Effect of various treatment modalities on the novel coronavirus (nCOV-2019) infection in humans: a systematic review & meta-analysis
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Abstract

Background and aim: Several therapeutic agents have been investigated for the treatment of novel Coronavirus-2019 (nCOV-2019). We aimed to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the effect of various treatment modalities in nCOV-2019 patients.

Methods: An extensive literature search was conducted before 22 May 2020 in PubMed, Google Scholar, Cochrane library databases. Quality assessment was performed using Newcastle Ottawa Scale. A fixed-effect model was applied if I² <50%, else the results were combined using random-effect model. Risk Ratio (RR) or Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) along-with 95% Confidence Interval (95%CI) were used to pool the results. Between study heterogeneity was explored using influence and sensitivity analyses & publication bias was assessed using funnel plots. Entire statistical analysis was conducted in R version 3.6.2.

Results: Eighty-one studies involving 44 in vitro and 37 clinical studies including 8662 nCOV-2019 patients were included in the review. Lopinavir-Ritonavir compared to controls was significantly associated with shorter mean time to clinical improvement (SMD -0.32; 95%CI -0.57 to -0.06) and Remdesivir compared to placebo was significantly associated with better overall clinical improvement (RR 1.17; 95%CI 1.07 to 1.29). Hydroxychloroquine was associated with less overall clinical improvement (RR 0.88; 95%CI 0.79 to 0.98) and longer time to clinical improvement (SMD 0.64; 95%CI 0.33 to 0.94). It additionally had higher all-cause mortality (RR 1.6; 95%CI 1.26 to 2.03) and more total adverse events (RR 1.84; 95% CI 1.58 to 2.13).

Conclusion: Our meta-analysis suggests that except in vitro studies, no treatment till now has shown clear-cut benefit on nCOV-2019 patients. Lopinavir-Ritonavir and Remdesivir have shown some benefits in terms less time to clinical improvement and better overall clinical improvement. Hydroxychloroquine use has a risk of higher mortality and adverse events. Results from upcoming large clinical trials must be awaited to draw any profound conclusions.
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Introduction:

The novel Coronavirus-2019 (nCOV-2019) has now encompassed more than 200 countries since a cluster of cases were initially reported in Wuhan, China on 31st December 2019 (1). As of 22nd May 2020, 5,322,698 people have been infected globally from nCOV-2019 while 340,319 have died of this severe infection (2). The nCOV-2019 belongs to the Coronaviridae family and has structural similarities to the betacoronavirus that has caused two epidemics in the past 18 years; Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV) and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-Cov) (3).

No drug or therapeutic agent has yet been approved by the United States- Food and Drug Administration (US-FDA) for treating nCOV-2019 pneumonia patients. Based on the initial results obtained from certain in vitro studies (4,5), non-randomized trials (6) and interim analysis of some randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (7), Hydroxychloroquine and Remdesivir received FDA emergency use authorization for nCOV-2019 (8,9). However, recent RCTs published on these respective drugs have shown inconclusive evidence for their usage in nCOV-2019 patients (10,11). Recently, FDA cautioned against the use of Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine outside clinical trial settings due to high risk of associated adverse events (12). With more than 500 trials already registered in clinicaltrials.gov on the treatment of nCOV-2019, it is imperative to investigate the available evidence till date and assess each treatment in terms of benefit or harm to the nCOV-2019 patients.

The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to pool the initial evidence available from RCTs, non-RCTs, observational and in vitro studies for analyzing the benefit/harm of various treatment modalities administered to nCOV-2019 pneumonia patients. The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis might be useful in designing future clinical trials and providing guidelines.
Methods

Electronic search
Electronic databases including PubMed, EMBASE, Medline, Google Scholar, Cochrane library and clinicaltrials.gov were searched independently by two authors (SM and MN) till 22 May 2020. The following MeSH terms or free text terms were used: “2019 novel coronavirus”, “2019 nCOV”, “COVID19”, “SARS-CoV-2”, “drug therapy”, “vaccine”, “antiviral therapy”, “symptomatic treatment”, “preventive therapy”, “immunotherapy”. The detailed search criteria are given in the supplementary file S1. Furthermore, any abstract proceedings in scientific conference and reference list of all the relevant identified articles were thoroughly searched. Grey literature and preprints were searched using the https://www.medrxiv.org and https://www.biorxiv.org databases. There were no restrictions on language. Studies published on human subjects after 31st December 2019 since the nCOV-2019 outbreak initiated, were only searched. The protocol for this systematic review and meta-analysis was registered in PROSPERO (ID: CRD42020175792) and there were no major deviations from the published protocol in PROSPERO.

Population
Subjects diagnosed with pneumonia caused by new Coronavirus 2019 infection (nCOV-2019).

Intervention
Various treatment modalities for nCOV-2019 patients.

Comparator
nCOV-2019 patients receiving standard care or placebo treatment or secondary treatment drug.

Outcome
Outcome for in vitro studies
Inhibition potential and Cytotoxicity of the drug
Outcome for clinical studies

(1) All-cause Mortality; (2) total adverse events; (3) overall clinical improvement defined as the number of patients becoming negative for nCOV-2019 or improvement in overall symptoms or discharged from the hospital; (4) time to clinical improvement defined as the time in number of days from treatment initiation to becoming negative for nCOV-2019 or time in number of days from treatment initiation to improvement in overall symptoms or time in number of days from treatment initiation to discharge from the hospital.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The criteria for the inclusion of studies in our systematic review and meta-analysis was:

For inclusion of clinical studies: (1) randomized controlled trials (RCTs), non-RCTs, cohort studies, case-control studies; (2) studies should be focused on various treatments given to nCOV-2019 patients; (3) studies must have a comparator group comparing the primary treatment drug to either standard care/control or placebo or a second treatment drug; (4) conducted on human subjects only.

For inclusion of in vitro studies: (1) case series, observational studies; (2) studies should be focused on various treatments given for nCOV-2019, (3) studies should have reported data on inhibitory effect and cytotoxicity of the drug.

The following clinical and in vitro studies were excluded from our systematic review and meta-analysis: (1) conducted on animal models; (2) completed studies but results not published or preprints not available; (3) ongoing registered clinical trials; (4) desired outcome data not reported; (5) single arm studies/trials (for clinical studies).

This systematic review and meta-analysis was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocol (PRISMA-P) 2015 guidelines (13).

Data extraction

All titles and abstracts retrieved by searching available literature were screened independently by two authors (SM and MN) against the eligibility criteria. The information extracted from each eligible study included the first author, year of publication, study design, sample size, interventions (including type of treatment.
administered), outcome measures, main results. Any disagreement was resolved by mutual consensus among all the authors.

Risk of bias assessment
The quality assessment was done for only the clinical studies included in our systematic review and meta-analysis by two independent authors (SM and MN) using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (14). Since we pooled the results from both RCTs as well as non-RCTs and cohort studies, the quality assessment of RCTs was done considering them as cohort studies only. Any disagreement was resolved by consulting with the remaining authors of the review.

The risk of publication bias was assessed by using Funnel plots and the asymmetry of the funnel plot was investigated using the Egger’s regression test (15).

Statistical analysis
Dichotomous variables were represented by number (percentage) and the continuous variables were represented by mean and standard deviation (SD). If median, ranges and/or interquartile range were reported, then they were converted to mean and SD using the formula depending upon the sample size given by Wan et al. 2014 (16). A meta-analysis was performed only for clinical studies and for those treatments in which required outcome data could be pooled from two or more studies. For dichotomous variables, the data was pooled using Risk ratio (RR) and 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI) while for continuous variables, the data was pooled using Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) and 95%CI. Heterogeneity among the included studies was investigated using Cochran’s Q statistic, I² metric tests and by using prediction intervals. A fixed-effect model was applied if I² was less than 50%, else a random-effect model was used to pool the results. Labbé plots were used to determine the trend and between-study heterogeneity present in a binary outcome meta-analysis. The source of heterogeneity was further assessed by using the influence diagnostic tools and by conducting the sensitivity analyses and meta-regression analyses. All the statistical analysis was conducted using R version 3.6.2.
**Results:**

Initial search yielded 1479 articles by searching various databases for published and preprint articles. After screening 917 articles, 355 full text articles were reviewed for eligibility and finally 81 studies were included in our systematic review and meta-analysis. Further, out of the 81 included studies, 44 were *in vitro* studies and 37 were clinical studies. The meta-analysis was finally conducted on 21 clinical studies. Fig 1 represents the PRISMA flow diagram for the inclusion of studies in our systematic review and meta-analysis.

**Results from the systematic review of *in vitro* studies**

Overall, 44 *in vitro* studies were included in the systematic review, which comprised majorly of treatments done on Vero E6 cells for viral titration, drug inhibition and cytotoxicity analyses. There were 32 preprints and 12 published articles amongst the selected studies. Fifteen studies were included from China(17–31), six from United States of America (USA)(32–37), five from France(38–42), four from Japan(43–46), two each from Germany(47,48), Netherlands(49,50) and South Korea(51,52) and one each from Australia(53), Brazil(54), Canada(55), Israel(56), Italy(57), Norway(58), Switzerland(59) and the United Kingdom (UK)(60).

There were five studies(23,30,37,59,60) involving the anti-malarial drug Chloroquine with multiplicity of infection (MOI) ranging from 0.01 to 0.05 except one that did not report any MOI, had average half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC\textsubscript{50}) of 25.94 µM [1.03 – 46.8], average cytotoxic concentration (CC\textsubscript{50}) of 40.48 µM [16.76 – 50] and average selectivity index (SI) of 34.92 [1.19 – 88.5]. All the studies used Vero E6 cells for anti-nCOV-2019 inhibition with Chloroquine treatment *in vitro* and reported significant inhibitory effect on viral population despite having some form of cellular cytotoxicity.

Six studies(30,31,36,37,41,52) involving the broad-spectrum antiviral Remdesivir with MOI in the range of 0.01 to 0.1 exhibited mean half-maximal effective concentration (EC\textsubscript{50}) of 6.7±0.085µM [0.72–23.15], average IC\textsubscript{50} of 1.9µM [1.3–2.5], average CC\textsubscript{50} of 137.5 µM [100–175] and average SI of 99.935 [70–129.87]. Remdesivir showed promising results *in vitro* and depicted potency inhibiting viral proliferation particularly in Vero E6 and Calu-3 cell lines.

There were four studies(21–23,38) on Hydroxychloroquine out of which three had positive controls (two studies with chloroquine and one with Remdesivir). The studies
had a wide range of MOI from 0.002 to 0.8 and an average EC\textsubscript{50} of 5.95\textmu M [0.72 – 4.17] in the treatment arm as compared to 4.83\textmu M [1.65–7.36] in the control arm. The average CC\textsubscript{50} of 101.58\textmu M [15.26–249.5] and average SI of 23.8 [10–61.45] resulted in a positive outcome in all the four studies where hydroxychloroquine showed better efficacy and lesser cytotoxicity in inhibiting nCOV-2019 than Chloroquine \textit{in vitro}.

Three studies(45,46,58) on the anti-retroviral drug Nelfinavir [MOI: 0.01–0.1] had an average EC\textsubscript{50} of 1.61±0.6\textmu M [1.13–2.1±0.6], CC\textsubscript{50} of 32.67 ± 0.4 \textmu M [9.7±0.4–64] and average SI of 13.6 [4.6–21.52]. Nelfinavir had been found to be highly potent when administered in combinatorial approach as well as stand-alone. While, two studies(31,44) on Lopinavir [MOI: 0.01–0.02] depicted an average EC\textsubscript{50} of 16.18\textmu M [5.73–26.63] and average CC\textsubscript{50} of 62.09\textmu M [49.75–74.44] which resulted in lesser efficacy less than Nelfinavir and Remdesivir \textit{in vitro}.

Two studies each of Chlorpromazine(39,60), Ciclesonide(43,51), Protoporphyrin IX(27,28) and Nafamostat mesylate(44,52) highlighting their inhibitory efficacy depicted that Chlorpromazine (EC\textsubscript{50} = 9\textmu M, IC\textsubscript{50} = 4.03\textmu M), Ciclesonide (EC\textsubscript{50} = 4.4\textmu M, IC\textsubscript{50} = 4.33\textmu M) and Protoporphyrin IX (EC\textsubscript{50} = 0.23\textmu M, IC\textsubscript{50} = 0.11±0.02\textmu M) effectively inhibited nCOV-2019 infected cell lines. However, Nafamostat mesylate (EC\textsubscript{50} = 0.0115\textmu M, IC\textsubscript{50} = 0.0022\textmu M) was found to be one of the most potent inhibitors of nCoV-2019 infection \textit{in vitro}(44,52).

One study each involving 47D11 H2L2 antibody, Arbidol(17), Atazanavir(54), Auranofin(32), Baicalein(18), Beta-d-N4-hydroxyctidine(33), Boceprevir(34), Darunavir(47), Genz-123346 (GlucosylCeramide synthase inhibitor)(56), Antibodies n3086/n3113(20), Interferon-\alpha/Interferon –\beta(35), Indomethacin(24), Lianhuaqingwen(25), Miglustat(57), Naproxen(40), Pudilan Xiaoyan Oral Liquid(29), Suramin(50) and T-705 (Favipiravir)(42) had a wide range of EC\textsubscript{50} [0.15–207 \textmu M] or IC\textsubscript{50} [0.08–411.2\textmu M] values. However, each of these compounds demonstrated the potential to stall the process of viral replication and growth through inhibiting viral titre in cell lines.

Two studies(34,55) of the novel protease inhibitor GC376 depicted an average EC\textsubscript{50} of 2.14±1.68\textmu M and average CC\textsubscript{50} > 150\textmu M suggests that these novel inhibitors of nCOV-2019 infected Vero E6 cells have the potential to be up-scaled into further animal model studies and clinical trials.
There was one *in vitro* study(19) on the phytochemical extracts from six Chinese traditional medicinal plants viz. *Cimicifuga rhizoma*, *Meliae cortex*, *Cop tidis rhizoma*, *Phellodendron cortex*, *Sophora subprostrata radix* and *Mountan cortex radicis*. Extracts from five of the six plants showed potential as herbal medicine by inhibiting coronavirus infection in both A59 and Vero cells with significant EC\textsubscript{50} [2.0±0.5–27.5±1.1µg/mL], CC\textsubscript{50} [71.3 ± 7.2–334.3 ± 7.0µg/mL] and SI [11.1–34.9] values. All the studies had an incubation time (hours post infection) of treatment ranging from 24 to 72 hours on average with a median of 48 hours. Table-1 depicts the baseline characteristics of *in vitro* studies included in our systematic review.

**Results from clinical studies**

A total of 37 clinical studies with 8662 nCOV-2019 pneumonia patients were included in the systematic review out of which 5222 (60.29%) patients were male. The overall mean age of the subjects present in the included studies was 53.82 ± 14.63. We included 14 RCTs, 3 non-RCTs and 20 observational (including retrospective/prospective cohort, case-control) studies. Among the included studies, there were 20 published articles and 17 articles with their preprints available. Twenty-five studies were included from China (10,11,61–83), six from USA (84–89), two from France (6,90) and one each from United Arab Emirates (UAE) (91 ), Brazil (92), Italy (93) and Hong Kong (94).

There was no significant difference in the mean age and male gender between any of the treatment and comparator groups included in our meta-analysis. Table-2 depicts the baseline characteristics of clinical studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Since only limited clinical trials and observational studies have been published till date, the data from several studies could not be pooled together to assess any of the four outcome measures. Fig S2.1 in the supplementary file S2 illustrates the effect of various treatment modalities in individual studies in terms of all-cause mortality, total adverse events, overall clinical improvement and time to clinical improvement.

**Results from the meta-analyses of clinical studies**

*Hydroxychloroquine Versus Control groups*

Ten studies consisting of 3184 nCOV-2019 cases were included in the meta-analysis and were divided into two groups: 1473 subjects to Hydroxychloroquine group and 1711
subjects to control group. Compared to the control group, Hydroxychloroquine was neither found to be significantly associated with an increase or decrease in the all-cause mortality (RR 1.22; 95%CI 0.72 to 2.07) nor was found to be significantly associated with overall clinical improvement (RR 0.92; 95%CI 0.82 to 1.04) and time to clinical improvement (SMD 0.33; 95%CI -0.28 to 0.93). Although, through the Labbé plots, we did observe a trend that all-cause mortality was more towards the Hydroxychloroquine group (supplementary file S2) while overall clinical improvement was more in the control group [Fig 8(a)]. However, Hydroxychloroquine had an increased risk of having total adverse events compared to the control group (RR 1.84; 95% CI 1.58 to 2.13) [Fig 2(a-d)].

Lopinavir-Ritonavir Versus Control groups
Four studies consisting of 397 nCOV-2019 cases were included in the meta-analysis and were divided into two groups: 227 subjects to Lopinavir-Ritonavir group and 170 subjects control group. There was no significant association between the two groups in terms of total adverse events (RR 1.73; 95%CI 0.57 to 5.26) and overall clinical improvement (RR 1.08; 95%CI 0.94 to 1.24). Labbé plot observed a trend of having more adverse events towards the Lopinavir-Ritonavir group (supplementary file S2). A borderline association was observed depicting a trend in terms of a shorter mean time (in days) to clinical improvement in the Lopinavir-Ritonavir group compared to the control group (SMD -0.47; 95%CI -1.00 to 0.07) [Fig 3(a-c)]. Due to less number of available studies, a meta-analysis could not be performed for assessing the all-cause mortality between the two groups.

Lopinavir-Ritonavir Versus Arbidol groups
The benefit/harm of Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment over Arbidol treatment was assessed in two studies consisting of 155 nCOV-2019 cases; 86 in the lopinavir-ritonavir treatment group and 69 in Arbidol treatment group. Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment group was significantly associated with higher total adverse events as compared to the Arbidol treatment group (RR 2.25; 95%CI 1.07 to 4.74). None of the two treatment groups were found to be associated with an increase in the overall clinical improvement of nCOV-2019 patients (RR 0.95; 95%CI 0.78 to 1.15) [Fig 3(d-e)]. The findings were concurrent when analysed using the Labbé plots (supplementary file S2). A meta-
analysis could not be performed for all-cause mortality and time to clinical improvement because of less number of studies.

**Arbidol Versus Control groups**

Two studies consisting of 134 nCOV-2019 cases were included in the meta-analysis and were divided into two groups: 69 subjects to Arbidol group and 65 subjects to control group. When compared to the control group, treatment with Arbidol was not found to be significantly associated with either an increase/decrease in the total adverse events (RR 1.80; 95%CI 0.52 to 6.19) or an increase/decrease in the overall clinical improvement (RR 1.08; 95%CI 0.85 to 1.38) ([Fig 4 (a, b)]). The findings were concurrent when analysed using the Labbé plots (supplementary file S2). A meta-analysis could not be performed for the remaining outcome measures of all-cause mortality and time to clinical improvement due to fewer number of studies.

**Remdesivir Versus Placebo group**

The effect of Remdesivir treatment over placebo was assessed in two RCTs consisting of 1295 nCOV-2019 patients; 696 in Remdesivir group while 599 in placebo group. Compared to placebo group, Remdesivir was not associated with either all-cause mortality (RR 0.74; 95%CI 0.40 to 1.37), total adverse events (RR 0.91; 95%CI 0.79 to 1.05) or time to clinical improvement (SMD -0.78; 95%CI -2.05 to 0.50). However, a significant association was observed with better overall clinical improvement (RR 1.17; 95%CI 1.07 to 1.29) in Remdesivir group compared to placebo group ([Figure 5 (a-d)]). Similar findings were observed in Labbé plot analysis as well (supplementary file S2).

**Corticosteroids Versus Control groups**

Four studies consisting of 211 nCOV-2019 cases were included in the meta-analysis and were divided into two groups: 119 subjects to Corticosteroid group and 92 subjects to control group. Administration of Corticosteroid treatment was found to have a borderline association depicting a trend towards an increase in the risk of all-cause mortality as compared to the control group (RR 2.24; 95%CI 0.96 to 5.25). Labbé plots also observed a similar trend of higher all-cause mortality towards the corticosteroid group (supplementary file S2). The Corticosteroid treatment was found to have no significant association with an increase/decrease in the average time to clinical
improvement (SMD 0.16; 95%CI -0.26 to 0.58) compared to the control group [Fig 6 (a, b)]. Since enough studies could not be pooled, no meta-analysis was performed to assess the effect of Corticosteroid treatment on the total adverse events and overall clinical improvement.

Combination therapy
The combination of Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin was tested in three studies including 1253 nCOV-2019 cases wherein, 854 cases were allocated to the Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin treatment group and the rest 399 cases to the control group. The combination of Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin was significantly associated with a higher risk of all-cause mortality compared to the control group (RR 2.01; 95%CI 1.47 to 2.73) while no association was observed between the two in terms of overall clinical improvement (RR 0.95; 95%CI 0.74 to 1.21) [Fig 7 (a, b)]. However, we did observe a slight trend in a lesser overall clinical improvement towards the Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin treatment group using the Labbé plot (supplementary file S2). The total adverse events and time to clinical improvement outcomes could not be assessed due to limited number of studies.

Two studies including 106 nCOV-2019 cases investigated another combination of Lopinavir-Ritonavir + Arbidol in 55 cases compared to Lopinavir-Ritonavir alone in 51 cases. Due to limited number of available studies, the data could only be pooled to assess the overall clinical improvement outcome. The addition of Arbidol to Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment was not found to be significantly associated with an increase/decrease in the overall clinical improvement (RR 1.27; 95%CI 0.55 to 2.90) compared to Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment alone [Fig 7 (c)].

Publication bias
The publication bias was assessed using funnel plot analysis for all those treatment modalities wherein data from more than two studies could be pooled together. The shape of the funnel plots did not show any evidence of significant publication bias except for one instance wherein Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment was compared with control group to assess the total adverse event outcome. This was confirmed by the significant p-value obtained from the Egger’s regression test (p-value: 0.02). The p-value of Egger’s regression test was not significant for the presence of any publication bias for the rest of the funnel plots. Fig 8(b) represents the funnel plot analysis carried
out for hydroxychloroquine vs. control group for assessing the overall clinical improvement outcome. The remaining funnel plots have been depicted in the Table S2.1 of supplementary file S2.

Quality assessment

The risk of bias in the studies included in our systematic review was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for quality measurement. The total score was divided into three categories: (1) 1-3 (High risk of bias); (2) 4-6 (Some concerns); 7-9 (Low risk of bias). Twelve studies (32.43%) included in our review had an overall low risk of bias while the rest 25 studies (67.57%) had some concerns related to the risk of bias. No study included in the systematic review had an overall high risk of bias [Fig 8 (c)]. The individual items for the quality scale are depicted supplementary file S1.

Meta-regression analysis

A meta-regression analysis was conducted to determine if the quality score of each study was associated with the overall effect size difference. A meta-regression analysis was performed only for those treatments where data from more than two studies was pooled. The “quality score” variable as a predictor, was found to be significantly associated with the overall effect size difference while assessing the time to clinical improvement outcome between Hydroxychloroquine and control groups (P-value: 0.02) [Fig 8 (d)] and similar outcome between Lopinavir-Ritonavir and control groups (P-value: 0.03). Quality score did not have any association with the overall effect size difference for assessing the remaining outcomes between other treatment groups.

Influence diagnostics and sensitivity analysis

Influence diagnostics tools and sensitivity analysis were used to further explain the heterogeneity observed in our results and to identify the outlier studies which could be significantly affecting the overall pooled effect estimates. The influence diagnostics and sensitivity analysis were performed for treatments in which data from more than two studies was pooled. The influence diagnostic tools generated two plots including 1) Baujat plots; 2) Influence analysis plots; and two plots for sensitivity analysis including 3) leave-one-out analysis ordered by heterogeneity and 4) leave-one-out analysis ordered by effect size.
The Baujat and influence analysis plots identified two potential outliers namely, Magagnoli J, 2020 and Yu B, 2020 while assessing the all-cause mortality outcome in Hydroxychloroquine vs. control group analysis. After conducting the sensitivity analysis by omitting a single study in each turn (ordered by both effect size and I²), the overall effect size changed significantly by omitting the Yu B, 2020 study. Hydroxychloroquine was found to be significantly associated with the risk of having more all-cause mortality compared to control group (RR 1.6; 95%CI 1.26 to 2.03). While assessing the overall clinical improvement in the same two groups, the Baujat plot found Geleris J, 2020; Tang W, 2020; Chen Z, 2020 and Gautret P, 2020 as potential outliers. After omitting each study in the sensitivity analysis, we observed that Hydroxychloroquine was significantly associated with less overall clinical improvement than the control group (RR 0.88; 95%CI 0.79 to 0.98) when Chen Z, 2020 study was removed from the pooled analysis (Fig 9). Similarly, after omitting the same Chen Z, 2020 outlier study in the sensitivity analysis for assessing the time to clinical improvement between the two groups, we observed that Hydroxychloroquine was significantly associated with a longer mean time to clinical improvement than the control group (SMD 0.64; 95%CI 0.33 to 0.94).

The influence diagnostic tools identified Ye XT, 2020 study as a potential outlier while assessing the time to clinical improvement outcome between Lopinavir-Ritonavir and control groups; and after omitting this study in the sensitivity analysis we observed that Lopinavir-Ritonavir was significantly associated with a shorter mean time to clinical improvement than the control group (SMD -0.32; 95%CI -0.57 to -0.06).

Gautret P, 2020 was identified as a significant outlier using the Baujat plot when assessing the overall clinical improvement between Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin and control groups. When this study was omitted in the sensitivity analysis, then the combination of Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin treatment was found to be significantly associated with lesser overall clinical improvement compared to the control group (RR 0.86; 95%CI 0.81 to 0.91).

**Discussion:**

Our systematic review and meta-analysis summarized the *in-vitro* and clinical evidence generated so far regarding the effect of various treatment modalities administered to nCOV-2019 pneumonia patients. *In vitro* studies observed significant inhibitory effects
of Remdesivir, Hydroxychloroquine and Nelfinavir on nCOV-2019. Hydroxychloroquine was found to have better efficacy and less cytotoxicity than Chloroquine in inhibiting nCOV-2019. However, the clinical translation of promising in vitro results in some of these drugs has not been successful. In 37 clinical studies consisting of 8662 nCOV-2019 patients, we assessed the potential of several treatments against their comparators in terms of harm which included all-cause mortality and total adverse events and in terms of benefit which included overall clinical improvement and time to clinical improvement. While assessing the benefits of administered treatments, our meta-analysis observed that Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment had a borderline association with shorter mean time to clinical improvement compared to the control group while Remdesivir treatment had significant association with better overall clinical improvement compared to placebo group. However, the present evidence stems from only a couple of trials conducted on these drugs and the clinical usefulness of these results will only be determined once further large RCTs are published on the same. In terms of harm, our meta-analysis suggests that Hydroxychloroquine treatment compared to control group and Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment compared to Arbidol treatment were significantly associated with more total adverse events in nCOV-2019 patients. Hydroxychloroquine combined with Azithromycin was associated with higher all-cause mortality compared to control group. We did not observe any significant association in terms of either benefit or harm for the remaining treatments administered to nCOV-2019 patients when analysed against their respective comparator groups. Although our systematic review observed several treatments associated with benefit including Favipiravir, Chloroquine, Zinc sulphate + Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin; and certain treatments associated with harm including corticosteroids and combination therapy of Lopinavir-Ritonavir + Ribavirin + Interferon beta B1 in nCOV-2019 patients (supplementary file S2), the results were reported only from single studies and thus lacked sufficient statistical power to draw any profound conclusions. Around 67.57% of the studies included in our review had moderate/some concerns related to the risk of bias. When we conducted the influence and sensitivity analysis, we observed that Hydroxychloroquine was associated with a higher all-cause mortality, less overall clinical improvement and a longer mean time to clinical improvement in nCOV-2019 patients when compared to the control group. Furthermore, Hydroxychloroquine
combined with Azithromycin was associated with a lesser overall clinical improvement compared to control group after conducting the sensitivity analysis. The borderline association of Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment having a shorter mean time to clinical improvement compared to control group was confirmed to be statistically significant after the sensitivity analysis. Our findings are in concordance with a review published in April 2020 by Sanders JM et al. which reviewed the initial pharmacological treatments available for nCOV-2019 and concluded that no available therapy was found to be effective for treating this infection (95).

Initial evidence from *in vitro* and observational studies suggested that Hydroxychloroquine has comparatively faster viral clearance and results in better clinical improvement of nCOV-2019 patients in contrast to control groups (5,64). Further, the combination of Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin resulted in 100% clinical improvement in a small open label non-RCT published by Gautret et al. 2020 (6). However, when early results from few RCTs were reported, Hydroxychloroquine no longer had any benefit over standard care and instead was associated with more adverse events and higher mortality rate (10,61). We also conducted a subgroup analysis based on study design which further strengthened this notion. Hydroxychloroquine compared to control group was found to be associated with less overall clinical improvement in non-RCTs/cohort study subgroup while no association was observed in the RCT subgroup (Fig S2.2 in supplementary file S2). A recently published multinational registry analysis on 96,032 nCOV-2019 patients observed that Hydroxychloroquine and Chloroquine were associated with an increased risk of in-hospital mortality (96). Two recent meta-analyses conducted by Ren L et al. 2020 and Wang J et al. 2020 found that patients taking Chloroquine or Hydroxychloroquine had more adverse events compared to patients assigned to placebo group (97,98). Another meta-analysis published last month by Sarma et al. 2020 found no association of Hydroxychloroquine with virological cure, death or clinical worsening and safety in nCOV-2019 patients (99). Similar findings on Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin were observed from another meta-analysis of five trials which although did observe a trend but the results were not found to be statistically significant in terms of negative conversion of nCOV-2019 (Odds Ratio [OR] 1.95; 95%CI 0.19 to 19.73) and reduction in progression rate (OR 0.89 95%CI 0.58 to 1.37) (100). Our meta-analysis along with the subgroup and sensitivity analyses further corroborates these findings.
The effectiveness and safety of corticosteroid treatment in nCOV-2019, SARS and MERS have been investigated in several meta-analyses. Use of corticosteroid treatment was found to be associated with higher mortality (RR 2.11; 95%CI 1.13 to 3.94) in nCOV-2019 and SARS patients in a meta-analysis of 15 studies conducted by Yang Z et al. 2020 (101). While three meta-analyses found that corticosteroid use did not worsen/improve mortality in patients with nCOV-2019, SARS-Cov and MERS-Cov (102–104). Further, the meta-analysis by Li H et al. 2020 also observed a delayed time to virus clearance in the corticosteroid group compared to controls (MD 3.78; 95%CI 1.16 to 6.41) (103). The findings of our meta-analysis are also in line with the previously published meta-analyses on corticosteroids. We did not observe any significant association between corticosteroid treatment and all-cause mortality and time to clinical improvement.

Use of Convalescent Plasma has been shown to be extremely promising in some recently published case-series (105,106). However, we could not assess the benefit/harm of plasma therapy for nCOV-2019 patients in our systematic review and meta-analysis due to the scarcity of available literature and specific inclusion criteria of our review. A recently published systematic review of five studies by Rajendran K et al. 2020 concluded that plasma therapy in nCOV-2019 patients was safe, clinically effective and was associated with a reduced mortality (107). Results from ongoing clinical trials on plasma therapy are awaited and will give us a better insight into the effectiveness of Convalescent Plasma in treating nCOV-2019 patients.

Limitations

Although we made sure that our systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted very comprehensively, certain inherent and obvious limitations cannot be ignored. Firstly, due to the limited number of studies, our meta-analysis pooled the data from RCTs and non-RCTs/cohort/case-control studies together which is generally not advisable. However, we did conduct a subgroup analysis based on study design wherever possible to separate the RCTs from non-RCTs/cohort/case-control studies. Secondly, all outcome measures could not be assessed for all the potential treatments due to scarcity of literature. Thirdly, a significant amount of studies included in the review were in their preprint versions and yet to be peer reviewed by experts. Lastly, since several clinical trials on nCOV-2019 treatments are currently ongoing, the results
of our meta-analysis might change significantly owing to the findings published in near future.
Nonetheless, our meta-analysis presents preliminary evidence of benefit/harm of the possible treatments being administered to nCOV-2019 patients and these preliminary results could be used for conducting and planning large clinical trials and prospective multicentric cohort studies.

Conclusion:
The result of this systematic review and meta-analysis suggest that Hydroxychloroquine, Remdesivir and Nelfinavir have shown promising results in the in vitro studies. However, based on the current clinical evidence, our meta-analysis did not observe significant beneficial effect of any treatment on nCOV-2019 patients apart from a significant association in better overall clinical improvement of Remdesivir compared to placebo and a borderline association in time to clinical improvement of Lopinavir-Ritonavir treatment compared to control group. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin might be associated with higher all-cause mortality, more total adverse events, less overall clinical improvement and a higher mean time to clinical improvement. Results from further large clinical trials are warranted.
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12. Research C for DE and. FDA cautions against use of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine for COVID-19 outside of the hospital setting or a clinical trial due to risk of heart rhythm


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Assay Used</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>EC50 or IC50</th>
<th>Incubation time (h)</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wang C, 2020(49)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>VNA</td>
<td>47D11 H2L2 antibody</td>
<td>Isotype 0.15ug/ml</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fintelmann-Rodrigues N, 2020(54)</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Vero E6; A549</td>
<td>CPE, RT-PCR</td>
<td>ATV; ATV/RTV</td>
<td>CQ Vero: ATV/RTV = 0.5 ± 0.08 μM; ATV = 2.0 ± 0.12 μM; A549: ATV/RTV = 0.60 ± 0.05 μM; ATV = 0.22 ± 0.02 μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rothan H, 2020(32)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Huh7</td>
<td>q-RT-PCR</td>
<td>Auranofin</td>
<td>DMSO 1.4uM</td>
<td></td>
<td>24, 48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tour et F, 2020(38)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>AZM, HQ, ODH, QHM, APS</td>
<td>RDV AZM = 2.12, HCQ = 4.17, ODH =5.05, QHM = 5.11, APS = 5.39 μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Su H, 2020(18)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CCK8; qRT-PCR</td>
<td>Bl; Ble</td>
<td>DMSO Bl = 10.27μM, Ble = 1.69μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sheahan T, 2020(33)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Calu 3, Vero E6</td>
<td>CTG; Plaque</td>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>- Vero: 0.3, Calu3: 0.08μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48, 72</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ma C, 2020(34)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>A549, MDCK, HCT-8, Caco-2, Vero, and BEAS2B</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Bcr, GC-376, CII, CXII</td>
<td>- Bcr =1.90, CII = 2.07±0.76, CXII = 0.49±0.18, GC-376 = 3.37±1.68 μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Weston S, 2020(60)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CTG</td>
<td>CQ, CFZ</td>
<td>- CQ = 42.03, 46.8; CFZ = 3.14, 4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Matsuyama S, 2020(43)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>96-well</td>
<td>Ciclesonide</td>
<td>- 4.4uM</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kim HY, 2020(19)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>MHV-A59; Vero</td>
<td>MTT</td>
<td>Clrh; MEco; Corh; PHco; Ssr; Mcr</td>
<td>No extract Clrh = 19.4±7.0, MEco = 13.0±1.4, Corh = 2.0±0.5, PHco = 10.4±2.2, Ssr = 27.5±1.1, Mcr = 61.9±6.1 μg/ml</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Meyer S, 2020(47)</td>
<td>Germany, USA, Belgium</td>
<td>Caco-2</td>
<td>MTT; CPE</td>
<td>Darunavir</td>
<td>RDV &gt;100uM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vuong W, 2020(55)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Vero E6, A549</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>GC373 and GC376</td>
<td>- GC373 = 1.5 μM, GC376 = 0.92 μM</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vitner E, 2020(56)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>LDH</td>
<td>Genz-123346, GENZ-667161</td>
<td>GZ-161 = GZ-346 = 2uM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wu Y, 2020(20)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Group E antibodies: n3086, n3113</td>
<td>n3086 = 26.6, n3113 = 18.9 ug/ml</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yao X, 2020(21)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero</td>
<td>96 Well</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>0.72uM</td>
<td>24, 48</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Liu J, 2020(22)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CCK8</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>12.96uM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mantlo E, 2020(35)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>IFN-α, IFN-β</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IFN-α = 1.35, IFN-β = 0.76 IU/ml</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Xu T, 2020(24)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>96 Well; MTT</td>
<td>Indomethacin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1uM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Caly L, 2020(53)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Vero/hSLAM</td>
<td>12-well; Taqman RT-PCR</td>
<td>Ivermectin</td>
<td>Viral DNA</td>
<td>2uM</td>
<td>0, 72</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Runfeng L, 2020(25)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>MTT; CPE; Plaque</td>
<td>Lianhuaqingwen (LH)</td>
<td>RDV</td>
<td>411.2 μg/ml.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rajasekharan S, 2020(57)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>Plaque; Cytotoxicity</td>
<td>Miglustat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41±22 μM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yamamoto M, 2020(44)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Calu-3; VeroE6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pre - 0.0115uM; No_pre - 3.16</td>
<td>72 or 120</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ko M, 2020(52)</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Calu3</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>NM, RDV, Dt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NM = 0.0022, RDV = 1.3, Dt = 0.16 uM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Terrier O, 2020(40)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>RMS; qRT-PCR</td>
<td>Naproxen</td>
<td>No drug</td>
<td>59.53uM</td>
<td>48, 72</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yamamoto N, 2020(45)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>96 well; qRT-PCR</td>
<td>NFV, LV, RTV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NFV = 1.13, LV = 5.73, RTV = 8.63uM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ohashi H, 2020(46)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>NFV, CEP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NFV = 0.77, CEP = 0.35 uM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jeon S, 2020(51)</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Vero</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>NS, CS</td>
<td>CQ, LV</td>
<td>NS = 0.28 uM; CS = 4.33uM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Zheng F, 2020(26)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>Novaferon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.02ng/ml</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gu C, 2020(27)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CCK8; 96 well; qRT-PCR</td>
<td>PPIX, VP</td>
<td>RDV</td>
<td>PI = 0.23; VP = 0.03 μM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lu S, 2020(28)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>MTT</td>
<td>PPIX</td>
<td>No drug</td>
<td>Pre-treat = 0.21±0.02; Full-time treat = 24</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year, Country</td>
<td>Cell Line</td>
<td>Assay</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Concentration(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Deng W.</td>
<td>2020, China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>PDL</td>
<td>0.11±0.02 μM</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wang M.</td>
<td>2020, China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CCK8</td>
<td>RDV, CQ</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Choy K T.</td>
<td>2020, China</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>TCID50</td>
<td>CQ, qRT-PCR, CTTG, LCVA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pruijssers A</td>
<td>2020, USA</td>
<td>Vero E6, Calu3, 2B4</td>
<td>CTG, CVA, qRT-PCR</td>
<td>RDV, GS-441524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24, 48, 72 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pizzorno A</td>
<td>2020, France</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>RMS, qRT-PCR</td>
<td>RDV, RDV-DZ</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Liu S.</td>
<td>2020, USA</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>RTMTCID</td>
<td>RDV, CQ</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>48 to 72 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Holwerda M</td>
<td>2020, Switzerland</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>GCA, CTG</td>
<td>Retro-2.1, PNDJ0803, CQ, URM099-C</td>
<td>RDV</td>
<td>24 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ianovsky A</td>
<td>2020, Norway</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CTG</td>
<td>SLM, OCX, ADQ, NFV, EH, and HH</td>
<td>No drug/ Mock treatment</td>
<td>72 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Gassen N.</td>
<td>2020, Germany</td>
<td>VeroFM</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>SPD, NS, MK-2206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24, 48, 72 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Silva C.</td>
<td>2020, Netherlands</td>
<td>Vero E6, Calu3</td>
<td>MTT</td>
<td>Suramin</td>
<td>20 ± 2.7 μM</td>
<td>3 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Shannon A.</td>
<td>2020, France</td>
<td>Vero E6</td>
<td>CPE, CTB</td>
<td>T-705 (Favipiravir)</td>
<td>207.1 μM</td>
<td>3 Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** Virus Neutralization assay (VNA); Cell counting kit 8 (CCK8); CellTiter-Glo (CTG); Methyl Thiazolyl Tetrazolium (MTT); Cytotoxicity assay (MTT); Cytotoxicity assay (MTT); Qualitative Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (qRT-PCR); Reed & Muench Tissue Culture Infectious Dose 50 Assay (RTMTCID); Reed & Muench Tissue Culture Infectious Dose 50 Assay (RTMTCID); Green cytotoxicity assay (GCA); CellTiter-Blue (CTB); CellTiter-Blue (CTB); Atazanavir (ATV); Ritonavir (RTV); Chloroquine (CQ); Remdesivir (RDV); Baicalein (Ba); Baicalein (Ba); Beta-d-N4-hydroxy-cytidine (NH4); Boceprevir (Bcr); Calpain inhibitors II, and XII (CII and CXII); Chlorpromazine (CPh); Chlorpromazine (CPh); Cimicifuga rhizome (Cirh); Meliac cortex (Meco); Coptis rhizome (Corh); Phellodendron cortex (Phco); Sophora subprostrata radix (Sar); Mountain cortex radices (Mc); Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ); Nafamostat mesylate (NM); Dithozone (Di); Nelfinavir (NFV); Cepharanthine (CEP); Lopinavir (LPV); Ritonavir (RTV); Nitosamide (NS); Ciclesonide (CS); Protoporphyrin IX (PPIX); Verteporfin (VP); Pudilan A. Oral Liquid (PDL); Emetine Hydrochloride (EH); Homoharringtonine (HH); Diltiazem (DZ); N-Nonyldeoxyarginine (NDN); Salinomycin (SLM); Oxytocin (OXO); amodiaquine (ADO); Spermide (SPD); Azithromycin (AZM); Opipramol dihydrochloride (ODH); Quinidine hydrochloride monohydrate (QHM); Alprostadil (APS); Interferon-α/ Interferon-β (IFN α/β)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Single/Multicentre</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
<th>Overall age, Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Total males, n(%)</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Published/Preprint</th>
<th>Quality score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tang W, 2020 (10)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Phase-4, Open label RCT</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>46.1 (14.7)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chen Z, 2020 (62)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Phase-4, Double blind RCT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44.7 (15.3)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chen J, 2020 (61)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Phase-3, Open label RCT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.6 (3.7)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gautret P, 2020 (6)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Open label non-RCT</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.1 (22)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geleis J, 2020 (84)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Observational study</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yu B, 2020 (64)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>66.67 (7.43)</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Magagnoli J, 2020 (85)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>67.82 (11.57)</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>HCQ, HCQ + Azithromycin</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mahévas M, 2020 (90)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Retrospective observational study</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>60 (11.96)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mallat J, 2020 (91)</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective observational study</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.67 (13.16)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rosenberger ES, 2020 (86)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Borba, Brazil</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Phase-2b,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Low dose CQ</td>
<td>High dose CQ</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Mean Age (SD)</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Huang M.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>44.65 (13.29)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Huang M.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46 (16.64)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cao B.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>58.33 (14.19)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ye XT.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jun C.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>48.25 (5.19)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir + Arbidol</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Li Y.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49.4 (14.7)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir + Arbidol</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wang Y.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>64 (11.19)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Remdesivir</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Beigel JH.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>58.9 (15)</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>Remdesivir</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chen C.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Favipiravir</td>
<td>Arbidol</td>
<td>Preprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cai Q.</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47.92 (19.06)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Favipiravir</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authors, Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lou Y, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Open label RCT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.5 (12.5)</td>
<td>Favipinavir, Baloxavir</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cantini F, 2020</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Open label non-RCT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.57 (11.95)</td>
<td>Baricitinib</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hung IFN, 2020</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Phase-2, Open label RCT</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>48.67 (22.5)</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir, Ribavirin, IFN-B1</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Published 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Deng L, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44.56 (15.73)</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir, Arbidol</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Published 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lan X, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Pilot retrospective study</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55.65 (14.77)</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir, Arbidol</td>
<td>Lopinavir-Ritonavir</td>
<td>Preprint 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Carlucci PM, 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Retrospective observational study</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>62.43 (15.62)</td>
<td>Zinc sulphate, HCQ, Azithromycin</td>
<td>HCQ, Azithromycin</td>
<td>Preprint 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fadel R, 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Quasi Experimental study</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>61.96 (16.07)</td>
<td>Pre-corticosteroid group</td>
<td>Post-corticosteroid group</td>
<td>Published 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wang Y, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.33 (12.24)</td>
<td>Corticosteroid</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Zha L, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Multicentre</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.67 (17.1)</td>
<td>Corticosteroid</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lu X, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Case-Control study</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.66 (13.6)</td>
<td>Corticosteroid</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Qin N, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective observational study</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49.33 (15.89)</td>
<td>Corticosteroid</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Published 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Shi C, 2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.83 (36.97)</td>
<td>Low Molecular Weight</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Preprint 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study ID</td>
<td>Main Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Abbreviations:</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Liu X.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.27(12.27)</td>
<td>China Single Retrospective cohort study Control Preprint 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Liu X.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.27(12.27)</td>
<td>China Retrospective cohort study Control Preprint 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: HCQ - Hydroxychloroquine; CQ - Chloroquine; IFN - Interferon; USA - United States of America; UAE - United Arab Emirates.
Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram for the systematic review and meta-analysis
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Figure 2(a-d): Meta-analysis of hydroxychloroquine vs. control groups to assess (a) all-cause mortality, (b) total adverse events, (c) overall clinical improvement, (d) time to clinical improvement.
Figure 3(a-c): Meta-analysis of lopinavir-ritonavir vs. control groups to assess (a) total adverse events, (b) overall clinical improvement, (c) time to clinical improvement.

Figure 3(d, e): Meta-analysis of lopinavir-ritonavir vs. arbidol groups to assess (d) total adverse events, (e) overall clinical improvement.
Figure 4(a, b): Meta-analysis of arbidol vs. control groups to assess (a) total adverse events, (b) overall clinical improvement.
**Figure 5(a-d):** Meta-analysis of Remdesivir vs. Control groups to assess (a) all-cause mortality, (b) total adverse events, (c) overall clinical improvement, (d) time to clinical improvement.
Figure 6(a, b): Meta-analysis of Corticosteroid vs. Control groups to assess (a) all-cause mortality, (b) time to clinical improvement.
Figure 7(a-b): Meta-analysis of combination therapy. Meta-analysis of Hydroxychloroquine + Azithromycin vs. Control groups to assess (a) all-cause mortality, (b) overall clinical improvement.

Figure 7(c): Meta-analysis of combination therapy. Meta-analysis of Lopinavir-Ritonavir + Arbidol vs. Lopinavir-Ritonavir groups to assess (d) overall clinical improvement.
Figure 8(a): Labbé plot analysis for observing the trend and between-study heterogeneity in meta-analysis between Hydroxychloroquine and Control group for assessing the overall clinical improvement outcome. Figure 8(b): Funnel plot for publication bias analysis of Hydroxychloroquine Vs. Control group assessing the overall clinical improvement (Egger's P-value: 0.07). Figure 8(c): Risk of bias assessment of the included studies in the systematic review using the Newcastle Ottawa Scale. Figure 8(d): Meta-regression analysis for assessing the time to clinical improvement outcome between Hydroxychloroquine and Control group.
Figure 9: Influence diagnostic tools and sensitivity analysis plots for identifying the potential outlier studies and assessing the heterogeneity in the pooled effect size for assessing the overall clinical improvement outcome between hydroxychloroquine treatment and control group.