

Antiviral Drugs That Are Approved or Under Evaluation for the Treatment of COVID-19

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

Summary Recommendations
<p>Remdesivir is the only Food and Drug Administration-approved drug for the treatment of COVID-19. In this section, the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) provides recommendations for using antiviral drugs to treat COVID-19 based on the available data. As in the management of any disease, treatment decisions ultimately reside with the patient and their health care provider. For more information on these antiviral agents, see Table 2e.</p>
<p>Remdesivir</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• See Therapeutic Management of Hospitalized Adults with COVID-19 for recommendations on using remdesivir with or without dexamethasone.
<p>Ivermectin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is insufficient evidence for the Panel to recommend either for or against the use of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19. Results from adequately powered, well-designed, and well-conducted clinical trials are needed to provide more specific, evidence-based guidance on the role of ivermectin in the treatment of COVID-19.
<p>Nitazoxanide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Panel recommends against the use of nitazoxanide for the treatment of COVID-19, except in a clinical trial (BIIa).
<p>Hydroxychloroquine or Chloroquine and/or Azithromycin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Panel recommends against the use of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine and/or azithromycin for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients (AI) and in nonhospitalized patients (AlIa).
<p>Lopinavir/Ritonavir and Other HIV Protease Inhibitors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Panel recommends against the use of lopinavir/ritonavir and other HIV protease inhibitors for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients (AI) and in nonhospitalized patients (AlII).
<p>Rating of Recommendations: A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional</p> <p>Rating of Evidence: I = One or more randomized trials without major limitations; IIa = Other randomized trials or subgroup analyses of randomized trials; IIb = Nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies; III = Expert opinion</p>

Antiviral Therapy

Because SARS-CoV-2 replication leads to many of the clinical manifestations of COVID-19, antiviral therapies are being investigated for the treatment of COVID-19. These drugs inhibit viral entry (via the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 [ACE2] receptor and transmembrane serine protease 2 [TMPRSS2]), viral membrane fusion and endocytosis, or the activity of the SARS-CoV-2 3-chymotrypsin-like protease (3CLpro) and the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase.¹ Because viral replication may be particularly active early in the course of COVID-19, antiviral therapy may have the greatest impact before the illness progresses to the hyperinflammatory state that can characterize the later stages of disease, including critical illness.² For this reason, it is necessary to understand the role of antiviral medications in treating mild, moderate, severe, and critical illness in order to optimize treatment for people with COVID-19.

The following sections describe the underlying rationale for using different antiviral medications, provide the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel's recommendations for using these medications to treat COVID-19, and summarize the existing clinical trial data. Additional antiviral therapies will be added to this section of the Guidelines as new evidence emerges.

References

1. Sanders JM, Monogue ML, Jodlowski TZ, Cutrell JB. Pharmacologic treatments for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): a review. *JAMA*. 2020;323(18):1824-1836. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32282022>.
2. Siddiqi HK, Mehra MR. COVID-19 illness in native and immunosuppressed states: a clinical-therapeutic staging proposal. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2020;39(5):405-407. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32362390>.

Remdesivir

Last Updated: April 21, 2021

Remdesivir is an intravenous nucleotide prodrug of an adenosine analog. Remdesivir binds to the viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase and inhibits viral replication through premature termination of RNA transcription. It has demonstrated in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2.¹ In a rhesus macaque model of SARS-CoV-2 infection, remdesivir treatment was initiated soon after inoculation; the remdesivir-treated animals had lower virus levels in the lungs and less lung damage than the control animals.²

Remdesivir is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized adult and pediatric patients (aged ≥ 12 years and weighing ≥ 40 kg). It is also available through an FDA Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized pediatric patients weighing 3.5 kg to < 40 kg or aged < 12 years and weighing ≥ 3.5 kg. Remdesivir should be administered in a hospital or a health care setting that can provide a similar level of care to an inpatient hospital.

Remdesivir has been studied in several clinical trials for the treatment of COVID-19. The recommendations from the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) are based on the results of these studies. See [Table 2a](#) for more information.

The safety and efficacy of combination therapy of remdesivir with corticosteroids have not been rigorously studied in clinical trials; however, there are theoretical reasons that combination therapy may be beneficial in some patients with severe COVID-19. For the Panel's recommendations on using remdesivir with or without dexamethasone in certain hospitalized patients, see [Therapeutic Management of Hospitalized Adults With COVID-19](#).

Monitoring and Adverse Effects

Remdesivir can cause gastrointestinal symptoms (e.g., nausea), elevated transaminase levels, an increase in prothrombin time (without a change in the international normalized ratio), and hypersensitivity reactions.

Liver function tests and prothrombin time should be obtained in all patients before remdesivir is administered and during treatment as clinically indicated. Remdesivir may need to be discontinued if alanine transaminase (ALT) levels increase to > 10 times the upper limit of normal and should be discontinued if an increase in ALT level and signs or symptoms of liver inflammation are observed.³

Considerations in Patients With Renal Insufficiency

Each 100 mg vial of remdesivir lyophilized powder contains 3 g of sulfobutylether beta-cyclodextrin sodium (SBECD), whereas each 100 mg/20 mL vial of remdesivir solution contains 6 g of SBECD.³ SBECD is a vehicle that is primarily eliminated through the kidneys. A patient with COVID-19 who receives a loading dose of remdesivir 200 mg would receive 6 g to 12 g of SBECD, depending on the formulation. This amount of SBECD is within the safety threshold for patients with normal renal function.⁴ Accumulation of SBECD in patients with renal impairment may result in liver and renal toxicities. Clinicians may consider preferentially using the lyophilized powder formulation (which contains less SBECD) in patients with renal impairment.

Because both remdesivir formulations contain SBECD, patients with an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) of < 50 mL/min were excluded from some clinical trials of remdesivir; other trials had an eGFR cutoff of < 30 mL/min. Remdesivir **is not recommended** for patients with an eGFR < 30 mL/

min due to lack of data.⁵ Renal function should be monitored before and during remdesivir treatment as clinically indicated.³

In two observational studies that evaluated the use of remdesivir in hospitalized patients with COVID-19, no significant differences were reported in the incidences of adverse effects or acute kidney injury between patients with an estimated creatinine clearance (CrCl) <30 mL/min and those with an estimated CrCl ≥30 mL/min.^{6,7} One of these studies evaluated patients who primarily received the solution formulation of remdesivir (20 patients had an estimated CrCl <30 mL/min and 115 had an estimated CrCl ≥30 mL/min);⁶ the other study evaluated patients who received the lyophilized powder formulation (40 patients had an estimated CrCl <30 mL/min and 307 had an estimated CrCl ≥30 mL/min).⁷

Drug-Drug Interactions

Clinical drug-drug interaction studies of remdesivir have not been conducted. In vitro, remdesivir is a substrate of cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4 and of the drug transporters organic anion-transporting polypeptide (OATP) 1B1 and P-glycoprotein. It is also an inhibitor of CYP3A4, OATP1B1, OATP1B3, and multidrug and toxin extrusion protein 1 (MATE1).³

Minimal to no reduction in remdesivir exposure is expected when remdesivir is coadministered with dexamethasone, according to information provided by Gilead Sciences (written communication, July 2020). Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine may decrease the antiviral activity of remdesivir; coadministration of these drugs **is not recommended**.³ Remdesivir is not expected to have any significant interactions with oseltamivir or baloxavir, according to information provided by Gilead Sciences (written communications, August and September 2020).

See [Table 2e](#) for more information.

Considerations in Pregnancy

- Pregnant patients were excluded from the clinical trials that evaluated the safety and efficacy of remdesivir for the treatment of COVID-19, but preliminary reports of remdesivir use in pregnant patients from the remdesivir compassionate use program are reassuring.
- Among 86 pregnant and postpartum hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 who received compassionate use remdesivir, the therapy was well tolerated, with a low rate of serious adverse events.⁸
- Remdesivir should not be withheld from pregnant patients if it is otherwise indicated.

Considerations in Children

- The safety and effectiveness of using remdesivir to treat COVID-19 have not been evaluated in pediatric patients aged <12 years or weighing <40 kg.
- Remdesivir is available through an FDA EUA for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized pediatric patients weighing 3.5 kg to <40 kg or aged <12 years and weighing ≥3.5 kg.
- A clinical trial is currently evaluating the pharmacokinetics of remdesivir in children (*ClinicalTrials.gov* Identifier [NCT04431453](#)).

Clinical Trials

Several clinical trials that are evaluating the use of remdesivir for the treatment of COVID-19 are currently underway or in development. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](#) for the latest information.

References

1. Wang M, Cao R, Zhang L, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell Res*. 2020;30(3):269-271. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32020029>.
2. Williamson BN, Feldmann F, Schwarz B, et al. Clinical benefit of remdesivir in rhesus macaques infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*. 2020;585(7824):273-276. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32516797>.
3. Remdesivir (Veklury) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2020. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2020/214787Orig1s000lbl.pdf.
4. Committee for Human Medicinal Products. Background review for cyclodextrins used as excipients. 2014. Available at: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/report/background-review-cyclodextrins-used-excipients-context-revision-guideline-excipients-label-package_en.pdf.
5. Adamsick ML, Gandhi RG, Bidell MR, et al. Remdesivir in patients with acute or chronic kidney disease and COVID-19. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2020;31(7):1384-1386. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32513665>.
6. Pettit NN, Pisano J, Nguyen CT, et al. Remdesivir use in the setting of severe renal impairment: a theoretical concern or real risk? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33315065>.
7. Ackley TW, McManus D, Topal JE, Cicali B, Shah S. A valid warning or clinical lore: an evaluation of safety outcomes of remdesivir in patients with impaired renal function from a multicenter matched cohort. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2021;65(2). Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33229428>.
8. Burwick RM, Yawetz S, Stephenson KE, et al. Compassionate use of remdesivir in pregnant women with severe covid-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33031500>.

Table 2a. Remdesivir: Selected Clinical Data

Last Updated: February 11, 2021

The clinical trials described in this table do not represent all the trials that the Panel reviewed while developing the recommendations for RDV. The studies summarized below are those that have had the greatest impact on the Panel's recommendations.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial (ACTT-1)¹			
<p>Multinational, placebo-controlled, double-blind RCT in hospitalized patients (n = 1,062)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • At least 1 of the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pulmonary infiltrates, as determined by radiographic imaging • SpO₂ ≤94% on room air • Required supplemental oxygen • Required mechanical ventilation • Required ECMO <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALT or AST >5 times ULN • eGFR <30 mL/min • Pregnancy or breastfeeding <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for up to 9 more days • Placebo for 10 days <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to clinical recovery <p>Ordinal Scale Definitions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not hospitalized, no limitations 2. Not hospitalized, with limitations 3. Hospitalized, no active medical problems 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV (n = 541) and placebo (n = 521) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median time from symptom onset to randomization was 9 days (IQR 6–12 days). <p>Outcomes</p> <p><i>Overall Results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV reduced time to recovery compared to placebo (10 days vs. 15 days; RRR 1.29; 95% CI, 1.12–1.49; <i>P</i> < 0.001). • Clinical improvement based on ordinal scale was higher at Day 15 in RDV arm (OR 1.5; 95% CI, 1.2–1.9; <i>P</i> < 0.001). • No statistically significant difference in mortality by Day 29 between RDV and placebo arms (HR 0.73; 95% CI, 0.52–1.03; <i>P</i> = 0.07). • Benefit of RDV was greatest in patients randomized during the first 10 days after symptom onset. <p><i>Results by Disease Severity at Enrollment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference in median time to recovery between arms among patients who had mild to moderate disease at enrollment. • Benefit of RDV for reducing time to recovery was clearest in patients who required supplemental oxygenation at enrollment (n = 435; RRR 1.45; 95% CI, 1.18–1.79), and RDV appeared to confer 	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of disease severity; study was not powered to detect differences within subgroups • Powered to detect differences in clinical improvement, not mortality • No data collected on longer-term morbidity <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In patients with severe COVID-19, RDV reduced time to clinical recovery. • Benefit of RDV was most apparent in hospitalized patients on supplemental oxygen. • No observed benefit in those on high-flow oxygen, noninvasive ventilation, mechanical ventilation, or ECMO, but the study was not powered to detect differences within subgroups. • No observed benefit of RDV in patients with mild or moderate COVID-19, but the number of participants in these categories was relatively small.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial (ACTT-1)¹, continued			
	4. Hospitalized, not on oxygen 5. Hospitalized, on oxygen 6. Hospitalized, on high-flow oxygen or noninvasive mechanical ventilation 7. Hospitalized, on mechanical ventilation or ECMO 8. Death	a survival benefit in this subgroup (HR for death by Day 29 0.30; 95% CI, 0.14–0.64). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No observed difference in time to recovery between arms in patients on high-flow oxygen or noninvasive ventilation at enrollment (RRR 1.09; 95% CI, 0.76–1.57). No evidence that RDV affected mortality rate in this subgroup (HR 1.02; 95% CI, 0.54–1.91). • No observed difference in time to recovery between arms in patients on mechanical ventilation or ECMO at enrollment (RRR 0.98; 95% CI, 0.70–1.36). No evidence that RDV affected mortality rate in this subgroup (HR 1.13; 95% CI, 0.67–1.89). <i>Safety Results:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentages of patients with SAEs were similar between arms (25% vs. 32%). • Transaminase elevations: 6% of RDV recipients, 10.7% of placebo recipients 	
Remdesivir Versus Placebo for Severe COVID-19 in China²			
Multicenter, placebo-controlled, double-blind RCT in hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 (n = 237)	Key Inclusion Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • Time from symptom onset to randomization <12 days • SpO₂ ≤94% on room air or PaO₂/FiO₂ <300 mm Hg • Radiographically confirmed pneumonia Key Exclusion Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALT or AST >5 times ULN • eGFR <30 mL/min • Pregnancy or breastfeeding 	Number of Participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITT analysis: RDV (n = 158) and placebo (n = 78) • Study stopped before reaching target enrollment of 453 patients due to control of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Participant Characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median time from symptom onset to randomization: 9 days for RDV arm, 10 days for placebo arm • Receipt of corticosteroids: 65% of patients in RDV arm, 68% in placebo arm • Receipt of LPV/RTV: 28% of patients in RDV arm, 29% in placebo arm 	Limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample size did not have sufficient power to detect differences in clinical outcomes. • Use of concomitant medications (i.e., corticosteroids, LPV/RTV, IFNs) may have obscured effects of RDV. Interpretation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference in time to clinical improvement, 28-day mortality, or rate of SARS-CoV-2 clearance between RDV-treated and placebo-treated patients;

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Remdesivir Versus Placebo for Severe COVID-19 in China², continued			
	<p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for 9 days • Saline placebo for 10 days <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to clinical improvement, defined as improvement on an ordinal scale or being discharged alive from the hospital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of IFN alfa-2b: 29% of patients in RDV arm, 38% in placebo arm <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference in time to clinical improvement between RDV and placebo arms (median time 21 days vs. 23 days; HR 1.23; 95% CI, 0.87–1.75). • For patients who started RDV or placebo within 10 days of symptom onset, faster time to clinical improvement was seen with RDV (median time 18 days vs. 23 days; HR 1.52; 95% CI, 0.95–2.43); however, this was not statistically significant. • 28-day mortality was similar between arms (14% of patients in RDV arm, 13% in placebo arm). • No difference between arms in SARS-CoV-2 viral load at baseline, and rate of decline over time was similar. • Percentage of patients with AEs: 66% in RDV arm, 64% in placebo arm • Discontinuations due to AEs: 12% of patients in RDV arm, 5% in placebo arm 	<p>however, study was underpowered to detect differences in these outcomes between arms.</p>
World Health Organization Solidarity Trial³			
<p>International, open-label, adaptive RCT with multiple treatment arms that enrolled hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n = 11,330). In 1 arm, patients received RDV.</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥ 18 years • Not known to have received any study drug • Not expected to be transferred elsewhere within 72 hours • Physician reported no contraindications to study drugs <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 0, then 100 mg daily on Days 1–9 • Local SOC 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITT analysis: RDV (n = 2,743) and SOC (n = 2,708) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of patients aged 50–69 years: 47% in RDV arm, 48% in SOC arm • Percentage of patients aged ≥ 70 years: 18% in RDV arm, 17% in SOC arm • 67% of patients in both arms were on supplemental oxygen at entry. • 9% of patients in both arms were mechanically ventilated at entry. 	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open-label study design limits the ability to assess time to recovery; clinicians and patients were aware of treatment assignment, so RDV may have been continued to complete the treatment course even if the patient had improved. • No data on time from symptom onset to enrollment • No assessment of outcomes post hospital discharge

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
World Health Organization Solidarity Trial³, continued			
	<p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-hospital mortality <p>Secondary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiation of mechanical ventilation • Duration of hospitalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of patients hospitalized for ≥ 2 days at entry: 40% in RDV arm, 39% in SOC arm • Percentages of patients with comorbid conditions were similar between RDV and SOC arms: diabetes (26% and 25%), heart disease (21% both groups), and chronic lung disease (6% and 5%). • 48% of patients in both arms received corticosteroids. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-hospital mortality: 301 deaths (11.0%) in RDV arm, 303 deaths (11.2%) in SOC arm • Rate ratios for in-hospital death: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall: 0.95 (95% CI, 0.81–1.11) • No mechanical ventilation at entry: 0.86 (99% CI, 0.67–1.11) • Mechanical ventilation at entry: 1.20 (99% CI, 0.80–1.80) <p>Secondary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiation of mechanical ventilation: 295 patients (10.8%) in RDV arm, 284 patients (10.5%) in SOC arm 	<p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV did not decrease in-hospital mortality in hospitalized patients when compared to local SOC.
Remdesivir Versus Standard of Care in Hospitalized Patients with Moderate COVID-19⁴			
Open-label randomized trial in hospitalized patients (n = 596)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • Moderate pneumonia, defined as radiographic evidence of pulmonary infiltrates and SpO₂ >94% on room air <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALT or AST >5 times ULN • CrCl <50 mL/min 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 584 patients began treatment: 10-day RDV (n = 193), 5-day RDV (n = 191), and SOC (n = 200) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic and baseline disease characteristics were similar across all arms. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-day RDV had significantly higher odds of better clinical status distribution on Day 11 than SOC (OR 1.65; 95% CI, 1.09–2.48; <i>P</i> = 0.02). 	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open-label design may have affected decisions related to concomitant medication use and hospital discharge. • Greater proportion of patients in SOC arm received HCQ, LPV/RTV, or AZM, which may cause AEs and have not shown clinical benefits in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Remdesivir Versus Standard of Care in Hospitalized Patients with Moderate COVID-19⁴, continued			
	<p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for 9 days • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for 4 days • Local SOC <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical status on Day 11, as measured by a 7-point ordinal scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical status distribution on Day 11 was not significantly different between the 10-day RDV and SOC arms ($P = 0.18$). • By Day 28, there were more hospital discharges among patients who received RDV (89% in 5-day arm and 90% in 10-day arm) than those who received SOC (83%). • Mortality was low in all arms (1% to 2%). • Percentages of patients with AEs in RDV arms vs. SOC arm: nausea (10% vs. 3%), hypokalemia (6% vs. 2%), and headache (5% vs. 3%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data on time to return to activity for discharged patients <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitalized patients with moderate COVID-19 who received 5 days of RDV had better outcomes than those who received SOC; however, difference between arms was of uncertain clinical importance.
Different Durations of Remdesivir Treatment in Hospitalized Patients⁵			
<p>Manufacturer-sponsored, multinational, randomized, open-label trial in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (n = 402)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥ 12 years • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • Radiographic evidence of pulmonary infiltrates • SpO₂ $\leq 94\%$ on room air or receipt of supplemental oxygen <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of mechanical ventilation or ECMO • Multiorgan failure • ALT or AST >5 times ULN • Estimated CrCl <50 mL/min <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for 4 days • IV RDV 200 mg on Day 1, then 100 mg daily for 9 days <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical status at Day 14, as measured by a 7-point ordinal scale 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 397 participants began treatment: 5-day RDV (n = 200) and 10-day RDV (n = 197) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At baseline, patients in 10-day arm had worse clinical status (based on ordinal scale distribution) than those in 5-day arm ($P = 0.02$) <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After adjusting for imbalances in baseline clinical status, Day 14 distribution in clinical status on the ordinal scale was similar between arms ($P = 0.14$). • Time to achieve clinical improvement of at least 2 levels on the ordinal scale (median day of 50% cumulative incidence) was similar between arms (10 days vs. 11 days). • Median durations of hospitalization among patients discharged on or before Day 14 were similar between 5-day (7 days; IQR 6–10 days) and 10-day arms (8 days; IQR 5–10 days). • Percentages of patients with SAEs: 35% in 10-day arm, 21% in 5-day arm 	<p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was an open-label trial without a placebo control arm, so clinical benefit of RDV (compared with no RDV) could not be assessed. • There were baseline imbalances in clinical status of patients in the 5-day and 10-day arms. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 who were not on mechanical ventilation or ECMO, RDV treatment for 5 or 10 days had a similar clinical benefit.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Different Durations of Remdesivir Treatment in Hospitalized Patients⁵ , continued			
		• Discontinuations due to AEs: 4% of patients in 5-day arm, 10% in 10-day arm	

Key: AE = adverse effects; ALT = alanine transaminase; AST = aspartate aminotransferase; AZM = azithromycin; CrCl = creatinine clearance; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; HCQ = hydroxychloroquine; IFN = interferon; ITT = intention to treat; IV = intravenous; LPV/RTV = lopinavir/ritonavir; the Panel = the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel; PaO₂/FiO₂ = ratio of arterial partial pressure of oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen; RCT = randomized controlled trial; RDV = remdesivir; RRR = recovery rate ratio; SAE = serious adverse effects; SARS-CoV-2 = severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SOC = standard of care; SpO₂ = saturation of oxygen; ULN = upper limit of normal

References

1. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, et al. Remdesivir for the treatment of COVID-19—final report. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32445440>.
2. Wang Y, Zhang D, Du G, et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10236):1569-1578. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32423584>.
3. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium, Pan H, Peto R, et al. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19—interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33264556>.
4. Spinner CD, Gottlieb RL, Criner GJ, 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;324(11):1048-1057. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32821939>.
5. Goldman JD, Lye DCB, Hui DS, et al. Remdesivir for 5 or 10 days in patients with severe COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32459919>.

Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine and/or Azithromycin

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

Chloroquine is an antimalarial drug that was developed in 1934. Hydroxychloroquine, an analogue of chloroquine, was developed in 1946. Hydroxychloroquine is used to treat autoimmune diseases, such as systemic lupus erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis, in addition to malaria.

Both chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine increase the endosomal pH, which inhibits fusion between SARS-CoV-2 and the host cell membrane.¹ Chloroquine inhibits glycosylation of the cellular angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor, which may interfere with the binding of SARS-CoV to the cell receptor.² In vitro studies have suggested that both chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine may block the transport of SARS-CoV-2 from early endosomes to endolysosomes, possibly preventing the release of the viral genome.³ Both chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine also have immunomodulatory effects, which have been hypothesized to be another potential mechanism of action for the treatment of COVID-19. Azithromycin has antiviral and anti-inflammatory properties. When used in combination with hydroxychloroquine, it has been shown to have a synergistic effect on SARS-CoV-2 in vitro and in molecular modeling studies.^{4,5} However, despite demonstrating antiviral activity in some in vitro systems, neither hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin nor hydroxychloroquine alone reduced upper or lower respiratory tract viral loads or demonstrated clinical efficacy in a rhesus macaque model.⁶

The safety and efficacy of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin and azithromycin alone have been evaluated in randomized clinical trials, observational studies, and/or single-arm studies. Please see [Table 2b](#) for more information.

Recommendation

- The COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) **recommends against** the use of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine and/or azithromycin for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients (**AI**) and in nonhospitalized patients (**AIIa**).

Rationale

Hospitalized Patients

In a large randomized controlled platform trial of hospitalized patients in the United Kingdom (RECOVERY), hydroxychloroquine did not decrease 28-day mortality when compared to the usual standard of care. Patients who were randomized to receive hydroxychloroquine had a longer median hospital stay than those who received the standard of care. In addition, among patients who were not on invasive mechanical ventilation at the time of randomization, those who received hydroxychloroquine were more likely to subsequently require intubation or die during hospitalization than those who received the standard of care.⁷

The results from several additional large randomized controlled trials have been published; these trials have failed to show a benefit for hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin or azithromycin alone in hospitalized adults with COVID-19. In the Solidarity trial, an international randomized controlled platform trial that enrolled hospitalized patients with COVID-19, the hydroxychloroquine arm was halted for futility. There was no difference in in-hospital mortality between patients in the hydroxychloroquine arm and those in the control arm.⁸ Similarly, PETAL, a randomized, placebo-controlled, blinded study, was stopped early for futility. In this study, there was no difference in the median scores on the COVID Outcomes Scale between patients who received hydroxychloroquine and those who received placebo.⁹ Data from two additional randomized studies of hospitalized patients

with COVID-19 did not support using hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin over hydroxychloroquine alone.^{10,11} In RECOVERY, azithromycin alone (without hydroxychloroquine) did not improve survival or other clinical outcomes when compared to the usual standard of care.¹²

In addition to these randomized trials, data from large retrospective observational studies do not consistently show evidence of a benefit for hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.¹³⁻¹⁵ Please see [Table 2b](#) or the [archived versions](#) of the Guidelines for more information.

Given the lack of a benefit seen in the randomized clinical trials, the Panel **recommends against** using hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine and/or azithromycin to treat COVID-19 in hospitalized patients (**AI**).

Nonhospitalized Patients

Several randomized trials have not shown a clinical benefit for hydroxychloroquine in nonhospitalized patients with early, asymptomatic, or mild COVID-19.^{16,17} In an open-label trial, Mitja et al. randomized 307 nonhospitalized people who were recently confirmed to have COVID-19 to receive hydroxychloroquine or no antiviral treatment. Patients in the hydroxychloroquine arm received hydroxychloroquine 800 mg on Day 1 followed by 400 mg daily for an additional 6 days. The authors reported no difference in the mean reduction in SARS-CoV-2 RNA at Day 3 or the time to clinical improvement between the two arms (see [Table 2b](#) for more information). In another trial, treating patients who had asymptomatic or mild COVID-19 with hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin did not result in greater rates of virologic clearance (as measured by a negative polymerase chain reaction [PCR] result on Day 6).¹⁸

An open-label, prospective, randomized trial compared oral azithromycin 500 mg once daily for 3 days plus standard of care to standard of care alone in nonhospitalized, high-risk, older adults who had laboratory-confirmed or suspected COVID-19. No differences were observed between the arms in the primary endpoints of time to first self-reported recovery and hospitalization or death due to COVID-19. These findings remained consistent in an analysis that was restricted to participants with positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR results. The study was ultimately halted due to futility.¹⁹ Similarly, in a preliminary report from ATOMIC-2, adding oral azithromycin 500 mg once daily to standard of care for 14 days did not reduce the risk of hospitalization or death among 292 participants with mild to moderate COVID-19.²⁰

While ongoing clinical trials are still evaluating the use of chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine, and azithromycin in outpatients, the existing data suggest that it is unlikely that clinical benefits will be identified for these agents. The Panel **recommends against** the use of chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine and/or azithromycin for the treatment of COVID-19 in nonhospitalized patients (**AIIa**).

Adverse Effects

Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine have similar toxicity profiles, although hydroxychloroquine is better tolerated and has a lower incidence of toxicity than chloroquine. Cardiac adverse events that have been reported in people who received hydroxychloroquine include QTc prolongation, Torsades de Pointes, ventricular arrhythmia, and cardiac deaths.²¹

The use of azithromycin has also been associated with QTc prolongation,²² and using it in combination with hydroxychloroquine has been associated with a higher incidence of QTc prolongation and cardiac adverse events in patients with COVID-19.^{23,24}

Drug-Drug Interactions

Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine are moderate inhibitors of cytochrome P450 2D6, and these drugs

are also P-glycoprotein inhibitors. Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine may decrease the antiviral activity of remdesivir; coadministration of these drugs **is not recommended**.²⁵

Drug Availability

Hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, and azithromycin **are not approved** by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of COVID-19. Furthermore, the FDA Emergency Use Authorization for hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine was revoked in June 2020.

References

1. Wang M, Cao R, Zhang L, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell Res*. 2020;30(3):269-271. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32020029>.
2. Vincent MJ, Bergeron E, Benjannet S, et al. Chloroquine is a potent inhibitor of SARS coronavirus infection and spread. *Virology*. 2005;2:69. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16115318>.
3. Liu J, Cao R, Xu M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic derivative of chloroquine, is effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. *Cell Discov*. 2020;6:16. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32194981>.
4. Fantini J, Chahinian H, Yahi N. Synergistic antiviral effect of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in combination against SARS-CoV-2: what molecular dynamics studies of virus-host interactions reveal. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32405156/>.
5. Andreani J, Bideau ML, Duflot I, et al. In vitro testing of combined hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic effect. *Microb Pathog*. 2020. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32344177/>.
6. Maisonnasse P, Guedj J, Contreras V, et al. Hydroxychloroquine use against SARS-CoV-2 infection in non-human primates. *Nature*. 2020;585(7826):584-587. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32698191>.
7. Recovery Collaborative Group, Horby P, Mafham M, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(21):2030-2040. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33031652>.
8. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium, Pan H, Peto R, et al. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19—interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(6):497-511. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33264556>.
9. Self WH, Semler MW, Leither LM, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine on clinical status at 14 days in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2020;324(21):2165-2176. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33165621>.
10. Furtado RHM, Berwanger O, Fonseca HA, 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;396(10256):959-967. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32896292>.
11. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin in mild-to-moderate COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(21):2041-2052. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32706953>.
12. Recovery Collaborative Group. Azithromycin in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10274):605-612. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33545096>.
13. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of treatment with hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin with in-hospital mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York state. *JAMA*. 2020. Available at:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32392282>.

14. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational study of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(25):2411-2418. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32379955>.
15. Arshad S, Kilgore P, Chaudhry ZS, et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;97:396-403. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32623082>.
16. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in nonhospitalized adults with early COVID-19: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(8):623-631. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32673060>.
17. Mitja O, Corbacho-Monne M, Ubals M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for early treatment of adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized-controlled trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020; Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32674126>.
18. Omrani AS, Pathan SA, Thomas SA, et al. Randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled trial of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for virologic cure of non-severe COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33251500/>.
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. *The Lancet*. 2021;397(10279):1063-1074. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33676597/>.
20. Hinks TS, Lucy C, Knight R, et al. A randomised clinical trial of azithromycin versus standard care in ambulatory COVID-19—the ATOMIC2 trial. *MedRxiv*. 2021; Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.21.21255807v1>.
21. Nguyen LS, Dolladille C, Drici MD, et al. Cardiovascular toxicities associated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: an analysis of the World Health Organization pharmacovigilance database. *Circulation*. 2020;142(3):303-305. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32442023>.
22. Azithromycin (Zithromax) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/050710s039,050711s036,050784s0231bl.pdf.
23. Mercurio NJ, Yen CF, Shim DJ, 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(9):1036-1041. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32936252/>.
24. Chorin E, Wadhvani L, Magnani S, et al. QT interval prolongation and torsade de pointes in patients with COVID-19 treated with hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin. *Heart Rhythm*. 2020;17(9):1425-1433. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32407884>.
25. Food and Drug Administration. Remdesivir by Gilead Sciences: FDA warns of newly discovered potential drug interaction that may reduce effectiveness of treatment. 2020. Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/safety/medical-product-safety-information/remdesivir-gilead-sciences-fda-warns-newly-discovered-potential-drug-interaction-may-reduce>.

Table 2b. Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine and/or Azithromycin: Selected Clinical Data

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

The information in this table may include data from preprints or articles that have not been peer reviewed. This section will be updated as new information becomes available. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov) for more information on clinical trials that are evaluating CQ, HCQ, and/or AZM.

The Panel has reviewed other clinical studies of HCQ with or without AZM, CQ, and AZM for the treatment of COVID-19.¹⁻¹⁹ These studies have limitations that make them less definitive and informative than the studies discussed here. The Panel's summaries and interpretations of some of those studies are available in the [archived versions](#) of the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Solidarity Trial: Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19²⁰			
Open-label randomized controlled platform trial with multiple arms; in 1 arm, hospitalized patients received HCQ (n = 11,330)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Received a diagnosis of COVID-19 <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already receiving study drug • Expected to be transferred elsewhere within 72 hours <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ plus local SOC. Patients received a loading dose of HCQ 800 mg PO at entry, then HCQ 800 mg PO 6 hours later followed by a daily dose of HCQ 400 mg PO twice daily for 10 days, starting 12 hours after the entry dose. • Local SOC alone 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITT analysis: HCQ (n = 947) and HCQ control (n = 906) • Enrollment occurred between March 22 and October 4, 2020. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35% of patients enrolled in each arm were aged <50 years; 21% of patients were aged ≥70 years. • 21% to 23% of patients had diabetes mellitus, 20% to 21% had heart disease, and 6.5% to 7% had chronic lung disease. • At entry, 36% to 38% of patients were not on supplemental oxygen, 53% to 55% were receiving supplemental oxygen only, and 9% were receiving IMV. • SOC included corticosteroids for 23% of patients in HCQ arm and 22% of patients in SOC only arm. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant difference in in-hospital mortality; 104 patients (10.2%) in HCQ arm and 84 patients (8.9%) in SOC arm died by Day 28 (rate ratio 1.19; 95% CI, 0.89–1.59; P = 0.23). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not blinded • Disease severity varied widely among patients. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ does not decrease in-hospital mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 when compared to SOC. • HCQ does not decrease the need for mechanical ventilation when compared to SOC. • There was no evidence of harm in the HCQ arm.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Solidarity Trial: Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19²⁰ , continued			
	<p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-hospital mortality (i.e., death during the original hospitalization; follow-up ended at discharge from the hospital) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subgroup analyses based on age or respiratory support at entry reported no significant difference in mortality between the arms. No difference between the arms in the secondary outcome of initiation of ventilation, and no difference in the composite outcome of in-hospital mortality or initiation of ventilation The number of deaths due to any cardiac cause during the 14 days after enrollment (the dosing period) was lower in these 2 arms than in the other study arms (the RDV, LPV/RTV, and IFN arms and their respective control arms). 	
PETAL Trial: Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19²¹			
Randomized, placebo-controlled, blinded trial in hospitalized adults (n = 479)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection Symptoms of respiratory illness for <10 days <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 1 dose of HCQ or CQ during the previous 10 days Prolonged QTc interval (>500 ms) <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ 400 mg PO twice daily for 2 doses, then HCQ 200 mg PO twice daily for 8 doses Matching placebo <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical status 14 days after randomization, as measured by a 7-point ordinal scale (the COVID Outcomes Scale) 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollment occurred between April 2 and June 19, 2020. HCQ (n = 242) and placebo (n = 237) Planned sample size was 510 participants, but study enrollment was halted early due to futility. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median age was 58 and 57 years in HCQ and placebo arms, respectively; 33% of patients were aged ≥65 years and 24% of patients were Black/African American. 33% to 36% of patients had diabetes mellitus, 6% to 12% had heart disease, and 7% to 9% had chronic lung disease. At randomization, 5.4% of patients in HCQ arm and 8% in placebo arm were receiving IMV or ECMO. In both arms, 11% to 12% of patients were receiving noninvasive ventilation or HFNC oxygen, 46% to 48% were receiving low-flow oxygen, and 35% were receiving no respiratory support. Among the patients who received concomitant medications, 22% received RDV, 19% received AZM, and 18% received corticosteroids. There was no difference in concomitant medication use between the arms. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear how the primary outcome of this study (a median COVID Outcomes Scale score) translates to clinical practice. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ does not improve patient scores on the COVID Outcomes Scale in hospitalized patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection when compared to placebo. HCQ did not improve survival or time to discharge in these patients when compared to placebo.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
PETAL Trial: Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19²¹, continued			
		<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median COVID Outcomes Scale score was 6 in HCQ arm (IQR 4–7) and 6 in placebo arm (IQR 4–7; aOR 1.02; 95% CI, 0.73–1.42). • No difference between the arms in the secondary outcome of all-cause, all-location death at Day 14 and Day 28 • No difference between the arms in the number of any of the following systematically collected safety events: cardiac arrest treated with CPR, symptomatic hypoglycemia, ventricular arrhythmia, or seizure • Among patients who had QTc assessed, 5.9% in HCQ arm and 3.3% in placebo arm had a recorded QTc interval >500 ms during the first 5 days of dosing. 	
RECOVERY Trial²²			
<p>Open-label, randomized controlled platform trial with multiple arms; in 1 arm, hospitalized patients received HCQ (n = 11,197)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinically suspected or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients with prolonged QTc intervals were excluded from HCQ arm. <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ 800 mg at entry and at 6 hours, then HCQ 400 mg every 12 hours for 9 days or until discharge • Usual SOC <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All-cause mortality at Day 28 after randomization 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ (n = 1,561) and SOC (n = 3,155) • Study enrollment ended early after investigators and trial-steering committee concluded that the data showed no benefit for HCQ. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 65 years in both arms; 41% of patients were aged ≥70 years. • 90% of patients had laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection. • 57% of patients had ≥1 major comorbidity: 27% had diabetes mellitus, 26% had heart disease, and 22% had chronic lung disease. • At randomization, 17% of patients were receiving IMV or ECMO, 60% were receiving oxygen only (with or without noninvasive ventilation), and 24% were receiving neither. • Use of AZM or another macrolide during the follow-up period was similar in both arms, as was use of dexamethasone. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not blinded • Information on occurrence of new major cardiac arrhythmia was not collected throughout the trial. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ does not decrease 28-day all-cause mortality when compared to the usual SOC in hospitalized patients with clinically suspected or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection. • Patients who received HCQ had a longer median length of hospital stay, and those who were not on IMV at the time of randomization were more likely to require intubation or die during hospitalization if they received HCQ.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
RECOVERY Trial²², continued			
		<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant difference in 28-day mortality between the 2 arms; 421 patients (26.8%) in HCQ arm and 790 patients (27.0%) in SOC arm had died by Day 28 (rate ratio 1.09; 95% CI, 0.97–1.23; <i>P</i> = 0.15). • A similar 28-day mortality for HCQ patients was reported during the post hoc exploratory analysis that was restricted to the 4,266 participants (90.5%) who had a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result. • Patients in HCQ arm were less likely to survive hospitalization and had a longer median time to discharge than patients in SOC arm. • Patients who received HCQ and who were not on IMV at baseline had an increased risk of requiring intubation and an increased risk of death. • At the beginning of the study, the researchers did not record whether a patient developed a major cardiac arrhythmia after study enrollment; however, these data were later collected for 735 patients (47.1%) in HCQ arm and 1,421 patients (45.0%) in SOC arm. • No differences between the arms in the frequency of supraventricular tachycardia, ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation, or instances of AV block that required intervention; 1 case of Torsades de Pointes was reported in HCQ arm. 	
Hydroxychloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine Plus Azithromycin for Mild or Moderate COVID-19²³			
Open-label, 3-arm RCT in hospitalized adults (n = 667)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Clinically suspected or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • Mild or moderate COVID-19 • Duration of symptoms ≤14 days 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mITT analysis included patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n = 504). <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 50 years. • 58% of patients were men. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not blinded • Follow-up period was restricted to 15 days. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither HCQ alone nor HCQ plus AZM improved clinical outcomes at Day 15 after randomization among hospitalized patients

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Hydroxychloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine Plus Azithromycin for Mild or Moderate COVID-19²³, continued			
	<p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for >4 L of supplemental oxygen or $\geq 40\%$ FiO₂ by face mask • History of ventricular tachycardia • QT interval ≥ 480 ms <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ 400 mg twice daily for 7 days plus SOC • HCQ 400 mg twice daily plus AZM 500 mg daily for 7 days plus SOC • SOC alone <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical status at Day 15, as measured by a 7-point ordinal scale among the patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection <p>Ordinal Scale Definitions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not hospitalized, no limitations 2. Not hospitalized, with limitations 3. Hospitalized, not on oxygen 4. Hospitalized, on oxygen 5. Hospitalized, oxygen administered by HFNC or noninvasive ventilation 6. Hospitalized, on mechanical ventilation 7. Death 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At baseline, 58.2% of patients were Ordinal Level 3; 41.8% were Ordinal Level 4. • Median time from symptom onset to randomization was 7 days. • 23.3% to 23.9% of patients received oseltamivir. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant difference in the odds of worse clinical status at Day 15 between patients in HCQ arm (OR 1.21; 95% CI, 0.69–2.11; <i>P</i> = 1.00) and patients in HCQ plus AZM arm (OR 0.99; 95% CI, 0.57–1.73; <i>P</i> = 1.00) • No significant differences in secondary outcomes of the 3 arms, including progression to mechanical ventilation during the first 15 days and mean number of days “alive and free of respiratory support” • A greater proportion of patients in HCQ plus AZM arm (39.3%) and HCQ arm (33.7%) experienced AEs than those in SOC arm (22.6%). • QT prolongation was more common in patients who received HCQ plus AZM or HCQ alone than in patients who received SOC alone, but fewer patients in SOC arm had serial electrocardiographic studies performed during the follow-up period. 	with mild or moderate COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19²⁴			
<p>Randomized, placebo-controlled trial in nonhospitalized adults (n = 491)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Symptoms that were compatible with COVID-19 and lasted ≤4 days • Either laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection or high-risk exposure within the previous 14 days <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged <18 years • Hospitalized • Receipt of certain medications <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ 800 mg once, then HCQ 600 mg in 6–8 hours, then HCQ 600 mg once daily for 4 days • Placebo <p>Primary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned primary endpoint was ordinal outcome by Day 14 in 4 categories: not hospitalized, hospitalized, ICU stay, or death. • Because event rates were lower than expected, a new primary endpoint was defined: change in overall symptom severity over 14 days, measured by a 10-point, self-reported, visual analogue scale 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributed to primary endpoint data: HCQ (n = 212) and placebo (n = 211) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 241 patients were exposed to people with COVID-19 through their position as health care workers (57%), 106 were exposed through household contacts (25%), and 76 had other types of exposure (18%). • Median age was 40 years. • 56% of patients were women. • Only 3% of patients were Black. • Very few patients had comorbidities: 11% had hypertension, 4% had diabetes, and 68% had no chronic medical conditions. • 56% of patients were enrolled on Day 1 of symptom onset. • 341 participants (81%) had either a positive PCR result or a high-risk exposure to a PCR-positive contact. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to the placebo recipients, HCQ recipients had a nonsignificant 12% difference in improvement in symptoms between baseline and Day 14 (-2.60 vs. -2.33 points; <i>P</i> = 0.117). • Ongoing symptoms were reported by 24% of those in HCQ arm and 30% of those in the placebo arm at Day 14 (<i>P</i> = 0.21). • No difference in the incidence of hospitalization between the arms (4 patients in the HCQ arm vs. 10 patients in placebo arm); 2 of 10 placebo participants were hospitalized for reasons that were unrelated to COVID-19 • A higher percentage of patients in HCQ arm experienced AEs than patients in placebo arm (43% vs. 22%; <i>P</i> < 0.001). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This study enrolled a highly heterogeneous population. • Only 227 of 423 participants (53.7%) were confirmed PCR-positive for SARS-CoV-2. • Changing the primary endpoint without a new power calculation makes it difficult to assess whether the study is powered to detect differences in outcomes between the study arms. • This study used surveys for screening, symptom assessment, and adherence reporting. • Visual analogue scales are not commonly used, and their ability to assess acute viral respiratory infections in clinical trials has not been validated. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study has some limitations, and it did not find evidence that early administration of HCQ reduced symptom severity in patients with mild COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Mild COVID-19²⁵			
<p>Open-label RCT in nonhospitalized adults (n = 353)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection <5 days of mild COVID-19 symptoms <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate to severe COVID-19 Severe liver or renal disease History of cardiac arrhythmia QT prolongation <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ 800 mg on Day 1, then HCQ 400 mg once daily for 6 days No antiviral treatment (control arm) <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in SARS-CoV-2 viral load, assessed using NP swabs on Days 3 and 7 <p>Secondary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disease progression up to Day 28 Time to complete resolution of symptoms 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITT analysis: HCQ (n = 136) and control (n = 157) 60 patients were excluded from the ITT analysis due to negative baseline RT-PCR, missing RT-PCR at follow-up visits, or consent withdrawal. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean age was 41.6 years. 67% of patients were woman. Majority of patients were health care workers (87%). 53% of patients reported chronic health conditions. Median time from symptom onset to enrollment was 3 days (IQR 2–4 days). Most common COVID-19 symptoms were fever, cough, and sudden olfactory loss. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant difference in viral load reduction between control arm and HCQ arm at Day 3 (-1.41 vs. -1.41 log₁₀ copies/mL; difference of 0.01; 95% CI, -0.28 to 0.29), or at Day 7 (-3.37 vs. -3.44 log₁₀ copies/mL; difference of -0.07; 95% CI, -0.44 to 0.29). No difference in the risk of hospitalization between control arm and HCQ arm (7.1% vs. 5.9%; risk ratio 0.75; 95% CI, 0.32–1.77) No difference in the median time from randomization to the resolution of COVID-19 symptoms between the 2 arms (12.0 days in control arm vs. 10.0 days in HCQ arm; <i>P</i> = 0.38) A higher percentage of participants in the HCQ arm than in the control arm experienced AEs during the 28-day follow-up period (72% vs. 9%). Most common AEs were GI disorders and “nervous system disorders.” SAEs were reported in 12 patients in control arm and 8 patients in HCQ arm. SAEs that occurred among patients in HCQ arm were not deemed to be related to the drug. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open-label, non-placebo-controlled trial Study design allowed for the possibility of dropouts in control arm and over-reporting of AEs in HCQ arm. The intervention changed during the study; the authors initially planned to include HCQ plus DRV/COBI. The majority of the participants were relatively young health care workers. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early administration of HCQ to patients with mild COVID-19 did not result in improvement in virologic clearance, a lower risk of disease progression, or a reduced time to symptom improvement.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Observational Study on Hydroxychloroquine With or Without Azithromycin²⁶			
<p>Retrospective, multicenter, observational study in a random sample of hospitalized adults with COVID-19 from the New York Department of Health (n = 1,438)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ plus AZM HCQ alone AZM alone Neither drug <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-hospital mortality <p>Secondary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cardiac arrest and arrhythmia or QT prolongation on an ECG 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ plus AZM (n = 735), HCQ alone (n = 271), AZM alone (n = 211), and neither drug (n = 221) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients in the treatment arms had more severe disease at baseline than those who received neither drug. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In adjusted analyses, patients who received 1 of the 3 treatment regimens did not show a decreased in-hospital mortality rate when compared with those who received neither drug. Patients who received HCQ plus AZM had a greater risk of cardiac arrest than patients who received neither drug (OR 2.13; 95% CI, 1.12–4.05). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This study has the inherent limitations of an observational study, including residual confounding from confounding variables that were unrecognized and/or unavailable for analysis. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite the limitations discussed above, these findings suggest that although HCQ and AZM are not associated with an increased risk of in-hospital death, the combination of HCQ and AZM may be associated with an increased risk of cardiac arrest.
Observational Study of Hydroxychloroquine Versus No Hydroxychloroquine in New York City²⁷			
<p>Observational study in hospitalized adults with COVID-19 at a large medical center (n = 1,376)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intubation, death, or transfer to another facility within 24 hours of arriving at the emergency department <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ 600 mg twice daily on Day 1, then HCQ 400 mg once daily for 4 days No HCQ <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time from study baseline (24 hours after patients arrived at the ED) to intubation or death 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received HCQ (n = 811) and did not receive HCQ (n = 565) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ recipients were more severely ill at baseline than those who did not receive HCQ. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using propensity scores to adjust for major predictors of respiratory failure and inverse probability weighting, the study demonstrated that HCQ use was not associated with intubation or death (HR 1.04; 95% CI, 0.82–1.32). No association between concomitant use of AZM and the composite endpoint of intubation or death (HR 1.03; 95% CI, 0.81–1.31) 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This study has the inherent limitations of an observational study, including residual confounding from confounding variables that were unrecognized and/or unavailable for analysis. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of HCQ for treatment of COVID-19 was not associated with harm or benefit in a large observational study.

Key: AE = adverse event; AV = atrioventricular; AZM = azithromycin; CPR = cardiopulmonary resuscitation; CQ = chloroquine; DRV/COBI = darunavir/cobicistat; ECG = electrocardiogram; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; ED = emergency department, FiO₂ = fraction of inspired oxygen; GI = gastrointestinal; HCQ = hydroxychloroquine; HFNC = high-flow nasal cannula; ICU = intensive care unit; IFN = interferon; IMV = invasive mechanical ventilation; ITT = intention-to-treat; LPV/RTV = lopinavir/ritonavir; mITT = modified intention-to-treat; NP = nasopharyngeal; the Panel = the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel; PCR = polymerase chain reaction; PO = orally; RCT = randomized controlled trial; RDV = remdesivir; RT-PCR = reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction; SAE = serious adverse event; SOC = standard of care

References

1. Chorin E, Dai M, Shulman E, et al. The QT interval in patients with COVID-19 treated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(6):808-809. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32488217>.
2. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, et al. Clinical and microbiological effect of a combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in 80 COVID-19 patients with at least a six-day follow up: A pilot observational study. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020:101663. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32289548>.
3. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020:105949. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32205204>.
4. Huang M, Tang T, Pang P, et al. Treating COVID-19 with chloroquine. *J Mol Cell Biol*. 2020;12(4):322-325. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32236562>.
5. Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. *Med (N Y)*. 2020;1(1):114-127.e3. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32838355>.
6. Molina JM, Delaugerre C, Le Goff J, et al. No evidence of rapid antiviral clearance or clinical benefit with the combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin in patients with severe COVID-19 infection. *Med Mal Infect*. 2020;50(4):384. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32240719>.
7. Satlin MJ, Goyal P, Magleby R, et al. Safety, tolerability, and clinical outcomes of hydroxychloroquine for hospitalized patients with coronavirus 2019 disease. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(7):e0236778. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32701969>.
8. Mikami T, Miyashita H, Yamada T, et al. Risk factors for mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York City. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2021;36(1):17-26. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32607928>.
9. Catteau L, Dauby N, Montourcy M, et al. Low-dose hydroxychloroquine therapy and mortality in hospitalised patients with COVID-19: a nationwide observational study of 8075 participants. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020:106144. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32853673>.
10. COVID-19 RISK and Treatments (CORIST) Collaboration. Use of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalised COVID-19 patients is associated with reduced mortality: findings from the observational multicentre Italian CORIST study. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2020;82:38-47. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32859477>.
11. Furtado RHM, Berwanger O, Fonseca HA, 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;396(10256):959-967. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32896292>.
12. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomised

- controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1849. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32409561>.
13. 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. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32339248>.
 14. Mahevas M, Tran VT, Roumier M, et al. Clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational comparative study using routine care data. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1844. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32409486>.
 15. Arshad S, Kilgore P, Chaudhry ZS, et al. Treatment with hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;97:396-403. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32623082>.
 16. Recovery Collaborative Group. Azithromycin in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10274):605-612. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33545096>.
 17. Omrani AS, Pathan SA, Thomas SA, et al. Randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled trial of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for virologic cure of non-severe COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;29:100645. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33251500>.
 18. 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(10279):1063-1074. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33676597>.
 19. Hinks TSC, Cureton L, Knight R, et al. A randomised clinical trial of azithromycin versus standard care in ambulatory COVID-19—the ATOMIC2 trial. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.21.21255807v1>.
 20. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium, Pan H, Peto R, et al. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19—interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(6):497-511. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33264556>.
 21. Self WH, Semler MW, Leither LM, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine on clinical status at 14 days in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2020;324(21):2165-2176. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33165621>.
 22. Recovery Collaborative Group, Horby P, Mafham M, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(21):2030-2040. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33031652>.
 23. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin in mild-to-moderate COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(21):2041-2052. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32706953>.
 24. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in nonhospitalized adults with early COVID-19: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(8):623-631. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32673060>.
 25. Mitja O, Corbacho-Monne M, Ubals M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for early treatment of adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized-controlled trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32674126>.
 26. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, et al. Association of treatment with hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin with in-hospital mortality in patients with COVID-19 in New York state. *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2493-2502. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32392282>.
 27. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, et al. Observational study of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(25):2411-2418. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32379955>.

Ivermectin

Last Updated: February 11, 2021

Ivermectin is a Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved antiparasitic drug that is used to treat several neglected tropical diseases, including onchocerciasis, helminthiasis, and scabies.¹ It is also being evaluated for its potential to reduce the rate of malaria transmission by killing mosquitoes that feed on treated humans and livestock.² For these indications, ivermectin has been widely used and is generally well tolerated.^{1,3} Ivermectin is not approved by the FDA for the treatment of any viral infection.

Proposed Mechanism of Action and Rationale for Use in Patients With COVID-19

Reports from in vitro studies suggest that ivermectin acts by inhibiting the host importin alpha/beta-1 nuclear transport proteins, which are part of a key intracellular transport process that viruses hijack to enhance infection by suppressing the host's antiviral response.^{4,5} In addition, ivermectin docking may interfere with the attachment of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) spike protein to the human cell membrane.⁶ Ivermectin is thought to be a host-directed agent, which may be the basis for its broad-spectrum activity in vitro against the viruses that cause dengue, Zika, HIV, and yellow fever.^{4,7-9} Despite this in vitro activity, no clinical trials have reported a clinical benefit for ivermectin in patients with these viruses. Some studies of ivermectin have also reported potential anti-inflammatory properties, which have been postulated to be beneficial in people with COVID-19.¹⁰⁻¹²

Some observational cohorts and clinical trials have evaluated the use of ivermectin for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19. Data from some of these studies can be found in [Table 2c](#).

Recommendation

- There is insufficient evidence for the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) to recommend either for or against the use of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19. Results from adequately powered, well-designed, and well-conducted clinical trials are needed to provide more specific, evidence-based guidance on the role of ivermectin in the treatment of COVID-19.

Rationale

Ivermectin has been shown to inhibit the replication of SARS-CoV-2 in cell cultures.¹³ However, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies suggest that achieving the plasma concentrations necessary for the antiviral efficacy detected in vitro would require administration of doses up to 100-fold higher than those approved for use in humans.^{14,15} Even though ivermectin appears to accumulate in the lung tissue, predicted systemic plasma and lung tissue concentrations are much lower than 2 μM , the half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}) against SARS-CoV-2 in vitro.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Subcutaneous administration of ivermectin 400 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ had no effect on SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in hamsters. However, there was a reduction in olfactory deficit (measured using a food-finding test) and a reduction in the interleukin (IL)-6:IL-10 ratio in lung tissues.²⁰

Since the last revision of this section of the Guidelines, the results of several randomized trials and retrospective cohort studies of ivermectin use in patients with COVID-19 have been published in peer-reviewed journals or have been made available as manuscripts ahead of peer review. Some clinical studies showed no benefits or worsening of disease after ivermectin use,²¹⁻²⁴ whereas others reported shorter time to resolution of disease manifestations that were attributed to COVID-19,²⁵⁻²⁷ greater reduction in inflammatory marker levels,²⁶ shorter time to viral clearance,²¹ or lower mortality rates in patients who received ivermectin than in patients who received comparator drugs or placebo.^{21,27}

However, most of these studies had incomplete information and significant methodological limitations, which make it difficult to exclude common causes of bias. These limitations include:

- The sample size of most of the trials was small.
- Various doses and schedules of ivermectin were used.
- Some of the randomized controlled trials were open-label studies in which neither the participants nor the investigators were blinded to the treatment arms.
- Patients received various concomitant medications (e.g., doxycycline, hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, zinc, corticosteroids) in addition to ivermectin or the comparator drug. This confounded the assessment of the efficacy or safety of ivermectin.
- The severity of COVID-19 in the study participants was not always well described.
- The study outcome measures were not always clearly defined.

[Table 2c](#) includes summaries of key studies. Because most of these studies have significant limitations, the Panel cannot draw definitive conclusions on the clinical efficacy of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19. Results from adequately powered, well-designed, and well-conducted clinical trials are needed to provide further guidance on the role of ivermectin in the treatment of COVID-19.

Monitoring, Adverse Effects, and Drug-Drug Interactions

- Ivermectin is generally well tolerated. Adverse effects may include dizziness, pruritis, nausea, or diarrhea.
- Neurological adverse effects have been reported with the use of ivermectin for the treatment of onchocerciasis and other parasitic diseases, but it is not clear whether these adverse effects were caused by ivermectin or the underlying conditions.²⁸
- Ivermectin is a minor cytochrome P 3A4 substrate and a p-glycoprotein substrate.
- Ivermectin is generally given on an empty stomach with water; however, administering ivermectin with food increases its bioavailability.
- The FDA [issued a warning](#) in April 2020 that ivermectin intended for use in animals **should not be used** to treat COVID-19 in humans.
- Please see [Table 2c](#) for additional information.

Considerations in Pregnancy

In animal studies, ivermectin was shown to be teratogenic when given in doses that were maternotoxic. These results raise concerns about administering ivermectin to people who are in the early stages of pregnancy (prior to 10 weeks gestation).²⁹ A 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis reviewed the incidence of poor maternal and fetal outcomes after ivermectin was used for its antiparasitic properties during pregnancy. However, the study was unable to establish a causal relationship between ivermectin use and poor maternal or fetal outcomes due to the quality of evidence. There are numerous reports of inadvertent ivermectin use in early pregnancy without apparent adverse effects.³⁰⁻³² Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to establish the safety of using ivermectin in pregnant people, especially those in the later stages of pregnancy.

One study reported that the ivermectin concentrations secreted in breastmilk after a single oral dose were relatively low. No studies have evaluated the ivermectin concentrations in breastmilk in patients who received multiple doses.

Considerations in Children

Ivermectin is used in children weighing >15 kg for the treatment of helminthic infections, pediculosis, and scabies. The safety of using ivermectin in children weighing <15 kg has not been well established. Ivermectin is generally well tolerated in children, with a side effect profile similar to the one seen in adults. Currently, there are no available pediatric data from clinical trials to inform the use of ivermectin for the treatment or prevention of COVID-19 in children.

Clinical Trials

Several clinical trials that are evaluating the use of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19 are currently underway or in development. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov) for the latest information.

References

1. Omura S, Crump A. Ivermectin: panacea for resource-poor communities? *Trends Parasitol.* 2014;30(9):445-455. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25130507>.
2. Fritz ML, Siegert PY, Walker ED, Bayoh MN, Vulule JR, Miller JR. Toxicity of bloodmeals from ivermectin-treated cattle to *Anopheles gambiae* s.l. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2009;103(6):539-547. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19695159>.
3. Kircik LH, Del Rosso JQ, Layton AM, Schaubert J. Over 25 years of clinical experience with ivermectin: an overview of safety for an increasing number of indications. *J Drugs Dermatol.* 2016;15(3):325-332. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26954318>.
4. Yang SNY, Atkinson SC, Wang C, et al. The broad spectrum antiviral ivermectin targets the host nuclear transport importin alpha/beta1 heterodimer. *Antiviral Res.* 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32135219>.
5. Arévalo AP, Pagotto R, Pórfido J, et al. Ivermectin reduces coronavirus infection in vivo: a mouse experimental model. *bioRxiv.* 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.02.363242v1>.
6. Lehrer S, Rheinstein PH. Ivermectin docks to the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain attached to ACE2. *In Vivo.* 2020;34(5):3023-3026. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32871846>.
7. Tay MY, Fraser JE, Chan WK, et al. Nuclear localization of dengue virus (DENV) 1-4 non-structural protein 5; protection against all 4 DENV serotypes by the inhibitor ivermectin. *Antiviral Res.* 2013;99(3):301-306. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23769930>.
8. Wagstaff KM, Sivakumaran H, Heaton SM, Harrich D, Jans DA. Ivermectin is a specific inhibitor of importin alpha/beta-mediated nuclear import able to inhibit replication of HIV-1 and dengue virus. *Biochem J.* 2012;443(3):851-856. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22417684>.
9. Barrows NJ, Campos RK, Powell ST, et al. A screen of FDA-approved drugs for inhibitors of Zika virus infection. *Cell Host Microbe.* 2016;20(2):259-270. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27476412>.
10. Zhang X, Song Y, Ci X, et al. Ivermectin inhibits LPS-induced production of inflammatory cytokines and improves LPS-induced survival in mice. *Inflamm Res.* 2008;57(11):524-529. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19109745>.
11. DiNicolantonio JJ, Barroso J, McCarty M. Ivermectin may be a clinically useful anti-inflammatory agent for late-stage COVID-19. *Open Heart.* 2020;7(2). Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32895293>.
12. Ci X, Li H, Yu Q, et al. Avermectin exerts anti-inflammatory effect by downregulating the nuclear transcription factor kappa-B and mitogen-activated protein kinase activation pathway. *Fundam Clin Pharmacol.* 2009;23(4):449-455. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19453757>.
13. Caly L, Druce JD, Catton MG, Jans DA, Wagstaff KM. The FDA-approved drug ivermectin inhibits the

- replication of SARS-CoV-2 in vitro. *Antiviral Res.* 2020;178:104787. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32251768>.
14. Chaccour C, Hammann F, Ramon-Garcia S, Rabinovich NR. Ivermectin and COVID-19: keeping rigor in times of urgency. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;102(6):1156-1157. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32314704>.
 15. Guzzo CA, Furtek CI, Porrás AG, et al. Safety, tolerability, and pharmacokinetics of escalating high doses of ivermectin in healthy adult subjects. *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2002;42(10):1122-1133. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12362927>.
 16. Arshad U, Pertinez H, Box H, et al. Prioritization of anti-SARS-CoV-2 drug repurposing opportunities based on plasma and target site concentrations derived from their established human pharmacokinetics. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2020;108(4):775-790. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32438446>.
 17. Bray M, Rayner C, Noel F, Jans D, Wagstaff K. Ivermectin and COVID-19: a report in antiviral research, widespread interest, an FDA warning, two letters to the editor and the authors' responses. *Antiviral Res.* 2020;178:104805. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32330482>.
 18. Momekov G, Momekova D. Ivermectin as a potential COVID-19 treatment from the pharmacokinetic point of view: antiviral levels are not likely attainable with known dosing regimens. *Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment.* 2020;34(1):469-474. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13102818.2020.1775118>.
 19. Jermain B, Hanafin PO, Cao Y, Lifschitz A, Lanusse C, Rao GG. Development of a minimal physiologically-based pharmacokinetic model to simulate lung exposure in humans following oral administration of ivermectin for COVID-19 drug repurposing. *J Pharm Sci.* 2020;109(12):3574-3578. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32891630>.
 20. de Melo GD, Lazarini F, Larrous F, et al. Anti-COVID-19 efficacy of ivermectin in the golden hamster. *bioRxiv.* 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.21.392639v1>.
 21. Ahmed S, Karim MM, Ross AG, et al. A five-day course of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19 may reduce the duration of illness. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;103:214-216. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33278625>.
 22. Chachar AZK, Khan KA, Asif M, Tanveer K, Khaqan A, Basri R. Effectiveness of ivermectin in SARS-COV-2/COVID-19 Patients. *Int J of Sci.* 2020;9:31-35. Available at: <https://www.ijsciences.com/pub/article/2378>.
 23. Chowdhury ATMM, Shahbaz M, Karim MR, Islam J, Guo D, He S. A randomized trial of ivermectin-doxycycline and hydroxychloroquine-azithromycin therapy on COVID19 patients. *Research Square.* 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-38896/v1/3ee350c3-9d3f-4253-85f9-1f17f3af9551.pdf>.
 24. Soto-Becerra P, Culquichicón C, Hurtado-Roca Y, Araujo-Castillo RV. 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;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.06.20208066v3>.
 25. Hashim HA, Maulood MF, Rasheed AW, Fatak DF, Kabah KK, Abdulamir AS. Controlled randomized clinical trial on using ivermectin with doxycycline for treating COVID-19 patients in Baghdad, Iraq. *medRxiv.* 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219345v1>.
 26. Niaee MS, Gheibi N, Namdar P, et al. Ivermectin as an adjunct treatment for hospitalized adult COVID-19 patients: a randomized multi-center clinical trial. *Research Square.* 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-109670/v1>.
 27. Khan MSI, Khan MSI, Debnath CR, et al. Ivermectin treatment may improve the prognosis of patients with COVID-19. *Arch Bronconeumol.* 2020;56(12):828-830. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33293006>.
 28. Chandler RE. Serious neurological adverse events after ivermectin—do they occur beyond the indication of

- onchocerciasis? *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018;98(2):382-388. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29210346>.
29. Ivermectin [package insert]. *DailyMed.* 2017. Available at: <https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/fda/fdaDrugXsl.cfm?setid=847a1dd7-d65b-4a0e-a67d-d90392059dac&type=display>.
30. Pacque M, Munoz B, Poetschke G, Foose J, Greene BM, Taylor HR. Pregnancy outcome after inadvertent ivermectin treatment during community-based distribution. *Lancet.* 1990;336(8729):1486-1489. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1979100>.
31. Chippaux JP, Gardon-Wendel N, Gardon J, Ernould JC. Absence of any adverse effect of inadvertent ivermectin treatment during pregnancy. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 1993;87(3):318. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8236406>.
32. Gyapong JO, Chinbuah MA, Gyapong M. Inadvertent exposure of pregnant women to ivermectin and albendazole during mass drug administration for lymphatic filariasis. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2003;8(12):1093-1101. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14641844>.

Table 2c. Ivermectin: Selected Clinical Data

Last Updated: July 19, 2021

The Panel has reviewed other clinical studies of IVM for the treatment of COVID-19.¹⁻¹⁶ However, those studies have limitations that make them less definitive and informative than the studies discussed here. The studies summarized below are those that have had the greatest impact on the Panel's recommendations.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Versus Placebo for Treatment of Mild COVID-19¹⁷			
Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in Cali, Colombia (n = 476)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR result or positive antigen test result Symptoms began ≤ 7 days prior to randomization Mild disease (defined as receiving outpatient or inpatient care, but not receiving HFNC oxygen or mechanical ventilation) <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asymptomatic disease Severe pneumonia Receipt of IVM within previous 5 days Hepatic dysfunction/abnormal liver function tests <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral IVM 300 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ per day in solution for 5 days, taken primarily on an empty stomach Placebo <p>Primary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time from randomization to resolution of symptoms within 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVM (n = 200) and placebo (n = 198) in primary analysis <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median age was 37 years; 4% of patients in IVM arm and 8% in placebo arm were aged ≥ 65 years. 39% of patients in IVM arm and 45% in placebo arm were male. 79% of patients had no known comorbidities; median BMI in both arms was 26. Median time from symptom onset to randomization was 5 days (IQR 4–6 days). 62% of patients in IVM arm and 55% in placebo arm were not hospitalized and had no limitations of activities at baseline (ordinal scale 1); 38% and 44% were not hospitalized but had some limitations on activities, or they were receiving oxygen at home, or both (ordinal scale 2). 1% of patients in both arms were hospitalized at baseline. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No difference in time to resolution of symptoms (median 10 days in IVM arm vs. 12 days in placebo arm; HR 1.07; 95% CI, 0.87–1.32; $P = 0.53$) Symptoms resolved in 82% of patients in IVM arm and 79% in placebo arm by Day 21. <p>Other Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant difference between arms in proportion of patients who showed clinical deterioration of ≥ 2 points on the ordinal scale (3.5% in IVM arm vs. 2.0% in placebo arm; absolute difference -1.5%; 95% CI, -4.8% to 1.7%) 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively small sample size Primary endpoint was modified during the trial due to lower than expected event rates. The first 65 patients received a placebo that smelled and tasted different from IVM. The study enrolled a younger, healthier demographic than those who typically experience more serious cases of COVID-19. Study included 4 hospitalized patients (out of 398). The IVM dose used in this study was higher than the dose that is usually administered (IVM 200 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ per day). <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 5-day course of IVM did not improve time to resolution of symptoms in patients with mild COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Versus Placebo for Treatment of Mild COVID-19¹⁷ , continued			
	<p>the 21-day follow-up period. Resolution of symptoms was defined as the first day a patient reported a score of 0 (no clinical evidence of infection) on an 8-point ordinal scale.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant difference between arms in the odds of improvement in ordinal scale score and the proportion of patients who sought medical care or required escalation in care. • 8% of patients in IVM arm and 3% in placebo arm discontinued treatment due to an AE. None of the reported SAEs were considered to be related to study interventions. 	
Ivermectin Versus Ivermectin Plus Doxycycline Versus Placebo for Treatment of COVID-19¹⁸			
<p>Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of hospitalized adults in Dhaka, Bangladesh (n = 72)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged 18–65 years • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection with fever, cough, or sore throat • Admitted to hospital within previous 7 days <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic cardiac, renal, or liver disease <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM 12 mg PO once daily for 5 days • Single dose of IVM 12 mg PO plus DOX 200 mg PO on Day 1, then DOX 100 mg every 12 hours for 4 days • Placebo <p>Primary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to virologic clearance, measured by obtaining an NP swab for SARS-CoV-2 PCR on Days 3, 7, and 14, then weekly until PCR result was negative • Resolution of fever and cough within 7 days 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 24; 2 withdrew), IVM plus DOX (n = 24; 1 withdrew), and placebo (n = 24; 1 withdrew) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 42 years. • 54% of patients were female. • Mean time from symptom onset to assessment was 3.83 days. • No patients required supplemental oxygen. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorter mean time to virologic clearance with IVM than placebo (9.7 days vs. 12.7 days; $P = 0.02$), but not with IVM plus DOX (11.5 days; $P = 0.27$). • Rates of virologic clearance were greater in IVM arm at Day 7 (HR 4.1; 95% CI, 1.1–14.7; $P = 0.03$) and at Day 14 (HR 2.7; 95% CI, 1.2–6.0; $P = 0.02$) compared to placebo, but not in the IVM plus DOX arm (HR 2.3; 95% CI, 0.6–9.0; $P = 0.22$ and HR 1.7; 95% CI, 0.8–4.0; $P = 0.19$). • No statistically significant difference in time to resolution of fever, cough, or sore throat between IVM and placebo arms ($P = 0.35$, $P = 0.18$, and $P = 0.35$, respectively) or IVM plus DOX and placebo arms ($P = 0.09$, $P = 0.23$, and $P = 0.09$, respectively). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • Unclear whether both IVM and DOX placebos were used. • Excluded patients with chronic diseases. • Disease appears to have been mild in all patients; thus, the reason for hospitalization is unclear. • Absolute changes in inflammatory markers were not presented, but were reportedly significant. • PCR results are not a validated surrogate marker for clinical efficacy. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 5-day course of IVM resulted in faster virologic clearance than placebo, but not a faster time to resolution of symptoms (fever, cough, and sore throat).

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Versus Ivermectin Plus Doxycycline Versus Placebo for Treatment of COVID-19¹⁸, continued			
		<p>Other Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean values of CRP, LDH, procalcitonin, and ferritin declined in all arms from baseline to Day 7, but there were no between-arm comparisons of the changes. • No between-arm differences in duration of hospitalization ($P = 0.93$). • No SAEs recorded. 	<p>Because time to virologic clearance is not a validated surrogate marker for clinical efficacy, the clinical efficacy of IVM is unknown.</p>
Effectiveness and Safety of Adding Ivermectin to Treatment in Patients With Severe COVID-19¹⁹			
<p>Randomized, single-blind trial of hospitalized adults in Turkey (n = 66)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitalized with PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • ≥ 1 of the following severity criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tachypnea (≥ 30 breaths/min), $SpO_2 < 90\%$ on RA, or $PaO_2/FiO_2 < 300$ mm Hg in patients who were receiving oxygen • Presence of “specific” radiologic findings • Mechanical ventilation • Acute organ dysfunction <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged < 18 years • Pregnant or breast feeding • Autoimmune disease • Chronic liver or kidney disease • Immunosuppression • SNP mutation in MDR1/ABCB1 gene and/or haplotypes and mutations of the CYP3A4 gene (affects IVM metabolism and toxicity) 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 36) and SOC (n = 30) • 6 participants in IVM arm were excluded after genotyping. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 58 years in IVM arm and 66 years in SOC arm. • 70% of patients were male in IVM arm and 63% were male in SOC arm. • Comorbidities (IVM vs. SOC): DM (30% vs. 33%), HTN (50% vs. 40%), CAD (17% vs. 27%) <p>Primary Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical improvement at Day 5: 14 of 30 patients (46.7%) in IVM arm, 11 of 30 (36.7%) in SOC arm ($P = 0.43$) <p>Secondary Outcomes</p> <p><i>Between-Arm Comparisons at Day 10:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical improvement: 73.3% in IVM arm, 53.3% in SOC arm ($P = 0.10$) • IVM vs. SOC arm SOFA score at Day 10: $P = 0.50$ • Mean SpO_2: 95.4% in IVM arm, 93.0% in SOC arm ($P = 0.032$) • Mean PaO_2/FiO_2: 236.3 mm Hg in IVM arm, 220.8 mm Hg in SOC arm ($P = 0.39$) • Serum CRP, ferritin, and D-dimer levels were lower in IVM arm than in SOC arm ($P = 0.02$, $P = 0.005$, and $P = 0.03$, respectively). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • Time from symptom onset to intervention was not reported. • Study used nonstandard severity classification for COVID-19. • Primary endpoint was difficult to characterize; it was presented in the Methods section as a composite endpoint, but each component was analyzed separately. • Power analysis performed for virologic endpoint, not primary endpoint. • Only 57% of patients in IVM arm and 27% in SOC arm were evaluated for VL changes. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 5-day course of IVM in hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 did not result in clinical improvement at the end of treatment, and no reduction in mortality was observed.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Effectiveness and Safety of Adding Ivermectin to Treatment in Patients With Severe COVID-19¹⁹ , continued			
	<p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM 200 µg/kg per day for 5 days plus SOC (HCQ plus favipiravir plus AZM) • SOC alone <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Clinical response” at Day 5: extubation (in mechanically ventilated patients), respiratory rate <26 breaths/min, SpO₂ >90% on RA, PaO₂/FiO₂ >300 mm Hg (if patient was receiving oxygen), presence of ≥2 of the 2-point reduction criteria in SOFA <p>Key Secondary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical response at Day 10: respiratory rate 22 to 24 breaths/min, SpO₂ >95% on RA, absence of oxygen requirement, and no need for intensive care • Changes in SpO₂, PaO₂/FiO₂, and levels of CRP, ferritin, and D-dimer • Mortality 	<p><i>Within-Group Changes from Baseline:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in SOFA score to Day 10: <i>P</i> = 0.009 in IVM arm, <i>P</i> = 0.88 in SOC arm • Mean changes in SpO₂ to Day 5: 89.9% to 93.5% (<i>P</i> = 0.005) in IVM arm, 89.7% to 93.0% (<i>P</i> = 0.003) in SOC arm <p><i>Mortality During Follow-Up Period:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 patients (20%) in IVM arm and 9 (30%) in SOC arm (<i>P</i> = 0.37). • Average length of follow-up was 3 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster improvement of oxygenation and more pronounced reduction in inflammatory markers were observed in IVM arm.
Chloroquine, Hydroxychloroquine, or Ivermectin in Patients With Severe COVID-19²⁰			
<p>Randomized, double-blind, Phase 2 trial of hospitalized adults in Brazil (n = 168)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitalized with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (PCR or IgM positive) • ≥1 of the following severity criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dyspnea • Tachypnea (>30 breaths/min) • SpO₂ <93% • PaO₂/FiO₂ <300 mm Hg 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQ (n = 61), HCQ (n = 54), and IVM (n = 53) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 53.4±15.6 years. • 58.2% of patients were male. • 78.9% of patients were Hispanic. • 37.5% of patients had a BMI >30. • Most common comorbidities were HTN (43.4% of patients) and DM (28.1%). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • No placebo control • No clear primary endpoint <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of IVM did not reduce risk of oxygen requirement, ICU admission, invasive mechanical ventilation, or death in

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Chloroquine, Hydroxychloroquine, or Ivermectin in Patients With Severe COVID-19²⁰ , continued			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of >50% of lungs on CXR or CT <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged <18 years old • Cardiac arrhythmia, including prolonged QT interval • Previous use of CQ, HCQ, or IVM for >24 hours <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CQ 450 mg twice daily on Day 0, then CQ 450 mg once daily for 4 days • HCQ 400 mg twice daily on Day 0, then HCQ 400 mg once daily for 4 days • IVM 14 mg once daily for 3 days followed by placebo for 2 days <p>Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for supplemental oxygen, invasive mechanical ventilation, or ICU admission • Mortality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On admission, 76.5% of patients had respiratory failure, and 42.5% had “pneumonic syndrome.” <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No differences between arms in proportion of patients who required supplemental oxygen (88.5% in CQ arm, 90.2% in HCQ arm, and 88.4% in IVM arm) or mean number of days of supplemental oxygenation (7.9 vs. 7.8 vs. 8.1 days) • No differences between arms in proportion of patients admitted to the ICU (22.4% in CQ arm, 21.1% in HCQ arm, and 28.0% in IVM arm) or proportion of patients who received invasive mechanical ventilation (20.6% vs. 21.1% vs. 23.5%) • No differences between arms in proportion of patients who were receiving concomitant medications, including steroids and anticoagulants • No differences between arms in death due to COVID-19 complications (21.3% in CQ arm, 22.2% in HCQ arm, and 23.0% in IVM arm) • Baseline characteristics that were associated with mortality included age >60 years (HR 2.44; 95% CI, 1.40–4.30), DM (HR 1.87; 95% CI, 1.02–2.59), BMI >33 (HR 1.95; 95% CI, 1.07–3.09), and SpO₂ <90% (HR 5.79; 95% CI, 2.63–12.7). • No difference in rates of AEs between arms 	<p>hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19.</p>
Ivermectin Versus Placebo for Outpatients With Mild COVID-19²¹			
<p>Open-label RCT of adult outpatients in Lahore, Pakistan (n = 50)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive • Mild disease <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe symptoms likely related to cytokine storm • Malignancy, chronic kidney disease, or cirrhosis • Pregnancy 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 25) and control (n = 25) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 40.6 years. • 62% of patients were male. • 40% of patients had diabetes, 30% were smokers, 26% had hypertension, 8% had cardiovascular disease, and 12% had obesity. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size • Open-label study • Authors reported the proportions of patients with certain symptoms and comorbidities but did not provide objective assessment of disease severity. This precludes the ability to compare outcomes between arms.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Versus Placebo for Outpatients With Mild COVID-19²¹ , continued			
	<p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM 12 mg PO immediately, followed by 12 mg doses at 12 and 24 hours, plus symptomatic treatment • Symptomatic treatment <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Symptoms reported on Day 7. Patients were stratified as asymptomatic or symptomatic. 	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of asymptomatic patients at Day 7 was similar in IVM and control arms (64% vs. 60%; $P = 0.500$). • AEs were attributed to IVM in 8 patients (32%). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study classified outcomes at Day 7 as “symptomatic” and “asymptomatic,” but did not account for symptom worsening or improvement. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM showed no effect on symptom resolution in patients with mild COVID-19.
Ivermectin in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19²²			
<p>Open-label, single-center, RCT of outpatients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in Bangladesh (n = 62)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥ 18 years • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • ≤ 7 days of symptoms • Mild or moderate disease <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hypersensitivity to IVM • Pregnancy or breastfeeding • Use of HCQ or “other antimicrobials” <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single dose of IVM 200 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ • SOC <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full recovery from all symptoms <p>Secondary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion to negative RT-PCR at Day 10 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 32) and SOC (n = 30) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 71% of patients were male. • Mean age was 39.2 years (SD 12.1 years). • 81% of patients had mild disease and 19% had moderate disease. • Study provided no information on comorbidities. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean overall recovery time was 5.3 days (SD 2.5 days) in IVM arm and 6.3 days (SD 4.2 days) in SOC arm. The difference was not statistically significant. Time to resolution of fever, shortness of breath, and fatigue were no shorter in IVM arm. • Negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR result at Day 10: 18 of 20 patients (90%) in IVM arm, 19 of 20 (95%) in SOC arm. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open-label study • Small study • Study enrolled young patients with mild disease who were unlikely to progress to severe COVID-19. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to SOC, use of IVM did not lead to faster recovery from mild to moderate COVID-19. • The small sample size and large number of comparisons make it difficult to assess the clinical efficacy of IVM in this population.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Plus Doxycycline Versus Hydroxychloroquine Plus Azithromycin for Asymptomatic Patients and Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19²³			
<p>RCT of outpatients with SARS-CoV-2 infection with or without symptoms in Bangladesh (n = 116)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection by RT-PCR SpO₂ ≥95% Normal or near-normal CXR No unstable comorbidities <p>Interventions</p> <p><i>Group A:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single dose of IVM 200 µg/kg plus DOX 100 mg twice daily for 10 days <p><i>Group B:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCQ 400 mg on Day 1, then HCQ 200 mg twice daily for 9 days plus AZM 500 mg once daily for 5 days <p>Primary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to negative PCR result. Asymptomatic patients were tested starting on Day 5, then every other day until a negative result occurred. Symptomatic patients were tested on their second symptom-free day, then every other day until a negative result occurred. Time to resolution of symptoms 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group A (n = 60) and Group B (n = 56) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean age was 33.9 years. 78% of patients were male. 91 of 116 patients (78.5%) were symptomatic. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCR became negative in 60 of 60 patients (100%) in Group A and in 54 of 56 patients (96.4%) in Group B. Mean time to negative PCR result: 8.93 days (range 8–13 days) in Group A, 9.33 days (range 5–15 days) in Group B (<i>P</i> = 0.2314). Mean time to symptom recovery: 5.93 days (range 5–10 days) in Group A, 6.99 days (range 4–12 days) in Group B (<i>P</i> = 0.071). In a subgroup analysis of patients who were symptomatic at baseline, the mean time to negative PCR result for Groups A and B were 9.06 days and 9.74 days, respectively (<i>P</i> = 0.0714). Patients who received IVM plus DOX had fewer AEs than those who received HCQ plus AZM (31.7% vs. 46.4%) in the subgroup analysis. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small sample size Open-label study No SOC alone group Study enrolled young patients without major risk factors for disease progression. None of the comparative outcome measures were statistically significant. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In this small study with a young population, the authors suggested that IVM plus DOX was superior to HCQ plus AZM despite no statistically significant difference in time from recovery to negative PCR result and symptom recovery between patients who received IVM plus DOX and those who received HCQ plus AZM.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Antiviral Effect of High-Dose Ivermectin in Adults with COVID-19²⁴			
<p>Multicenter, randomized, open-label, blinded trial of hospitalized adults with mild to moderate COVID-19 in Argentina (n = 45)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection Hospitalized ≤5 days of symptoms <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of immunomodulators or any agent with potential anti-SARS-CoV-2 activity prior to enrollment Poorly controlled comorbidities <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVM 600 µg/kg once daily plus SOC for 5 days SOC <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VL reduction at Day 5. VL was quantified by NP swab at baseline, then at 24, 48, and 72 hours and Day 5. <p>PK Sampling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performed 4 hours after dose on Days 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 to assess elimination 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVM (n = 30) and SOC (n = 15) After excluding patients with poor sample quality, those without a detectable VL at baseline, and those who withdrew, 32 patients (20 IVM, 12 SOC) were included in the viral efficacy analysis population. <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean age was 42.3±12.8 years in IVM arm and 38.1±11.7 years in SOC arm. 50% of patients were male in IVM arm and 67% were male in SOC arm. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By Day 5, a similar magnitude of VL reduction was seen in both arms. <p>Other Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients with higher IVM concentrations had greater reductions in VL (r 0.44; P < 0.04). Treated patients were divided into 2 groups based on IVM C_{max}: IVM >160 ng/mL (median of 202 ng/mL) and <160 ng/mL (median of 109 ng/mL). Median percentage of VL reduction by C_{max} concentration vs. control (P = 0.0096) was 72% (IQR 59% to 77%) in >160 ng/mL group (n = 9), 40% (IQR 21% to 46%) in <160 ng/mL group (n = 11), and 42% (IQR 31% to 73%) in SOC arm. Median viral decay rate (P = 0.04) was 0.64 day⁻¹ in >160 ng/mL group, 0.14 day⁻¹ in <160 ng/mL group, and 0.13 day⁻¹ in SOC arm. Percentages of AEs were similar between the arms (43% in IVM arm, 33% in SOC arm), and AEs were mostly mild. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small sample size No clinical response data reported. The C_{max} level of 160 ng/mL used in the analysis appears to be arbitrary. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentration-dependent virologic response was seen when using a higher-than-usual dose of IVM (600 µg/kg vs. 200 or 400 µg/kg once daily), with minimal associated toxicities. The study results showed large interpatient variation of IVM C_{max}. Larger sample sizes are needed to further assess the safety and efficacy of using higher doses of IVM to treat COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Effect of Early Treatment With Ivermectin Versus Placebo on Viral Load, Symptoms, and Humoral Response in Patients With Mild COVID-19²⁵			
<p>A single-center, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot trial in Spain (n = 24)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection ≤72 hours of symptoms No risk factors for severe disease or COVID-19 pneumonia <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single dose of IVM 400 µg/kg Nonmatching placebo tablet administered by a nurse who did not participate in the patient's care <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR result from an NP swab at Day 7 post-treatment 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVM (n = 12) and placebo (n = 12) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean age was 26 years (range 18–54 years). 50% of patients were male. All patients had symptoms at baseline; 70% had headache, 66% had fever, 58% had malaise, and 25% had cough. Median onset of symptoms was 24 hours in IVM arm and 48 hours in placebo arm. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At Day 7, 12 patients (100%) in both groups had a positive PCR (for gene N), and 11 of 12 who received IVM (92%) and 12 of 12 who received placebo (100%) had a positive PCR (for gene E); <i>P</i> = 1.0 for both comparisons. In a post hoc analysis, the authors reported fewer patient-days of cough and anosmia in the IVM-treated patients, but no differences in the patient-days for fever, general malaise, headache, and nasal congestion. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small sample size PCR is not a validated surrogate marker for clinical efficacy. PCR cycle threshold values were higher for patients who received IVM than those who received placebo at some time points, but these comparisons are not statistically significant. Symptom results were not a prespecified outcome and are of unclear statistical and clinical significance. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients who received IVM showed no difference in viral clearance compared to those who received placebo. The small sample size and large number of comparisons make it difficult to assess the clinical efficacy of IVM in this population.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin Plus Doxycycline Plus Standard Therapy Versus Standard Therapy Alone in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19²⁶			
<p>Randomized, unblinded, single-center study of patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in Baghdad, Iraq (n = 140)</p> <p><i>This is a preliminary report that has not yet been peer reviewed.</i></p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnosis by clinical, radiological, and PCR testing • Outpatients had mild or moderate COVID-19, while inpatients had severe and critical COVID-19. <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM 200 µg/kg PO daily for 2 days. If patient required more time to recover, a third dose was given 7 days after the first dose, plus DOX 100 mg twice daily for 5–10 days plus standard therapy (based on clinical condition). • Standard therapy was based on clinical condition and included AZM, acetaminophen, vitamin C, zinc, vitamin D3, dexamethasone 6 mg daily or methylprednisolone 40 mg twice daily if needed, and oxygen or mechanical ventilation if needed. • All critically ill patients were assigned to receive IVM plus DOX. 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM plus DOX plus standard therapy (n = 70) and standard therapy alone (n = 70) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median age was 50 years in IVM arm and 47 years in standard therapy arm. • 50% of patients were male in IVM arm and 53% were male in standard therapy arm. • In IVM arm, 48 patients had mild or moderate COVID-19, 11 had severe COVID-19, and 11 had critical COVID-19. • In standard therapy arm, 48 patients had mild or moderate COVID-19, 22 had severe COVID-19, and no patients had critical COVID-19. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean recovery time in IVM arm was 10.1 days (SD 5.3 days) vs. 17.9 days (SD 6.8 days) for standard therapy arm ($P < 0.0001$). This result was only significant for those with mild to moderate disease. • Disease progression occurred in 3 of 70 patients (4.3%) in IVM arm and 7 of 70 (10.0%) in standard therapy arm ($P = 0.19$) • 2 of 70 patients (2.85%) in IVM arm and 6 of 70 (8.57%) in standard therapy arm died ($P = 0.14$) 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not blinded • Patient deaths prevent an accurate comparison of mean recovery time between arms in this study, and the authors did not account for competing mortality risks. • Relies heavily on post hoc subgroup comparisons. • Substantial imbalance in disease severity at baseline • Authors noted that critical patients were not assigned to standard therapy arm; thus, the arms were not truly randomized. • Unclear how many patients required corticosteroids. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM may shorten the time to recovery for patients with mild or moderate disease, but the lack of control for competing mortality causes in the study limits the ability to interpret the results.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19²⁷			
<p>Double-blind RCT in patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 in India (n = 157)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR or antigen test • Nonsevere COVID-19 (defined as SpO₂ >90% on RA and no hypotension or need for mechanical ventilation) <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CrCl <30 mL/min • Transaminases >5 times ULN • MI or heart failure in previous 90 days • QTc interval >450 ms • Severe comorbidity <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single dose of IVM 24 mg in alcohol-based elixir prepared by pharmacy • Single dose of same elixir with IVM 12 mg • Single dose of same elixir without IVM (placebo) <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of SARS-CoV-2 VL as measured by NP and OP swab at Day 5 • Conversion to negative RT-PCR at Day 5 <p>Key Secondary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative RT-PCR on Days 3 and 7 • Time to clinical resolution 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITT analysis (safety): IVM 24 mg (n = 51), IVM 12 mg (n = 49), and placebo (n = 52) • mITT analysis (included only those with positive NP/OP RT-PCR result): IVM 24 mg (n = 40), IVM 12 mg (n = 40), and placebo (n = 45) • 64% of patients had mild disease (including asymptomatic disease) and 36% had moderate disease <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 35.5 years (SD 10.4 years). • 88.8% of patients were male. • Mean BMI was 25. • Median duration of symptoms was similar between the arms (5 days; IQR 3–7 days). • 10% of patients received concurrent antivirals (RDV, favipiravir, or HCQ). No difference in use of antivirals between arms. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of patients with negative RT-PCR result on Day 5: 47.5% in IVM 24 mg arm, 35.0% in IVM 12 mg arm, and 31.1% in placebo arm (<i>P</i> = 0.30) • VL at enrollment did not impact conversion to negative RT-PCR on Day 5. • No significant difference in VL decline by Day 5 between the arms • No difference in VL decline in the mild or moderate disease strata at Day 5 <p>Secondary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference between arms in mean time to symptom resolution or number of hospital-free days at Day 28 • Proportions of patients with clinical worsening were similar across the arms: 7.5% in IVM 24 mg arm, 5.0% in IVM 12 mg arm, and 11.1% in placebo arm (<i>P</i> = 0.65) 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though the rate of negative RT-PCR results was numerically higher in the IVM arms than in the placebo arm on Day 5, the result was not statistically significant. • No difference in clinical outcomes or frequency of AEs.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19²⁷, continued			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of clinical worsening • Clinical status at Day 14 • Number of hospital-free days at Day 28 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difference between arms in frequency of AEs or SAEs 	
Efficacy and Safety of Ivermectin and Hydroxychloroquine in Patients With Severe COVID-19²⁸			
<p>Randomized, double-blind trial of hospitalized adults with COVID-19 pneumonia in Mexico (n = 106)</p> <p><i>This is a preliminary report that has not yet been peer reviewed.</i></p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • Pneumonia, diagnosed by CXR or high-resolution chest CT scan • Recently established hypoxemic respiratory failure or deterioration of pre-existing lung or heart disease <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of HFNC oxygen or invasive mechanical ventilation • Patients with QT intervals \geq500 ms were not eligible for HCQ but were eligible for IVM. <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ 400 mg twice daily on Day 1, then HCQ 200 mg/kg twice daily for 4 days • Single dose of IVM 12 mg (in patients weighing \leq80 kg) or 18 mg (in those weighing >80 kg) plus calcium citrate for subsequent doses • Calcium citrate placebo <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to discharge due to recovery 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ (n = 33), IVM (n = 36), and placebo (n = 37) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 53 years (SD 16.9 years). • 62% of patients were male. • 34% of patients had diabetes, 32% had hypertension, and 72% had any comorbidity. • Mean BMI was 29.6 (SD 6.6). <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median time to discharge due to recovery was 7 days (IQR 3–9 days) in HCQ arm, 6 days (IQR 4–11 days) in IVM arm, and 5 days (IQR 4–7 days) in placebo arm. The differences between arms were not statistically significant. • Proportion of patients discharged alive: 79% in HCQ arm, 75% in IVM arm, and 73% in placebo arm • Mortality: 6% of patients in HCQ arm, 14% in IVM arm, and 16% in placebo arm 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small study • Length of follow-up period is unclear. • The study was stopped prior to achieving its target sample size. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In hospitalized patients with COVID-19 pneumonia who were not critically ill, neither IVM nor HCQ decreased the number of in-hospital days, rate of respiratory deterioration, or mortality. • The small sample size and large number of comparisons make it difficult to assess the clinical efficacy of IVM in this population.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Ivermectin as Adjunctive Therapy to Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19²⁹			
<p>Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter, Phase 2 clinical trial of hospitalized adults with mild to severe SARS-CoV-2 infection in 5 facilities in Iran (n = 180)</p> <p><i>This is a preliminary report that has not yet been peer reviewed.</i></p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 pneumonia, with chest CT compatible with mild to severe COVID-19 or positive RT-PCR result for SARS-CoV-2 <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe immunosuppression, malignancy, or chronic kidney disease • Pregnancy <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ 200 mg/kg twice daily alone as SOC (standard arm) • SOC plus 1 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placebo • Single dose of IVM 200 µg/kg • IVM 200 µg/kg on Days 1, 3, and 5 • Single dose of IVM 400 µg/kg • IVM 400 µg/kg on Day 1, then IVM 200 µg/kg on Days 3 and 5 <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical recovery within 45 days of enrollment (defined as normal temperature, respiratory rate, and SpO₂ >94% for 24 hours) 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 6 arms (n = 30 in each arm) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average age was 56 years (range 45–67 years). • 50% of patients were male. • Disease stratification (based on CT findings): negative (1%), mild (14%), moderate (73%), and severe (12%) • Mean SpO₂ at baseline was 89%. <p>Primary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durations of hypoxemia and hospitalization were shorter in IVM arms than placebo arm ($P = 0.025$ and $P = 0.006$, respectively), and mortality was lower in the IVM arms ($P = 0.001$). • There was no difference in number of days of tachypnea ($P = 0.584$) or return to normal temperature ($P = 0.102$). • Significant differences in change from baseline to Day 5 in absolute lymphocyte count, platelet count, erythrocyte sedimentation rate, and CRP. • Higher mortality was reported in standard and placebo arms than IVM arms. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small study • Power estimation is confusing. • Mortality was not listed as the primary or secondary outcome. • It is unclear whether IVM patients also received HCQ. • It is unclear whether the between-group comparisons are between combined IVM groups and placebo plus SOC. • Patients were stratified by disease severity based on CT findings. These categorizations are unclear and were not taken into account in outcome comparisons. • The post hoc grouping of randomized arms raises risk of false positive findings. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM appeared to improve laboratory outcomes and some clinical outcomes (shorter duration of hypoxemia and hospitalization) and lowered mortality. • The small size of the study, the unclear treatment arm assignments, and the lack of accounting for disease severity at baseline make it difficult to draw conclusions about the efficacy of using IVM to treat patients with mild COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Retrospective Analysis of Ivermectin in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19³⁰			
<p>Retrospective analysis of consecutive patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection who were admitted to 4 Florida hospitals (n = 276)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive NP swab with SARS-CoV-2 RNA <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single dose of IVM 200 µg/kg, repeated on Day 7 at the doctors' discretion; 90% of patients also received HCQ. • Usual care: 97% of patients received HCQ and most also received AZM. <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All-cause, in-hospital mortality 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 173; 160 patients received a single dose, 13 patients received a second dose) and usual care (n = 103) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age was 60.2 years in IVM arm and 58.6 years in usual care arm. • 51.4% of patients were male in IVM arm and 58.8% were male in usual care arm. • 56.6% of patients were Black in IVM arm and 51.4% were Black in usual care arm. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All-cause mortality was lower in IVM arm than in usual care arm (OR 0.27; 95% CI, 0.09–0.80; <i>P</i> = 0.03); the benefit appeared to be limited to the subgroup of patients with severe disease. • No difference in median length of hospital stay between arms (7 days for both) or proportion of mechanically ventilated patients who were successfully extubated (36% in IVM arm vs. 15% in usual care arm; <i>P</i> = 0.07). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not randomized • Little to no information on SpO₂ or radiographic findings • Timing of therapeutic interventions was not standardized. • Ventilation and hospitalization duration analyses do not appear to account for death as a competing risk. • No virologic assessments were performed. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM use was associated with lower mortality than usual care. However, the limitations of this retrospective analysis make it difficult to draw conclusions about the efficacy of using IVM to treat patients with COVID-19.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Observational Study on the Effectiveness of Hydroxychloroquine, Azithromycin, and Ivermectin Among Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19³¹			
<p>Retrospective cohort study of hospitalized adults with COVID-19 in Peru (n = 5,683)</p> <p><i>This is a preliminary report that has not yet been peer-reviewed.</i></p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥18 years • Symptomatic • Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection • No life-threatening illness at admission <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required oxygen at admission • Use of tocilizumab, LPV/RTV, or RDV <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the following interventions administered within 48 hours of admission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ or CQ alone • IVM alone • AZM alone • HCQ or CQ plus AZM • IVM plus AZM • SOC (e.g., supportive care, antipyretics, hydration) <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All-cause mortality <p>Secondary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All-cause mortality and/or transfer to ICU 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCQ or CQ alone (n = 200), IVM alone (n = 203), AZM alone (n = 1,600), HCQ or CQ plus AZM (n = 692), IVM plus AZM (n = 358), and SOC (n = 2,630) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63% of patients were male. • Mean age was 59.4 years (range 18–104 years). • All patients had mild or moderate disease. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median follow-up time was 7 days. Mortality rate was 18.9% at the end of follow-up. • IVM alone was associated with increased risk of death and/or ICU transfer compared to SOC (wHR 1.58; 95% CI, 1.11–2.25). • IVM plus AZM did not have an effect on deaths or any secondary outcomes (all-cause death and/or ICU transfer, all-cause death and/or oxygen prescription) compared to SOC. • HCQ or CQ plus AZM was associated with a higher risk of death (wHR 1.84; 95% CI, 1.12–3.02), death and/or ICU transfer (wHR 1.49; 95% CI, 1.01–2.19), and death and/or oxygen prescription (wHR 1.70; 95% CI, 1.07–2.69) compared to SOC. 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not randomized • Unclear whether all patients received IVM or other medications according to Peruvian guidelines referred to in the manuscript. • Dosing and timing of administration are unclear. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to SOC, IVM alone was associated with increased risk of death and/or ICU admission. Using IVM in combination with AZM was not associated with effects on mortality, ICU transfer, or oxygen prescription compared to SOC.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Retrospective Study of Ivermectin Versus Standard of Care in Patients With COVID-19³²			
<p>Retrospective study of consecutive adult patients hospitalized in Bangladesh with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n = 248)</p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥ 18 years • Positive NP swab with SARS-CoV-2 RNA • “Free from any other serious pathological conditions” <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single dose of IVM 12 mg within 24 hours of hospital admission • SOC <p>Primary Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not specified 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVM (n = 115) and SOC (n = 133) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median age in IVM arm was 34 years; 70% of patients were male. • Median age in SOC arm was 35 years; 52% of patients were male. • All patients had mild or moderate disease. • 12% of patients had hypertension in both arms. • 17% of patients in IVM arm and 12% in SOC arm had DM. <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer patients in IVM arm had evidence of disease progression compared to SOC arm ($P < 0.001$): moderate respiratory distress (2.6% vs. 15.8%), pneumonia (0% vs. 9.8%), ischemic stroke (0% vs. 1.5%). • Fewer patients in IVM arm required intensive care management compared to SOC arm (0.9% vs. 8.8%; $P < 0.001$). • Fewer patients in IVM arm required antibiotic therapy (15.7% vs. 60.2%; $P < 0.001$) or supplemental oxygen (9.6% vs. 45.9%; $P < 0.001$) compared to SOC arm. • Shorter median duration of viral clearance in IVM arm compared to SOC arm (4 vs. 15 days; $P < 0.001$). • Shorter median duration of hospital stay in IVM arm compared to SOC arm (9 vs. 15 days; $P < 0.001$) • Lower mortality in IVM arm compared to SOC arm (0.9% vs. 6.8%; $P < 0.05$) 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not randomized • Disease severity at admission was reported as mild or moderate, but 12% of patients in IVM arm and 9% in SOC arm had $SpO_2 < 94\%$ • Even though only 10% of patients developed pneumonia, 60% received antibiotics. • Possibility of harm from concomitant medications <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to SOC, IVM use was associated with faster rates of viral clearance and better clinical outcomes, including shorter hospital stay and lower mortality.

Key: AE = adverse event; AZM = azithromycin; BMI = body mass index; CAD = coronary artery disease; C_{max} = maximum concentration; CQ = chloroquine; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CRP = C-reactive protein; CT = computed tomography; CXR = chest X-ray; CYP = cytochrome P450; DM = diabetes mellitus; DOX = doxycycline; HCQ = hydroxychloroquine; HFNC = high-flow nasal cannula; HTN = hypertension; ICU = intensive care unit; Ig = immunoglobulin; ITT = intention-to-treat; IVM = ivermectin; LDH = lactose dehydrogenase; LPV/RTV = lopinavir/ritonavir; MDR1 = multidrug resistance mutation 1; MI = myocardial infarction; mITT = modified intention-to-treat; NP = nasopharyngeal; OP = oropharyngeal; the Panel = the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel; PaO_2/FiO_2 = ratio of arterial partial pressure of oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen; PCR = polymerase chain reaction; PK = pharmacokinetic; PO = orally; r = correlation coefficient; RA = room air; RCT = randomized controlled trial; RDV = remdesivir; RT-PCR = reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction; SAE = severe adverse event; SNP = single-nucleotide polymorphism; SOC = standard of care; SOFA = sequential organ failure assessment; SpO_2 = oxygen saturation; ULN = upper limit of normal; VL = viral load

References

1. Spoorthi V, Sasank S. Utility of ivermectin and doxycycline combination for the treatment of SARS-CoV-2. *Int Arch Integr Med*. 2020;7(10):117-182. Available at: https://iaimjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/iaim_2020_0710_23.pdf.
2. Camprubi D, Almuedo-Riera A, Marti-Soler H, et al. Lack of efficacy of standard doses of ivermectin in severe COVID-19 patients. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(11):e0242184. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33175880>.
3. Bhattacharya R, Ray I, Mukherjee R, Chowdhury S, Kulasreshtha MK, Ghosh R. Observational study on clinical features, treatment and outcome of COVID-19 in a tertiary care centre in India - a retrospective case series. *Int J Sci Res*. 2020;9(10). Available at: [https://www.worldwidejournals.com/international-journal-of-scientific-research-\(IJSR\)/article/observational-study-on-clinical-features-treatment-and-outcome-of-covid-19-in-a-tertiary-care-centre-in-india-andndash-a-retrospective-case-series/MzI0NTg=?is=1&b1=141&k=36](https://www.worldwidejournals.com/international-journal-of-scientific-research-(IJSR)/article/observational-study-on-clinical-features-treatment-and-outcome-of-covid-19-in-a-tertiary-care-centre-in-india-andndash-a-retrospective-case-series/MzI0NTg=?is=1&b1=141&k=36).
4. Morgenstern J, Redondo JN, León A, et al. The use of compassionate ivermectin in the management of symptomatic outpatients and hospitalized patients with clinical diagnosis of COVID-19 at the Medical Center Bournigal and the Medical Center Punta Cana, Rescue Group, Dominican Republic, from May 1 to August 10, 2020. *medRxiv*. 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.29.20222505v1>.
5. Cadebiani FA, Goren A, Wambier CG, McCoy J. Early COVID-19 therapy with azithromycin plus nitazoxanide, ivermectin or hydroxychloroquine in outpatient settings significantly reduced symptoms compared to known outcomes in untreated patients. *medRxiv*. 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.31.20223883v1>.
6. Carvallo H, Roberto H, Eugenia FM. Safety and efficacy of the combined use of ivermectin, dexamethasone, enoxaparin and aspirin against COVID 19. *medRxiv*. 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.10.20191619v1>.
7. Bukhari KHS, Asghar A, Perveen N, et al. Efficacy of ivermectin in COVID-19 patients with mild to moderate disease. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.02.21250840v1>.
8. Elalfy H, Besheer T, El-Mesery A, et al. Effect of a combination of nitazoxanide, ribavirin, and ivermectin plus zinc supplement (MANS.NRIZ study) on the clearance of mild COVID-19. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(5):3176-3183. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33590901>.
9. Chahla RE, Ruiz LM, Mena T, et al. Cluster randomised trials—ivermectin repurposing for COVID-19 treatment of outpatients with mild disease in primary health care centers. *Research Square*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-495945/v1>.
10. Tanioka H, Tanioka S, Kaga K. Why COVID-19 is not so spread in Africa: how does ivermectin affect it? *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.26.21254377v1>.
11. Roy S, Samajdar SS, Tripathi SK, Mukherjee S, Bhattacharjee K. Outcome of different therapeutic interventions in mild COVID-19 patients in a single OPD clinic of West Bengal: a retrospective study. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.08.21252883v2>.
12. Pott-Junior H, Bastos Paoliello MM, Miguel AQC, et al. Use of ivermectin in the treatment of COVID-19: a pilot trial. *Toxicol Rep*. 2021;8:505-510. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33723507>.
13. Merino J, Borja VH, Lopez O, et al. Ivermectin and the odds of hospitalization due to COVID-19: evidence from a quasi-experimental analysis based on a public intervention in Mexico City. *SocArXiv Papers*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/r93g4/>.
14. Shahbaznejad L, Davoudi A, Eslami G, et al. Effects of ivermectin in patients with COVID-19: a multicenter, double-blind, randomized, controlled

clinical trial. *Clin Ther*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34052007>.

15. Samaha AA, Mouawia H, Fawaz M, et al. Effects of a single dose of ivermectin on viral and clinical outcomes in asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects: a pilot clinical trial in Lebanon. *Viruses*. 2021;13(6). Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34073401>.
16. Roman YM, Burela PA, Pasupuleti V, Piscocoya A, Vidal JE, Hernandez AV. Ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.21.21257595v2.full>.
17. Lopez-Medina E, Lopez P, Hurtado IC, et al. Effect of ivermectin on time to resolution of symptoms among adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2021;325(14):1426-1435. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33662102>.
18. Ahmed S, Karim MM, Ross AG, et al. A five-day course of ivermectin for the treatment of COVID-19 may reduce the duration of illness. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;103:214-216. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33278625>.
19. Okumus N, Demirturk N, Cetinkaya RA, et al. Evaluation of the effectiveness and safety of adding ivermectin to treatment in severe COVID-19 patients. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021;21(1):411. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33947344>.
20. Galan LEB, Santos NMD, Asato MS, et al. Phase 2 randomized study on chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine or ivermectin in hospitalized patients with severe manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Pathog Glob Health*. 2021;115(4):235-242. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33682640>.
21. Chachar AZK, Khan KA, Asif M, Tanveer K, Khaqan A, Basri R. Effectiveness of ivermectin in SARS-COV-2/COVID-19 Patients. *Int J of Sci*. 2020;9:31-35. Available at: <https://www.ijsciences.com/pub/article/2378>.
22. Podder CS, Chowdhury N, Sina MI, Haque W. Outcome of ivermectin treated mild to moderate COVID-19 cases: a single-centre, open-label, randomised controlled study. *IMC J Med Sci*. 2020. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3329/imcjms.v14i2.52826>.
23. Chowdhury ATMM, Shahbaz M, Karim MR, Islam J, Dan G, He S. A comparative study on ivermectin-doxycycline and hydroxychloroquine-azithromycin therapy on COVID-19 patients. *EJMO*. 2021;5(1):63-70. Available at: <https://ejmo.org/pdf/A%20Comparative%20Study%20on%20IvermectinDoxycycline%20and%20HydroxychloroquineAzithromycin%20Therapy%20on%20COVID19%20Patients-16263.pdf>.
24. Krolewiecki A, Lifschitz A, Moragas M, et al. Antiviral effect of high-dose ivermectin in adults with COVID-19: a proof-of-concept randomized trial. *Lancet*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S258953702100239X?via%3Dihub>.
25. Chaccour C, Casellas A, Blanco-Di Matteo A, et al. The effect of early treatment with ivermectin on viral load, symptoms and humoral response in patients with non-severe COVID-19: A pilot, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial. *Lancet*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2589-5370%2820%2930464-8>.
26. Hashim HA, Maulood MF, Rasheed AW, Fatak DF, Kabah KK, Abdulmir AS. Controlled randomized clinical trial on using ivermectin with doxycycline for treating COVID-19 patients in Baghdad, Iraq. *medRxiv*. 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219345v1/>.
27. Mohan A, Tiwari P, Suri T, et al. Ivermectin in mild and moderate COVID-19 (RIVET-COV): a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Research Square*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-191648/v1>.
28. Gonzalez JLB, Gámez MG, Enciso EAM, et al. Efficacy and safety of ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine in patients with severe COVID-19. A randomized controlled trial. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.18.21252037v1>.

29. Niae MS, Gheibi N, Namdar P, et al. Ivermectin as an adjunct treatment for hospitalized adult COVID-19 patients: a randomized multi-center clinical trial. *Research Square*. 2020;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-109670/v1>.
30. Rajter JC, Sherman MS, Fattah N, Vogel F, Sacks J, Rajter JJ. Use of ivermectin is associated with lower mortality in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019: the ICON study. *Chest*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33065103>.
31. Soto-Becerra P, Culquichicón C, Hurtado-Roca Y, Araujo-Castillo RV. 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;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.06.20208066v3>.
32. Khan MSI, Khan MSI, Debnath CR, et al. Ivermectin treatment may improve the prognosis of patients with COVID-19. *Arch Bronconeumol*. 2020;56(12):828-830. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33293006>.

Lopinavir/Ritonavir and Other HIV Protease Inhibitors

Last Updated: February 11, 2021

The replication of SARS-CoV-2 depends on the cleavage of polyproteins into an RNA-dependent RNA polymerase and a helicase.¹ Two proteases are responsible for this cleavage: 3-chymotrypsin-like protease (3CLpro) and papain-like protease (PLpro).

Lopinavir/ritonavir and darunavir/cobicistat have been studied in patients with COVID-19. The clinical trials discussed below have not demonstrated a clinical benefit for protease inhibitors in patients with COVID-19.

Recommendations

- The COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) **recommends against** the use of **lopinavir/ritonavir** and **other HIV protease inhibitors** for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized patients (**AI**).
- The Panel **recommends against** the use of **lopinavir/ritonavir** and **other HIV protease inhibitors** for the treatment of COVID-19 in nonhospitalized patients (**AIII**).

Rationale

The pharmacodynamics of lopinavir/ritonavir raise concerns about whether it is possible to achieve drug concentrations that can inhibit the SARS-CoV-2 proteases.^{2,3} In addition, lopinavir/ritonavir did not show efficacy in two large randomized controlled trials in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.^{4,5}

There is currently a lack of data on the use of lopinavir/ritonavir in nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19. However, the pharmacodynamic concerns and the lack of evidence for a clinical benefit among hospitalized patients with COVID-19 undermine confidence that lopinavir/ritonavir has a clinical benefit at any stage of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Adverse Events

The adverse events for lopinavir/ritonavir include:

- Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea (common)
- QTc prolongation
- Hepatotoxicity

Drug-Drug Interactions

Lopinavir/ritonavir is a potent inhibitor of cytochrome P450 3A. Coadministering lopinavir/ritonavir with medications that are metabolized by this enzyme may increase the concentrations of those medications, resulting in concentration-related toxicities. Please refer to the [Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Adults and Adolescents with HIV](#) for a list of potential drug interactions.

Summary of Clinical Data for COVID-19

- The plasma drug concentrations achieved using typical doses of lopinavir/ritonavir are far below the levels that may be needed to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication.³
- Lopinavir/ritonavir did not demonstrate a clinical benefit in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 during a large randomized trial in the United Kingdom.⁴

- In a large international randomized trial, lopinavir/ritonavir did not reduce the mortality rate among hospitalized patients with COVID-19.⁵
- A moderately sized randomized trial (n = 199) failed to find a virologic or clinical benefit of lopinavir/ritonavir over standard of care.⁶
- Results from a small randomized controlled trial showed that darunavir/cobicistat was not effective for the treatment of COVID-19.⁷
- There are no data from clinical trials that support using other HIV protease inhibitors to treat COVID-19.
- Please see Clinical Data for COVID-19 below for more information.

Clinical Data for COVID-19

The information presented in this section may include data from preprints or articles that have not been peer reviewed. This section will be updated as new information becomes available. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov) for more information on clinical trials that are evaluating lopinavir/ritonavir.

Lopinavir/Ritonavir in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19: The RECOVERY Trial

The Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy (RECOVERY) trial is an ongoing, open-label, randomized controlled trial with multiple arms, including a control arm; in one arm, participants received lopinavir/ritonavir. The trial was conducted across 176 hospitals in the United Kingdom and enrolled hospitalized patients with clinically suspected or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection.⁴

Patients were randomized into several parallel treatment arms; this included randomization in a 2:1 ratio to receive either the usual standard of care only or the usual standard of care plus lopinavir 400 mg/ritonavir 100 mg orally every 12 hours for 10 days or until hospital discharge. Patients who had severe hepatic insufficiency or who were receiving medications that had potentially serious or life-threatening interactions with lopinavir/ritonavir were excluded from randomization into either of these arms. Mechanically ventilated patients were also underrepresented in this study because it was difficult to administer the oral tablet formulation of lopinavir/ritonavir to patients who were on mechanical ventilation. The primary outcome was all-cause mortality at Day 28 after randomization.

The lopinavir/ritonavir arm was discontinued on June 29, 2020, after the independent data monitoring committee concluded that the data showed no clinical benefit for lopinavir/ritonavir.

Patient Characteristics

- Of the 7,825 participants who were eligible to receive lopinavir/ritonavir, 1,616 were randomized to receive lopinavir/ritonavir and 3,424 were randomized to receive standard of care only. The remaining participants were randomized to other treatment arms in the study.
- In both the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and the standard of care arm, the mean age was 66 years; 44% of patients were aged ≥ 70 years.
- Test results for SARS-CoV-2 infection were positive for 88% of patients. The remaining 12% had a negative test result.
- Comorbidities were common; 57% of patients had at least one major comorbidity. Of those patients, 28% had diabetes mellitus, 26% had heart disease, and 24% had chronic lung disease.
- At randomization, 4% of patients were receiving invasive mechanical ventilation, 70% were receiving oxygen only (with or without noninvasive ventilation), and 26% were receiving neither.
- The percentages of patients who received azithromycin or another macrolide during the follow-up

period were similar in both arms (23% in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm vs. 25% in the standard of care arm). In addition, 10% of patients in both arms received dexamethasone.

Results

- There was no significant difference in the primary outcome of 28-day mortality between the two arms; 374 patients (23%) in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and 767 patients (22%) in the standard of care arm had died by Day 28 (rate ratio 1.03; 95% CI, 0.91–1.17; $P = 0.60$).
- A similar 28-day mortality was reported for patients who received lopinavir/ritonavir in an analysis that was restricted to the 4,423 participants who had positive SARS-CoV-2 test results (rate ratio 1.05; 95% CI, 0.92–1.19; $P = 0.49$).
- Patients in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and patients in the standard of care arm had similar median times to discharge (11 days in both arms) and similar probabilities of being discharged alive within 28 days (69% vs. 70%).
- Among participants who were not on invasive mechanical ventilation at baseline, patients who received lopinavir/ritonavir and those who received standard of care only had similar risks of progression to intubation or death.
- Results were consistent across subgroups defined by age, sex, ethnicity, or respiratory support at baseline.

Limitations

- The study was not blinded.
- No laboratory or virologic data were collected.

Interpretation

Lopinavir/ritonavir did not decrease 28-day all-cause mortality when compared to the usual standard of care in hospitalized persons with clinically suspected or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection. Participants who received lopinavir/ritonavir and those who received standard of care only had similar median lengths of hospital stay. Among the patients who were not on invasive mechanical ventilation at the time of randomization, those who received lopinavir/ritonavir were as likely to require intubation or die during hospitalization as those who received standard of care.

Lopinavir/Ritonavir in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: The Solidarity Trial

The Solidarity trial was an open-label, randomized controlled trial that enrolled hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in 405 hospitals across 30 countries. The study included multiple arms; in one arm, participants received lopinavir/ritonavir. The control group for this arm included people who were randomized at the same site and time who could have received lopinavir/ritonavir but received standard of care instead. Lopinavir 400 mg/ritonavir 100 mg was administered orally twice daily for 14 days or until hospital discharge. Only the oral tablet formulation of lopinavir/ritonavir was available, which precluded administration to those on mechanical ventilation. The primary outcome was in-hospital mortality.⁵

After the results of the RECOVERY trial prompted a review of the Solidarity data, the lopinavir/ritonavir arm ended enrollment on July 4, 2020. At that time, 1,411 patients had been randomized to receive lopinavir/ritonavir, and 1,380 patients received standard of care.

Patient Characteristics

- In both the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and the standard of care arm, 20% of the participants were aged ≥ 70 years and 37% were aged < 50 years.
- Comorbidities were common. Diabetes mellitus was present in 24% of patients, heart disease in 21%, and chronic lung disease in 7%.

- At randomization, 8% of patients were receiving invasive mechanical ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, 53% were receiving oxygen only (with or without noninvasive ventilation), and 39% were receiving neither.
- Similar percentages of patients received corticosteroids in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and the standard of care arm (23% vs. 24%). Other nonstudy treatments were administered less often, and the use of these treatments was balanced between arms.

Results

- There was no significant difference in in-hospital mortality between the two arms; 148 patients (9.7%) in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and 146 patients (10.3%) in the standard of care arm had died by Day 28 (rate ratio 1.00; 95% CI, 0.79–1.25; $P = 0.97$).
- Progression to mechanical ventilation among those who were not ventilated at randomization occurred in 126 patients in the lopinavir/ritonavir arm and 121 patients in the standard of care arm.
- In-hospital mortality results appeared to be consistent across subgroups.

Limitations

- The study was not blinded.
- Those who were on mechanical ventilation were unable to receive lopinavir/ritonavir.
- The study includes no data on time to recovery.

Interpretation

Among hospitalized patients, lopinavir/ritonavir did not decrease in-hospital mortality or the number of patients who progressed to mechanical ventilation compared to standard of care.

Lopinavir/Ritonavir Pharmacokinetics in Patients With COVID-19

In a case series, eight patients with COVID-19 were treated with lopinavir 400 mg/ritonavir 100 mg orally twice daily and had plasma trough levels of lopinavir drawn and assayed by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry.³

Results

- The median plasma lopinavir concentration was 13.6 $\mu\text{g/mL}$.
- After correcting for protein binding, trough levels would need to be approximately 60-fold to 120-fold higher to achieve the in vitro half-maximal effective concentration (EC_{50}) for SARS-CoV-2.

Limitations

- Only the trough levels of lopinavir were quantified.
- The concentration of lopinavir required to effectively inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication in vivo is currently unknown.

Interpretation

The plasma drug concentrations that were achieved using typical doses of lopinavir/ritonavir are far below the levels that may be needed to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication.

Other Reviewed Studies

The Panel has reviewed other clinical studies that evaluated the use of protease inhibitors for the treatment of COVID-19.^{6,8,9} These studies have limitations that make them less definitive and

informative than larger randomized clinical trials. The Panel's summaries and interpretations of some of these studies are available in the [archived versions of the Guidelines](#).

References

1. Zumla A, Chan JF, Azhar EI, Hui DS, Yuen KY. Coronaviruses - drug discovery and therapeutic options. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2016;15(5):327-347. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26868298>.
2. Marzolini C, Stader F, Stoeckle M, et al. Effect of systemic inflammatory response to SARS-CoV-2 on lopinavir and hydroxychloroquine plasma concentrations. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2020;64(9). Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32641296>.
3. Schoergenhofer C, Jilma B, Stimpfl T, Karolyi M, Zoufaly A. Pharmacokinetics of lopinavir and ritonavir in patients hospitalized with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Ann Intern Med*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32422065>.
4. Group RC. Lopinavir-ritonavir in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33031764>.
5. WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium, Pan H, Peto R, et al. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19—interim WHO Solidarity Trial results. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33264556>.
6. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A trial of lopinavir-ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(19):1787-1799. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32187464>.
7. Chen J, Xia L, Liu L, et al. Antiviral activity and safety of darunavir/cobicistat for the treatment of COVID-19. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2020;7(7):ofaa241. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32671131>.
8. Hung IF, Lung KC, Tso EY, 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;395(10238):1695-1704. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32401715>.
9. Li Y, Xie Z, Lin W, et al. Efficacy and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir or arbidol in adult patients with mild/moderate COVID-19: an exploratory randomized controlled trial. *Med*. 2020:[In Press]. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666634020300015>.

Nitazoxanide

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

Nitazoxanide is a broad-spectrum thiazolide antiparasitic agent that is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia duodenalis* infections in children aged ≥ 1 year and adults. Nitazoxanide is rapidly metabolized to its active metabolite, tizoxanide, and has in vitro antiviral activity against a range of viruses, including influenza viruses, hepatitis B and C viruses, norovirus, rotavirus, Ebola virus, Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV), and SARS-CoV-2.¹⁻³ The mechanism of antiviral activity is not fully characterized. Nitazoxanide inhibits host enzymes, which impairs the posttranslational processing of viral proteins. It also has inhibitory effects on proinflammatory cytokines. With the exception of a Phase 2b/3 trial for uncomplicated influenza, the evidence for clinical activity of nitazoxanide against other viruses is limited or of low quality.⁴

Recommendation

- The COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel (the Panel) **recommends against** the use of **nitazoxanide** for the treatment of COVID-19, except in a clinical trial (**BIIa**).

Rationale

Two randomized controlled trials that were conducted in Brazil and the United States did not find a significant clinical benefit for nitazoxanide treatment in nonhospitalized adults with COVID-19 when treatment was initiated within 2 to 5 days after illness onset.^{5,6} One of these trials, which has not yet been published, reported that fewer patients in the nitazoxanide arm progressed to severe COVID-19 than in the placebo arm. However, the study was underpowered to detect a difference, and this finding was not statistically significant.⁶ Additional small, unpublished studies were reviewed; however, due to their limitations, they did not provide support for the use of nitazoxanide.^{7,8} Nitazoxanide was well tolerated in these trials. The Panel concluded that results from adequately powered, well-designed, and well-conducted clinical trials are needed to provide more specific, evidence-based guidance on the role of nitazoxanide in the treatment of COVID-19.

Please see [Table 2d](#) for more information.

Monitoring, Adverse Effects, and Drug-Drug Interactions

- Nitazoxanide is generally well tolerated. The most commonly reported side effects include abdominal pain, diarrhea, headache, nausea, vomiting, urine discoloration, and, rarely, ocular discoloration.
- Nitazoxanide is a highly plasma protein-bound drug (>99.9%). Drug-drug interactions may occur when nitazoxanide is administered concurrently with other highly plasma protein-bound drugs due to competition for binding sites. If nitazoxanide is coadministered with other highly protein-bound drugs with narrow therapeutic indices, monitor the patient for adverse drug reactions.
- Please see [Table 2e](#) for more information.

Considerations in Pregnancy

According to the animal study data included in the product label, nitazoxanide does not appear to affect fertility, nor does it cause fetal toxicity.⁹ There are no data on using nitazoxanide to treat COVID-19 in pregnant women.

Considerations in Children

Nitazoxanide is approved by the FDA for use in children aged ≥ 1 year old to treat *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia duodenalis* infections. Dosing for the nitazoxanide suspension or tablets is available for children that provides exposure that is similar to the approved adult dose of oral nitazoxanide 500 mg twice daily. There are no data on using nitazoxanide to treat COVID-19 in children.

Clinical Trials

Several clinical trials that are evaluating the use of nitazoxanide for the treatment of COVID-19 are currently underway or in development. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov) for the latest information.

References

1. Jasenosky LD, Cadena C, Mire CE, et al. The FDA-approved oral drug nitazoxanide amplifies host antiviral responses and inhibits ebola virus. *iScience*. 2019;19:1279-1290. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31402258>.
2. Rossignol JF. Nitazoxanide: a first-in-class broad-spectrum antiviral agent. *Antiviral Res*. 2014;110:94-103. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25108173>.
3. Cao J, Forrest JC, Zhang X. A screen of the NIH Clinical Collection small molecule library identifies potential anti-coronavirus drugs. *Antiviral Res*. 2015;114:1-10. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25451075>.
4. Haffizulla J, Hartman A, Hoppers M, et al. Effect of nitazoxanide in adults and adolescents with acute uncomplicated influenza: a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 2b/3 trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(7):609-618. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24852376>.
5. Rocco PRM, Silvia PL, Cruz FF, et al. Early use of nitazoxanide in mild COVID-19 disease: randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Eur Respir J*. 2021; Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33361100>.
6. Rossignol J, Bardin MC, Oaks JB, et al. Early treatment with nitazoxanide prevents worsening of mild and moderate COVID-19 and subsequent hospitalization. *medRxiv*. 2021; Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441v1>.
7. Blum VF, Cimerman S, Hunter JR, et al. Nitazoxanide in vitro efficacy against SARS CoV-2 and in vivo superiority to placebo to treat moderate COVID-19—a Phase 2 randomized double-blind clinical trial. *Preprints with the Lancet*. 2021. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3763773.
8. Silva M, Espejo A, Pereyra ML, et al. Efficacy of nitazoxanide in reducing the viral load in COVID-19 patients: randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blinded, parallel-group, pilot study. *MedRxiv*. 2021; Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252509v1.full.pdf>.
9. Nitazoxanide (Alinia) [package insert]. Lupin Pharma. 2021. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2016/021497s001,021498s0041bl.pdf.

Table 2d. Nitazoxanide: Selected Clinical Data

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

The information in this table may include data from preprints or articles that have not been peer reviewed. This section will be updated as new information becomes available. Please see [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://www.clinicaltrials.gov) for more information on clinical trials that are evaluating NTZ for the treatment of COVID-19. The clinical trials described in this table do not represent all the trials that the Panel reviewed while developing recommendations for NTZ.^{1,2}

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Early Treatment of Mild COVID-19 with Nitazoxanide³			
Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in nonhospitalized adults with mild COVID-19 in Brazil (n = 475)	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinical signs and symptoms of COVID-19 for ≤3 days (fever, dry cough, and/or fatigue) <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR result from an NP swab Renal, heart, respiratory, liver, or autoimmune diseases Participant had a history of cancer in the past 5 years <p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTZ 500 mg 3 times daily for 5 days using the oral liquid formulation Color-matched placebo 3 times daily for 5 days <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete resolution of dry cough, fever, and/or fatigue after receiving treatment for 5 days <p>Key Secondary Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in SARS-CoV-2 VL Incidence of hospital admission after completing therapy 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTZ (n = 194) and placebo (n = 198) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median age of patients was 37 years. Percentage of patients aged 18–39 years: 58% Percentage of patients aged 40–59 years: 36% Percentage of patients aged 60–77 years: 6% 53% of patients were women. 69% of patients were White. 31% of patients had a BMI ≥30. 85% of patients had no reported comorbidities. Median time from symptom onset to first dose of study drug was 5 days (IQR 4–5 days). Baseline median SARS-CoV-2 VL was 7.06 log₁₀ c/mL (IQR 5.77–8.13) in NTZ arm and 7.49 log₁₀ c/mL (IQR 6.15–8.32) in placebo arm (P = 0.065). <p>Primary Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no difference in time to complete resolution of symptoms between NTZ and placebo arms (P = 0.277) <p>Secondary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After 5 days, median SARS-CoV-2 VL was lower in NTZ arm (3.63 log₁₀ c/mL [IQR 0–5.03]) than in placebo arm (4.13 log₁₀ c/mL [IQR 2.88–5.31]; P = 0.006). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, the patients in this study were young and relatively healthy. At baseline, the median VL was 0.43 log₁₀ c/mL lower in the NTZ arm than in the placebo arm; however, this difference was not statistically significant (trend toward a significant difference; P = 0.065). Although the difference in absolute VLs between the arms at Day 5 was reported as statistically significant, without the information on the change in VL in each arm, it is difficult to interpret the significance of the findings. Some participants who received the study drug were excluded from the analysis population due to discontinued intervention (21 in NTZ arm vs. 18 in placebo arm); AEs (6 in NTZ arm vs. 1 in placebo arm); hospitalization (5 in NTZ arm vs. 5 in placebo arm); and protocol deviations (7 in NTZ arm vs. 7 in placebo arm). This complicates the interpretation of the study results, because an ITT analysis was not included.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Early Treatment of Mild COVID-19 with Nitazoxanide³, continued			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29.9% of patients in NTZ arm and 18.2% of patients in placebo arm had a negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR result at the fifth treatment visit ($P = 0.009$). • In the ITT study population, 5 patients on NTZ and 5 on placebo were hospitalized due to clinical deterioration; 2 who received NTZ required ICU admission vs. 0 who received placebo. These individuals were excluded from the analysis population because they did not complete the 5-day treatment course before clinical progression occurred. <p>Other Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to moderate AEs occurred in about 30% of participants in each arm who completed 5 days of therapy. 	<p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTZ did not improve time to resolution of symptoms compared to placebo. • Median VL was lower at Day 5 in the NTZ arm than in the placebo arm, but this may reflect differences in baseline VLs. • NTZ was well tolerated.
Early Treatment of Mild to Moderate COVID-19 with an Investigational Formulation of Nitazoxanide⁴			
<p>Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19 in the United States and Puerto Rico (n = 1,092)</p> <p><i>This is a preliminary, unpublished report that has not been peer reviewed.</i></p>	<p>Key Inclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged ≥ 12 years • Enrollment ≤ 72 hours of symptom onset • Mild to moderate COVID-19 • ≥ 2 respiratory symptom domains with a score ≥ 2 on FLU-PRO questionnaire at screening, and no improvement in overall symptom severity compared to previous day <p>Key Exclusion Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signs or symptoms of severe COVID-19 • Previous COVID-19 or any symptom suggestive of COVID-19 • Recent acute upper respiratory tract infection • Severe immunodeficiency • Severe heart, lung, neurological, or other systemic diseases 	<p>Number of Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mITT analysis: NTZ (n = 184) and placebo (n = 195) <p>Participant Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median age of patients was 40 years. • 43.5% of patients were men. • 87.6% of patients were White. • Median BMI was 28.9. • Median time from symptom onset to randomization was 45.9 hours. • 64.8% of patients had mild disease. • 35.2% of patients had moderate disease. • 62.8% of patients were at risk for severe illness. <p>Primary Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTZ was not associated with a reduction in median time to sustained response compared to placebo (13.3 days in NTZ arm vs. 12.4 days in placebo arm; $P = 0.88$) <p>Secondary Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progression to severe disease occurred in 1 of 184 patients (0.5%) in NTZ arm and 7 of 195 patients (3.6%) in placebo arm ($P = 0.07$). 	<p>Key Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is limited in this preliminary report. • Because the number of high-risk participants who progressed to severe COVID-19 in this study was small, the results for this subgroup are fragile. Larger studies are needed. <p>Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTZ did not demonstrate significant clinical or virologic benefits when compared to placebo. • NTZ was well tolerated.

Study Design	Methods	Results	Limitations and Interpretation
Early Treatment of Mild to Moderate COVID-19 with an Investigational Formulation of Nitazoxanide⁴, continued			
	<p>Interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 investigational NTZ 300 mg extended-release tablets (for a total dose of 600 mg) PO with food twice daily for 5 days • Matching placebo for 5 days • All subjects received a vitamin B complex supplement twice daily to mask potential NTZ-associated chromaturia. <p>Primary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time from first dose to sustained response <p>Secondary Endpoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate of progression to severe COVID-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Among a subgroup of patients who had a high risk for severe illness according to CDC criteria, 1 of 112 patients (0.9%) in NTZ arm and 7 of 126 patients (5.6%) in placebo arm progressed to severe disease ($P = 0.07$). • 1 of 184 patients (0.5%) in NTZ arm and 5 of 195 (2.6%) in placebo arm were hospitalized ($P = 0.18$). • There was no significant difference in viral endpoints between arms at Days 4 and 10. <p>Other Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safety analysis included 935 participants (472 in NTZ arm and 463 in placebo arm). • 2 patients in NTZ arm and 3 patients in placebo arm stopped the study drug due to AEs. 	

Key: AE = adverse event; BMI = body mass index; CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; FLU-PRO = Influenza Patient Reported Outcomes; ICU = intensive care unit; ITT = intention-to-treat; mITT = modified intention-to-treat; NP = nasopharyngeal; NTZ = nitazoxanide; the Panel = the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel; PO = orally; RT-PCR = reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction; VL = viral load

References

1. Blum VF, Cimerman S, Hunter JR, et al. Nitazoxanide superiority to placebo to treat moderate COVID-19—a pilot prove of concept randomized double-blind clinical trial. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34222847/>.
2. Silva M, Espejo A, Pereyra ML, et al. Efficacy of nitazoxanide in reducing the viral load in COVID-19 patients. Randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blinded, parallel group, pilot study. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252509v1>.
3. Rocco PRM, Silva PL, Cruz FF, et al. Early use of nitazoxanide in mild COVID-19 disease: randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Eur Respir J*. 2021. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33361100>.
4. Rossignol J, Bardin MC, Oaks JB, et al. Early treatment with nitazoxanide prevents worsening of mild and moderate COVID-19 and subsequent hospitalization. *medRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255441v1>.

Table 2e. Characteristics of Antiviral Agents That Are Approved or Under Evaluation for the Treatment of COVID-19

Last Updated: July 8, 2021

- The information in this table is derived from data on the use of these drugs for FDA-approved indications or in investigational trials, and it is supplemented with data on their use in patients with COVID-19, when available.
- Information on CQ, HCQ, and LPV/RTV are available in the [archived versions](#) of the Guidelines. However, the Panel **recommends against** using these agents to treat COVID-19.
- There are limited or no data on dose modifications for patients with organ failure or those who require extracorporeal devices. Please refer to product labels, when available.
- There are currently not enough data to determine whether certain medications can be safely coadministered with therapies for the treatment of COVID-19. When using concomitant medications with similar toxicity profiles, consider performing additional safety monitoring.
- The potential additive, antagonistic, or synergistic effects and the safety of using combination therapies for the treatment of COVID-19 are unknown. Clinicians are encouraged to report AEs to the [FDA MedWatch program](#).
- For drug interaction information, please refer to product labels and visit [the Liverpool COVID-19 Drug Interactions website](#).
- For the Panel’s recommendations on using the drugs listed in this table, please refer to the individual drug sections or [Therapeutic Management of Hospitalized Adults With COVID-19](#).

Dosing Regimens <i>The doses listed here are for approved indications or from reported experiences or clinical trials.</i>	Adverse Events	Monitoring Parameters	Drug-Drug Interaction Potential	Comments and Links to Clinical Trials
Remdesivir				
<p>The doses and indications listed below come from the FDA product information. Please see Therapeutic Management of Hospitalized Adults With COVID-19 for the Panel’s recommendations on when to use RDV.</p> <p>For Hospitalized Adults and Children (Aged ≥12 Years and Weighing ≥40 kg)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nausea • ALT and AST elevations • Hypersensitivity • Increases in prothrombin time • Drug vehicle is SBECD, which has been associated with renal and liver toxicity. SBECD accumulation may occur in patients with moderate or severe renal impairment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infusion reactions • Renal function and hepatic function should be monitored before and during treatment as clinically indicated. • In the FDA product information, RDV is not recommended when eGFR is <30 mL/min. See the Remdesivir section for a discussion on using RDV in people with renal insufficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical drug-drug interaction studies of RDV have not been conducted. • In vitro, RDV is a substrate of CYP3A4, OATP1B1, and P-gp and an inhibitor of CYP3A4, OATP1B1, OATP1B3, and MATE1.¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV should be administered in a hospital or a health care setting that can provide a similar level of care to an inpatient hospital. • RDV is approved by the FDA for the treatment of COVID-19 in hospitalized adult and pediatric patients (aged ≥12 years and weighing ≥40 kg).

Dosing Regimens <i>The doses listed here are for approved indications or from reported experiences or clinical trials.</i>	Adverse Events	Monitoring Parameters	Drug-Drug Interaction Potential	Comments and Links to Clinical Trials
Remdesivir , continued				
<p><i>For Patients Who Are Not Mechanically Ventilated and/or on ECMO:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV 200 mg IV^a on Day 1, then RDV 100 mg IV on Days 2–5 • For patients who do not show clinical improvement after 5 days of therapy, treatment may be extended to up to 10 days. <p><i>For Mechanically Ventilated Patients and/or Patients on ECMO:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV 200 mg IV^a on Day 1, then RDV 100 mg IV on Days 2–10 <p>Suggested Dose in EUA^b for Hospitalized Children</p> <p><i>For Patients Weighing 3.5 kg to <40 kg:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV 5 mg/kg IV^a on Day 1, then RDV 2.5 mg/kg IV once daily starting on Day 2 • For patients who are not mechanically ventilated and/or on ECMO, the duration is 5 days. If patients have not shown clinical improvement after 5 days, treatment may be extended to up to 10 days. • For mechanically ventilated patients and/or patients on ECMO, the recommended treatment duration is 10 days. <p><i>For Patients Aged <12 Years and Weighing ≥40 kg:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same dose as for adults 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each 100 mg vial of RDV lyophilized powder contains 3 g of SBECD, and each 100 mg/20 mL vial of RDV solution contains 6 g of SBECD. • Clinicians may consider preferentially using the lyophilized powder formulation (which contains less SBECD) in patients with renal impairment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDV may need to be discontinued if ALT level increases to >10 times ULN and should be discontinued if there is an increase in ALT level and signs or symptoms of liver inflammation are observed.¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal to no reduction in RDV exposure is expected when RDV is coadministered with dexamethasone (Gilead Sciences, written communication, July 2020). • CQ or HCQ may decrease the antiviral activity of RDV; coadministration of these drugs is not recommended.¹ • No significant interaction is expected between RDV and oseltamivir or baloxavir (Gilead Sciences, personal and written communications, August and September 2020). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An EUA^b is available for hospitalized pediatric patients weighing 3.5 kg to <40 kg or aged <12 years and weighing ≥3.5 kg. • A list of clinical trials is available here: Remdesivir

Dosing Regimens <i>The doses listed here are for approved indications or from reported experiences or clinical trials.</i>	Adverse Events	Monitoring Parameters	Drug-Drug Interaction Potential	Comments and Links to Clinical Trials
Ivermectin				
Adults: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dose most commonly used in clinical trials is IVM 0.2–0.6 mg/kg PO given as a single dose or as a once-daily dose for up to 5 days. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally well tolerated Dizziness Pruritis GI effects (e.g., nausea, diarrhea) Neurological AEs have been reported when IVM has been used to treat parasitic diseases, but it is not clear whether these AEs were caused by IVM or the underlying conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor for potential AEs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor CYP3A4 substrate P-gp substrate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally given on an empty stomach with water; however, administering IVM with food increases its bioavailability.² A list of clinical trials is available here: Ivermectin
Nitazoxanide				
Adults: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doses reported in COVID-19 studies range from NTZ 500 mg PO 3 times daily to 4 times daily.^{3,4} Higher doses are being studied (<i>ClinicalTrials.gov</i> Identifier NCT04746183). Doses used for antiprotozoal indications range from NTZ 500 mg to 1 g PO twice daily. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally well tolerated Abdominal pain Diarrhea Headache Nausea Vomiting Urine discoloration Ocular discoloration (rare) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor for potential AEs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drug-drug interactions may occur if NTZ is administered concurrently with other highly plasma protein-bound drugs due to competition for binding sites.⁵ If NTZ is coadministered with other highly protein-bound drugs with narrow therapeutic indices, monitor the patient for AEs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTZ should be taken with food. The oral suspension is not bioequivalent to the tablet formulation. A list of clinical trials is available here: Nitazoxanide

^a Infuse over 30–120 minutes.

^b The FDA EUA permits the emergency use of RDV for the treatment of suspected COVID-19 or laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in hospitalized pediatric patients weighing 3.5 kg to <40 kg or aged <12 years and weighing ≥3.5 kg.⁶

Key: AE = adverse event; ALT = alanine transaminase; AST = aspartate aminotransferase; CQ = chloroquine; CYP = cytochrome P450; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; EUA = Emergency Use Authorization; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; GI = gastrointestinal; HCQ = hydroxychloroquine; IV = intravenous; IVM = ivermectin; LPV/RTV = lopinavir/ritonavir; MATE = multidrug and toxin extrusion protein; NTZ = nitazoxanide; OATP = organic anion transporter polypeptide; the Panel = the COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel; P-gp = P-glycoprotein; PO = orally; RDV = remdesivir; SBECD = sulfobutylether-beta-cyclodextrin; ULN = upper limit of normal

References

1. Remdesivir (Veklury) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2020. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2020/214787Orig1s000lbl.pdf.
2. Ivermectin (Stromectol) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2009. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2009/050742s024s025lbl.pdf.
3. Rocco PRM, Silvia PL, Cruz FF, et al. Early use of nitazoxanide in mild COVID-19 disease: randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Eur Respir J*. 2021;Published online ahead of print. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33361100/>.
4. Silva M, Espejo A, Pereyra ML, et al. Efficacy of Nitazoxanide in reducing the viral load in COVID-19 patients: randomized, placebo-controlled, single-blinded, parallel-group, pilot study. *MedRxiv*. 2021;Preprint. Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252509v1.full.pdf>.
5. Nitazoxanide (Alinia) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2017. Available at: <https://www.alinia.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/prescribing-information.pdf>.
6. Food and Drug Administration. Fact sheet for health care providers emergency use authorization (EUA) of remdesivir (GS-5734™). 2020. Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/media/137566/download>.