect*. 2019 Jan;101(1):42-46. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2018.09.005. Epub 2018 Sep 18.
12. Lim J et. al. Case of the Index Patient Who Caused Tertiary Transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Korea: the Application of Lopinavir/Ritonavir for the Treatment of COVID-19 Pneumonia Monitored by Quantitative RT-PCR. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2020 Feb 17;35(6):e79
13. Momattin H et. al. A Systematic Review of therapeutic agents for the treatment of the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV). *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2019 Jul - Aug;30:9-18. doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2019.06.012. Epub 2019 Jun 25.
14. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results from an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. Unpublished manuscript found at AJC.com (Atlanta news) March 19, 2020.
15. Wang M et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell Res*. 2020 Mar;30(3):269-271. doi: 10.1038/s41422-020-0282-0. Epub 2020 Feb 4.

16. Al-Baru AA. Targeting endosomal acidification by chloroquine analogs as a promising strategy for the treatment of emerging viral diseases. *Pharma Res Per*, 5(1), 2017, e00293, doi: 10.1002/prp2.293
17. Barnard DL et al. Evaluation of immunomodulators, interferons and known in vitro SARS-coV inhibitors for inhibition of SARS-coV replication in BALB/c mice. *Antivir Chem Chemother*. 2006;17(5):275-84.
18. Gao J et al. Breakthrough: Chloroquine phosphate has shown apparent efficacy in treatment of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical studies. *BioScience Trends*. DOI: 10.5582/bst.2020.01047.
19. Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi. [Expert consensus on chloroquine phosphate for the treatment of novel coronavirus pneumonia]. 2020 Feb 20;43(0):E019. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1001-0939.2020.0019. [Epub ahead of print]
20. Tan E et al. Inhibition of SARS Coronavirus Infection In Vitro with Clinically Approved Antiviral Drugs. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* Vol. 10, No. 4, April 2004.
21. Shen et. al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA*. Mar 27 2020. *JAMA*. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4783. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/articlepdf/2763983/jama_shen_2020_pc_200002.pdf
22. Roback JD and Guarner J. Convalescent Plasma to Treat COVID-19 Possibilities and Challenges. *JAMA*. Mar 27 2020. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2763982>
23. Duan K et al. The feasibility of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID19 patients: a pilot study. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.16.20036145v1.full.pdf>