The Medical Letter®
on Drugs and Therapeutics

Treatments Considered for COVID-19 (Updated July 15, 2021)

The table below lists pertinent evidence on the clinical effectiveness and safety of some drugs and other therapies being considered for COVID-19. Most authorities recommend use of these drugs only in the setting of a clinical trial or when access via clinical trial is not available. **Inclusion in this table is not a recommendation for use for treatment of COVID-19.** The information on these drugs is evolving rapidly and The Medical Letter does not warrant that all the material in this publication is current, accurate, or complete in every respect.

RECENT TABLE UPDATES

July 15, 2021

Remdesivir
- Updated NIH and IDSA guidelines
- No difference in viral load or mortality vs standard care in open-label NOR-Solidarity trial

Monoclonal antibodies – Updated NIH and IDSA guidelines

GM-CSF Inhibitor – Lenalizumab NIH guidelines updated

Dexamethasone – Updated NIH guidelines

IL-6 Inhibitors – updated NIH guidelines for tocilizumab; associated with reduced mortality in a WHO meta-analysis

Janus Kinase Inhibitors – updated NIH guidelines for baricitinib

Hydroxychloroquine – no difference in viral load or mortality vs standard care in open-label NOR-Solidarity trial

Azithromycin – did not reduce hospitalization or death in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19

Adenovirus-Vectored Vaccines –
- Warning about risk of Guillain-Barré syndrome added to label of J&J vaccine
- Efficacy of AstraZeneca vaccine against variants, including Delta, in Canada study
- *In vitro* data against Delta variant for J&J vaccine

mRNA Vaccines –
- Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine associated with lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in pregnant women
- Israel Ministry of Health reports lower vaccine efficacy with Delta variant
- Efficacy against variants, including Delta, in Canada study
- FDA investigating adverse events of interest with Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine in persons ≥65 years old

June 30, 2021

Antivirals –
- Lower mortality risk in retrospective trials with remdesivir

Monoclonal antibodies –
- Use of bamlanivimab and etesevimab restricted nationwide due to increased frequency of variants

IL-6 Inhibitors –
- FDA issues EUA for tocilizumab in hospitalized patients

Adenovirus-Vectored Vaccines –
- Efficacy of AstraZeneca vaccine against Delta variant
- Mixing of ChAdOx1 vaccine and Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine

mRNA Vaccines –
- FDA to add warning about myocarditis
- Efficacy of Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine against Delta variant
- Mixing of ChAdOx1 vaccine and Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine


Indicates change in selected section from last version in Table of Contents on next page

Table of Contents

INVESTIGATIONAL DRUGS

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
Antivirals			
FAVIPIRAVIR – *AVIGAN* (FUJIFILM) *(updated 9/24/2020)* **Dosage:** ▪ 1600 mg PO bid on day 1, then 600 mg bid on days 2-7[1] ▪ Some suggest a dosage of 2400-3000 mg bid on day 1, then 1200-1800 mg bid[2]	**Q Cai et al. 2020**[1] **Population:** hospitalized, non-severe (n=80) **Design:** open-label, non-randomized **Results:** shorter viral clearance time (4 vs 11 days) and improvements in chest CT (91.4% vs 62.2%) with favipiravir vs lopinavir/ritonavir; results should be interpreted with caution[1] **Chen et al. 2020**[3] **Population:** hospitalized patients (n=236) **Design:** ▪ randomized, open-label ▪ favipiravir vs arbidol (an influenza drug not available in the US); both in addition to standard therapy **Results:** ▪ clinical recovery rate at day 7 was similar for favipiravir and arbidol (51.67% vs 61.21%; p=0.1396) ▪ in patients with moderate disease, clinical recovery rates were higher with favipiravir than arbidol (71.43% vs 55.86%; p=0.0199) **Limitations**: ▪ not peer-reviewed **Ivashchenko et al. Clin Infect Dis 2020**[5] *(added 8/9/2020)*	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Elevated LFTs, diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, chest pain and elevated serum uric acid **Drug Interactions:** ▪ May increase serum concentrations of some drugs such as acetaminophen, penicillins, tazobactam, repaglinide, pioglitazone and rosiglitazone, oseltamivir, theophylline, and progestins	▪ Not FDA-approved and not available yet in the US ▪ Approved in other countries for treatment of influenza ▪ Russian Ministry of Health granted conditional marketing authorization for favipiravir (*Avifavir*) *(added 8/9/2020)* ▪ Viral RNA polymerase inhibitor ▪ Limited data available to date; may be less effective for patients with more severe disease ▪ Randomized controlled trial of favipiravir alone and in combination with tocilizumab ongoing in China **Pregnancy:** ▪ Contraindicated for use in pregnant women[4] ▪ Teratogenic effects in animal studies ▪ Men taking the drug should avoid intercourse with pregnant women during treatment and for at least 7 days after the last dose

FAVIPIRAVIR (continued)	**Population:** hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 pneumonia in Russia; 25% on supplemental oxygen and 75% on ambient air (n=60) **Design:** adaptive, multicenter, randomized, open-label trial; results from 60 patients in phase II trial presented ▪ Favipiravir 1600 mg BID on day 1, then 600 mg bid days 2-14, favipiravir 1800 mg BID on day 1, then 800 mg bid days 2-14, or standard of care (75% received hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine) ▪ Mean 6.7 days from start of symptoms **Results:** ▪ Viral clearance (2 negative PCR tests with at least a 24-hour interval) was achieved by day 5 in 62.5% of patients taking favipiravir vs 30.0% of those who received standard of care (p=0.018) ▪ Viral clearance by day 10 was achieved in 92.5% of favipiravir-treated patients vs 80.0% on standard of care (p=0.155) **Limitations:** interim results **Phase 3 Trial 2020**[6]*(added 9/24/2020)* **Population:** COVID-19 patients with non-severe pneumonia in Japan (n=156) **Design:** randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blind phase 3 trial **Results:** recovery time was 11.9 days with favipiravir vs 14.7 days with placebo (p=0.0136)

Limitations: preliminary data; trial not yet published

1. Q Cai et al. Experimental treatment with favipiravir for COVID-19: an open-label control study. Available at : https://www.researchgate.net/pulication/340000976_experimental_treatment_with_favipiravir_for_covid-19_an_open-label_control_study. Accessed April 2, 2020.
2. JM Sanders et al. Pharmacologic treatment for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). A review. JAMA 2020 April 13 (epub).
3. C Chen et al. Favipiravir versus arbidol for COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037432v2.article-info. Accessed April 1, 2020.
4. FG Hayden and N Shindo. Influenza virus polymerase inhibitors in clinical development. Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2019; 32:176.
5. AA Ivashchenko et al. Avifavir for treatment of patients with moderate COVID-19: interim results of a phase II/III multicenter randomized clinical trial. Clin Infect Dis 2020 August 9 (epub).
6. Press release. Anti-influenza drug Avigan Tablet meets primary endpoint in phase III clinical trial in Japan for COVID-19 patients. Fujifilm. Available at: https://www.fujifilm.com/jp/en/news/hq/5451. Accessed September 24, 2020.

REMDESIVIR –
***VEKLURY* (GILEAD)**

(updated 7/15/2021)

Dosage[1]: *(updated 11/9/2020)*

- Patients ≥12 years old and ≥40 kg: 200 mg IV on day 1, then 100 mg IV once/day for a total of 5 or 10 days[2]
- Infuse over 30-120 minutes
- In addition to standard care
- Not recommended if eGFR <30 ml/min or ALT >10x ULN; discontinue if signs and symptoms of liver inflammation are observed
- Monitor eGFR, hepatic function, and prothrombin time before starting and periodically during treatment
- NIH guidelines recommend a duration of 5 days or until hospital discharge[7]

Beigel et al. NEJM 2020[3] *(added 5/4/20; updated 10/8/20)*
Population: 1062 hospitalized patients with evidence of lower respiratory tract infection (85.0% had severe disease)
Design:

- randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in US, Europe and Asia
- 200 mg on day 1, then 100 mg once/day days 2-10 or until discharge or death
  median time from symptom onset to randomization was 9 days

Results:

- recovery time shorter with remdesivir (10 days vs 15 days with placebo; 95% CI 13 to 18)
- the median number of days between symptom onset and randomization was 9; the benefit of remdesivir was larger when given earlier in the illness
- Kaplan-Meier estimates of mortality by day 29 were 11.4% with remdesivir vs 15.2% with

Adverse Effects: *(updated 11/9/2020)*

- Elevated liver enzymes, increased prothrombin time, hypokalemia, headache, and infusion-related reactions, including hypotension, nausea, vomiting, sweating, and shivering
- European Medicine's Agency is evaluating cases of acute kidney injury in patients treated with remdesivir, but a causal relationship has not been established; COVID-19 itself can also cause kidney injury; the Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee (PRAC) safety review concluded there is no evidence to indicate remdesivir is associated with kidney injury *(updated 2/16/2021)*
- PRAC is investigating cases of sinus bradycardia in patients taking remdesivir after the Italian Medicines Agency raised a safety signal *(updated 2/16/2021)*
- Broad-spectrum nucleotide analog prodrug that inhibits viral RNA replication by blocking RNA-dependent RNA polymerase
- Has *in vivo* and *in vitro* activity against Ebola virus and coronaviruses (MERS and SARS) and *in vitro* activity against SARS- CoV-2
- Remdesivir FDA approved for treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients ≥12 years old weighing ≥40 kg[22] *(updated 10/22/2020)*
- To ensure continued availability of the drug for pediatric patients, FDA revised its Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to allow use of remdesivir for treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized pediatric patients weighing ≥3.5 kg-<40 kg or < 12 years of age weighing ≥3.5 kg[2,22] *(updated 10/22/2020)*
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against routine use of remdesivir in

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

placebo (HR 0.73; 95% CI 0.52 to 1.03)
- Effect appeared to be greatest in hospitalized patients requiring oxygen (baseline ordinal score of 5; this category had largest sample size); mortality difference between remdesivir and placebo groups appeared smaller in patients who did not require oxygen (ordinal score of 4) and in those who required mechanical ventilation (ordinal score of 6)

Limitations: unclear if earlier use of remdesivir would improve outcomes; not powered to detect differences in subgroups

J Grein et al. NEJM 2020[4]

Population: 53 hospitalized patients in US, Canada, Europe and Japan with SaO_2 ≤94% on O_2 or room air (n=61)
- 57% on mechanical compassionate ventilation

Design:
- report on use

Results:
- median follow-up 18 days
- 68% had improvement in O_2 support class; 57% were extubated; 47% discharged; 18% died

JD Goldman et al. NEJM 2020[9]

Population: hospitalized patients w/oxygen saturation ≤94% on ambient air, radiologic evidence of pneumonia

Design:
- randomized, open-label (n = 397)
- remdesivir x 5 days vs 10 days

Drug Interactions: *(updated 6/18/2020)*
- No human drug trial conducted
- Substrate for CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4, and for Organic Anion Transporting Polypeptides 1B1 (OAPT1B1) and P-glycoprotein (P-gp) transporters *in vitro*.[2] Strong inducers of these enzymes/transporters may decrease serum concentrations of remdesivir[5,6] and inhibitors of these enzymes/transporters could potentially increase the risk of toxicity such as hepatotoxicity[14]
- Inhibitor of CYP3A4, OATP1B1, OATP1B3, BSEP, MRP4, and NTCP
- Clinical relevance has not been established
- FDA warns that coadministration of remdesivir and chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine may decrease the antiviral activity of remdesivir; concurrent use is not recommended[12] *(added 6/18/2020)*

Pregnancy: *(updated 11/9/2020)*
- In 86 pregnant and postpartum women with severe COVID-19 who were treated with compassionate-use remdesivir, the rate of serious adverse events was low[7]
- No adverse effects on embryo-fetal development were observed in animals

hospitalized patients who do not require supplemental oxygen; use of remdesivir may be appropriate for patients who are at high risk for diseases progression[7] *(updated 7/12/2021)*
- NIH guidelines recommend use of remdesivir in hospitalized patients who require supplemental oxygen, but it is not routinely recommended in patients who require mechanical ventilation[7] *(updated 12/6/2020)*
- NIH guidelines recommend that patients recently hospitalized (i.e., within the previous 3 days) with COVID-19 who have rapidly increasing oxygen needs, require high-flow oxygen therapy or noninvasive ventilation and have increased markers of inflammation receive dexamethasone with or without remdesivir, plus either tocilizumab or baricitinib. For patients hospitalized who require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone is recommended; for those who were admitted to the ICU ≤24 hours previously and require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone plus tocilizumab is recommended[7] *(updated 7/12/2021)*
- IDSA guidelines suggest use of remdesivir in hospitalized patients with severe, but not critical, COVID-19 (SpO_2≤94% on room air); they suggest against routine initiation of remdesivir in patients on invasive ventilation and/or ECMO; suggested duration of treatment is 5 days in patients on

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

Results:
- baseline clinical status significantly worse in patients in the 10-day group
- no significant differences between 5 and 10 days of treatment were reported
- 64% in the 5-day group and 54% in the 10-day group achieved clinical improvement of ≥2 points on a 7-point ordinal scale by day 14
- in a post-hoc analysis, among patients on mechanical ventilation or ECMO at day 5, 40% in the 5-day group died by day 14 vs 17% in the 10-day group

Limitations: open-label, no placebo group[10]

Spinner et al. JAMA 2020[11,16]
(updated 8/23/2020)
Population: hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 (pneumonia, but not reduced oxygen levels) (n = 584)
Design: randomized, open-label; remdesivir x 5 days or 10 days in addition to standard care or standard care alone
Results:
- median duration of symptoms before day 1 was 8 days in the remdesivir groups and 9 days in the standard care group
- median duration of treatment was 5 days in the 5-day group and 6 days in the 10-day group
- on day 11, the odds of a better clinical status distribution on a 7-point ordinal scale was significantly higher in those treated with remdesivir for 5 days than with supplemental oxygen, but not mechanical ventilation or ECMO and 10 days in patients on mechanical ventilation or ECMO; they recommend against routine use in hospitalized patients not on supplemental oxygen[19] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- The manufacturer has initiated a phase 1a trial of an inhaled, nebulized solution of remdesivir in healthy volunteers; this trial is intended to form the basis for further clinical studies of this formulation in outpatients with COVID-19[13] *(added 7/9/2020)*

- In a case report, occurrence of a mutation in RdRP polymerase following failure of remdesivir in a patient with B-cell immunodeficiency was described[18] *(added 9/28/2020)*

- NIH starting a trial (ACTIV-5 Big Effect Trial) to evaluate use of remdesivir in combination with the monoclonal antibodies risankizumab or lenzilumab[21] *(added 10/19/2020)*

- European Society of Intensive Care Medicine expected to recommend against routine use of remdesivir in patients requiring critical care in upcoming recommendations *(added 11/13/2020)*

- FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for use of baricitinib, in combination with remdesivir, for treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients ≥2 years old who require supplemental oxygen,

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

standard care (OR 1.65; 95% CI 1.09-2.48; p=0.02); clinical importance unclear
- treatment with remdesivir x 10 days did not reach statistical significance

Limitations: open-label; median symptom duration at start of trial was 8 days; only 38% of remdesivir 10-day group received the drug for 10 days

Olender et al. Clin Infect Dis 2020[15] *(added 7/31/2020)*

Population: hospitalized adults with severe COVID-19 (oxygen saturation ≤94% on room air or requiring supplemental oxygen and pulmonary infiltrates) (n=312 remdesivir; n=818 non-remdesivir)

Design: comparative analysis of 2 ongoing studies
- a randomized, open-label phase 3 trial comparing 2 courses of remdesivir and a retrospective cohort study in patients receiving standard-of-care

Results:
- 74.4% of remdesivir-treated patients recovered at day 14 vs 59.0% of non-remdesivir-treated patients (adjusted OR 2.03; p<0.001)
- 7.6% of remdesivir-treated patients died vs 12.5% in non-remdesivir-treated patients (adjusted OR 0.38; p=0.001)

Limitations: comparative analysis of interim data sponsored by manufacturer

invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO[24] *(added 11/20/2020)*

- American College of Physicians (ACP) practice points recommend remdesivir should not be started in patients on mechanical ventilation or ECMO (these patients likely past the viral stage of the illness); remdesivir for 5 days can be considered for treatment of hospitalized patients not on mechanical ventilation or ECMO; use of remdesivir for up to 10 days can be considered in patients who require mechanical ventilation or ECMO within the 5-day course[25] *(added 2/10/2021)*

- The manufacturer has stopped a trial of IV remdesivir in high-risk non-hospitalized patients; the trial was not stopped for efficacy or safety reasons, but because the manufacturer believes outpatient administration of a treatment that requires multiple days of an IV infusion addresses an unmet need *(added 4/13/2021)*

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

Wang et al. Lancet 2020[23]
(added 11/9/2020)
Population: hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 in China (n=237; 453 planned)
Design: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled multicenter trial
- Remdesivir vs placebo x 10 days
- Patients were also allowed to received corticosteroids, lopinavir/ritonavir, and interferon

Results:
- Median time from symptom onset to randomization 9 days with remdesivir and 10 days with placebo
- Trial stopped before target enrollment reached
- No difference in time to clinical improvement between groups (18 vs 23 days; HR 1.23, 95% CI 0.87-1.75)
- The time to clinical improvement was numerically, but not statistically significantly, faster in patients who received remdesivir within 10 days of symptom onset (HR 1.52, 95% CI 0.95-2.43)

Limitations: small sample size; trial stopped before enrollment reached

Inhaled Remdesivir *(added 7/9/2020)*
- The manufacturer has initiated a phase 1a trial evaluating remdesivir in an inhaled, nebulized formulation in healthy volunteers[13]

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

NIH Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial 3 (ACTT 3) *(added 8/9/2020)*

- A randomized, double-blind trial comparing remdesivir plus interferon beta 1a to remdesivir alone has begun
- Expected to enroll >1000 adults

NIH Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial 2 (ACTT-2) 2020[17] *(added 9/18/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n>1000)
Design: Phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- remdesivir plus baricitinib 4 mg vs remdesivir alone

Results:

- mean recovery time was about 1 day shorter with the combination of remdesivir plus baricitinib compared to remdesivir alone, a statistically significant difference
- the combination improved outcomes at day 15 on an ordinal scale compared to remdesivir alone

Limitations: limited data available; not yet published or peer reviewed

WHO SOLIDARITY 2020[20] *(added 10/19/20; updated 12/2/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 at 405 hospitals in 30 countries (n=11,330 patients randomized; n=2750 to remdesivir)
Design: randomized, open-label trial evaluating remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, and interferon-

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

beta 1a compared to local standard of care

Results:

- Remdesivir did not reduce mortality, need for ventilation, or duration of hospitalization
- death rate ratio with remdesivir was 0.95 (95% CI 0.81-1.11; 301/2743 active vs 303/2708 control; p=0.50**)**
- ventilation initiated after randomization in 295 patients in the remdesivir group vs 284 in the control group
- 69% of patients who received remdesivir were still hospitalized at day 7 vs 59% in the control group

Limitations: interim analysis; open-label; conducted in many varied settings around the world; timing of treatment initiation not standardized

BT Garibaldi et al. JAMA Netw Open 2021[28] *(added 3/29/2021)*

Population: consecutive adults admitted with COVID-19 (n=2483)

Design: retrospective comparative effectiveness study in a hospital system in Baltimore, MD and Washington, DC

- Patients who received remdesivir matched to individuals who did not receive the drug

Results:

- 342 patients received remdesivir; 184 also received corticosteroids and 128 received remdesivir alone
- 80.7% of patients who received remdesivir self-identified as non-White race/ethnicity
- Time to clinical improvement was shorter in those treated with remdesivir compared to matched controls (5 days vs 7 days; adjusted hazard ratio 1.47, 95% CI 1.22-1.79)

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)

- 28-day mortality rate was 7.7% (22 death) in remdesivir recipients and 14.0% (40 deaths) in matched controls, the difference was not statistically significant (adjusted hazard ratio 0.70, 95% CI 0.38-1.28)

Limitations: retrospective data

Gilead 2021

(added 6/29/2021)

Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n=~100,000)

Design: data from 3 retrospective studies

Results:

- Lower risk for mortality in patients given remdesivir compared to controls in all 3 studies
- Increased likelihood of hospital discharge in patients given remdesivir in 2 studies

Limitations: retrospective data; not yet published

Barratt-Due et al. NOR-Solidarity Ann Intern Med 2021[30]

(added 7/15/2021)

Population: hospitalized adults with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 at 23 hospitals in Norway (n=185)

Design: independent, add-on, randomized controlled trial to WHO Solidarity trial

- Patients given remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, or standard of care

Results:

- No significant difference in mortality during hospitalization between groups
- There was a decrease in SARS-CoV-2 oropharyngeal viral load during the

REMDESIVIR (CONTINUED)	first week after randomization in all groups; the decreases in viral load and 10-day viral loads were similar among remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, and standard of care groups **Limitations:** no placebo group, small sample size		
MOLNUPIRAVIR (Ridgeback Biotherapeutics/Merck) *(added 4/15/2021)* **Dosage:** ▪ Administered orally twice daily x 5 days	▪ Phase 2/3 efficacy and safety trials underway in outpatients and hospitalized patients; manufacturer plans to continue to phase 3 trials in outpatients, but not inpatients *(updated 4/15/2021)* **Ridgeback/Merck 2021[26]** **Population:** 202 outpatient adults with confirmed COVID-19 with signs or symptoms within 7 days **Design:** phase 2a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ 200, 400, or 800 mg of molnupiravir or placebo **Results:** ▪ At day 5, infectious virus was recovered on nasopharyngeal swab from 0% of molnupiravir-treated patients and 24% of placebo-treated patients **Limitations:** not yet published or peer reviewed, phase 2a; small sample size	▪ No serious adverse events considered related to the study drug were reported in the phase 2a trial ▪ Headache, nausea, diarrhea, and rash were among the adverse effects reported in a phase 1 trial[27]	▪ Ribonucleoside analog that inhibits replication of RNA viruses, including SARS-CoV-2

1. Dosage used for treatment of COVID-19.
2. FDA. COVID-19 update: FDA broadens Emergency Use Authorization for Veklury (remdesivir) to include all hospitalized patients for treatment of COVID-19. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/covid-19-update-fda-broadens-emergency-use-authorization-veklury-remdesivir-include-all-hospitalized. Accessed August 31, 2020.
3. JH Beigel et al. Remdesivir for the treatment of Covid-19 – final report. N Engl J Med 2020 October 8 (epub).
4. J Grein et al. Compassionate use of remdesivir for patients with severe COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 April 10 (epub).
5. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
6. Interactions with experimental COVID-19 therapies. Liverpool Drug Interaction Group, Pharmacology Research Labs, University of Liverpool. Available at: www.covid19-druginteractions.org. Accessed March 27, 2020.
7. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
8. FDA. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA issues emergency use authorization for potential COVID-19 treatment. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-issues-emergency-use-authorization-potential-covid-19-treatment. Accessed May 4, 2020.
9. JD Goldman et al. Remdesivir for 5 or 10 days in patients with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 May 27 (epub).
10. R Dolin and MS Hirsch. Remdesivir – an important first step. N Engl J Med 2020 May 27 (epub).

11. CD Spinner et al. Effect of remdesivir vs standard care on clinical status at 11 days in patients with moderate COVID-19. A randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020 August 21 (epub).
12. FDA. Remdesivir by Gilead Sciences: FDA warns of newly discovered potential drug interaction that may reduce effectiveness of treatment. June 15, 2020. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/safety/medical-product-safety-information/remdesivir-gilead-sciences-fda-warns-newly-discovered-potential-drug-interaction-may-reduce. Accessed June 18, 2020.
13. Gilead Sciences statement on the initiation of clinical testing of an inhaled solution of remdesivir for potential outpatient treatment of COVID-19. July 8, 2020. Available at: https://www.gilead.com/news-and-press/company-statements/gilead-sciences-statement-on-the-initiation-of-clinical-testing-of-an-inhaled-solution-of-remdesivir-for-potential-outpatient-treatment-of-covid19. Accessed July 9, 2020.
14. E Leegwater et al. Drug-induced liver injury in a COVID-19 patient: potential interaction of remdesivir with P-glycoprotein inhibitors. Clin Infect Dis 2020 June 28; ciaa883.
15. SA Olender et al. Remdesivir for severe COVID-19 versus a cohort receiving standard of care. Clin Infect Dis 2020 July 24 (epub).
16. EK McCreary and DC Angus. Efficacy of remdesivir in COVID-19. JAMA 2020 August 21 (epub).
17. Lilly Press Release. Baricitinib in combination with remdesivir reduces time to recovery in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in NIAID-sponsored ACTT-2 trial. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/baricitinib-combination-remdesivir-reduces-time-recovery. Accessed September 18, 2020.
18. M Martinot et al. Remdesivir failure with SARS-CoV-2 RNA-dependent RNA-polymerase mutation in a B-cell immunodeficient patient with protracted COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020 September 28 (epub).
19. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021 . Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
20. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. Repurposed antiviral drugs for Covid-19 – interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:497.
21. NIH study aims to identify promising COVID-19 treatments for larger clinical trials. 2020 October 13. Available at: https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/nih-study-aims-identify-promising-covid-19-treatments-larger-clinical-trials. Accessed October 19, 2020.
22. FDA. FDA approved first treatment for COVID-19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-treatment-covid-19. Accessed October 22, 2020.
23. Y Wang et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. Lancet 2020; 395: 1569.
24. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes drug combination for treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-drug-combination-treatment-covid-19?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed November 20, 2020.
25. A Qaseem et al. Should remdesivir be used for the treatment of patients with COVID-19? Rapid, living practice points from the American College of Physicians (Version 2). Ann Inter Med 2021 February 9 (epub). A Kaka et al. Major update: remdesivir for adulst with COVID-19. A living systematic review and meta-analysis for the American College of Physicians Practice Points. Ann Intern Med 2021 February 9.
26. News Release. Ridgeback Biotherapeutics and Merck announce preliminary findings from a Phase 2a trial of investigational COVID-19 therapeutic molnupiravir. 2021 March 6. Available at: https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20210305005610/en/. Accessed March 13, 2021.
27. WP Painter et al. Human safety, tolerability, and pharmacokinetics of molnupiravir, a novel broad-spectrum oral antiviral agent with activity against SARS-CoV-2. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2021 March 1 (epub).
28. BT Garibaldi et al. Comparison of time to clinical improvement with vs without remdesivir treatment in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. JAMA Netw Open 2021; 4:e213071.
29. News Release. Gildead's Veklury (remdesivir) associated with a reduction in mortality rate in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 across three analyses of large retrospective real-world data sets. 2021 June 21. Available at: https://www.gilead.com/news-and-press/press-room/press-releases/2021/6/gileads-veklury-remdesivir-associated-with-a-reduction-in-mortality-rate-in-hospitalized-patients-with-covid19-across-three-analyses-of-large-ret. Accessed June 29, 2021.
30. A Barratt-Due et al. Evaluation of the effects of remdesivir and hydroxychloroquine on viral clearance and COVID-19. Ann Intern Med 2021 July 13 (epub).

CONVALESCENT PLASMA

(updated 5/19/2021)

Dosage:

- Only high titer convalescent plasma should be used
- One or two 200-ml infusions[1]

- **Case series** of 5 critically ill patients with COVID-19 and ARDS in China; administration of convalescent plasma improved clinical status (e.g., body temperature normalized, viral load decreased, antibody titers increased, ARDS resolved, weaning from mechanical ventilation).[2]
- **Case series** of 10 patients with severe COVID-19; clinical symptoms improved within 3 days and improvement in lung lesions reported within 7 days[3]

Li et al. JAMA 2020[7] *(added 8/16/2020)*
Population: hospitalized patients in China with severe or life-threatening COVID-19 (n=103)
Design: open-label, multicenter, randomized trial

- Convalescent plasma plus standard treatment vs standard treatment alone
- Plasma units with an S-RBD–specific IgG titer of at least 1:640 were used
- Median time from symptom onset to randomization: 30 days

Results:

- Trial stopped early
- Clinical improvement within 28 days occurred in 51.9% of patients treated with convalescent plasma vs 43.1% of those given standard treatment alone, not a statistically significant difference (p=0.26)

Adverse Effects:

- No severe adverse effects were reported in case series
- Risks expected to be similar to those of other transfusions
- Transfusion-transmissible infection risk is very low in the US
- Allergic transfusion reactions, transfusion associated circulatory overload (TACO), and transfusion related acute injury (TRALI)
- Theoretical risk of antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE) presumably due to antibodies from previous infection with other coronaviruses
- May lower natural immune response when given for prophylaxis
- In an evaluation of 20,000 hospitalized patients administered convalescent plasma under the US FDA expanded access program, serious adverse events included transfusion reactions (n=89, <1%), thromboembolic or thrombotic events (n=87, <1%), and cardiac events (n=680, ~3%); 37 TACO events, 20 TRALI events, and 26 severe allergic reactions occurred; mortality rate was higher in more critically ill patients[10] *(added 10/1/2020)*

- Passive antibody therapy by infusion of convalescent plasma may prevent infection or reduce severity of illness[1]
- Used previously for treatment of SARS-CoV-1, MERS, Ebola, and H1N1 influenza
- Most likely to be effective when given as prophylaxis or early in the course of disease
- Clinical trials underway in the US
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of low-titer COVID-19 convalescent plasma[4] *(updated 4/23/2021)*
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of convalescent plasma in mechanically ventilated patients[4] *(updated 4/23/2021)*
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of high-titer convalescent plasma for treatment of patients who do not require mechanical ventilation, except in a clinical trial[4] *(updated 4/23/2021)*
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient clinical data to recommend either for or against use of high-titer convalescent plasma in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who have impaired immunity[4,11] *(updated 4/23/2021)*

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)

- In those with severe disease, clinical improvement occurred in 91.3% with convalescent plasma vs 68.2% with standard care alone (p-0.03) and in those with life-threatening disease in 20.7% vs 24.1% (p=0.83)
- 28-day mortality was 15.7% with convalescent plasma vs 24.0% with standard care (p=0.30)
- Negative conversion rate of viral PCR at 72 hours was 87.2% with convalescent plasma vs 37.5% with standard care (p<0.001)

Limitations: trial stopped early before full enrollment reached; open label; time from symptom onset 30 days

A Gharbharan et al. ConCOVID, MedRxiv 2020[13] *(added 10/14/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients in the Netherlands (n=86)

Design: open-label, randomized trial

- convalescent plasma vs standard care

Results:

- Trial stopped early; SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody titers of participant and convalescent plasma were comparable
- 53/66 patients tested had SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at baseline; symptomatic for 10 days at the time of inclusion
- No difference in mortality, duration of hospitalization, or disease severity

Limitations: trial stopped early; not peer reviewed

- Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines suggest against routine use of convalescent plasma in critically ill adults[5]

- IDSA guidelines recommend use of convalescent plasma in ambulatory patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 only in the context of a clinical trial; they recommend against use in patients hospitalized with COVID-19[12] *(updated 4/15/2021)*

- FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization for convalescent plasma[6,9] (*added 8/19/2020*)

- NIH released statement following FDA EUA (Sept 1, 2020) stating insufficient data to recommend for or against use of convalescent plasma for COVID-19, Serious adverse effects infrequent, but long-term risks, including whether use of convalescent plasma attenuates the immune response to SARS-Co-V-2 making patients more susceptible to reinfection, are unknown

- FDA EUA revised to limit use to only high titer convalescent plasma for treatment of hospitalized patients early in the disease course and to those hospitalized patients who have impaired humoral immunity and cannot produce and adequate antibody response[17] (*added 2/10/2021)*

Pregnancy:

- Clinical trials ongoing evaluating use in pregnant women

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)	**A Agarwal et al. PLACID, BMJ 2020**[14] *(updated 10/26/2020)* **Population**: hospitalized patients in India with moderate COVID-19 (PaO2/FiO2 ratio 200-300 mm Hg or respiratory rate > 24/min with oxygen saturation ≤93% in room air) (n=464) **Design:** open-label, multicenter, phase 2, randomized controlled trial ▪ convalescent plasma (2 doses of 200 mL each, transfused 24 hrs apart) plus standard care vs standard care alone ▪ administered within 3 days of symptom onset **Results:** ▪ Composite outcome (progression to severe disease or all-cause mortality at 28 days) was 19% with convalescent plasma vs 18% with standard care (risk difference 0.008, 95% CI -0.062-0.078; risk ratio 1.04, 95% CI 0.71-1.54) ▪ More patients treated with convalescent plasma had resolution of shortness of breath (76% vs 66%; 95%) and fatigue (73% vs 60%) at day 7 compared to standard care; differences in resolution of fever and cough were not significantly different between groups ▪ Negative conversion of SARS-CoV-2 RNA at day 7 was higher in patients given convalescent plasms compared to those who were not (68% vs 55%; 95% CI 1.04-1.5) ▪ 83% had detectable neutralizing antibodies at enrollment

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)	**Limitations:** open-label; presence and level of neutralizing antibodies not measured before administration **MJ Joyner et al NEJM 2020[8]** *(added 8/17/2020; updated 1/18/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients ≥18 years old in the US who had or were at high risk of progressing to severe or life-threatening COVID-19 (n=3082) **Design:** open-label exploratory analysis of patients who received convalescent plasma through an Expanded Access Program in the US **Results:** ▪ 52.3% of patients in ICU; 27.5% on mechanical ventilation ▪ Death within 30 days after plasma transfusion occurred in 115 of 515 patients (22.3%) in the high-titer group, 549 of 2006 (27.4%) in the medium-titer group, and 166 of 561 (29.6%) in the low-titer group ▪ Transfusion with high-titer plasma was associated with a lower risk of death than low-titer plasma in patients not on mechanical ventilation (relative risk 0.66; 95% CI 0.48-0.91) ▪ There was no effect on the risk of death in patients who were on mechanical ventilation (relative risk 1.02; 95% CI 0.78-1.32) ▪ 30-day mortality was lower in patients who received a transfusion within 3 days after diagnosis than in those who received a transfusion ≥4 days after diagnosis

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)	**Limitations:** retrospective, no control arm; only limited amount of total data available at the time of this analysis **VA Simonovich et al. PlasmAr. NEJM 2020[15]** *(added 11/28/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized adults in Argentina with severe COVID-19 pneumonia (SaO2<93% on ambient air, PaO2:FiO2 <300 mm Hg, SOFA or mSOFA score of ≥2 points above baseline) (n=334) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled multicenter trial ▪ convalescent plasma or placebo in addition to usual therapy **Results:** ▪ Median time from onset of symptoms to enrollment was 8 days ▪ >95% of transfused convalescent plasma units had a total anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody titer of at least 1:800 ▪ No significant difference in clinical status after 30 days between the two groups (p=0.46) ▪ Overall mortality was 10.96% and 11.43% in the convalescent plasma group and placebo group, respectively ▪ Infusion reactions occurred in 4.8% of patients given convalescent plasma vs 1.9% of those given placebo **Limitations:** only in patients with severe disease; usual therapy not standardized **P Janiaud et al. JAMA 2021[17]**

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)	*(added 2/27/2021)* **Population:** patients with COVID-19 in any treatment setting treated with convalescent plasma or control (n=1060) **Design:** meta-analysis of 4 peer-reviewed, published, randomized clinical trials **Results:** ▪ Risk ratio for mortality was 0.93 ▪ In a secondary analysis, with addition of 6 unpublished trials (n=10,772), risk ratio for mortality was 1.02 ▪ Convalescent plasma was not associated with improvement in length of hospitalization, mechanical ventilation use, clinical improvement, or clinical deterioration **Limitations:** meta-analysis; reporting of clinical outcomes inconsistent across trials; data too limited for analysis of high-titer plasma **R Libster et al. NEJM 2021[18]** *(added 2/28/2021)* **Population:** older adults with mild COVID-19 within 72 hours after symptom onset (n=160) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ High-titer convalescent plasma vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Severe respiratory disease developed in 16% of patients who received convalescent plasma vs 31% who received placebo (RR 0.52; 95% CI 0.29-0.94, p=0.03) ▪ Trial stopped early at 76% of projected sample size due to lack of patient enrollment after local COVID-19 infection rates dropped

CONVALESCENT PLASMA (continued)	**Limitations:** trial stopped early; only mild cases **RECOVERY Group Lancet 2021[19]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in the UK (n=11558) **Design:** randomized, controlled, open-label, platform trial ▪ High-titer convalescent plasma plus usual care vs usual care alone **Results:** ▪ 28-day mortality rate ratio was not significantly different between the convalescent plasma and usual care groups (24% vs 24%; rate ratio 1.00, 95% CI 0.93-1.07 p=0.95) ▪ There was no significant difference between groups in the proportion of patients discharged from the hospital within 28 days (66% vs 66%; rate ratio 0.99, 95% CI 0.94-1.03; p=0.57) ▪ The proportion of patients who were not on invasive mechanical ventilation at baseline meeting a composite endpoint of progression to invasive mechanical ventilation or death was 29% in the convalescent plasma group and 29% in the usual care group (rate ratio 0.99, 95% CI 0.93-1.05; p=0.79) ▪ There were no differences in mortality noted in any subgroup analyses including duration of symptoms before randomization **Limitations:** only hospitalized patients studied

ARDS = acute respiratory distress syndrome

1. E Bloch et al. Deployment of convalescent plasma for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19. J Clin Invest. 2020 April 7 (In press: preview).
2. C Shen et al. Treatment of 5 critically ill patients with COVID-19 with convalescent plasma. JAMA 2020 March 27 (epub).
3. K Duan et al. The feasibility of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19 patients: a pilot study. Medrxiv 2020 March 16.

4. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed April 23, 2021.
5. W Alhazzani et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with COVID-19. Crit Care Med 2020 March 27 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/abstract/onlinefirst/surviving_sepsis_campaign__guidelines_on_the.95707.aspx. Accessed June 8, 2020.
6. FDA. Recommendations for investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/recommendations-investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma. Accessed April 14, 2020.
7. L Li et al. Effect of convalescent plasma therapy on time to clinical improvement in patients with severe and life-threatening COVID-19. A randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020; 324:460.
8. MJ Joyner et al. Convalescent plasma antibody levels and the risk of death from Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:1015.
9. FDA. Convalescent plasma Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) letter. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/141477/download. Accessed August 23, 2020.
10. MJ Joyner et al. Safety update: COVID-19 convalescent plasma in 20,000 hospitalized patients. Mayo Clin Proc 2020; 95:1888. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7368917/pdf/main.pdf. Accessed October 1, 2020.
11. AK Pau et al. Convalescent plasma for the treatment of COVID-19: perspectives of the National Institutes of Health COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Ann Intern Med 2020 September 25.
12. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021; Version 4.2.0. Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed April 15, 2021.
13. A Gharbharan et al. Convalescent plasma for COVID-19. A randomized clinical trial. MedRxiv 2020 July 3 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.01.20139857v1. Accessed October 14, 2020.
14. A Agarwal et al. Convalescent plasma in the management of moderate COVID-19 in adults in India: open-label phase II multicetre randomised controlled trial. (PLACID Trial). BMJ 2020 October 22 (epub).
15. VA Simonovich et al. A randomized trial of convalescent plasma in Covid-19 severe pneumonia. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:619.
16. FDA In Brief: FDA updates emergency use authorization for COVID-19 convalescent plasma to reflect new data. February 4, 2021. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/fda-brief/fda-brief-fda-updates-emergency-use-authorization-covid-19-convalescent-plasma-reflect-new-data. Accessed February 10, 2021.
17. P Janiaud et al. Association of convalescent plasma treatment with clinical outcomes in patients with COVID-19. A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA 2021; 325:1185.
18. R Libster et al. Early high-titer plasma therapy to prevent severe COVID-19 in older adults. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:610
19. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Convalescent plasma in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised controlled, open-label, platform trial. Lancet 2021 May 14 (epub).

INTRAVENOUS IMMUNE GLOBULIN (IVIG)
(added 6/8/2020)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage for COVID-19 unclear
- Phase 3 trial of *Octagam* will use a dosage of 0.5 g/kg IV infusion over 2 hours x 4 days

W Cao et al. Open Forum Infect Dis 2020[1]
Population: Hospitalized patients in China with severe disease and deteriorating course (n = 3)
Design: Case series; patients received IVIg at the start of respiratory distress
Results: all 3 patients had clinical improvement; no fever within 1-2 days, alleviation of breathing difficulties in 3-5 days
Limitations: small case series, 2 patients also received antivirals, 1 received steroids

Xie et al. J Infect 2020[2]
Population: ICU patients with severe or critical illness in Wuhan, China (n=58)
Design: retrospective review of 58 cases
Results: administration of IVIG within 48 hrs of hospital admission was associated with reduced 28-day mortality, shorter hospital stay, and reduced ventilator use compared to administration after 48 hours
Limitation: small retrospective study

Shao et al. 2020[3]
Population: Hospitalized severely and critically ill patients (n=325)
Design: multicenter retrospective cohort study
Results:

Adverse Effects: rarely can case anaphylaxis, aseptic meningitis, renal failure, thromboembolism, hemolytic reactions, transfusion-related lung injury

- Used for treatment of immune disorders and as an adjunct for treatment of severe pneumonia in influenza patients; modulates immune inflammation, improves passive immunity
- Existing IVIG product unlikely to contain antibodies against SARS-CoV-2
- FDA approved an investigational new drug application (IND) for a phase 3 trial with *Octagam* 10% in COVID-19 patients with severe disease progression (SpO2≤93%, requiring oxygen supplementation)[4]
- Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines suggest against routine use of standard IVIG in critically ill adults[5]
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of non-SARS-CoV-2-specific IVIG outside of the context of a clinical trial for treatment of COVID-19; they state this should not preclude use of IVIG when otherwise indicated for treatment of complications arising during the course of COVID-19 illess[6]
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulins[6] *(added 7/22/2020)*
- Shortages have been an issue (even prior to COVID-19)

INTRAVENOUS IMMUNE GLOBULIN (IVIG) (CONTINUED)	▪ IVIG not associated with improved 28- or 60-day mortality compared to no IVIG in overall cohort ▪ Duration of hospitalization and disease were longer in patients treated with IVIG than in those who were not ▪ In a subgroup analysis, IVIG was associated with reduced 28-day mortality in critically ill patients **Limitation:** not peer reviewed, IVIG group more likely to have coronary heart disease and severe COVID-19

1. W Cao et al. High-dose intravenous immunoglobulin as a therapeutic option for deteriorating patients with coronavirus disease 2019. Open Forum Infect Dis 2020; 7:ofaa102.
2. Y Xie et al. Effect of regular intravenous immunoglobulin therapy on prognosis of severe pneumonia in patients with COVID-19. J Infec 2020 April 10 (epub).
3. Shao et al. Clinical efficacy of intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in critical patients with COVID-19: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. 2020 April 13. Available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3576827. Accessed June 17, 2020.
4. FDA approves Octapharma USA investigational new drug application for severe COVID-19 patients. Press release May 20, 2020. Available at: https://www.octapharma.com/news/press-release/2020/fda-approves-octapharma-usa-investigational-new-drug-application/. Accessed June 8, 2020.
5. W Alhazzani et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with COVID-19. Crit Care Med 2020 March 27 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/abstract/onlinefirst/surviving_sepsis_campaign__guidelines_on_the.95707.aspx. Accessed June 8, 2020.
6. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 22, 2020.

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab)

(Eli Lilly/AbCellera)

(updated 7/12/2021)

Bamlanivimab:[7] **(EUA for bamlanivimab alone revoked 4/16/2021)**
(added 11/23/2020)

- Single 700 mg IV infusion given over at least 60 minutes
- Patients should be monitored for hypersensitivity reactions during infusion and for at least 1 hour after completion
- Should be given as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-2 positive test result and within 10 days of COVID-19 symptom onset
- Patients should be treated in facility staffed and equipped to manage anaphylaxis

Bamlanivimab and Etesevimab[19]
(added 2/10/2021)

- 700 mg of bamlanivimab and 1400 mg of etesevimab given together as a single IV infusion
- Authorization of this dose was based on analysis of pre-clinical, clinical, and virologic data and pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic modeling suggesting it would have

NIH ACTIV-2[1]

- Phase 2 trial
- Expected to enroll 200 outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 symptoms for < 10 days
- LY-CoV555 vs placebo

BLAZE-4 Trial[16] *(added 1/29/2021)*

- Randomized, double-blind, phase 2 trial in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19
- Trial expanded to evaluate bamlanivimab in combination with VIR-7831, a monoclonal antibody that binds to a different region of the spike protein than bamlanivimab
- VIR-7831 is being developed by GSK and Vir Biotechnology
- The manufacturer states VIR-7831 has a high barrier to resistance

ACTIV-3/TICO LY-CoV555 Study Group. NEJM 2020 (NIH ACTIV-3)[1]
(updated 1/1/2021; updated 3/14/2021)

- Trial stopped based on review of data that suggested the antibody is unlikely to improve clinical outcomes in hospitalized patients

Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 without end-organ failure (n=314)
Design: Randomized, platform trial of therapeutic agents

- LY-CoV555 7000 mg vs placebo; both groups received standard care including remdesivir, oxygen, steroids

- Infusion reactions (pruritis, flushing, rash, facial swelling)
- Hypersensitivity reactions including anaphylaxis have occurred
- Clinical worsening of COVID-19 has been reported after administration of bamlanivimab; it has not been established if these events were related to use of bamlanivimab use or COVID-19 *(added 2/10/2021)*
- Adverse effects reported with bamlanivimab and etesevimab given together include nausea, dizziness, pruritis, and rash *(added 2/10/2021)*

- LY-CoV555 and LY-CoV016 are investigational monoclonal antibodies for treatment of COVID-19
- Discovered in a blood sample from a recovered COVID-19 patient
- LY-CoV555 and LY-CoV016 bind different regions of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein
- FDA issued an emergency use authorization (EUA) for bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555) for treatment of mild to moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients ≥12 years old who weigh ≥40 kg and are at high risk for progression to severe disease or hospitalization[7]; FDA revoked EUA for bamlanivimab when administered alone based on sustained increase of SARS-CoV-2 viral variants resistant to bamlanivimab alone[24] (*updated 4/19/2021)*
- FDA issued an emergency use authorization for bamlanivimab and etesevimab given together for treatment of mild to moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients (≥12 years old and ≥40 kg) who test positive for SARS-CoV-2 and who are at high risk for progressing to severe COVID-19[18] *(added 2/10/2021)*
- Bamlanivimab and etesevimab not authorized for use in patients who are hospitalized or require oxygen therapy for COVID-19; monoclonal antibodies may be associated with worse clinical

similar clinical effects to a 2800 mg of bamlanivimab and etesevimab

- Patients should be monitored for hypersensitivity reactions during infusion and for at least 1 hour after completion

- Should be given as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-2 positive test result and within 10 days of COVID-19 symptom onset

- Patients should be treated in facility staffed and equipped to manage anaphylaxis

Results:

- Data safety and monitoring board recommended stopping enrollment for futility after 314 patients were randomized and received an infusion (163 to LY-CoV555 and 151 to placebo)
- Median interval since onset of symptoms was 7 days
- Distribution of patients across 7 categories of the pulmonary ordinal outcome were similar between groups at day 5
- 50% (81/163) who received LY-CoV555 vs 54% (81/151) who received placebo were in 1 of the 2 most favorable categories
- The odds ratio of being in a more favorable category in the LY-CoV555 group than in the placebo group was 0.85 (95% CI 0.56-1.29; p=0.45)
- The percentage of patient with the primary safety outcome (composite of death, serious adverse events, or clinical grade 3 or 4 adverse events through day 5) was similar between the groups (19% LY-CoV555 group vs 14% placebo group; OR 1.56, 95% CI 0.78-3.10, p=0.20

Limitations: preliminary report; trial stopped early; wide CI for safety endpoint

BLAZE-2[14] *(updated 1/24/2021)*

Population: residents and staff of nursing homes who tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline (n=965; 299 residents and 666 staff)

outcomes when administered to hospitalized patients with COVID-19 requiring high flow oxygen or mechanical ventilation *(added 2/10/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of bamlanivimab monotherapy [8] *(updated 4/12/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of bamlanivimab plus etesevimab due to an increase in the proportion of Gamma (P.1) and Beta (B.1.351), which have reduced susceptibility to bamlanivimab and etesevimab[8] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend use of casirivimab plus imdevimab or sotrovimab for treatment of patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 not requiring hospitalization or supplemental oxygen who are at high risk of clinical progression[8] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- IDSA guidelines suggest bamlanivimab/etesevimab or casirivimab/imdevimab or sotrovimab among ambulatory patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 at high risk for progression to severe disease; local variant susceptibility should be considered in choosing an agent[10] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- NIH ACTIV-3 trial of LY-CoV555 in hospitalized patients, which was previously paused because of a potential safety concern, has now been

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab) (continued)

Design: ongoing randomized, phase 3 trial evaluating bamlanivimab for COVID-19 prophylaxis
- Bamlanivimab 4200 mg vs placebo

Results:
- Frequency of symptomatic COVID-19 at 8 weeks was significantly lower with bamlanivimab than placebo (odds ratio 0.43; p=0.00021); for the subgroup of nursing home residents OR was 0.20 (p=0.00026)
- 4 deaths occurred in the placebo group and 0 in the treatment group

Limitations: interim results; not peer-reviewed or published

Chen et al. NEJM (BLAZE-1) 2020[2,5] *(updated 10/29/2020)*

Population: outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 (n=452)

Design: phase 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled
- **Monotherapy cohort:** LY-CoV555 700 mg, 2800 mg, or 7000 mg vs placebo
- **Combination cohort:** LY-CoV555 plus LY-CoV016; 2800 mg of each antibody (n=112) vs placebo (n=156)

Results:

Monotherapy Cohort (Chen et al NEJM 2020): *(updated 10/29/2020)*
- Infusion given median of 4 days after onset of symptoms (>80% had mild symptoms)
- Change from baseline in viral load at day 11 was statistically significant compared to placebo with the 2800 mg dose only (-0.53; 95%CI -0.98 to -0.08; p=0.02)

stopped because of insufficient evidence that the antibody improved clinical outcomes; no significant differences in safety outcomes were reported in updated dataset *(updated 10/27/2020)*

- Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) will stop distribution of bamlanivimab alone because of sustained increase in SARS-CoV-2 viral variants in the US that are resistant to bamlanivimab; the FDA Fact Sheet has been updated to reflect resistance data *(updated 3/24/2021)*[18]

- FDA has suspended distribution of bamlanivimab and etesevimab nationwide because the frequency of the P.1 (Gamma) and B.1.351 (Beta) variants exceeds 11% throughout the US (previously distribution was restricted only in certain states[27]); bamlanivimab and etesevimab are not active against these variants; REGEN-COV, which is likely to retain activity against P.1 and B.1.351, is still available in these states[34] *(updated 6/28/2021)*

Pregnancy: *(updated 11/23/2020)*
- Insufficient data on the use of bamlanivimab during pregnancy

- Human IgG1 antibodies can cross the placenta; therefore, bamlanivimab has the potential to be transferred from the mother to the fetus

- NIH guidelines state bamlanivimab should not be withheld from pregnant women who have conditions that pose

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab) (continued)	▪ Complete viral clearance by day 11 was achieved by most patients, including those in the placebo group ▪ In additional analysis, LY-CoV555 improved viral clearance at day 3 ▪ Hospitalization or ER visit occurred in 1.6% of patients taking LY-CoV555 vs 6.3% taking placebo ▪ Slightly lower severity of symptoms was reported in patients who received LY-CoV555 compared to those who received placebo on days 2-6 **Combination Cohort Results:** ▪ Reduced viral load at day 11 compared to placebo (p=0.011) ▪ Complete viral clearance by day 11 was achieved by most patients, including those in the placebo group ▪ Reduced viral levels at day 3 (p=0.016) and day 7 (p<0.001) ▪ Reduced symptoms vs placebo ▪ Lowered the rate of COVID-19-related hospitalization and ER visits vs placebo (0.9% vs 5.8%) **Limitations:** interim data; unclear if earlier evaluation of viral clearance would have shown a difference at lower dosages; unclear if RT-PCR is accurate measure of viral neutralization	a high risk of progression to severe disease if the clinician thinks the potential benefit outweighs the risk
	RL Gottlieb et al. JAMA 2021 (BLAZE-1)[13] *(added 1/24/2021)* **Population:** adult outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 presenting within 3 days of first positive test result (n=577)	

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab) (continued)

Design: phase 2 portion of a multicenter, randomized, double-blind phase 2/3 trial

- Patients randomized to receive bamlanivimab 700 mg, bamlanivimab 2800 mg, bamlanivimab 7000 mg, bamlanivimab 2800 mg plus etesevimab 2800 mg, or placebo

Results:

- Change in viral load from baseline at day 11 was -3.72 with bamlanivimab 700 mg, -4.08 with 2800 mg, -3.49 with 7000 mg, -4.37 with bamlanivimab plus etesevimab, and -3.80 with placebo; only the reduction in viral load with bamlanivimab plus etesevimab was statistically significantly lower than with placebo
- The proportion of patients who required hospitalization or ED visit due to COVID-19 at day 29 was 1.0% with 700 mg, 1.9% with 2800 mg, 2.0% with 7000 mg, 0.9% with combination therapy, and 5.8% with placebo; the only difference that was statistically significant was with combination therapy

Limitations: primary endpoint may have been too late to detect differences; only 1 combination dose

BLAZE-1 Phase 3 Lilly 2021[17]

(added 2/5/2021)

Population: adult outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 presenting within 3 days of first positive test result who were at high

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab) (continued)	risk of progressing to severe COVID-19 and/or hospitalization (n=1035) **Design:** phase 3 portion of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 2/3 trial ▪ Bamlanivimab 2800 mg plus etesevimab 2800 mg vs placebo **Results:** ▪ The primary endpoint of COVID-19-related hospitalization or death occurred in 2.1% (11 events) of patients taking bamlanivimab plus etesevimab compared to 7.0% (36 events) of those taking placebo; a 70% reduction (p=0.0004) ▪ 10 deaths occurred in the placebo group and 0 in the treatment group (p<0.001) **Limitations:** not published or peer reviewed **<u>BLAZE-1 Phase 3 Lilly 2021</u>**[21] *(added 3/15/2021)* **Population:** outpatients ≥12 years old with mild to moderate COVID-19 presenting within 3 days of first positive test result who were at high risk of progressing to severe COVID-19 and/or hospitalization (n=769) **Design:** new cohort of a phase 3, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Bamlanivimab 700 mg mg plus etesevimab 1400 mg vs placebo **Results:** ▪ 4 events of COVID-19-related hospitalization or death occurred in patients taking bamlanivimab plus etesevimab compared to 15 events in those taking placebo; an 87% risk reduction (p<0.0001)

LY-CoV555 (bamlanivimab) and LY-CoV016 (etesevimab) (continued)

- 4 COVID-19-related deaths occurred in the placebo group and 0 in the treatment group

Limitations: not published or peer reviewed

MS Cohen et al. JAMA 2021[30]

(added 6/5/2021)

Population: residents and staff at US skilled nursing and assisted living facilities with at least 1 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 index case and who were negative at baseline for SARS-CoV-2 infection and serology (n=966)

Design: randomized, double-blind phase 3 trial

- Single IV dose of bamlanivimab 4200 mg or placebo
- August-November 2020

Results:

- Incidence of COVID-19 was 8.5% among those treated with bamlanivimab and 15.2% with placebo (OR 0.43 95% CI 0.28-0.68; p<0.001)

Limitations: trial conducted before widespread vaccination and before variants circulating

REGN-COV-2 (REGEN-COV) CASIRIVIMAB (REGN10933) and IMDEVIMAB (REGN10987)

(Regeneron)

(updated 7/12/2021)

Dosage:[9]
(updated 6/5/2021)

- 1200 mg (casirivimab 600 mg and imdevimab 600 mg) administered together as a single IV infusion over at least 60 minutes or by SC injection
- Available in separate vials or a co-formulated vial containing both casirivimab and imdevimab
- Patients should be monitored for hypersensitivity reactions during infusion and for at least 1 hour after completion
- Should be given as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-2 positive test result and within 10 days of COVID-19 symptom onset
- Patients should be treated in facility staffed and equipped to manage anaphylaxis

Clinical trials ongoing

- Two phase 2/3 trials in hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients
- Phase 3 RECOVERY trial
- Phase 3 prevention trial with NIAID and NIH

Regeneron 2020[4,6,9] *(added 9/29/2020; updated 11/23/2020)*
Population: outpatients with COVID-19 (n=799)
Design: ongoing, randomized, double-blind phase 2/3 trial

- REGN-COV2 plus standard-of-care vs placebo plus standard-of-care

Results:

- Significantly greater reduction in viral load though day 7 with REGN-COV-2 vs placebo
- Most benefit appears to be in seronegative patients and/or patients with higher baseline viral loads
- Reduced COVID-19 related medical visits (2.8% REGN-COV-2 vs 6.5% placebo; p=0.024)
- Also reduced COVID-19 related medical visits in patients with risk factors (>50 years of age, BMI>30, CV, metabolic, lung, liver or kidney disease, or immunocompromised)
- Post-hoc analysis: 2% of antibody-treated patients and 4% of placebo-treated patients were hospitalized or visited the emergency department within 28 days after treatment; percentages were 3% and 9% in patients at higher risk for hospitalization
- Median time to symptom improvement was 5 days with the
- Infusion reactions and hypersensitivity reactions, including anaphylaxis, have been reported

- Investigational combination of 2 SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies that bind to the spike protein
- Partnered with Roche
- FDA issued an emergency use authorization (EUA) for casirivimab and imdevimab to be administered together for treatment of mild to moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients ≥12 years old who weigh ≥40 kg and are at high risk for progression to severe disease or hospitalization[9] (*added 11/23/2020)*
- FDA EUA updated: dosage decreased from 2400 mg to 1200 mg and SC administration authorized when IV infusion not possible or would delay treatment *(added 6/5/2021)*
- Not authorized for use in patients who are hospitalized or require oxygen therapy for COVID-19; monoclonal antibodies may be associated with worse clinical outcomes when administered to hospitalized patients with COVID-19 requiring high flow oxygen or mechanical ventilation *(added 11/23/2020)*
- NIH guidelines recommend use of casirivimab plus imdevimab or sotrovimab for treatment of patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 not requiring hospitalization or supplemental oxygen who are at high risk of clinical progression[8] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

REGN-COV2 (continued)	antibody combination and 6 days with placebo. **Limitations:** preliminary data from an ongoing trial **<u>Weinreich et al. NEJM 2020:</u>**[11] *(added 12/18/2020)* **Population:** nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n=275) **Design:** ongoing, randomized, double-blind, phase 1-3 trial ▪ data presented here are of first 275 patients in Regeneron trial described above ▪ Patients randomized to 2.4g REGN-COV2, 8.0 g REGN-COV2, or placebo **Results:** ▪ Least-squares mean difference (combined REGN-COV2 dose groups vs placebo group) in time-weighted average change in viral load from day 1-7 was -0.56 log_{10} copies/mL among serum antibody-negative patients and -0.41 log_{10} copies/mL in the overall trial population ▪ 3% of patients in the combined REGN-COV2 dose groups reported at least 1 medically attended visit, compared to 6% of those in the placebo group ▪ Among serum antibody-negative patients the percentages were 6% vs 15% (with placebo) ▪ Safety was similar between groups **Limitations:** interim analysis; no formal hypothesis testing performed to control type I error **<u>Regeneron 2020</u>**[12]*(added 1/1/2021)*	▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of casirivimab plus imdevimab in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 outside of a clinical trial[8] *(added 12/2/2020)* ▪ IDSA guidelines suggest bamlanivimab/etesevimab or casirivimab/imdevimab or sotrovimab among ambulatory patients with mild to moderate CO VID-19 at high risk for progression to severe disease; local variant susceptibility should be considered in choosing an agent[10] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ Enrollment of hospitalized patients who require high-flow oxygen or mechanical ventilation was suspended at the recommendation of an independent data monitoring committee due to a potential safety signal and unfavorable risk/benefit profile (added 11/2/2020); after review, it was recommended that the trial can continue enrollment in all arms *(updated 11/17/2020)* ▪ Intranasal delivery of the antibody therapy via adeno-associated virus vectors is being investigated *(added 12/6/2020)* ▪ Neutralizing titers against the India variant (B.1.617) were decreased about 5-fold in an *in vitro* study[26] *(added 5/20/2021)* **Pregnancy:** *(updated 11/23/2020)* ▪ Insufficient data on use during pregnancy

REGN-COV2 (continued)	▪ Initial data from ongoing phase 1/2/3 trial in hospitalized, seronegative patients on low-flow oxygen suggests treatment may be beneficial; lower risk of death or mechanical ventilation reported ▪ Trial to continue based on these preliminary data **Regeneron/NIAID Prevention Trial 2021**[15,25] *(added 1/27/2020; updated 4/20/2021)* **Population:** individuals at high risk of COVID -19 infection (due to household exposure) (n= 1505) **Design:** ongoing phase 3 trial ▪ REGEN-COV (casirivimab and imdevimab) 1200 mg SC injection vs placebo **Results:** **Interim analysis:** ▪ Interim analysis of first ~400 individuals ▪ Symptomatic infection occurred in 8/223 individuals who were given placebo and 0/186 individuals who were given REGEN-COV ▪ When symptomatic and asymptomatic infection was evaluated, there were 23 cases reported in the placebo group and 10 cases in the REGEN-COV group ▪ Viral loads were lower in the group who received antibody treatment ▪ Duration of infection was < 1 week in the REGEN-COV group and 3-4 weeks in 40% of subjects in the placebo group ▪ Duration of viral shedding was shorter in the treatment group **Update:**	▪ Human IgG1 antibodies can cross the placenta; therefore, casirivimab and imdevimab have the potential to be transferred from the mother to the fetus

REGN-COV2 (continued)	▪ After enrollment of 1505 participants ▪ Administration of REGEN-COV reduced risk of symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection through day 29 by 81% (p<0.0001) ▪ symptomatic infection occurred in 11 patients (1.5%) who received REGEN-COV and 59 patients (7.8%) who received placebo **Limitations:** interim analysis of ongoing trial; not peer reviewed or published **Regeneron 2021[23]** *(added 3/29/2021)* **Population:** high-risk outpatients with COVID-19 (n=4567) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial ▪ REGN-COV2 1200 mg IV or 2400 mg IV vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Risk of hospitalization or death was reduced by 70% with the 1200 mg dose of REGN-COV2 and by 71% with the 2400 mg dose compared to placebo ▪ Median time to symptom resolution was 10 days with either dose of REGN-COV2 and 14 days with placebo, a statistically significant difference **Limitations:** data not yet published or peer reviewed **RECOVERY Trial 2021[32]** *(added 6/16/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 (n=9785)

REGN-COV2 (continued)	**Design:** phase 3 randomized, controlled trial ▪ REGEN-COV 8000 mg plus usual care vs usual care alone **Results:** ▪ All-cause mortality reduced by 20% in seronegative patients with addition of REGEN-COV to usual care vs usual care alone (24% of patients in REGEN-COV group died vs 30% in the usual care group by day 28; rate ratio 0.8 95% CI 0.70-0.91; p=0.001) ▪ When seropositive patients (and those with unknown status) were included, there was no significant difference in 28-day mortality between the groups (20% of patients in REGEN-COV group died vs 21% in the usual care group; rate ratio 0.96; 95% CI 0.86-1.03; p=0.17) **Limitations:** not yet published or peer-reviewed	
AZD7442 **Tixagevimab (AZD8895) and Cilgavimab (AZD1061)** **(AstraZeneca)** *(updated 6/16/2021)*	▪ Phase 1 dose-escalation trial ongoing in the UK[3] ▪ Phase 3 trials underway: 1 trial for prevention of COVID-19 is expected to enroll ~5000 participants and another trial for post-exposure prophylaxis and pre-emptive treatment is expected to enroll ~1100 subjects; additional trials for treatment expected to enroll ~4000 subjects *(updated 11/29/2020)* **STORM CHASER 2021[33]** *(updated 6/16/2021)* **Population:** unvaccinated adults with confirmed exposure to a person	▪ Investigational combination of 2 SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies (AZD8895 [tixagevimab] and AZD1061 [cilgavimab]) that bind to distinct parts of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein ▪ Discovered at Vanderbilt University Medical Center ▪ AstraZeneca proprietary technology being used to extend the half-life ▪ Being administered IV and IM in phase 1 trial

with SARS-CoV-2 infection in the previous 8 days (n=1121)
Design: phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- Single IM dose of AZD7442 vs placebo for post-exposure prevention of COVID-19

Results:

- Risk of developing SARS-CoV-2 infection was reduced 33% with AZD7442 compared to placebo, not a statistically significant difference (95% CI -26, 65)
- 23 cases (23/749) occurred in the treatment group vs 17 cases (17/372) in the placebo group
- In a planned subgroup analysis of PCR negative participants, the risk of developing SARS-CoV-2 was reduced 73% compared to placebo (95% CI 27, 90)
- In a post-hoc analysis of PCR-negative subjects, the risk reduction was 51% up to 7 days following dosing and 92% more than 7 days after dosing

Limitations: not yet published or peer reviewed

VIR-7831 (Sotrovimab) (Vir Biotechnology/GSK) *(updated 7/12/2021)* **Dosage:** ▪ 500 mg IV infusion over 30 minutes ▪ Patients should be monitored for hypersensitivity reactions during infusion and for at least 1 hour after completion ▪ Should be given as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-2 positive test result and within 10 days of COVID-19 symptom onset ▪ Patients should be treated in facility staffed and equipped to manage anaphylaxis	**COMET-ICE 2021**[20] *(added 3/14/2021; updated 3/26/2021)* **Population:** adults with COVID-19 at high risk of hospitalization (n=583) **Design:** ongoing, randomized, double-blind, phase 3 trial ▪ VIR-7831 single 500 mg infusion vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Independent data monitoring committee recommend stopping early for efficacy ▪ 85% reduction in hospitalization or death in patients who received VIR-7831 compared to placebo (p=0.002) **Limitations:** interim analysis, not published or peer-reviewed	▪ Infusion reactions and hypersensitivity reactions, including anaphylaxis, have been reported[29] ▪ Rash (2%) and diarrhea (1%) reported in COMET-ICE[28]	▪ Monoclonal antibody against SARS-CoV-2; may block viral entry into healthy cells and clear infected cells ▪ Binds to an epitope that is shared by SARS-CoV-1 and -2; may have a higher barrier to resistance ▪ Designed to achieve high lung concentrations ▪ Intramuscular formulation in development ▪ Vir/GSK submitted an application to FDA for emergency use authorization (EUA) of VIR-7831 for patients ≥12 years old (weighing ≥40 kg) with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 who are at risk for progressing to hospitalization or death *(updated 3/26/2021)* ▪ In vitro data suggest VIR-7831 may retain activity against UK, South Africa, and Brazil variants[22] *(added 3/26/2021)* ▪ FDA issued an emergency use authorization (EUA) for sotrovimab for treatment of mild to moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients ≥12 years old weighing ≥40 kg with results of direct SARS-CoV-2 viral testing and who are at high risk for progression to severe COVID-19, including hospitalization or death[28] (*added 5/27/2021)* ▪ Not authorized for use in patients who are hospitalized or require oxygen therapy for COVID-19; monoclonal antibodies may be associated with worse clinical outcomes when

administered to hospitalized patients with COVID-19 requiring high flow oxygen or mechanical ventilation[28] *(added 5/27/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend use of casirivimab plus imdevimab or sotrovimab for treatment of patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 not requiring hospitalization or supplemental oxygen who are at high risk of clinical progression[8] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- IDSA guidelines suggest bamlanivimab/etesevimab or casirivimab/imdevimab or sotrovimab among ambulatory patients with mild to moderate CO VID-19 at high risk for progression to severe disease; local variant susceptibility should be considered in choosing an agent[10] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

Pregnancy:
(updated 5/27/2021)

- Insufficient data on use during pregnancy

- Human IgG1 antibodies can cross the placenta; therefore, sotrovimab has the potential to be transferred from the mother to the fetus

1. ACTIV-3/TICO LY-CoV555 Study Group. A neutralizing monoclonal antibody for hospitalized patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:905.
2. P Chen et al. SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody LY-CoV555 in outpatients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 October 28 (epub).
3. AZD7442 – a potential combination therapy for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04507256. Accessed September 17, 2020.
4. Press Release. Regeneron's REGN-COV2 antibody cocktail reduced viral levels and improved symptoms in non-hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/regenerons-regn-cov2-antibody-cocktail-reduced-viral-levels-and. Accessed September 29, 2020.

5. Press Release. Lilly provides comprehensive update on progress of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody programs. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/lilly-provides-comprehensive-update-progress-sars-cov-2. Accessed October 8, 2020.
6. Press Release. Regeneron's COVID-19 outpatient trial prospectively demonstrates that REGN-COV2 antibody cocktail significantly reduced virus levels and need for further medical attention. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/regenerons-covid-19-outpatient-trial-prospectively-demonstrates/. Accessed October 29, 2020.
7. FDA. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorized monoclonal antibody for treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-monoclonal-antibody-treatment-covid-19?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed November 9, 2020.
8. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
9. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes monoclonal antibodies for treatment of COVID-19. November 21, 2020. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-monoclonal-antibodies-treatment-covid-19. Accessed November 23, 2020.
10. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021 Version 4.2.0. Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
11. DM Weinreich et al. REGN-COV2, a neutralizing antibody cocktail, in outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 December 17 (epub).
12. News Release. Regeneron announces encouraging initial data from COVID-19 antibody cocktail trial in hospitalized patients on low-flow oxygen. 2020 December 29. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/regeneron-announces-encouraging-initial-data-covid-19-antibody. Accessed January 1, 2021.
13. RL Gottlieb et al. Effect of bamlanivimab as monotherapy or in combination with etesevimab on vial load in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021; 325:632.
14. News Release. Lilly's neutralizing antibody bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555) prevented COVID-19 at nursing homes in the BLAZE-2 trial, reducing risk by up to 80 percent for residents. January 21, 2021. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/lillys-neutralizing-antibody-bamlanivimab-ly-cov555-prevented. Accessed January 24, 2021.
15. News Release. Regeneron reports positive interim data with REGEN-COV antibody cocktail used as passive vaccine to prevent COVID-19. January 26, 2021. Available at: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/regeneron-reports-positive-interim-data-with-regen-cov-antibody-cocktail-used-as-passive-vaccine-to-prevent-covid-19-301214619.html. Accessed January 27, 2021.
16. News Release. Lilly, Vir Biotechnology and GSK announce first patient dosed in expanded BLAZE-4 trial evaluating bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555) with VIR-7831 (GSK4182136) for COVID-19. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/lilly-vir-biotechnology-and-gsk-announce-first-patient-dosed. Accessed January 29, 2021.
17. News Release. New data show treatment with Lilly's neutralizing antibodies bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555) and etesevimab (LY-CoV016) together reduced risk of COVID-19 hospitalizations and death by 70 percent. 2021 January 26. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/new-data-show-treatment-lillys-neutralizing-antibodies. Accessed February 5, 2021.
18. News Release. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Bamlanivimab. Outpatient monoclonal antibody treatment for COVID-19 made available under Emergency Use Authorization. Available at: https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx. Accessed March 24, 2021.
19. FDA. Fact sheet for health care providers emergency use authorization (EUA) of bamlanivimab and etesevimab. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/145802/download. Accessed February 10, 2021.
20. News Release. Vir Biotechnology and GSK announce submission of Emergency Use Authorization request to FDA for VIR-7831 for the early treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.gsk.com/en-gb/media/press-releases/gsk-and-vir-biotechnology-announce-submission-of-emergency-use-authorization-request-to-fda-for-vir-7831-for-the-early-treatment-of-covid-19/. Accessed March 26, 2021.
21. News Release. Lilly's bamlanivimab and etesevimab together reduced hospitalizations and death in Phase 3 trial for early COVID-19. 2021 March 10. Available at: https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/lillys-bamlanivimab-and-etesevimab-together-reduced. Accessed March 15, 2021.
22. AL Cathcart et al. The dual function monoclonal antibodies VIR-7831 and VIR-7832 demonstrate potent in vitro and in vivo activity against SARS-CoV-2. bioRxiv 2021 March 10 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.09.434607v1. Accessed March 26, 2021.
23. News Release. Regeneron. Phase 3 trial shows REGEN-COV (casirivimab with imdevimab) antibody cocktail reduced hospitalization or death by 70% in non-hospitalized COVID-19 patients. March 23, 2021. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/phase-3-trial-shows-regen-covtm-casirivimab-imdevimab-antibody. Accessed March 29, 2021.
24. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA revokes Emergency Use Authorization for monoclonal antibody bamlanivimab. 2021 April 16. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-revokes-emergency-use-authorization-monoclonal-antibody-bamlanivimab. Accessed April 19, 2021.
25. News Release. Regeneron. Phase 3 prevention trial showed 81% reduced risk of symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections with subcutaneous administration of REGEN-COV (casirivimab with imdevimab). 2021 April 12. Available at: https://newsroom.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/phase-3-prevention-trial-showed-81-reduced-risk-symptomatic-sars. Accessed April 20, 2021.
26. T Tada et al. The spike proteins of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 and B.1.618 variants identified in India provide partial resistance to vaccine-elicited and therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. bioRxiv 2021 May 16 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.14.444076v1. Accessed May 20, 2021.

27. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response. Bamlanivimab/etesevimab. Important update: May 26, 2021. Available at: https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab-etesevimab/Pages/default.aspx. Accessed May 27, 2021.
28. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes additional monoclonal antibody for treatment of COVID-19. May 26, 2021. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-additional-monoclonal-antibody-treatment-covid-19. Accessed May 27, 2021.
29. Sotrovimab Fact Sheet for Health Care Providers. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/149534/download. Accessed May 27, 2021.
30. MS Cohen et al. Effect of bamlanivimab vs placebo on incidence of COVID-19 among residents and staff of skilled nursing and assisted living facilities. A randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021 June 3 (epub).
31. Press Release. FDA authorizes lower 1200 mg intravenous and subcutaneous dose of REGEN-COV (casirivimab and imdevimab) antibody cocktail to treat patients with COVID-19. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/index.php/news-releases/news-release-details/fda-authorizes-lower-1200-mg-intravenous-and-subcutaneous-dose. Accessed June 5, 2021.
32. News Release. Regeneron. REGEN-COV (casirivimab and imdevimab) phase 3 RECOVERY trial meets primary outcome, improving survival in hospitalized COVID-19 patients lacking an immune response to SARS-CoV-2. 2021 June 16. Available at: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/regen-covtm-casirivimab-and-imdevimab-phase-3-recovery-trial. Accessed June 16, 2021.
33. News Release. AstraZeneca. Update on AZD7442 STORM CHASER trial in post-exposure prevention of symptomatic COVID-19. 2021 June 15. Available at: https://www.astrazeneca.com/media-centre/press-releases/2021/update-on-azd7442-storm-chaser-trial.html. Accessed June 16, 2021.
34. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response. Pause in the distribution of bamlanivimab/etesevimab. June 25, 2021. Available at: https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab-etesevimab/Pages/bamlanivimab-etesevimab-distribution-pause.aspx. Accessed June 28, 2021

GM-CSF Inhibitor

Lenzilumab

(Humanigen)

(added 7/12/2021)

Z Temesgen et al. medRxiv 2021[1,3]

Population: adults hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia (≤ 94% oxygen saturation on room air and/or requiring supplemental oxygen, but not invasive mechanical ventilation) (n=520)

Design: phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- Lenzilumab 600 mg IV x 3 infusions 8 hours apart vs placebo

Results:

- Likelihood of survival without need of invasive mechanical ventilation was 54% greater with lenzilumab compared to standard care alone
- Kaplan-Meier estimate for invasive mechanical ventilation and/or death was 15.6% in lenzilumab arm vs 22.1% in placebo arm
- Mortality 9.6% with lenzilumab and 13.9% with standard care (HR: 1.39; 05% CI 0.82-2.39; p=0.239)
- 94% of patients received, corticosteroids, 72% received remdesivir, and 69% received both (balanced in both study arms)

Limitations: not peer reviewed or published; not powered for mortality

- Recombinant monoclonal antibody targeting human GM-CSF
- GM-CSF depletion may prevent cytokine release syndrome
- Humanigen plans to submit to FDA for EUA
- NIH guidelines state there is insufficient evidence to recommend either for or against use of GM-CSF inhibitors for treatment of patients hospitalized with COVID-19[2] *(added 7/12/2021)*

1. News release. Humanigen reports positive phase 3 topline results demonstrating that lenzilumab improves survival without need for mechanical ventilation in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. March 29, 2021. Available at: https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20210329005301/en/Humanigen-Reports-Positive-Phase-3-Topline-Results-Demonstrating-That-Lenzilumab%E2%84%A2-Improves-Survival-Without-Need-for-Mechanical-Ventilation-in-Hospitalized-Patients-With-COVID-19. Accessed March 29, 2021.
2. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
3. Z Temesgen et al. Lenlizumab efficacy and safety in newly hospitalized COVID-19 subjects: results from the Live-Air phase 3 randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. medRxiv 2021 (epub).

Glutathione and N-acetylcysteine

GLUTATHIONE

Dosage: 2 g IV/PO used in case report[1]

N-ACETYLCYSTEINE (NAC; GLUTATHIONE PRECURSOR)
6 g/day IV[2]

(Added 4/28/2020)

No clinical trial results available

Trial recruiting in the US using NAC in severely or critically ill patients[2]

R Horowitz et al. Resp Med Case Rep 2020[1] Case Report

Population: Two patients with COVID-19 pneumonia

Regimen: 2 g IV/PO glutathione

Adverse Effects:
- Nausea, vomiting, other gastrointestinal symptoms, and rash, with or without fever
- Anaphylactoid reactions to IV acetylcysteine, including rash, pruritus, angioedema, bronchospasm, tachycardia, and hypotension have occurred.

Pregnancy:
- Acetylcysteine crosses the placenta

- Intracellular anti-oxidant with possible antiviral properties
- One researcher has hypothesized that glutathione deficiency is risk factor for severe COVID-19 illness
- NAC has been proposed for treatment of multiple respiratory conditions and viral illnesses

1. RI Horowitz et al. Efficacy of glutathione therapy in relieving dyspnea associated with COVID-19 pneumonia: a report of 2 cases. Resp Med Case Rep 2020 April 21 (epub).
2. Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. A study of N-acetylcysteine in patients with COVID-19 infection. In progress. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04374461?term=acetylcysteine&cond=covid&draw=2&rank=1

MESENCHYMAL STEM CELL THERAPY
(updated 7/21/2020)

Remestemcel-L *(Ryoncil)*

- 10 patients with ARDS treated with remestemcel-L under the FDA compassionate use program with encouraging results
- Randomized clinical trial to be conducted at Mount Sinai in NY
- **Results:** Dyspnea improved within 1 hour of administration

Leng et al. Aging Dis 2020[1] *(updated 7/21/2020)*
Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in China (n=10)
Design: pilot trial; 7 patients (1 critical, 4 severe, 2 common-type illness) treated with mesenchymal stem cells and 3 (severe illness) treated with placebo
Results:

- pulmonary function and symptoms improved within 2 days of transplantation
- All patients in the treatment group recovered

Limitation: small pilot study

Shu et al. Stem Cell Res Ther 2020[6]
(added 10/13/2020)
Population: hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 who did not respond to 7-10 days of standard care in China (n=41)
Design: single-center, open-label controlled trial

- Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells (n=12) vs standard care (n=29)

Adverse Effects:

- Risks in patients with COVID-19 not established
- Possible product contamination, infusion site reactions, thrombosis, infection, tumor growth
- Remestemcel-L well tolerated in trials reported by the manufacturer in children with GVHD

- May mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease by decreasing production of proinflammatory cytokines, increased production of anti-inflammatory cytokines, and recruitment of anti-inflammatory cells
- FDA granted an investigational new drug (IND) application for use of remestemcel-L (*Ryoncil* - Mesoblast), an allogenic mesenchymal stem cell therapy, to treat patients with ARDS caused by COVID-19[2] *(updated 7/21/2020)*
- FDA approved an expanded access protocol for compassionate use of remestemcel-L in children with multisystem inflammatory syndrome associated with COVID-19[3] *(updated 7/21/2020)*
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of mesenchymal stem cells, except in a clinical trial[4] *(updated 7/21/2020)*
- FDA has warned about safety concerns with use of unapproved or illegal stem cell therapies[5] *(updated 7/21/2020)*

Pregnancy:

- There are inadequate data on the use of stem cell therapies in pregnant women

MESENCHYMAL STEM CELL THERAPY (continued)	**Results:** ▪ 0 patients in the stem cell group progressed to critical illness vs 4 patients in the control group ▪ 3 patients in the control group died **Limitation:** small study; due to lack of sufficient stem cells some patients were not randomized to the treatment arm

1. Z Leng et al. Transplantation of ACE2-mesenchymal stem cells improves the outcome of patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. Aging Dis 2020; 11:216.
2. Press Release. GlobeNewswire. FDA clears investigational new drug application for mesoblast to use remestemcel-L in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome caused by COVID-19. Available at: https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/04/06/2011944/0/en/FDA-CLEARS-INVESTIGATIONAL-NEW-DRUG-APPLICATION-FOR-MESOBLAST-TO-USE-REMESTEMCEL-L-IN-PATIENTS-WITH-ACUTE-RESPIRATORY-DISTRESS-SYNDROME-CAUSED-BY-COVID-19.html. Accessed July 21, 2020.
3. Press Release. BioSpace. Expanded Access Protocol initiated for compassionate use of remestemcel-L in children with multisystem inflammatory syndrome associated with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.biospace.com/article/releases/expanded-access-protocol-initiated-for-compassionate-use-of-remestemcel-l-in-children-with-multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-associated-with-covid-19-/. Accessed July 21, 2020.
4. NIH. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/ Accessed July 21, 2020.
5. FDA. FDA warns about stem cell therapies. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/fda-warns-about-stem-cell-therapies. Accessed July 21, 2020.
6. L Shu et al. Treatment of severe COVID-19 with human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells. Stem Cell Res Ther 2020; 11:361.

AVIPTADIL
(Zyesami)

(added 6/8/2021)

NeuroRX 2021[1]
Population: critically ill adults with COVID-19 (n=196)
Design: phase 2b/3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial
- IV aviptadil vs placebo

Results:
- In overall population: met primary endpoint of successful recovery from respiratory failure at day 28 (p=0.014) and day 60 (p=0.013)
- In patients treated with high flow nasal cannula (HFNC; n=127), chance of successful recovery was 71% with aviptadil vs 48% with placebo by day 28 (p=0.017) and 75% with aviptadil vs 55% with placebo by day 60 (p=0.036)
- 84% of HFNC patients given aviptadil were alive at day 60 compared to 60% of those given placebo (p=0.007)

Limitations: company press release; not published or peer reviewed

Adverse Effects:
- In studies in healthy volunteers, alterations in blood pressure, heart rate, or ECG have been reported

- Anti-inflammatory and anti-cytokine activity in animal models of respiratory distress, acute lung injury and inflammation

- Binds to alveolar type II (ATII) cell in the lung and stimulations production of surfactant; ATII cells contain ACE2 receptors which are a route of entry for SARS-CoV-2; infection of ATII cells decreases surfactant production and increases production of inflammatory cytokines

- Clinical trial evaluating use of aviptadil for moderate and severe COVID-19 is ongoing

- The manufacturer has submitted to FDA for an EUA

1. News Release. NeuroRx announces Zyesami (aviptadil, RLF-100) met the primary endpoint of its phase 2b/3 clinical trial and also demonstrated a meaningful benefit in survival from COVID-19. March 29, 2021. Available at: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/neurorx-announces-zyesami-aviptadil-rlf-100-met-the-primary-endpoint-of-its-phase-2b3-clinical-trial-and-also-demonstrated-a-meaningful-benefit-in-survival-from-critical-covid-19-301257291.html. Accessed June 8, 2021.

Oleandrin

OLEANDRIN

(added 8/19/2020)

- No published *in vivo* data on use of oleandrin for treatment or prevention of COVID-19
- An *in vitro* study (not peer reviewed) suggested that oleandrin may inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication[1]

Adverse Effects:

- Toxicity includes nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, diarrhea (possibly bloody stools), anorexia, arrhythmias, drowsiness, tremors, seizures, coma, death
- Toxicity occurs several hours after ingestion

- There are no available data to support use of oleandrin for COVID-19 and it can have serious, life-threatening toxicity; avoid use
- Toxic cardiac glycoside from the *Nerium oleander* plant
- All parts of the oleander plant are toxic; it is responsible for cases of accidental poisoning worldwide

1. KS Plante et al. Prophylactic and therapeutic inhibition of in vitro SARS-CoV-2 replication by oleandrin. BioRxiv 2020 July 15. Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.15.203489v1.full.pdf. Accessed August 19, 2020.

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
Corticosteroids (systemic)			
CORTICOSTEROIDS (DEXAMETHASONE, PREDNISONE, METHYLPREDNISOLONE, HYDROCORTISONE) *(updated 7/12/2021)* **Dexamethasone:** ▪ 6 mg PO or IV daily for up to 10 days or hospital discharge[3] ▪ If dexamethasone is not available, equivalent doses of other corticosteroids such as prednisone 40 mg (once daily or in two divided doses), methylprednisolone 32 mg (once daily or in two divided doses), or hydrocortisone 160 mg (in two to four divided doses) may be used[3,4]	**RECOVERY Trial 2020[1]** **Population:** hospitalized patients in the UK (n=6425) **Design:** ▪ Randomized, controlled, open-label, adaptive, platform trial designed to evaluate a range of treatments for COVID-19 including dexamethasone ▪ Dexamethasone 6 mg PO or IV once daily (n=2104) x 10 days vs usual care (n=4321) **Results:** 28-day mortality rates (dexamethasone vs usual care) ▪ Overall: 22.9% vs 25.7% (p<0.001) ▪ Patients on invasive mechanical ventilation: 29.3% vs 41.4% (rate ratio 0.64; 95% CI 0.51-0.81) ▪ Oxygen without invasive mechanical ventilation: 23.3% vs 26.2% (rate ratio 0.82; 95% CI 0.72-0.94) ▪ No respiratory support at randomization: 17.8% vs 14.0% (rate ratio 1.19; 95% CI 0.91-1.55) **Limitation:** preliminary results; open-label study	**Adverse Effects:** hyperglycemia, insomnia, adrenal suppression, delirium, depression, mania ▪ Prolonged use can increase the risk of reactivation of latent infections such as hepatitis B virus, herpesvirus infections, strongyloidiasis, tuberculosis **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Dexamethasone induces CYP3A4 and P-gp and may decrease concentrations of drugs that are substrates of CYP3A4 or P-gp ▪ Causes hyperglycemia; may decrease the efficacy of antihyperglycemic drugs	▪ Anti-inflammatory effects may modulate immune-mediated lung damage ▪ Authors of RECOVERY trial state that treating 8 ventilated patients or 25 patients requiring oxygen would prevent 1 death[2] ▪ NIH guidelines recommend that patients recently hospitalized (i.e., within the previous 3 days) with COVID-19 who have rapidly increasing oxygen needs, require high-flow oxygen therapy or noninvasive ventilation and have increased markers of inflammation receive dexamethasone with or without remdesivir, plus either tocilizumab or baricitinib. For patients hospitalized who require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone is recommended; for those who were admitted to the ICU ≤24 hours previously and require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone plus tocilizumab is recommended[3] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of dexamethasone in hospitalized patients who do not require supplemental oxygen[3] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ NIH guidelines recommend use of oral dexamethasone in patients who are discharged from the ED despite new or increasing need for supplemental oxygen; dexamethasone should be continued for

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CORTICOSTEROIDS (continued)	**Keller et al. J Hosp Med 2020[5]** *(added 7/27/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in NYC (n=1806) **Design:** observational study ▪ patients treated with steroids within 48 hrs of admission (n=148) compared to those who did not receive steroid treatment **Results:** ▪ patients in the steroid group were more likely to have COPD, asthma, rheumatoid arthritis, or lupus, or to have taken steroids in the year before admission than those in the control group ▪ overall, early use of glucocorticoids was not associated with mortality or mechanical ventilation ▪ in patients with CRP ≥ 20 mg/dL, glucocorticoid treatment was associated with a significant reduction in risk of mortality or mechanical ventilation ▪ in those with CRP < 10 mg/dL, glucocorticoid use was associated with a significant increase in the risk of mortality or mechanical ventilation **Limitations:** observational data **Tomazini et al. JAMA 2020[6]** **The CoDEX Trial** *(added September 3, 2020)* **Population:** ICU patients w/ mod-severe ARDS (n=299) **Design:** ▪ randomized, open-label trial		the duration of supplemental oxygen (or up to 10 days)[3] *(added 7/12/2021)* ▪ IDSA guidelines recommend use of dexamethasone for hospitalized patients with critical illness (mechanical ventilation, ECMO, ARDS)[4] *(updated 10/14/2020)* ▪ IDSA guidelines suggest use of dexamethasone for hospitalized patients with severe illness (patients with $SpO_2 \leq 94\%$ on room air, including patients on supplemental oxygen)[4] *(updated 10/14/2020)* ▪ NIH and IDSA recommend against use of dexamethasone for treatment of COVID-19 in patients who do not require supplemental oxygen *(updated 10/14/2020)*[3,4] ▪ NIH recommends against use of dexamethasone or other systemic corticosteroids in outpatients in the absence of another indication[3] *(added 4/23/2021)* ▪ WHO recommends systemic corticosteroids (dexamethasone 6 mg PO or IV daily or hydrocortisone 50 mg IV q8h x 7-10 days) to treat patients with severe and critical COVID-19[10] *(added 9/3/2020)* ▪ WHO recommends against use of systemic corticosteroids in patients with non-severe disease[10] *(added 9/3/2020)* **Pregnancy:**

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CORTICOSTEROIDS (continued)	▪ dexamethasone 20 mg IV daily x 5 days, then 10 mg daily x 5 days or until hospital discharge plus standard care vs standard care **Results:** ▪ patients in dexamethasone group had significantly more ventilator-free days (days alive and free of mechanical ventilation) compared to control group (6.6 vs 4.0) ▪ no significant difference in all-cause mortality at 28 days, ICU-free days durimg first 28 days, mechanical ventilation duration at 28 days **Limitations:** ▪ open-label ▪ 35% of patients in control group received steroids ▪ trial was underpowered to detect significant differences in secondary endpoints **PF Dequin et al. JAMA 2020[7]** *(added September 3, 2020)* **Population:** ICU patients w/ respiratory failure **Design:** ▪ randomized double-blind trial (n=149) ▪ low-dose hydrocortisone vs placebo **Results:** ▪ trial ended early ▪ no significant difference in rate of treatment failure (death or respiratory support) at day 21 (42.1% w/ low-dose		▪ NIH recommends use of dexamethasone in pregnant women with COVID-19 who are mechanically ventilated or who require supplemental oxygen but are not mechanically ventilated[3] *(added 7/20/2020)* ▪ Monitor for hypoadrenalism in newborns of mothers who received substantial doses

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CORTICOSTEROIDS (continued)	hydrocortisone vs 50.7% w/ placebo **Limitations:** ▪ trial stopped early so underpowered to detect significant differences **REMAP-CAP JAMA 2020[8]** *(added September 3, 2020)* **Population:** ICU patients w/ respiratory or CV support (n=384) **Design:** ▪ open-label adaptive platform trial ▪ IV hydrocortisone 50 or 100 mg q6h x 7 days vs hydrocortisone 50 mg q6h when shock was clinically evident vs no hydrocortisone **Results :** ▪ No difference in median organ-support free days in patients treated with fixed-dose or shock-dependent hydrocortisone compared to no hydrocortisone (all 0 days) ▪ Bayseian model found both hydrocortisone regimens probably superior to no hydrocortisone **Limitations:** ▪ trial stopped early so underpowered to detect significant differences		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CORTICOSTEROIDS (continued)	**WHO JAMA 2020[9]** *(added September 3, 2020)* **Population:** critically ill patients (n=1703) **Design:** ▪ meta-analysis ▪ dexamethasone, hydrocortisone or methylprenisolone vs placebo or usual care **Results:** ▪ 28-day all-cause mortality was lower in those treated with a corticosteroid (OR 0.64 for dexamethasone; 0.69 0.69 for hydrocortisone; 0.91 for methylprednisolone) **L Pasin et al. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2021[11]** *(added 1/30/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized adult patients with COVID-19 with acute hypoxemic failure (n=7692) **Design:** meta-analysis of 5 randomized controlled trials of corticosteroids vs a comparator **Results:** ▪ Overall mortality was statistically significantly lower in patients treated with corticosteroids than with controls (26% vs 28%; RR=0.89, CI 0.82-0.96; p=0.003) ▪ In patients who required mechanical ventilation, mortality was lower than with controls (42% vs 48%; RR=0.85, 95% 0.72-1.00; p=0.05; NNT=19) ▪ In patients not requiring oxygen, mortality was increased (17% vs		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CORTICOSTEROIDS (continued)	13%; RR 1.23, 95% CI 1.00-1.62; p=0.05; NNH=29)) ▪ Risk of need for mechanical ventilation was lower in corticosteroid group than in control group (5% vs 7%; RR=0.74, CI 0.59-0.92; p=0.007) **Limitations:** meta-analysis; small number of trials, heterogeneity of studies **K Ranjbar et al. BMC Infect Dis 2021**[12] *(added 6/8/2021)* **Population**: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Iran (n=86) Design: randomized, triple-blinded trial ▪ Methylprednisolone 2 mg/kg/day vs dexamethasone 6 mg/day **Results:** ▪ Clinical status was statistically significantly better with methylprednisolone compared to dexamethasone at day 5 and day 10 ▪ Mean length of hospital stay was 7.43 days with methylprednisolone and 5.47 days with dexamethasone ▪ Mechanical ventilation was needed in 18.2% of patients given methylprednisolone and 38.1% of those given dexamethasone **Limitations:** small sample size, more potent methylprednisolone dose		

1. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:693.
2. Low-cost dexamethasone reduces death by up to one third in hospitalized patients with severe respiratory complications of COVID-19. June 16, 2020. Available at: https://www.recoverytrial.net/news/low-cost-dexamethasone-reduces-death-by-up-to-one-third-in-hospitalised-patients-with-severe-respiratory-complications-of-covid-19. Accessed June 17, 2020.
3. NIH. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/ Accessed April 23, 2021.
4. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020 September 25 (epub).
5. MJ Keller et al. Effect of systemic glucocorticoids on mortality or mechanical ventilation in patients with COVID-19. J Hosp Med 2020 July 22 (epub).
6. BM Tomazini et al. Effect of dexamethasone on days alive and ventilator-free in patients with moderate or severe acute respiratory distress syndrome and COVID-19. The CoDEX randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020; 324:1307.
7. PF Dequin et al. Effect of hydrocortisone on 21-day mortality or respiratory support among critically ill patients with COVID-19. A randomized trial. JAJA 2020 September 3 (ebub).
8. REMAP-CAP Investigators. Effect of hydrocortisone on mortality and organ support in patients with severe COVID-19. The REMAP-CAP COVID-19 corticosteroid domain randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020; 324:1317.
9. WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) Working Group. Association between administration of systemic corticosteroids and mortality among critically ill patients with COVID-19. A meta-analysis.
10. WHO. Corticosteroids for COVID-19. Living Guidance, 2 September 2020. Available at: file:///C:/Users/jpflo/OneDrive/Desktop/WHO-2019-nCoV-Corticosteroids-2020.1-eng.pdf. Accessed September 3, 2020.
11. L Pasin et al. Corticosteroids for patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) with different disease severity: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2021; 35:578.
12. K Ranjbar et al. Methylprednisolone or dexamethasone, which one is superior corticosteroid in the treatment of hospitalized COVID-19 patients: a triple-blinded randomized controlled trial. BMC Infect Dis 2021; 21:337.

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
Inhaled Corticosteroids			
INHALED CORTICOSTEROIDS (ICSs) *(added 7/30/2020)* ▪ **Ciclesonide *(Alvesco)*** ▪ **Budesonide *(Pulmicort Flexhaler)***	**Iwabuchi et al. J Infect Chemother 2020[1]** **Population:** hospitalized patients with poor oxygenation and CT findings in Japan (n=3) **Design:** case series: all given inhaled ciclesonide **Results:** favorable outcomes in all **Limitations:** cases series of 3 patients **Schultze et al. medRxiv 2020[2]** **Population:** asthma (n=817,973) and COPD (n=148,588) patients in the UK **Design:** cohort study using linked electronic health records (OpenSAFELY platform); compared patients using an ICS to those taking other drugs for COPD/asthma **Results:** ▪ COPD: risk of death higher in patients using ICSs than in those use a long-acting beta agonist and a long-acting muscarinic antagonist (adjusted HR = 1.38; 95% CI 1.08-1.75) ▪ Asthma: risk of death higher in patients using ICSs than in those using only a short-acting beta agonist (adjusted HR = 1.52; 95% CI 0.82-1.49) **Limitations:** observational; not peer reviewed; possible confounding **Covis Pharma 2021[6]** *(added 4/19/2021)* **Population:** outpatients ≥12 years old with symptomatic COVID-19 (n=400)	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ local adverse effects include oral candidiasis (thrush), dysphonia, and reflex cough and bronchospasm ▪ high doses may cause HPA axis suppression, changes in bone density, and development of cataracts or glaucoma ▪ increases the risk of pneumonia in patients with COPD ▪ rinse mouth after use to reduce the risk of local adverse effects **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Significant drug interactions less likely with inhaled corticosteroids than with systemic formulations ▪ Strong CYP3A4 inhibitors may increase serum concentrations of inhaled corticosteroids	▪ Hypothesized that inhaled corticosteroids delivered to the lungs may inhibit adhesion and inflammatory effects of cytokines released in response to the virus ▪ Ciclesonide may have anti-viral activity against SARS-CoV-2[3] ▪ NIH guidelines recommend that patients with COVID-19 who are using inhaled corticosteroids for treatment of asthma or COPD should not discontinue treatment[4] ▪ No data available on use of inhaled corticosteroids for treatment of COVID-19 from randomized controlled trials **Pregnancy:** ▪ Low-to-moderate doses appear to be safe for use during pregnancy[5]

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
	Design: phase 3, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Ciclesonide metered-dose inhaler (MDI) vs placebo **Results:** ▪ The primary endpoint of time to alleviation of COVID-19-related symptoms (defined as symptom-free for continuous period of ≥24 hours by day 30) was not statistically significantly different between the ciclesonide and placebo groups (p=0.5502) **Limitations:** not published or peer reviewed		

1. K Iwabuchi et al. Therapeutic potential of ciclesonide inhalation for COVID-19 pneumonia: report of three cases. J Infect Chemother 2020 26:625.
2. A Schultze et al. Inhaled corticosteroid use and risk COVID-19 related death among 966,461 patients with COPD or asthma: an OpenSAFELY analysis. MedRxiv 2020. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.19.20135491v1. Accessed July 30, 2020.
3. S Jeon et al. Identification of antiviral drug candidates against SARS-CoV-2 from FDA-approved drugs. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2020; 64:e00819-20.
4. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 30, 2020.
5. Drugs for asthma. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2017; 59:139.
6. News Release. Covis Pharma Group announces top-line safety and efficacy data from a phase 3 placebo-controlled COVID-19 study using inhaled corticosteroid (ciclesonide). 2021 April 15. Available at: https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2021/04/15/2210630/11011/en/COVIS-PHARMA-GROUP-Announces-Top-line-Safety-and-Efficacy-Data-from-a-Phase-3-Placebo-Controlled-COVID-19-Study-Using-Inhaled-Corticosteroid-ciclesonide.html. Accessed April 19, 2021.

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
IL-6 Inhibitors			
SARILUMAB – *KEVZARA*[1] (SANOFI/REGENERON) *(updated 7/15/2021)* **Dosage:** ▪ No clinical trial data yet ▪ Optimal dosage not established ▪ High and low IV doses are expected to be studied	▪ US-based phase 2 and 3 clinical trials ongoing[2] ▪ Preliminary results have suggested that the drug may have negative or no effects in patients with severe illness (on oxygen therapy, not on ventilator/in ICU), but may be beneficial in critically ill patients (on a ventilator/requiring ICU) *(updated May 4, 2020)* ▪ Phase 3 trials will continue to enroll critical patients only ○ U.S. phase 3 trial in mechanically ventilated patients has been stopped because the trial did not meet primary or key secondary endpoints and negative trends were found in a subgroup of critically ill patients who were not mechanically ventilated at baseline[11] *(updated 7/6/2020)* **AC Gordon et al. REMAP-CAP Trial. NEJM 2021[19]** *(added 1/11/2021; updated 2/27/2021)* **Population:** adults in the ICU with COVID-19 within 24 hours of starting respiratory or cardiovascular organ support (n=803; 353 tocilizumab, 48 sarilumab, 402 control) **Design:** ongoing, randomized, open-label, multifactorial, adaptive platform trial	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, serious infections, hypersensitivity reactions including anaphylaxis **Drug Interactions:** ▪ May normalize CYP enzyme formation; could increase metabolism and decrease serum concentrations of drugs with narrow therapeutic indices that are metabolized by CYP isozymes ▪ Hematologic toxicity may be additive with other drugs such as linezolid, clozapine, or azathioprine	▪ Monoclonal antibody that inhibits IL-6 receptors; may mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease ▪ NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of sarilumab for treatment of COVID-19 in patients who are within 24 hours of admission to the ICU and require invasive or noninvasive mechanical ventilation or high-flow oxygen (>0.4 FiO2/30 L/min oxygen flow)[3] *(updated 4/26/2021)* ▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of sarilumab, except in a clinical trial, for treatment of COVID-19 in patients who do not require ICU-level care or are admitted to the ICU but do not require mechanical ventilation or high-flow oxygen[3] *(updated 2/5/2021)* ▪ UK Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) recommends clinicians consider use of tocilizumab or sarilumab (alternative) in adult patients admitted to the ICU with COVID-19 pneumonia[20] *(added 1/11/2021)* **Pregnancy:** ▪ Crosses the placenta, especially in the third trimester, and may affect the immune response in an exposed infant ▪ Parturition is associated with IL-6 increases in the cervix and myometrium; inhibition of IL-6 may lead to possible delays of parturition

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
	▪ Tocilizumab 8 mg/kg, sarilumab 400 mg, or standard care **Results:** ▪ 610/654 patients who were enrolled after announcement of RECOVERY trial results received corticosteroids ▪ Median organ support-free days: 10 with tocilizumab, 11 with sarilumab, 0 with standard care ▪ In-hospital mortality: 27% in pooled IL-6 group and 36% in standard care group **Limitations:** open-label; standard care varied; small number of patients received sarilumab **WHO REACT Working Group. JAMA 2021**[28] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Population:** trials that included patients hospitalized for COVID-19 who were randomly assigned to receive an IL-6 antagonist or no IL-6 antagonist or other immunomodulator (except corticosteroids) (n=27 trials; 10,930 patients) **Design:** meta-analysis of 27 trials **Results:** ▪ Lower 28-day all-cause mortality with IL-6 inhibitor vs no IL-6 inhibitor ▪ By 28 days, 1407 death were reported among 6449 patients who received and IL-6 inhibitor and 1158 deaths among 4481 subjects not receiving an IL-6 inhibitor (OR 0.86; 95% CI 0.79-0.95; p=0.003)		▪ Not associated with embryotoxic or teratogenic effects when given in high doses to pregnant monkeys

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
	▪ OR for tocilizumab was 0.83 (95% CI 0.74-0.92, p<0.001) and 1.08 for sarilumab (95% CI 0.86-1.36, p=0.52) ▪ In those receiving corticosteroids, OR was 0.77 (95% CI 0.68-0.87) for tocilizumab and 0.92 (95% CI 0.61-1.38) for sarilumab; most trials of sarilumab patients not on corticosteroids **Limitations:** meta-analysis, some trials not peer-reviewed; some trials ongoing		
TOCILIZUMAB – *ACTEMRA*[4] (GENENTECH) *(updated 7/15/2021)* **Dosage:**[5] ▪ <30 kg: 12 mg/kg IV once ▪ ≥ 30 kg: 8 mg/kg IV once ▪ Max dose 800 mg/infusion ▪ Infuse over 1 hour ▪ Optimal timing of administration is unclear	**Zhou et al. Lancet 2020**[6] **Population:** hospitalized patients in China (n=191) **Design:** retrospective study **Results:** elevated levels of IL-6 were associated with severe illness and death **Xu et al 2020**[7] **Population:** hospitalized patients with severe or critical illness and elevated IL-6 levels; (n=20) **Design:** case series; tocilizumab added to standard care **Results:** ▪ improvement in fever (all patients), oxygen requirement (75% of patients), reduction in CRP levels (in 82.4% of patients), lung opacities on CT scan improved (90.5% of patients) **Limitations:**	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Constipation, anxiety, diarrhea, insomnia, hypertension, nausea, neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, serious infections, GI perforation, hepatotoxicity, hypersensitivity reactions including anaphylaxis **Drug Interactions:** ▪ May normalize CYP enzyme formation; could increase metabolism and decrease serum concentrations of drugs with narrow therapeutic indices that are metabolized by CYP isozymes ▪ Hematologic toxicity may be additive with other drugs such as linezolid, clozapine, or azathioprine ▪ Avoid use of live vaccines in patients taking tocilizumab	▪ Monoclonal antibody that inhibits IL-6 receptors; may mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease ▪ Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines state that there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation on use of tocilizumab[8] ▪ Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) recommends use of tocilizumab and a corticosteroid in all hospitalized patients with progressive severe (SpO2 ≤94% on room air) or critical (requiring mechanical ventilation or ECMO) COVID-19 and increased markers of inflammation[9] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ NIH guidelines recommend that patients recently hospitalized (i.e., within the previous 3 days) with COVID-19 who have

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	▪ not peer-reviewed **CORIMUNO-19** *(added 5/4/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in France with moderate to severe illness not requiring ICU care upon admission (n=129) **Design:** open-label; tocilizumab added to standard care vs standard care alone **Results:** ▪ significantly fewer patients who received tocilizumab died or required ventilation at day 14 **Limitations:** open-label; not yet published **Somers et al. 2020**[10] *(added 6/18/2020; updated 7/14/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients requiring mechanical ventilation (n=154) ▪ tocilizumab-treated patients were younger (55 yrs vs 60 yrs), less likely to have chronic pulmonary disease (10% vs 28%), and had lower D-dimer values at intubation (median 2.4 vs 6.5 mg/dL) **Design:** single-center cohort; patients treated with tocilizumab vs patients not treated with tocilizumab **Results:** median follow-up 47 days ▪ tocilizumab associated with a reduced risk of death (hazard ratio 0.55; 95% CI 0.33,0.90) ▪ tocilizumab associated with an increased risk of superinfections (54% vs 26%; p<0.001) ▪ no significant difference in 28-day case fatality rate in patients treated		rapidly increasing oxygen needs, require high-flow oxygen therapy or noninvasive ventilation and have increased markers of inflammation receive dexamethasone with or without remdesivir, plus either tocilizumab or baricitinib. For patients hospitalized who require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone is recommended; for those who were admitted to the ICU ≤24 hours previously and require invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO, dexamethasone plus tocilizumab is recommended[3] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of baricitinib in combination with tocilizumab because of the risk of additive immunosuppression[1] *(updated 7/12/2021)* ▪ The WHO recommends use of an IL-6 inhibitor such as tocilizumab and a corticosteroid in all patients with severe or critical COVID-19[27] *(added 7/12/2021)* ▪ Results of trials for tocilizumab have been mixed; some randomized controlled trials have not found the same benefits as those reported in observational trials *(added 10/26/2020)* ▪ UK Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) recommends clinicians consider use of tocilizumab or sarilumab (alternative) in adult patients admitted to the ICU with COVID-19 pneumonia[20] *(added 1/11/2021)*

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	with tocilizumab who had superinfections vs those who did not (22% vs15%; p=0.42) **Limitation:** observational data **I Rosas et al. (COVACTA) NEJM 2021[12]** *(added 8/16/2020; updated 2/5/2021; updated 2/27/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia (n=452) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled ▪ IV tocilizumab plus standard of care vs placebo plus standard of care ▪ ~25% of patients received a 2nd tocilizumab or placebo dose 8-24 hrs after the 1st dose **Results:** ▪ No significant difference between tocilizumab and placebo in the primary endpoint of clinical status on a 7-point scale at week 4 (between group difference -1.0; 95% CI -2.5 to 0; p=0.31) ▪ No difference between groups in mortality at week 4 (19.7% tocilizumab vs 19.4% placebo) ▪ Median time to hospital discharge was 20 days with tocilizumab and 28 days with placebo (p=0.037) ▪ Duration of ICU stay was 9.8 days with tocilizumab and 15.5 days with placebo (p=0.045) ▪ Compared to the placebo group, fewer patients in tocilizumab group were given corticosteroids **Limitations:** other treatments not standardized; limitations of primary endpoint		▪ Results of REMAP-CAP trial in critically ill patients and RECOVERY trial in hospitalized patients reported improved outcomes with tocilizumab use, while the results of the COVACTA trial in hospitalized patients with severe pneumonia did not report improved outcomes with tocilizumab[23] *(added 2/27/2021)* ▪ Emergency use authorization (EUA) issued by FDA for use of tocilizumab in adults and children ≥2 years old who are hospitalized with COVID-19, receiving systemic corticosteroids, and who require supplemental oxygen, noninvasive or invasive mechanical ventilation, or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation[26] *(added 6/26/2021)* **Pregnancy:** ▪ Crosses the placenta, especially in the third trimester, and may affect the immune response in an exposed infant ▪ Parturition is associated with IL-6 increases in the cervix and myometrium; inhibition of IL-6 may lead to possible delays of parturition ▪ Increased incidence of abortion/ embryo-fetal death when given to pregnant monkeys during the period of organogenesis

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	**EMPACTA 2020**[13] *(added 9/18/2020; update below, See Salama et al.)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia (SpO2 <94% on ambient air with no mechanical ventilation) (n=389) ▪ 85% of patients were from racial and ethnic minority groups **Design:** Phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Tocilizumab plus standard care vs placebo plus standard care **Results:** ▪ Mechanical ventilation or death was less likely in patients treated with tocilizumab compared to those who were not (p=0.0348; HR 0.56) **Limitations:** not yet published or peer reviewed data **C Salvarani et al. JAMA Intern Med 2020**[14] *(added 10/22/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in Italy with COVID-19 pneumonia and PaO2/FiO2 ratio of 200-300 mm Hg (n=126) **Design:** open-label, randomized trial ▪ tocilizumab (given within 8 hours of randomization) vs standard care **Results:** ▪ Composite outcome of clinical worsening (ICU admission with invasive mechanical ventilation, death from all causes, PaO2/FiO2 ratio <150 mm HG) occurred in 28.3% of patients who received tocilizumab vs 27.0% of patients who received standard care		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	▪ Trial was stopped early for futility **Limitations:** small open-label trial; tocilizumab allowed as rescue therapy in standard care group **S Gupta et al. JAMA Intern Med 2020**[15] *(added 10/22/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in the ICU with COVID-19 (n=3924) **Design:** retrospective, multicenter cohort study ▪ patients who received tocilizumab within 2 days of ICU admission compared to those who did not **Results:** ▪ 1544 patients (39.3%) died; 125 (28.9%) who received tocilizumab and 1419 (40.6%) who did not receive tocilizumab ▪ During a median follow-up of 27 days, risk of death was lower in patients treated with tocilizumab compared to those who were not (HR 0.71; 95% CI 0.56-0.92) ▪ Estimated 30-day mortality was 27.5% in patients who were given tocilizumab and 37.1% in those who were not given tocilizumab (risk difference 9.6%; 95% CI 3.1%-16.0%) **Limitations:** retrospective data; differences in baseline characteristics between groups; possible unmeasured confounding **O Hermine et al. JAMA Intern Med 2020 – CORIMUNO-TOCI 1**[16] *(added 10/22/2020; updated 5/25/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in France with moderate-to-severe		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	COVID-19 pneumonia (≥3 L of oxygen but not on ventilation or in the ICU) (n=131) **Design:** cohort-embedded, investigator-initiated, multicenter, open-label, bayesian randomized trial ▪ tocilizumab plus usual care vs usual care alone **Results:** ▪ At day 14, compared to the usual care group fewer patients in the tocilizumab group needed noninvasive ventilation or mechanical ventilation or died (24% vs 36% with usual care; median posterior HR 0.58; 90%CrI 0.33-1.00) ▪ Tocilizumab did not reduce scores on the WHO 10-point Clinical Progression Scale lower than 5 on day 4 ▪ No difference in 28-day mortality was found **90-Day Follow-up[25]** ▪ Death occurred in 7 of 63 (11%) patients in the tocilizumab group and in 11 of 67 (18%) patients in the usual care group by day 90 (HR 0.64; 95% CI 0.25-1.65) ▪ A post-hoc analysis stratified by CRP level found a benefit in patients given tocilizumab who had CRP levels >15.0 mg/dL ▪ 90-day mortality in patients with CRP >15 mg/dL was 9% with tocilizumab and 35% with usual care (HR 0.18; 95% CI 0.04-0.9; p=0.02)		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	**Limitations:** small sample, not blinded **J Stone et al. NEJM 2020**[17] *(added 10/22/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 not on mechanical ventilation (n=243) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Tocilizumab plus standard care vs placebo plus standard care **Results:** ▪ Tocilizumab not effective for preventing intubation or death (HR 0.83; 95% CI 0.38-1.81; p=0.64) ▪ Worsening of disease occurred in 18.0% of patients in the tocilizumab group vs 14.9% of those in the placebo group at 14 days ▪ Median time to oxygen discontinuation 5.0 days with tocilizumab and 4.9 days with placebo ▪ 24.6% of patients who received tocilizumab and 21.2% of those who received placebo were still receiving supplemental oxygen at 14 days ▪ There were fewer serious infections in patients who received tocilizumab **Limitations:** primary event rate lower than anticipated; higher number of patients >65 years old in tocilizumab group		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	**C Salama et al. NEJM 2020 (EMPACTA):**[18] *(added 12/17/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia not on mechanical ventilation (n=389) ▪ >25% were over 65 years of age, >75% had ≥1 coexisting condition, >80% were in a minority racial or ethnic group **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Tocilizumab (1 or 2 doses of 8 mg/kg) plus standard care or standard care alone **Results:** ▪ Mechanical ventilation or death by day 28 was 12.0% with tocilizumab and 19.3% with standard care alone (hazard ratio 0.56; 95% CI 0.33-0.97; p=0.04) ▪ Outcome was similar to overall population when assessed according to race or ethnic group ▪ Mortality differences alone were not statistically significant **Limitations:** other treatments used not uniform; outcome by race or ethnic group was exploratory **AC Gordon et al. REMAP-CAP Trial. NEJM 2021**[19] *(added 1/11/2021; updated 2/27/2021)* **Population:** adults in the ICU with COVID-19 within 24 hours of starting respiratory or cardiovascular organ support (n=803; 353 tocilizumab, 48 sarilumab, 402 control)		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	**Design:** ongoing, randomized, open-label, multifactorial, adaptive platform trial ▪ Tocilizumab 8 mg/kg, sarilumab 400 mg, or standard care **Results:** ▪ 610/654 patients who were enrolled after announcement of RECOVERY trial results received corticosteroids ▪ Median organ support-free days: 10 with tocilizumab, 11 with sarilumab, 0 with standard care ▪ In-hospital mortality: 27% in pooled IL-6 group and 36% in standard care group **Limitations:** open-label; standard care varied; small number of patients received sarilumab **VC Veiga et al. BMJ 2021**[21] *(added 1/25/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized adults with severe or critical COVID-19 on supplemental oxygen or mechanical ventilation with abnormal levels of ≥2 serum biomarkers (C reactive protein, D dimer, lactate dehydrogenase, ferritin) (n=129) **Design:** randomized, open-label trial ▪ Tocilizumab 8 mg/kg IV single dose plus standard care vs standard care alone **Results:** ▪ A composite of mechanical ventilation or death at 15 days occurred in 28% of patients receiving tocilizumab compared to 20% of those receiving standard care alone		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	▪ Trial stopped early after enrollment of 129 patients because of an increased number of deaths in the tocilizumab group at day 15 **Limitations:** open-label; small sample; severe or critical illness only **RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Lancet 2021**[22] *(updated 5/5/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized adults with COVID-19 with evidence of hypoxia (oxygen saturation <92% on room air or requiring oxygen therapy) and systemic inflammation (C-reactive protein ≥75 mg/L) (n=4116) **Design:** randomized, open-label, platform trial ▪ Tocilizumab IV 400-800 mg (based on weight) added to standard care vs standard care alone **Results :** ▪ 28-day mortality was 31% (621/2022) with tocilizumab compared to 35% (729/2094) with standard care alone (rate ratio 0.85, 95% CI 0.76-0.94; p=0.0028) ▪ Results consistent in subgroups, including those on corticosteroids ▪ The percentage of patients discharged from the hospital alive within 28 days was 57% with tocilizumab and 50% with standard care (rate ratio 1.22, 95% CI 1.12-1.33; p<0.0001) ▪ In patients not on mechanical ventilation at baseline, the composite endpoint of invasive mechanical ventilation or death		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	occurred less often in patients who received tocilizumab compared to those on standard care (35% vs 42%; risk ratio 0.84, 95% CI 0.77-0.92; p<0.0001) **Limitations:** open-label trial; after randomization ~16% of patients did not receive treatment for unknown reasons; data past 28 days not yet available **REMDACTA 2021[24]** *(added 3/14/2021)* **Population:** patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia **Design:** phase 3, randomized, double-blind, trial ▪ Tocilizumab + remdesivir vs placebo plus remdesivir **Results:** ▪ Primary endpoint of improvement in time to hospital discharge by day 28 was not met ▪ Secondary endpoints including death, likelihood of progression to mechanical ventilation or death, and clinical status were not met **Limitations:** not published **WHO REACT Working Group. JAMA 2021[28]** *(added 7/15/2021)* **Population:** trials that included patients hospitalized for COVID-19 who were randomly assigned to receive an IL-6 antagonist or no IL-6		

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
TOCILIZUMAB (CONTINUED)	antagonist or other immunomodulator (except corticosteroids) (n=27 trials; 10,930 patients) **Design:** meta-analysis of 27 trials **Results:** ▪ Lower 28-day all-cause mortality with IL-6 inhibitor vs no IL-6 inhibitor ▪ By 28 days, 1407 death were reported among 6449 patients who received and IL-6 inhibitor and 1158 deaths among 4481 subjects not receiving an IL-6 inhibitor (OR 0.86; 95% CI 0.79-0.95; p=0.003) ▪ OR for tocilizumab was 0.83 (95% CI 0.74-0.92, p<0.001) and 1.08 for sarilumab (95% CI 0.86-1.36, p=0.52) ▪ In those receiving corticosteroids, OR was 0.77 (95% CI 0.68-0.87) for tocilizumab and 0.92 (95% CI 0.61-1.38) for sarilumab; most trials of sarilumab patients not on corticosteroids **Limitations:** meta-analysis, some trials not peer-reviewed; some trials ongoing		

1. FDA-approved for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis.
2. Clinical trials information available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04315298?Term=sarilumab&draw=2&rank=4. Accessed March 31, 2020.
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 12, 2021.
4. FDA-approved for chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T cell-induced severe or life-threatening cytokine release syndrome, rheumatoid arthritis, giant cell arteritis, polyarticular juvenile idiopathic arthritis, and systemic juvenile idiopathic arthritis.
5. Fact sheet for healthcare providers: emergency use authorization for Actemra (tocilizumab). Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/150321/download. Accessed June 26, 2021.
6. F Zhou et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020; 395:1054.
7. X Xu et al. Effective treatment of severe COVID-19 patients with tocilizumab. Available at: http://chinaxiv.org/abs/202003.00026. Accessed March 31, 2020.
8. W Alhazzani et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with COVID-19. Crit Care Med 2020 March 27 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/abstract/onlinefirst/surviving_sepsis_campaign__guidelines_on_the.95707.aspx. Accessed April 1, 2020.
9. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021 Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed July 12, 2021.

10. EC Somers et al. Tocilizumab for treatment of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020 July 11 (epub):ciaa954.
11. Press Release. Regeneron and Sanofi provide update on Kevzara (sarilumab) Phase 3 U.S. trial in COVID-19 patients. Available at: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/regeneron-and-sanofi-provide-update-on-kevzara-sarilumab-phase-3-us-trial-in-covid-19-patients-301087849.html. Accessed July 6, 2020.
12. I Rosas et al. Tocilizumab in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. N Engl J Med 2021 February 25 (epub).
13. Press release. Roche's phase III EMPACTA study showed Actemra/RoActemra reduced the likelihood of needing mechanical ventilation in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 associated pneumonia. Available at: https://www.roche.com/investors/updates/inv-update-2020-09-18.htm. Accessed 18 September 2020.
14. C Salvarani et al. Effect of tocilizumab vs standard care on clinical worsening in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2020 October 20 (epub).
15. S Gupta et al. Association between early treatment with tocilizumab and mortality among critically ill patients with COVID-19. JAMA Intern Med 2020 October 20 (epub).
16. O Hermine et al. Effect of tocilizumab vs usual care in adults hospitalized with COVID-19 and moderate or severe pneumonia: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2020 October 20 (epub).
17. JH Stone et al. Efficacy of tociluzumab in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2333.
18. C Salama et al. Tocilizumab in patients hospitalized with Covid-19 pneumonia. N Engl J Med 2020 December 17 (epub).
19. The REMAP-CAP Investigators. AC Gordon et al. Interleukin-6 receptor antagonists in critically ill patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2021 February 25 (epub).
20. Interim Position Statement: interleukin-6 inhibitors (tocilizumab or sarilumab) for patients admitted to ICU with COVID-19 pneumonia (adults). 2021 January 8. Available at: file:///C:/Users/smorey/Downloads/IL6_Inhibitors_Position_Statement.pdf. Accessed January 11, 2021.
21. VC Veiga et al. Effect of tocilizumab on clinical outcomes at 15 days in patients with severe or critical coronavirus disease 2019: randomised controlled trial. BMJ 2021 January 20 (epub).
22. RECOVERY Collaborative Goup. Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. Lancet 2021 May 1 (epub).
23. EJ Rubin, DL Longo, and LR Baden. Interleukin-6 receptor inhibition in COVID-19 – cooling the inflammatory soup. N Engl J Med 2021 February 25 (epub).
24. News Release. Genentech provides update on the phase III REMDACTA trial of Actemra plus Veklury in patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia. 2021 March 11. Available at: https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20210310006075/en/Genentech-Provides-Update-on-the-Phase-III-REMDACTA-Trial-of-Actemra-Plus-Veklury-in-Patients-With-Severe-COVID-19-Pneumonia. Accessed March 14, 2021.
25. X Mariette et al. Effectiveness of tocilizumab in patients hospitalized with COVID-19: a follow-up of the CORIMUNDO-TOCI-1 randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2021 May 24 (epub).
26. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes drug for treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-drug-treatment-covid-19. Accessed June 26, 2021.
27. WHO. Therapeutics and COVID-19: living guideline. V6.1. July 6, 2021. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wsysse. Accessed July 8, 2021.
28. The WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) Working Group. Association between administration of IL-6 antagonists and mortality among patients hospitalized for COVID-19: a meta-analysis. JAMA 2021 July 6 (epub).

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
IL-1 Receptor Antagonists			
ANAKINRA – *KINERET* (BIOVITRUM AB) *(updated 7/27/2020)* **Dosage:** ▪ Optimal dosage for COVID-19 unknown[1,2,3] ▪ In a trial being conducted by the manufacturer, anakinra is being administered IV at a dosage of 100 mg q6h x 15 days. According to US *Kineret* labeling, the drug is indicated for SC administration.	**Cavalli et al. Lancet Rheum 2020[4]** **Population:** consecutive hospitalized patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS and serum C-reactive protein ≥100 mg/L, ferritin ≥900 ng/mL, or both; not on mechanical ventilation **Design:** retrospective cohort study; single hospital in Italy ▪ Addition of anakinra vs standard treatment (HCQ + LPV/RTV) **Results:** at 21 days ▪ Improved survival with high-dose (5 mg/kg IV bid) anakinra vs standard treatment (90% vs 56%; p=0.009) ▪ Mechanical ventilation-free survival similar between groups (72% vs 50%; p=0.15) ▪ Associated with reduced serum C-reactive protein and improved respiratory function **Limitations:** small, retrospective study **Cauchois et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2020[5]** *(added 7/27/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in France with hypoxemic pneumonia or ARDS (n=22) **Design:** retrospective ▪ anakinra plus standard care compared to standard care alone ▪ anakinra dosage: 300 mg IV x 5 days, then tapered to 200 mg/d x 2 days, then 100 mg x 1 day	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Injection-site reactions, infections, neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, hepatic transaminase elevations **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Use with TNF inhibitors or other biologics may increase risk of serious infections and neutropenia and should be avoided	▪ Clinical trials are ongoing[1,2] ▪ IL-1 receptor antagonist; IL-1 mediates inflammatory and immune responses antagonist ▪ May mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease ▪ NIH guidelines state there are insufficient clinical data to recommend either for or against use of IL-1 inhibitors[3] *(updated 4/28/2020)* ▪ FDA-approved for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and neonatal-onset multisystem inflammatory disease. **Pregnancy:** ▪ Not associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes in small retrospective studies in humans or in animal studies

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
ANAKINRA (continued)	**Results:** ▪ compared to standard care alone, all anakinra-treated patients had clinical improvement ($p<0.01$), decreases in oxygen requirements ($p<0.05$), and more days off invasive mechanical ventilation ($p<0.06$) ▪ there were no deaths in the anakinra group and 1 death in the standard care group ▪ significant reduction of fever and CRP by day 3 with anakinra **Limitations:** small retrospective study		
CANAKINUMAB – *ILARIS* (NOVARTIS) *(added 11/29/2020)* **Dosage:** ▪ Optimal dosage for COVID-19 unknown ▪ Single IV infusion administered over 2 hours on day 1[6] Weight-based dosing: ▪ 40-<60 kg: 450 mg ▪ 60-80 kg: 600 mg ▪ >80 kg 750 mg	**CAN-COVID 2020[6]** **Population:** hospitalized adult patients with COVID-19 pneumonia (not on invasive mechanical ventilation) and cytokine release syndrome (n=454) **Design:** ongoing, phase 3, randomized, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Canakinumab vs placebo ▪ Added to standard care **Results:** ▪ Survival without need for mechanical ventilation at day 29 was achieved in 88.8% of patients who received canakinumab and 85.7% of those who received placebo ($p=0.29$) ▪ Mortality rates were 4.9% with canakinumab and 7.2% with placebo ($p=0.33$)	**Adverse Effects:** Injection-site reactions, infections, neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, and hepatic transaminase elevations **Drug Interactions:** Use with TNF inhibitors or other biologics may increase the risk of serious infections and neutropenia and should be avoided	▪ Selectively binds to IL-1β and inactivates its signaling, inhibiting the induction of intracellular mediators involved in inflammatory and immune responses ▪ May mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease ▪ NIH guidelines state there are insufficient clinical data to recommend either for or against use of IL-1 inhibitors[3] ▪ Interim analysis of one randomized controlled trial, sponsored by the manufacturer, did not meet primary or secondary endpoints for efficacy[6]

DRUG AND DOSAGE	EFFICACY	ADVERSE EFFECTS/INTERACTIONS	COMMENTS
CANAKINUMAB (CONTINUED)	**Limitations:** interim analysis, not yet published		▪ FDA-approved for treatment of cryopyrin-associated periodic syndromes (CAPS), tumor necrosis factor receptor associated periodic syndrome (TRAPS), hyperimmunoglobulin D syndrome (HIDS)/mevalonate kinase deficiency (MKD), Familial Mediterranean Fever (FMF), adult onset Still's disease, and systemic juvenile idiopathic arthritis (SJIA) **Pregnancy:** ▪ Not adequately studied in pregnant women. Associated with delays in fetal skeletal development in animal studies. Monoclonal antibodies are unlikely to cross the placenta in the first trimester but may do so subsequently.

1. Efficacy and safety of emapalumab and anakinra in reducing hyperinflammation and respiratory distress in patients with covid-19 infection. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04324021?term=anakinra&cond=covid&draw=2&rank=1**.** Accessed April 14, 2020.
2. Treatment of COVID-19 patients with anti-interleukin drugs (COV-AID). Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04330638**.** Accessed April 14, 2020.
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/**.** Accessed November 29, 2020.
4. G Cavalli et al. Interleukin-1 blockade with high-dose anakinra in patients with COVID-19, acute respiratory distress syndrome, and hyperinflammation: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Rheum 2020 May 7 (epub).
5. R Couchois et al. Early IL-1 receptor blockade in severe inflammatory respiratory failure complicating COVID-19. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2020 July 22 (epub).
6. News Release. Novartis provides update on CAN-COVID trial in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia and cytokine release syndrome (CRS). 2020 November 6. Available at: https://www.novartis.com/news/media-releases/novartis-provides-update-can-covid-trial-hospitalized-patients-covid-19-pneumonia-and-cytokine-release-syndrome-crs. Accessed November 29, 2020.

ACALABRUTINIB – *CALQUENCE* (ASTRAZENECA)

(added 11/29/2020)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage for COVID-19 unknown
- 100 mg PO q 12 h

CALAVI 2020[1]

Population: hospitalized adult patients with respiratory symptoms of COVID-19 (not on invasive mechanical ventilation or in ICU)
Design: phase 2, randomized, open-label trials (1 in US; 1 in other countries across the world)
- acalabrutinib vs placebo
- added to standard care

Results:
- Treatment with acalabrutinib did not meet the primary endpoint of reducing respiratory failure or death

Limitations: minimal information available

Adverse Effects:

- Neutropenia, anemia, pneumonia, thrombocytopenia, headache, diarrhea, musculoskeletal pain, hemorrhage, atrial fibrillation or flutter, serious and opportunistic infections

Drug Interactions:

- Avoid coadministration with strong CYP3A inhibitors and CYP3A inducers
- Avoid use with PPIs and stagger dosing with H2-receptor antagonists and antacids
- BTK inhibitors have broad immunosuppressive effects; can modulate signaling that promotes inflammation
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of BTK inhibitors[2]
- FDA-approved for treatment of mantle cell lymphoma (MCL), chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), and small lymphocytic lymphoma (SLL)

Pregnancy:

- May cause fetal harm and dystocia

1. News Release. AstraZeneca. Update on CALAVI phase II trials for Calquence in patients hospitalized with respiratory symptoms of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.astrazeneca.com/media-centre/press-releases/2020/update-on-calavi-phase-ii-trials-for-calquence-in-patients-hospitalised-with-respiratory-symptoms-of-covid-19.html. Accessed November 29, 2020.
2. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed November 29, 2020.

BARICITINIB –
***OLUMIANT* (LILLY)**

(updated 7/12/2021)

Dosage:

- **Adults and children ≥9 years old:** 4 mg PO once/daily x 14 days or until hospital discharge

- **Children 2-<9 years old:** 2 mg once daily x 14 days or until hospital discharge

- For patients unable to swallow, baricitinib tablets can be dispersed in water and given via G or NG tube

- **Renal Dosage Adjustments:**

eGFR 30-<60 mL/min/1.73m^2:
- 2 mg once daily in patients ≥9 years old
- 1 mg once daily in patients 2-<9 years old

eGFR 15-<30 mL/min/1.73m^2:
- 1 mg once daily in patients ≥9 years old
- Not recommended in patients 2-<9 years old

- Should not be used in patients with end-stage renal disease (eGFR <15 mL/min/1.73 m^2), or who are on dialysis

AC Kalil et al. NEJM 2020 (NIH Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial 2 [ACTT-2])[6] *(added 9/18/2020; updated 12/11/2020)*
Population: hospitalized patients with moderate or severe COVID-19 (n=1033)
Design: Phase 3, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial
- remdesivir (≤10 days) plus either baricitinib (≤14 days) or placebo

Results:
- Mean recovery time was about 1 day shorter with the combination of remdesivir plus baricitinib compared to remdesivir alone (7 days vs 8 days; rate ratio for recovery 1.16; 95% CI 1.01-1.32; p=0.03)
- Recovery in patients on high-flow oxygen or noninvasive ventilation at enrollment was 10 days with combination treatment and 18 days with remdesivir alone (rate ratio for recovery 1.51; 95% CI 1.10-2.08)
- Odds of clinical improvement at day 15 was greater with the combination compared with remdesivir alone (OR 1.3; 95% CI 1.0 to 1.6)
- Number of patients who progressed to death or ventilation at day 29 was lower with the combination (23%) than with remdesivir alone (28%)
- Morality rate at day 28 after randomization was 5.1% with the combination and 7.8% with

Adverse Effects:
- Nausea is common

- Serious, sometimes fatal, infections, including multi-dermatomal herpes zoster and tuberculosis (TB)

- Serious, sometimes fatal, thromboembolic events

- Malignancy, GI perforation, neutropenia, lymphopenia, anemia, thrombocytosis, and elevations in liver enzymes, creatine phosphokinase levels, and lipid levels have also been reported

Drug Interactions:
- The strong organic anion transporter 3 (OAT3) inhibitor probenecid doubled baricitinib exposure

- Avoid use of live vaccines

- FDA-approved for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis

- Inhibits JAK enzymes, which mediate signaling of proinflammatory cytokines including IL-6; may mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease

- The NIH recommends that patients recently hospitalized (i.e., within the previous 3 days) with COVID-19 who have rapidly increasing oxygen needs, require high-flow oxygen therapy or noninvasive ventilation and have or increased markers of inflammation receive the corticosteroid dexamethasone with or without remdesivir, plus either tocilizumab or baricitinib[1] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of baricitinib in combination with tocilizumab because of the risk of additive immunosuppression[1] *(updated 7/12/2021)*

- FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for use of baricitinib, in combination with remdesivir, for treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients ≥2 years old who require supplemental oxygen, invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO[7] *(added 11/20/2020)*

Pregnancy:
- Administration to pregnant animals resulted in reduced fetal weights,

BARICITINIB (continued)

- Should not be used in patients with severe hepatic impairment (Child-Pugh C)

- Dosage reductions are recommended for patients taking strong OAT3 inhibitors with baricitinib: reduce daily dose to 2 mg if recommended dose is 4 mg; reduce daily dose to 1 mg if recommended dose is 2 mg; consider stopping OAT3 inhibitor if recommended dose is 1 mg

- Treatment should be interrupted for an absolute lymphocyte count <200 cells/mm^3 or absolute neutrophil count <500 cells/mm^3, or drug-induced liver injury is suspected

- Should not be used in patients with known active tuberculosis

remdesivir alone (hazard ratio for death 0.65; 95% CI 0.39-1.09)
- Greatest mortality benefit appeared to be in patients receiving oxygen

Limitations: not powered to detect differences in mortality

COV-BARRIER 2021[9]

(added 4/12/2021)

Population: patients hospitalized with COVID-19 who required supplemental oxygen (ordinal scale [OS] 5) or high-flow oxygen/non-invasive mechanical ventilation (OS 6) and ≥1 increased marker of inflammation (n=1525)

Design: phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- Baricitinib 4 mg vs placebo x 14 days or until discharge; both groups received standard care

Results:

- 79% of patients received corticosteroids and 19% received remdesivir
- Patients who received baricitinib were not statistically significantly less likely than those who received standard care alone to progress to non-invasive ventilation or death by day 28 (OR 0.85; 95% CI 0.67-1.08; p=0.18)
- Death from any cause by day 28 occurred in 8.1% of patients who received baricitinib and 13.1% of those who received standard care alone, a statistically significant difference

Limitations: data not yet published or peer reviewed

embryolethality, and skeletal malformations

RUXOLITINIB –
***JAKAFI* (INCYTE/NOVARTIS)**

(updated 12/16/2020)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage not established
- 10 mg PO bid x 14 days[2]
- Taper dosage when stopping: 5 mg bid x 2 days, then 5 mg once daily x 1 day

- Manufacturer is initiating phase III clinical trials in patients with severe COVID-19 to compare ruxolitinib to standard care[3,4]

Novartis. RUXCOVID Trial 2020[8]
(added 12/16/2020)
Population:

- Patients ≥12 years old hospitalized for COVID-19 (not intubated or in ICU) (n=432)

Design:

- Phase 3, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial
- Ruxolitinib plus standard care vs standard care alone

Results:

- Did not meet primary endpoint of reducing the number of patients with severe complications (death, mechanical ventilation, or ICU admission)
- Proportion of patients with severe complications by day 29 was 12% with ruxolitinib and 11.8% with standard care

Adverse Effects:

- Most common adverse effects include thrombocytopenia, anemia, fatigue, diarrhea, bruising, dizziness, dyspnea, and headache
- Severe withdrawal symptoms including a systemic inflammatory response syndrome have been reported when ruxolitinib was stopped

Drug Interactions:

- Strong CYP3A4 inhibitors can increase serum concentrations of ruxolitinib (ketoconazole increased ruxolitinib AUC by 91%)
- Concurrent use of ruxolitinib with a strong CYP3A4 inhibitor[5] should be avoided in patients with platelet counts less than 100 X 10^9/L; dosage reductions may be needed for patients with a platelet count ≥100 X 10^9 /L

Pregnancy:

- No adequate studies in pregnant women
- Administration to pregnant animals result in an increase in late resorptions and reduced fetal weights

- NIH recommends against use of JAK inhibitors, except in the context of a clinical trial, because of their broad immunosuppressive effect[1] *(updated 4/28/2020)*
- *Jakavi* outside the US
- FDA-approved for treatment of myelofibrosis
- Inhibits JAK1 and 2, which mediate signaling of proinflammatory cytokines including IL-6; may mitigate the effects of cytokines release in response to the virus and limit lung damage in patients with severe disease
- Manufacturer initiating an open-label emergency Expanded Access Plan (EAP) in the US
- Should be avoided in patients with end stage renal disease (CrCl <15 mL/min) not requiring dialysis and in patients with moderate or severe renal impairment or hepatic impairment and a platelet count 100 X 10^9/L

1. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 12, 2021
2. Dosage to be used in clinical trials for COVID-19.
3. Study of the efficacy and safety of ruxolitinib to treat COVID-19 pneumonia. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04331665?term=covid&cond=ruxolitinib&draw=2&rank=1. Accessed April 6, 2020.
4. Treatment of SARS caused by COVID-19 with ruxolitinib. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04334044?term=covid&cond=ruxolitinib&draw=2&rank=2. Accessed April 6, 2020.
5. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
6. AC Kalil et al. Baricitinib plus remdesivir for hospitalized adults with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:795.
7. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes drug combination for treatment of COVID-19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-drug-combination-treatment-covid-19?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed November 20, 2020.
8. Novartis. News Release. Novartis provides update on RUXCOVID study of ruxolitinib for hospitalized patients with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.novartis.com/news/media-releases/novartis-provides-update-ruxcovid-study-ruxolitinib-hospitalized-patients-covid-19. Accessed December 16, 2020.

TNF INHIBITORS

(added 7/29/2020)

- Optimal dosage for treatment of COVID-19 not established

- Adalimumab *(Humira)*
- Certolizumab pegol *(Cimzia)*
- Infliximab (*Remicade*, and biosimilars)
- Etanercept *(Enbrel)*
- Golimumab *(Simponi)*

Brenner et al. Gastroenterology 2020[1]

Population: patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and COVID-19 (525 cases)
Design: international (33 countries) registry to monitor outcomes of IBD patients with COVID-19 (Surveillance Epidemiology of Coronavirus Under Research Exclusion for Inflammatory Bowel Disease (SECURE-IBD)
Results:
- 31% hospitalized and 3% died
- Risk factors for severe COVID-19 included corticosteroid and sulfasalazine or 5-aminosalicylate use, but not TNF-inhibitor use

Limitations: observational data

Gianfrancesco et al. Ann Rheum Dis 2020[2]

Population: patients with rheumatic disease and COVID-19 (600 cases)
Design: international (40 countries) case series from the C19-GRA registry
Results:
- 46% hospitalized and 9% died
- Risk factors for hospitalization included corticosteroid use (prednisone dose ≥ 10 mg/day); TNF-inhibitor use was associated with reduced odds of hospitalization

Limitations: observational data

Adverse Effects:
- Injection-site reactions or infusion reactions (fever, urticaria, dyspnea, hypotension)
- Cytopenias; malignancies, especially lymphomas, have been reported, but a cause-and-effect relationship has not been established
- Increased risk of infections, including reactivated and disseminated tuberculosis, invasive or disseminated fungal infection, and other opportunistic infections; reactivation of HBV
- Rarely induces or exacerbates heart failure or induces a reversible lupus-like syndrome
- Demyelinating conditions, including multiple sclerosis, optic neuritis, and Guillain-Barré syndrome have been reported

Drug Interactions:
- Concomitant administration of a TNF inhibitor with another biologic agent may increase the risk of serious infections and neutropenia
- Patients being treated with TNF inhibitors should not receive live vaccines

- Patients with COVID-19 have been found to have increased levels of inflammatory cytokines including TNF

- TNF-inhibitors may mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus

- No clinical trial data yet available on efficacy of TNF inhibitors in patients with COVID-19

Pregnancy:
- Generally considered safe for use during pregnancy
- Placental transfer of anti-TNF antibodies is higher in the late second and third trimesters, especially with infliximab, adalimumab, and golimumab

1. EJ Brenner et al. Corticosteroids, but not TNF antagonists, are associated with adverse COVID-19 outcomes in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases: results from an international registry. Gastroenterology 2020 July 8 (epub).
2. M Gianfrancesco et al. Characteristics associated with hospitalization for COVID-19 in people with rheumatic disease: data from the COVID-19 Global Rheumatology Alliance physician-reported registry. Ann Rheum Dis 2020; 79:859.

ITOLIZUMAB

(added 7/16/2020)

- Optimal dosage for treatment of COVID-19 not established
- Formulation: 25 mg/5 mL vials for injection were approved for emergency use in India

Biocon Trial – 2020[1]

Population: hospitalized patients with moderate to severe ARDS in 4 hospitals in India (n=30)

Design: Randomized, controlled, open-label trial

- 20 patients randomized to itolizumab plus best supportive care and 10 patients randomized to best supportive care

Results:

- at one month, no deaths occurred in patients treated with itolizumab and 3 deaths occurred in patients treated with supportive care alone
- reductions in IL-6 and TNF-α were reported in itolizumab-treated patients

Limitation: trial results not yet published

Adverse Effects:

- Infusion reactions including nausea, rash, urticaria, flushing, cough, wheezing, dyspnea, dizziness, headache; diarrhea
- Increased risk of infections

Drug Interactions:

- Live vaccines should be avoided

- Approved in India for emergency use in COVID-19 patients; also approved in India for psoriasis
- Not available in the US
- Anti-CD6 IgG1 monoclonal antibody that binds to the CD6 receptor and blocks activation of T lymphocytes; may mitigate the effects of cytokines released in response to the virus

Pregnancy:

- No adequate data on use in pregnant women
- Crosses the placenta

1. Equillium. Press Release. Clinical trial shows itolizumab reduced mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/07/13/2060993/0/en/Clinical-Trial-Shows-Itolizumab-Reduces-Mortality-in-Patients-Hospitalized-with-COVID-19.html. Accessed July 16, 2020.

RAVULIZUMAB
Ultomiris (Alexion)

(added 1/21/2021)

- Weight-based dosing
- Administered IV on days 1, 5, 10, and 15

Phase 3 Trial – 2021[1]
Population: adults with severe COVID-19 requiring mechanical ventilation (trial was expected to enroll 270 patients; interim analysis conducted after 122 patients completed 29 days)
Design: phase 3 randomized, open-label trial
- Ravulizumab plus standard care vs standard care alone

Results:
- Enrollment in study paused because an independent data monitoring committee reported a lack of efficacy with addition of ravulizumab to standard care compared to standard care alone after an interim review of data
- Patients currently enrolled will continue the trial
- Primary endpoint: survival at day 29

Adverse Effects:
- Upper respiratory tract infection, headache, diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, hypertension, pyrexia
- Infusion reactions, life-threatening meningococcal infections

- FDA-approved for paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria in adults and for atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome in adults and children >1 month old

- C5 complement inhibitor thought to decrease levels of cytokines and chemokines and reduce lung inflammation

Pregnancy:
- No available data on use of ravulizumab in pregnant women
- In animal studies, developmental abnormalities and an increased rate of death in the offspring was reported

1. News Release. Alexion provides update on phase 3 study of Ultomiris (ravulizumab-cwvz) in hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19. January 13, 2021. Available at: https://ir.alexion.com/news-releases/news-release-details/alexion-provides-update-phase-3-study-ultomirisr-ravulizumab. Accessed January 21, 2021.

CHLOROQUINE[1]

(updated 4/23/2021)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage not established
- Dosages used in COVID-19 clinical trials have varied

500 mg chloroquine phosphate (300 mg chloroquine base) bid x 7-10 days

OR

500 mg bid x 2 days, then 500 mg once/day x 12 days[2,3]

OR

1 g on day 1, then 500 mg once daily x 4-7 days

- Based on *in vitro* data (M Wang et al, Cell Res 2020)[4]
- Unpublished clinical data from China[3] in approximately 100 patients suggest more rapid decline in fever, improvement on lung CT scan, shorter time to recovery vs control group

ChloroCovid-19[5] *(updated 4/30/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients with severe illness in Brazil (n=81)

Design:

- parallel, double-blind, randomized, phase IIb
- chloroquine high dose (600 mg bid x 10 days) vs low dose (450 mg bid x 1 day, then once/day x 4 days); all patients received azithromycin

Results:

- Trial stopped early because of a higher rate of death and QT interval prolongation in the high-dose chloroquine group
- Lethality was 39.0% (16 of 41) in the high-dosage group and 15.0% (6 of 40) in the low-dosage group at day 13
- QTc interval >500 milliseconds occurred in 18.9% (7 of 37) in the high-dose group compared to 11.1% (4 of 36) in the low-dosage group
- Respiratory secretion negative in 22.2% (6 of 27) at day 4

Adverse Effects:

- Retinopathy and other ocular disorders (generally associated with longer use), urticaria, angioedema, tinnitus, reduced hearing, myopathy, muscle atrophy, suppressed tendon reflexes, liver enzyme elevations, hepatitis, GI disturbances, skin reactions, cytopenias, hemolytic anemia (in G6PD-deficient patients), neuropathy, convulsions, extrapyramidal disorders, neuropsychiatric changes, hypotension, cardiomyopathy, hypoglycemia
- QT interval prolongation and arrhythmias, including torsades de pointes can occur. Risk is higher in patients with cardiac disease, electrolyte abnormalities, or concurrent use of other QT interval prolonging drugs such as azithromycin.[6-8] The AHA/ACC/HRS recommend the drug be withheld in patients with baseline QT prolongation or if QT interval exceeds 500 msec during treatment. Potassium and magnesium levels should be corrected and other QTc prolonging drugs should be avoided.[7]
- Cases (some fatal) of QT interval prolongation, ventricular tachycardia, and ventricular fibrillation have been reported in patients being treated with chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine, alone or in combination with azithromycin or other QTc prolonging drugs, for treatment of COVID-19[9]

- *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV
- FDA issued a Drug Safety Communication warning against use of chloroquine outside of a clinical trial because of the risk of serious cardiac arrhythmias, including QT prolongation; it is not recommended for treatment of outpatients[9] (updated 4/28/2020)
- Infectious Diseases Society of America recommends against use with or without azithromycin in the hospital setting[12] *(updated 8/23/2020)*
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of chloroquine (with or without azithromycin) in hospitalized patients and outpatients[19] *(updated 4/23/2021)*
- Clinical trials evaluating the efficacy and safety of chloroquine for pre-exposure and post-exposure prophylaxis and treatment of mild, moderate, or severe COVID-19 are underway in the US
- FDA revoked Emergency Use Authorization that allowed use in some hospitalized patients for whom a clinical trial was not feasible; ongoing analysis indicated that chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine are unlikely to be effective for treatment of COVID-19 and are associated with serious cardiac adverse events; FDA concluded benefit no longer outweighs risk[13] *(updated 6/16/2020)*

CHLOROQUINE[1] (CONTINUED)	**Mehra et al. 2020[22]** *(added 5/26/20) (updated 6/4/2020)* *****Study Retracted[24]***** ▪ *Retracted because of concerns about the accuracy of the data and analysis; an independent audit was not possible because the full dataset was not made available* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who received chloroquine or HCQ with or without a macrolide within 48 hrs of diagnosis; control patients did not receive treatment with these drugs (n = 96,032) **Design:** observational analysis of multinational registry **Results:** ▪ treatment was associated with an increased risk of in-hospital mortality and ventricular arrhythmia compared to control group **Limitation:** observational	**Drug Interactions:** ▪ Avoid use with QTc prolonging drugs[6-8] ▪ Substrate of CYP2C8, 2D6, and 3A4, and inhibitor of CYP2D6[10,11] ▪ Use with antihyperglycemic drugs can increase risk of hypoglycemia ▪ Separate from antacids/kaolin by 4 hours ▪ Use with tamoxifen can increase risk of ocular toxicity and should be avoided ▪ FDA warns that coadministration of remdesivir and chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine may decrease the antiviral activity of remdesivir; concurrent use is not recommended[26] *(added 6/18/2020)*	**Pregnancy:** ▪ Accumulates in fetal ocular tissues and is retained there for months after elimination from remainder of body ▪ Chloroquine has been used safely in pregnant women for treatment and prophylaxis of malaria
HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (HCQ)[1] – GENERICS *PLAQUENIL* (CONCORDIA) *(updated 7/15/2021)* **Dosage:** ▪ Optimal dosage not established ▪ Dosages used in COVID-19 clinical trials have varied	**P Gautret et al. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020[14]** **Population:** hospitalized patients; varying severity of illness (n=42) **Design:** ▪ open-label, observational ▪ HCQ + azithromycin vs HCQ vs standard care **Results:** ▪ HCQ-treated patients had more rapid viral clearance vs controls	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Better tolerated than chloroquine ▪ Retinopathy and other ocular disorders (sometimes irreversible, but generally associated with longer use), serious cardiomyopathy, worsening of psoriasis and porphyria, proximal myopathy, neuropathy, suicidality, hypoglycemia ▪ QT interval prolongation and arrhythmias, including torsades de pointes can occur.	▪ *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV-2 ▪ The FDA issued a Drug Safety Communication warning against use of hydroxychloroquine outside of a clinical trial because of the risk of serious arrythmias, including QT prolongation it; is not recommended for treatment of outpatients[9] *(updated 4/28/2020)*

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)

- Most frequently used dosage in the US has been 400 mg PO bid on day 1, then 200 mg PO bid x 4 days[2]

- addition of azithromycin to HCQ (n=6) resulted in a more rapid decrease in viral load compared to treatment w/ HCQ alone

Limitations:

- not randomized or double-blind, some dropouts not included in trial results
- International Society of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy states concerns about the paper

Z Chen et al. 2020[15]

Population: hospitalized patients w/ pneumonia; mild illness (n=62)

Design:

- randomized, parallel-group
- hydroxychloroquine 200 mg bid vs standard care

Results:

- shortened duration of fever and cough
- pneumonia improvement on chest CT in 80.6% of patients w/ HCQ vs 54.8% w/ standard care
- 4 patients in control group progressed to severe illness vs none with HCQ

Limitations: published online ahead w/o peer review

M Mahevas et al. 2020[16]

Population: hospitalized patients with pneumonia requiring oxygen ≥2 L (n=181)

Design:

- Retrospective; HCQ 600 mg/day within 48 hrs of admission vs no HCQ

Results:

Risk is higher in patients with pre-existing cardiac disease, electrolyte abnormalities or concurrent use of other QT interval prolonging drugs such as azithromycin. EKG monitoring recommended.[6-8] The

AHA/ACC/HRS recommend use be avoided in patients with baseline QT prolongation or if QT interval exceeds

500 msec during treatment. Potassium and magnesium levels should be corrected and other QTc prolonging drugs should be avoided.[7]

- Cases (some fatal) of QT interval prolongation, ventricular tachycardia, and ventricular fibrillation have been reported in patients being treated with chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine, alone or in combination with azithromycin or other QTc prolonging drugs, for treatment of COVID-19[8]

- In a cohort of 84 patients with COVID-19 who were treated with hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin, QTc was significantly prolonged; in 9 (11%) patients, QTc was prolonged to >500 ms[18]

- In a cohort 649 COVID-19 patients, HCQ use was associated with a significant QT and QTc interval prolongation (median +13 ms); ventricular arrythmia rate was 1.1%[38] *(added 10/1/2020)*

- In a cohort of 90 COVID-19 patients, 19% of patients on HCQ monotherapy developed prolonged QTc ≥500 ms; concurrent azithromycin use was associated with a greater risk of QT

- Infectious Diseases Society of America recommends against use with or without azithromycin in the hospital setting[12] *(updated 8/23/2020)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of hydroxychloroquine (with or without azithromycin) in hospitalized patients or outpatients[19] *(updated 4/23/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of hydroxychloroquine for SARS-CoV-2 post-exposure prophylaxis[19] *(added 2/14/2021)*

- Some clinicians claim the combination of HCQ plus azithromycin is effective for early outpatient treatment of COVID-19, but randomized, controlled trials are lacking *(added 9/10/2020)*

- FDA revoked Emergency Use Authorization that allowed use in some hospitalized patients for whom a clinical trial was not feasible; ongoing analysis indicated that chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine are unlikely to be effective for treatment of COVID-19 and are associated with serious cardiac adverse events; FDA concluded benefit no longer outweighs risk[13] *(updated 6/16/2020)*

- WHO guidelines strongly recommend against use of hydroxychloroquine for prevention of COVID-10[47] *(added 3/6/2021)*

Pregnancy:

- No evidence of increased rate of birth defects in pregnant women

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ Transferred to ICU or died w/in 7 days: 20.2% HCQ vs 22.1% w/o HCQ (no significant difference) **Limitations:** not randomized or peer reviewed **J Magagnoli et al 2020[17]** *(updated 4/28/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized male patients in VA medical centers across the US (n=368) **Design:** ▪ Retrospective; HCQ vs HCQ plus azithromycin vs no HCQ **Results:** ▪ No significant difference in the rate of mechanical ventilation between groups (13.3% HCQ, 6.9% HCQ + azithromycin, and 14.1% no HCQ) ▪ Compared to no HCQ, rates of death higher in the HCQ group, but not the HCQ + azithromycin group (11.4% no HCQ vs 27.8% with HCQ and 22.1% with HCQ + azithromycin) **Limitations:** retrospective, not peer reviewed **J Geleris et al. NEJM 2020[20]** *(added 5/9/2020)* **Population:** consecutive hospitalized patients (n=1376 patients in analysis) **Design:** observational; single medical center in New York City; median follow-up 22.5 days **Results:** ▪ 811 (58.9%) patients treated with HCQ	interval changes than HCQ alone *(added 10/14/2020)* **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Avoid use with other QT interval-prolonging drugs. Concurrent use with azithromycin can cause additive effects on the QT interval; avoid coadministration in patients at high risk of QT interval prolongation; ECG monitoring, correction of electrolyte abnormalities, and avoidance of other QT prolonging agents is recommended if coadministered[6-8] ▪ May inhibit CYP2D6 and may be metabolized by CYP2C8, 2D6, and 3A4 to some extent; less likely to cause CYP-related interactions than chloroquine ▪ Separate from antacids/kaolin by 4 hours ▪ May increase digoxin levels ▪ May impair activity of antiepileptic drugs ▪ FDA warns that coadministration of remdesivir and chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine may decrease the antiviral activity of remdesivir; concurrent use is not recommended[26] *(added 6/18/2020)*	▪ Embryonic deaths and ocular malformations have occurred in pregnant rats

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ HCQ-treated patients had more severe illness than those who were not treated with the drug ▪ No significant association between HCQ use and intubation or death (HR 1.04; 95% CI 0.82-1.32) **Limitations:** observational data **W Tang et al. BMJ 2020**[21] *(added 5/18/20)* **Population:** hospitalized patients, mostly mild to moderate disease (n=150) **Design:** open-label HCQ 1200mg x 3 days, then 800 mg/day x2-3 weeks vs standard care **Results:** ▪ No significant difference in probability of negative conversion ▪ Adverse effects more common with HCQ (mainly diarrhea) **Limitations:** open label, tx initiated late, confounding tx allowed **Mehra et al. Lancet 2020**[22] *(added 5/26/20)* *(updated 6/4/2020)* ***Study Retracted[24]*** ▪ *Retracted because of concerns about the accuracy of the data and analysis; an independent audit was not possible because the full dataset was not made available* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who received chloroquine or HCQ with or without a macrolide within 48 hrs of diagnosis; control patients did not

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	receive treatment with these drugs (n = 96,032) **Design:** observational analysis of multinational registry **Results:** ▪ treatment was associated with an increased risk of in-hospital mortality and ventricular arrhythmia compared to control group **Limitation:** observational **<u>WHO Solidarity Trial 2020</u>[23,42]** *(updated 6/20/2020;)* ▪ HCQ arm stopped on June 18, 2020 based on data from the Solidarity trial, the RECOVERY trial, and a Cochrane review of other HCQ evidence *(update 10/19/2020; 12/2/2020)*[42] **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 at 405 hosptials in 30 countries (n=11,330 patients randomized; n=954 to HCQ) **Design:** randomized, open-label trial evaluating remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, and interferon-beta 1a **Results:** ▪ HCQ did not reduce mortality, need for ventilation, or duration of hospitalization ▪ death rate ratio with remdesivir was 1.19 (95% CI 0.89-1.59; 104/947 HCQ vs 84/906 control; p=0.23) ▪ ventilation initiated after randomization in 75 patients in the HCQ group vs 66 in the control group ▪ 64% of patients who received HCQ were still hospitalized at day 7 vs 54% in the control group

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	**Limitations:** interim results; open-label; conducted in many varied settings around the world; timing of treatment initiation not standardized **RECOVERY Trial 2020[41]** *(updated 10/14/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized adults in the UK (n=4716) **Design:** open-label, randomized controlled trial; HCQ vs usual care **Results**: ▪ 28-day mortality was not significantly different between patients treated with HCQ and those who received usual care (27.0% vs 25.0%; p=0.15) ▪ Consistent results reported in all subgroups ▪ Results suggested HCQ-treated patients less likely to be discharged alive within 18 days vs patients given standard care ▪ Among patients not on mechanical ventilation at baseline, HCQ group had higher frequency of invasive mechanical ventilation or death (30.7% vs 26.9%) ▪ No difference in incidence of new major cardiac arrhythmia **Limitations**: enrollment stopped early when interim analysis showed lack of efficacy **S Arshad et al. Int J Infect Dis 2020[28]** *(added July 7, 2020)* **Population:** Consecutive hospitalized patients in a hospital system in Michigan (n=2541)

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	**Design:** Multi-center, retrospective observational study comparing hydroxychloroquine alone or with azithromycin, azithromycin alone or neither **Results:** ▪ in-hospital mortality was 20.1% with hydroxychloroquine + azithromycin, 13.5% with hydroxychloroquine, 22.4% with azithromycin, and 26.4% with neither drug (p<0.001) ▪ 82% of patients received hydroxychloroquine within 24 hours of admission **Limitations:** retrospective, observational data **CP Skipper et al. Ann Intern Med 2020[29]** *(added 7/17/2020)* **Population:** symptomatic outpatients with COVID-19 or probable COVID-19 within 4 days of symptom onset (n=423) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ HCQ (800 mg once, 600 mg 6-8 hrs later, then 600 mg once/day x 4 days) vs placebo **Results:** ▪ 81% had confirmed COVID-19 or exposure to a person with confirmed infection ▪ 56% enrolled within 1 day of symptom onset ▪ no significant difference in **symptom severity** over 14 days between HCQ and placebo groups (relative difference in symptom severity 12%; p=0.117) ▪ no significant difference in percentage of patients who had

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	symptoms at 14 days (24% vs 30% with placebo; p=0.21) ▪ significantly more patients treated with HCQ had **adverse effects** (43% vs 22%; p<0.001) ▪ 4 hospitalizations and 1 nonhospitalized death in the HCQ group vs 10 hospitalizations and 1 hospitalized death in the placebo group (p=0.29) **Limitations:** only 58% of patients received COVID-19 testing **Rosenberg et al. JAMA 2020**[30] *(added 7/22/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients **Design:** retrospective multicenter cohort study ▪ HCQ plus azithromycin, HCQ alone, azithromycin alone, or neither **Results:** ▪ Patients in the treatment groups had more severe disease at baseline than those not treated ▪ Compared with patients receiving neither drug, there was no difference in the in-hospital mortality rate in patients who received any of the 3 treatments ▪ Patients who received HCQ plus azithromycin had a higher risk of cardiac arrest compared to those who received neither drug **Limitations:** observational data **Cavalcanti et al. NEJM 2020**[31] *(added 7/23/2020; updated 11/28/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 receiving no supplemental oxygen or a max of 4 L/min (n=667

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	randomized; n=504 with confirmed COVID-19 in the modified intention-to-treat) **Design:** open-label, multicenter randomized controlled trial ▪ HCQ 400 mg bid vs HCQ 400 mg bid plus azithromycin 500 mg once/day x 7 days vs standard care alone **Results:** ▪ Treatment started a median of 7 days after symptom onset; patients who started treatment up to 14 days after symptom onset were included ▪ HCQ alone or with azithromycin did not improve clinical status at 15 days on an ordinal scale compared to standard care alone (primary endpoint in the modified intention-to-treat population, which included only those with confirmed COVID-19) ▪ QT interval prolongation and liver enzyme elevations occurred more frequently with HCQ with or without azithromycin than with standard care alone **Limitations:** open-label trial, some patients previously received treatment
	Mitja et al. Clin Infect Dis 2020[33] *(added 9/9/2020)* **Population:** non-hospitalized adults in Spain with COVID-19 and <5 days of symptoms (n=293) **Design:** open-label, randomized trial

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ HCQ 800 mg x 1 day, then 400 mg once/day x 6 days vs no antiviral treatment (not placebo controlled) **Results:** ▪ Median time from symptom onset to randomization: 3 days ▪ No significant difference in mean reduction of viral load at day 3 or at day 7 ▪ Risk of hospitalization was not significantly different between the groups (5.9% HCQ vs 7.1% control) ▪ Time to resolution of symptoms was similar (10 days HCQ vs 12 days control; p=0.38) (study not powered for this endpoint) ▪ No cardiovascular events reported **Limitations:** open-label trail, did not evaluate HCQ with azithromycin; 7-day evaluations not included in original protocol **Million et al. Travel Med Infect Dis 2020**[34] *(added 9/9/2020)* **Population:** patients with mild (95% of patients) to severe COVID-19 in France (n=1061) **Design:** retrospective analysis of outcomes of patients who were given early treatment with HCQ + azithromycin for ≥3 days **Results:** ▪ Mean time from onset of symptoms to treatment was 6.4 days ▪ Good clinical outcome and virologic cure occurred in 973 patients (91.7%) within 10 days ▪ Poor clinical outcome (death, transfer to ICU, or hospitalization for >10 days) occurred in 46

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	patients (4.3%) and 10 patients (0.9%) died ▪ Poor clinical outcomes were associated with older age, illness severity, and low HCQ serum concentrations ▪ 9 patients had QTc prolongation ≥ 60 ms from baseline; none were > 500 ms **Limitations:** retrospective data, no control group; data incomplete for some patients **Scholz, Derwand, Zelenko. 2020**[35] *(added 9/10/2020; updated 1/1/2020)* **Population:** outpatients with COVID-19 (n=141) **Design:** retrospective case series ▪ **Cases** received treatment with HCQ + azithromycin + zinc x 5 days after risk stratification criteria were met ▪ **Untreated controls**: independent public reference data from 337 patients with COVID-19 from the same community **Results:** ▪ Treatment started after 4 days of symptom onset ▪ 4 of 141 (2.8%) treated patients were hospitalized; 58 of 377 (15.4%) controls were hospitalized (p<0.001) ▪ 1 of 141 (0.7%) treated patients died vs 13 of 377 (3.5%) controls (p=0.16) **Limitations:** not peer reviewed; retrospective case series; risk criteria unclear; control group characteristics unclear

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	**Barbosa Esper et al. 2020[36]** *(added 9/11/2020)* **Population:** symptomatic outpatients with suspected COVID-19 evaluated by telemedicine in Brazil (n=636) **Design:** Prospective, observational ▪ patients given hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin (n=412) were compared to those who refused medication (n=224) **Results:** ▪ mean time from symptom onset to treatment was 5 days ▪ 1.9% of treatment group required hospitalization compared to 5.4% of control group (p<0.001) ▪ 1.17% of patients treated before day 7 of symptoms needed hospitalization compared to 3.2% of patients treated after day 7 **Limitations:** not peer reviewed, observational data **WH Self et al. JAMA 2020[44]** *(updated 11/9/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized adults with COVID-19 with respiratory symptoms (n=479) **Design:** multicenter, blinded, randomized trial ▪ Hydroxychloroquine 400 mg bid x 1 day, then 200 mg bid x 4 days vs placebo **Results:** ▪ At day 14, there was no significant difference in the COVID Outcomes Scale score between the hydroxychloroquine and placebo groups

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ Trial enrollment stopped for futility **Limitations:** long duration of symptoms before randomization for treatment (up to 10 days), only monotherapy evaluated, drug concentrations not evaluated **FH Annie et al. Pharmacotherapy 2020[45]** *(added 11/30/2020)* **Population:** patients receiving HCQ within 48 hours of hospital admission (n=3012) **Design:** retrospective cohort study **Results:** ▪ No difference in overall 30-day mortality between the HCQ and no-HCQ groups ▪ No difference between groups in outcome combining mortality and an arrhythmogenic diagnosis ▪ Results remained statistically insignificant with HCQ+azithromycin **Limitations:** restrospective data **Barratt-Due et al. NOR-Solidarity Ann Intern Med 2021[48]** *(added 7/15/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized adults with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 at 23 hospitals in Norway (n=185) **Design:** independent, add-on, randomized controlled trial to WHO Solidarity trial ▪ Patients given remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, or standard of care **Results:** ▪ No significant difference in mortality during hospitalization between groups

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ There was a decrease in SARS-CoV-2 oropharyngeal viral load during the first week after randomization in all groups; the decreases in viral load and 10-day viral loads were similar among remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, and standard of care groups **Limitations:** no placebo group, small sample size **PROPHYLAXIS TRIALS:** **DR Boulware et al NEJM 2020[25] (prophylaxis)** *(added 6/4/2020)* **Population:** adults with household or occupational exposure to an individual with confirmed COVID-19 at a distance <6 feet for >10 mins with no mask or eye shield (high-risk) or with a mask but no eye shield (moderate-risk) (n = 821) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in the US and Canada Prophylaxis given within 4 days after exposure ▪ HCQ (800 mg x 1, then 600 mg in 6 to 8 hrs, then 600 mg daily x 4 days) vs placebo **Results:** ▪ 87.6% had a high-risk exposure ▪ New illness compatible with COVID-19 within 14 days was similar between the 2 groups (11.8% HCQ vs 14.3% placebo; p=0.35) ▪ Patient-reported adherence to study drug regimen was lower in HCQ group (75.4% with HCQ vs 82.6% with placebo; p=0.01)

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ Adverse effects occurred more often with HCQ (GI effects most common) ▪ No arrhythmias or deaths reported **Limitations:** endpoint did not require laboratory-confirmed COVID-19; study population generally younger and healthier than those at most risk for COVID-19 **N White and W Schilling et al (COPCOV trial)[27]** *(added July 1, 2020)* **(prophylaxis)** **Population:** Healthcare workers and staff who have close contact with COVID-19 patients (anticipated enrollment is 40,000+ subjects) **Design:** ▪ Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multi-center prophylaxis trial ▪ Chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine vs placebo **Results:** trial enrolling as of July 2020 **Mitja et al. NEJM 2021[32]** *(added 7/31/2020; updated 11/28/2020; updated ref 2/5/2021)* **Population:** asymptomatic contacts exposed to a PCR-positive COVID-19 case in Spain (n=2314) **Design:** open-label, cluster-randomized trial ▪ HCQ 800 mg once, then 400 mg/day x 6 days vs usual care (no specific therapy) **Results:** ▪ PCR-confirmed symptomatic COVID-19 within 14 days was not statistically significant between the two groups (5.7% with HCQ vs 6.2% with usual care)

HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE (CONTINUED)	▪ HCQ not associated with a lower incidence of SARS-CoV-2 transmission than usual care (18.7% vs 17.8%) ▪ Incidence of adverse effects higher in HCQ group (56.1% vs 5.9% with usual care) (mostly GI; 0.3% were cardiac events) **Limitations:** open-label, no placebo group **Abella et al. JAMA Intern Med 2020 (PATCH trial)[37]** *(added 10/1/2020)* **Population:** healthcare workers exposed to patients with COVID-19 (n=132); all patients had negative results for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pre-exposure prophylaxis trial ▪ HCQ 600 mg daily vs placebo x 8 weeks **Results:** ▪ No significant difference in infection rates (determined by SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal swab) in patients given HCQ vs placebo (6.3 vs 6.6%; p>0.99) ▪ 8 infections occurred during the study; none required hospitalization ▪ Mild adverse events more common in patients taking HCQ ▪ Median change in QTc was similar between groups **Limitations:** trial stopped early for futility and may have insufficient power; most participants were young and healthy **Gentry et al. Lancet Rheumatol 2020[38]** **Population:** patients in the VA health system with rheumatoid arthritis,

systemic lupus erythematosus, or associated rheumatological conditions (n=32,109)
Design: retrospective cohort study
- Patients receiving chronic HCQ vs those not on HCQ

Results:
- Incidence of active SARS-CoV-2 infections not significantly different between patients receiving HCQ vs those who were not

Limitations: retrospective data

Rajasingham et al. Clin Infect Dis 2020[43] *(added 10/28/2020)*
Population: adult healthcare workers with ongoing exposure to persons with SARS-CoV-2 in the US and Canada (n=1483)
Design: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled
- HCQ 400 mg once/week or twice/week or placebo x 12 weeks

Results:
Incidence of COVID-19:
- 0.27 events per person-year with HCQ once/wk
- 0.28 events per person-year with HCQ twice/wk
- 0.38 events per person-year with placebo

Hazard Ratio (compared to placebo):
- HCQ once/wk: 0.72 (95% CI 0.44-1.16; p=0.18)
- HCQ twice/wk: 0.74 (95% CI 0.46-1.19; p=0.22)

Limitations: challenges with availability and sensitivity of PCR testing in early COVID illness; HCQ dosing; underpowered

RV Barnabas et al. Ann Intern Med 2020[46] *(added 12/10/2020)*

	Population: close contacts recently exposed (<96 hours) to persons with diagnosed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=671 households) **Design**: Household-randomized, double-blind, controlled trial ▪ HCQ 400 mg/day x 3 days, then 200 mg/day x 11 days or ascorbic acid 500 mg/day, then 250 mg/day **Results:** ▪ SARS-CoV-2 acquisition at day 14 was not significantly different between HCQ (53 events) and control (45 events) among 689 participants who had a negative SARS-CoV-2 test result at baseline ▪ More patients in HCQ group experienced adverse effects ▪ **Limitations:** median delay of 2 days between exposure, testing, and treatment

1. FDA-approved for other indications.
2. Experimental dosage used for treatment of COVID-19 in trials, but optimal dosage not yet established.
3. A Cortegiani et al. A systematic review on the efficacy and safety of chloroquine for the treatment of COVID-19. J Crit Care 2020 March 10 (epub).
4. M Wang et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. Cell Res 2020; 30:269.
5. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, et al. Effect of high vs low doses of chloroquine diphosphate as adjunctive therapy for patients hospitalized with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3(4):e208857
6. DN Juurlink. Safety considerations with chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in the management of SARS-CoV-2 infection. CMAJ 2020 April 8 (epub).
7. DM Roden et al. Drug interactions on QTc in exploratory COVID-19 treatment. Circulation 2020 April 8 (epub).
8. RL Woosley and KA Romero. QT drugs list. Available at: www.crediblemeds.Org. Accessed March 31, 2020.
9. FDA Drug Safety Communication. FDA cautions against use of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine for COVID-19 outside of the hospital setting or a clinical trial due to risk of heart rhythm problems. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-cautions-against-use-hydroxychloroquine-or-chloroquine-covid-19-outside-hospital-setting-or. Accessed April 27, 2020.
10. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
11. D Projean et al. In vitro metabolism of chloroquine: identification of CYP2C8, CYP3A4, and CYP2D6 as the main isoforms catalyzing N-desethylchloroquine formation. Drug Metab Dispos 2003; 31:748.
12. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed August 23, 2020.
13. FDA. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA revokes emergency use authorization for chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-revokes-emergency-use-authorization-chloroquine-and. Accessed June 16, 2020.
14. P Gautret 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; 56:105949.
15. Z Chen et al. Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: results of a randomized clinical trial. Medrxiv 2020 (epub). Available At: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.22.20040758v2. Accessed April 13, 2020.

16. M Mahevas et al. Clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational comparative study using routine care data. BMJ 2020; May 14 (epub).
17. J Magagnoli et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. Medrxiv 2020 (epub) Available At: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.16.20065920v2.full.pdf+html. Accessed April 28, 2020.
18. E Chorin et al. The QT interval in patients with COVID-19 treated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. Nat Med 2020 April 24 (epub).
19. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed April 23, 2021.
20. J Geleris et al. Observational study of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 May 7 (epub).
21. Tang et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomized controlled trial. BMJ 2020; May 14 (epub).
22. MR Mehra et al. Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet 2020 May 22 (epub).
23. WHO "Solidarity" clinical trial for COVID-19 treatments. Available at: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-treatments. Accessed May 28, 2020.
24. MR Mehra et al. Retraction – hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet 2020 June 4 (epub).
25. DR Boulware et al. A randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 June 3 (epub).
26. FDA. Remdesivir by Gilead Sciences: FDA warns of newly discovered potential drug interaction that may reduce effectiveness of treatment. June 15, 2020. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/safety/medical-product-safety-information/remdesivir-gilead-sciences-fda-warns-newly-discovered-potential-drug-interaction-may-reduce. Accessed June 18, 2020.
27. N White and W Schilling et al. MORU Tropical Health Network. COPCOV trial. Available at: https://www.tropmedres.ac/covid-19/copcov/copcov-key-messages. Accessed July 1, 2020.
28. S Arshad et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Int J Infect Dis 2020 July 1 (pre-proof).
29. CP Skipper et al. Hydroxychloroquine in nonhospitalized adults with early COVID-19: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2020 July 16 (epub).
30. ES Rosenberg et al. Association of treatment with hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin with in-hospital mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York State. JAMA 2020; 323:2493.
31. AB Cavalcanti et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin in mild-to-moderate Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2041.
32. O Mitja et al. A cluster-randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine for prevention of Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:417.
33. O Mitja et al. Hydroxychloroquine for early treatment of adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized-controlled trial. Clin Infect Dis 2020 July 16 (epub).
34. M Million et al. Early treatment of COVID-19 patients with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: a retrospective analysis of 1061 cases in Marseille, France. Travel Med Infect Dis 2020; 35:101738.
35. R Derwand, M Scholz, and V Zelenko. COVID-19 outpatients: early risk-stratified treatment with zinc plus low-dose hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: a retrospective case series study. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020; 56: 106214.
36. R Barbosa Esper et al. Empirical treatment with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin for suspected cases of COVID-19 followed-up by telemedicine. Available at: https://pgibertie.files.wordpress.com/2020/04/2020.04.15-journal-manuscript-final.pdf. Accessed September 11, 2020.
37. BS Abella et al. Efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine vs placebo for pre-exposure SARS-CoV-2 prophylaxis among health care workers: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2020 September 30 (epub).
38. A Gasperetti et al. Arrhythmic safety of hydroxychloroquine in COVID-19 patients from different clinical settings. EP Europace 2020 September 24 (epub).
39. CA Gentry et al. Long-term hydroxychloroquine use in patients with rheumatic conditions and development of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Rheumatol 2020 September 21 (epub).
40. NJ Mercuro et al. Risk of QT Interval prolongation associated with use of hydroxychloroquine with or without concomitant azithromycin among hospitalized patients testing positive for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA Cardiol 2020; 5:1036.
41. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Effect of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2030.
42. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. Repurposed antiviral drugs for Covid-19 – interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:497.
43. R Rajasingham et al. Hydroxychloroquine as pre-exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19 in healthcare workers: a r andomized trial. Clin Infect Dis 2020 October 17 (epub).
44. WH Self et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine on clinical status at 14 days in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020 November 9 (epub).
45. FH Annie et al. Hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: real-world experience assessing mortality. Pharmacotherapy 2020; 40: 1072.
46. RV Barnabas et al. Hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis to prevent severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2020 December 8 (epub).
47. F Lamontagne et al. A living WHO guideline on drugs to prevent COVID-19. BMJ 2021;372:n526.
48. A Barratt-Due et al. Evaluation of the effects of remdesivir and hydroxychloroquine on viral clearance in COVID-19. A randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2021 July 13 (epub).

Macrolide Antibiotic

AZITHROMYCIN – GENERICS
***ZITHROMAX* (PFIZER)[1]**

(updated 7/15/2021)

Dosage:
- Optimal dosage not established

500 mg on day 1, then 250 mg once/day on days 2-5[2]

- In addition to hydroxychloroquine

P Gautret et al. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2020[3]

- Addition of azithromycin to hydroxychloroquine (n=6) resulted in a more rapid decrease in viral load compared to hydroxychloroquine treatment alone in one open-label trial in France (see hydroxychloroquine above)

Rosenberg et al. JAMA 2020[10]
(added 7/22/2020)
Population: hospitalized patients
Design: retrospective multicenter cohort study
- HCQ plus azithromycin, HCQ alone, azithromycin alone, or neither

Results:
- Patients in the treatment groups had more severe disease at baseline than those not treated
- Compared with patients receiving neither drug, there was no difference in the in-hospital mortality rate in patients who received any of the 3 treatments
- Patients who received HCQ plus azithromycin had a higher risk of cardiac arrest compared to those who received neither drug

Limitations: observational data

S Arshad et al. Int J Infect Dis 2020[11]
(added July 7, 2020)
Population: Consecutive hospitalized patients in a hospital system in Michigan (n=2541)

Adverse Effects:
- GI disturbances, headache, dizziness, hepatotoxicity, QT prolongation[4]

Drug Interactions:
- Use with other drugs that prolong the QT interval (such as chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine) can result in additive effects; avoid coadministration in patients at high risk of QT interval prolongation; ECG monitoring, correction of electrolyte abnormalities, and avoidance of other QT prolonging agents is recommended if coadministered[4-6]

- In a cohort of 84 patients with COVID-19 who were treated with hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin, QTc was significantly prolonged; in 9 (11%) patients, QTc was prolonged to >500 ms[7]

- May increase the risk of toxicity with digoxin, cyclosporine, tacrolimus

- *In vitro* activity against some viruses (influenza A H1N1 and Zika); no data on its activity against SARS-CoV-2

- Minimal data supporting efficacy in COVID-19 in humans and cardiac toxicity can occur when used with chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine

- Infectious Diseases Society of America recommends against use with chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine in the hospital setting [8]

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without azithromycin[9] *(updated 4/23/2021)*

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of antibacterial therapy, including azithromycin, in the absence of another indication[9] *(added 4/23/2021)*

- Some evidence of immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory activity; it has been used as adjunctive treatment for other respiratory conditions (such as COPD)

Pregnancy:
- No evidence of fetal harm

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)	**Design:** Multi-center, retrospective observational study comparing hydroxychloroquine alone or with azithromycin, azithromycin alone or neither **Results:** ▪ in-hospital mortality was 20.1% with hydroxychloroquine + azithromycin, 13.5% with hydroxychloroquine, 22.4% with azithromycin, and 26.4% with neither drug (p<0.001) ▪ 82% of patients received hydroxychloroquine within 24 hours of admission **Limitations:** retrospective, observational data **Mehra et al. Lancet 2020**[12] *(added 5/26/20)* *(updated 6/4/2020)* *****Study Retracted**[13]******* ▪ *Retracted because of concerns about the accuracy of the data and analysis; an independent audit was not possible because the full dataset was not made available* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who received chloroquine or HCQ with or without a macrolide within 48 hrs of diagnosis; control patients did not receive treatment with these drugs (n = 96,032) **Design:** observational analysis of multinational registry **Results:** ▪ treatment was associated with an increased risk of in-hospital mortality and ventricular

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)

arrhythmia compared to control group

Limitation: observational

J Magagnoli et al 2020[14] *(updated 4/28/2020)*

Population: hospitalized male patients in VA medical centers across the US (n=368)

Design:

- Retrospective; HCQ vs HCQ plus azithromycin vs no HCQ

Results:

- No significant difference in the rate of mechanical ventilation between groups (13.3% HCQ, 6.9% HCQ + azithromycin, and 14.1% no HCQ)
- Compared to no HCQ, rates of death higher in the HCQ group, but not the HCQ + azithromycin group (11.4% no HCQ vs 27.8% with HCQ and 22.1% with HCQ + azithromycin)

Limitations: retrospective, not peer reviewed

Cavalcanti et al. NEJM 2020[15] *(added 7/23/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 receiving no supplemental oxygen or a max of 4 L/min (n=667 randomized; n=504 with confirmed COVID-19 in the modified intention-to-treat)

Design: open-label, multicenter randomized controlled trial

- HCQ 400 mg bid vs HCQ 400 mg bid plus azithromycin 500 mg once/day x 7 days vs standard care alone

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)	**Results:** ▪ Treatment started a median of 7 days after symptom onset; patients who started treatment up to 14 days after symptom onset were included ▪ HCQ alone or with azithromycin did not improve clinical status at 15 days on an ordinal scale compared to standard care alone (primary endpoint in the modified intention-to-treat population, which included only those with confirmed COVID-19) ▪ QT interval prolongation and liver enzyme elevations occurred more frequently with HCQ with or without azithromycin than with standard care alone **Limitations:** open-label trial, some patients previously received treatment **Barbosa Esper et al. 2020**[16] *(added 9/11/2020)* **Population:** symptomatic outpatients with suspected COVID-19 evaluated by telemedicine in Brazil (n=636) **Design:** Prospective, observational ▪ patients given hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin (n=412) were compared to those who refused medication (n=224) **Results:** ▪ mean time from symptom onset to treatment was 5 days ▪ 1.9% of treatment group required hospitalization compared to 5.4% of control group (p<0.001) ▪ 1.17% of patients treated before day 7 of symptoms needed

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)

hospitalization compared to 3.2% of patients treated after day 7

Limitations: not peer reviewed, observational data

RHM Furtado et al Lancet 2020[17] *(added 9/18/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients in Brazil with severe disease (requiring >4 L/min supplemental oxygen, high-flow nasal cannula, non-invasive mechanical ventilation, or invasive mechanical ventilation) (n=447; n=397 in mITT with confirmed COVID)

Design: open-label, randomized trial

- azithromycin plus standard care (which included HCQ) vs standard care alone

Results:

- clinical status measured on an ordinal scale at day 15 was similar between the two groups
- adverse events, including cardiac arrhythmias, were not significantly different between groups

Limitations: open-label; high-risk population; some patients in control group received macrolide during trial

RECOVERY TRIAL Lancet 2021[18] *(updated 2/15/2021)*

Population: hospitalized adults with COVID-19 in the UK (n=7763)

Design: randomized, open-label, adaptive platform

- Azithromycin 500 mg QD x 10 days vs standard care alone

Results:

- 28-day mortality rate was 22% (561/2582) with azithromycin and

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)

22% (1162/5181) with standard care alone
- Duration of hospitalization or risk of requiring ventilation was also not significantly reduced with azithromycin

Limitations: open-label, hospitalized patients only

PRINCIPLE Trial Lancet 2021[19]
(added 3/7/2021)
Population: outpatient adults in the UK with suspected COVID-19 who were at risk of an adverse clinical outcome (≥65 years old or ≥50 years old with 1 or more comorbidities) (n=2265)
Design: primary care, randomized, open-label, multi-arm, adaptive platform trial
- Azithromycin 500 mg/day x 3 days, usual care plus other interventions, or usual care alone

Results:
- 80% of patients treated with azithromycin and 77% of patients treated with usual care reported feeling recovered within 28 days (HR 1.08; 95% Bayesian credibility interval 0.95-1.23)
- 3% of patients in the azithromycin group and 3% in the usual care group were hospitalized

Limitation: open-label; included patients without SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results

AZITHROMYCIN (continued)	**Hinks et al. ATOMIC2 Lancet Respir Med 2021[20]** *(added 7/15/2021)* **Population:** adults who presented to hospitals in the UK with highly probable or confirmed COVID-19 who were symptomatic <14 days and were considered suitable for ambulatory management (n=298) **Design:** randomized, open-label trial ▪ azithromycin 500 mg PO once/day x 14 days plus standard care vs standard care alone **Results:** ▪ 10% of patients who received azithromycin and 12% of those who received standard care alone were hospitalized or died during the study (adjusted odd ratio 0.91; 95% CI 0.43-1.92; p=0.80) **Limitations:** small open-label trial; PCR confirmation not required for enrollment

1. FDA-approved for other indications.
2. Experimental dosage used for treatment of COVID-19 in trials, but optimal dosage not yet established.
3. P Gautret 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 March 20 (epub).
4. RL Woosley and KA Romero. QT drugs list. Available at: www.crediblemeds.org. Accessed March 31, 2020.
5. DN Juurlink. Safety considerations with chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in the management of SARS-CoV-2 infection. CMAJ 2020 April 8 (epub).
6. DM Roden et al. Drug interactions on QTc in exploratory COVID-19 treatment. Circulation 2020 April 8 (epub).
7. E Chorin et al. The QT interval in patients with COVID-19 treated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. Nat Med 2020 April 24 (epub).
8. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed August 23, 2020.
9. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed April 23, 2021.
10. ES Rosenberg et al. Association of treatment with hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin with in-hospital mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York State. JAMA 2020; 323:2493.
11. S Arshad et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Int J Infect Dis 2020 July 1 (pre-proof).

12. MR Mehra et al. Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet 2020 May 22 (epub).
13. MR Mehra et al. Retraction – hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet 2020 June 4 (epub).
14. J Magagnoli et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. Medrxiv 2020 (epub) Available At: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.16.20065920v2.full.pdf+html. Accessed April 28, 2020.
15. AB Cavalcanti et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin in mild-to-moderate Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 July 23 (epub).
16. R Barbosa Esper et al. Empirical treatment with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin for suspected cases of COVID-19 followed-up by telemedicine. Available at: https://pgibertie.files.wordpress.com/2020/04/2020.04.15-journal-manuscript-final.pdf. Accessed September 11, 2020.
17. RHM Furtado et al. Azithromycin in addition to standard of care versus standard of care alone in the treatment of patients admitted to the hospital with severe COVID-19 in Brazil (COALITION II): a randomised clinical trial. Lancet 2020 September 4 (epub).
18. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Azithromycin in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. Lancet 2021; 397:605.
19. PRINCIPLE Trial Collaborative Group. Azithromycin for community treatment of suspected COVID-19 in people at increased risk of an adverse clinical course in the UK (PRINCIPLE): a randomised, controlled, open-label, adaptive platform trial. Lancet 2021; 397:1063.
20. TSC Hinks et al. Azithromycin versus standard care in patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 (ATOMIC2): an open-label, randomised trial. Lancet Respir Med 2021 July 9 (epub).

HIV Protease Inhibitors

ATAZANAVIR[1] (ATV) – *REYATAZ* (BMS) AND GENERICS **Dosage:** ▪ Optimal dosage/duration not established ▪ 300-400 mg PO once/day[2]	▪ Predicted to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication[3,4] ▪ No clinical trial data available	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Nausea, diarrhea, asymptomatic indirect hyperbilirubinemia, rash, nephrolithiasis, cholelithiasis, PR interval prolongation **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Substrate of CYP3A4 and inhibitor of CYP3A4 and CYP2C8[5] ▪ Use of drugs that increase gastric pH, such as PPIs, H2-antihistamines, and antacids may decrease absorption of atazanavir; administer atazanavir 2 hours before or 10 hours after an H2-antihistimine; consider avoiding use of PPIs	▪ No clinical trials available evaluating use of atazanavir for COVID-19 ▪ Available in powder form or capsules can be opened for administration via enteral tube ▪ NIH recommends against use of HIV protease inhibitors, except in the context of a clinical trial, because of unfavorable pharmacodynamics and negative clinical trial data[6] **Pregnancy:** ▪ Does not appear to increase the risk of major birth defects
DARUNAVIR/COBICISTAT[1] - *PREZCOBIX* (JOHNSON & JOHNSON) **Dosage:** 800/150 mg PO once/day x 5 days[7]	**Shanghai Public Health Clinical Center (SPHCC)[8,9]** **Population:** hospitalized patients (n=30) **Design:** ▪ randomized, open label ▪ darunavir/cobicistat 800/150 mg once/day x 5 days vs standard care **Results:** ▪ darunavir/cobicistat was **not** effective	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Nausea, diarrhea, increased transaminases, headache, rash, severe skin reactions (including Stevens-Johnson syndrome) **Drug Interactions:** ▪ Substrate and inhibitor of CYP3A4 and CYP2D6[5]	▪ An initial laboratory study had suggested darunavir (at exposures higher than those achieved in humans) may be effective against SARS-CoV-2 ▪ No evidence that darunavir is effective for treatment of COVID-19 ▪ NIH recommends against use of HIV protease inhibitors, except in the context of a clinical trial, because of unfavorable pharmacodynamics and negative clinical trial data[6] **Pregnancy:** ▪ Not recommended for use in pregnant women

LOPINAVIR/RITONAVIR[1] (LPV/RTV) – *KALETRA* (ABBVIE)

(updated 10/19/2020)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage/duration not established
- Dosages/duration/ concomitant drugs used in COVID-19 clinical trials have varied
- 400/100 mg PO bid[2]
- With or without food
- Tablets should not be crushed (decrease exposure)

B Cao et al. NEJM 2020[10]

Population:

- hospitalized patients w/ pneumonia, SaO_2 ≤94% or PaO_2:FiO_2 ≤300 mm Hg (n=199)
- median time from symptom onset to randomization was 13 days

Design:

- randomized, open-label vs standard care

Results:

- no statistically significant difference in time to clinical improvement (median of 16 days in both groups), time to discharge (median 12 days with LPV/RTV vs 14 days with standard care), mortality (19.2% vs 25.0%), or viral load reduction

Limitations:

- not blinded
- treatment started long after symptom onset

Schoergenhofer et al. Ann Intern Med 2020[15] *(added 7/22/2020)*

Population: hospitalized patients admitted to "normal care" ward (n=8)

Design: case series; pharmacokinetic analysis

Results:

- median trough lopinavir concentrations 13.6 mcg/mL
- to achieve half-maximal effective concentration (EC_{50}) for SARS-CoV-2, lopinavir trough concentrations would need to be 60- to 120-fold higher

Adverse Effects:

- Diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, headache, asthenia, hepatoxicity, pancreatitis, PR and QT interval prolongation, bradycardia[14]

Drug Interactions:

- Substrate and inhibitor of CYP3A4[5]
- Avoid use with other PR or QT interval-prolonging drugs[11]

- *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV; data in SARS-CoV-2 limited
- Society of Critical Care Medicine recommends against use of LPV/RTV in critically ill patients[12]
- Infectious Diseases Society of America recommends use only in the context of a clinical trial[13]
- NIH recommends against use of HIV protease inhibitors, except in the context of a clinical trial, because of unfavorable pharmacodynamics and negative clinical trial data[6]

Pregnancy:

- No association with teratogenic effects; may be associated with preterm delivery

LOPINAVIR/RITONAVIR (continued)	**Limitations:** small case series; only trough concentration evaluated; no *in vivo* data on EC_{50} dose of lopinavir for SARS-CoV-2 **RECOVERY Group. Lancet 2020[16]** *(added 10/6/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in the UK (n=5040) **Design:** randomized, open-label, platform trial ▪ LPV/RTV 400/100 mg or standard care x 10 days **Results:** ▪ Mortality at 28 days was 23% with LPV/RTV and 22% with standard care (p=0.60) ▪ Time until discharge was a median of 11 days in both groups ▪ In patients not on baseline invasive mechanical ventilation, no significant difference in number of patients who met a composite endpoint of invasive mechanical ventilation or death ▪ Results consistent across subgroups **Limitations:** open-label, very few intubated patients, unclear if dose achieved adequate lung concentrations **WHO SOLIDARITY 2020[17]** *(update 10/19/2020; 12/2/2020)* ▪ LPV/RTV arm stopped on July 4, 2020 **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 at 405 hospitals in 30 countries (n=11,330 patients randomized; n=1411 to LPV/RTV) **Design:** randomized, open-label trial evaluating remdesivir, HCQ, LPV/RTV,

LOPINAVIR/RITONAVIR (continued)	and interferon-beta 1a compared to local standard of care **Results:** ▪ LPV/RTV did not reduce mortality, need for ventilation, or duration of hospitalization ▪ death rate ratio with LPV/RTV was 1.00 (95% CI 0.79-1.25; 148/1399 vs 146/1372 control; p=0.97) ▪ ventilation initiated after randomization in 124 patients in the LPV group vs 119 in the control group ▪ 68% of patients who received LPV were still hospitalized at day 7 vs 59% in the control group **Limitations:** interim results; open-label; conducted in many varied settings around the world; timing of treatment initiation not standardized

1. FDA-approved for other indications.
2. Dosage for treatment of COVID-19 not established.
3. BR Beck et al. Predicting commercially available antiviral drugs that may act on the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) through a drug-target interaction deep learning model. Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal 2020; 18:784.
4. YC Chang et al. Potential therapeutic agents for COVID-19 based on the analysis of protease and RNA polymerase docking. Available at: file:///C:/Users/smorey/Downloads/preprints202002.0242.v1.pdf. Accessed April 12, 2020.
5. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/CYP_PGP_Tables.pdf.
6. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed April 28, 2020.
7. Dosage used for treatment of COVID-19 in trials; optimal dosage not established.
8. Johnson & Johnson. Lack of evidence to support use of darunavir-based treatments for SARS-CoV-2. Available at: https://www.jnj.com/lack-of-evidence-to-support-darunavir-based-hiv-treatments-for-coronavirus. Accessed March 31, 2020.
9. Efficacy and safety of darunavir and cobicistat for treatment of pneumonia caused by 2019-nCoV (DACO-nCoV). Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT04252274. Accessed March 31, 2020.
10. B Cao et al. A trial of lopinavir-ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020; 382:1787.
11. RL Woosley and KA Romero. QT drugs list. Available at www.crediblemeds.org. Accessed March 31, 2020.
12. W Alhazzani et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with COVID-19. Crit Care Med 2020 March 27 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/Abstract/onlinefirst/Surviving_Sepsis_Campaign__Guidelines_on_the.95707.aspx. Accessed April 13, 2020.
13. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Available At: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed April 13, 2020.
14. C Beyls et al. Lopinavir-ritonavir treatment for COVID-19 infection in intensive care unit: risk of bradycardia. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol 2020 July 9 (epub).
15. C Schoergenhofer et al. Pharmacokinetics of lopinavir and ritonavir in patients hospitalized with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Ann Intern Med 2020 May 12 (epub).
16. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Lopinavir-ritonavir in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label platform trial. Lancet 2020; 396:1345.
17. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. Repurposed antiviral drugs for Covid-19; interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:497.

INTERFERON BETA-1B –
BETASERON
EXTAVIA

RIBAVIRIN –
***REBETOL*, AND GENERICS**

(added 5/14/2020; updated 10/19/2020)

Dosage:
- Optimal dosage unknown

- Dosage used in clinical trial: **Interferon beta-1b**: 1 mL on alternate days x 1-3 doses depending on day of initiation

Ribavirin: 400 mg q12h x 14 days

Hung et al. Lancet 2020[1]
Population: hospitalized patients with symptom duration ≤14 days (n=127)
Design:
- prospective, randomized, open-label, multi-center
- LPV/RTV + ribavirin + interferon beta-1b vs LPV/RTV x 14 days
- Treatment started within 48 hrs of admission

Results:
- Time to negative nasopharyngeal swab shorter with triple combination vs LPV/RTV (7 vs 12 days; p=0.0010)
- Time to alleviation of symptoms: 4 days with combination vs 8 days with LPV/RTV (p<0.0001)

Limitations: patients presenting ≥7 days from symptom onset did not receive interferon due to concerns about proinflammatory effects; no critically ill patients included

Adverse Effects:
- Hung et al trial found no difference in adverse events between 2 groups

- **Interferon:** injection- depression site reactions, flu-like symptoms, transaminase elevations, possible cardiac toxicity, autoimmune disorders, allergic reactions, hepatotoxicity, seizures, suicidal ideation, lymphopenia

- **Ribavirin:** hemolytic anemia, leukopenia, cough, dyspnea, bronchospasm, rash, conjunctival irritation, neuropsychologic symptoms

Drug Interactions:
- **Ribavirin:** may decrease anticoagulant effect of warfarin, increase concentrations of azathioprine, increased risk of hepatic decompensation and lactic acidosis with NRTIs, additive myelosuppression with interferons, linezolid, clozapine, adalimumab

- Interferons modulate immune response and may have antiviral properties

- *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV, but did not appear to improve disease outcomes in human studies[2]

- Society of Critical Care Medicine recommends against use of LPV/RTV in critically ill patients and states the evidence is insufficient to recommend interferons or ribavirin[3]

- NIH guidelines recommend against use of interferons in patients with severe or critical illness, except in a clinical trial; they state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use in patients with early (<7 days from symptom onset) mild and moderate illness[4]

- If administered, should be given early in course of disease

- Peginterferon lambda (not available in the US) accelerated viral decline in outpatients with COVID-19 in a phase 2 trial[7] *(added 2/10/2021)*

Pregnancy:
Interferon:
- may cause fetal harm, based on data from animal studies
- data from pregnancy registries have not found an association between interferon exposure and major birth defects

Ribavirin:
- contraindicated in pregnant women and in men whose partners are pregnant

			▪ pregnancy should be avoided for 6 months after treatment in women who received the drug and in women whose partners received the drug
INTERFERON BETA-1A – INHALED (SNG001) *(updated 1/13/2021)* **Dosage:** ▪ 6 MIU by inhalation via a mouthpiece once daily x 14 days[5]	**PD Monk et al. Lancet Respir Med – Inhaled Interferon[5]** *(added 7/20/2020; updated 11/13/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients in UK (n=101) **Design:** phase 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Inhaled nebulized interferon beta-1a (SNG001) vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Mean symptom duration before starting treatment (9.6 days interferon vs 9.8 days placebo) ▪ Odds of improvement on the WHO Ordinal Scale for Clinical Improvement (OSCI) scale was more likely with interferon (HR 2.32; 95% CI 1.07-5.04; p=0.033) ▪ Development of severe disease (requiring ventilation or death) was nonsignificantly less likely in the ITT population with interferon than with placebo (OR 0.28; 95% CI 0.07-1.08; p=0.064) ▪ Breathlessness reduced in patients receiving interferon compared to placebo (p=0.007) ▪ 0 deaths with interferon; 3 deaths with placebo ▪ In patients with more severe disease on admission (requiring supplemental oxygen), interferon nonsignificantly increased the likelihood of hospital discharge (p=0.096)	▪ The most common adverse effect in the clinical trial was headache (15% vs 10% with placebo) ▪ Cough, decreased oxygen saturation, diarrhea, dry throat, oral pain, night sweats, tremor were also reported	▪ Interferons modulate immune response and may have antiviral properties ▪ *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV, but did not appear to improve disease outcomes in human studies[2] ▪ SARS-CoV-2 suppresses interferon beta ▪ Patients with COVID-19 who develop more severe disease may have decreased interferon activity ▪ If administered, should be given early in course of disease ▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of interferons in patients with severe or critical illness, except in a clinical trial; they state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use in patients with early (<7 days from symptom onset) mild and moderate illness[4] ▪ Nebulized interferon not available in the US *(added 7/20/2020)* ▪ WHO SOLIDARITY trial arm of interferon beta-1a was stopped on October 16, 2020; no effects of IV interferon beta-1a compared to control on mortality (rate ratio, 1.16; 95% CI 0.96-1.39; p=0.11), ventilation, or duration of hospital stay were found[6] *(added 10/19/2020; updated 12/2/2020)*

INTERFERON BETA-1A – INHALED (SNG001) (continued)	▪ Median time to discharge was 6 days with interferon and 9 days with placebo **Limitations:** phase 2 trial; only in hospitalized, non-critically ill patients; limited sample size		▪ Synairgen initiating a phase 3 trial in the UK to evaluate use of an inhaled interferon beta 1a formulation (SNG001) for treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients who require supplemental oxygen *(added 1/13/2021)* **Pregnancy:** ▪ data from pregnancy registries have not found an association between interferon exposure and major birth defects
INTERFERON ALPHA-2b (inhaled) *(added 5/25/2021)*	**J Yu et al. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2021[8]** *(added 5/25/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized adult patients with COVID-19 in China (n=1401) **Design:** retrospective study ▪ 852 (60.8%) patients received treatment with inhaled interferon alpha-2b 5 000 000 U twice daily **Results:** ▪ After adjusting for confounders, use of interferon alpha-2a was associated with a lower risk of the composite outcome of mechanical ventilation, ICU admission and death (hazard ratio 0.36; 95% CI 0.21-0.62) **Limitations:** retrospective study	▪ Adverse effects associated with interferons include depression, flu-like symptoms, transaminase elevations, possible cardiac toxicity, autoimmune disorders, allergic reactions, hepatotoxicity, seizures, suicidal ideation, lymphopenia	▪ Interferons modulate immune response and may have antiviral properties ▪ *In vitro* activity against SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV, but did not appear to improve disease outcomes in human studies[2] ▪ NIH guidelines recommend against use of interferons in patients with severe or critical illness, except in a clinical trial; they state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of interferon beta in patients with early (<7 days from symptom onset) mild and moderate illness[4] ▪ If administered, should be given early in course of disease ▪ Inhaled interferon alpha-2b not available in the US **Pregnancy:** ▪ Interferons may cause fetal harm, based on data from animal studies ▪ Data from pregnancy registries have not found an association between interferon exposure and major birth defects

1. IFN Hung et al. Triple combination of interferon beta-1b, lopinavir–ritonavir, and ribavirin in the treatment of patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19: an open-label, randomised, phase 2 trial. Lancet 2020; 396: 1695.
2. E Sallard et al. Type 1 interferons as a potential treatment against COVID-19. Antiviral Res 2020 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.antiviral.2020.104791. Accessed May 14, 2020.
3. W Alhazzani et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with COVID-19. Crit Care Med 2020 March 27 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/Abstract/onlinefirst/Surviving_Sepsis_Campaign__Guidelines_on_the.95707.aspx. Accessed May 14, 2020.
4. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 20, 2020.
5. PD Monk et al. Safety and efficacy of inhaled nebulized interferon beta-1a (SNG001) for treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet Respir Med 2020 November 12 (epub).
6. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. Repurposed antiviral drugs for Covid-19 – interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:497.
7. JJ Feld et al. Peginterferon lambda for the treatment of outpatients with COVID-19: a phase 2, placebo-controlled randomised trial. Lancet Respir Med 2021 February 5 (epub).
8. J Yu et al. Interferon-α-2b aerosol inhalation is associated with improved clinical outcomes in patients with coronavirus disease-2019. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2021 May 13 (epub).

IVERMECTIN – *STROMECTOL* (MSD)

(updated 7/15/2021)

Dosage:
- Dosage for COVID-19 not established

200-400 mcg/kg/dose PO[1]

- Inhibits SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro*; ~5000-fold reduction in viral RNA in cell culture 48 hours after a single treatment[2]

Rajter et al. Chest 2020[5] *(updated 10/26/2020)*
Population: hospitalized patients (n=280)
Design: retrospective cohort; ivermectin compared to usual care
- 200 mcg/kg x 1 dose, 2nd dose given after 7 days if still hospitalized

Results:
- Most patients in both groups also received hydroxychloroquine and/or azithromycin
- Ivermectin associated with lower all-cause mortality compared to usual care (15.0% vs 25.2%; p=0.03)
- In the propensity-matched cohort, mortality remained lower with ivermectin (13.3% vs 24.5%; OR 0.47, CI 0.22-0.99; p<0.05)
- In 75 patients with severe pulmonary disease, mortality was lower with ivermectin (38.8% vs 80.7%, p=0.001)
- No significant difference in extubation rates (36.1% vs 15.4%, p=0.07)

Limitations: retrospective data; intervention timing not standardized

Adverse Effects:
- Generally well tolerated when used for treatment of lice; diarrhea has occurred
- Diarrhea, nausea, dizziness, pruritis, dermatologic reactions, lymphadenitis, arthralgia, and fever have been reported when used for treatment of onchocerciasis

Drug Interactions:
- Azithromycin may increase serum concentrations of ivermectin

- FDA-approved for treatment of intestinal strongyloidiasis and onchocerciasis; used off-label for a variety of other parasitic infections including lice and scabies
- Inhibited SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro*; may inhibit nuclear transport activity
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of ivermectin[3] *(updated 1/18/2021)*
- IDSA guidelines recommend against use of ivermectin outside the context of a clinical trial in outpatients or hospitalized patients with COVID-19[16] *(added 3/29/2021)*
- FDA warns against human use of ivermectin intended for use in animals[4]
- Results of an *in vitro* study suggest that ivermectin concentrations needed to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 in humans may not be achievable without toxic dosages of the drug[6] *(updated 10/26/2020)*

Pregnancy:
- Limited data available in pregnant women

IVERMECTIN (continued)	**R Mahmud et al. 2020[7]** *(added 10/26/2020)* **Population:** patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 in Bangladesh (n=400) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled ▪ Ivermectin + doxycycline added to standard care vs placebo plus standard care ▪ Ivermectin 6 mg stat; doxycycline 100 mg bid x 5 days **Results:** ▪ More patients receiving ivermectin + doxycycline had early clinical improvement (60.7% vs 44.4%: p<0.03) ▪ Fewer patients receiving ivermectin + doxycycline had late clinical recovery (23.0% vs 37.2%; p<0.004) **Limitations:** limited information available; has not been published or become available on a pre-print server; not peer reviewed **HA Hashim et al. MedRxiv 2020[8]** *(added 11/4/2020)* **Population:** outpatients or inpatients in Baghdad with COVID-19 with severity ranging from mild to critical (most patients had mild to moderate disease) (n=140) **Design:** randomized controlled trial Ivermectin (200 mcg/kg/day x 2 days; some patients received a 3rd dose 7 days after the 1st) plus doxycycline (100 mg bid x 5-10 days) added to standard care vs standard care alone **Results:**

IVERMECTIN (continued)	▪ Patients with critical disease were not included in the control group ▪ 3/70 patients (4.28%) treated with ivermectin/doxycycline and 7/70 patients (10%) given standard care alone progressed to more advanced COVID-19 (p>0.05) ▪ Among patients with severe disease at randomization, 9% (1/11) given the active treatment and 31.81% (7/22) given standard care progressed to more advanced disease (p>0.05) ▪ Mortality rate in patients with severe disease was 0% (0/11) in patients treated with ivermectin/doxycycline and 27.27% (6/22) in those given standard care (p=0.14) ▪ Mean time to recovery was 10.61 days with ivermectin/doxycycline vs 17.9 days with standard care (p<0.05) **Limitations:** not peer reviewed, small sample size, single-blind **S Ahmed et al. Int J Infect Dis 2021**[9] *(added 1/19/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Bangladesh (n=72) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Ivermectin alone (12 mg once/day x 5 days), ivermectin (12 mg single dose) + doxycycline (200 mg day 1, then 100 mg q12h x 4 days), or placebo **Results:** ▪ Virologic clearance occurred at 9.7 days in 5-day ivermectin vs 12.7 days with placebo (p=0.02); ivermectin + doxycycline not
IVERMECTIN (continued)	

significantly different than placebo (11.5 days; p=0.27)

Limitations: most patients mild disease; small study, if improves clinical outcomes unclear

AZK Chachar et al. Int J of Sci 2020[10] *(added 1/19/2021)*

Population: patients with mild COVID-19 in Pakistan (n=50)

Design: open-label, randomized trial

Results: no significant difference in percentage of patients who were asymptomatic at 7 days between ivermectin and placebo groups

Limitations: small, open-label trial

ATMM Chowdhury et al. Research Square 2020[11] *(added 1/19/2021)*

Population: non-hospitalized patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 in Bangladesh (n=116)

Design: randomized trial

- ivermectin + doxycycline or hydroxychloroquine + azithromycin

Results:

- Difference in time to negative PCR and time to resolution of symptoms was not statistically significant between the two groups

Limitations: small study, methods not clear, many patients excluded

P Soto-Becerra et al. medRxiv 2020[12] *(added 1/19/2021)*

Population: adults hospitalized with COVID-19 (without life-threatening illness) in mid- and high-level complexity hospitals in Peru (n=5683)

Design: retrospective cohort emulating a target trial; data from

IVERMECTIN (continued)	electronic records from the Peruvian Social Security Health System ▪ Hydroxychloroquine, ivermectin, azithromycin, hydroxychloroquine + azithromycin, or ivermectin + azithromycin within 48 hours of admission compared to standard care **Results:** ▪ Ivermectin was not associated with improvements in mortality, death and/or oxygen requirement, or death and/or ICU admission **Limitations:** observational data; not peer reviewed **A Elgazzar et al. Research Square 2020**[13] *(added 1/19/2021)* **Population:** treatment of patients with mild/moderate and severe COVID-19 (n=400) and prophylaxis of healthcare and/or household contacts (n=200) in Egypt **Design:** randomized, controlled trial Ivermectin plus standard care vs hydroxychloroquine plus standard care **Results:** ▪ Ivermectin reduced mortality compared to hydroxychloroquine and incidence of infection in contacts **Limitations**: preprint; not peer reviewed **M Niaee et al. Research Square 2020**[14] *(added 1/19/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with mild to severe COVID-19 (n=180)

IVERMECTIN (continued)	**Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 2 trial **Results:** ▪ Ivermectin reduced mortality rate, duration of low O2, and duration of hospitalization **Limitations:** preprint; not peer reviewed **E Lopez-Medina et al. JAMA 2021[15]** *(added 3/7/2021)* **Population:** outpatient or hospitalized adults in Colombia with mild COVID-19 who were symptomatic for ≤7 days (n=476) **Design:** randomized, double-blind trial ▪ Ivermectin 300 mcg/kg x 5 days vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Median time to resolution of symptoms was not significantly different between patients who received ivermectin (10 days) compared those who received placebo (12 days) (HR 1.07, 95% CI 0.87-1.32, p=0.53) **Limitations:** primary outcome changed after start of trial; labeling error occurred during trial; may have been underpowered; no virological assessments **YM Roman et al. medRxiv 2021[17]** **Population:** randomized controlled trials in adults with COVID-19 who were treated with ivermectin or a control (n=1173; 10 trials) **Design:** meta-analysis **Results:**

IVERMECTIN (continued)	▪ Most trials evaluated patients with mild COVID-19 ▪ All cause mortality was not decreased with ivermectin compared to controls (RR 1.11; 95% CI 0.16-7.65, very low quality of evidence) ▪ Length of hospitalization was not reduced with ivermectin compared to controls (mean difference 0.72 days; 95% CI -0.86-2.29, very low quality of evidence) **Limitations:** meta-analysis; quality of evidence low or very low; not published or peer reviewed **Hill et al. Open Forum Infectious Diseases 2021[18]** *(added 7/15/2021)* **Population:** included randomized controlled trials that compared and ivermectin-based regimen with a comparator or standard of care for treatment of COVID-19 (n=3328 participants) **Design:** meta-analysis of 24 randomized clinical trials **Results:** ▪ Ivermectin associated with reduced inflammatory markers such as C-reactive protein, d-dimer, and ferritin ▪ Ivermectin associated with faster viral clearance ▪ Total number of deaths was 128 ▪ In 11 trials in patients with moderate to severe COVID-19, ivermectin was associated with a 56% reduction in mortality (relative risk 0.44; 95% CI 0.25-0.77; p=0.004); death occurred in 3% of

	patients on ivermectin and 9% of controls ▪ In mild to moderate disease, 70% improvement in survival with ivermectin (relative risk 0.44; 95% CI 0.25-0.77; p=0.0004) ▪ No significant difference in mortality between ivermectin and control in severe subgroup (relative risk 0.58; 95% CI 0.25-1.32; p=0.19) ▪ Ivermectin associated with shorter duration of hospitalization (-4.27 days; 95% CI -8.6 to -0.06; p=0.05) ▪ Ivermectin associated with shorter time to clinical recovery (-1.58 days; 95% CI -2.80 to-0.35; p=0.01) ▪ Ivermectin not associated with lower risk of hospitalization (RR 0.40; 95% CI 0.14-1.08; p=0.07) **Limitations:** meta-analysis, many trials not peer-reviewed; dosing and duration of ivermectin not standardized, comparators varied

1. Dosage for other indications. For some indications only a single dose is required, but for others the dose may need to be repeated 2-3 times.
2. L Caly et al. The FDA-approved drug ivermectin inhibits the replication of SARS-CoV-2 in vitro. Antiviral Res 2020 April 3 (epub).
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed January 18, 2021.
4. FDA letter to stakeholders: do not use ivermectin intended for animals as treatment for COVID-19 in humans. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/product-safety-information/fda-letter-stakeholders-do-not-use-ivermectin-intended-animals-treatment-covid-19-humans. Accessed August 29, 2020.
5. JC Rajter et al. Use of ivermectin is associated with lower mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (ICON study). Chest 2020 October 12 (epub; in press).
6. G Momekov and D Momekova. Ivermectin as a potential COVID-19 treatment from the pharmacokinetic point of view: antiviral levels are not likely attainable with known dosing regimens. MedRxiv 2020 May 22. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.11.20061804v2. Accessed October 26, 2020.
7. R Mahmud et al. Clinical trial of ivermectin plus doxycycline for the treatment of confirmed COVID-19 infection. ClinicalTrials.gov. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT04523831. Accessed October 26, 2020.
8. HA Hashim et al. Controlled randomized clinical trial on using ivermectin with doxycycline for treating COVID-19 patients in Baghdad, Iraq. MedRxiv 2020 October 27 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219345v1. Accessed November 4, 2020.
9. S Ahmed et al. A five-day course of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19 may reduce the duration of illness. Int J Infect Dis 2021; 103:214.
10. AZK Chachar et al. Effectiveness of ivermectin in SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 patients. Int J of Sci 2020; 9:31.
11. ATMM Chowdhury et al. A randomized trial of ivermectin-doxycycline and hydroxychloroquine-azithromycin therapy on COVID-19 patients. Research Square 2020 (preprint).
12. P Soto-Becerra et al. Real-world effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and ivermectin among hospitalized COVID-19 patients: results of a target trial emulation using observational data from a nationwide healthcare system in Peru. medRxiv 2020 October 14 (epub).
13. A Elgazzar et al. Efficacy and safety of ivermectin for treatment and prophylaxis of COVID-19 pandemic. Research Square 2020 December 28 (epub).
14. MS Niaee et al. Ivermectin as an adjunct treatment for hospitalized adult COVID-19 patients: a randomized multi-center clinical trial. Research Square 2020 November 24 (epub).

15. E Lopez-Medina et al. Effect of ivermectin on time to resolution of symptoms among adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021; 325:1426.
16. A Bhimraj et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Available at: https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed March 29, 2021.
17. YM Roman et al. Ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. medRxiv 2021 May 25 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.21.21257595v1. Accessed May 27, 2021.
18. A Hill et al. Meta-analysis of randomized trials of ivermectin to treat SARS-CoV-2 infection. Open Forum Infect Dis 2021 July 6 (accepted manuscript).

ICATIBANT – *FIRAZYR,* and generics

Dosage:
- Dosage for COVID-19 not established
- 30 mg SC x 3 doses given 6 hours apart[1]

van de Veerdonk et al. JAMA Netw Open 2020[1]

Population: hospitalized patients with confirmed COVID-19 in the Netherlands (n=27; 9 cases/18 controls)
- oxygen saturation <90% without supplemental oxygen, requiring ≥3 L/min supplemental oxygen, and with computed tomography severity score ≥7

Design: case-control study

Results:
- icatibant-treated patients required less oxygen supplementation vs controls
- 4 of 9 patients given icatibant were no longer oxygen dependent within 10-35 hours
- 8 of 9 had a reduction of oxygen requirements ≥3 L/min after 24 hrs with icatibant vs 3 of 18 controls
- 3 patients had a resurgence in need for oxygen supplementation; possibly due to short half-life of icatibant

Limitations: retrospective data; 9 cases

Adverse Effects:
- Injection site reactions, pyrexia, transaminase increases, dizziness, rash

Drug Interactions:
- May attenuate antihypertensive effect of ACE inhibitors

- FDA-approved for treatment of acute attacks of hereditary angioedema (HAE)

- SARS-CoV-2 enters cells via ACE2, which breaks down bradykinin; loss of ACE2 may result in stimulation of the bradykinin 2 receptor, which could be a contributing factor in pulmonary edema in patients with COVID-19

- Icatibant is a competitive antagonist selective for the bradykinin B2 receptor

Pregnancy:
- Icatibant use has not been associated with a risk of major birth defects, miscarriage, or adverse maternal or fetal outcomes based on available data from published literature and the pharmacovigilance database

- Adverse maternal and fetal outcomes have been reported in animal studies

1. FL van de Veerdonk et al. Outcomes associated with use of a kinin B2 receptor antagonist among patients with COVID-19. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3:e2017708.

COLCHICINE
(updated 7/15/2021)

Dosage:
- Optimal dosage in patients with COVID-19 is unclear

GRECCO-19 trial[1]
Population: Hospitalized patients (n=105)
Design:
- Randomized, open-label trial in Greece
- Colchicine plus standard of care vs standard of care alone x 3 weeks

Results:
- Differences in inflammatory biomarkers (high sensitivity cardiac troponin, C-reactive protein) were not statistically significant between groups
- The clinical primary endpoint (time from baseline to clinical deterioration, defined as a 2-grade increase on a 7 point scale) occurred in 7 patients (14.0%) in the control group and in 1 patient (1.8%) in the colchicine group (p = 0.02)

Limitations:
- Small, open-label trial
- Almost all patients also received treatment with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin or lopinavir/ritonavir

ColCORONA Trial 2021[4,6]
(added 1/26/2021; updated 4/23/2021)
Population: outpatients ≥ 40 years old with COVID-19 diagnosed within 24 hours of study entry who also had ≥1 risk factor for severe COVID-19 complications (>70 years old, BMI ≥ 30 kg/m^2, diabetes, uncontrolled hypertension, respiratory disease,

Adverse Effects:[2]
- Diarrhea, nausea, and vomiting are common
- Blood dyscrasias have been reported
- Neuromyopathy is rare; it typically occurs in elderly patients or in those with hepatic or renal impairment
- Overdosage of colchicine can be fatal

Drug Interactions:
- Substrate of CYP3A4 and the efflux transporter P-glycoprotein (P-gp); fatalities have been reported rarely in patients taking colchicine with a strong CYP3A4 inhibitor such as clarithromycin or a strong P-gp inhibitor such as cyclosporine
- Dosage should be reduced when colchicine is taken concurrently with or within 2 weeks after a CYP3A4 or P-gp inhibitor
- Myopathy and rhabdomyolysis have occurred in patients taking colchicine with a statin or a fibrate

- Colchicine has anti-inflammatory properties
- More trials are ongoing to evaluate the efficacy of colchicine for treatment of COVID-19
- The colchicine arm of the RECOVERY trial has been stopped because an independent data monitoring committee found lack of efficacy in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 *(added 3/6/2021)*
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of colchicine in nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19[5] *(added 4/23/2021)*
- NIH guidelines recommend against use of colchicine in hospitalized patients for treatment of COVID-19[5] *(updated 7/15/2021)*

Pregnancy:
- No adequate studies in pregnant women
- Embryofetal toxicity and teratogenicity and altered postnatal development reported in animal studies

heart failure, coronary disease, fever ≥38.4°C in last 48 hours, dyspnea at presentation, bicytopenia, pancytopenia, or high neutrophil count + low lymphocyte count) (n=4488)

Design: contactless, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- Colchicine 0.5 mg bid x 3 days, then once/day x 27 days vs placebo

Results:

- Composite of death or hospitalization occurred in 4.7% of patients given colchicine and 5.8% of those given placebo (odds ratio 0.79, 95.1% CI 0.61-1.03; p=0.08)
- In 4159 patients with COVID-19 diagnosis confirmed by PCR, dealth or hospitalization occurred in 4.6% of patients given colchicine and 6.0% of those given placebo (odds ratio 0.75, 95% CI 0.57-0.99; p=0.04)
- Odds ratio for hospitalization 0.75 (95% CI 0.57-0.99), for mechanical ventilation 0.50 (95% CI 0.23-1.07) and for death 0.56 (95% CI 0.19-1.66)
- Diarrhea occurred more often with colchicine than with placebo (13.7% vs 7.3%)

Limitations: not peer reviewed or published yet; trial stopped before full enrollment reached; uncertainty about accuracy of diagnosis of cases; patient-reported outcomes potentially misclassified

1. SG Deftereos et al. Cardiac and inflammatory biomarkers and clinical outcomes in patients hospitalized with Coronavirus Disease 2019. The GRECCO-19 randomized clinical trial. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3:e2013136.
2. Drugs for gout. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019; 61:33.
3. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
4. News Release. Institut de Cardiologie de Montreal. Colchicine reduces the risk of COVID-19-related complications. January 23, 2021. Available at: https://www.icm-mhi.org/en/pressroom/news/colchicine-reduces-risk-covid-19-related-complications. Accessed January 26, 2021.
5. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 15, 2021.
6. JC Tardif et al. Efficacy of colchicine in non-hospitalized patients with COVID-19. MedRxiv 2021 January 27 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.26.21250494v1. Accessed April 26, 2021.

ALOGLIPTIN – *NESINA*
LINAGLIPTIN – *TRADJENTA*
SAXAGLIPTIN – *ONGLYZA*
SITAGLIPTIN – *JANUVIA*
(Updated 10/1/2020)

Dosage:
- Optimal dosage in patients with COVID-19 is unclear
- Dosage adjustments are needed for reduced renal function

Usual dosage for treatment of type 2 diabetes:
- Alogliptin: 25 mg PO once/day
- Linagliptin: 5 mg PO once/day
- Saxagliptin: 2.5-5 mg PO once/day
- Sitagliptin: 100 mg PO once/day

- Clinical trials with linaglipatin in patients with type 2 diabetes and mild or moderate COVID-19 are expected to begin to determine if use of the drug can improve glucose control and reduce the severity of COVID-19[1,2]

Solerte et al. Diabetes Care 2020[6] *(added 10/1/2020)*
Population: patients with type 2 diabetes hospitalized with COVID-19 (pneumonia, oxygen saturation <95% on ambient air or with oxygen support) (n=388)
Design: multicenter, case-control, retrospective, observational study
- Sitagliptin added to standard care (e.g., insulin) vs untreated controls

Results:
- Compared to controls, sitagliptin use associated with reduced mortality (18% vs 37% with controls; p=0.0001), improved clinical outcomes (60% vs 38% with controls; p=0.0001), and more hospital discharges (120 vs 89 with controls; p=0.008)

Limitations: retrospective data; increased inflammatory markers at baseline in sitagliptin group

Adverse Effects:
- Acute pancreatitis, fatal hepatic failure, possible worsening of heart failure, possible severe and disabling joint pain

Drug Interactions:
- Strong P-glycoprotein or CYP3A4 inducers[5] can decrease serum concentrations of linagliptin; concurrent use should be avoided if possible
- Strong CYP3A4/5 inhibitors[5] can increase saxagliptin concentrations; the dose of saxagliptin should not exceed 2.5 mg when used in combination with a CYP3A4/5 inhibitor
- Sitagliptin may increase digoxin concentrations; monitor patients taking digoxin

- Hypothesized that inhibition of DPP-4 may prevent infection with or progression of COVID-19

- Mechanism not established, but it has been suggested that DPP-4 may be involved in SARS-CoV-2 cell adhesion and DPP-4 inhibitors may have effects on inflammation[3,4]

Pregnancy:
- Limited data on use during pregnancy; insulin is generally preferred in pregnant women

1. G Iacobellis et al. Effects of DPP4 Inhibition on COVID-19. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04341935?term=dpp&cond=COVID&draw=2&rank=1. Accessed May 12, 2020.
2. Ran Abuhasira et al. Efficacy and safety of dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors in diabetic patients with established COVID-19. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04371978?term=dpp&cond=COVID&draw=2&rank=2. Accessed May 12, 2020.
3. R Strollo and P Pozzilli. DPP4 inhibition: preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or progression of COVID-19? Diabetes Metab Res Rev 2020 Apr 26 (epub).
4. SR Bornstein et al. Practical recommendations for the management of diabetes in patients with COVID-19. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2020 April 23 (epub).
5. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
6. SB Solerte et al. Sitagliptin treatment at the time of hospitalization was associated with reduced mortality in patients with type 2 diabetes and COVID-19: a multicenter, case-control, retrospective, observational study. Diabetes Care 2020 September 29 (epub).

DAPAGLIFLOZIN – *FARXIGA* (ASTRAZENECA)

(Updated 6/6/2021)

Dosage:

- 10 mg once/day[1]

DARE-19 2021[1,4]

(updated 6/6/2021)

Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who had risk factors for developing serious complications (hypertension, type 2 diabetes, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, heart failure, or chronic kidney disease stage 3 or 4) (n=1250)

Design: phase 3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial

- Addition of dapagliflozin 10 mg once daily to standard care vs standard care alone

Results:

- Addition of dapagliflozin did not result in statistically significant improvements in primary endpoints including organ dysfunction, all-cause mortality, or clinical status
- Organ failure or death (primary endpoint) occurred in 11.2% of patients treated with dapagliflozin and 13.8% of those given placebo (p=0.17)
- Primary outcome of recovery: Win ratio 1.09 (95% CI 0.97-1.22; p=0.14)
- Composite kidney endpoint occurred in 7.7% of dapagliflozin-treated patients and 10.4% of placebo-treated patients
- All cause mortality: 6.6% with dapagliflozin vs 8.6% with placebo (p>0.05)

Limitations: primary analysis; not yet published or peer reviewed

Adverse Effects:

- Genital mycotic and urinary tract infections, acute kidney injury, volume depletion, hypotension, and ketoacidosis

Drug Interactions:

- Metabolized primarily by UGT1A9; mefenamic acid *(Ponstel)*, a UGT1A9 inhibitor, increased dapagliflozin AUC by about 50%, but dapagliflozin dosage reduction not needed
- Taking dapagliflozin with insulin or a sulfonylurea increases the risk of hypoglycemia

- Some experts have advised that SGLT2 inhibitors be stopped in hospitalized COVID-19 patients because of in increased risk of DKA and have concerns with the conduction of the DARE-19 trial[2]
- SGLT2 inhibitors have been shown to have beneficial effects in patients with cardiovascular and renal comorbidities not infected with COVID-19; hypothesized that they may also have protective effects in patients with COVID-19[1]
- Mechanism not established, but SGLT2 inhibitors may have favorable effects on mechanisms involved in respiratory failure, sepsis, and multi-organ failure/cytokine storm[1]

Pregnancy:

- Not recommended during the second and third trimester; adverse renal effects have been reported in animal studies

	RJ Vitale et al. AACE Clinical Case Reports 2020[3] *(added 1/13/2021)* **Population:** patients with type 2 diabetes using SGLT2 inhibitors who developed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=5) **Design:** case series **Results:** ▪ 5 cases of euglycemic diabetic ketoacidosis in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection ▪ All patients were taking an SGLT2 inhibitor before hospital admission **Limitations:** case reports

1. Dapagliflozin in respiratory failure in patients with COVID-19 (DARE-19). Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04350593?term=farxiga&cond=covid&draw=2&rank=1. Accessed April 29, 2020.
2. ME Tucker et al. New study of diabetes drug for COVID-19 raises eyebrows. Medscape. Available at: https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/929716#vp_2. Accessed April 28, 2020.
3. RJ Vitale et al. Euglycemic diabetic ketoacidosis with COVID-19 infection in patients with type 2 diabetes taking SGLT2 inhibitors. AACE Clinical Case Reports 2020 (pre-proof).
4. News Release. AstraZeneca. Update on the DARE-19 phase III trial for Farxiga in COVID-19. April 12, 2021. Available at: https://www.astrazeneca.com/media-centre/press-releases/2021/update-on-farxiga-covid-19-dare-19-phase-iii-trial.html. Accessed April 13, 2021.
5. DJ Kumbhani et al. Dapagliflozin in respiratory failure in patients with COVID-19 – DARE-19. Presented by M. Kosiborod at the American College of Caridology Virtual Annual Scientific Session (ACC 2021), May 16, 2021. Available at: https://www.acc.org/Latest-in-Cardiology/Clinical-Trials/2021/05/14/02/40/DARE-19. Accessed June 6, 2021.

FAMOTIDINE –
***PEPCID* (VALEANT)**
(Updated 11/4/2020)

Dosage:
- Clinical trial administering high-dose IV treatment (120 mg IV q8h)

- Ongoing trial in New York

- Review of patient records from China suggested that use of famotidine was associated with a lower death rate compared to those not taking the drug (Science April 26, 2020)

DE Freedberg et al. Gastroenterology 2020[1] *(updated 6/5/2020)*
Population: hospitalized, non-intubated, non-ICU (n=1620)
Design: Retrospective cohort, famotidine vs no famotidine
Results:
- Reduced risk for death or intubation (adjusted HR 0.42)
- PPI use not associated with lower risk
- 5.1% of patients were given famotidine within 24 hours of admission

Limitations: observational, retrospective, single center, not peer reviewed

T Janowitz et al. Gut 2020[2] *(added 6/5/2020)*
Population: non-hospitalized patients (n=10)
Design: case series; self-administered famotidine (80 mg tid x 11 days most commonly used)

Adverse Effects:
- Hepatitis, hematologic toxicity, and CNS effects such as headache, lethargy, depression, and cognitive impairment have occurred

Drug Interactions:
- May decrease serum concentrations of drugs that require gastric acidity for absorption

- Mechanism not established; computer simulation suggested famotidine may inhibit an enzyme required for replication of the virus

- Concerns about use in patients with renal impairment (especially at high doses)

Pregnancy:
- No adequate data in pregnant women; no evidence of risk in animal studies

FAMOTIDINE (continued)	**Results:** ▪ combined symptom score improved significantly within 24 hrs of famotidine ▪ symptoms (cough, shortness of breath, fatigue, headache, anosmia) were scored on a 4-point ordinal scale ▪ no patients were hospitalized ▪ time from onset of symptoms to start of treatment ranged from 2 to 26 days **Limitations:** case series (small number of patients, no placebo group) **Mather et al. Am J Gastroenterol 2020**[3] *(added 8/19/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 at a single center in Connecticut (n=878; 83 received famotidine) **Design:** retrospective, propensity-matched observational study ▪ compared patients receiving famotidine (PO or IV at any dose within 7 days of COVID screening or hospital admission) to those not receiving the drug **Results:** ▪ patients treated with famotidine were younger than those who were not ▪ famotidine use associated with decreased risk of in-hospital mortality (OR 0.37; 95% CI 0.16-0.86; p=0.021) ▪ famotidine also associated with decreased risk of combined death or intubation and lower levels of serum markers for severe disease (CRP, procalcitonin, ferritin)

FAMOTIDINE (continued)	**Limitations:** observational data **Hogan et al. Pulm Pharmacol Ther 2020**[4] *(added 9/21/2020)* **Population**: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 treated with famotidine 20 mg bid and cimetidine 10 mg bid plus standard care (n=110) **Design:** retrospective cohort study **Results:** combination appeared to reduce symptom progression when compared to published reports of COVID-19 inpatients **Limitations:** retrospective data; not enough patients in control group for comparison **S Yeramaneni et al. Gastroenterology 2020**[5] *(added 11/4/2020)* **Population:** hospitalized adults with COVID-19 (n=7158) **Design:** multicenter, retrospective ▪ famotidine use within 24 hrs of admission vs no famotidine **Results:** ▪ 30-day mortality was higher in famotidine users than nonusers **Limitations:** observational; low to medium famotidine doses used

1. DE Freedberg et al. Famotidine use is associated with improved clinical outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: a propensity score matched retrospective cohort study. Gastroenterology 2020 (journal pre-proof).
2. T Janowtiz et al. Famotidine use and quantitative symptom tracking for COVID-19 in non-hospitalized patients: a case series. Gut 2020 (epub).
3. JF Mather et al. Impact of famotidine use on clinical outcomes of hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Am J Gastroenterol 2020 (preprint). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ajg/Documents/AJG-20-2074_R1.pdf. Accessed August 19, 2020.
4. RB Hogan et al. Dual-histamine receptor blockade with cetirizine-famotidine reduces pulmonary symptoms in COVID-19 patients. Pulm Pharmacol Ther 2020; 63:101942.
5. S Yeramaneni et al. Famotidine use is not associated with 30-day mortality: a coarsened exact match study in 7158 hospitalized COVID-19 patients from a large healthcare system. Gastroenterology 2020 October 6 (pre-proof).

FLUVOXAMINE

(updated 4/23/2021)

Dosage:
- 100 mg tid x 15 days

EJ Lenze et al. 2020[1]
(updated 11/12/2020)
Population: outpatient adults with mild COVID-19 with symptom onset within 7 days and oxygen saturation ≥ 92% (n=152)
Design: randomized, placebo-controlled, contactless trial
- Fluvoxamine 100 mg tid or placebo x 15 days

Results:
- After 15 days, 0 of 80 patients who received fluvoxamine had clinical deterioration vs 6 of 72 who took placebo (absolute difference 8.7%; 95% CI 1.8%-16.4%; p=0.009)

Limitations: small, preliminary study, short duration of follow-up, 20% of participants stopped responding to surveys during the trial

Seftel and Boulware Open Forum Infect Dis 2021[2] *(added 3/29/2021)*
Population: mostly Latino employees at a horse racing track in California during a mass outbreak of COVID-19 in Nov and Dec 2020 (n=113)
Design: prospective cohort
- Fluvoxamine (50-100 mg loading dose, then 50 mg bid x 14 days) offered to persons with documented disease

Results:
- 65 persons accepted treatment; 48 declined
- At 14 days, residual symptoms were present in 29 of 48 untreated patients (6 hospitalized, 2 intubated, and 1 died) and 0 of 65 treated patients

Adverse Effects:
- Restlessness, agitation, insomnia, nausea, diarrhea, headache, dizziness, fatigue, sexual dysfunction, hyponatremia
- SSRIs can increase the risk of bleeding by inhibiting serotonin uptake by platelets
- QT interval prolongation has been reported with all SSRIs; the risk appears to be greatest with citalopram and escitalopram

Drug Interactions:
- Increased risk of serotonin syndrome when used with other serotonergic drugs
- Use of SSRIs and monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs) concurrently or within 2 weeks of each other is contraindicated
- Use with antiplatelet or anticoagulant drugs may increase the risk of bleeding
- Use with other QT-interval prolonging drugs could result in additive effects and an increased risk of torsades de pointes
- Fluvoxamine is a strong inhibitor of CYP1A2 and moderate inhibitor of CYP2C19 and can increase serum concentrations of drugs metabolized by these pathways
- SSRI often used for treatment of OCD
- Effects on the sigma-1 receptor may down-regulate cytokine release
- A multicenter, phase 3, randomized, controlled trial for early treatment of COVID-19 is underway
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient evidence to recommend for or against use of fluvoxamine for treatment of COVID-19[3] *(added 4/23/2021)*

Pregnancy:
- Limited data are available on use of fluvoxamine in pregnancy compared to other SSRIs
- Risk of congenital malformations after taking an SSRI during pregnancy appears to be very low, and no increase in perinatal mortality has been demonstrated
- Increased risk of cardiovascular and other malformations has been reported in infants born to mothers who took paroxetine in the first trimester

	Limitations: small sample, prospective cohort trial

1. EJ Lenze et al. Fluvoxamine vs placebo and clinical deterioration in outpatients with symptomatic COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020; 324:2292.
2. D Seftel and DR Boulware. Prospective cohort of fluxovamine for early treatment of coronavirus disease 19. Open Forum Infect Dis 2021 February 1 (epub).
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed April 23, 2021.

Progesterone

Progesterone *(added 3/29/2021)*	**S Ghandehari et al. 2021[1]** *(added 3/29/2021)* **Population:** men hospitalized with moderate to severe COVID-19 (n=42) **Design: pilot,** randomized, open-label trial ▪ Progesterone 100 mg SC bid x up to 5 days plus standard care vs standard care alone **Results:** ▪ Compared to standard care alone, on there was an improvement in clinical status with progesterone (1.5-point improvement on a 7-point ordinal scale; 95% CI 0.0-2.0; p=0.024) ▪ Duration of supplemental oxygen use was 4.5 days with progesterone and 7.5 days with standard care ▪ Duration of hospitalization was 7.0 days with progesterone and 9.5 days with standard care **Limitations:** small, open-label, pilot study	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ No serious adverse events were reported in the trial	▪ Severity of COVID-19 illness is lower in women ▪ Progesterone receptors are expressed on innate and adaptive immune cells, regulating local and systemic inflammation

1. S Ghandehari et al. Progesterone in addition to standard of care vs standard of care alone in the treatment of men hospitalized with moderate to severe COVID-19. Chest 2021 February 20 (epub)

Statins

Atorvastatin
(*Lipitor*, and generics)

(added 6/8/2021)

B Bikdeli et al. INSPIRATION-S ACC 2021[1]
(added 6/8/2021)
Population: ICU patients with COVID-19 (n=605)
Design: randomized, double-blind trial
- Atorvastatin 20 mg once/day vs placebo

Results:
- All-cause death, venous or arterial thrombosis, or ECMO occurred in 32.7% of patients treated with atorvastatin and 36.3% of those given placebo (p=0.35)
- Major bleeding occurred in 3.7% of atorvastatin-treated patients and 1.6% of placebo-treated patients (p-0.12)

Limitations: only available as abstract

Adverse Effects:
- Adverse effects of statins include muscle pain and weakness with or without increased creatinine kinase levels; rhabdomyolysis and myoglobinemia leading to renal failure, elevated serum aminotransferase levels, new-onset diabetes, peripheral neuropathy, memory loss, sleep disturbances, erectile dysfunction, gynecomastia, lupus-like syndrome, acute pancreatitis

Drug Interactions:
- Multiple drug interactions
- Concurrent use of CYP3A4 inhibitors can increase atorvastatin serum concentrations and the risk of rhabdomyolysis
- Use with caution in combination with inhibitors of organic anion transporter polypepties (OATP), P-glycoprotein (P-gp), and breast cancer resistance protein (BCRP)
- Concurrent use with dabigatran etexilate can increase the risk of hemorrhage
- Statins are thought to have anti-inflammatory and antithrombotic effects

Pregnancy:
- Contraindicated

1. B Bikdeli et al. Intermediate versus standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation in critically ill patients with COVID-19 – INSPRIATION-S. American College of Cariology Virtual Annual Scientific Session (ACC 2021). May 16, 2021. Available at: https://www.acc.org/latest-in-cardiology/clinical-trials/2021/05/14/03/14/inspiration-s. Accessed June 8, 2021.

ASCORBIC ACID – GENERICS

(updated 4/26/2021)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage not established

12 g IV q12h x 7 days (infused at a rate of 12 ml/hr)[1]

Patients without COVID-19

- In the CITRIS-ALI trials, a 50 mg/kg dose q6h x 4 days did not significantly improve organ dysfunction or inflammation markers in patients with sepsis and ARDS[2]

- In clinical trials in patients with septic shock, treatment with vitamin C plus thiamine (+/- hydrocortisone) did not improve survival, but reductions in organ dysfunction and duration of shock were reported[4-6] *(added 11/9/2020)*

Patients with COVID-19

- Trials in China and Italy of high-dose ascorbic acid in patients with severe COVID-19-associated pneumonia are ongoing

- The results of these trials have not been published to date

S Thomas et al. JAMA Netw Open 2021[7] *(added 4/26/2021)*

Population: outpatient adults with PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=214)

Design: randomized, open-label trial

- Zinc gluconate 50 mg, ascorbic acid 8000 mg, both, or standard care x 10 days

Results:

- No significant difference between groups in the primary endpoint of number of days required to reach 50% reduction in symptoms (mean

Adverse effects:

- Large doses can acidify the urine, causing cysteine, urate, or oxalate stones; prolonged administration of high IV doses can cause oxalate nephropathy

- Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, dizziness, and flushing can occur

Drug Interactions:

- May decrease serum concentrations of amphetamines

- May decrease the efficacy of bortezomib (*Velcade*, and generics) and cyclosporine

- May cause deferoxamine (*Desferal*) toxicity and left ventricular dysfunction; avoid oral doses >200 mg/day

- Accuracy of point-of-care glucometers may be affected by high circulating vitamin C levels *(added 11/9/2020)*

- Antioxidant properties may protect host cells against infection-induced oxidative stress; may boost host defenses against infection

- Infection may reduce vitamin C concentrations

- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of vitamin C in non-critically ill patients or in critically ill patients[3] *(added 7/21/2020)*

Pregnancy:

- No data are available in pregnant women

5.9 days with zinc, 5.5 days with ascorbic acid, 5.5 days for zinc +ascorbic acid and 6.7 days with usual care; overall p=0.45)
Limitations: small sample size, open-label

1. Randomized, controlled trial beginning. Https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/nct04264533.
2. AA Fowler et al. The CITRIS-ALI randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2019; 322:1261.
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed November 9, 2020.
4. T Fujii et al. Effect of vitamin C, hydrocortisone, and thiamine vs hydrocortisone alone on time alive and free of vasopressor support among patients with septic shock: the VITAMINS randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020; 323:423.
5. P Chang et al. Combined treatment with hydrocortisone, vitamin c, and thiamine for sepsis and septic shock: a randomized controlled trial. Chest 2020; 158:174.
6. J Iglesias et al. Outcomes of metabolic resuscitation using ascorbic acid, thiamine, and glucocorticoids in the early treatment of sepsis: the ORANGES trial. Chest 2020; 158:164.
7. S Thomas et al. Effect of high-dose zinc and ascorbic acid supplementation vs usual care on symptom length reduction among ambulatory patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection: the COVID A to Z randomized clinical trial. JAMA Netw Open 2021 Feb 1 (epub).

ZINC –
ZINC SULFATE

(updated 4/26/2021)

Dosage:
- Optimal dosage not established
- 220 mg daily x 5 days[1]
- Recommended dietary allowance: 11 mg/day for men and 8 mg/day for nonpregnant women

Carlucci et al. 2020[2] *(added 7/21/2020)*
Population: patients (n=932)
Design: retrospective observational study hospitalized
- Zinc plus hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin compared to hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin alone

Results:
- no difference in duration of hospitalization or mechanical ventilation, maximum oxygen flow rate, average oxygen flow rate, or average FiO_2 (in univariate analysis)
- zinc associated with increased frequency of discharge and reduced mortality or transfer to hospice (in bivariate logistic regression analysis)
- association with decreased mortality no longer significant when non-ICU patients were excluded

Limitations: observational data, only in combination with

Adverse Effects:
- Bad taste and nausea
- Irreversible anosmia when administered intranasally
- GI symptoms have occurred with high doses
- Long-term use: copper deficiency leading to reversible hematologic (anemia, leukopenia) and neurologic adverse effects (myelopathy, paresthesia, ataxia, spasticity)

Drug Interactions:
- Zinc can interfere with absorption of many drugs including fluoroquinolones

- Impairs replication of some RNA viruses including SARS-CoV *in vitro*[4]; no data on the activity of zinc against SARS-CoV-2
- Chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine may increase cellular uptake of zinc by SARS-CoV-2[5]
- NIH guidelines state there is insufficient data to recommend for or against use of zinc; they recommend against use of doses above the recommended dietary allowance for prevention of COVID-19, except in a clinical trial[6] *(added 7/21/2020)*
- Several trials are ongoing assessing the efficacy of zinc, some in combination with other vitamins, such as ascorbic acid, and/or drugs, such as hydroxychloroquine[3]

Pregnancy:
- Limited data on the safety of doses higher than the recommended daily allowance in pregnant women

ZINC (continued)

hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin, not peer-reviewed or published

S Abd-Elsalam et al Biol Trace Elem Res 2020[7] *(added 4/26/2021)*
Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Egypt (n=191)
Design: randomized clinical trial
- HCQ plus zinc vs HCQ alone

Results:
- No significant differences between the two groups for the endpoints of recovery within 28 days, the need for mechanical ventilation, and death

Limitations: small sample size

S Thomas et al. JAMA Netw Open 2021[8] *(added 4/26/2021)*
Population: outpatient adults with PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=214)
Design: randomized, open-label trial
- Zinc gluconate 50 mg, ascorbic acid 8000 mg, both, or standard care x 10 days

Results:
- No significant difference between groups in the primary endpoint of number of days required to reach 50% reduction in symptoms (mean 5.9 days with zinc, 5.5 days with ascorbic acid, 5.5 days for zinc +ascorbic acid and 6.7 days with usual care; overall p=0.45)

Limitations: small sample size, open-label

ZINC (continued)	**JS Yao et al. Chest 2021[9]** *(added 4/26/2021)* **Population:** patients with COVID-19 admitted to Hoboken University Medical Center (n=242) **Design:** retrospective, observational study ▪ 196 patients received zinc sulfate 440 mg (of those, 191 also received HCQ) ▪ 46 patients did not receive zinc (of those, 32 received HCQ) **Results:** ▪ Use of zinc was not significantly associated with a change in risk of in-hospital mortality **Limitations:** retrospective data; small sample size **JA Frontera et al. Res Sq 2020[10]** (*added 4/26/2021*) **Population:** hospitalized patients with PCR positive SARS-CoV-2 infection in New York City (n=3473) **Design:** multicenter cohort study ▪ Compared patients who received zinc plus HCQ to those who received HCQ without zinc **Results:** ▪ 12% of those who received zinc plus HCQ died compared to 17% who did not (adjusted hazard ratio 0.76, 95% CI 0.60-0.96; p=0.023) ▪ Treatment with HCQ alone appeared to be harmful **Limitations:** retrospective, observational data; not peer reviewed

1. Dosage regimen tried for treatment of covid-19; effective dosage has not been established in clinical trials.
2. PM Carlucci et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin plus zinc vs hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin alone: outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. medRxiv May 8, 2020.
3. Clinicaltrials.gov. Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=Covid19&term=zinc&cntry=&state=&city=&dist=. Accessed July 22, 2020.
4. Aj te velthuis et al. Zn2+ inhibits coronavirus and arterivirus rna polymerase activity in vitro and zinc ionophores block the replication of these viruses in cell culture. Plos pathog 2010; 6: e1001176.
5. X xue j et al. Chloroquine is a zinc ionophore. Plos one 2014; 9:e109180.
6. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 21, 2020.
7. S Abd-Elsalam et al. Do zinc supplements enhance the clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine?: a randomized, multicenter trial. Biol Trace Elem Res 2020 Nov 27 (epub).
8. S Thomas et al. Effect of high-dose zinc and ascorbic acid supplementation vs usual care on symptom length reduction among ambulatory patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection: the COVID A to Z randomized clinical trial. JAMA Netw Open 2021 Feb 1 (epub).
9. JS Yao et al. The minimal effect of zinc on the survival of hospitalized patients with COVID-19: an observational study. Chest 2021; 159:108.
10. JA Frontera et al. Treatment with zinc is associated with reduced in-hospital mortality among COVID-19 patients: a multi-center cohort study. Res Sq 2020 Oct 26 (preprint).

VITAMIN D

(updated 5/26/2021)

Dosage:

- Dosage in patients with COVID-19 not established
- 400-800 IU/day (recommended daily allowance for most people)
- Serum 25(OH)D 20 to 30 ng/mL: 800-2000 IU/day
- Serum 25(OH)D <20 ng/mL: may need 50,000 IU/week

- Observational studies have suggested there is an association between vitamin D levels and severity of COVID-19 illness; people with vitamin D deficiency may be at higher risk of more severe disease[1,2,8,9,10,11] *(updated 1/11/2020)*
- Earlier meta-analysis of randomized trials in patients with respiratory tract infections (non-COVID-19) found vitamin D supplementation associated with reduced risk of respiratory tract infections[3]
- Earlier randomized, double-blind trial of critically ill (non-COVID-19) patients found no significant effect of vitamin D administration on 90-day mortality vs placebo[4]

Adverse Effects:

- Excessive doses could cause toxicity (hypercalciuria, hypercalcemia, nausea, vomiting, anorexia, constipation, dehydration, fatigue, irritability, confusion, weakness)
- Metabolism of vitamin D altered in patients with chronic kidney disease

- Vitamin D plays an important role in immune function
- Limited data in COVID-19 and other serious illness
- NIH guidelines state there are insufficient data to recommend for or against use of vitamin D for prevention or treatment of COVID-19[7] *(added 7/22/2020)*
- NICE guidance states that there is no evidence to support use of vitamin D supplements to prevent or treat COVID-19[5] *(added 6/30/2020)*
- An expert consensus paper states that vitamin D supplements have not been shown to prevent or treat COVID-19 and strongly cautions against use of high doses of vitamin D; avoidance of vitamin D deficiency is recommended[6] *(added 6/17/2020)*

VITAMIN D (continued)	**A Rastogi et al. Postgrad Med J 2020[12]** *(added 1/11/2021)* **Population:** asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic patients with positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA test results who were vitamin D deficient (25(OH)D <20 ng/mL) (n=40) **Design:** randomized, placebo-controlled trial ▪ 60,000 IU cholecalciferol x 7 days (target 25(OH)D > 50 ng/mL) vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Baseline 25(OH)D was 8.6 in vitamin D group and 9.54 in placebo group ▪ 10 (62.5%) patients in the vitamin D group and 5 (20.8%) patients in the control group became SARS-CoV-2 RNA negative before day 21 (p<0.018) ▪ Statistically significant decrease in fibrinogen levels with vitamin D compared to placebo (p<0.01) **Limitations:** small sample size; only asymptomatic or mild cases included; high-dose treatment that could be associated with toxicity; clinical role of inflammatory markers unknown; long time frame of primary endpoint **M Castillo et al. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 2020[13]** *(added 1/11/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Spain (n=76) **Design:** randomized, open-label trial Oral calcifediol vs standard care (hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin) **Results:** ▪ 1 of 50 patients in the calcifediol group required ICU admission	▪ Some sources of vitamin D include exposure to sunlight, fortified cereals and dairy products, fatty fish

VITAMIN D (continued)	compared to 13 of 26 patients in the standard care group ▪ 0 patients in the calcifediol group died and 2 patients in the standard care group died **Limitations:** small sample size; open-label; vitamin D status not evaluated at study entry **I Murai et al. JAMA 2021**[14] *(added 1/11/2021; updated 2/28/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 in Brazil (n=240) **Design:** multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial Single oral dose of 200,000 IU vitamin D_3 vs placebo **Results:** ▪ Hospital length of stay was 7 days in both groups ▪ Mortality rate was 7.6% in the vitamin D group and 5.1% in the placebo group (p=0.43) ▪ Mechanical ventilation rate was 7.0% in the vitamin D group and 14.4% in the placebo group (p=0.09) ▪ ICU admission rate was 16.0% with vitamin D and 21.2% with placebo (p=0.30) **Limitations:** only in patients with severe disease; long time from symptom onset to randomization; percentage of patients with vitamin D deficiency low

VITAMIN D (continued)	**DO Meltzer et al. JAMA Netw Open 2020[15]** *(added 1/18/2021)* **Population:** patients with a vitamin D level measured in the year before being tested for COVID-19 (n=489) **Design:** retrospective cohort study **Results:** ▪ Relative risk of testing positive for COVID-19 was 1.77 times greater in patients with a vitamin D status of likely deficient compared to those with a status of likely sufficient (p=0.02) **Limitations:** retrospective data; limited sample size **DO Meltzer et al. JAMA Netw Open 2020[16]** *(added 3/20/2021)* **Population:** patients with a vitamin D level measured in the year before being tested for COVID-19 (n=4638) **Design:** retrospective cohort study **Results:** ▪ Risk of testing positive for COVID-19 in Black individuals was 2.64 times greater in patients with a vitamin D level of 30-39.9 ng/mL compared to those with a level ≥40 ng/mL ▪ There were no statistically significant associations observed in White individuals **Limitations:** retrospective data; limited sample size **Y Li et al. JAMA Netw Open 2021** **Population:** individuals that were part of an employer-sponsored health screening program who chose to be tested for SARS-CoV-2 IgG and who had vitamin D levels measured

VITAMIN D (continued)	before the COVID-19 pandemic (n=18148) **Design:** population-based cohort study **Results:** ▪ After adjusting for confounders, low vitamin D level (< 20 or 30 ng/mL) was not associated with seropositivity for SARS-CoV-2 (OR 1.04; 95% CI 0.88-1.22 for vitamin D level < 20 ng/mL and OR 1.09; 95% CI 0.93-1.27 for vitamin D level <30 ng/mL) **Limitations:** retrospective data

1. M Alipio. Vitamin D supplementation could possibly improve clinical outcomes of patients infected with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19). SSRN 2020 April 9. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3571484. Accessed May 12, 2020.
2. A Daneshkhah et al. The possible role of vitamin D in suppressing cytokine storm associated mortality in COVID-19 patients. MedRxiv 2020 April 30. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.08.20058578v3. Accessed May 12, 2020.
3. AR Martineau et al. Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. Br Med J 2017; 356:i6583.
4. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute PETAL Clinical Trials Network. Early high-dose vitamin D3 for critically ill, vitamin D-deficient patients. N Engl J Med 2019; 381:2529.
5. NICE Guidance. COVID-19 rapid evidence summary: vitamin D for COVID-19. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/advice/es28/chapter/Key-messages. Accessed June 30, 2020.
6. SA Lanham-New et al. Vitamin D and SARS-CoV-2 virus/COVID-19 disease. BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health 2020 April 30 (epub).
7. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed July 22, 2020.
8. Abstract presented at American Society of Bone and Mineral Research (ASBMR) 2020 annual meeting. September 11-15, 2020. Virtual.
9. Z Maghbooli et al. Vitamin D sufficiency, a serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D at least 30 ng/mL reduced risk for adverse clinical outcomes in patients with COVID-19 infection. PloS One 2020 September 25.
10. HW Kaufman et al. SARS-CoV-2 positivity rates associated with circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels. PloS One 2020 September 17.
11. M Pereira et al. Vitamin D deficiency aggravates COVID-19: systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 2020 November 4 (epub).
12. A Rastogi et al. Short term, high-dose vitamin D supplementation for COVID-19 disease: a randomised, placebo-controlled study (SHADE study). Postgrad Med J 2020 November 12 (epub).
13. ME Castillo et al. Effect of calcifediol treatment and best available therapy versus best available therapy on intensive care unit admission and mortality among patients hospitalized for COVID-19: a pilot randomized clinical study. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol 2020; 203:105751.
14. IH Murai et al. Effect of a single high dose of vitamin D3 on hospital length of stay in patients with moderate to severe COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021; 325:1053.
15. DO Meltzer et al. Association of vitamin D status and other clinical characteristics with COVID-19 test results. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3:e2019722.
16. DO Meltzer et al. Association of vitamin D levels, race/ethnicity, and clinical characteristics with COVID-19 test results. JAMA Netw Open 2021; 4:e214117.
17. Y Li et al. Assessment of the association of vitamin D level with SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity among working-age adults. JAMA Netw Open 2021; 4:e2111634.

THIAMINE

(added 7/29/2020)

Dosage:

- Dosage in patients with COVID-19 not established
- 200 mg IV q12h[1]

- There are no published trials evaluating use of thiamine for treatment or prevention of COVID-19
- One protocol that has not yet been evaluated in randomized controlled trials includes thiamine in addition to methylprednisolone, ascorbic acid, and heparin for treatment of hospitalized patients with COVID-19[1]
- In a retrospective study in (non-COVID) patients with septic shock, thiamine was associated with improved lactate clearance and reduced 28-day mortality compared to controls[2]
- In a randomized clinical trial of ICU patients (non-COVID), administration of an intervention consisting of IV vitamin C, hydrocortisone, and thiamine did not increase time alive or vasopressor free compared to hydrocortisone alone[3]

Adverse Effects:

- Thiamine is water-soluble and toxic levels are not expected

- Thiamine deficiency has been reported to occur commonly in critically ill patients; evidence on whether thiamine use can improve mortality in critically ill (non-COVID) patients has been conflicting[2,3]
- There are no controlled trials evaluating use of thiamine in critically ill patients with COVID-19

1. Dosage used in MATH+ protocol. Available at https://covid19criticalcare.com/treatment-protocol/. Accessed July 29, 2020.
2. JA Woolum et al. Effect of thiamine administration on lactate clearance and mortality in patients with septic shock. Crit Care Med 2018; 46:1747.
3. T Fujii et al. Effect of vitamin C, hydrocortisone, and thiamine vs hydrocortisone alone on time alive and free of vasopressor support among patients with septic shock: the VITAMINS randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020 323:423.

ASPIRIN
(updated 3/29/2021)

Dosage:
- 81 mg once daily

JH Chow et al. Anesth Analg 2020[1]
(added 11/4/2020; updated 3/29/2021)
Population: hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n=412)
Design: retrospective, observational cohort
- no aspirin vs low-dose aspirin within 24 hrs of admission or 7 days prior to admission

Results:
- Patients taking aspirin had significantly higher rates of hypertension, diabetes, coronary artery disease, and renal disease
- Aspirin use had a crude association with less mechanical ventilation (35.7% vs 48.4% no aspirin; p=0.030) and ICU admissions (38.8% vs 51.0% no aspirin; p=0.04), but not in-hospital mortality (26.5% aspirin vs 23.2% no aspirin; p=0.51)
- After adjustment for confounding, aspirin use was associated with decreased risk of mechanical ventilation (HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.37-0.85, p=0.007), ICU admission (HR 0.57, 95% CI 0.38-0.85, p=0.005), and in-hospital mortality (HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.31-0.90, p=0.02)
- No differences in major bleeding or thrombosis between groups

Limitations: observational; modest sample size; comorbidities in aspirin patients

Adverse Effects:
- Increased risk of bleeding
- Single doses can precipitate asthma symptoms in aspirin-sensitive patients
- High doses can cause GI ulceration and salicylate intoxication
- Risk of Reye's syndrome; should not be used to treat viral syndromes in children and teenagers

Drug Interactions:
- Concurrent use with other antiplatelet drugs or with anticoagulant drugs can increase the risk of bleeding
- Increased risk of GI, renal, and bleeding adverse effects with NSAIDs
- NSAIDs may decrease cardioprotective effects of aspirin; routine use should be avoided; separate doses if intermittent use of both drugs is needed
- Increased risk of metabolic acidosis and CNS toxicity if used in combination with carbonic anhydrase inhibitor

- Mainly used in low doses as platelet inhibitor; irreversibly inhibits platelet function for 8- to 10-day life of platelet

- Evidence of a hypercoagulability has been observed in patients with COVID-19; aspirin has antiplatelet and anti-inflammatory properties

- NIH guidelines recommend patients with COVID-19 who are taking anticoagulant or antiplatelet therapy for underlying medical conditions should continue their treatment unless significant bleeding develops or other contraindications are present

Pregnancy:
- Low-dose aspirin is generally considered safe for use during pregnancy

1. JH Chow et al. Aspirin use is associated with decreased mechanical ventilation, ICU admission, and in-hospital mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. Anesth Analg 2021; 132:930.
2. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed November 4, 2020.

Nasal Saline Irrigation

NASAL SALINE IRRIGATION – (NETI POT OR SINUS RINSE SQUEEZE BOTTLE) **Dosage:** Multiple times per day	▪ No data for treatment or prevention of COVID-19 ▪ Open-label, randomized trial in 61 patients with viral upper respiratory tract infections (including rhinovirus and coronavirus), hypertonic nasal saline irrigation shortened the duration of illness, lowered transmission to household contacts, and reduced viral shedding[1]	**Adverse Effects:** ▪ Minor nasal discomfort or irritation ▪ Sterile, distilled, or boiled (and cooled) tap water should be used to prevent bacterial or protozoal infection[2]	▪ No evidence that regular nasal saline irrigation can prevent or treat COVID-19 infection ▪ Some limited evidence that nasal irrigation with hypertonic saline can shorten the duration of the common cold ▪ Hypothesized mechanism is cellular use of chloride ions to produce hypochlorous acid (HOCL), which has antiviral effects[1]

1. S Ramalingam et al. A pilot, open labelled, randomised controlled trial of hypertonic saline nasal irrigation and gargling for the common cold. Sci Rep 2019; 9:1015.
2. FDA. Is rinsing your sinuses with Neti Pots safe? Available at: https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/rinsing-your-sinuses-neti-pots-safe. Accessed March 31, 2020.

Melatonin

MELATONIN – GENERICS

(updated 11/17/2020)

Dosage:

- Optimal dosage not established

5-10 mg/day PO[1]

- No data available on use of melatonin for treatment of COVID-19

- Based on data suggesting melatonin may be helpful in acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome caused by other pathogens[2]

- In a combined network-based prediction and propensity score matching observational study including 26,779 patients from a COVID-19 registry, melatonin use was significantly associated with a reduced chance of having a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result (OR 0.72; 95% CI 0.56-0.91)[4] *(added 11/17/2020)*

Adverse effects:

- Well tolerated; dizziness, headache, nausea, and sleepiness can occur

Drug Interactions:

- May decrease the antihypertensive effects of calcium channel blockers

- Melatonin is a substrate of CYP1A2; inducers of CYP1A2 may decrease melatonin concentrations and inhibitors of CYP1A2 may increase melatonin concentrations[3]

- May have anti-viral and anti-inflammatory effects; could decrease serum levels of inflammatory cytokines

- Has been used in critical care patients (not COVID-19) to reduce vessel permeability, anxiety, sedation use, and improving sleeping quality[2]

Pregnancy:

- Limited data on the safety of melatonin use during pregnancy

1. Dosage used for reduction of pro-inflammatory cytokines in studies for other indications. Optimal dosage for use in patients with COVID-19 unknown.
2. R Zhang et al. COVID-19: melatonin as a potential adjuvant treatment. Life Sci 2020; 250:117583.
3. Inhibitors and inducers of CYP enzymes and P-glycoprotein. Med Lett Drugs Ther 2019 November 6 (epub). Available at: medicalletter.org/downloads/cyp_pgp_tables.pdf.
4. Y Zhou et al. A network medicine approach to investigation and population-based validation of disease manifestations and drug repurposing for COVID-19. PLoS Biol 18:e3000970.

BENZALKONIUM CHLORIDE
(added 5/9/2020)

Dosage:

- Topical use

- Available OTC in hand sanitizer formulations and an intranasal formulation

- The manufacturer of a nasal formulation of 0.13% benzalkonium chloride *(NanoBio Protect)* states the product has been shown to kill SARS-CoV-2 in *in vitro* studies conducted by Public Health England; published data are not yet available[1]

Previous studies have reported that 0.05-0.2% benzalkonium chloride formulations were less effective than alcohol-based disinfectants against other coronaviruses

Adverse Effects:

- Irritation, burning or stinging, hypersensitivity reactions

- No clinical data demonstrating efficacy of a nasal formulation of benzalkonium chloride for prevention of COVID-19 infection

- The CDC recommends alcohol-based hand sanitizers containing 80% ethanol or 75% isopropanol[3]

1. Press Release. Available at: https://www.bluewillow.com/%ef%bb%bf%ef%bb%bfnanobio-protect-over-the-counter-nasal-antiseptic-kills-covid-19-virus-in-lab-tests/. Accessed May 6, 2020.
2. G Kampf et al. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. J Hosp Infect 2020; 104:246.
3. CDC. Hand hygiene recommendations. Guidance for healthcare providers about hand hygiene and COVID-19. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/hand-hygiene.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhcp%2Fhand-hygiene-faq.html#references. Accessed May 6, 2020.

Povidone-Iodine

POVIDONE-IODINE
(updated 2/10/2021)

Dosage:
- Intranasal solution 0.5%

- OTC topical formulations are not safe for intranasal use

- In an *in vitro* study, a 15 second treatment with a 0.5% intranasal povidone-iodine solution appeared to inactivate SARS-CoV-2[1]

- In a small trial evaluating nasopharyngeal application of povidone-iodine 1% solution and 10% ointment, the mean relative difference in viral titers between baseline and day 1 was 75% in the povidone-iodine group and 32% in the control group, but the there was no influence on changes of viral RNA quantification over time and 42% of patients treated with povidone-iodine had thyroid disfunction[2] *(added 2/10/2021)*

Adverse Effects:
- Risk of iodine absorption expected to be minimal

- Avoid use in patients with thyroid disease or those undergoing radioactive iodine therapy

- Administration of topical povidone iodine formulations intranasally could be toxic and should not be used

- Povidone-iodine is a broad-spectrum antiseptic with antiviral activity

- A trial evaluating intranasal povidone-iodine for prophylaxis in health care workers and hospital patients is ongoing

Pregnancy:
- Avoid use in pregnant women

1. S Frank et al. In vitro efficacy of a povidone-iodine nasal antiseptic for rapid inactivation of SARS-CoV-2. JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2020 September 17 (epub).
2. J Guenezan et al. Povidone iodine mouthwash, gargle, and nasal spray to reduce nasopharyngeal viral load in patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2021 February 4 (epub).

VENOUS THROMBOEMBOLISM (VTE) PROPHYLAXIS

DRUG	DOSAGE
Unfractionated Heparin (UFH)	
Heparin	Usual adult dosage for VTE prophylaxis: ▪ 5000 units SC q8-12h
Low Molecular Weight Heparin (LMWH)	
Enoxaparin (*Lovenox*, and generics)	Usual adult dosage for VTE prophylaxis: ▪ 40 mg SC once/day ▪ CrCl<30 ml/min: 30 mg SC once/day ISTH recommends consideration of higher prophylactic doses (40-60 mg SC once/day) or half-therapeutic-doses (0.5 mg/kg bid) in critically ill patients at high risk, and consideration of higher doses for obese patients
Dalteparin (*Fragmin*)	Usual adult dosage for VTE prophylaxis: ▪ 2500-5000 IU SC once/day
Factor Xa Inhibitor	
Fondaparinux (*Arixtra*, and generics)	Usual adult dosage for VTE prophylaxis: ▪ ≥50 kg: 2.5 mg SC once/day ▪ <50 kg: contraindicated ▪ CrCl <30 mL/min: contraindicated

RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

- SARS-CoV-2 infection is associated with arterial and venous thrombotic complications including MI, ischemic stroke, and VTE[1]
- Thrombosis may contribute to multisystem organ dysfunction in patients with severe COVID-19
- Use of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) is not recommended due to bleeding risk and drug-drug interactions with DOACs
- LMWH or fondaparinux are recommended over UFH to limit staff exposure (once-daily dosing) and because of the lower risk of heparin-induced thrombocytopenia
- Optimal dosages of anticoagulant drugs for VTE prophylaxis in patients with COVID-19 are not established
- Full dose anticoagulation of moderately ill patients hospitalized for COVID-19 reduced the need for vital organ support, such as mechanical ventilation, based on interim results of 3 clinical trials (REMAP-CAP, ACTIV-4, ATTACC; trial data not yet published)[4] *(added 1/25/2021)*
- In an observational cohort study in 4297 hospitalized patients with COVID-19, early initiation of prophylactic anticoagulation was associated with a 27% decreased risk for 30-day mortality[5] *(added 2/16/2021)*
- In a randomized trial in 600 patients in the ICU with COVID-19, there was no significant difference in the primary endpoint of a composite of adjudicated venous or arterial thrombosis, treatment with ECMO, or mortality within 30 days between patients given intermediate-dose (enoxaparin 1 mg/kg daily) or prophylactic-dose (enoxaparin 40 mg daily) anticoagulation[6] *(added 3/20/2021)*

ACCP[2] AND ISTH[3] RECOMMENDATIONS

(in patients without contraindications)

Critically ill patients with COVID-19:

- ACCP and ISTH recommend LMWH

Acutely (non-critically ill) hospitalized patients with COVID-19:

- ACCP recommends LMWH or fondaparinux
- ISTH recommends LMWH

After Discharge:

DRUG	DOSAGE	RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS
		▪ Extended prophylaxis not recommended by ACCP ▪ ISTH recommends considering LMWH (or a DOAC) for up to 30 days in patients at high thrombosis risk and low bleeding risk **Nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19:** ▪ Routine prophylaxis not recommended by ACCP, ISTH, or NIH[7]

ACCP = American College of Chest Physicians; ISTH = International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis

1. G Piazza and DA Morrow. Diagnosis, management, and pathophysiology of arterial and venous thrombosis in COVID-19. JAMA 2020 November 23 (epub).
2. LK Moores et al. Prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of VTE in patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. CHEST Guideline and Expert Panel Report. Chest 2020; 158:1143.
3. AC Spyropoulos et al. Scientific and Standardization Committee communication: clinical guidance on the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. J Thromb Haemost 2020; 18:1859.
4. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Full-dose blood thinners decreased need for life support and improved outcome in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. January 22, 2021. Available at: https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/news/2021/full-dose-blood-thinners-decreased-need-life-support-and-improved-outcome-hospitalized. Accessed January 25, 2021.
5. CT Rentsch et al. Early initiation of prophylactic anticoagulation for prevention of coronavirus disease 2019 mortality in patients admitted to hospital in the United States: cohort study. BMJ 2021; 372:n311.
6. INSPIRATION Investigators. Effect of intermediate-dose vs standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation on thrombotic events, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation treatment, or mortality among patients with COVID-19 admitted to the intensive care unit: the INSPIRATION randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021; 325:1620.
7. NIH. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/ Accessed April 23, 2021.

CONCOMITANT DRUGS

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
Renin-Angiotensin System (RAS) Inhibitors			
ANGIOTENSIN-CONVERTING ENZYME (ACE) INHIBITORS *(updated 2/28/2021)* ▪ Benazepril (*Lotensin*, and generics) ▪ Captopril (generic) ▪ Enalapril (*Vasotec*, and others) ▪ Fosinopril (generic) ▪ Lisinopril (*Zestril*, *Prinivil*, and others) ▪ Moexipril (generic) ▪ Perindopril (generic) ▪ Quinapril (*Accupril*, and generics) ▪ Ramipril (*Altace*, and generics) ▪ Trandolapril (generic) **ANGIOTENSIN RECEPTOR BLOCKERS (ARBS)** ▪ Azilsartan (*Edarbi*) ▪ Candesartan (*Atacand*, and generics) ▪ Eprosartan (*Teveten* and generics) ▪ Irbesartan (*Avapro*, and generics) ▪ Losartan (*Cozaar*, and generics) ▪ Olmesartan (*Benicar*, and generics) ▪ Telmisartan (*Micardis*, and generics)	▪ Increased risk of severe COVID-19 in patients with cardiovascular disease ▪ ACE inhibitors and ARBs increase expression of ACE2 by epithelial cells in the lung, and pathogenic coronaviruses such as SARS-CoV-2 enter these cells via ACE2 receptors[1] ▪ Some researchers have suggested that this increase in risk may be due to use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs in patients with diabetes, hypertension, or heart failure ▪ Others have suggested, however, that ACE2 may protect against lung injury in coronavirus infection and that taking an ACE inhibitor or an ARB might be beneficial[2,3]	**P Zhang et al. Circ Res 2020[4]** **Population:** ▪ hospitalized patients w/ hypertension (n=1128) ▪ 188 taking an ACE inhibitor or ARB **Design:** ▪ retrospective, multi-center **Results:** ▪ all-cause mortality was lower in patients taking an ACE inhibitor or ARB compared to those not taking an ACE inhibitor or ARB (3.7% vs 9.8%) ▪ adjusted HR 0.37 (95% CI, 0.15-0.89; P = 0.03) in a propensity score-matched analysis **Limitations:** retrospective **J Li et al. JAMA Cardiol 2020[5]** **Population:** hospitalized patients (n = 1178); 362 patients with hypertension, 115 taking an ACE inhibitor or ARB **Design:** retrospective, single-center **Results:** percentage of patients taking an ACE inhibitor or ARB was similar between patients with (32.9%) and without (30.7%) severe infection and between survivors (33.0%) and non-survivors (27.3%) **Limitations:** no adjustment for confounding factors	▪ Multiple medical organizations, including the NIH, have advised against stopping or starting these drugs to prevent or treat COVID-19 infection[3,10,11] ▪ Patients who are taking an ACE inhibitor or an ARB and subsequently develop COVID-19 should continue to take the drug[3,10,23] ▪ Some evidence from retrospective trials suggesting that use of an ACE inhibitor or an ARB in patients with hypertension who were hospitalized for COVID-19 was associated with similar or lower mortality rates compared to patients who were not taking a drug from either class prior to infection.[4,5,6] ▪ Prospective randomized-controlled trials evaluating these drugs in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 are in progress[16]

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
▪ Valsartan (*Diovan*, and generics)		**DM Bean et al. 2020[6]** **Population:** hospitalized patients (n=205) **Design:** retrospective, single-center **Results:** Lower rate of death or transfer to the ICU within 7 days of symptom onset in patients on an ACE inhibitor (OR 0.29) **Limitations:** small sample size, not peer reviewed **Mancia et al. NEJM 2020[7]** **Population:** 6272 case patients with COVID-19; 30,759 controls **Design:** population-based case-control study in Italy **Results:** ▪ use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs was not associated with COVID-19 among case patients (adjusted OR for ACE inhibitors 0.96 [CI 0.87-1.07] and for ARBs 0.95 [CI 0.86-1.05]) ▪ no association between use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs and severe or fatal disease (adjusted OR for ACE inhibitors 0.91 [CI 0.69-1.21] and for ARBs 0.83 [CI 0.63-1.10]) **Limitations:** observational data **Mehra et al. NEJM 2020[8]** *(updated 6/4/2020)* *****Study Retracted[12]***** ▪ *Retracted because of concerns about the accuracy of the data and analysis; an independent audit was not possible because the full dataset was not made available* **Population:** 8910 hospitalized patients in Asia, Europe, and North America **Design:** observational; data collected from an international registry	▪ A review of multiple trials of ACEI or ARB use in patients with COVID-19 concluded there is high-certainty evidence that use of these drugs is not associated with more severe disease[17] *(added 7/28/2020)*

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
ACE INHIBITORS AND ARBS (CONTINUED)		**Results:** Use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs was not found to be associated with an increased risk of in-hospital death **Limitations:** observational data **Reynolds et al. NEJM 2020**[9] **Population:** 12,954 patients tested for COVID-19 in a New York City health system **Design:** observational; data obtained from electronic medical records **Results:** ▪ 5894 (46.8%) were positive; 1002 of them (17.0%) had severe illness ▪ ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or other antihypertensive drug classes (beta-blockers, calcium channel blockers, thiazide diuretics) were not associated with an increased risk of COVID-19 infection or of severe illness **Limitations:** observational data **Flacco et al. Heart 2020**[13] *(added 7/15/2020)* **Population:** 9890 hypertensive patients treated with ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or both vs untreated patients **Design:** meta-analysis of observational data from 10 cohort or case-control studies comparing risk of severe/fatal COVID-19 in patients treated with ACE inhibitors/ARBs vs untreated patients **Results:** The risk of severe/fatal COVID-19 was similar between patients treated with ACE inhibitors/ARBs and untreated patients (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.65 to 1.26 for ACE inhibitors; OR 0.92, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.12 for ARBs) **Limitations:** meta-analysis of observational data; intermediate-to-high level of heterogeneity	

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
ACE INHIBITORS AND ARBS (CONTINUED)		**Fosbøl et al. JAMA 2020[14]** *(added 7/28/2020)* **Population: Retrospective Cohort Study:** ▪ hypertensive patients with COVID-19 (n=4480) **Nested, Case-Control:** ▪ Cases (COVID-19, prior hypertension; n=571); controls (no COVID-19, prior hypertension; n=5710) **Design:** retrospective cohort study examining outcomes in patients with COVID-19; nested, case-control design for susceptibility analysis; from Danish registry **Results:** **Retrospective Cohort Study: ACEI/ARB use vs no use** ▪ Mortality within 30 days was 18.1% in the ACEI/ARB group compared to 7.3% in the nonuser group (significant difference in unadjusted analysis; not statistically significant after adjustment for age, sex, and medical history) ▪ Death or severe COVID-19 occurred in 31.9% of ACEI/ARB users and 14.2% of nonusers by 30 days (significant difference in unadjusted analysis; not statistically significant after adjustment) **Nested Case-Control Susceptibility Analysis: ACEI/ARB use vs other hypertensive drugs** ▪ ACEI/ARB use was not associated with a higher incidence of COVID-19, compared with use of other antihypertensives **Limitations:** retrospective data	

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
ACE INHIBITORS AND ARBS (CONTINUED)		**Felice et al. Am J Hypertens 2020[15]** *(added 7/28/2020)* **Population:** consecutive hypertensive patients presenting to ER in Italy with acute respiratory symptoms and/or fever or diagnosis of COVID-19 (n=133) **Design:** single center, retrospective study **Results:** rate of admission to semi-intensive/intensive care units was lower patients treated with ACEIs or ARBs, compared to patients not treated with ACEIs or ARBs **Limitations:** small retrospective study **Selçuk et al. Clin Exp Hypertens 2020[18]** *(added 7/28/2020)* **Population:** consecutive hypertensive patients hospitalized for COVID-19 in Turkey (n=113) **Design:** retrospective study **Results:** ▪ Patients in the ACEI/ARB group were older and were more likely to have coronary artery disease than those taking other antihypertensives ▪ Use of an ACEI or ARB was associated with a higher frequency of admission to the ICU, endotracheal intubation, and death compared with other antihypertensives **Limitations:** small retrospective study; patients on ACEIs/ARBs more likely to have coronary artery disease and were older **Lopes et al. BRACE CORONA Trial, JAMA 2021[21]** *(added September 2020; updated 1/19/2021)* **Population:** patients hospitalized with mild to moderate COVID-19 who were taking an ACEI or ARB before admission (n=659)	

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
ACE INHIBITORS AND ARBS (CONTINUED)		**Design:** multicenter, registry-based, open-label randomized clinical trial with blinded endpoint assessment ▪ Patients randomized to discontinue or continue taking ACEI or ARB therapy for 30 days **Results:** ▪ No significant differences between those who stopped taking the ACEI or ARB and those who continued taking it ▪ Number of days alive and out of hospital 21.9 in those who stopped their ACEI or ARB vs 22.9 in those who continued taking it ▪ Death occurred in 2.7% of patients in the discontinuation group and in 2.8% of those in the continuation group ▪ Cardiovascular death (0.6% vs 0.3%) ▪ COVID-19 progression (38.3% vs 32.3%) **Limitations:** open-label, results limited to trial population; few patients with heart failure; effect of ACEI/ARB on susceptibility to COVID not evaluated **Chu et al. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2020**[19] *(added 12/21/2020)* **Population:** **Non-COVID-19:** 25 studies (330,780 patients) **COVID-19**: risk of infection (11 studies; 8.4 million patients); mortality risk (34 studies; 67,644 patients) **Design:** meta-analysis ▪ **Non-COVID-19 patients:** meta-analysis of effects of ACEIs and ARBs on risk of pneumonia and pneumonia-related death ▪ **COVID-19 studies:** meta-analysis of risk of infection with SARS-CoV-2, risk of severe adverse clinical outcomes, and risk of all-cause mortality in patients treated with ACEIs or ARBs **Results:**	

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
ACE INHIBITORS AND ARBS (CONTINUED)		**Non-COVID-19:** ▪ ACEI (but not ARB) associated with a 26% reduction in pneumonia risk (OR 0.74; p<0.001) ▪ ACEI associated with reduction in pneumonia-related death (OR 0.73; p=0.004) **COVID-19:** ▪ ACEI (but not ARB) associated with a 13% reduction in risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection (OR 0.87; p=0.014) ▪ RAAS blockade associated with 24% reduced all-cause mortality (OR 0.76; p=0.04) **Limitations:** meta-analyses; high heterogeneity **JB Cohen et al. REPLACE COVID, Lancet Respir Med 2021**[20] *(added 1/11/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who were receiving an ACE inhibitor or ARB before admission (n=152) **Design:** multicenter (7 countries), prospective, randomized, open-label trial ▪ Patients were randomized to continue their ACE inhibitor/ARB or to discontinue treatment **Results:** ▪ No significant different in the global rank score between groups ▪ ICU admission or invasive mechanical ventilation occurred in 21% of patients in the continuation group and 18% of patients in the discontinuation group (p=0.61) ▪ Death occurred in 15% of patients in the continuation group and 13% in the discontinuation group (p=0.99) **Limitations:** small sample size; open-label; no control for dosing or other therapies given	

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
		RSG Sablerolles et al. COMET Study, Br J Clin Pharmacol 2021[22] *(added 2/28/2021)* **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who were receiving an ACE inhibitor or ARB before admission (n=4870) **Design:** observational, multinational study **Results:** ▪ No significant association with use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs and the composite endpoint of hospital mortality and ICU admission (ACE inhibitors: adjusted OR 0.94; 95% CI 0.79-1.12; ARBs: adjusted OR 1.09 95% CI 0.90-1.30) **Limitations:** observational data	

1. L Fang et al. Are patients with hypertension and diabetes mellitus at increased risk for COVID-19 infection? Lancet Respir Med 2020 March 11 (epub).
2. MA Sparks et al. The coronavirus conundrum: ACE2 and hypertension edition. Available at: http://www.nephjc.com/news/covidace2. Accessed April 30, 2020.
3. M Vaduganathan et al. Renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors in patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 March 30 (epub).
4. P Zhang et al. Association of inpatient use of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II receptor blockers with mortality among patients with hypertension hospitalized with COVID-19. Circ Res 2020 April 17 (epub).
5. J Li et al. Association of renin-angiotensin system inhibitors with severity or risk of death in patients with hypertension hospitalized for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection in Wuhan, China. JAMA Cardiol 2020 April 23 (epub).
6. DM Bean et al. Treatment with ACE-inhibitors is associated with less severe disease with SARS-COVID-19 infection in a multisite UK acute hospital trust. Medrxiv 2020 April 11 (preprint).
7. G Mancia et al. Renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system blockers and the risk of COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 May 1 (epub).
8. MR Mehra et al. Cardiovascular disease, drug therapy, and mortality in COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 May 1 (epub).
9. HR Reynolds et al. Renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system inhibitors and risk of COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2020 May 1 (epub).
10. ACC. HFSA/ACC/AHA statement addresses concerns re: using RAAS antagonists in COVID-19. Available at: https://bit.ly/2uimyt6. Accessed May 4, 2020.
11. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed May 4, 2020.
12. MR Mehra et al. Retraction: cardiovascular disease, drug therapy, and mortality in Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020 June 4 (epub).
13. ME Flacco et al. Treatment with ACE inhibitors or ARBs and risk of severe/lethal COVID-19: a meta-analysis. Heart 2020 July 1 (epub).
14. EL Fosbøl et al. Association of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor or angiotensin receptor blocker use with COVID-19 diagnosis and mortality. JAMA 2020; 324:168.
15. C Felice et al. Use of RAAS inhibitors and risk of clinical deterioration in COVID-19: results from an Italian cohort of 133 hypertensives. Am J Hypertens 2020 June 8 (epub).
16. DHF Gommans et al. Rationale and design of the PRAETORIAN-COVID trial: a double-blind, placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial with valsartan for prevention of acute respiratory distress syndrome in patients with SARS-COV-2 infection disease. Am Heart J 2020; 226:60.
17. K Mackey et al. Update Alert 2: Risks and impact of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin-receptor blockers on SARS-CoV-2 infection in adults. Ann Intern Med 2020 July 23 (epub).
18. M Selçuk et al. Is the use of ACE inb/ARBs associated with higher in-hospital mortality in Covid-19 pneumonia patients? Clin Exp Hypertens 2020; 42:738.
19. C Chu et al. Comparison of infection risks and clinical outcomes in patients with and without SARS-CoV-2 lung infection under renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system blockade: systemic review and meta-analysis. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2020 December 18; 1-18.
20. JB Cohen et al. Continuation versus discontinuation of renin-angiotensin system inhibitors in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19: a prospective, randomised, open-label trial. Lancet Respir Med 2021 January 7 (epub).

21. RD Lopes et al. Effect of discontinuing vs continuing angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II receptor blockers on days alive and out of the hospital in patients admitted with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021; 325: 254.
22. RSG Sablerolles et al. No association between use of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin II receptor blockers prior to hospital admission and clinical course of COVID-19 in the COvid MEdicaTion (COMET) study. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2021 January 28 (epub).
23. NIH. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at: https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/ Accessed April 23, 2021.

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs)			
NSAIDS (E.G., IBUPROFEN, NAPROXEN)	▪ The Health Minister of France has warned that use of NSAIDs such as ibuprofen (*Advil*, *Motrin*, and others) to reduce fever in patients with COVID-19 increases the risk of severe adverse events and recommended use of acetaminophen (*Tylenol*, and others) instead[1]	▪ No convincing evidence that NSAIDs are especially dangerous for patients with COVID-19,[2] but they can cause GI bleeding, fluid retention, and renal dysfunction in any patient, which can be dangerous for the critically ill ▪ Acetaminophen is an effective antipyretic alternative to an NSAID and in recommended doses is less likely than an NSAID to cause serious adverse effects in most patients ▪ In a cohort study in the UK, NSAID use was not associated with higher mortality or increased disease severity in hospitalized patients with COVID-19[4] (*added 5/8/2021*)	▪ Use of an NSAID or acetaminophen for continual fever suppression may reduce the immune response and prolong viral shedding ▪ NIH guidelines recommend that antipyretic strategies (e.g., with acetaminophen or NSAIDs) should not differ between patients with or without COVID-19[3] ▪ Patients who are taking NSAIDs for other indications should not stop taking them[3]

1. M Day. COVID-19: ibuprofen should not be used for managing symptoms, say doctors and scientists. BMJ 2020; 368:m1086.
2. FDA. FDA advises patients on use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) for COVID-19. Available at: https://bit.ly/3dnggwx. Accessed May 4, 2020.
3. National Institutes of Health (NIH). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment guidelines. Available at: https://covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed May 4, 2020.
4. TM Drake et al. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug use and outcomes of COVID-19 in the ISARIC clinical characterisation protocol UK cohort: a matched, prospective cohort study. Lancet Rheumatol 2021 May 7 (epub).

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs)			
PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS (PPIs) *(updated 6/8/2021)* ▪ Dexlansoprazole *(Dexilant)* ▪ Esomeprazole magnesium (*Nexium*, *Nexium 24HR*, and generics) ▪ Lansoprazole (*Prevacid*, *Prevacid 24HR*, and generics) ▪ Omeprazole (*Prilosec*, *Prilosec OTC*, and generics) ▪ Omeprazole/sodium bicarbonate (*Zegerid*, *Zegerid OTC*, and generics) ▪ Pantoprazole (*Protonix*, and generics) ▪ Rabeprazole (*Aciphex*, and generics)	▪ PPI use may increase the risk of COVID-19 ▪ PPIs increase gastric pH and have been associated with an increased risk of enteric infections[1] ▪ SARS-CoV-1 is impaired at a pH of 3 or below; it is possible that pH has a similar effect on SARS-CoV-2 ▪ Theoretically, higher gastric pH may allow viral replication in the gut; SARS-CoV-2 enters cells via ACE-2 receptors, which are widely expressed in the GI tract[1]	**Almario Gastroenterology 2020[2]** **Population:** English-speaking adults in the US (n=53,130) **Design:** online population-based survey ▪ Survey included questions about PPI and/or H2-receptor antagonist use and positive test results for COVID-19 **Results:** ▪ Twice-daily PPI use was associated with a 3.7-fold increased odds of COVID-19 and once-daily PPI use was associated with a 2.2-fold increase, compared to no PPI use ▪ Use of H2-receptor antagonists was not associated with an increased risk of COVID-19 **Limitations:** observational data, patients taking PPIs may have more underlying risk factors than those not on PPIs **Lee et al. Gut 2020[3]** *(added 10/14/2020)* **Population:** adults tested for SARS-CoV-2 in South Korea (n=132,316) **Design:** nationwide cohort study with propensity score matching ▪ 111,911 PPI non-users, 14,163 current PPI users, 6242 past PPI users **Results:** ▪ SARS-CoV-2 test positivity rate was not associated with current or past PPI use ▪ Current PPI use was associated with higher risk of severe clinical outcomes in patients positive for COVID-19 **Limitations:** observational data; potential confounders	▪ No randomized controlled trials ▪ Twice-daily PPI use was associated with higher risk than once-daily use in an observational trial[2] ▪ American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) recommends use of the lowest effective dose of PPIs in patients with a clinical indication for their use[1] ▪ Some meta-analyses have reported associations between PPI use and severe outcomes such as severe COVID-19, increased risk of secondary infection, and mortality[4,5,6]; other meta-analyses have reported no significant difference in severe events with or without PPI use[7] *(updated 6/8/2021)*

1. American College of Gastroenterology. Information sheet and FAQs about proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) and risk of COVID-19. Available at: https://webfiles.gi.org/links/media/ACG_Almario_et_al_Info_Sheet_and_FAQs_About_PPIs_COVID19_07072020_FINAL.pdf. Accessed July 30, 2020.
2. CV Almario et al. Increased risk of COVID-19 among users of proton pump inhibitors. Am J Gastroenerol 2020 July 7 (epub). Available at: https://journals.lww.com/ajg/Documents/AJG-20-1811_R1(PUBLISH%20AS%20WEBPART).pdf. Accessed July 30, 2020.
3. SW Lee et al. Severe clinical outcomes of COVID-19 associated with proton pump inhibitors: a nationwide cohort study with propensity score matching. Gut 2020 July 30 (epub).
4. GF Li et al. Do proton pump inhibitors influence SARS-CoV-2 related outcomes? A meta-analysis. Gut 2020 November 10 (epub).
5. CS Cow and SS Hasan. Use of proton pump inhibitors and risk of adverse clinical outcomes from COVID-19: a meta-analysis. J Intern Med 2020 October 20 (epub).

6. AA Toubasi et al. A meta-analysis : proton pump inhibitors current use and the risk of Coronavirus Infectious Disease 2019 development and its related mortality. Arch Med Res 2021 March 26 (epub).
7. M Zippi et al. Paradoxical relationship between proton pump inhibitors and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Clin Cases 2021; 9:2763.

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
Biguanide			
METFORMIN *(updated 1/25/2021)* ▪ *Glucophage*, *Glucophage XR,* and generics ▪ *Riomet, Riomet ER* ▪ *Glumetza* ▪ Also available in multiple combinations with other antihyperglycemic agents	▪ Metformin associated with reduced risk of death from COVID-19 in patients with type 2 diabetes in observational studies[1] ▪ Mechanism not established, but may be associated with effects of metformin on glucose control, body weight, and insulin resistance, anti-inflammatory effects of metformin, and decreased viral entry due to effects of metformin on ACE2[1] ▪ Potential risk of lactic acidosis in hospitalized COVID-19 patients with multiple organ failure	**Crouse et al MedRxiv 2020[2]** **Population:** hospitalized patients tested for COVID-19 at a single hospital in the Southern US (n=25,326) **Design:** retrospective review of electronic health records **Results:** in patients with diabetes and COVID-19, metformin was associated with a significant reduction in mortality (OR 0.33; 95% CI 0.13-0.84; p=0.0210) **Limitations:** not peer reviewed, observational data, possible confounders **Bramante et al. Lancet Healthy Longevity 2020[3]** **Population:** hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n=6,256) **Design:** retrospective review of records from a large health insurance organization **Results:** ▪ Metformin use was associated with a decreased risk of mortality in women by COX proportional hazards (HR 0.785; 95% CI 0.650-0.951) and propensity matching (OR 0.759; 95% CI 0.601-0.960, p=0.021) ▪ Metformin use was not associated with a reduction in mortality in men **Limitations:** retrospective, observational trial; possible confounders; selection bias **AB Crouse et al. Front Endocrinol 2021[4]** *(added 1/25/2021)* **Population:** consecutive patients tested for COVID-19 (n=24,722 COVID-19 negative and 604 COVID-19 positive) **Design:** retrospective observational study ▪ analysis of electronic health record data	▪ No randomized controlled trials ▪ Diabetes is a risk factor for severe COVID-19 illness and death

DRUG	CONCERNS/MECHANISM	CLINICAL STUDIES	COMMENTS
METFORMIN (continued)		**Results:** ▪ In patients with diabetes and COVID-19, metformin use before diagnosis was associated with a reduction in mortality (OR 0.33, 95% CI 0.13-0.84; p=0.0210) **Limitations:** retrospective trial	

1. AJ Scheen. Metformin and COVID-19: from cellular mechanisms to reduced mortality. Diabetes Metab 2020 August 1 (epub). Available at:
2. A Crouse et al. Metformin use is associated with reduced mortality in a diverse population with COVID-19 and diabetes. MedRxiv 2020 July 29. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.29.20164020v1. Accessed August 19, 2020.
3. C Bramante et al. Metformin and risk of mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort analysis. Lancet Healthy Longevity 2020 December 3.
4. AB Crouse et al. Mortality in a diverse population with COVID-19 and diabetes. Front Endocrinol 2021 January 13 (epub).

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
Adenovirus-Vectored Vaccines			
CHIMPANZEE ADENOVIRUS-VECTORED COVID-19 (ChAdOx1 nCoV-19) VACCINE (AZD1222) (AstraZeneca/Oxford) *(updated 6/29/2021)*	**Folegatti et al. Lancet 2020[1]** **Population:** healthy adults 18-55 years old in the UK (n=1077) **Design:** phase 1/2, single-blind, multicenter, randomized controlled trial ▪ participants randomized to 1 dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine or a comparator meningococcal conjugate vaccine (MenACWY) **Results:** ▪ >90% of participants developed neutralizing antibodies; in 10 patients who received a booster dose, 100% had neutralizing antibodies ▪ Increases in SARS-CoV-2 spike-specific effector T-cell responses occurred by day 7, peaked at day 14, and were maintained up to day 56 ▪ Local and systemic adverse effects were common **Limitations:** preliminary results of phase 1/2 trial **M Voysey et al. (COV002 and COV003) Lancet 2020[5]** *(added 11/23/2020; updated 12/10/2020)* **Population:** healthy adults ≥18 years old (23,848 enrolled; 11,636 included in interim efficacy analysis) ▪ 12.2% of subjects ≥56 years old **Design: ongoing,** phase 2/3, randomized, controlled trials in the UK and Brazil ▪ Half-dose/full-dose regimen (n=2741; subset in UK received this dose) ▪ 2 full-dose regimen (n=8895) ▪ Meningococcal conjugate vaccine (MenACWY) or saline as control	▪ Common adverse effects in the phase 1/2 trial included injection-site pain (67%) and tenderness (83%), fatigue (70%), headache (68%), muscle ache (60%), malaise (61%), chills (56%), feeling feverish (51%), fever (18%) ▪ Use of acetaminophen reduced adverse effects ▪ Transient neutropenia was reported in 46% ▪ A participant in one of the ongoing phase 3 trials in the UK experienced a serious neurologic adverse reaction, which has been reported to possibly be transverse myelitis; whether the adverse reaction was caused by the vaccine is under investigation *(added 9/18/2020)* ▪ Two additional cases of transverse myelitis were reported, but determined to be unlikely to be related to the vaccine *(12/10/2020)* ▪ A safety investigation is ongoing after a trial volunteer in Brazil died; it has been reported that the volunteer may have received placebo *(added 10/22/2020)*	▪ Replication-deficient chimpanzee adenovirus-vectored vaccine expressing the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein ▪ Demonstrated immunogenicity in a phase 1/2 trial ▪ Phase 2/3 trials ongoing in several countries including the US ▪ Phase 3 trials were temporarily halted due to a serious neurologic adverse reaction in a participant in the UK who received the vaccine; the UK trial was restarted in September after review by the Medicines Health Regulatory Authority (MHRA); the US trial was cleared by the FDA to restart on October 23, 2020 *(added 9/18/2020; updated 10/26/2020)* ▪ Manufacturer reported the vaccine has produced immune responses in older adults that were similar to those seen in younger adults and vaccine-related adverse events were lower in older subjects *(added 10/28/2020)* ▪ AstraZeneca to conduct more clinical trials to clarify vaccine efficacy data after it was reported that some patients in the current phase 2/3 trial received a half dose of the vaccine *(added 11/30/2020)* ▪ Approved for use in the UK by the Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency; vaccination is

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	**Results:** ▪ Vaccine efficacy 90.0% when given as a half dose, followed by a full dose at least 1 month apart ▪ Vaccine efficacy 62.1% when given as 2 full doses at least 1 month apart ▪ Average vaccine efficacy from combined analysis 70.4%; 30 cases of COVID-19 among 5807 vaccine recipients and 101 cases among 5829 subjects in the control group ▪ All results statistically significant ▪ 10 patients hospitalized, 2 of these had severe COVID-19 and 1 case was fatal; all cases were in control group **Limitations:** interim analysis; half-dose regimen due to manufacturing error; efficacy data from combined analysis includes 2 different vaccine dosages that were used; duration of protection unknown **MN Ramasamy et al. Lancet 2020 (COV002)[6]** *(added 12/21/2020)* **Population:** adults enrolled in an age-escalation manner: 18-55 years (n=160), 56-69 years (n=160), and ≥70 years old (n=240) without severe or uncontrolled medical comorbidities or a high frailty score in (those ≥65 years old) **Design:** ongoing phase 2 component of a single-blind, randomized phase 2/3 trial ▪ ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (1 or 2 doses) vs control MenACWY vaccine (1 or 2 doses) ▪ Some patients received low-dose ChAdOx1 vaccine **Results:** ▪ Local and systemic adverse reactions (injection-side pain, feverish, muscle ache, headache) more frequent with ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine compared to control vaccine; adverse effects were	*Thromboembolic Events: (updated 4/19/2021)* ▪ Cases of thrombotic events and thrombocytopenia have been reported with the Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine (cases have included cerebral venous sinus thrombosis [CVST], splanchnic-vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, disseminated intravascular coagulation [DIC]) ▪ Reported cases were almost all in women < 55 years old and most occurred within 14 days after vaccination ▪ In a population-based cohort study in Denmark and Norway, increased rates of venous thromboembolism were observed within 28 days of vaccination; 11 excess events/100,000 vaccinations, including 2.5 excess cerebral venous thrombosis events/100,000 vaccinations; absolute risks of events were small[20] *(added 5/10/2021)* ▪ Incidence of CVST with thrombocytopenia has been associated with high serum levels of antibodies against platelet factor 4 (PF4)-polyanion complexes similar to those that occur in heparin-induced thrombocytopenia (HIT); treatment with platelet transfusions or heparin is not recommended; use of a non-heparin anticoagulant and intravenous immune globulin should be considered instead[15-18] EMA evaluating reports of Guillain-Barre syndrome (*added 5/8/2021)*	expected to begin 1/4/2021 *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ B.1.1.7 Variant: Vaccine efficacy after 2 doses was 74.6% (95% CI 41.6-88.9) against symptomatic infection from the B.1.1.7 variant based on data from the phase 2/3 trials; efficacy against non-B.1.1.7 lineages was 84% (95% CI 70.7-91.4)[8] *(added 2/10/2021)*; in an exploratory analysis of a randomized controlled trial, reduced neutralization activity against B.1.1.7 variant was reduced, but clinical efficacy against symptomatic infection with the B.1.1.7 variant was 70.4% and against non-B.1.1.7 lineages was 81.5%[19] *(updated 4/26/2021)* ▪ B.1.351 Variant: vaccine efficacy 10.4% against South Africa variant[11] *(added 3/23/2021)* ▪ AstraZeneca vaccine (2 doses) was 92% effective for preventing hospitalization in patients infected with the Delta variant; based on observational data from England *(added 6/15/2021)*[23] ▪ In observational data from Scotland, the AstraZeneca vaccine was 60% effective against infection with Delta variant (2 weeks after the 2nd dose)[24] *(added 6/29/2021)* ▪ In a study in Canada, vaccine efficacy against **Alpha** was 89% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 92% after 2 doses of Moderna, and 64% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Beta/Gamma** 84% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 77% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 48% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Delta**

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	less common in adults ≥56 years old compared to younger subjects ▪ Median anti-spike SARS-CoV-2 IgG responses and neutralizing antibody titers after the boost doses were similar across all age groups ▪ By 14 days after the boost dose, >99% of participants had neutralizing antibody responses **Limitation:** preliminary data; ongoing trial; single-blind; half-dose regimen **M Voysey et al. Lancet 2021**[7] *(added 2/4/2021)* **Population:** healthy adults ≥ 18 years old (n=17,177) **Design:** primary analysis of phase 3 trials in UK and Brazil and data from phase 1/2 trials in UK and South Africa ▪ 2 doses of vaccine vs a control vaccine/saline placebo ▪ A subset of patients in the UK received a low dose (LD) of vaccine for the first dose and a standard dose (SD) for the second **Results:** ▪ Overall vaccine efficacy >14 days after the second dose (including LD/SD and SD/SD dose groups) was 66.7% ▪ Vaccine efficacy after a single SD vaccine from day 22 to day 90 post-vaccination was 76% ▪ After a second SD vaccine, efficacy was 82.4% when the 2nd dose was given 12 weeks or more after the 1st, compared to 54.9% with an interval <6 weeks ▪ From the day of vaccination, 2 hospitalizations were reported in the vaccine group and 22 in the control group, 3 were severe ▪ In subjects who performed weekly nasal swabs, regardless of symptoms, PCR positive readings were reduced by 67% after a single vaccine dose and 50% after	▪ In a trial evaluating vaccine mixing, greater systemic reactogenicity (feverishness, chills, fatigue, headache, joint pain, malaise, and muscle ache) was reported following heterologous vaccine schedules compared to their homologous counterparts[21] (see RH Shaw et al in Efficacy column; *added 5/19/2021*)	87% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 72% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 67% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca[26] *(added 7/15/2021)* ▪ WHO has listed the AstraZeneca/Oxford COVID-19 vaccine for emergency use; this listing allows the vaccine to be available through the COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access (COVAX) Facility[9] *(added 2/16/2021)* ▪ Phase 2 trial has been initiated in children and adolescents 6-17 years old; expected to enroll 300 participants; trial has been paused due to concerns about blood clots that have been reported in adults given the vaccine (added 2/16/2021; updated 4/7/2021) ▪ Com-COV study in the UK will evaluate efficacy of using one vaccine for the 1st dose and a different vaccine for the 2nd dose (Oxford/AstraZeneca and Pfizer-BioNTech vaccines will be used) *(added 2/28/2021)* ▪ Use of the vaccine suspended in some countries in Europe because of several reports of serious adverse effects, including blood clots; on March 18th the EMA safety committee review concluded that the benefit of the vaccine continues to outweigh the risk and the vaccine is not associated with an increase in the overall risk of thromboembolic events, however, the vaccine may be associated with very rare cases of blood clots with thrombocytopenia (7 cases of disseminated intravascular coagulation [DIC] and 18 cases of cerebral venous sinus thrombosis [CVST] reported after

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	2 doses; the authors suggest these data may indicate an impact of the vaccine on virus transmission, but the trials were not designed to evaluate this outcome **Limitations:** primary analysis of data from multiple trials; studies not designed to determine differences in efficacy by dose interval; LD/SD group; variable duration of follow-up after 2nd dose **J Lopez Bernal et al. BMJ 2021[10]** *(added 3/8/2021; updated 5/20/2021)* **Population:** older adults in the UK who received the Pfizer/BioNTech or AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine **Design:** test negative case control **Results:** ▪ The B.1.117 variant was prominent in the UK during the period of this study ▪ After 1 dose of either vaccine, protection against symptomatic COVID-19 was 60-70% and protection against hospitalization was ~80% ▪ Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine efficacy ~60-70% after 1 dose and ~85-90% after 2 doses; ~85% effective at preventing death ▪ AstraZeneca vaccine was ~60-75% effective after 1 dose ▪ Patients who were infected after 1 dose of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine were 43% less likely to be hospitalized and 51% less likely to die compared to those who were not vaccinated; patients who received 1 dose of the AstraZeneca vaccine were 37% less likely to be hospitalized **Limitations:** observational; not peer reviewed **SA Madhi et al. NEJM 2021[11]** *(added 3/23/2021)*		vaccination of ~20 million people); reported cases were almost all in women < 55 years old and most occurred within 14 days after vaccination; the number of thromboembolic events reported after vaccination was lower than the expected number in the general population[14-17] *(added 3/13/2021; updated 3/20/2021)(see safety column)* ▪ The National Advisory Committee on Immunization in Canada has recommended use of the AstraZeneca vaccine be paused in people <55 years of age because of reports of blood clots; no blood clots have been reported in Canada after administration of 300,000 vaccinations *(added 3/30/2021)* ▪ Oxford has started a phase 1 trial of a nasal spray vaccine formulation *(added 3/27/2021)* ▪ Two-dose vaccine (4-12 weeks apart) ▪ Refrigeration required for vaccine storage

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	**Population:** HIV-negative persons 18-<65 years old in South Africa (n=2026) **Design:** randomized, double-blind trial ▪ 2 doses of AZD1222 vaccine or placebo 21-35 days apart **Results:** ▪ Mild-to-moderate COVID-19 reported in 23 of 717 placebo recipients (3.2%) and 19 of 750 vaccine recipients (2.5%); efficacy of 21.9% (95% CI -49.9-59.8) ▪ Among the 42 COVID-19 cases, 39 (92.9%) were caused by the B.1.351 variant; efficacy against this variant was 10.4% (95% CI -76.8-54.8) **Limitations:** not enough data to determine efficacy against severe COVID-19; efficacy against variant a secondary analysis **AstraZeneca 2021[12]** *(added 3/26/2021)* **Population:** healthy adults ≥18 years old (n=32,449) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial ▪ Two doses of AZD1222 or placebo 4 weeks apart **Results:** **Primary efficacy analysis in US** ▪ 76% overall efficacy (15 days after 2nd dose) ▪ 100% efficacy against severe/critical disease and hospitalization ▪ 85% efficacy against symptomatic infection in those ≥65 years old **Limitations:** AstraZeneca criticized for initially releasing interim results reporting 79% overall efficacy when additional data from the primary analysis were available, but not included *(3/23/2021)*[13] **RH Shaw Lancet 2021[21]** *(added 5/19/2021)*		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	**Population:** subjects ≥50 years old with no or mild-to-moderate, well controlled comorbidity in the UK (n=830) **Design:** multicenter, participant-masked, randomized heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccination study Subjects randomized to 1 of 4 vaccine schedules administered 28 or 84 days apart: ▪ AstraZeneca/AstraZeneca ▪ AstraZeneca/Pfizer-BioNTech ▪ Pfizer-BioNTech/Pfizer-BioNTech ▪ Pfizer-BioNTech/AstraZeneca **Results:** ▪ Reactogenicity results reported for 436 subjects who received vaccines at 28-day intervals ▪ Greater systemic reactogenicity was reported following heterologous vaccine schedules compared to their homologous counterparts ▪ Adverse effects that were reported in more subjects who received a heterologous vaccine schedule included feverishness, chills, fatigue, headache, joint pain, malaise, and muscle ache ▪ There were no hospitalizations due to these adverse reactions ▪ No thrombocytopenia was reported in any group at 7 days post-boost ▪ Efficacy results expected in June 2021 **Limitations:** interim results; only subjects ≥ 50 years old		
	J Lopez Bernal et al. 2021[22] *(added 5/26/2021)* **Population:** subjects vaccinated with the BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1 vaccine in the UK (n=12,675 sequenced cases) **Design:** test negative case control		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
AZD1222 (continued)	**Results:** ▪ Of 12,675 cases, 11,621 were B.1.1.7 and 1054 were B.1.617.2 ▪ Vaccine effectiveness after 2 doses of ChAdOx1 against the B.1.617.2 variant was 59.8% compared to 66.1% against B.1.1.7 ▪ Vaccine effectiveness after 1 dose of ChAdOx1 was 32.9% against B.1.617.2 and 51.4% against B.1.1.7 **Limitations:** observational data; preprint report **AM Borobia et al. Lancet 2021[25]** *(added 6/29/2021)* **Population:** adults 18-60 years old in Spain who were vaccinated with a single dose of ChAdOx1-S 8-12 weeks before screening (n=676) **Design:** phase 2, open-label, randomized trial ▪ Subjects randomized 2:1 to BNT162b2 or maintain observation (control group) **Results:** ▪ At day 14, geometric mean titres of receptor binding domain antibodies, and IgG against trimeric spike protein were significantly increased from baseline ▪ Injection-site pain and induration, headache, and myalgia were the most common adverse events **Limitations:** ongoing trial; not compared to a control group that received a 2nd dose of ChAdOx1-S		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
RECOMBINANT ADENOVIRUS TYPE-5 (Ad5)-VECTORED COVID-19 VACCINE (CanSino Biologics) *(updated 9/23/2020)*	**Zhu et al. Lancet 2020**[2] **Population:** healthy adults >18 years old (n=508) **Design:** phase 2, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Participants randomized to 1 dose of vaccine with $1x10^{11}$ viral particles/mL or $5x10^{10}$ viral particles/mL or to placebo **Results:** ▪ Seroconversion rates were >96% ▪ >90% had T-cell responses ▪ antibody responses were lower in participants >55 years old and in those with previous vector immunity ▪ local and systemic adverse reactions were common **Limitations:** phase 2 data; possible lack of power to show a difference between dose groups	▪ The most common adverse effects in the phase 2 trial were injection-site pain (56-57%), fatigue (34-42%), fever (16-32%), and headache (28-29%) ▪ No serious adverse events were reported	▪ Non-replicating adenovirus type-5 (Ad5)-vectored COVID-19 vaccine ▪ Contained replication-defective Ad5 vectors expressing the full-length spike gene based on Wuhan-Hu-1 ▪ Possibly lower responses in people with pre-existing immunity to the vector and in those >55 years old ▪ In earlier trials, Ad5-vectored vaccines were not effective for prevention of HIV; in one trial, the incidence of HIV was higher in the vaccinated group than the placebo group *(added 9/23/2020)* ▪ Approved for military use in China

1. PM Folegatti et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary report of a phase 1/2, single-blind, randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2020; 396:467.
2. FC Zhu et al. Immunogenicity and safety of a recombinant adenovirus type-5-vectored COVID-19 vaccine in healthy adults aged 18 years or older: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet 2020; 396:479.
3. SP Buchbinder et al. Efficacy assessment of a cell-mediated immunity HIV-1 vaccine (the Step Study): a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, test-of-concept trial. Lancet 2008; 372:1881.
4. DW Fitzgerald et al. An Ad-5 vectored HIV-1 vaccine elicits cell-mediated immunity but does not affect disease progression in HIV-1-infected male subjects: results from a randomized placebo-controlled trial (the Step Study). J Infect Dis 2011; 203:765.
5. M Voysey et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. Lancet 2021; 397:99.
6. MN Ramasamy et al. Safety and immunogenicity of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine administered in a prime-boost regimen in young and old adults (COV002): a single-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 2/3 trial. Lancet 2020; 396:1979.
7. M Voysey et al. Single dose administration, and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV19 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials. Lancet 2021; 397:881.
8. KRW Emary et al. Efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 VOC 202012/01 (B.1.1.7). Preprints with the Lancet 2021 Februrary 4 (epub). Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3779160. Accessed February 10, 2021.
9. News Release. WHO lists two additional COVID-19 vaccines for emergency use and COVAX roll-out. 2021 February 15. Available at: https://www.who.int/news/item/15-02-2021-who-lists-two-additional-covid-19-vaccines-for-emergency-use-and-covax-roll-out. Accessed February 16, 2021.
10. J Lopez Bernal et al. Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccines on covid-19 related symptoms, hospital admissions, and mortality in older adults in England: test negative case-control study. BMJ 2021; 373:n1088.
11. SA Madhi et al. Efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 Covid-19 vaccine against the B.1.351 variant. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:1885.
12. News Release. AZD1222 US Phase III primary analysis confirms safety and efficacy. 2021 March 25. Available at: https://www.astrazeneca.com/content/astraz/media-centre/press-releases/2021/azd1222-us-phase-iii-primary-analysis-confirms-safety-and-efficacy.html. Accessed March 26,2021.

13. News Release. NIAID Statement on AstraZeneca Vaccine. 2021 March 23. Available at: https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/niaid-statement-astrazeneca-vaccine. Accessed 3/26/2021.
14. News Release. European Medicines Agency. COVID-19 vaccine AstraZeneca: benefits still outweigh the risks despite possible link to rare blood clots with low blood platelets. March 18, 2021. Available at: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-benefits-still-outweigh-risks-despite-possible-link-rare-blood-clots. Accessed March 20, 2021.
15. A Greinacher et al. Thrombotic thrombocytopenia after ChAdOx1 nCov-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).
16. K Muir et al. Correspondence. Thrombotic thrombocytopenia after Ad26.COV2.S vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).
17. NH Schultz et al. Thrombosis and thrombocytopenia after ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).
18. M Scully et al. Pathologic antibodies to platelet factor 4 after ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:2202.
19. KRW Emary et al. Efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern 202012/01 (B.1.1.7): an exploratory analysis of a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2021; 397:1351.
20. A Pottegard et al. Arterial events, venous thromboembolism, thrombocytopenia, and bleeding after vaccination with Oxford-AstraZeneca ChAdOx1-S in Denmark and Norway: population based cohort study. BMJ 2021; 373:n1114.
21. RH Shaw et al. Heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccination: initial reactogenicity data. Correspondence. Lancet 2021 May 12 (epub).
22. J Lopez Bernal et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against the B.1.617.2 variant. Preprint report. 2021. Available at: https://khub.net/documents/135939561/430986542/Effectiveness+of+COVID-19+vaccines+against+the+B.1.617.2+variant.pdf/204c11a4-e02e-11f2-db19-b3664107ac42. Accessed May 26, 2021.
23. J Stowe et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against hospital admission with the Delta (B.1.617.2) variant. Public Health England 2021 June 14. Available at: https://khub.net/web/phe-national/public-library/-/document_library/v2WsRK3ZlEig/view_file/479607329?_com_liferay_document_library_web_portlet_DLPortlet_INSTANCE_v2WsRK3ZlEig_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fkhub.net%3A443%2Fweb%2Fphe-national%2Fpublic-library%2F-%2Fdocument_library%2Fv2WsRK3ZlEig%2Fview%2F479607266. Accessed June 15, 2021.
24. A Sheikh et al. SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. Lancet 2021; 397:P2461.
25. A Borobia et al. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of BNT162b2 booster in ChAdOx1-S-primed participants (CombiVacS): a multicenter, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet 2021 June 25 (epub).
26. S Nasreen et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against variants of concern, Canada. medRxiv 2021 July 3 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259420v1. Accessed July 15, 2021.

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
ADENOVIRUS SEROTYPE 26 (Ad26) VECTOR-BASED COVID-19 VACCINE (Ad26.COV2.S)(JNJ-78436735) (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson) *(updated 7/12/2021)* **Dosage:**[9] ▪ A single 0.5 mL dose ▪ Suspension for IM injection ▪ Available in multiple-dose vials; each vial contains 5 doses ▪ CDC states in exceptional situations where a patient received 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine and is unable to complete the series with an mRNA vaccine (e.g., contraindication), a single dose of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine may be considered at a minimum of 28 days after the first mRNA vaccine dose[11] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ COVID-19 vaccines should generally not be given within 14 days of other vaccines[11] *(added 3/6/2021)*	▪ A single dose induced neutralizing antibody responses in primates (Mercado et al. Nature 2020)[1] ▪ Antibodies detected in vaccine recipients by day 8 and in all recipients by day 57 after a single dose in a phase 1 trial[13] *(added 3/14/2021)* **J Sadoff et al. NEJM 2020[4]** *(added 10/1/2020; updated 1/18/2021)* **Population:** adults 18-55 years old (n=405; cohort 1a) or ≥65 years old (n=405; cohort 3) in Belgium and the US **Design**: ongoing, phase 1/2a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Vaccine given at a dose of $5x10^{10}$ (low dose) or $1x10^{11}$ (high dose) viral particles per vaccination, either as a single dose or 2 doses (separated by 56 days) ▪ Subjects randomized to 1 of 5 groups: low dose followed by low dose, low dose followed by placebo, high dose followed by high dose, high dose followed by placebo, or placebo followed by placebo **Results:** ▪ Data reported are after the 2nd dose in patients 18-55 years old and after the 1st dose in those ≥65 years old ▪ On day 29 after the first vaccine dose, >90% of all participants had neutralizing antibody titers against wild-type virus detected; 100% by day 57 ▪ A 2nd vaccine dose increased the titer by a factor of 2.6 to 2.9 ▪ Titers remained stable for at least 71 days **Limitations:** interim analysis of phase 1/2a data **ENSEMBLE Trial 2021[7]**	*(updated 2/27/2021)* ▪ Adverse effects in the clinical trials included injection-site pain, fatigue, headache, myalgia, fever, nausea, injection-site erythema and swelling ▪ Systemic adverse effects were less common in subjects ≥65 years old than in those 18-55 years old ▪ Reactogenicity was lower after the 2nd dose ▪ Urticaria was reported in 5 subjects who received vaccine and 1 who received placebo within 7 days of vaccination; 1 case of hypersensitivity with urticaria and angioedema was reported in a vaccinated subject ▪ Thromboembolic events, such as deep vein thrombosis (6 events vs 2 events with placebo), pulmonary embolism (4 events vs 1 event with placebo), and transverse sinus thrombosis (1 event vs 0 with placebo), seizures (4 events vs 1 events with placebo), and tinnitus (6 events vs 0 with placebo) were reported in numerically more vaccine recipients than placebo recipients, but a causal relationship has not been established; ▪ Fever occurred in 9% of patients who received the vaccine in the ENSEMBLE trial; 0.2% had grade 3 fever *(updated 2/28/2021)* ▪ Serious adverse events were more common in placebo group than among those who received the vaccine in the ENSEMBLE trial *(updated 2/28/2021)*	▪ Adenovirus serotype 26 (Ad26) vector-based vaccine expressing the SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein ▪ Ad26 technology used in the manufacturer's Ebola vaccine recently approved by the European Commission ▪ Phase 3 trial (ENSEMBLE) has started; expected to enroll up to 60,000 participants[2,3] *(updated 9/23/2020)* ▪ After being paused for safety review due to an unexplained illness in a study participant, the phase 3 trial (ENSEMBLE) has restarted in the US; no clear cause of the adverse event was identified[5] *(updated 10/26/2020)* Adolescents 12-17 years old are now being enrolled in clinical trials *(added 11/2/2020)* ▪ Phase 3 study to investigate a 2-dose regimen (given 57 days apart) initiated (ENSEMBLE 2); expected to enroll up to 30,000 participants *(11/17/2020)* ▪ FDA Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC) scheduled to review EUA for Janssen's COVID-19 vaccine on February 26, 2021 *(added 2/10/2021)* ▪ FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to allow administration of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine for prevention of COVID-19 caused by SARS-CoV-2 in persons ≥18 years old; this is the third EUA for a COVID-19 vaccine issued by the FDA[8] *(added 2/27/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
ADENOVIRUS SEROTYPE 26 (Ad26) VECTOR-BASED COVID-19 VACCINE (Ad26.COV2.S)(JNJ-78436735) (continued)	*(added 1/30/2021; updated 6/9/2021)* **Population:** adult participants ≥18 years old (n=43,783) **Design:** phase 3, multinational, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial ▪ Single dose of vaccine vs placebo **Results:** ▪ In the overall study population, the vaccine was 66% effective in preventing moderate to severe COVID-19 at 28 days after vaccination (468 symptomatic cases in 43,783 participants); 67% effective 14 days after vaccination ▪ In the US, the vaccine was 72% effective at 28 days after vaccination ▪ Efficacy was 66% in Latin America and 57% in South Africa (95% of cases were due to infection with the variant from the B.1.351 lineage) ▪ 85% effective in preventing severe disease 28 days after vaccination ▪ 100% effective against hospitalization and death ▪ 74% effective against asymptomatic infection at 71 days after vaccination[10] **Limitations:** long-term data not available **<u>CDC report (data based on persons vaccinated with any 1 of the 3 vaccines authorized in the US)</u>[23]** *(added 4/20/2021; updated 5/26/2021)* ▪ 5814 vaccine breakthrough infections out of >75 million vaccinated persons in the US ▪ 2622 (45%) were ≥60 years old ▪ 3752 (65%) in women ▪ 1695 (29%) asymptomatic ▪ 396 (7%) hospitalized; of those, 133 (34%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID19	▪ Severe hypersensitivity reactions, including anaphylaxis, have been reported with use of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine[10] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ Allergy to polysorbate (a vaccine ingredient) is a contraindication to vaccination with the Janssen vaccine[11] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ Case report of Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS) within 2 weeks of vaccination in a patient in the clinical trial (GBS was also reported in a patient in the placebo group); a causal association was not established[14] *(added 4/7/2021)* ▪ Warning added to labeling about increased risk of Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) *(added 7/12/2021)* • 100 cases reported after 12.8 million doses • 95 required hospitalization; 1 death • Persons >50 years old and men appear to be at greatest risk • Most cases occurred within 42 days after vaccination *Thromboembolic Events:* ▪ FDA and EUA are evaluating rare reports of thromboembolic events in people who received the J&J COVID-19 vaccine; >6.8 million doses of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine have been administered in the US[15-18] ▪ FDA and CDC are investigating 6 cases of cerebral venous sinus thrombosis in combination with thrombocytopenia; all cases occurred in women 18-4 years old and symptoms occurred 6-13 days	▪ Endorsed for use by the European Commission *(added 3/14/2021)* ▪ WHO recommends J&J vaccine for use in adults *(added 3/20/2021)* ▪ FDA and CDC recommend lifting the pause and resuming use of the Johnson & Johnson (Janssen) vaccine in the US; they state that available data suggest the chance of thrombosis-thrombocytopenia syndrome (TTS) occurring is very low; the vaccine labeling now contains information about the risks of TT [15-18,24] *(updated 4/26/2021)* ▪ In a small *in vitro* study, neutralizing antibody titers against the Delta variant were reduced 1.6-fold[28] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Pregnancy:** ▪ American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends that COVID-19 vaccines should not be withheld from pregnant women and should be offered to lactating individuals who meet criteria for vaccination based on ACIP-recommended priority groups[11,12] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ ACIP/CDC state vaccine can be administered to pregnant or lactating women[11] *(added 3/6/2021)* **Vaccine Storage:** ▪ Store unpunctured multi-dose vials under refrigeration at 2-8°C (36-46°F)

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
ADENOVIRUS SEROTYPE 26 (Ad26) VECTOR-BASED COVID-19 VACCINE (Ad26.COV2.S)(JNJ-78436735) (continued)	▪ 74 (1%) died; of those, 9 (12%) were asymptomatic or death was unrelated to COVID-19 **MMWR Report[25]:** *(added 5/26/2021)* ▪ As of April 30, 2021 10,262 vaccine breakthrough cases reported in the US out of ~101 million vaccinated persons ▪ 6446 (63%) were in women ▪ Median patient age: 58 years ▪ 2725 (27%) were asymptomatic ▪ 995 (10%) were hospitalized; of these 289 (29%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ 160 (2%) died; of these, 28 (18%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ Median age of patients who died: 82 years ▪ Sequence data was available for 555 (5%); of these 356 (64%) were variants of concern (B1.1.7 in 199 [56%], B.1.429 in 88 [25%], B1.427 in 28 [8%], P.1 in 28 [8%], and B.1.351 in 13 [4%]) **May 17th Report** (CDC now monitoring only hospitalized or fatal cases instead of all cases) ▪ 1949 hospitalized or fatal vaccine breakthrough cases out of >123 million people ▪ 1539 (79%) were ≥65 years old ▪ 980 (50%) in women ▪ 354 (18%) asymptomatic ▪ 1811 (93%) hospitalized; of those 443 (25%) reported as asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19 353 (18%) fatal cases; of those, 63 (18%) were asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19	after vaccination; in addition to CVST, three of the women had extracranial thromboses; 4 women developed intraparenchymal brain hemorrhage, and one died; comorbid conditions included obesity (n=3), hypertension (n=1), hypothyroidism (n=1), and asthma (n=1); one woman was taking estrogen/progesterone [15-18,21](*added 4/12/2021; updated 4/16/2021*) ▪ CDC Update: 28 cases of TTS reported to VAERS as of May 7, 2021 out of ~9 million vaccinations; median age 40 years (range 18-59 years), median time to onset 9 days (range 3-15 days); 22 cases were in women; 19 of 28 cases were CVST[27] *(added 6/8/2021)* ▪ Incidence of CVST with thrombocytopenia has been associated with high serum levels of antibodies against platelet factor 4 (PF4)-polyanion complexes similar to those that occur in heparin-induced thrombocytopenia (HIT)[19,20,22]*(added 4/16/2021)* ▪ The CDC recommends that persons who experience a thrombotic event and thrombocytopenia after administration of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine be screened with a PF4 HIT enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and referred to a hematologist; if the assay is positive or cannot be completed, heparin should not be used for thrombosis management; other anticoagulants and intravenous immune globulin should be considered instead *(added 4/16/2021)*[17]	▪ Vaccine is initially stored frozen by the manufacturer, then shipped refrigerated at 2-8°C ▪ Unpunctured vials can be stored at room temperature (9-25°C; 47-77°F) for up to 12 hours ▪ Punctured vials can be stored at 2-8°C (36-46°F) for up to 6 hours or at room temperature for up to 2 hours ▪ Protect vials from light

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
		▪ Interim safety data from the first 288,368 participants in a phase 3b study in South Africa reported adverse events in 5898 (2%); 81% of these were mild to moderate reactogenicity events; 5 arterial, venous thrombotic or embolic events were reported in 5 subjects with risk factors for thromboembolism[26] *(added 6/8/2021)*	

1. NB Mercado et al. Single-shot Ad26 vaccine protects against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus macaques. Nature 2020 July 30 (epub).
2. A study of Ad26.COV2.S for the prevention of SARS-CoV-2-mediated COVID-19 in adult participants (ENSEMBLE). Available at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04505722. Accessed August 20, 2020.
3. Johnson & Johnson initiates pivotal global phase 3 clinical trial of Janssen's COVID-19 vaccine candidate. Available at: https://www.jnj.com/johnson-johnson-initiates-pivotal-global-phase-3-clinical-trial-of-janssens-covid-19-vaccine-candidate. Accessed September 23, 2020.
4. J Sadoff et al. Interim results of a phase1-2a trial of Ad26.COV2.S Covid-19 vaccine. N Engl J Med 2021 January 13 (epub).
5. J Sadoff et al. Safety and efficacy of single-dose Ad26.COV2.S vaccine against COVID-19. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:2187.
6. Press release. AstraZeneca. AZD1222 clinical trials now resumed globally. Available at: https://www.astrazeneca.com/media-centre/press-releases/2020/fda-authorises-restart-of-the-covid-19-azd1222-vaccine-us-phase-iii-trial.html. Accessed October 26, 2020.
7. News Release. Johnson & Johnson announces single-shot Janssen COVID-19 vaccine candidate met primary endpoints in interim analysis of its Phase 3 ENSEMBLE trial. Available at: https://www.jnj.com/johnson-johnson-announces-single-shot-janssen-covid-19-vaccine-candidate-met-primary-endpoints-in-interim-analysis-of-its-phase-3-ensemble-trial. Accessed January 30, 2021.
8. News Release. FDA issues emergency use authorization for third COVID-19 vaccine. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-issues-emergency-use-authorization-third-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed February 27, 2021.
9. FDA. Fact sheet for healthcare providers administering vaccine. Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine to prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/146304/download?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed February 27, 2021.
10. FDA Briefing Document. Janssen Ad26.COV2.S vaccine for the prevention of COVID-19. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee Meeting. February 26, 2021. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/146217/download. Accessed February 28, 2021.
11. CDC. Interim clinical consideration for use of COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized in the United States. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-by-product/clinical-considerations.html. Accessed March 6, 2021.
12. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Vaccinating pregnant and lactating patients against COVID-19. Practice advisory. December 13, 2020. Available at: https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19. Accessed March 6, 2021.
13. KE Stephenson et al. Immunogenicity of the Ad26.COV2.S vaccine for COVID-19. JAMA 2021 March 11 (epub).
14. AM Márquez Loza et al. Guillian-Barré syndrome in the placebo and active arms of a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial: temporal associations do not imply causality. Neurology 2021 April 6 (epub).
15. FDA. News Release. Joint CDC and FDA statement on Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine. April 13, 2021. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/joint-cdc-and-fda-statement-johnson-johnson-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed April 13, 2021.
16. CDC. Health Alert Network. Cases of cerebral venous sinus thrombosis with thrombocytopenia after receipt of the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine. CDCHAN-00442April 13, 2021. Available at: https://emergency.cdc.gov/han/2021/han00442.asp. Accessed April 14, 2021.
17. CDC Health Alert Network. Cases of cerebral venous sinus thrombosis with thrombocytopenia after receipt of the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine. April 13, 2021. Available at: https://bit.ly/3sjDO4X . Accessed April 16, 2021.
18. T Shimabukuro. Update on thromboembolic events, COVID-19 vaccines safety surveillance. ACIP Presentation Slides: April 14, 2021 Meeting. Available at: https://bit.ly/3gcWf9l. Accessed April 16, 2021.
19. A Greinacher et al. Thrombotic thrombocytopenia after ChAdOx1 nCov-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).
20. NH Schultz et al. Thrombosis and thrombocytopenia after ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).
21. K Muir et al. Correspondence. Thrombotic thrombocytopenia after Ad26.COV2.S vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 9 (epub).

22. M Scully et al. Pathologic antibodies to platelet factor 4 after ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2021 April 16 (epub).
23. CDC. COVID-19 breakthrough case investigations and reporting. 2021 April 16. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/health-departments/breakthrough-cases.html. Accessed May 26, 2021.
24. FDA News Release. FDA and CDC lift recommended pause on Johnson & Johnson (Janssen) COVID-19 vaccine use following thorough safety review. 2021 April 23. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-and-cdc-lift-recommended-pause-johnson-johnson-janssen-covid-19-vaccine-use-following-thorough. Accessed April 26, 2021.
25. COVID-19 vaccine breakthrough infections reported to CDC – United States, January 1-April 30, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly 2021; 70:792. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7021e3. Accessed May 26, 2021.
26. S Takuva et al. Thromboembolic events in the South African Ad26.COV2.S vaccine study. N Engl J Med 2021 June 2 (epub).
27. T Shimabukuro. CDC COVID-19 Vaccine Task Force, Vaccine Safety Team. Update: thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome (TTS) following COVID-19 vaccination. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/meetings/downloads/slides-2021-05-12/07-COVID-Shimabukuro-508.pdf. Accessed June 8, 2021.
28. M Jongeneelen et al. Ad26.COV2.S elicited neutralizing activity against Delta and other SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. bioRxiv 2021 July 1 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.07.01.450707v1. Accessed July 15, 2021.

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA Vaccines			
mRNA-1273 (Moderna) *(updated 6/28/2021)* **Dosage:**[16] ▪ Two 0.5 mL doses given 1 month apart ▪ Available as multiple-dose vials ▪ Persons who have received 1 dose of the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine should complete the series with the same vaccine; there is no data on the interchangeability with other COVID-19 vaccines ▪ CDC recommends in exceptional situations when the vaccine product used for the first dose cannot be determined or is no longer available, any mRNA COVID-19 vaccine can be given at least 28 days after the first dose[22] *(added 1/25/2021)* ▪ If the second vaccine dose cannot be given within the recommended interval, CDC now recommends it may be given up to 6 weeks (42 days) after the first dose[22] *(added 1/23/2021)*	**Jackson et al. NEJM 2020[1]** *(updated 11/12/2020)* **Population:** healthy adults 18-55 years old (n=45) **Design:** phase 1, dose-escalation, open-label trial ▪ 2 vaccinations delivered 28 days apart at a 25 mcg, 100 mcg, or 250 mcg dose **Results:** ▪ antibody responses higher with the higher dose after 1st vaccination ▪ titers increased after 2nd vaccination ▪ serum-neutralizing activity detected after 2nd vaccination in all participants **Limitations:** preliminary results from a phase 1 trial **Anderson et al. NEJM 2020[5]** *(added 10/1/2020)* **Population:** older adults (≥56 years old) stratified according to age (56-70 years old or ≥71 years old) (n=40) **Design:** phase 1, dose-escalation, open-label trial ▪ 2 doses of 25 mcg or 100 mcg vaccine given 28 days apart **Results:** ▪ Serum neutralizing activity was detected in all participants after the 2nd vaccine dose ▪ Binding- and neutralizing-antibody responses appeared similar to those in adults <55 years old who were given the vaccine and were higher than a panel of convalescent serum controls ▪ Antibody titers were higher with the 100-mcg dose than the 25-mcg dose ▪ Mild to moderate adverse reactions reported; mostly after the 2nd dose	*(section updated 12/17/2020)* ▪ Most common adverse effects were injection site pain (91.6%), fatigue (68.5%), headache (63.0%), muscle pain (59.6%), joint pain (44.8%), and chills (43.4%) ▪ Severe reactions occurred more frequently after the second dose than the first and occurred less often in subjects ≥65 years compared to younger people ▪ Lymphadenopathy has been reported ▪ Bell's palsy was reported in 3 vaccine recipients and 1 placebo recipient; a causal relationship has not been established; an analysis using the WHO pharmacovigilance database did not detect a signal of disproportionality of facial paralysis with mRNA COVID-19 vaccines compared with other viral vaccines or influenza vaccines alone[65] *(updated 5/3/2021)* ▪ 2 serious events of facial swelling occurred in vaccine recipients ▪ 1 serious event of intractable nausea and vomiting reported in a patient with a history of severe headache and nausea requiring hospitalization ▪ No serious adverse events reported in clinical trials ▪ Anaphylactic reactions were identified as important potential risks; no anaphylactic reactions with close temporal relation to	▪ Lipid nanoparticle-encapsulated, nucleoside-modified messenger RNA (mRNA)-based vaccine ▪ Encodes the SARS-CoV2 spike (S) glycoprotein, which is needed for host cell attachment and viral entry ▪ FDA granted fast track designation ▪ Reduced viral replication in the lungs and noses of primates (KS Corbett et al. NEJM 2020)[2] ▪ Phase 3 trial has begun; expected to enroll about 30,000 participants and use a dose of 100 mcg ▪ Moderna filed for an EUA; FDA advisory committee is scheduled to review on December 17, 2020[16] *(updated 12/16/2020)* ▪ FDA Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC) voted (20-0, 1 abstention) to recommended emergency authorization of the Moderna's COVID-19 vaccine; they note more data are needed on long-term safety and efficacy, and in certain populations such as pregnant women and pediatric patients [16] *(updated 12/17/2020)* ▪ FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to allow administration of the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine for prevention of COVID-19 caused by SARS-CoV-2 in persons ≥18 years old; this is the second EUA for a

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued) ▪ CDC states in exceptional situations where a patient received 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine and is unable to complete the series with an mRNA vaccine (e.g., contraindication), a single dose of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine may be considered at a minimum of 28 days after the first mRNA vaccine dose[22] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ COVID-19 vaccines should generally not be given within 14 days of other vaccines[22] *(added 3/6/2021)*	**Limitations:** small number of participants; phase 1 data **A Widge et al. NEJM 2020[10]** *(added 12/3/2020)* **Population:** 34 healthy adults who participated in the phase 1 trial **Design:** phase 1, dose-escalation, open-label trial (interim results reported previously; see Jackson et al and Anderson et al above) ▪ Immunogenicity results 119 days after first vaccination presented ▪ 2 doses of the 100-mcg vaccine given 28 days apart ▪ Stratified according to age: 18-55 yrs, 56-70 yrs, or ≥71 yrs **Results:** ▪ Serum neutralizing antibodies were detected in all participants at day 119 ▪ Expected, slight decrease in antibodies over time **Limitations:** phase 1 data **LR Baden et al. NEJM 2021 (COVE Trial)[8]** *(added 11/17/2020; updated 12/31/2020)* **Population:** adults ≥18 years old in the US, including those at high risk of severe complications of COVID-19 (n=30,420) **Design:** ongoing**,** phase 3, randomized, observer-blinded, placebo-controlled trial ▪ mRNA-1273 100 mcg vs placebo ▪ 2 doses given 28 days apart **Results:** ▪ 2.2% of subjects had evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection at baseline ▪ vaccine efficacy 94.1% 14 days after the second vaccine dose (95% CI 89.3-96.8%; p<0.001; 185 cases of COVID-19 in the placebo group and 11 in the vaccine group	the vaccine were reported in the phase 3 clinical trial ▪ Should not be administered to persons with a history of severe allergic reaction to any component of the vaccine ▪ Case of a severe allergic reaction reported in a physician in Boston with a history of shellfish allergy; the patient self-administered an *EpiPen (added 1/1/2021)* ▪ Case of an anaphylactic reaction reported in a healthcare worker in Oregon after vaccination; the patient required hospitalization *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ CDC recommends that people who experienced an allergic reaction (even if not severe) after administration of the first dose of an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine not be given the second dose[18] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ CDC states that allergy to polyethylene glycol (PEG; a vaccine ingredient) is a contraindication to vaccination with an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine[18,22]; an allergy to polysorbate (related to PEG, but not a vaccine ingredient) is a precaution to vaccination[22] *(updated 3/6/2021)* ▪ American College of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology (ACAAI) recommend mRNA COVID-19 vaccines be administered in a healthcare setting where anaphylaxis can be treated, and patients should be observed for at least 15-30 minutes after vaccination[19] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ ACAAI states that people with common allergies to medications, foods, inhalants,	COVID-19 vaccine issued by the FDA[17] *(added 12/18/2020)* ▪ Moderna started trials in children 6 months to 11 years old; expected to enroll ~6750 children in US and Canada; manufacturer reports they expect results in 2022 *(added 3/20/2021)* ▪ A NIAIAD trial to investigate whether vaccination prevents transmission has started; expected to enroll 12,000 college students in the US; half will be given Moderna vaccine immediately and half will be vaccinated 4 months later; degree of transmission will be determined by infection rate in close contacts *(added 3/26/2021)* **Variants:** ▪ In an *in vitro* study, sera containing antibodies from people who received the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine showed activity against SARS-CoV-2 with mutations including the B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants first identified in the UK and South Africa; there was no impact on neutralizing titers against B.1.1.7 relative to prior variants, but a 6-fold reduction in neutralizing titers was reported with B.1.351 and a reduction in titers against the P.1 (Brazilian) variant relative to prior variants (titers were still above levels expected to be protective)[28,29,36]; neutralizing titers also reported against the B.1.526 (New York) variant[63,64] ; neutralizing titers against B.1.617 (India) variant were about 4-fold lower, but expected to be protective[80] *(updated 5/20/2021)* ▪ In an *in vitro* study, after vaccination with mRNA-1273, binding and

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	▪ vaccine efficacy 95.6% in participants 18-<65 years old ▪ vaccine efficacy 86.4% for those ≥65 years old ▪ severe COVID-19 occurred in 30 participants who received placebo (1 fatality) and 0 who received the vaccine **Limitations:** longer-term data needed; more data needed in some subgroups **F Krammer et al. NEJM 2021[43]** *(added 3/15/2021)* ▪ In subjects who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA vaccine, those who were seronegative at baseline had variable and relatively low antibody responses 9-12 days after vaccination, while subjects who were seropositive at baseline had rapid development of high antibody titers ▪ Antibody titers were 10-45 times higher in those with preexisting immunity than in those without **BJ Boyarsky et al. JAMA 2021[45]** *(added 3/15/2021)* **Population:** transplant recipients vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 with 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine in the US (n=436) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 48% received the Moderna vaccine and 52% received the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine ▪ Maintenance immunosuppression regimens included tacrolimus (83%), corticosteroids (54%), mycophenolate (66%), azathioprine (9%), sirolimus (4%), everolimus (2%) ▪ 76/436 patients (17%) a had detectable antibody response	insects and latex are not more likely than the general public to have an allergic reaction to an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine; data on individuals with a history of allergic reactions to previous vaccinations and/or mast call activation syndrome/idiopathic anaphylaxis is limited[19] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ A higher number of allergic reactions than expected was reported in California after administration of vaccines from lot 41L20A; and investigation is ongoing *(added 1/23/2021)* ▪ Estimated rate of 2.5 cases of anaphylaxis per million doses administered after administration of 4,014,396 first vaccine doses; based on reports to VAERS[27] *(added 1/25/2021)* ▪ 2 patients who had immediate hypersensitivity reactions to the first dose of Moderna vaccine were successfully administered the second vaccine dose using graded doses[61] *(added 4/20/2021)* CDC analysis of adverse events reported through VAERS and v-safe after administration of 13.8 million vaccine doses (Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna) found[34] *(added 2/28/2021)*: ▪ most reports were for nonserious events ▪ occurrence of anaphylaxis was within range reported for other vaccines ▪ of 113 reported deaths, most were in residents of long-term care facilities and causes of death were consistent with expected all-cause mortality in this population ▪ adverse reactions were more common after the second dose	functional antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants (B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1, B.1.429, B.1.526) were maintained for 6 months[81] *(added 5/20/2021)* ▪ An additional booster dose of the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine (mRNA-1273) is being evaluated to determine if it can increase neutralizing titers against new variants and a booster vaccine (mRNA-1273.351) against the B.1.351 variant (first identified in South Africa) is entering preclinical and phase 1 trials[28] *(added 1/25/2021)*; neutralizing antibody titers against SARS-CoV-2 and the variants B.1.351 and P.1 were increased after a booster dose of mRNA-1273 or mRNA-1273.351 in previously vaccinated individuals[83] *(added 5/20/2021)* ▪ In a study in Canada, vaccine efficacy against **Alpha** was 89% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 92% after 2 doses of Moderna, and 64% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Beta/Gamma** 84% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 77% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 48% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Delta** 87% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 72% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 67% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca[102] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Pregnancy:** ▪ American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends that COVID-19 vaccines should not be withheld from pregnant women and should be offered to lactating individuals who meet criteria for

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	▪ Recipients receiving anti-metabolite maintenance immunosuppression were less likely than those who were not to develop an antibody response (37% vs 63%; adjusted incidence rate ratio [IRR] 0.22, 95% CI 0.15-0.34; p<0.001) ▪ Older patients were less likely to develop an antibody response than younger patients (adjusted IRR 0.83 per 10 years, 95% CI 0.73-0.93, p=0.002) ▪ Antibody response was more likely with Moderna vaccine than Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (69% vs 31%, IRR 2.15, 95% CI 1.29-3.57; p=0.003) **Limitations:** no control group, convenience sample, lack of serial measurements after vaccine, only response after 1st dose **BJ Boyarsky et al. JAMA 2021[71]** *(added 5/9/2021)* **Population:** transplant recipients vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 with 2 doses of an mRNA vaccine in the US (n=658) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 1st dose results in 396 of these patients reported previously (see Boyarsky et al above) ▪ Maintenance immunosuppression regimens included tacrolimus (83%), corticosteroids (54%), mycophenolate (66%), azathioprine (9%), sirolimus (4%), everolimus (2%) ▪ 98/658 patients (15%) a had detectable antibody response at a median of 21 days after dose 1 ▪ 357/658 patients (54%) a had detectable antibody response at a median of 29 days after dose 2	▪ Delayed cutaneous reactions reported in 12 patients given the Moderna vaccine; reactions (≥10 cm in diameter in 5 patients) near the injection site occurred a median of 8 days after the 1st dose; median resolution 6 days; half of patients had recurrent reactions after the 2nd vaccine dose[41] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ A case series in Switzerland reported stage III hypertension occurring in 9 patients within minutes of BNT162b2 vaccination; 8 of 9 patients reported well-controlled hypertension before vaccination[51] *(added 3/29/2021)* ▪ Registry-based study reported 414 cutaneous reactions to mRNA COVID-19 vaccines between December 2020 and February 2021; reactions included large local reactions, injection-site reactions, urticarial eruptions, morbilliform eruptions; less common reactions included pernio/chilblains, cosmetic filler reactions, zoster, herpes simplex flares, and pityriasis rosea-like reactions *(added 5/8/2021)* ▪ Of 1422 reports of postvaccination reactions submitted to a COVID-19 vaccine allergy case registry, 510 were delayed large local reactions; of these events, 55 (11%) were in blacks, Indigenous persons, and people of color; most reactions occurred after the first vaccine dose; mean time from vaccination to onset was 8 days; 11 patients had reactions other than at the injection site (diffuse itching, hives, other rash, angioedema) *(added 6/9/2021)*[92]	vaccination based on ACIP-recommended priority groups; the mRNA-1273 vaccine has not been tested in pregnant women in clinical trials[14,15] *(added 12/17/2020)* ▪ ACIP/CDC state vaccine can be administered to pregnant or lactating women[22] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ CDC analysis of data reported to V-safe in pregnant women who received the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (>30,000) found that most adverse events in pregnant women were not related to **Pregnancy (continued):** pregnancy (e.g., local and systemic reactions); pregnancy-specific adverse events were within known background rates[44] *(added 3/15/2021)* ▪ A prospective cohort study including 131 reproductive-age vaccine recipients (84 pregnant, 31 lactating, 16 non-pregnant) reported immunogenicity and reactogenicity in pregnant and lactating women was similar to that in non-pregnant women; antibodies were present in umbilical cord blood and breast milk[50] *(added 3/29/2021)* CDC evaluated data reported to the v-safe surveillance system, v-safe pregnancy registry, and vaccine adverse event reporting system (VAERS) from December 14, 2020-February 28, 2021[62] *(added 4/22/2021)* ▪ 35,691 participants 16-54 years old identified as pregnant ▪ Injection-site pain reported more frequently in pregnant women than in non-pregnant women; headache,

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	▪ Of the 658 patients, 98 (15%) had measurable antibody response after dose 1 and 2, 301 (46%) had no antibody response after dose 1 or dose 2, and 259 (39%) had no antibody response after dose 1 but did have antibody response after dose 2 ▪ Of 473 patients receiving anti-metabolites, 38 (8%) had antibody response after dose 1 and 2, 268 (57%) had no antibody response after dose 1 or 2, and 167 (35%) had no antibody response after dose 1 but did have antibody response after dose 2 ▪ Antibody levels were below those reported in immunocompetent persons who were vaccinated **Limitations:** no control group, convenience sample, lack of serial measurements after vaccine **NEJM Correspondence 2021**[46-48] *(added 3/23/2021)* **2 California Healthcare Systems (UCSD and UCLA)**[46] ▪ 36,659 health care workers were vaccinated with a 1st mRNA vaccine dose between December 16, 2020 and February 9, 2021; 77% received the 2nd dose ▪ 379 persons tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 ≥1 day after vaccination; most (71%) of positive tests were in the 1st 2 weeks after vaccination ▪ After both vaccine doses, 37 persons tested positive; 22 were <7days after the 2nd dose; only 8 workers tested positive 8-14 days after the 2nd dose and 7 did so ≥15 days after the 2nd dose **Texas Medical Center (UTSW)** ▪ 59% of 23,234 employees received a 1st mRNA vaccine dose and 30% received a	▪ In an analysis of VAERS data, the incidence of sudden sensorineural hearing loss after COVID-19 vaccination did not exceed that of the general population[88] *(added 6/6/2021)* **Myocarditis** ▪ CDC investigating reports of myocarditis following mRNA vaccines; currently there are few reports and most cases appear to be mild; according to CDC, these cases seem to occur predominantly in adolescents and young adults, more often in males than females, more often following the 2nd dose than the 1st, and typically within 4 days after vaccination; rates of myocarditis after vaccination have not exceeded expected baseline rates[87] *(added 5/27/2021)* ▪ CDC reviewing cases of myocarditis/pericarditis after mRNA vaccination (285 of 475 reported cases investigated as of 5/31/2021)[95] *(added 6/15/2021)* ▪ Most cases occurred after 2nd dose ▪ Most occurred in patients 16-24 years old ▪ Median time to onset 2 days (after dose 2) ▪ 79% occurred in males ▪ 81% had full recovery of symptoms ▪ There were more reported cases than expected ▪ A warning statement about the risk of myocarditis is now included in the FDA fact sheets for the Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna mRNA vaccines[13,96] (*added 6/28/2021*)	myalgia, chills, and fever reported less often ▪ 827 of 3958 women in the v-safe pregnancy registry had a completed pregnancy; of these, 115 (13.9%) resulted in pregnancy loss and 712 (86.1%) resulted in a live birth (mostly women vaccinated in 3rd trimester) ▪ Preterm birth occurred in 9.4% and small size for gestational age in 3.2% ▪ No neonatal deaths were reported ▪ Calculated proportions of adverse pregnancy and neonatal outcomes in women vaccinated against COVID-19 who had a completed pregnancy were similar to incidences reported in studies in pregnant women before COVID-19; not direct comparison ▪ Among 221 adverse events related to pregnancy that were reported to VAERS, spontaneous abortion was the most frequent (46 cases) ▪ No obvious safety signals found in this preliminary report ▪ Report states more follow-up needed ▪ In a prospective cohort study in 103 women (30 were pregnant and 16 were lactating) who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, immunogenicity was reported in all women and vaccine-elicited antibodies were found in infant cord blood and breast milk; antibody titers against B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants were reduced, but T-cell responses were preserved[74] *(added 5/19/2021)* ▪ In a small study in 7 breastfeeding women, there were no detectable levels

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	2nd dose within 31 days of December 15, 2020 ▪ Between December 15, 2020 and January 28, 2021, SARS-CoV-2 infections were reported in 234 of 8969 nonvaccinated employees, 112 of 6144 partially vaccinated employees, and 4 of 8121 fully vaccinated employees **Jerusalem Medical Center (HHUMC)[48]** Among workers vaccinated with the Pfizer vaccine the weekly incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection declined **S Saadat et al. JAMA 2021[52]** *(added 3/29/2021)* **Population:** health care workers who had been previously enrolled in a hospital-wide serosurvey study were randomly contacted based on stratification in 3 groups: SARS-CoV-2 IgG-antibody negative, IgG antibody positive asymptomatic COVID-19, and IgG-positive symptomatic COVID-19 (n=59) **Design:** volunteers were vaccinated with the Pfizer/BioNTech or Moderna vaccine and then had blood drawn on days 0, 7, and 14 **Results:** ▪ At all time points, antibody titer responses were higher in patients who were previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 than in those who did not have prior infection **Limitations:** small sample size, does not demonstrate efficacy **MG Thompson et al. HEROES-RECOVER MMWR 2021[53]** *(added 3/29/2021; updated 6/8/2021)*		of vaccine RNA in breast milk samples collected from 4 to 48 hours after vaccination[104] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Vaccine Storage:** ▪ Vials are stored frozen (-58 to 5° F/ -50 to -15° C); they should not be stored on dry ice or below -50° C ▪ If transport between -50 to -15° C is not possible, vials can be transported at 2-8° C for up to 12 hours; once thawed and transported at 2-8° C vials should not be refrozen and should continue to be stored at 2-8° C until use ▪ Can be stored under refrigeration (2-8° C/ 36-46° F) for 30 days before first use and unpunctured vials can be stored at room temperature for 12 hours and should be discarded after 6 hours ▪ After the first dose has been withdrawn from the vial, it should be stored between 2 to 25° C (36-77° F); discard vial after 12 hours ▪ Vials should be thawed before use; they can be thawed under refrigeration for 2 hours and 30 minutes. Vials should be allowed to stand at room temperature for 15 minutes before administration *(added 12/18/2020)* ▪ Vials can also be thawed at room temperature for 1 hour *(added 12/18/2020)* ▪ Vials should be protected from light ▪ If a vial contains enough liquid after dilution for administration of >10 full

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	**Population:** health care personnel, first responders, and other essential/frontline workers in the US who were routinely tested for SARS-CoV-2 for 13 weeks (n=3950) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 2479 (62.8%) received both mRNA doses and 477 (12.1%) received only 1 dose ▪ There were 1.38 SARS-CoV-2 infections per 1,000 person-days among unvaccinated persons, 0.04 infections per 1,000 person-days among fully-vaccinated persons, and 0.19 infections per 1,000 person-days among partially immunized persons **Effectiveness under real-world conditions:** ▪ 90% ≥14 days after 2nd dose ▪ 80% ≥14 days after 1st dose, but before second dose ▪ 22.9% of infections were medically attended, including 2 hospitalizations (there were 0 deaths) **Updated Analysis, CDC[91]** *(added 6/9/2021)* ▪ 3975 subjects; completed weekly testing for 17 weeks ▪ Risk of infection reduced by 91% in fully vaccinated ▪ Risk of infection reduced 81% in partially vaccinated ▪ Vaccinated subjects who developed COVID-19 had milder and shorter illness compared to unvaccinated subjects (6 fewer days sick, 2 fewer days sick in bed) ▪ 60% lower risk of developing symptoms in vaccinated persons compared to unvaccinated ▪ 40% lower viral load and 6 fewer days of detectable virus in vaccinated vs unvaccinated		doses, those extra doses may be used, but residual vaccine from multiple vials should not be combined to form a full dose *(added 1/19/2021)* ▪ FDA-approved new vials from Moderna that contain up to 15 doses *(added 4/7/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	**Limitations:** moderately wide confidence intervals partly because of limited number of infections **Doria-Rose et al. NEJM 2021[56]** *(added 4/7/2021)* **Population:** healthy adults (n=33) **Design:** analysis of 33 participants from an ongoing phase 1 trial **Results:** ▪ 180 days after the second vaccination there was high antibody activity in all age groups ▪ In a pseudovirus neutralization assay, detectable activity was observed in almost all participants; activity was noted in all participants when a more sensitive test was used ▪ Titers were lower in participants ≥56 years old than in those 18-55 years old **Limitations:** interim analysis; antibody titers and assays that best correlate with vaccine efficacy not known **CDC report (data based on persons vaccinated with any 1 of the 3 vaccines authorized in the US)[60]** *(added 4/20/2021; updated 6/6/2021)* ▪ 5814 vaccine breakthrough infections out of >75 million vaccinated persons in the US ▪ 2622 (45%) were ≥60 years old ▪ 3752 (65%) in women ▪ 1695 (29%) asymptomatic ▪ 396 (7%) hospitalized; of those, 133 (34%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID19 ▪ 74 (1%) died; of those, 9 (12%) were asymptomatic or death was unrelated to COVID-19		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	**MMWR Report[85]:** *(added 5/26/2021)* ▪ As of April 30, 2021 10,262 vaccine breakthrough cases reported in the US out of ~101 million vaccinated persons ▪ 6446 (63%) were in women ▪ Median patient age: 58 years ▪ 2725 (27%) were asymptomatic ▪ 995 (10%) were hospitalized; of these 289 (29%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ 160 (2%) died; of these, 28 (18%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ Median age of patients who died: 82 years ▪ Sequence data was available for 555 (5%); of these 356 (64%) were variants of concern (B1.1.7 in 199 [56%], B.1.429 in 88 [25%], B1.427 in 28 [8%], P.1 in 28 [8%], and B.1.351 in 13 [4%]) **June 1st Report** (CDC now monitoring only hospitalized or fatal cases instead of all cases) ▪ 3016 hospitalized or fatal vaccine breakthrough cases out of >135 million people ▪ 2334 (77%) were ≥65 years old ▪ 1492 (49%) in women ▪ 502 (17%) asymptomatic ▪ 2854 (95%) hospitalized; of those 654 (23%) reported as asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19 ▪ 535 (18%) fatal cases; of those, 88 (16%) were asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19 **Moderna TeenCOVE 2021[73]** *(updated 5/25/2021)* **Population:** adolescents 12 to <18 years old (n=3732)		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	**Design:** phase 2/3 randomized, double-blind trial ▪ Subjects randomized 2:1 to 2 doses of mRNA-1273 or placebo **Results:** ▪ 100% efficacy 14 days after the 2nd dose (0 cases in vaccine group and 4 cases in placebo group) using the case definition from the COVE trial ▪ 93% efficacy 14 days after the 2nd dose using the CDC definition (included cases presenting with milder symptoms; 1 COVID symptom and a positive PCR test by nasopharyngeal or saliva sample) ▪ Safety and tolerability profile similar to that in adults **Limitations:** preliminary data; not published or peer reviewed **SY Wong et al. Gastroenterology 2021[76]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population:** Patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA COVID-19 vaccine (n=48) **Design:** 48 vaccinated IBD patients were compared to 2 control groups consisting of 14 completely vaccinated healthcare workers and 29 vaccinated healthy volunteers without IBD **Results:** ▪ 85% of patients receiving a biologic (including TNF inhibitors, vedolizumab, and ustekinumab) at time of vaccination ▪ All vaccinated IBD patients demonstrated serological responses **Limitations:** small sample size; single center **EM White et al. NEJM 2021[78]** *(added 5/19/2021)*		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
mRNA-1273 (continued)	**Population:** nursing home residents in 280 nursing homes across 21 states in the US **Design:** review of immunization records identified residents who: ▪ received 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine ▪ received 2 doses of an mRNA vaccine ▪ were present on the day of the first facility vaccination clinic but who were not vaccinated **Results:** ▪ 18242 vaccinated residents (80.4% Pfizer/BioNTech and 19.6% Moderna) and 3990 unvaccinated residents ▪ Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection decreased over time in residents who were vaccinated and in those who were not vaccinated ▪ After 1st vaccine dose: 822 incident cases (4.5% of vaccinated residents) occurred within 14 days and 250 cases (1.4%) at 15-28 days ▪ After 2nd vaccine dose: 130 cases (1.0%) occurred within 14 days and 38 cases (0.3%) after >14 days ▪ Unvaccinated residents: 173 cases (4.3%) within 14 days of 1st vaccination clinic and 12 cases (0.3%) >42 days after the clinic ▪ Most infections were asymptomatic **Limitations:** observational data		
	FS Vahidy et al. medRxiv 2021[82] *(added 5/20/2021)* **Population:** established patients in a healthcare system in the US who were vaccinated with an mRNA vaccine, partially vaccinated with an mRNA vaccine, or not vaccinated through April 4, 2021 (n=91, 134) **Design:** retrospective cohort		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
	Results: ▪ 70.2% not vaccinated, 4.5% partially vaccinated, 25.4% fully vaccinated ▪ Hospitalization occurred in 0.7% of fully vaccinated patients, 3.4% of partially vaccinated patients, and 2.7% of non-vaccinated patients ▪ 255 deaths occurred in patients hospitalized with COVID-19; of those, 219 (97.3%) were in unvaccinated patients, 5 (2.2%) were in partially vaccinated patients, and 1 (0.0041%) in a fully vaccinated patient ▪ Full vaccination was reported to be 96% effective at preventing COVID-19 hospitalization and 98.7% effective at preventing death ▪ Partial vaccination was reported to be 77% effective at preventing hospitalization and 64.2% effective at preventing death **Limitations:** observational data; not published or peer reviewed **MW Tenforde et al. MMWR 2021[90]** *(added 6/9/2021)* **Population:** adults ≥65 years old at 24 hospitals in 14 states (n=417) **Design:** test negative case control **Results:** ▪ Adjusted vaccine efficacy against COVID-19 hospitalization was 94% for full vaccination and 64% for partial vaccination **Limitations:** small sample size; wide confidence intervals; observational; interim analysis with self-reported data		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 ***Comirnaty*** (Pfizer/BioNTech) *(updated 7/15/2021)* **Dosage:**[13] ▪ Two 0.3-mL doses given 3 weeks apart ▪ Available as multiple-dose vials ▪ Persons who have received 1 dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine should complete the series with the same vaccine; there is no data on the interchangeability with other COVID-19 vaccines ▪ CDC recommends in exceptional situations when the vaccine product used for the first dose cannot be determined or is no longer available, any mRNA COVID-19 vaccine can be given at least 28 days after the first dose[22] *(added 1/25/2021)* ▪ If the second vaccine dose cannot be given within the recommended interval, CDC now recommends it may be given up to 6 weeks (42 days) after the first dose[22] *(added 1/23/2021)*	**Mulligan et al. 2020**[3] **Population:** healthy adults 18-55 years old (n=45) **Design:** phase 1/2 randomized, placebo-controlled, observer-blinded dose escalation study ▪ 2 doses separated by 21 days of 10 mcg, 30 mcg, or 100 mcg of BNT162b1 or placebo **Results:** ▪ At day 28, all subjects in the 10- and 30-mcg groups had significantly elevated RBD-binding IgG antibodies and neutralizing antibodies **Limitations:** phase 1/2 results **Walsh et al. NEJM 2020**[6] *(added 8/23/2020; updated 10/19/20)* **Population:** healthy adults 18-55 and 65-85 years old (n=195) **Design:** phase 1, randomized, observer-blinded, placebo-controlled, dose-escalation trial ▪ 2 vaccinations delivered 21 days apart of 1 of 3 doses (10, 20, or 30 mcg) of BNT162b1 or BNT162b2 or placebo ▪ 1 group received 1 dose of BNT162b1 100 mcg **Results:** ▪ 50% neutralizing antibody titers for the 2 vaccine candidates at the 30 mcg dose on day 28 (7 days after the second dose) or 35 days (14 days after the second dose) ranged from 1.7-4.6 times those of the convalescent serum panel in subjects 18-55 years old; titers ranged from 1.1-2.2 times those of the convalescent serum panel in subjects 65-85 years old ▪ Antibody responses were similar between BNT162b1 and BNT162b2	*(section updated 12/10/2020)* ▪ Local adverse effects included injection-site reactions (84.1%), such as pain, redness, and swelling[11] ▪ Fatigue (62.9%) and headache (55.1%) were the most common systemic adverse effects in the phase 3 trial[11] ▪ Other systemic adverse effects included fever (14.2%), chills (31.9%), muscle pain (38.3%), and joint pain (23.6%)[11] ▪ Local and systemic reactions were more frequent after the second dose[9] ▪ Reactions less common and less severe in older adults than in younger adults[9] ▪ No serious adverse events reported in the clinical trials ▪ The manufacturer has reported mostly mild to moderate adverse reactions in clinical trials; severe or grade 4 reactions have been rare[4] ▪ FDA requested potential anaphylactic reactions be added to pharmacovigilance plans; after vaccination, anaphylaxis occurred in 2 people in the U.K. with a history of allergic reactions[11] ▪ An additional case of anaphylaxis has been reported in the US in a women with no history of allergies *(added 12/17/2020)* ▪ CDC recommends that people who experienced an allergic reaction (even if not severe) after administration of the	▪ Both are lipid nanoparticle-formulated, nucleoside modified mRNA vaccines ▪ BNT162b1 encodes an optimized SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain (RBD) antigen ▪ BNT162b2 encodes an optimized SARS-CoV-2 full-length spike protein antigen ▪ FDA granted fast track designation ▪ The manufacturer advanced BNT162b2 to phase 2/3 clinical trials based on data from phase 1 trials indicating it caused fewer adverse events than BNT1621b1[6] *(added 8/23/2020)* ▪ Phase 3 trial has begun; expected to enroll up to 30,000 participants; manufacturer submitted to FDA to increase to 44,000 participants *(updated 9/18/2020)* ▪ Adolescents 12-17 years old are now being enrolled in clinical trials *(added 11/2/2020)* ▪ Manufacturer plans to submit to FDA for Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) since they report the safety data milestone required by the FDA has been achieved *(updated 11/18/2020)* ▪ The U.K. granted emergency authorization for BNT162b2 *(added 12/2/2020)* ▪ Health Canada approved use of BNT162b2 *(added 12/11/2020)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued) ▪ CDC states in exceptional situations where a patient received 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine and is unable to complete the series with an mRNA vaccine (e.g., contraindication), a single dose of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine may be considered at a minimum of 28 days after the first mRNA vaccine dose[22] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ COVID-19 vaccines should generally not be given within 14 days of other vaccines[22] *(added 3/6/2021)*	▪ Mild-to-moderate local and systemic reactions were reported with both vaccines; local adverse effects were more frequent after the second dose ▪ Incidence and severity of systemic adverse events was lower with BNT162b2 than with BNT162b1, particularly in older subjects ▪ Data from this trial were used to support use of BNT162b2 in ongoing phase 3 trials **Limitations:** phase 1 data; cannot determine degree of protection against COVID-19 **FP Polack et al. NEJM 2020[7,9]** *(added 11/9/2020; updated 12/10/2020)* **Population:** adults ≥16 years old who were healthy or had stable chronic medical conditions (n=43,448 randomized; 43,448 received injections) ▪ Exclusion criteria included a medical history of COVID-19, immunocompromising conditions or immunosuppressive therapy ▪ Median age 52 years ▪ 42% of subjects > 55 years old **Design:** ongoing, phase 3, multinational, randomized, placebo-controlled, observer-blinded trial ▪ 2 vaccinations delivered 21 days apart of BNT162b2 (30 mcg/dose) or placebo **Results:** ▪ BNT1621b2 vaccine efficacy rate reported to be 95% (95% credible interval, 90.3 to 97.6) at 28 days after the 1st dose ▪ 170 confirmed cases of COVID-19 with onset at least 7 days after the second dose in patients without evidence of existing or prior SARS-CoV-2 infection;	first dose of an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine not be given the second dose[18] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ 2 patients who had immediate hypersensitivity reactions to the first dose of Moderna vaccine were successfully administered the second vaccine dose using graded doses[61] *(added 4/20/2021)* ▪ CDC states that allergy to polyethylene glycol (PEG; a vaccine ingredient) is a contraindication to vaccination with an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine[18,22]; an allergy to polysorbate (related to PEG, but not a vaccine ingredient) is a precaution to vaccination[22] *(updated 3/6/2021)* ▪ American College of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology (ACAAI) recommend mRNA COVID-19 vaccines be administered in a healthcare setting where anaphylaxis can be treated, and patients should be observed for at least 15-30 minutes after vaccination[19] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ ACAAI states that people with common allergies to medications, foods, inhalants, insects and latex are not more likely than the general public to have an allergic reaction to an mRNA COVID-19 vaccine; data on individuals with a history of allergic reactions to previous vaccinations and/or mast call activation syndrome/idiopathic anaphylaxis is limited[19] *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ Estimated rate of 11.1 cases of anaphylaxis per million doses administered after administration of 1,893,360 first vaccine doses; based on reports to VAERS[25,26] *(added 1/25/2021)*	▪ FDA Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC) voted (17-4, 1 abstention) to recommended emergency authorization of the BNT162b2 vaccine; they note more data are needed on long-term safety, prevention of severe disease, and in certain populations such as pregnant women[11] *(updated 12/10/2020)* ▪ FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to allow administration of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine for prevention of COVID-19 caused by SARS-CoV-2 in persons ≥16 years old; this is the first EUA for a COVID-19 vaccine issued by the FDA[12] *(added 12/11/2020)*; on 5/10/2021 FDA authorized use of the vaccine in persons ≥12 years old *(updated 5/10/2021)* ▪ Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine listed for emergency use by WHO in December 2020[31] *(added 2/16/2021)* ▪ Com-COV study in the UK will evaluate efficacy of using one vaccine for the 1st dose and a different vaccine for the 2nd dose (Oxford/AstraZeneca and Pfizer-BioNTech vaccines will be used) *(added 2/28/2021)* ▪ Pfizer/BioNTech begin trials in children 6 months to 11 years old; expected to enroll >4600 children in US and Europe; manufacturer reports they expect results in the second half of 2021 and authorization request in early 2022 *(added 3/28/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	162 observed in the placebo group and 8 in the vaccine group ▪ In participants with and without evidence of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, 9 cases of COVID-19 occurred in vaccinated subjects and 169 occurred in placebo-treated subjects (94.6% vaccine efficacy) ▪ Vaccine efficacy in adults ≥65 years old was 94.7% ▪ 10 severe cases of COVID-19 reported in the trial; 9 cases in the placebo group and 1 in the vaccine group **Limitations:** preliminary report; not large enough to detect less common adverse events; long-term assessment of efficacy and safety needed; unknown if vaccination prevents asymptomatic infection **S Amit et al. Lancet 2021[33]** *(added 2/27/2021)* **Population:** vaccine-eligible healthcare workers in Isreal (n=9109) **Design:** retrospective cohort study comparing vaccinated vs unvaccinated persons **Results:** ▪ 75% reduction in infections (including asymptomatic infections) 15-28 days after the first dose among vaccinated healthcare workers **Limitations:** observational study; possible underestimation of asymptomatic infection **N Dagan et al. NEJM 2021[35]** *(updated 2/27/2021)* **Population:** vaccinated persons ≥16 years old in Israel (n=596,618 vaccinated persons matched to unvaccinated controls)	▪ Lymphadenopathy was reported in 64 patients in the vaccine group and 6 in the placebo group ▪ FDA noted a numerical imbalance in cases of Bell's palsy (4 in the vaccine group vs 0 in the placebo group) [11]; an analysis using the WHO pharmacovigilance database did not detect a signal of disproportionality of facial paralysis with mRNA COVID-19 vaccines compared with other viral vaccines or influenza vaccines alone[65] *(updated 5/3/2021)* CDC analysis of adverse events reported through VAERS and v-safe after administration of 13.8 million vaccine doses (Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna) found[34] *(added 2/28/2021)*: ▪ most reports were for nonserious events ▪ occurrence of anaphylaxis was within range reported for other vaccines ▪ of 113 reported deaths, most were in residents of long-term care facilities and causes of death were consistent with expected all-cause mortality in this population ▪ adverse reactions were more common after the second dose ▪ A case series in Switzerland reported stage III hypertension occurring in 9 patients within minutes of BNT162b2 vaccination; 8 of 9 patients reported well-controlled hypertension before vaccination[51] *(added 3/29/2021)* ▪ Cases of herpes zoster reactivation in patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic diseases[57] *(added 4/17/2021)*	▪ Vaccine efficacy 92.6% after one dose[38] *(added 2/28/2021)* **Variants:** ▪ In *in vitro* studies, sera containing antibodies from people who received the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine neutralized SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus with mutations, including the N501Y mutation identified in the B.1.1.7 strain detected in the UK variant, with mutations including the E484K and N501Y mutations identified in the South Africa variant, and the P.1 variant identified in Brazil [20,21,23,24,30,37]; neutralizing titers also reported against the B.1.526 (New York) variant[63,64]; neutralizing titers against B.1.617 (India) variant were about 4-fold lower, but expected to be protective[80] *(updated 5/20/2021)* ▪ Neutralizing antibody titers 5.8-fold reduced against B.1.617.2 (Delta) vs wild-type; B.1.1.7 (Alpha) titers reduced 2.6-fold vs wild-type; B.1.351 (Beta) reduced 4.9-fold vs wild-type; increased age and time since vaccine correlated with reduced titers[88] *(added 6/6/2021)* ▪ Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (2 doses) was 96% effective for preventing hospitalization in patients infected with the Delta variant; based on observational data from England *(added 6/15/2021)*[94] ▪ In observational data from Scotland, the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine was 79% effective against infection with Delta variant (2 weeks after the 2nd dose)[98] *(added 6/29/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Design:** observational trial analyzing data from health care organization in Israel **Results:** ▪ 92% effective at preventing COVID-19 (including asymptomatic infection) ≥7 days after the 2nd dose ▪ 94% effective at preventing symptomatic cases ≥ 7 days after the second dose ▪ 92% effective at preventing severe disease ≥ 7 days after the second dose ▪ After the first dose (14-20 days), the estimated effectiveness was 46% for any infection, 57% for symptomatic infection, 74% for hospitalization, 62% for severe disease, and 72% in preventing death ▪ some have reported this may suggest the vaccine could reduce transmission, but more data are needed ▪ the vaccine was as effective in older patients as it was in younger patients **Limitations:** observational data **MI Samanovic et al medRxiv 2021[39]** *(added 2/28/2021)* **Population:** subjects who received 2 BNT162b2 vaccine doses (n=32) **Design:** evaluation of antibody response using blood samples ▪ Subjects SARS-CoV-2 naïve vs subjects with prior exposure **Results:** ▪ Robust immune response reported after both doses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve subjects ▪ In subjects with prior exposure to SARS-CoV-2 immune responses after the 2nd vaccine dose were lower than after the first dose **Limitations:** not peer reviewed **L Stamatatos et al medRxiv 2021[40]** *(added 2/28/2021)*	▪ Registry-based study reported 414 cutaneous reactions to mRNA COVID-19 vaccines between December 2020 and February 2021; reactions included large local reactions, injection-site reactions, urticarial eruptions, morbilliform eruptions; less common reactions included pernio/chilblains, cosmetic filler reactions, zoster, herpes simplex flares, and pityriasis rosea-like reactions *(added 5/8/2021)* ▪ Of 1422 reports of postvaccination reactions submitted to a COVID-19 vaccine allergy case registry, 510 were delayed large local reactions; of these events, 55 (11%) were in blacks, Indigenous persons, and people of color; most reactions occurred after the first vaccine dose; mean time from vaccination to onset was 8 days; 11 patients had reactions other than at the injection site (diffuse itching, hives, other rash, angioedema) *(added 6/9/2021)*[92] EMA Pharmacovigilence Risk Assessment Committee (PRAC) investigating reports of myocarditis and CDC evaluated data reported to the v-safe surveillance system, v-safe pregnancy registry, and vaccine adverse event reporting system (VAERS) from December 14, 2020-February 28, 2021[62] ▪ pericarditis and recommended adding facial swelling in people with dermal fillers as a side effect of the Pfizer vaccine (*5/8/2021*)	▪ Israel Ministry of Health reports vaccine effectiveness of 65% with Delta variant circulating in Israel; they not it maintains effectiveness of 93% against serious illness and hospitalization[101] *(added 7/15/2021)* ▪ In a study in Canada, vaccine efficacy against **Alpha** was 89% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 92% after 2 doses of Moderna, and 64% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Beta/Gamma** 84% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 77% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 48% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca; against **Delta** 87% after 2 doses of Pfizer/BioNTech, 72% after 1 dose of Moderna, and 67% after 1 dose of AstraZeneca[102] *(added 7/15/2021)* ▪ 2 cases of vaccine breakthrough infections were reported in a cohort of 417 persons who received the 2nd BNT162b2 dose 2 weeks earlier; variants of likely clinical importance including E484K, T95I, del142-144, and D614G were detected *(added 5/9/2021)*[72] ▪ Pfizer developing booster vaccine against variants *(added 1/30/2021)* **Pregnancy and Lactation:** ▪ American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends that COVID-19 vaccines should not be withheld from pregnant women and should be offered to lactating individuals who meet criteria for vaccination based on ACIP-recommended priority groups;

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Population:** subjects who were previously infected and recovered from SARS-CoV-2 and then later received 1 mRNA vaccine dose (n=10) **Design:** neutralization study using sera of volunteers **Results:** ▪ Before vaccination sera weakly neutralized Wuhan-Hu-1 and sporadically neutralized the variant virus B.1.351 ▪ Vaccination increased neutralizing antibody titers against both strains by 1000-fold **Limitations:** not peer reviewed **J Lopez Bernal et al. medRxiv 2021[42]** *(added 3/8/2021)* **Population:** older adults in the UK who received the Pfizer/BioNTech or AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine **Design:** test negative case control **Results:** ▪ The B.1.117 variant was prominent in the UK during the period of this study ▪ Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine efficacy ~60-70% after 1 dose and ~85-90% after 2 doses; AstraZeneca vaccine was ~60-75% effective after 1 dose ▪ Patients who were infected after 1 dose of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine were 43% less likely to be hospitalized and 51% less likely to die compared to those who were not vaccinated; patients who received 1 dose of the AstraZeneca vaccine were 37% less likely to be hospitalized **Limitations:** observational; not peer reviewed **F Krammer et al. NEJM 2021[43]** *(added 3/15/2021)*	▪ FDA Fact Sheet now has a warning describing a risk of syncope following injection; the risk is higher in adolescents than in adults[13] *(added 5/19/2021)* ▪ In a trial evaluating vaccine mixing, greater systemic reactogenicity (feverishness, chills, fatigue, headache, joint pain, malaise, and muscle ache) was reported following heterologous vaccine schedules compared to their homologous counterparts[77] (see RH Shaw et al in Efficacy column; *added 5/19/2021*) ▪ In an analysis of VAERS data the incidence of sudden sensorineural hearing loss after COVID-19 vaccination did not exceed that of the general population[88] *(added 6/6/2021)* ▪ FDA identified 4 potential adverse events of interest via near real-time surveillance in the Medicare healthcare claims database of persons 65 years and older who received the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine; the adverse events of interest are: pulmonary embolism, acute myocardial infarction, immune thrombocytopenia, and disseminated intravascular coagulation; other vaccine reporting systems have not identified an association with vaccines and these adverse events of interest; FDA states no need to delay vaccination to wait for investigation results[103] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Myocarditis:** ▪ CDC investigating reports of myocarditis following mRNA vaccines; currently there are few reports and most cases appear to be mild; according to CDC, these cases	BNT162b2 has not been tested in pregnant women in clinical trials[14,15] *(added 12/16/2020)* ▪ ACIP/CDC state vaccine can be administered to pregnant or lactating women[22] *(added 3/6/2021)* ▪ CDC analysis of data reported to V-safe in pregnant women who received the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (>30,000) found that most adverse events in pregnant women were not related to pregnancy (e.g., local and systemic reactions); pregnancy-specific adverse events were within known background rates[44] *(added 3/15/2021)* ▪ A prospective cohort study including 131 reproductive-age vaccine recipients (84 pregnant, 31 lactating, 16 non-pregnant) reported immunogenicity and reactogenicity in pregnant and lactating women was similar to that in non-pregnant women; antibodies were present in umbilical cord blood and breast milk[50] *(added 3/29/2021)* ▪ Prospective cohort study in Israel reported secretion of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgA and IgG antibodies in breast milk for 6 weeks after breastfeeding women were vaccinated with the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine; no serious adverse events were reported in mothers or infants during the study period[59] *(added 4/19/2021)* *(added 4/22/2021)* ▪ 35,691 participants 16-54 years old identified as pregnant ▪ Injection-site pain reported more frequently in pregnant women than in

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ In subjects who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA vaccine, those who were seronegative at baseline had variable and relatively low antibody responses 9-12 days after vaccination, while subjects who were seropositive at baseline had rapid development of high antibody titers ▪ Antibody titers were 10-45 times higher in those with preexisting immunity than in those without **BJ Boyarsky et al. JAMA 2021[45]** *(added 3/15/2021)* **Population:** transplant recipients vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 with 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine in the US (n=436) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 48% received the Moderna vaccine and 52% received the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine ▪ Maintenance immunosuppression regimens included tacrolimus (83%), corticosteroids (54%), mycophenolate (66%), azathioprine (9%), sirolimus (4%), everolimus (2%) ▪ 76/436 patients (17%) a had detectable antibody response ▪ Recipients receiving anti-metabolite maintenance immunosuppression were less likely than those who were not to develop an antibody response (37% vs 63%; adjusted incidence rate ratio [IRR] 0.22, 95% CI 0.15-0.34; p<0.001) ▪ Older patients were less likely to develop an antibody response than younger patients (adjusted IRR 0.83 per 10 years, 95% CI 0.73-0.93, p=0.002) ▪ Antibody response was more likely with Moderna vaccine than Pfizer/BioNTech	seem to occur predominantly in adolescents and young adults, more often in males than females, more often following the 2nd dose than the 1st, and typically within 4 days after vaccination; rates of myocarditis after vaccination have not exceeded expected baseline rates[87] *(added 5/27/2021)* ▪ CDC reviewing cases of myocarditis/pericarditis after mRNA vaccination (285 of 475 reported cases investigated as of 5/31/2021)[95] *(added 6/15/2021)* ▪ Most cases occurred after 2nd dose ▪ Most occurred in patients 16-24 years old ▪ Median time to onset 2 days (after dose 2) ▪ 79% occurred in males ▪ 81% had full recovery of symptoms ▪ There were more reported cases than expected ▪ As of 6/21/2021, 616 reports made to VAERS; CDC/FDA confirmed 393 reports *(added 6/28/2021)*[97] ▪ A warning statement about the risk of myocarditis is now included in the FDA fact sheets for the Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna mRNA vaccines[13,96] (*added 6/28/2021*) ▪ ACIP concludes benefits of vaccine outweigh risk of myocarditis[105] *(added 7/15/2021)*	non-pregnant women; headache, myalgia, chills, and fever reported less often ▪ 827 of 3958 women in the v-safe pregnancy registry had a completed pregnancy; of these, 115 (13.9%) resulted in pregnancy loss and 712 (86.1%) resulted in a live birth (mostly women vaccinated in 3rd trimester) ▪ Preterm birth occurred in 9.4% and small size for gestational age in 3.2% ▪ No neonatal deaths were reported ▪ Calculated proportions of adverse pregnancy and neonatal outcomes in women vaccinated against COVID-19 who had a completed pregnancy were similar to incidences reported in studies in pregnant women before COVID-19; not direct comparison ▪ Among 221 adverse events related to pregnancy that were reported to VAERS, spontaneous abortion was the most frequent (46 cases) ▪ No obvious safety signals found in this preliminary report ▪ Report states more follow-up needed ▪ In a prospective cohort study in 103 women (30 were pregnant and 16 were lactating) who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, immunogenicity was reported in all women and vaccine-elicited antibodies were found in infant cord blood and breast milk; antibody titers against B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants were reduced, but T-cell responses were preserved[74] *(added 5/19/2021)* ▪ A retrospective cohort study in Israel compared 7350 vaccinated pregnant

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	vaccine (69% vs 31%, IRR 2.15, 95% CI 1.29-3.57; p=0.003) **Limitations:** no control group, convenience sample, lack of serial measurements after vaccine, only response after 1st dose **BJ Boyarsky et al. JAMA 2021[71]** *(added 5/9/2021)* **Population:** transplant recipients vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 with 2 doses of an mRNA vaccine in the US (n=658) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 1st dose results in 396 of these patients reported previously (see Boyarsky et al above) ▪ Maintenance immunosuppression regimens included tacrolimus (83%), corticosteroids (54%), mycophenolate (66%), azathioprine (9%), sirolimus (4%), everolimus (2%) ▪ 98/658 patients (15%) a had detectable antibody response at a median of 21 days after dose 1 ▪ 357/658 patients (54%) a had detectable antibody response at a median of 29 days after dose 2 ▪ Of the 658 patients, 98 (15%) had measurable antibody response after dose 1 and 2, 301 (46%) had no antibody response after dose 1 or dose 2, and 259 (39%) had no antibody response after dose 1 but did have antibody response after dose 2 ▪ Of 473 patients receiving anti-metabolites, 38 (8%) had antibody response after dose 1 and 2, 268 (57%) had no antibody response after dose 1 or 2, and 167 (35%) had no antibody		women with 7530 matched unvaccinated controls; SARS-CoV-2 infection was reported in 118 women in the vaccinated group and in 202 women in the unvaccinated group; adjusted hazard ratio 0.22 (95% CI 0.11-0.43); no severe adverse events were reported[100] *(added 7/13/2021)* ▪ In a small study in 7 breastfeeding women, there were no detectable levels of vaccine RNA in breast milk samples collected from 4 to 48 hours after vaccination[104] *(added 7/15/2021)* **Vaccine Storage:** ▪ Ultra-cold (-97 to -112° F/-60 to -80° C) freezer conditions required for vaccine storage ▪ Cartons of the vaccine arrive in thermal containers with dry ice; vials should be removed immediately and stored in ultra-cold freezers; if ultra-cold freezer storage is not available, the thermal container may be used for temporary storage when consistently re-filled to the top with dry ice[13] *(added 12/11/2020)* ▪ FDA has authorized transportation and storage of undiluted vaccine vials at common pharmaceutical freezer temperatures of -25 to -15°C (-13 to 5° F) for a total period of up to 2 weeks; frozen vials stored at this alternative freezer temperature may be returned one time to the recommended ultra-cold storage conditions[32] *(added 2/27/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	response after dose 1 but did have antibody response after dose 2 ▪ Antibody levels were below those reported in immunocompetent persons who were vaccinated **Limitations:** no control group, convenience sample, lack of serial measurements after vaccine **<u>NEJM Correspondence 2021</u>[46-48]** *(added 3/23/2021)* **2 California Healthcare Systems (UCSD and UCLA)[46]** ▪ 36,659 health care workers were vaccinated with a 1st mRNA vaccine dose between December 16, 2020 and February 9, 2021; 77% received the 2nd dose ▪ 379 persons tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 ≥1 day after vaccination; most (71%) of positive tests were in the 1st 2 weeks after vaccination ▪ After both vaccine doses, 37 persons tested positive; 22 were <7days after the 2nd dose; only 8 workers tested positive 8-14 days after the 2nd dose and 7 did so ≥15 days after the 2nd dose **Texas Medical Center (UTSW)** ▪ 59% of 23,234 employees received a 1st mRNA vaccine dose and 30% received a 2nd dose within 31 days of December 15, 2020 ▪ Between December 15, 2020 and January 28, 2021, SARS-CoV-2 infections were reported in 234 of 8969 nonvaccinated employees, 112 of 6144 partially vaccinated employees, and 4 of 8121 fully vaccinated employees **Jerusalem Medical Center (HHUMC)[48]**		▪ Vials may be thawed and then stored undiluted in the refrigerator (35-46° F /2 -8° C) for up to 1 month[13,79] *(updated 5/20/2021)* ▪ For immediate use, undiluted vials may be thawed and stored at room temperature for no more than 2 hours; vials must reach room temperature before dilution[13] *(added 12/11/2020)* ▪ After dilution, vials may be stored be at 35 to 77° F (2 to 25° C) and used within 6 hours from the time of dilution[13] *(added 12/11/2020)* ▪ Vaccine must be diluted with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection, USP that is not supplied with the vaccine[13] *(added 12/11/2020)* ▪ Vials should be protected from light ▪ If a vial contains enough liquid after dilution for administration of >5 full doses, those extra doses may be used, but residual vaccine from multiple vials should not be combined to form a full dose *(added 1/19/2021)* ▪ FDA fact sheet updated to indicate vials contain 6 doses of 0.3 mL; a low dead-volume syringe and/or needle is recommended to withdraw the 6 doses from the vial *(added 1/25/2021)*

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ Among workers vaccinated with the Pfizer vaccine the weekly incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection declined **A Angyal et al. Preprints with The Lancet 2021[49]** *(added 3/26/2021)* **Population:** health care workers 22-71 years old in the UK **Design:** observational cohort study ▪ Measurement of antibody and T-cell responses before and after 1 dose of BNT162b2 ▪ Compared responses in subjects with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection to those with no evidence of prior infection **Results:** ▪ Higher antibody titers and T-cell responses reported after a single vaccine dose in persons with previous SARS-CoV-2 infections than in infection-naïve persons ▪ Plasma from previously infected persons showed higher *in vitro* neutralization of the B.1.351 variant compared to infection-naïve persons **Limitations:** preprint; observational data **MG Thompson et al. HEROES-RECOVER MMWR 2021[53]** *(added 3/29/2021; updated 6/8/2021)* **Population:** health care personnel, first responders, and other essential/frontline workers in the US who were routinely tested for SARS-CoV-2 for 13 weeks (n=3950) **Design:** prospective cohort **Results:** ▪ 2479 (62.8%) received both mRNA doses and 477 (12.1%) received only 1 dose		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ There were 1.38 SARS-CoV-2 infections per 1,000 person-days among unvaccinated persons, 0.04 infections per 1,000 person-days among fully-vaccinated persons, and 0.19 infections per 1,000 person-days among partially immunized persons **Effectiveness under real-world conditions:** ▪ 90% ≥14 days after 2nd dose ▪ 80% ≥14 days after 1st dose, but before second dose ▪ 22.9% of infections were medically attended, including 2 hospitalizations (there were 0 deaths) **Updated Analysis, CDC[91]** *(added 6/9/2021)* ▪ 3975 subjects; completed weekly testing for 17 weeks ▪ Risk of infection reduced by 91% in fully vaccinated ▪ Risk of infection reduced 81% in partially vaccinated ▪ Vaccinated subjects who developed COVID-19 had milder and shorter illness compared to unvaccinated subjects (6 fewer days sick, 2 fewer days sick in bed) ▪ 60% lower risk of developing symptoms in vaccinated persons compared to unvaccinated ▪ 40% lower viral load and 6 fewer days of detectable virus in vaccinated vs unvaccinated **Limitations:** moderately wide confidence intervals partly because of limited number of infections **A Britton et al. MMWR 2021[54]** *(added 3/29/2021)* **Population:** residents of 2 skilled nursing facilities in CT (n=463)		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Design:** retrospective cohort **Results:** ▪ Efficacy >14 days after dose 1 through 7 days after dose 2 of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine was 63% **Limitations:** small sample size **RW Frenck et al. NEJM 2021[55]** *(added 3/31/3021; updated 5/27/2021)* **Population:** adolescents 12-15 years of age, with or without prior evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection, in the US (n=2260) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial ▪ 2 doses of BNT162b2 or placebo 21 days apart **Results:** ▪ Vaccine efficacy 100%; 16 cases of COVID-19 in the placebo group (n=1129) vs 0 in the vaccine group (n=1131) ≥7 days after the second dose ▪ SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing antibody geometric mean titers (GMTs) of 1239.5 reported one month after the 2nd dose (GMTs were 705.1 in earlier trial in participants 16-25 years old); the geometric mean ratio of SARS-CoV-2 50% neutralizing titers after dose 2 in subjects 12 to 15 years old relative to subjects 16-25 years old was 1.76 and met the criteria for noninferiority ▪ Side effects consistent with those observed in participants 16-25 years old in previous trials; injection-site pain, fatigue, and headache were most common **Limitations:** only short-term data on safety and efficacy available **T Kustin et al. medRxiv 2021[58]**		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	*(added 4/17/2021)* **Population**: individuals with documented SARS-CoV-2 infection (symptomatic or asymptomatic) identified in a health care organization in Israel **Design:** case-control study ▪ Investigated whether persons with SARS-CoV-2 infection who had received a BNT162b2 vaccine were more likely to become infected with B.1.1.7 or B.1.351 compared with unvaccinated controls ▪ 2 categories of vaccinated carriers: those with a positive test between 14 days after the 1st dose and a week after the 2nd dose and those with a positive test at least 1 week after the 2nd dose **Results:** ▪ B.1.1.7 was predominant strain in Israel during sample period ▪ Frequency of B.1.351 infection was less than 1% ▪ Vaccinated persons who were infected ≥1 week after the 2nd dose were disproportionately infected with B.1.351 (OR 8.1) ▪ Vaccinees infected between 2 weeks after the 1st dose and 1 week after the second dose were disproportionality infected with B.1.1.7 (OR 26.10) **Limitations:** not peer reviewed; observational data; only able to evaluate high viral load cases; not intended to determine efficacy **<u>CDC report (data based on persons vaccinated with any 1 of the 3 vaccines authorized in the US)</u>[60]** *(added 4/20/2021; updated 6/6/2021)* ▪ 5814 vaccine breakthrough infections out of >75 million vaccinated persons in the US		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ 2622 (45%) were ≥60 years old ▪ 3752 (65%) in women ▪ 1695 (29%) asymptomatic ▪ 396 (7%) hospitalized; of those, 133 (34%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID19 ▪ 74 (1%) died; of those, 9 (12%) were asymptomatic or death was unrelated to COVID-19 **MMWR Report[85]:** *(added 5/26/2021)* ▪ As of April 30, 2021 10,262 vaccine breakthrough cases reported in the US out of ~101 million vaccinated persons ▪ 6446 (63%) were in women ▪ Median patient age: 58 years ▪ 2725 (27%) were asymptomatic ▪ 995 (10%) were hospitalized; of these 289 (29%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ 160 (2%) died; of these, 28 (18%) were asymptomatic or unrelated to COVID-19 ▪ Median age of patients who died: 82 years ▪ Sequence data was available for 555 (5%); of these 356 (64%) were variants of concern (B1.1.7 in 199 [56%], B.1.429 in 88 [25%], B1.427 in 28 [8%], P.1 in 28 [8%], and B.1.351 in 13 [4%]) **June 1st Report** (CDC now monitoring only hospitalized or fatal cases instead of all cases) ▪ 3016 hospitalized or fatal vaccine breakthrough cases out of >135 million people ▪ 2334 (77%) were ≥65 years old ▪ 1492 (49%) in women ▪ 502 (17%) asymptomatic ▪ 2854 (95%) hospitalized; of those 654 (23%) reported as asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ 535 (18%) fatal cases; of those, 88 (16%) were asymptomatic or not related to COVID-19 **VJ Hall et al. Lancet 2021[66]** *(added 5/5/2021)* **Population:** health care staff ≥18 years old working in publicly-funded hospitals in the UK (n=23,324) **Design:** prospective cohort ▪ Patients assigned to positive cohort (antibody positive or history of infection [previous positivity of antibody or PCR tests] or negative cohort (antibody negative with no previous positive test) **Results:** ▪ Dominant variant in circulation during this study was B.1.1.7 ▪ Vaccine coverage was 89% (94% of those received the BNT162b2 vaccine) ▪ Total follow-up was 2 months ▪ 977 new infections in the unvaccinated cohort (incidence density 14 infections per 10,000 person-days) ▪ 71 new infections 21 or more days after 1st vaccine dose (incidence density 8 infections per 10,000 person-days) and 9 infections 7 days after the second dose (incidence density 4 infections per 10,000 person-days) in the vaccinated cohort ▪ In the unvaccinated cohort: 543 (56%) of participants had typical COVID-19 symptoms and 140 (14%) were asymptomatic on or 14 days before positive PCR ▪ In the vaccinated cohort: 29 (36%) had typical COVID-19 symptoms and 15 (19%) were asymptomatic		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ Vaccine effectiveness was 70% at 21 days after the first dose and 85% at 7 days after the second dose **Limitations:** timing of testing may have influenced results; high vaccine coverage in study population may not be generalizable **<u>Y Angel et al. JAMA 2021</u>** *(added 5/8/2021)* **Population:** health care workers in Israel who were regularly screened for SARS-CoV-2 infection via PCR testing (n=6710) **Design:** retrospective cohort study ▪ Compared incidence of infection between fully vaccinated and unvaccinated health care workers **Results:** ▪ 5953 (88.7%) received at least 1 dose, 5517 (82.2%) received 2 doses, and 757 (11.3%) were not vaccinated ▪ Lower incidence of symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection ▪ Symptomatic infection occurred in 8 vaccinated health care workers and 38 unvaccinated health care workers (incidence rate of 4.7 vs 149.8 per 100,000 person-days, respectively) ▪ Asymptomatic infection occurred in 19 fully vaccinated health care workers and 17 unvaccinated health care workers (incidence rate 11.3 vs 67.0 per 100,000 person-days) ▪ Adjusted incidence rate ratio (IRR) of 0.03 for symptomatic infection (95% CI 0.01-0.06) and 0.14 for asymptomatic infection (95% CI 0.07-0.31) >7 days after the 2nd dose ▪ Adjusted IRR corresponding to estimated vaccine effectiveness of 97% for symptomatic infection and 86% for asymptomatic infection		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Limitations:** observational study **Abu-Raddad et al. NEJM 2021[69]** *(added 5/8/2021)* **Population:** cases of SARS-CoV-2 in persons vaccinated with the Pfizer/BioNTech BNT162b2 vaccine compared to unvaccinated persons in Qatar **Design:** test-negative case-control **Results:** ▪ Estimated vaccine effectiveness against infection with B.1.1.7 variant was 89.5% and against the B.1.351 variant was 75.0% ≥14 days after the second dose ▪ Vaccine effectiveness against severe, critical, or fatal disease due to infection with any SARS-CoV-2 variant was 97.4% (B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 were predominant) **Limitations:** observational; limited data **L Tang et al. JAMA 2021[70]** *(added 5/9/2021)* **Population:** routinely screened health care workers eligible for vaccination at St. Jude Children's Research Hospital (n=5217) **Design:** observational cohort study **Results:** ▪ 3052 (58.5%) received 1 vaccine dose, 2776 (53.2%) received 2 vaccine doses, 2165 (41.5%) unvaccinated ▪ Median follow-up 81 days in unvaccinated group and 72 days in vaccinated group ▪ 51 vaccinated health care workers had a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result; 29 (56.9%) were diagnosed through asymptomatic screening ▪ 185 unvaccinated health care workers tested positive; 79 (42.7%) were asymptomatic		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ The incidence rate ratio (IRR) was 0.21 (95% CI 0.15-0.28) for any SARS-CoV-2 infection, 0.28 (95% CI 0.18-0.42) for asymptomatic cases, and 0.16 (95% CI 0.10-0.25) for symptomatic or known exposure cases **Limitations:** observational; small cohort; short follow-up **H Parry et al. MedRxiv 2021[75]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population**: 172 people >80 years old who were vaccinated with BNT162b2 with either a standard 3 weeks interval between doses or an extended interval schedule (12 weeks) **Design:** population-based cohort study **Results:** ▪ Peak antibody response was 3.5-fold higher in subjects who were vaccinated on the extended interval schedule ▪ Cellular immune responses were 3.6-fold lower **Limitations:** small sample size; cohort study; not published or peer-reviewed **SY Wong et al. Gastroenterology 2021[76]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population:** Patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) who were vaccinated with the Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA COVID-19 vaccine (n=48) **Design:** 48 vaccinated IBD patients were compared to 2 control groups consisting of 14 completely vaccinated healthcare workers and 29 vaccinated healthy volunteers without IBD **Results:** ▪ 85% of patients receiving a biologic (including TNF inhibitors, vedolizumab, and ustekinumab) at time of vaccination		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	▪ All vaccinated IBD patients demonstrated serological responses **Limitations:** small sample size; single center **RH Shaw Lancet 2021[77]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population:** subjects ≥50 years old with no or mild-to-moderate, well controlled comorbidity in the UK (n=830) **Design:** multicenter, participant-masked, randomized heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccination study Subjects randomized to 1 of 4 vaccine schedules administered 28 or 84 days apart: ▪ AstraZeneca/AstraZeneca ▪ AstraZeneca/Pfizer-BioNTech ▪ Pfizer-BioNTech/Pfizer-BioNTech ▪ Pfizer-BioNTech/AstraZeneca **Results:** ▪ Reactogenicity results reported for 436 subjects who received vaccines at 28-day intervals ▪ Greater systemic reactogenicity was reported following heterologous vaccine schedules compared to their homologous counterparts ▪ Adverse effects that were reported in more subjects who received a heterologous vaccine schedule included feverishness, chills, fatigue, headache, joint pain, malaise, and muscle ache ▪ There were no hospitalizations due to these adverse reactions ▪ No thrombocytopenia was reported in any group at 7 days post-boost ▪ Efficacy results expected in June 2021 **Limitations:** interim results; only subjects ≥ 50 years old		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**EM White et al. NEJM 2021[78]** *(added 5/19/2021)* **Population:** nursing home residents in 280 nursing homes across 21 states in the US **Design:** review of immunization records identified residents who: ▪ received 1 dose of an mRNA vaccine ▪ received 2 doses of an mRNA vaccine ▪ were present on the day of the first facility vaccination clinic but who were not vaccinated **Results:** ▪ 18242 vaccinated residents (80.4% Pfizer/BioNTech and 19.6% Moderna) and 3990 unvaccinated residents ▪ Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection decreased over time in residents who were vaccinated and in those who were not vaccinated ▪ After 1st vaccine dose: 822 incident cases (4.5% of vaccinated residents) occurred within 14 days and 250 cases (1.4%) at 15-28 days ▪ After 2nd vaccine dose: 130 cases (1.0%) occurred within 14 days and 38 cases (0.3%) after >14 days ▪ Unvaccinated residents: 173 cases (4.3%) within 14 days of 1st vaccination clinic and 12 cases (0.3%) >42 days after the clinic ▪ Most infections were asymptomatic **Limitations:** observational data **FS Vahidy et al. medRxiv 2021[82]** *(added 5/20/2021)* **Population:** established patients in a healthcare system in the US who were vaccinated with an mRNA vaccine, partially vaccinated with an mRNA vaccine, or not vaccinated through April 4, 2021 (n=91, 134) **Design:** retrospective cohort		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Results:** ▪ 70.2% not vaccinated, 4.5% partially vaccinated, 25.4% fully vaccinated ▪ Hospitalization occurred in 0.7% of fully vaccinated patients, 3.4% of partially vaccinated patients, and 2.7% of unvaccinated patients ▪ 255 deaths occurred in patients hospitalized with COVID-19; of those, 219 (97.3%) were in unvaccinated patients, 5 (2.2%) were in partially vaccinated patients, and 1 (0.0041%) in a fully vaccinated patient ▪ Full vaccination was reported to be 96% effective at preventing COVID-19 hospitalization and 98.7% effective at preventing death ▪ Partial vaccination was reported to be 77% effective at preventing hospitalization and 64.2% effective at preventing death **Limitations:** observational data; not published or peer reviewed **J Lopez Bernal et al. 2021[84]** *(added 5/26/2021)* **Population:** subjects vaccinated with the BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1 vaccine in the UK (n=12,675 sequenced cases) **Design:** test negative case control **Results:** ▪ Of 12,675 cases, 11,621 were B.1.1.7 and 1054 were B.1.617.2 ▪ Vaccine effectiveness after 2 doses of BNT162b2 against the B.1.617.2 variant was 87.9% compared to 93.4% against B.1.1.7 ▪ Vaccine effectiveness after 1 dose of BNT162b2 was 33.2% against B.1.617.2 and 49.2% against B.1.1.7 **Limitations:** observational data; preprint report		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**RH Haberman et al. Ann Rheum Dis 2021[86]** *(added 5/27/2021)* **Population:** ▪ established patients in a New York Hospital system with immune-mediated inflammatory diseases receiving methotrexate, anti-cytokine biologics or both who were receiving the BNT162b2 vaccine (n=51) ▪ healthy subjects served as controls (n=26) ▪ a second, independent validation cohort of controls (n=182) and patients with immune-mediated inflammatory diseases (n=31) evaluated for humoral immune response **Design:** cohort study **Results:** ▪ After vaccination, adequate antibody responses were observed in 98.1% of healthy controls, 91.9% of patients on biologic treatments and 62.2% of patients taking methotrexate (p<0.001) ▪ Activated CD8+ T cell response was not induced after vaccination in subjects on methotrexate **Limitations:** observational, small sample size **MW Tenforde et al. MMWR 2021[90]** *(added 6/9/2021)* **Population:** adults ≥65 years old at 24 hospitals in 14 states (n=417) **Design:** test negative case control **Results:** ▪ Adjusted vaccine efficacy against COVID-19 hospitalization was 94% for full vaccination and 64% for partial vaccination		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Limitations:** small sample size; wide confidence intervals; observational; interim analysis with self-reported data **L Monin et al. Lancet Oncol 2021[93]** *(added 6/9/2021)* **Population:** cancer patients and healthy controls recruited from 3 London hospitals who were vaccinated with the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (n=151 cancer patients and 54 healthy controls) **Design:** prospective observational study **Results:** ▪ Proportion of positive anti-S IgG titers at 21 days following vaccine dose 1 were 32 of 34 (94%) healthy controls, 21 of 56 (38%) of patients with solid cancer, and 8 of 44 (18%) of patients with hematological cancer ▪ 2 weeks after vaccine dose 12 of 12 (100%) healthy controls, 18 of 19 (95%) of patients with solid cancer, and 3 of 5 (60%) of patients with hematological cancers were seropositive ▪ Injection-site pain was the most common adverse reaction ▪ No vaccine-related toxicities were reported **Limitations:** interim analysis; insufficient power to assess 21 day boost; no matched control group or nonvaccinated control group **AM Borobia et al. Lancet 2021[99]** *(added 6/29/2021)* **Population:** adults 18-60 years old in Spain who were vaccinated with a single dose of ChAdOx1-S 8-12 weeks before screening (n=676) **Design:** phase 2, open-label, randomized trial ▪ Subjects randomized 2:1 to BNT162b2 or maintain observation (control group)		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
BNT162b1 and BNT162b2 (continued)	**Results:** ▪ At day 14, geometric mean titres of receptor binding domain antibodies, and IgG against trimeric spike protein were significantly increased from baseline ▪ Injection-site pain and induration, headache, and myalgia were the most common adverse events **Limitations:** ongoing trial; not compared to a control group that received a 2nd dose of ChAdOx1-S		

1. LA Jackson et al. An mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 – preliminary report. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:1920.
2. KS Corrbett et al. Evaluation of the mRNA-1273 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in nonhuman primates.
3. MJ Mulligan et al. Phase 1/2 study of COVID-19 RNA vaccine BNT162b1 in adults. Nature 2020 August 12 (epub).
4. Pfizer. COVID-19 R&D. Available at: https://s21.q4cdn.com/317678438/files/doc_presentations/2020/09/Covid-19-Programs_FINAL.pdf. Accessed September 18, 2020.
5. EJ Anderson et al. Safety and immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccine in older adults. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2427.
6. EE Walsh et al. Safety and immunogenicity of two RNA-based Covid-19 vaccine candidates. N Engl J Med 2020 October 14 (epub).
7. Press release. Pfizer and BioNTech conclude phase 3 study of COVID-19 vaccine candidate, meeting all primary efficacy endpoints. Available at: https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-conclude-phase-3-study-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed November 18, 2020.
8. LR Baden et al. Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. N Engl J Med 2021; 384: 403.
9. FP Polack et al. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2603.
10. AT Widge et al. Durability of responses after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccination. N Engl J Med 2020 December 3 (epub).
11. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee Meeting. FDA Briefing Document. Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. December 10, 2020. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/144245/download. Accessed December 10, 2020.
12. FDA. FDA News Release. FDA takes key action in fight against COVID-19 by issuing emergency use authorization for first COVID-19 vaccine. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-takes-key-action-fight-against-covid-19-issuing-emergency-use-authorization-first-covid-19. Accessed December 12, 2020.
13. FDA. Fact sheet for healthcare providers administering vaccine (vaccination providers). Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the Pfiizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine to prevent coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/144413/download. Accessed June 28, 2021.
14. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Vaccinating pregnant and lactating patients against COVID-19. Practice advisory. December 13, 2020. Available at: https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19. Accessed December 21, 2020.
15. K Dooling et al. The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices' interim recommendation for allocating initial supplies of COVID-19 vaccine – United States, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020; 69:1857. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6949e1.htm. Accessed December 16, 2020.
16. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee Meeting. FDA Briefing Document. Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. December 17, 2020. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/144434/download. Accessed December 17, 2020.
17. FDA. Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine EUA Letter of Authorization. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/144636/download?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed December 18, 2020.
18. CDC. COVID-19 vaccines and allergic reactions. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/allergic-reaction.html#:~:text=If%20you%20have%20had%20a,not%20get%20the%20second%20dose. Accessed January 1, 2021.
19. American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology updates guidance on risk of allergic reactions to mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. Available at: https://acaai.org/news/american-college-allergy-asthma-and-immunology-updates-guidance-risk-allergic-reactions-mrna. Accessed January 1, 2021.
20. News Release. Pfizer/BioNTech. An in vitro study shows Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine elicits antibodies that neutralize SARS-CoV-2 with a mutation associated with rapid transmission. 2021 January 8. Available at: https://pfe-pfizercom-d8-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/2021-01/N501Y_Mutant_SARS-CoV-2_Preprint_Statement_VF.pdf?TULSDANd2JQHgwdPYqau3.8BInFvW.od. Accessed January 11, 2021.
21. X Xie et al. Neutralization of n501Y mutant SARS-CoV-2 by BNT162b2 vaccine-elicited sera. bioRxiv 2021 January 7 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.07.425740v1.full.pdf. Accessed January 11, 2021.

22. CDC. Interim clinical consideration for use of COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized in the United States. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-by-product/clinical-considerations.html. Accessed March 6, 2021.
23. A Muik et al. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 pseudovirus by BNT162b2 vaccine-elicited human sera. bioRxiv 2021 January 19. Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.18.426984v1. Accessed January 25, 2021.
24. News Release. Pfizer/BioNTech publish results of study showing COVID-19 vaccine elicits antibodies that neutralize pseudovirus bearing the SARS-CoV-2 U.K. strain spike protein in cell culture. Available at: https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-puresults-study-showing-covid-19. Accessed January 25, 2021.
25. Allergic reactions including anaphylaxis after receipt of the first dose of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine – United States, December 14-23, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021; 70:46. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7002e1.htm. Accessed January 25, 2021.
26. T Shimabukuro and N Nair. Allergic reactions including anaphylaxis after receipt of the first dose of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine. JAMA 2021 January 21 (epub).
27. Allergic reactions including anaphylaxis after receipt of the first dose of Moderna COVID-19 vaccine – United States, December 21,2020-January 10, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021 January 22 (epub). Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7004e1.htm. Accessed January 25, 2021.
28. News Release. Moderna COVID-19 vaccine retains neutralizing activity against emerging variants first identified in the U.K. and the Republic of South Africa. January 25, 2021. Available at: https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/moderna-covid-19-vaccine-retains-neutralizing-activity-against. Accessed January 25, 2021.
29. K Wu et al. mRNA-1273 vaccine induces neutralizing antibodies against spike mutants from global SARS-CoV-2 variants. bioRxiv. 2021 January 25. Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.25.427948v1. Accessed January 25, 2021.
30. X Xie et al. Neutralization of spike 69/70 deletion, E484K, and N501Y SARS-CoV-2 by BNT162b2 vaccine elicited sera. bioRxiv 2021 January 27. Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.27.427998v1. Accessed January 30, 2021.
31. News Release. WHO issues its first emergency use validation for a COVID-19 vaccine and emphasizes need for equitable global access. 2020 December 31. Available at: https://www.who.int/news/item/31-12-2020-who-issues-its-first-emergency-use-validation-for-a-covid-19-vaccine-and-emphasizes-need-for-equitable-global-access. Accessed February 16, 2021.
32. News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA allows more flexible storage, transportation conditions for Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-allows-more-flexible-storage-transportation-conditions-pfizer. Accessed February 27, 2021.
33. S Amit et al. Early rate reductions of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 in BNT162b2 vaccine recipients. Lancet 2021 February 18 (epub).
34. J Gee et al. First month of COVID-19 vaccine safety monitoring – United States, December 14, 2020-January 13, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021; 70:283. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7008e3.htm. Accessed February 28, 2021.
35. N Dagan et al. BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in a nationwide mass vaccination setting. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:1412.
36. K Wu et al. Serum neutralizing activity elicited by mRNA-1273 vaccine. N Engl J Med 2021 March 17 (epub).
37. Y Liu et al. Neutralizing activity of BNT162b2-elicited serum. N Engl J Med 2021 March 8 (epub).
38. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine. N Engl J Med 2021 February 17 (epub).
39. MI Samanovic et al. Poor antigen-specific responses to the second BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine dose in SARS-CoV-2-experienced individuals. medRxiv 2021 February 9 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.07.21251311v1. Accessed February 28, 2021.
40. L Stamatatos et al. Antibodies elicited by SARS-CoV-2 infection and boosted by vaccination neutralize an emerging variant and SARS-CoV-1. medRxiv 2021 February 8 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.05.21251182v1.full.pdf. Accessed February 28, 2021.
41. KG Blumenthal et al. Delayed large local reactions to mRNA-1273 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:1273.
42. J Lopez Bernal et al. Early effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination with BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine and ChAdOx1 adenovirus vector vaccine on symptomatic disease, hospitalisations and mortality in older adults in England. medRxiv 2021 March 2 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.01.21252652v1. Accessed March 8, 2021.
43. F Krammer et al. Antibody responses in seropositive persons after a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine. N Engl J Med 2021 March 10 (epub).
44. T Shimabukuro. CDC COVID-19 Vaccine Task Force Vaccine Safety Team. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). COVID-19 vaccine safety update. 2021 March 1. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/meetings/downloads/slides-2021-02/28-03-01/05-covid-Shimabukuro.pdf. Accessed March 15, 2021.
45. BJ Boyarsky et al. Immunogenicity of a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccine in solid organ transplant recipients. JAMA 2021; 325:1784.
46. J Keehner et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection after vaccination in health care workers in California. N Engl J Med 2021; 384: 1774.
47. W Daniel et al. Early evidence of the effect of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine at one medical center. N Engl J Med 2021 March 23 (epub).
48. S Benenson et al. BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine effectiveness among health care workers. N Engl J Med 2021 March 23 (epub).
49. A Angyal et al. T-cell and antibody responses to first BNT162b2 vaccine dose in previously SARS-CoV-2-infected and infection-naïve UK healthcare workers: a multicentre, prospective, observational cohort study. Preprints with The Lancet 2021 March 25 (epub).
50. KJ Gray et al. COVID-19 vaccine response in pregnant and lactating women: a cohort study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2021 March 25 (epub).
51. S Meylan et al. Research Letter. Stage III hypertension in patients after mRNA-based SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. Hypertension 2021 March 25 (epub).

52. S Saadat et al. Research Letter. Binding and neutralization antibody titers after a single vaccine dose in health care workers previously infected with SARS-CoV-2. JAMA 2021 March 1 (epub).
53. MG Thompson et al. Interim estimates of vaccine effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccines in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection among health care personnel, first responders, and other essential and frontline workers – eight U.S. locations, December 2020-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021; 70:495.
54. A Britton et al. Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine among residents of two skilled nursing facilities experiencing COVID-19 outbreaks – Connecticut, December 2020-February 2021.
55. RW Frenck et al. Safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy of the BNT162b2 Covid-19 vaccine in adolescents. N Engl J Med 2021 May 27 (epub).
56. N Doria-Rose et al. Correspondence. Antibody persistence through 6 months after the second dose of mRNA-1273 vaccine for Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021 April 6 (epub).
57. V Furer et al. Herpes zoster following BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccination in patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic disease: a case series. Rheumatology 2021 April 12 (epub).
58. T Kustin et al. Evidence for increased breakthrough rates of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in BNT162b2 mRNA vaccinated individuals. medRxiv 2021 April 9. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.06.21254882v1. Accessed April 17, 2021.
59. SH Perl et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies in breast milk after COVID-19 vaccination of breastfeeding women. JAMA 2021 April 12 (epub).
60. CDC. COVID-19 breakthrough case investigations and reporting. 2021 April 16. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/health-departments/breakthrough-cases.html. Accessed May 26, 2021.
61. SS Mustafa et al. Administration of a second dose of the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine after an immediate hypersensitivity reaction with the first dose: two case reports. Ann Intern Med 2021 April 6 (epub).
62. TT Shimabukuro et al. Preliminary findings of mRNA Covid-19 vaccine safety in pregnant persons. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:2273.
63. AP West Jr et al. Detection and characterization of the SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.526 in New York. bioRxiv 2021 April 22 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.14.431043v3. Accessed April 26, 2021.
64. H Zhou et al. B.1.526 SARS-CoV-2 variants identified in New York City are neutralized by vaccine-elicited and therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. 2021 March 24 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.24.436620v1. Accessed April 26, 2021.
65. L Renoud et al. Association of facial paralysis with mRNA COVID-19 vaccines: a disproportionality analysis using the World Health Organization Pharmacovigilance Database. JAMA Intern Med 2021 April 27 (epub).
66. VJ Hall et al. COVID-19 vaccine coverage in health-care workers in England and effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against infection (SIREN): a prospective, multicentre, cohort study. Lancet 2021 April 23 (epub).
67. Y Angel et al. Association between vaccination with BNT162b2 and incidence of symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections among health care workers. JAMA 2021 May 6 (epub).
68. DE McMahon et al. Cutaneous reactions reported after Moderna and Pfizer COVID-19 vaccination: a registry-based study of 414 cases. J Am Acad Dermatol 2021 April 7 (epub).
69. LJ Abu-Raddad and AA Butt. Effectiveness of the BNT162b2 Covid-19 vaccine against the B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants. Correspondence. N Engl J Med 2021 May 5 (epub).
70. L Tang et al. Asymptomatic and symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections after BNT162b2 vaccination in a routinely screened workforce. JAMA 2021 May 6 (epub).
71. BJ Boyarsky et al. Antibody response to 2-dose SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine series in solid organ transplant recipients. JAMA 2021; 325:2204.
72. E Hacisuleyman et al. Vaccine breakthough infections with SARS-CoV-2 variants. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:2212.
73. News Release. Moderna announces TeenCOVE study of its COVID-19 vaccine in adolescents meets primary endpoint and plans to submit data to regulators in early June. 2021 May 25. Available at: https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/moderna-announces-teencove-study-its-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed May 25, 2021.
74. AY Collier et al. Immunogenicity of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines in pregnant and lactating women. JAMA 2021 May 13 (epub).
75. H Parry et al. Extended Interval BNT162b2 vaccination enhances peak antibody generation in older people. MedRxiv 2021 May 17 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257017v1. Accessed May 19, 2021.
76. SY Wong et al. Serological response to mRNA COVID-19 vaccines in IBD patients receiving biological therapies. Gastroenterology 2021. Available at: https://www.gastrojournal.org/article/S0016-5085(21)00648-X/pdf. Accessed May 19, 2021.
77. RH Shaw et al. Heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccination: initial reactogenicity data. Correspondence. Lancet 2021 May 12 (epub).
78. EM White et al. Incident SARS-CoV-2 infection among mRNA-vaccinated and unvaccinated nursing home residents. Correspondence. N Engl J Med 2021 May 19 (epub).
79. FDA In Brief: FDA authorizes longer time for refrigerator storage of thawed Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine prior to dilution, making vaccine more widely available. 2021 May 19. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-brief-fda-authorizes-longer-time-refrigerator-storage-thawed-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed May 20, 2021.
80. T Tada et al. The spike proteins of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 and B.1.618 variants identified in India provide partial resistance to vaccine-elicited and therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. bioRxiv 2021 May 16 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.14.444076v1. Accessed May 20, 2021.

81. A Pegu et al. Durability of mRNA-1273-induced antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants. bioRxiv 2021 May 16 (epub). Available at: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.13.444010v1. Accessed May 20, 2021.
82. FS Vahidy et al. Real world effectiveness of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines against hospitalizations and deaths in the United States. medRxiv 2021 April 23 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.21.21255873v1. Accessed May 20, 2021.
83. K Wu et al. Preliminary analysis of safety and immunogenicity of a SARS-CoV-2 variant vaccine booster. medRxiv 2021 May 6. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.05.21256716v1. Accessed May 20, 2021.
84. J Lopez Bernal et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against the B.1.617.2 variant. Preprint report. 2021. Available at: https://khub.net/documents/135939561/430986542/Effectiveness+of+COVID-19+vaccines+against+the+B.1.617.2+variant.pdf/204c11a4-e02e-11f2-db19-b3664107ac42. Accessed May 26, 2021.
85. COVID-19 vaccine breakthrough infections reported to CDC – United States, January 1-April 30, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly 2021 May 25 (epub). Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7021e3. Accessed May 26, 2021.
86. RH Haberman et al. Methotrexate hampers immunogenicity to BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in immune-medicated inflammatory disease. Ann Rheum Dis 2021 May 25 (epub).
87. CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). COVID-19 VaST Work Group Technical Report. May 17, 2021. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/work-groups-vast/technical-report-2021-05-17.html. Accessed May 27, 2021.
88. EC Wall et al. Neutralising antibody activity against SARS-CoV-2 VOCs B.1.617.2 and B.1.351 by BNT162b2 vaccination. Lancet 2021 June 3 (epub).
89. EJ Formeister et al. Preliminary analysis of association between COVID-19 vaccination and sudden hearing loss using US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System Data. JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2021 May 20 (epub).
90. MW Tenforde et al. Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines against COVID-19 among hospitalized adults aged ≥65 years – United States, January-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021; 70:674.
91. News Release. COVID-19 study shows mRNA vaccines reduce risk of infection by 91% for fully vaccinated people. June 7, 2021. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2021/p0607-mrna-reduce-risks.html. Accessed June 9, 2021.
92. U Samarakoon et al. Delayed large local reactions to mRNA Covid-19 vaccines in Blacks, Indigenous Persons, and People of Color. N Engl J Med 2021 June 9 (epub).
93. L Monin et al. Safety and immunogenicity of one versus two doses of the COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b2 for patients with cancer: interim analysis of a prospective observational study. Lancet Oncol 2021 April 27 (epub).
94. J Stowe et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against hospital admission with the Delta (B.1.617.2) variant. Public Health England 2021 June 14. Available at: https://khub.net/web/phe-national/public-library/-/document_library/v2WsRK3ZlEig/view_file/479607329?_com_liferay_document_library_web_portlet_DLPortlet_INSTANCE_v2WsRK3ZlEig_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fkhub.net%3A443%2Fweb%2Fphe-national%2Fpublic-library%2F-%2Fdocument_library%2Fv2WsRK3ZlEig%2Fview%2F479607266. Accessed June 15, 2021.
95. T Shimabukuro. Vaccine Safety Team. CDC COVID-19 Vaccine Task Force. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC). 2021 June 10. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/150054/download. Accessed June 15, 2021.
96. FDA. Fact sheet for healthcare providers administering vaccine (vaccination providers). Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine to prevent coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/144637/download. Accessed June 28, 2021.
97. CDC. Selected adverse events reported after COVID-19 vaccination. June 23, 2021. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html. Accessed June 28, 2021.
98. A Sheikh et al. SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. Lancet 2021; 397:P2461.
99. A Borobia et al. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of BNT162b2 booster in ChAdOx1-S-primed participants (CombiVacS): a multicenter, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet 2021 June 25 (epub).
100. I Goldshtein et al. Association between BNT162b2 vaccination and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in pregnant women. JAMA 2021 July 12 (epub).
101. News Release. Decline in vaccine effectiveness against infection and symptomatic illness. Israel Ministry of Health. 2021 July 5. Available at: https://www.gov.il/en/departments/news/05072021-03. Accessed July 15, 2021.
102. S Nasreen et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against variants of concern, Canada. medRxiv 2021 July 3 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.28.21259420v1. Accessed July 15, 2021.
103. FDA. Initial results of near real-time safety monitoring of COVID-19 vaccines in persons aged 65 years and older. 2021 July 12. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/safety-availability-biologics/initial-results-near-real-time-safety-monitoring-covid-19-vaccines-persons-aged-65-years-and-older?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery. Accessed July 15, 2021.
104. Y Golan et al. Evaluation of messenger RNA from COVID-19 BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 vaccines in human milk. JAMA Pediatr 2021 July 6 (epub).

105. JW Gargano et al. Use of mRNA COVID-19 vaccine after reports of myocarditis among vaccine recipients: update from the Advisory Committee on Immunizaiton Practices – United States, June 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021; 70:977.

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
Adjuvanted Recombinant Nanoparticle Vaccine			
NVX-CoV2373 (Novavax) *(updated 6/17/2021)*	**Keech et al. NEJM 2020**[1] *(updated 9/20/2020)* **Population:** healthy adults 18-59 years old (n=131) **Design:** phase 1/2, randomized, observer-blinded, placebo-controlled trial ▪ 2 vaccinations (5 or 25 mcg) given 21 days apart with or without *Matrix-M1* adjuvant or placebo **Results:** ▪ The adjuvanted vaccine induced neutralizing antibody responses and antigen-specific T cells ▪ Neutralizing antibody responses after the second vaccination exceeded levels in COVID-29 convalescent serum **Limitations:** phase 1/2 trial **UK Phase 3 Trial 2021**[3] *(added 1/30/2021; updated 3/13/2021)* **Population:** adults 18-84 years old (n=>15,000) **Design:** phase 3, randomized, double-blind, controlled trial **Results:** **Interim Analysis (1/30/2021)** ▪ 56 cases of COVID-19 in the placebo group and 6 cases in the NVX-CoV2373 group, resulting in a vaccine efficacy of 89.3% ▪ 61 cases were mild or moderate and 1 was severe (in the placebo group) ▪ UK variant strain detected in >50% of PCR-confirmed symptomatic cases ▪ Efficacy against original strain was 95.6% and against the UK variant strain was 85.6% **Final Analysis** *(updated 3/13/2021)*	▪ Tenderness and pain at the injection site ▪ Headache, fatigue, myalgia ▪ No serious adverse events reported ▪ In PREVENT-19 trial, injection-site pain and tenderness were the most common local symptoms and fatigue, headache, and muscle pain were the most common systemic symptoms; most adverse reactions were mild to moderate severity and lasted <3 days	▪ Recombinant nanoparticle vaccine composed of trimeric full-length SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoproteins[2] ▪ Contains saponin-based *Matrix-M* adjuvant ▪ Phase 2b trial ongoing in South Africa ▪ Phase 3 trial initiated in the UK; expected to enroll up to 10,000 participants *(added 9/27/2020)* ▪ Novavax announced initiation of phase 3 trial in the US and Mexico on December 28, 2020; expected to enroll up to 30,000 participants *(added 1/1/2021)* ▪ In a sub-study, co-administration with influenza vaccine resulted in no change to influenza vaccine immune response and a reduction in antibody response to the Novavax COVID-19 vaccine; Novavax COVID-19 vaccine efficacy was 87.5% (95% CI -0.2,98.4) in the sub-study and 89.8% (95% CI 79.7, 95.5) in the main study *(added 6/16/2021)* ▪ Two-dose vaccine (21 days apart) ▪ Stored under refrigeration ▪ Shipped in ready-to-use liquid formulation

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
NVX-CoV2373 (continued)	▪ 96 cases of COVID-19 in the placebo group and 10 cases in the vaccine group, resulting in a vaccine efficacy of 89.7% ▪ 5 cases of severe disease were reported, all in the placebo group ▪ Efficacy against original virus strain was 96.4% and against the UK variant strain (B.1.1.7/501Y.V1) was 86.3% **Limitations:** not peer reviewed or published **Shinde et al. South Africa Phase 2b Trial NEJM 2021[3,4]** *(added 1/30/2021; updated 5/7/2021)* **Population:** adults 18-84 years old (n=6324) **Design:** phase 2b, randomized, placebo-controlled trial **Results:** **Interim Analysis** *(added 1/30/2021)* ▪ 60% efficacy for prevention of mild, moderate, and severe COVID-19 in HIV-negative subjects (94% of study population) ▪ 29 cases of COVID-19 in the placebo group and 15 cases in the NVX-CoV2373 group; 1 severe case was in placebo group ▪ South Africa variant strain detected in 92.6% of cases **Complete Analysis** *(updated 3/13/2021)* ▪ 51 cases in the vaccine group and 96 in the placebo group, resulting in an overall vaccine efficacy of 48.6% against predominantly variant strains (majority were B.1.351/501Y.V2) ▪ 5 cases of severe disease were all in the placebo group ▪ Efficacy in HIV-negative subjects was 55.4%		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
NVX-CoV2373 (continued)	▪ Vaccine induced protection began 14 days after the 1st dose; increased efficacy was observed 7 days after the 2nd dose **Published Data NEJM 2021 (*updated 5/7/2021*):[5]** ▪ In 2684 baseline seronegative participants, 15 cases of COVID-19 were reported in vaccinated subjects and 29 cases in those given placebo; vaccine efficacy 49.4% ▪ In HIV-negative subjects, vaccine efficacy was 60.1%; 92.7% of cases were the B.1.351 variant ▪ Post hoc vaccine efficacy against B.1.351 was 51.0% (in HIV negative subjects) and 43.0% in the overall population **Limitations:** preliminary results, limited followup **PREVENT-19 Trial. Novavax 2021[6]** *(added 6/16/2021)* **Population:** participants ≥18 years old in the US and Mexico (n=29,960) **Design:** 2:1 randomized, placebo-controlled, observer-blinded trial ▪ NVX-CoV2373 vs placebo **Results:** ▪ 90.4% overall efficacy (7 days after 2nd dose); 77 cases observed (63 in placebo group and 14 in vaccine group; all cases in vaccine group were mild) ▪ 100% efficacy against moderate or severe disease; 10 moderate cases and 4 severe cases occurred, all in the placebo group ▪ 91.0% efficacy in "high-risk" populations (>65 years or <65 years with certain comorbidities or frequent COVID-19 exposure); 62 cases in placebo group and 13 in vaccine group ▪ All hospitalizations and death occurred in placebo group Variants:		

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
NVX-CoV2373 (continued)	▪ Sequence data available for 54 of 77 cases; 35 (65%) were variants of concern; 9 (17%) variants of interest; 10 (19%) other variants ▪ 93.2% efficacy against variants of concern and variants of interest ▪ 100% efficacy against variants not considered variants of concern or variants of interest **Limitations:** top-line results from manufacturer; not yet published or peer-reviewed		

1. C Keech et al. Phase 1-2 trial of a SARS-CoV-2 recombinant spike protein nanoparticle vaccine. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:2320.
2. Press Release. Novavax announces positive phase 1 data for its COVID-19 vaccines candidate. 2020 August 4. Available at: https://ir.novavax.com/news-releases/news-release-details/novavax-announces-positive-phase-1-data-its-covid-19-vaccine. Accessed August 21, 2020.
3. News Release. Novavax COVID-19 vaccine demonstrates 89.3% efficacy in UK Phase 3 trial. Available at: https://ir.novavax.com/news-releases/news-release-details/novavax-covid-19-vaccine-demonstrates-893-efficacy-uk-phase-3. Accessed January 30, 2021.
4. News Release. Novavax confirms high levels of efficacy against original and variant COVID-19 strains in United Kingdom and South Africa trials. 2021 March 11 Available at: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/novavax-confirms-high-levels-of-efficacy-against-original-and-variant-covid-19-strains-in-united-kingdom-and-south-africa-trials-301246019.html. Accessed March 1, 2021.
5. V Shinde et al. Efficacy of NVX-CoV2373 Covid-19 vaccine against the B.1.351 variant. N Engl J Med 2021; 384:1899.
6. News Release. Novavax COVID-19 vaccine demonstrates 90% overall efficacy and 100% protection against moderate and severe disease in PREVENT-19 Phase 3 Trial. 2021 June 14. Available at: https://ir.novavax.com/news-releases/news-release-details/novavax-covid-19-vaccine-demonstrates-90-overall-efficacy-and. Accessed June 16, 2021.
7. S Toback et al. Safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy of a COVID-19 vaccine (NVX-CoV2373) co-administered with seasonal influenza vaccines. medRxiv 2021 June 13 (epub). Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.09.21258556v1. Accessed June 16, 2021.

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
Inactivated Vaccine			
Whole-Virus Inactivated SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine (WIV04 strain) (Sinopharm) *(updated 5/26/2021)*	**Xia et al. JAMA 2020[1]** **Population:** healthy adults 18-59 years old in China (phase 1 trial n=96; phase 2 trial n=224) **Design:** randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 1 and 2 trials ▪ Phase 1: 3 injections at day 0, 28, and 56 of a 2.5, 5, or 10 mcg vaccine or aluminum hydroxide adjuvant only ▪ Phase 2: 5 mcg vaccine at days 0 and 14, 5 mcg vaccine at days 0 and 21, or aluminum hydroxide adjuvant only **Results:** ▪ Neutralizing antibodies reported in all dose groups 14 days after completion of 3 injections in phase 1 and 2 injections in phase 2 ▪ 100% seroconversion in patients in the phase 1 trial and in those who received injections on days 0 and 21 in phase 2 ▪ Antibody titers increased after second and third injections **Limitations:** phase 1/2 interim data; did not use comparator group of convalescent serum samples **N Al Kaabi et a. JAMA 2021[2]** *(added 5/26/2021)* **Population:** healthy adult volunteers without a history of COVID-19 in the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain (n=40382) **Design:** ongoing, randomized, double-blind phase 3 trial ▪ Participants randomized to receive 1 of 2 inactivated vaccines developed from SARS-CoV-2 WIV04 (5 mcg/dose; n=13459) and HBO2 (4 mcg/dose; 13465) or an aluminum hydroxide (alum)-only control (n=13458)	▪ Pain at the injection site, fever ▪ In the phase 3 trial, the most common adverse reactions were pain at the injection site and headache ▪ Serious adverse events occurred at similar rates in the vaccine and alum-only groups ▪ 1 case of possible demyelinating myelitis and 1 case of severe emesis were reported in the phase 3 trial	▪ Whole-virus inactivated vaccine ▪ Phase 3 trial enrolling 15,000 volunteers started in Abu Dhabi in July

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
Whole-Virus Inactivated SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine (WIV04 strain)	▪ Administered as 2 IM injections 21 days apart **Results:** ▪ Primary analysis included 38,206 subjects ▪ 26 cases of symptomatic COVID-19 occurred in the WIV04 group, 21 in the HB02 group, and 95 in the alum-only group ▪ Efficacy 14 days after the 2nd dose was 72.8% for WIV04 and 78.1% for HBO2 compared with alum-only ($p<0.001$ for both) ▪ Severe COVID-19 occurred in 2 subjects in the alum-only group and in no patients in the vaccine groups **Limitations:** interim analysis		

1. S Xia et al. Effect of an inactivated vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 on safety and immunogenicity outcomes. Interim analysis of 2 randomized clinical trials. JAMA 2020; 324:951.
2. N Al Kaabi et al. Effect of 2 inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccines on symptomatic COVID-19 infection in adults: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2021 May 26 (epub).

VACCINE	EFFICACY	SAFETY	COMMENTS
DNA Vaccine			
INO-4800 (Inovio) *(added 11/29/2020)*	**Inovio Phase 1 Trial**[1] **Population:** healthy adult volunteers (n=40) **Design:** phase 1 trial ▪ 1 mg or 2 mg vaccine each given 4 weeks apart **Results:** ▪ 94% of participants had an overall immune response	▪ Redness at the injection site ▪ No serious adverse events reported in phase 1 trial	▪ DNA vaccine ▪ Manufacturer has another DNA vaccine in clinical trials for MERS ▪ Vaccine administered directly into cells via a proprietary smart device *(Cellectra 2000)* that uses a brief electrical pulse to reversibly open small pores in the cell, allowing plasmids to enter[1] ▪ Phase 2 trial expected to include 400 participants received FDA approval to begin ▪ Phase 3 portion of the clinical trials is on hold until the manufacturer resolves questions from the FDA regarding the vaccine delivery device ▪ Does not need to be frozen for transport or storage
1. News Release. Inovio announces positive interim phase 1 data for INO-4800 vaccine for COVID-19. Available at: http://ir.inovio.com/news-releases/news-releases-details/2020/INOVIO-Announces-Positive-Interim-Phase-1-Data-For-INO-4800-Vaccine-for-COVID-19/default.aspx. Accessed November 29, 2020.			
Adjuvanted Recombinant Protein-Based Vaccine			
Adjuvanted Recombinant Protein-Based Vaccine (GSK/Sanofi) *(added 12/3/2020)*	**Phase 1/2 Trial**[1] ▪ Enrolled 440 healthy adults in the US ▪ Results anticipated in December	▪ Not yet available	▪ Recombinant protein-based technology is the same as one of Sanofi's influenza vaccines and ▪ Use of GSK's pandemic adjuvant technology may reduce amount of vaccine protein required per dose ▪ Expected to begin phase 3 trials in December
1. News Release. Sanofi and GSK initiate phase 1/2 clinical trial of COVID-19 adjuvanted recombinant protein-based vaccine candidate. Available at: https://www.sanofi.com/en/media-room/press-releases/2020/2020-09-03-07-00-00. Accessed December 3, 2020.			

Subscription Services

Address:
The Medical Letter, Inc.
145 Huguenot St. Ste. 312
New Rochelle, NY 10801-7537
www.medicalletter.org

Customer Service:
Call: 800-211-2769 or 914-235-0500
Fax: 914-632-1733
E-mail: custserv@medicalletter.org

Permissions:
To reproduce any portion of this issue, please e-mail your request to:
permissions@medicalletter.org

Subscriptions (US):
1 year - $159; 2 years - $298;
3 years - $398. $65 per year
for students, interns, residents,
and fellows in the US and Canada.
Reprints - $45 per issue or article

Site License Inquiries:
E-mail: SubQuote@medicalletter.org
Call: 800-211-2769
Special rates available for bulk subscriptions.

Get Connected: