



Therapeutic Management of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Systematic Review and Treatment Algorithm

**Rafat Zreiq^{1,2}, Najoua Haouas³, Asma M. Khemakhem⁴,
Rawan M. Obeidat¹, Reem M. Ali⁵, Asma Ayyed AL-Shammary^{1,6},
Bandar Alsaif¹ and Fahad D. Algahtani^{1,2}**

¹Department of Public Health, College of Public Health and Health Informatics, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Saudi Arabia.

²Molecular Diagnostic and Personalised Therapeutics Unit, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

³Laboratory of Medical and Molecular Parasitology-Mycology LP3M (Code LR12ES08), Department of Clinical Biology, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Monastir, Tunisia.

⁴Department of Biology, Faculty of Science of Sfax, University of Sfax, Sfax, Tunisia.

⁵Department of Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Faculty of Applied Medical Sciences, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

⁶Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Saudi Arabia.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JPRI/2020/v32i2230780

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Thomas F. George, University of Missouri- St. Louis and University Boulevard St. Louis, USA.

(2) Dr. Dharmesh Chandra Sharma, G. R. Medical College & J. A. Hospital, India.

(3) Dr. N. Alyautdin Renad, Scientific Centre for Expert Evaluation of Medicinal Products, Russia.

Reviewers:

(1) Mónica Maria Ramos Tavares, São João University Hospital Center, Portugal.

(2) Shailaja, Gandhi Medical College, Kaloji Narayana Rao University of Health Sciences, India.

(3) Bhavika R. Patel, Junagadh Agricultural University, India.

(4) Mahmud Yerima Iliyasu, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Nigeria.

(5) Leonardo Fernandes e Santana, Universidade Federal do Vale do São Francisco, Brazil.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/61061>

Systematic Review Article

Received 28 August 2020

Accepted 17 September 2020

Published 22 September 2020

ABSTRACT

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is emerging contagious pneumonia due to the new Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). It initially appeared in Wuhan China in December 2019 then rapidly spread worldwide and became a pandemic. For the time being, there

is no specific therapeutic treatment for this disease. Herein, the "state-of-the-art" of treatment modalities was systematically reviewed and ultimately a practical therapeutic algorithm for the COVID-19 management was proposed. The systematic review was performed by using published articles retrieved from Science Direct, MEDLINE, and Scopus databases concerning this topic. Among 1060 articles collected from the different databases, 19 publications were studied in-depth and incorporated in this review. The most three frequently used medications for the treatment of COVID-19 was: the available anti-viral drugs (n= 9), the antimalarial hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine (n = 8), and the passive antibody transfer therapy (n = 2). Among all treatment modalities, antimalarial hydroxychloroquine ranked the highest cure rate. Therefore, this drug is considered as the first-line of COVID-19 treatment. The second-line treatment includes the lopinavir/ritonavir drugs combined with interferon β -1b and ribavirin. Finally, the third-line treatments include the remdesivir drug and passive antibody transfer therapy. However, our review emphasis the urgent need for adequately designed randomized controlled trials, enabling a more significant comparison between the most used treatment modalities.

Keywords: COVID-19; therapeutic management; treatment algorithm; Chloroquine; hydroxychloroquine.

ABBREVIATIONS

CQ	:	<i>Chloroquine</i>
HCQ	:	<i>Hydroxychloroquine</i>
AZ	:	<i>Azithromycin</i>
LPV	:	<i>lopinavir:</i>
RTV	:	<i>Ritonavir:</i>
ICU	:	<i>Intensive care unit</i>
QT-interval	:	<i>Time of ventricular activity.</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

A new human coronavirus causing acute respiratory disease has emerged in Wuhan, China since December 2019. This new virus and the resulted illness were termed as the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and the Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), respectively. The human to human transmission mode of SARS-CoV-2 virus has led to pandemic. As of August 1st 2020, more than 18 million of COVID-19 cases have been reported in the World including 688,289 deaths [1]. The human to human transmission occurs through close contact with patients during coughing, sneezing, or discussing without any protective measures. The clinical manifestation of the disease varies from mild symptoms (non-pneumonia), to mild to moderate symptoms (mild pneumonia) and severe disease (dyspnea, respiratory frequency ≥ 30 /min, blood oxygen saturation (SpO₂) $\leq 93\%$, PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio < 300 , and/or lung infiltrates $> 50\%$ within 24 to 48 hours). The extremely rapid pandemic worldwide associated with the absence of specific treatment and vaccine has resulted in a severe public

health risk. Thereby, in February 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) raised the threat of the COVID-19 epidemic to the "very high" level. Since that time, scientists all over the globe have started working on different aspects related to SARS-CoV-2 including the clinical features and consequences of the disease, the transmission routes, emerging diagnostic approaches as well as prevention and therapeutic strategies.

Thereby, getting treatment for and prevention against SARS-CoV-2 infection became an urgent need for policy-makers and public health professionals to stop the pandemic through: i) establishing proper guidelines for the treatment of the COVID-19 suspected/confirmed patients using previously known drugs, and ii) developing vaccines neutralizing SARS-CoV-2 virulence antigens.

Hundreds of clinical trials are being conducted worldwide, striving to treat COVID-19. They tested HIV antiretroviral drugs and LPV/RTV to treat patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 [2,3]. Other physicians assessed the effect of other commonly used antiviral drugs such as Remdesivir, Umifenovir and combination of 2 anti-viral molecules or an anti-viral drug with interferon on SARS-CoV-2 proliferation [4–9]. Passive antibody transfer using convalescent's plasma therapy approach as well as polyclonal immunoglobulin were also investigated [10,11]. All data derived from these critical preliminary investigations did not definitively confirm the effectiveness of these different medications for the treatment of or prevention against the SARS-CoV-2 infection.

In the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic, with the absence of a therapeutic consensus, our review aimed to discuss the outcomes of the recently tested therapeutic modalities. Such an updated systematic review should point out the effectiveness, reliability, adverse events of each alternative, thereby learning lessons from these clinical trials and provides evidence-based recommendations for future therapeutic essays.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This systematic review was conducted in consistent with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) and the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews [12,13]. The systematic review process was carried out as follows: i) literature search, ii) data extraction and analysis and iii) description of the results and translation into practical guidelines.

For this, three clinical topics related to COVID-19 were formulated and used to direct the sub-topics of the systematic review. This includes: i) the treatment with anti-malarial drugs (key words: Chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine and COVID-19), ii) the treatment with anti-viral drugs (Keys words: anti-viral drugs and COVID-19) and iii) the immunotherapy treatment (key words: Immunotherapy and COVID-19). Thus, collected articles during the systematic review were categorized into these three topics.

The systematic search was conducted by searching in MEDLINE (PubMed), Science Direct and Scopus databases to identify relevant articles from January 2000 to May 23th 2020 using keywords according to the three topics mentioned above. Unpublished clinical studies were excluded from this study. All eligible collected articles were preliminarily nominated based on the title and content of the abstract of each article. Selected articles were identified and data extraction concerning the study (authors, date of publication, type of study and sample size), the therapeutic modality (anti-coronavirus molecule, dosage and dose, duration and control group) and the main findings (clinical outcomes, viral clearance, adverse events and mortality) were performed. Results obtained from the selected studies underwent a descriptive summary of the statement of evidence. According to the results obtained from all articles, a proposed therapeutic algorithm for COVID-19 was structured.

A flow chart describing the selection criteria used in the systematic review. A pool of 1060 articles was extracted from different research data bases as indicated. Irrelevant or less relevant articles (case studies, short communications, articles with unwell described methodology) were then excluded based on title and abstract (n=136). Eligible articles were identified after concise full text reading (n=57). Nineteen out of fifty seven articles were used as the basis of the review while thirty nine were considered in the discussion.

3. RESULTS

We retrieved 1060 articles from the cited databases. Among them, 924 were excluded after careful checking of titles and abstracts. The rest of the articles (136) were further checked for eligibility and non-eligible articles were excluded (n=79). Ultimately, 57 eligible studies were split into two groups including 19 studies that have been used as the backbone of the review, while 38 studies were used as supporting studies for further discussion. The 19 legible studies presented the results of randomized clinical trials (n=6), non-randomized trial (n=1), observational study (n=2), consecutive cohort study (n=2), retrospective cohort study (n=6) or case series (n=2), as shown in Fig. 1. These studies have been conducted in China (n=12), France (n=3), Italy (n=1), Republic of Korea (n=1), Brazil (n=1), and USA (n=1). The studies included patients with mild COVID-19 symptoms (n=8 studies), mild to moderate COVID-19 symptoms (n=3 studies), moderate and severe COVID-19 symptoms (n=2 studies) and severe COVID-19 symptoms (n=5 studies). Data concerning the clinical status of COVID-19 patients were missing from one study. The interventions concerned CQ (n=2) [14,15], HCQ (n=6) [16–21], remdesivir (n=2) [4,5] LPV/RTV (n=4) [2,3,6,22], Umifenovir or Arbidol (n=2) [7,9], the combination of Arbidol with interferon IFN- α 2b (n=1) [8], the injection of high dose of immunoglobulin (n=1) [10] and the transfusion of convalescent plasma (n=1) [11]. A comprehensive summarie of the outcomes of the literatures reviewed in this study is shown in Table 1. It includes description of the studies, the treatment molecules used and their dose and duration, major findings, adverse effects and the mortality rate.

3.1 Chloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine

CQ and HCQ are two 4-aminoquinoline drugs that have inhibitory effects on pro-inflammatory

cytokine production, DNA replication and chemotaxis [23]. They have been widely used in the treatment of malaria, amoebiasis and some autoimmune diseases [24]. Moreover, they have earned a reputation for the inhibition and spread of many viruses such as HIV and SARS-CoV-1 [25,26]. It is known that HCQ is a metabolite of CQ and both of them have the same mechanism of action. They are weak bases that increase the pH of acidic vesicles like endosomes, Golgi vesicles and lysosomes. They have been additionally proved to decrease the affinity of angiotensin-converting enzyme-2 (ACE2) receptor for SARS-CoV-1 by impairing terminal

glycosylation of ACE2 and decrease viral infectivity [25]. As a result of the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic, many research teams have directly recruited these molecules and tested their impact on the SARS-CoV-2 infectivity *in vitro* using cultured cells as an experimental model. Wang and colleagues have demonstrated the efficiency of CQ in inhibiting the replication of SARS-CoV-2 at an EC50 of 1.13 μ M in *Vero E6* cells. It has been speculated that, as previously shown for other viral infections, QC might alter the virion assembly by interfering with the maturation of the M protein failing phagosome formation [25,27,28].




Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram

Table 1. Summary of clinical characteristics of the analyzed clinical studies

Type of study (Number of patients)	Molecule	Dose and duration	Principal findings	Adverse effects	Mortality (death/total cases)	Reference and (country)
Retrospective clinical study (>100)	Chloroquine phosphate	NR	-Suppresses pneumonia progression. -Promote virus negative conversion.	None	NR	[14] (China)
non-randomized clinical trial (36)	HCQ-AZ	HCQ: 200 mg in a triple-daily dose along 10 days. AZ: 500mg on day1 followed by 250mg per day, for 4 days.	- Significant reduction in viral carriage. - Effect of HCQ reinforced by AZ.	NR	0/20	[17] (Fance)
pilot observational study (80)	HCQ-AZ	HCQ: 200 mg in a triple-daily dose along 10 days. AZ: 500mg on day1 followed by 250 mg per day, for 4 days.	- Good clinical improvement. - Rapid fall of nasopharyngeal viral load.	Nausea, vomiting, diarrhea and blurred vision.	1/80	[16] (Fance)
Randomized Clinical Trial (81)	Chloroquine Diphosphate	Low dose (LD): 450 mg twice daily on the first day and 450 mg once daily for 4 days. High dose (HD): 600 mg twice daily for 10 days.	- Higher dosage does not increase recovery. - Not recommended for critical illnesses.	Prolongation of QTc interval.	- LD: 6/40 - HD: 16/41	[15] (Brazil)
Consecutive cohort (84)	HCQ-AZ	HCQ: a double-daily dose of 400 mg on the first day, followed by a double-daily dose of 200 mg along 4 days. AZ: 500 mg/day.	NR	Prolongation of QTc interval.	4/84	[18] (USA)
observational comparative Study (81)	HCQ	600 mg/day for 10 days.	No significant reduction in the transfer to ICU and lethality rate.	Electrocardiographic modifications in 10% of treated patients.	9/84	[19] (France)

Type of study (Number of patients)	Molecule	Dose and duration	Principal findings	Adverse effects	Mortality (death/total cases)	Reference and (country)
Randomized controlled trial (150)	HCQ	A regular loading dose of 1200 mg HCQ on the first 3 days followed by a daily dose of 800 mg for 2-3 weeks.	HCQ had no impact on negative conversion.	- Serious adverse event (3%). - Mild adverse events (27%).	0/150	[20] (China)
Retrospective study (1061)	HCQ-AZ	A triple-daily dose of 200 mg for 10 days AZ: 500 mg on first day followed by a single-daily dose of 250 mg for 4 days.	- Good clinical outcome and virological cure for 91.7% of patients. - HCQ+AZ combination is safe. - a very low fatality rate.	Mild adverse events for 2.4% of patients	8/1061	[21] (France)
Randomized multicenter trial (237)	Remdesivir (GS-5734)	Intravenous: loading dose of 200 mg on first day followed by 100 mg/day for 9 days.	- Remdesivir has no significance in COVID-19 recovery.	Remdesivir recipients: 66% Placebo recipients: 64%.	remdesivir recipients : 22/158 Placebo recipients: 10/79	[27] (China)
Prospective open-label study (35)	Remdesivir (GS-5734)	Intravenous: loading dose of 200 mg on first day followed by 100 mg/day for 9 days.	Remdesivir can benefit covid-19 patients hospitalized outside ICU.	Hypertransaminasemia and acute kidney injury (8/35).	ICU: 6/18 Non-ICU: 1/17	[5](Italy)
randomized controlled trial (86)	LPV/RTV	- 200 mg of LPV combined with 50 mg of RTV (50mg), twice a day for 7-14 days. - Arbidol: 200 mg in triple-daily doses for 1-2 weeks.	Limited beneficial of LPV/RTV or arbidol monotherapy on mild/moderate COVID-19 hospitalized patients.	17/86	0/86	[2] (China)
randomized, controlled, trial (199)	LPV/RTV	2 doses of 400 mg of LBV combined with 100 mg RTV a day for 2 weeks.	- No improvement in comparison to control group.	Gastro intestinal adverse events.	LPV/RTV group: 19/99 standard care group: 25/100	[3] (China)
Randomised,	interferon β -1b-	- Combination of 400 mg of	Triple antiviral therapy is	Self-limited	0/127	[22] (China)

Type of study (Number of patients)	Molecule	Dose and duration	Principal findings	Adverse effects	Mortality (death/total cases)	Reference and (country)
phase 2 trial (127)	LPV/RTV and ribavirin	LPV and 100 mg of RTV twice a day, 400 mg ribavirin twice a day and 3 doses of 8 million IU of interferon beta-1b a day for 2 weeks. - Control group: 400 mg LPV and 100 mg RTV twice a day for 2 weeks.	more safe and superior in eliminating virus, alleviating symptoms and shortening the duration of viral shedding than the use of LPV/RTV alone.	nausea and diarrhea in the 2 groups.		
Retrospective cohort study (33)	Arbidol- LPV/RTV	A dose of 200 mg arbidol every 8 h and a dose of 400 mg LPV combined with 100 mg RTV every 12 h for 5-21 days.	Favourable clinical response with arbidol and LPV/RTV compared to LPV/RTV only.	Mild diarrhea and nausea (43.7%).	0/33	[6](China)
retrospective study (50)	Group Arbidol Group LPV/RTV	A dose of 400 mg LPV combined with 100 mg RTV twice a day in addition to a dose of 0.2 g arbidol three times a day for one week.	- No influence on fever duration. - Viral clearance in the Arbidol-treated group within 14 days in comparison to 55.1% of LPV/RTV-treated group.	None	0/50	[7] (China)
Retrospective Cohort Study (141)	IFN- α 2b only Arbidol/IFN- α 2b combination	- IFN- α 2b alone: A dose of 5×10^5 IU, 2 times a day for 10-14 days. - Arbidol/IFN- α 2b: a triple-daily dose of 200 mg Arbidol (oral) combined with a daily-dose of 5×10^5 IU IFN- α 2b for 7-10 days.	- Combined treatment had no influence on viral RNA clearance and hospitalization.	NR	0/141	[8] (China)
retrospective study (81)	Arbidol	A triple-daily dose of 0.2 g arbidol for 5-10 days.	- No influence on the negative rate of virus in pharyngeal specimen. - The median time of	NR	0/81	[9] (China)

Type of study (Number of patients)	Molecule	Dose and duration	Principal findings	Adverse effects	Mortality (death/total cases)	Reference and (country)
Case series (3)	High-Dose Intravenous Immunoglobulin	25g/d for 5 days.	hospitalization was longer. Gradually improvement of clinical status and negative detection of virus from oropharyngeal swab.	None	0/3	[10] (China)
Case series (5)	convalescent plasma transfusion	400 ml of convalescent Plasma with a binding titer greater than 1:1000	Normalization of body temperature and negativity of viral load.	None	0/5	[11] (China)

NR: not reported, QTc interval: corrected QT interval, HCQ: hydroxychloroquine, CQ: Chloroquine, AZ: azithromycin, PCBO: Placebo, ICU: Intensive care unit

An extensive study by the same group revealed that HCQ is more efficient in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection and these molecules can alter viral entry into the target cells. Additionally, the study revealed that the transport of the virion within the host cell is affected due to the blocking of the endosome maturation at intermediate stages of endocytosis, leading to frustration of virion trafficking to the ultimate releasing site [29]. Furthermore, HCQ has been reported to be less toxic with higher efficiency in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection than CQ *in vitro* [29,30]. Such promising experimental studies-derived findings have encouraged clinicians to use these two molecules for the treatment of COVID-19 confirmed cases. Thus, as of May 23th, 2020 a total of eight clinical studies including two randomized clinical trials, two retrospective studies, two observational studies, one non-randomized clinical trial and one consecutive cohort study were published [14–21]. These studies have resulted in sometimes contradictory findings. A total of 181 and 1412 patients were treated with CQ and HCQ-respectively. A Brazilian randomized clinical trial using 2 different dosages that includes both a low dose (450 mg, 2 doses on the first day followed by a single-daily dose on the next 4 days) and a high dose (600 mg, , in double-daily dose for 10 days) of CQ diphosphate was conducted on 81 COVID-19 patients. This trial has shown that there was no clear benefit of CQ regarding the lethality rate among patients. Therefore, the authors have recommended avoiding the use of high dosage of CQ in particular for those with previous cardiac diseases [15]. However, a Chinese clinical study on more than 100 patients treated has demonstrated that CQ (i) inhibits the exacerbation of pneumonia, (ii) improves lung imaging finding, (iii) promotes the virus-negative conversion and (iv) accelerates the disease recovery [14].

Concerning the HCQ treatment regimen, a Chinese randomized controlled trial was carried on 148 individuals experiencing with mild to moderate and 2 additional cases with severe symptoms of disease, respectively. Among this group 75 patients were treated with HCQ (1200 mg/day for three days followed by 800 mg/day along 14 days for patients with mild to moderate illnesses and 21 days for those with severe illness) and 75 patients were treated with the standard care regimen only. This trial has shown that there is no significant difference in the viral clearance between the two groups [20]. Gautret et al. 2020 have conducted two studies, one non-

randomized clinical trial and one pilot observational study, assessing the effectiveness of the combination of HCQ with Azithromycin (HCQ-AZ) for the administration of confirmed COVID-19 cases with mild symptoms. A total of 100 patients has benefited from this treatment regimen (HCQ: 200 mg in a triple-daily dose for 10 days and AZ: 500 mg on day1 followed by 250 mg in a single-daily dose for 4 days). These two French clinical studies have proved that HCQ-AZ led to a significant of nasopharyngeal viral load.

Interestingly, it has been demonstrated that AZ reinforced the HCQ effect with only mild adverse events [16,17]. A consecutive study conducted in USA has assessed the impact of HCQ-AZ on the prolongation of QT-interval (the time of ventricular activity including both depolarization and repolarization) among 84 patients. The study revealed prolongation of the corrected QT-interval from a baseline average of 435 ± 24 ms to a maximal average value of 463 ± 32 ms ($P < 0.001$), suggesting that a repeated follow up of this parameter during the treatment period should be taken in concern [18]. A French observational comparative study conducted on 181 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia requiring oxygen demonstrated that treatment of COVID-19 patients ($n=84$) with 600 mg/day of HCQ for a period of 10 days has no positive impact on reducing the needs of transmitting the patients to intensive care unit (ICU) and lethality rate [19]. Finally, the latest retrospective 1061 infected persons with mild COVID-19 in French hospitals showed that the combination HCQ-AZ (HCQ: 200 mg in a triple-daily dose for 10 days and AZ: 500 mg on the first day followed by 250 mg/day for 4 days) resulted in a significantly efficient recovery of 91.7% patients, with a significant decrease in fatality rate [21].

Collectively, a daily of 3 doses of 200 mg for 10 days combined with 500 mg AZ on first day followed by 250 mg/day for the next four days results in a highly successful treatment of COVID-19 patients with mild adverse events (such as diarrhea, vomiting, nausea, abdominal discomfort and headache). Nevertheless, CQ and HCQ should not be prescribed for patients with contraindications including patients less than 14 years old, allergy/intolerance to CQ, HCQ or AZ, cardiac pathology (prolonged corrected QT, Brugada syndrome, myocarditis history) ophthalmologic pathologies (retinopathy, glaucoma, accommodation disorder), G6PD deficiency, epilepsy and hypokalemia [21].

3.2 Remdesivir

Remdesivir (GS-5734) is an analogue of adenosine triphosphate and a phosphoramidite prodrug with a broad spectrum activity against several virus families including *Coronaviridae* (Such SARS-CoV-1 and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus [MERS-CoV]) [31,32]. It is used as a substrate for many viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) complexes. It affects the nascent viral RNA chains resulting in premature chain termination of viral RNA transcription [33]. It was already demonstrated that remdesivir possesses an *in vitro* and *in vivo* activity against all the animals and human coronaviruses including SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV [34–37].

Subsequently, and since the COVID-19 outbreak, many researchers have renewed their interest in remdesivir for the elimination of SARS-CoV-2. Thus, *in vitro* infection assay has shown a potent antiviral activity of Remdesivir [27]. The first reported case treated with remdesivir was by Holshue et al, 2020 in USA. This patient recovered significantly after one day of receiving the first dose of remdesivir without more requirement of oxygen [38]. Another report included 53 severe and critical cases who showed clinical improvement (68%) after treatment with a course of remdesivir for 1-10 days [39]. Though, the small size of the treated patients, the lack of data on some patients as well as the absence of a control group prevented clinicians to draw solid conclusions from such studies.

Up to date, one randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled multi-centre trial and one prospective open-label study were published concerning the use of remdesivir as a therapeutic regimen for patients with severe symptoms of COVID-19 [4,5]. The first randomized trial was conducted in China, including ten hospitals in Hubei. A total of 158 patients have benefited from intravenous remdesivir (200 mg on the first day followed by a daily infusion of 100 mg along the next 9 days) versus 79 patients have received identical volumes of placebo infusions along the same period. Unfortunately, no significant clinical benefit was retrieved from this trial. Additionally, no significant difference neither in mortality (14% death in remdesivir-recipients group vs. 13% in placebo-recipients group) nor in viral load was achieved between the two groups. Nevertheless, patients receiving remdesivir showed a faster recovery time in comparison to those receiving placebo. Ultimately, adverse

events were reported in 66% and 64% of remdesivir and placebo recipients respectively [4]. The latest prospective open-label study (published on May 2020) was performed at Luigi Sacco Hospital, Italy and has included 35 patients from which 18 were admitted in the ICU while 17 patients were hospitalized outside ICU. On day 28, 82.3% of patients outside ICU were discharged versus 33.3% of the ICU group. Besides, 44.4% of ICU patients died [5]. The authors concluded that Remdesivir could have a beneficial effect on COVID-19 in non-critically ill patients.

Accordingly, till now, compassionate use of remdesivir was restricted for patients with severe and ICU- hospitalized patients. Currently, no evidence-based conclusion could be drawn for mild to moderate COVID-19 patients.

3.3 Lopinavir/Ritonavir

LPV is a protease inhibitor that is used in parallel with RTV as a treatment regimen for patients with Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). It targets the HIV-1 protease resulting in immature non-infectious virions [40]. RTV has no direct effect on viruses but extends bioavailability of LPV by blocking the host's cytochrome P450 3A4 enzyme and thereby boosting LPV concentration [41]. Previously, *in vitro* experimental studies have reported the inhibition effect of LPV on the replication of SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV with EC50 at 17.1 μ M and 8 μ M, respectively [42,43]. The same drug has demonstrated high recovery outcomes when it was used in the administration of non-human primate models (common marmosets) suffering from a severe disease mimicking the human MERS [44]. Recently, Choy et al. have assessed the impact of Remdesivir, LPV, emetine, and homoharringtonine against SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro*. In this study, the authors demonstrated that LPV has an antiviral effect on SARS-CoV-2 with EC50 at 26.1 μ M [45]. Another study reported the improvement of clinical symptoms and the rapid and drastic decrease of viral load in a patient with mild symptoms treated with LPV/RTV [46]. As of May 23th, 2020, three randomized controlled trials and two retrospective cohort studies were published and had assessed the effectiveness and safety of LPV/RTV monotherapy or in combination with other molecules as a possible improved treatment of COVID-19 [1,2,6,7,22]. All randomized controlled trials were conducted in China. They have involved a total of 412 patients, of whom 213 and 199 suffered from mild to moderate and severe

illnesses, respectively [2,3,22]. Out of this population, 117 patients were included as a control group receiving a standard care regimen. LPV/RTV monotherapy has shown little benefit regarding the improvement of the clinical outcomes of hospitalized COVID-19 patients with the same mortality rate among the treated and control groups [2,3]. However, the most recent open-label randomized phase 2 trial performed in China has evaluated the combination LPV/RTV, ribavirin and interferon β -1b (ABT-378 /RTV: 400 mg/100 mg twice a day, ribavirin 400 twice a day, and 3 doses of 8 million IU of interferon β -1b for 11 days) for the treatment of patients with mild to moderate symptoms of the disease. This study demonstrated that triple antiviral therapy result in alleviating symptoms and shorten the time period of viral clearance compared to the control group who received a LPV/RTV monotherapy regimen [22]. Another study included 16 cases with mild symptoms of the disease that were treated with the combination of LPV/RTV/Arbidol versus 17 patients treated by LPV/RTV only, have highlighted the benefit of the combination in improving the clinical outcomes of patients. Indeed, 14 days post-treatment, the virus was not detected in 94% and 52.9% of patients treated with LPV/RTV/Arbidol and LPV/RTV only, respectively [6]. A similar retrospective study comparing the clinical and viral outcomes of two groups of patients (one treated with LPV/RTV and one treated with Arbidol only) has reported no significant differences in fever duration between the two groups [7]. After 14 days, no viral load was detected in the Arbidol group, while it was detected in 44.1% patients treated with LPV/RTV, implying that Arbidol monotherapy seems to be more efficient than LPV/RTV in the treatment of COVID-19. However, no definitive conclusion could be decided since these results were not retrieved from a randomized controlled trial.

Accordingly, LPV/RTV monotherapy has negative to weak efficacy for the treatment of COVID-19 patients. Its association with interferon β -1b and ribavirin has proved a superior effect in alleviating symptoms and viral clearance. LPV/RTV (400/100 mg every 12 hours) combined with ribavirin (400 mg every 12 h) and interferon beta-1b (3 doses of 8 million IU on alternate days) for 14 days can be used as the second choice if HCQ/CQ was contraindicated. For optimal effectiveness, it was suggested to administer this antiviral therapy within 10 days after symptoms onset [47].

3.4 Umifenovir (Arbidol)

Umifenovir is an antiviral drug used for the treatment of influenza A and B virus infections in Russia and China. The action mode of this molecule is direct by the inhibition of virus proliferation and indirect through the induction of interferon and immune cell production [48,49]. In 2008, Khamitov et al. assessed the action of Arbidol on SARS-CoV-1 virus using cultured cells and reported a promising antiviral activity of this molecule [50]. By the outbreak of COVID-19, the Chinese National Health Commission published the guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infection. It recommended the combination of IFN- α -Arbidol as a therapeutic option [51]. However, up-to-date, clinical studies on the Arbidol effect on COVID-19 patients are scarce. By making a thorough literature review, we find only three published retrospective cohort studies (total of 236 patients) two of them have assessed the effect of Arbidol monotherapy on COVID-19 patients [7,9] and a single study has evaluated the combination Arbidol/Interferon (IFN)- α 2b [8]. Overall, Arbidol monotherapy did not prove any benefit for enhancing the clinical and viral outcomes of patients with mild, moderate or severe COVID-19 compared to the control group (with standard care regimen only) [9]. Indeed, after one week of treatment (0.2 g Umifenovir in triple-daily doses for 5-10 days), no positive effect was obtained. In contrast, the study team observed higher median time for hospitalization of the Umifenovir-treated patients in comparison to the control patients. Another retrospective Cohort Study included 70 patients treated with IFN- α 2b only and 71 patients treated with the combination of Arbidol/IFN- α 2b. This study reported that this last combination had no benefit for SARS-CoV-2 RNA clearance and hospitalization compared to IFN- α 2b monotherapy. Besides, the clearance duration of the viral RNA in the IFN- α 2b monotherapy group was not longer than that obtained in the combined therapy group [8]. Finally, the authors concluded that Arbidol/IFN-2b therapy could positively enhance the SARS-Cov-2-induced pneumonia of mild patients, but it remains unable to accelerate the virus clearance.

3.5 Passive Antibodies Transfer

Another promising treatment regimen option for COVID-19 patients is the passive transfer of antibodies. This therapeutic alternative gathers two strategies: (i) the administration of

convalescent plasma containing neutralizing antibodies or (ii) the administration of high-dose intravenous immunoglobulin (Ig) containing polyclonal IgG antibodies. The first strategy is known as an empirical therapeutic option previously used for the treatment of SARS-CoV-1, H1N1 influenza, Ebola and MERS [52–54]. It consists of plasma collected from individuals with a prior confirmed diagnosis of the relative infection and who have recovered at least 14 days prior to donation with negative PCR evidence for the presence of the intended virus. This strategy has demonstrated an interesting benefit in enhancing clinical outcomes, shortening hospital stay, dropping the respiratory tract viral load and reducing the mortality rate related to these infections [52–54]. These previous promising findings have encouraged clinicians to try the transfusion of convalescent plasma to the SARS-CoV-2-severely-infected individuals. Thus, a preliminary finding of a case series, including five severe cases of SARS-Cov-2-induced pneumonia and benefiting from the transfer of convalescent plasma was recently published [11]. The administration of convalescent plasma with a SARS-CoV-2 IgG

titer higher than 1:1000 by ELISA and neutralizing antibody titer >40 resulted in (i) the normalization of body temperature after 3 days, (ii) the decrease of the sequential organ failure assessment score and the negativity of viral load after 12 days and (iii) the resolving of the acute respiratory distress syndrome [11].

The second strategy for passive antibodies transfer is the administration of High-Dose Intravenous Immunoglobulin (IVIg). It is a blood product isolated from healthy donors containing polyclonal IgG and bioactive moieties and has an immunomodulatory effect [55]. It was previously used for the treatment of SARS and MERS and demonstrated many clinical benefits and good tolerance [56,57]. A preliminary study of a series of three patients with severe COVID-19 reported that the administration of High-Dose Intravenous Immunoglobulin was effective to improve the clinical outcomes and viral overcome in these patients. Indeed, it led to a progressive enhancement of clinical status, partial resolution of lung lesions and negative detection of virus from oropharyngeal swab [10].




Fig. 2. Proposed algorithm for treatment of COVID-19 treatment

Results obtained from the selected studies were summarized accordingly. Specification of proposed treatment strategy and the corresponding drug concentration/plasma titer for severe, moderate and mild illnesses are indicated. HCQ: Hydroxychloroquine, AZ: Azythromycin, LPV/RTV/RBV: lopinavir/ritonavir/ribavirin

Although these findings are promising, the small number of COVID-19 patients recruited in this treatment strategy prevents clinicians from concluding its effectiveness. For this, controlled randomized trials are urgently needed to evaluate the treatment by passive antibodies transfer accurately.

4. CONCLUSION AND PROPOSED ALGORITHM

Based on the analysis of the published clinical studies concerning the treatment of COVID-19 patients and with the absence of a specific treatment and vaccine for SARS-CoV-2, clinicians are still obliged to deal with the available treatment strategies with a lot of precautions. Thus, in the absence of any contraindication, a combination of HCQ-AZ can result in good clinical and infection recovery outcomes for patients with mild to moderate illness. Nevertheless, this treatment regimen should be closely gathered with a follow up of vital parameters and the electrocardiogram of the patient. In the case of any contraindications, this treatment can be substituted by LPV/RTV combined with interferon β -1b and ribavirin to alleviate symptoms and eliminate the virus. Another alternative is the treatment with the combination of Arbidol/IFN α -2b. Compassionate use of remdesivir should be prescribed for patients with severe COVID-19 and hospitalized in ICU. In case of the availability of eligible donors, convalescent plasma is considered as a promising alternative treatment for critically ill patients (Fig. 2).

This evidence-based algorithm derived from the analysis of clinical studies may help clinicians to manage the COVID-19 cases in their respective hospitals and point out the property of each treatment strategy of choice on efficacy and safety outcomes. Nevertheless, it is still primordial to conduct more large-scale clinical trials to assess the efficiency of the available treatment strategies accurately.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

It is not applicable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research has been funded by the Scientific Research Deanship at University of Ha'il - Saudi Arabia through project number COVID-1938.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease situation report-60; 2019. Available:https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200621-covid-19-sitrep-153.pdf?sfvrsn=c896464d_2 (2020).
2. Li Y. 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. DOI:10.1016/j.medj.2020.04.001
3. Cao B. et al. A trial of lopinavir-ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe covid-19. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2020;382:1787–1799.
4. Wang Y. et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet.* 2020;395:1569–1578.
5. Antinori S. et al. Compassionate remdesivir treatment of severe Covid-19 pneumonia in intensive care unit (ICU) and Non-ICU patients: Clinical outcome and differences in post-treatment hospitalisation status. *Pharmacol. Res.* 2020;158.
6. Deng L. et al. Arbidol combined with LPV/r versus LPV/r alone against Corona Virus Disease 2019: A retrospective cohort study. *J. Infect.* 2020;81:1–5.
7. Zhu Z. et al. Arbidol monotherapy is superior to lopinavir/ritonavir in treating COVID-19. *J. Infect.* 2020;81:21–23.
8. Xu P. et al. Arbidol/IFN- α 2b therapy for patients with corona virus disease 2019: a retrospective multicenter cohort study. *Microbes Infect.* 2020;22:200–205.
9. Lian N. et al. Umifenovir treatment is not associated with improved outcomes in patients with coronavirus disease 2019: a retrospective study. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 2020;26:917–921.

10. Cao W. et al. High-Dose Intravenous Immunoglobulin as a Therapeutic Option for Deteriorating Patients With Coronavirus Disease. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*; 2020.
DOI:10.1093/ofid/ofaa102
11. Shen C. et al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19 with Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 2020;323:1582–1589.
12. Moher D. et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Rev. Esp. Nutr. Humana y Diet.* 2015;20:148–160.
13. Higgins JP, Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* The Cochrane Collaboration ®. (John Wiley & Sons Ltd); 2008.
14. Gao J, Tian Z, Yang X. Breakthrough: Chloroquine phosphate has shown apparent efficacy in treatment of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical studies. *BioScience Trends* 14, (International Advancement Center for Medicine and Health Research Co., Ltd); 2020.
15. Borba MGS. 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* 3, e208857; 2020.
16. Gautret 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;34.
17. Gautret P. et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents.* 2020;56.
18. Chorin E. et al. The QT interval in patients with COVID-19 treated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin. *Nat. Med.* 2020;26:807–812.
19. Mahévas 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.
20. Tang W. et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: Open label, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2020;369.
21. Million M. et al. Early treatment of COVID-19 patients with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: A retrospective analysis of 1061 cases in Marseille, France. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* 2020;35.
22. Hung IFN. 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;395:1695–1704.
23. Werth VP. Principles of therapy of sin diseases" In 'Goldman's Cecil Medicine'. Elsevier; 2012.
24. Savarino A, Boelaert JR, Cassone A, Majori G, Cauda R. Effects of chloroquine on viral infections: An old drug against today's diseases? *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 2003;3:722–727.
25. Vincent MJ. et al. Chloroquine is a potent inhibitor of SARS coronavirus infection and spread. *Virology* 2005;2:69.
26. Savarino A. et al. Anti-HIV Effects of Chloroquine. *JAIDS J. Acquir. Immune Defic. Syndr.* 2004;35:223–232.
27. Wang M. et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. *Cell Research.* 2020;30:269–271.
28. Colson P, Rolain JM, Raoult D. Chloroquine for the 2019 novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents.* 2020;55.
29. Liu J. et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic derivative of chloroquine, is effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. *Cell Discov.* 2020;6.
30. Yao X. et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of Optimized Dosing Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 2020;71.
31. Sheahan TP. et al. Broad-spectrum antiviral GS-5734 inhibits both epidemic and zoonotic coronaviruses. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 2017;9.
32. Martinez MA. Compounds with therapeutic potential against novel respiratory coronavirus. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2020;64.

33. Agostini ML. et al. Coronavirus susceptibility to the antiviral remdesivir (GS-5734) is mediated by the viral polymerase and the proofreading exoribonuclease. *MBio*. 2018;9.
34. Brown AJ. et al. Broad spectrum antiviral remdesivir inhibits human endemic and zoonotic deltacoronaviruses with a highly divergent RNA dependent RNA polymerase. *Antiviral Res.* 2019; 169.
35. Gordon CJ, Tchesnokov EP, Feng JY, Porter DP, Götte M. The antiviral compound remdesivir potently inhibits RNAdependent RNA polymerase from Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2020;295:4773–4779.
36. Sheahan TP. et al. Comparative therapeutic efficacy of remdesivir and combination lopinavir, ritonavir, and interferon beta against MERS-CoV. *Nat. Commun.* 2020;11:1–14.
37. De Wit, E. et al. Prophylactic and therapeutic remdesivir (GS-5734) treatment in the rhesus macaque model of MERS-CoV infection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2020;117:6771–6776.
38. Holshue ML. et al. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2020;382:929–936.
39. Grein J. et al. Compassionate use of remdesivir for patients with severe Covid-19. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2020;382:2327–2336.
40. Chandwani A, Shuter J. Lopinavir/ritonavir in the treatment of HIV-1 infection: A review. *Ther. Clin. Risk Manag.* 2008;4:1023–1033.
41. Kempf DJ. et al. Pharmacokinetic enhancement of inhibitors of the human immunodeficiency virus protease by coadministration with ritonavir. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 1997;41:654–660.
42. De Wilde AH. et al. Screening of an FDA-approved compound library identifies four small-molecule inhibitors of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus replication in cell culture. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 2014;58:4875–4884.
43. Chu CM. et al. Role of lopinavir/ritonavir in the treatment of SARS: Initial virological and clinical findings. *Thorax.* 2004;59:252–256.
44. Fuk-Woo Chan J. et al. Treatment With Lopinavir/Ritonavir or Interferon-β1b Improves Outcome of MERS-CoV Infection in a Nonhuman Primate Model of Common Marmoset. *J. Infect. Dis.* 2015;212:1904–1913.
45. Choy KT. et al. Remdesivir, lopinavir, emetine, and homoharringtonine inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication in vitro. *Antiviral Res.* 2020;178.
46. Lim J. et al. Case of the index patient who caused tertiary transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 in Korea: The application of lopinavir/ritonavir for the treatment of COVID-19 pneumonia monitored by quantitative RT-PCR. *J. Korean Med. Sci.* 2020;35.
47. Ierssel SV, Dauby N, Bottieau E. Interim clinical guidance for patients suspected of/confirmed with COVID-19 in Belgium. Unpublished; 2020.
48. Blaising J, Polyak SJ, Pécheur EI. Arbidol as a broad-spectrum antiviral: An update. *Antiviral Res.* 2014;107:84–94.
49. Du Q. et al. The antiviral activity of arbidol hydrochloride against herpes simplex virus type II (HSV-2) in a mouse model of vaginitis. *Int. Immunopharmacol.* 2019;68:58–67.
50. Khamitov RA et al. [Antiviral activity of arbidol and its derivatives against the pathogen of severe acute respiratory syndrome in the cell cultures] - PubMed. *Vopr Virusol.* 2008;53:9–13.
51. Lin L, Li TS. Interpretation of 'Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infection by the National Health Commission (Trial Version 5)'. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi* 100, E001; 2020.
52. Lai ST. Treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* 2005;24:583–591.
53. Ivan FN Hung et al. Convalescent Plasma Treatment Reduced Mortality in Patients With Severe Pandemic Influenza A (H1N1) 2009 Virus Infection | *Clinical Infectious Diseases* | Oxford Academic. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 2011;2:447–456.
54. Arabi Y. et al. Feasibility, safety, clinical, and laboratory effects of convalescent plasma therapy for patients with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection: a study protocol. *Springerplus.* 2015;4:1–8.
55. Hartung HP. Advances in the understanding of the mechanism of action of IVIg. *J. Neurol.* 2008;255:3–6.
56. Wang JT. et al. Clinical Manifestations, Laboratory Findings, and Treatment

- Outcomes of SARS Patients. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2004;10:818–824.
57. Arabi YM. et al. Clinical Course and Outcomes of Critically Ill Patients With Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection. Ann. Intern. Med. 2014;160:389–397.

© 2020 Zreiq et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/61061>