

Association between Use of Qingfei Paidu Tang and Mortality in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: A national retrospective registry study

Lihua Zhang^{1*} PhD, Xin Zheng^{1*} PhD, Xueke Bai¹ MS, Qing Wang¹ MS, Bowang Chen¹ PhD, Haibo Wang² MPH, Jiapeng Lu¹ PhD, Shuang Hu¹ PhD, Xiaoyan Zhang¹ MS, Haibo Zhang¹ MD, Jiamin Liu¹ MD, Ying Shi³ BMS, Zhiye Zhou³ MS, Lanxia Gan³ BE, Xi Li^{1, 4¶} PhD, Jing Li^{1, 4, 5¶} PhD

¹ National Clinical Research Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, State Key Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, People's Republic of China

² Clinical Trial Unit, First Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou Province, People's Republic of China

³ China Standard Medical Information Research Center, Shenzhen, People's Republic of China

⁴ Central China Subcenter of the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Zhengzhou, People's Republic of China

⁵ Fuwai Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Shenzhen, People's Republic of China.

*Joint first authors

23 [¶] Joint correspondence authors

24 Correspondence:

25 Jing Li, National Clinical Research Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, State Key

26 Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for

27 Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union

28 Medical College, Beijing, China. Electronic address: jing.li@fwoxford.org.

29

30 Xi Li, National Clinical Research Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, State Key

31 Laboratory of Cardiovascular Disease, Fuwai Hospital, National Center for

32 Cardiovascular Diseases, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union

33 Medical College, Beijing, China. Electronic address: xi.li@fwoxford.org.

34

35

36 **Word count:** 2911 (not including the abstract, references, tables, boxes, or figure
37 legends).

38 **Number of tables and figures:** 2 tables and 3 figures are included in this article.

39

40 **ABSTRACT**

41 **Background**

42 Qingfei Paidu Tang (QPT), a formula of traditional Chinese medicine, which was
43 suggested to be able to ease symptoms in patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019
44 (COVID-19), has been recommended by clinical guidelines and widely used to treat
45 COVID-19 in China. However, whether it decreases mortality remains unknown.

46 **Purpose**

47 We aimed to explore the association between QPT use and in-hospital mortality
48 among patients hospitalized for COVID-19.

49 **Study design**

50 A retrospective study based on a real-world database was conducted.

51 **Methods**

52 We identified patients consecutively hospitalized with COVID-19 in 15 hospitals
53 from a national retrospective registry in China, from January through May 2020.
54 Data on patients' characteristics, treatments, and outcomes were extracted from the
55 electronic medical records. The association of QPT use with mortality was evaluated
56 using Cox proportional hazards models based on propensity score analysis.

57 **Results**

58 Of the 8939 patients included, 28.7% received QPT. The crude mortality was 1.2%
59 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.8% to 1.7%) among the patients receiving QPT and
60 4.8% (95% CI 4.3% to 5.3%) among those not receiving QPT. After adjustment for
61 patient characteristics and concomitant treatments, QPT use was associated with a

relative reduction of 50% in in-hospital mortality (hazard ratio, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.37 to 0.66 $P < 0.001$). This association was consistent across subgroups by sex and age. Meanwhile, the incidence of acute liver injury (8.9% [95% CI, 7.8% to 10.1%] vs. 9.9% [95% CI, 9.2% to 10.7%]; odds ratio, 0.96 [95% CI, 0.81% to 1.14%], $P = 0.658$) and acute kidney injury (1.6% [95% CI, 1.2% to 2.2%] vs. 3.0% [95% CI, 2.6% to 3.5%]; odds ratio, 0.85 [95% CI, 0.62 to 1.17], $P = 0.318$) was comparable between patients receiving QPT and those not receiving QPT. The major study limitations included that the study was an observational study based on real-world data rather than a randomized control trial, and the quality of data could be affected by the accuracy and completeness of medical records.

Conclusions

QPT was associated with a substantially lower risk of in-hospital mortality, without extra risk of acute liver injury or acute kidney injury among patients hospitalized with COVID-19.

Key words Qingfei Paidu Tang; Mortality; COVID-19

Abbreviations

QPT: Qingfei Paidu Tang

COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019

IQR: interquartile range

SMD: standard mean difference

IPTW: inverse probability treatment weighting

HR: hazard ratios

- 84 **OR:** odds ratios
- 85 **CI:** confidence interval
- 86
- 87

Introduction

Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by a novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus type 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has posed a huge threat to global health as the largest pandemic in a century. Nearly 50 million people worldwide have been infected, of whom over 1.2 million died by middle November 2020.¹ The pandemic is still evolving, effective treatments against COVID-19 are therefore urgently needed to reduce the mortality of COVID-19.

Qingfei Paidu Tang (QPT), a traditional Chinese medicine, was formulated on the basis of one of the classics of traditional Chinese medicine, Treatise on Febrile and Miscellaneous Diseases (*Shang Han Zabing Lun*).² It is a compound prescription containing four traditional Chinese medicine prescriptions, each of which has been widely applied as therapy of common cold, fever, influenza, and other virus infection.³⁻⁷ Basic research also found that QPT possessed properties such as antiviral,^{8,9} anti-inflammation,⁸⁻¹³ and immune regulation,^{8,11-13} which might be beneficial for patients with COVID-19. Moreover, several small observational studies in China have suggested its potential effectiveness in relieving symptom (i.e., fever and cough) and preventing disease progression in patients with COVID-19.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Therefore, QPT has been recommended in the Chinese guidelines for the treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) since early February 2020 and widely used in China.¹⁸ However, it is unknown whether it could reduce the mortality of COVID-19.

Accordingly, using the data from a national retrospective registry, we sought to evaluate the effectiveness and safety of QPT in COVID-19. Specifically, we

110 hypothesized that QPT use would be associated with a lower risk of in-hospital
 111 mortality in patients with COVID-19, and tested it using propensity score analysis.
 112 We also assessed whether there was an association of QPT with the incidence of acute
 113 liver injury and acute renal injury during hospitalization.

114

115 **Methods**

116 **Data Sources**

117 In a government-mandated national registry, hospitalizations for COVID-19 in all the
 118 designated hospitals across China were registered retrospectively. Information relating
 119 to patient characteristics, treatments, and outcomes, in the electronic medical records
 120 (EMR), were required to be submitted to a system deployed by the National Health
 121 Commission of China, in forms of either structured database for the front page, or
 122 unstructured text for the progress notes, lab test results, and physician's orders. By the
 123 date of May 6th 2020, over 40 thousand COVID-19 cases from more than five
 124 hundred hospitals have been included.

125 **Ethical approval**

126 The Ethics Committee at the the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases
 127 (NCCD)/Fuwai Hospital ethics committee approved this study and the Ethics
 128 Committee at the First Affiliated Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University approved the
 129 current analysis. Informed consent of individual patients was waived.

130

131 **Study cohort**

132 Among all the designated hospitals providing inpatient care for COVID-19 in the
133 national registry, we excluded hospitals that were ineligible for data extraction or
134 analysis for the following two reasons. First, the number of patients hospitalized with
135 COVID-19 was less than 100. Second, the number of patients receiving QPT in the
136 hospitals was less than 50. In the end, 15 hospitals were included in our study, all of
137 which were located in Hubei province.

138 Among eligible hospitals, we included all patients aged ≥ 18 years discharged
139 between January and May, 2020 with a confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19. We
140 identified these patients, according to International Classification of Diseases, Clinical
141 Modification codes revision 10 (U07.100, U07.100.00x, U07.100.00x001,
142 U07.100.00x002, U07.100.00x003), when available, or through principal diagnosis
143 terms noted at discharge. We excluded patients who were transferred out, since the
144 records of their hospitalizations were truncated. Patients who died or were discharged
145 within 24 hours of admission were also excluded from the analysis, because the
146 testing and treatments for them were likely to be influenced due to the short length of
147 hospital stay.

148 **Data Extraction**

149 For each patient, the demographic characteristics (age and sex), prior medical
150 histories/comorbidities (hypertension, diabetes, coronary heart disease, stroke, chronic
151 kidney diseases, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and cancer), clinical status at
152 admission (critical or not), and in-hospital death was obtained from the front-page

153 database or progress notes. The vital signs (heart rate, blood pressure, and respiratory
154 rate) at admission were extracted from the progress notes. The in-hospital medications
155 (QPT, Arbidol, Ribavirin, Oseltamivir, Ganciclovir, Lopinavir, Lianhuaqingwen,
156 Xuebijing, Diammonium Glycyrrhizinate, Methylprednisolone, Dexamethasone, and
157 Interferon) were extracted from the physician orders, progress notes, and nurse
158 records. The in-hospital acute liver injury and acute kidney injury were identified
159 based on the front-page database, progress notes, and lab test results.

160 We searched predefined keywords in unstructured text of the submitted medical
161 records using Python software (version 3.6) and MYSQL software (version 8.0), in
162 order to extract the data. Particularly, research clinicians randomly selected and
163 reviewed 5% of the medical records in the hospitals with QPT use rate under 20%, to
164 ensure the exhaustion of synonyms of this medication and completeness of data
165 extraction. Furthermore, to ensure the data accuracy, research clinicians adjudicated
166 the prior medical history/comorbidities based on the progress note.

167 **Treatment and outcome measures**

168 As the treatment of interest in our analysis, QPT use was defined as receiving this
169 medication for no less than three days during the hospitalization, according to the
170 Chinese diagnosis and treatment protocol for COVID-19 (Trial Version 6) (i.e., one
171 formula a day, three formulas were defined as a course of treatment).¹⁸

172 Correspondently, the study cohort was categorized into two treatment groups –
173 patients receiving QPT and those not receiving QPT. Meanwhile, we also explored
174 the effectiveness and safety of QPT between patients who ever received QPT during

175 hospitalization and those who did not.

176 The outcome measure of effectiveness was in-hospital mortality. The outcome
177 measure of safety included acute liver injury and acute kidney injury during
178 hospitalization. Acute liver injury was defined as documented acute liver injury, acute
179 liver renal insufficiency, acute liver failure, hepatic encephalopathy, or hepatic coma,
180 then adjudicated based on the elevation in aspartate aminotransferase, alanine
181 aminotransferase, or total bilirubin. Acute renal injury was defined as documented
182 acute renal failure, acute renal injury, or acute renal insufficiency, then adjudicated
183 based on the elevation in serum creatinine.

184 **Statistical analysis**

185 We described participant characteristics, treatments, and outcomes, with frequencies
186 and percentages for categorical variables, while means \pm standard deviations or
187 median with interquartile range (IQR) for continuous variables. The difference
188 between groups was estimated by standard mean difference (SMD), and absolute
189 values less than 0.1 was considered small differences.¹⁹

190 We conducted a statistical power analysis in advance, based on the projected
191 sample size of this retrospective registry. Assuming the in-hospital mortality rate was
192 4% in patients not receiving QPT, a total sample size of 9000 can achieve a statistical
193 power of 80% at a 2-sided 0.05 significance level to detect a hazard ratio of 0.7 or
194 below, for the treatment with a 30% or greater prevalence.

195 We used inverse probability treatment weighting (IPTW) based on probability of
196 receiving treatment to make the characteristics between the two treatment groups

comparable. The probability of receiving QPT was estimated by multilevel logistic regression that adjusted for baseline characteristics including demographics, comorbidities, and prior histories extracted in previous referred (Table S1), with hospital as random effect.

To assess the effectiveness of QPT, we obtained hazard ratios (HR) between treatment groups with developing frailty proportional hazards models on in-hospital death, accounted hospital as random effect, adjusted for other in-hospital medications, and weighted with inverse probability of QPT use. We then plotted Kaplan-Meier curve in patients receiving and those not receiving QPT. To assess the safety of QPT, we obtained odds ratios (OR) with the multilevel logistic regression on acute liver injury and acute renal injury, which handled random effect, adjustment, and weight, using the similar approaches described earlier. We also added interaction items to explore the heterogeneity of effectiveness across subgroups by age (<60, 60-69, or \geq 70 years), sex (male or female), and prior medical history/comorbidities (with any or without). In each subgroup, we recalculated inverse probability and reweighting separately, as aforementioned.

We conducted two sensitivity analysis. First, we matched propensity score between patients receiving and not receiving QPT using the nearest-neighbour method, to create two groups with similar characteristics and sample size. Second, we added the propensity score as covariate in the frailty model without weighting, to account for the difference between treatment groups.

In the submitted medical records, small proportions of blood pressure (1.7%),

219 heart rate (0.1%), and respiratory rate (0.2%) were missing. Assuming that these data
220 were missing at random, we applied a multiple imputation method based on Markov
221 Chain Monte Carlo by PROC MI procedure in SAS to impute missing value.²⁰

222 Two-tailed P values were reported with $P < 0.05$ considered to indicate statistical
223 significance. All statistical analyses were performed with SAS software, version 9.4
224 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

225

226 **Results**

227 **Study Participants**

228 There were 9115 patients with COVID-19 admitted to the 15 designated hospitals in
229 this study, with the numbers of cases in each included hospital ranging from 140 to
230 1856. After excluding 96 patients with age < 18 years, 66 patients transferred out, and
231 14 patients with the length of stay less than 24 hours, 8939 eligible cases were
232 included in the analysis (Figure 1). Of them, the average age was 55.9 ± 15.6 years,
233 and 53.4% (4771) were women. 4.4% (390) patients were at critical state at admission,
234 while 33.7% (3016) had hypertension, and 15.2% (1357) had diabetes.

235 Of these patients, 2833 (31.7%) ever received QPT during hospitalization, with a
236 median treatment duration of 6 (4 to 9) days. Half of the QPT users received the first
237 formula within 5 days after hospitalization. The timing of QPT use after
238 hospitalization was shown in Figure S1.

239 In the study cohort, 2568 patients (28.7%) received QPT for no less than 3 days
240 and 6371 (71.3%) did not. The patient characteristics of the two treatment groups

241 were provided in Table 1. Unweighted comparisons showed that patients who
242 received QPT were younger (SMD>0.1). After adjustment for inverse probability of
243 treatment weighting, all covariates were well balanced (i.e., standardized mean
244 differences were <0.1). The distributions of inverse probability score weights of
245 treatment groups were shown separately in Figure S2.

246 **Outcomes**

247 During hospitalization with a median length of stay of 15 (9 to 21) days, 334 (3.7%)
248 patients died. The crude mortality was 1.2% (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.8% to
249 1.7%) among patients who received QPT and 4.8% (95% CI, 4.3% to 5.3%) among
250 patients who did not (Figure 2). In the unadjusted analysis, patients who received QPT
251 were less likely to die than patients who did not receive QPT (hazard ratio, 0.17; 95%
252 CI, 0.11% to 0.26%, $P<0.001$). In the Cox model with inverse propensity score
253 weighting, all covariates in the Cox model were shown in Table S2. QPT use was
254 associated with a lower mortality risk (adjusted hazard ratio, 0.50; 95% CI, 0.37 to
255 0.66, $P<0.001$).

256 In terms of sex and age, no significant differences were observed among their
257 subgroups in the associations between QPT treatment and in-hospital mortality (all P
258 for interaction>0.05). Although significant heterogeneity in associations between QPT
259 treatment and in-hospital mortality were detected between subgroups by prior medical
260 history/comorbidities status (P for interaction=0.020), the significantly lower
261 mortality risk for patient receiving QPT was observed in both these subgroups (Figure
262 3).

Regarding the safety of QPT, patients who received QPT had a comparable incidence of acute hepatic injury (crude rate, 8.9% [95% CI, 7.8% to 10.1%] vs 9.9% [95% CI, 9.2% to 10.7%]; adjusted OR, 0.96 [95% CI, 0.81 to 1.14], $P=0.658$) and acute kidney injury (crude rate, 1.6% [95% CI, 1.2% to 2.2%] vs. 3.0% [95% CI, 2.6% to 3.5%]; adjusted OR, 0.85 [95% CI, 0.62 to 1.17], $P=0.318$), in comparison with those who did not.

Furthermore, we also conducted the analysis of the effectiveness and safety of QPT between patients who ever received QPT during hospitalization and those who did not, and found similar results with those mentioned above (Table S3-4).

Sensitivity Analyses

In addition to the IPTW analysis, we matched 3492 patients based on their propensity score (1746 patients receiving QPT and 1746 patients not receiving QPT). The two groups were well-balanced in characteristics and concomitant treatments (Table S5, Figure S3). The risk of mortality in patients who received QPT was significantly lower than in those who did not receive QPT (1.1% [95% CI, 0.7% to 1.7%] vs 2.7% [95% CI, 2.0% to 3.6%], HR, 0.42; 95%CI, 0.24 to 0.74; $P=0.002$) (Table 2 and Figure S4). In the meantime, patients receiving QPT had a comparable incidence of acute kidney injury (1.1% [95% CI, 0.7% to 1.8%] vs. 1.9% [95% CI, 1.3% to 2.6%]; OR, 0.74 [95% CI, 0.40 to 1.35], $P=0.327$) compared with the patients who did not, but a lower risk of acute liver injury (5.4% [95% CI, 4.4% to 6.5%] vs. 8.1% [95% CI, 6.9% to 9.5%]; OR, 0.72 [95% CI, 0.54 to 0.96], $P=0.025$).

We also included the propensity score as an additional covariate in the models, in

285 which patients who received QPT had a significantly lower risk of mortality than
286 those who did not receive QPT (adjusted HR, 0.24 95% CI, 0.15 to 0.37; $P<0.001$).
287 Meanwhile, patients receiving QPT had comparable incidence of acute liver injury
288 (OR, 0.93 [95% CI, 0.76 to 1.14], $P=0.497$) and acute kidney injury (OR, 0.74 [95%
289 CI, 0.50 to 1.10], $P=0.133$) compared with the patients not receiving QPT.

290

291 **DISCUSSION**

292 In this analysis based on a national registry of hospitalized patients with COVID-19,
293 we first demonstrated that QPT use was associated with halving the risk of in-hospital
294 mortality, without significant increase in risk of adverse effects, such as acute liver
295 injury or acute kidney injury. Our findings have provided new evidence and insights
296 regarding the treatment of COVID-19.

297 Our study has extended the literature on the effectiveness of QPT for patients
298 with COVID-19. First, this is the first study assessing the association between the
299 QPT use and in-hospital mortality that is considered the most important and objective
300 outcome metrics, rather than surrogate indicators widely used before. Second, in
301 comparison with prior studies in China about QPT for COVID-19 treatment,¹⁴⁻¹⁷ our
302 study has involved an over ninety-time larger sample size that ensured sufficient
303 statistical power even for subgroup analysis. Third, using various propensity score
304 approaches, we established control groups to enable appropriate comparisons in both
305 effectiveness and safety of QPT. Forth, this national registry included consecutive
306 patients from multiple Chinese hospitals, which represented the use and effectiveness

307 of QPT in real-world practice.

308 The effects of QPT on decreasing mortality of COVID-19 observed in our study
309 are supported by the mechanisms shown in prior experimental studies, which
310 included antiviral,^{8,9} anti-inflammation,⁸⁻¹³ immune regulation,^{8,11-13} regulating
311 metabolism,^{9,12} anti-platelet aggregation,¹⁰ and organ protection.^{11,13} QPT was
312 composed of four traditional Chinese medicine prescriptions, which were shown to
313 be separately effective in antiviral,^{3,5} anti-inflammatory,⁷ or immuno-modulating.⁶
314 QPT has multiple components acting on the multiple pathways. Some studies
315 employed molecular network and network pharmacology to analyse the ingredients
316 of QPT, and found that the key active ingredients, including quercetin, luteolin,
317 kaempferol, naringenin, and isorhamnetin, could alleviate excessive immune
318 responses, by regulating the function of cytokines related pathways, such as tumour
319 necrosis factor signalling pathways and mitogen-activated protein kinases signalling
320 pathways.¹¹⁻¹³ Further research is needed to fully investigate the underlying
321 mechanism of the effect of QPT.

322 In this study, we did not observe the elevated risk of acute liver injury or acute
323 kidney injury among patients receiving QPT. This is consistent with the previous
324 observational studies.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Moreover, our findings are particularly reassuring given the
325 complexity in comorbidities (such as hypertension, diabetes and chronic kidney
326 disease) and concomitant treatments (such as antivirals, corticosteroids and
327 immunomodulators) observed in our cohort. Nevertheless, long-term safety related to
328 QPT still needs to be verified in future studies.

329 This study has provided valuable evidence and prospects for the treatment of
330 COVID-19. Currently, there are globally nearly 7.5 million active cases that need
331 treatments.¹ However, there is no evidence about any medication that could decrease
332 mortality in COVID-19 except for dexamethasone, which has been proved to be able
333 to reduce the 28-day mortality in those who received mechanical ventilation or
334 oxygen alone.^{21,22} To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study implying that
335 QPT could reduce the mortality risk of patients with COVID-19. Our findings were
336 consistent across subgroups, and robust regardless of analytic methods. It is
337 encouraging that the use of QPT can probably prevent tens of thousands of deaths, if
338 our findings are further confirmed and applied globally.

339 **Limitations**

340 The results of our study should be interpreted in the context of several limitations.
341 First, due to the nature of observational study, we cannot exclude the influence of
342 residual confounders. However, after the IPTW, patients who received QPT had
343 higher rates of co-morbidities which was positively related to mortality risk,
344 compared with those who did not received QPT. Thus, the effectiveness we observed
345 tended to be conservative. Second, our study was based on real-world data and the
346 quality of data could be affected by the accuracy and completeness of medical records.
347 Therefore, we only included the highly reliable variables on patient characteristics,
348 treatments, and outcomes in the analysis. Third, our study merely collected in-hospital
349 outcomes, therefore, we could not evaluate the long-term effectiveness and safety.
350 Finally, all the patients in our study were from China, and the beneficial effects of

351 QPT in other racially diverse populations still await further validation.

352 **Conclusion**

353 Among the patients hospitalized for COVID-19, the use of QPT was associated with
354 halving the risk of mortality, without raising the risk of acute liver injury or acute
355 kidney injury. Further validation with randomized controlled trials is needed to
356 support the use of QPT worldwide for COVID-19.

357

358

359

360 **Declarations**

361 **Ethics approval**

362 The Ethics Committee at the First Affiliated Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University
363 approved the current analysis. Informed consent of individual patients was waived.

364 **Consent for publication**

365 Not applicable

366 **Availability of data and materials**

367 The data sharing needs to be approved by national registry, which is under the
368 supervision of National Health commission. However, on site data audit is allowed
369 under current regulation.

370 **Competing interests**

371 Dr Li reported receiving research grants, through Fuwai Hospital, from the People's
372 Republic of China for work to improve the management of hypertension and blood lipids

373 and to improve care quality and patient outcomes of cardiovascular disease; receiving
374 research agreements, through the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases and Fuwai
375 Hospital, from Amgen for a multicenter clinical trial assessing the efficacy and safety of
376 omecamtiv mecarbil and for dyslipidemic patient registration; receiving a research
377 agreement, through Fuwai Hospital, from Sanofi for a multicenter clinical trial on the effects
378 of sotagliflozin; receiving a research agreement, through Fuwai Hospital, with the
379 University of Oxford for a multicenter clinical trial of empagliflozin; receiving a research
380 agreement, through the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, from AstraZeneca for
381 clinical research methods training outside the submitted work; and receiving a research
382 agreement, through the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, from Lilly for
383 physician training outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

384 **Funding**

385 This project was supported by the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences
386 Innovation Fund for Medical Science (2020-I2M-Cov19-003) and the National
387 Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants (No. U1611261). The funder of
388 the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data
389 interpretation, or writing of the report.

390 **Authors' contributions**

391 JL and XL conceived of the project and take responsibility for all aspects of it. JL and
392 XL designed the study. LHZ and XZ wrote the first draft of the manuscript, with
393 further contributions from JPL, XKB, HBZ, JML, BWC, QW, XYZ, HS, HBW, YS,
394 ZYZ and LXG. XKB and SH did the statistical analysis. YZW, ZYZ, ESS, WQ,
395 BWC, YS and XYZ collected, extracted, processed, and cleaned the data. All authors

396 have read and approved the submission of this review, which neither has been
397 published on any other peer-review platforms, nor is being considered for publication
398 elsewhere, in whole or in part, in any language.

399 **Acknowledgements**

400 We appreciate the Bureau of Medical Administration and Medical Service
401 Supervision, National Health Commission of China, for the approval and support on
402 collecting data. We appreciate all the COVID-19 designated hospitals for submitting
403 medical records, and China Standard Medical Information Research Center for the
404 support in collecting and processing data. We appreciate the team in National Center
405 for Cardiovascular Diseases for their multiple contributions in data cleaning and
406 manuscript coordinating.

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>. Accessed Nov 15 2020
2. National Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine. <http://www.satcm.gov.cn/hudongjiaoliu/guanfangweixin/2020-03-05/13622.html>. Accessed Sep 22 2020
3. Shi KY, Han GX, Zhang WW, et al. Systematic Evaluation of Xiaochaihu Decoction Combined with Antiviral Agent in the Treatment of Chronic Hepatitis B. *Evaluation and Analysis of Drug-Use in Hospitals of China*. 2019; 19: 1039-1050.
4. Zheng CS, Wu YS, Bao HJ, et al. Understanding the polypharmacological anticancer effects of Xiao Chai Hu Tang via a computational pharmacological model. *Exp Ther Med*. 2014; 7: 1777-1783..
5. Hsieh CF, Lo CW, Liu CH, et al. Mechanism by which ma-xing-shi-gan-tang inhibits the entry of influenza virus. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2012;143:57-67.
6. Lin CC, Wang YY, Chen SM, et al. Shengan-Mahuang Decoction ameliorates asthmatic airway hyperresponsiveness by downregulating Th2/Th17 cells but upregulating CD4+FoxP3+ Tregs. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2020; 253: 112656.
7. Yang Y, Zhang DM, Liu JH, et al. Wuling San protects kidney dysfunction by inhibiting renal TLR4/MyD88 signaling and NLRP3 inflammasome activation in high fructose-induced hyperuricemic mice. *J Ethnopharmacol* 2015; 169: 49-59.
8. Zhao J, Tian SS, Yang J, et al. Investigating the mechanism of Qing-Fei-Pai-Du-Tang for the treatment of Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia by network pharmacology. *Chinese Traditional and Herbal Drugs* 2020; 51: 829-835.
9. Chen J, Wang Y-k, Gao Y, et al. Protection against COVID-19 injury by qingfei paidu decoction via anti-viral, anti-inflammatory activity and metabolic programming. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2020; 129: 110281.
10. Yang R, Liu H, Bai C, et al. Chemical composition and pharmacological mechanism of Qingfei Paidu Decoction and Ma Xing Shi Gan Decoction against Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): In silico and experimental study. *Pharmacol Res* 2020; 157: 104820.
11. Xu DY, Xu YL, Wang ZW, et al. Mechanism of Qingfei Paidu decoction on COVID-19 based on network pharmacology. *Pharmacol Clin Chin Materia Med* 2020; 36: 26-31.
12. Xu TF, He CG, Yang K. Network pharmacology-based study on material basis and mechanism of Qingfei Paidu Decoction against Novel coronavirus pneumonia. *Natural Product Research and Development* 2020, <http://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/51.1335.Q.20200413.1918.018.html>. Accessed Sep 2 2020
13. Wu H, Wang JQ, Yang YW, et al. Preliminary exploration of the mechanism of Qingfei Paidu decoction against novel coronavirus pneumonia based on network pharmacology and molecular docking technology. *Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica* 2020; 55: 374–383.
14. Wang R, Yang SJ, Xie C, et al. Clinical efficacy of Qingfei Paidu Decoction in the treatment of COVID-19. *Pharmacology and Clinics of Chinese Materia Medica* 2020; 36: 13-18.
15. Zhang LJ, Fan H, Chen R, et al. Rational usage of Qingfei Paidu Decoction from clinical practice. *Journal of Traditional Chinese Medicine* 2020. Available from: <http://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/11.2166.R.20200326.1355.002.html>. Accessed Sep 2 2020
16. Li KY, An W, Xia F, et al. Observation on clinical effect of modified Qingfei Paidu Decoction in

458 treatment of COVID-19. *Chinese Traditional and Herbal Drugs* 2020; **51**: 2046-9.

459 17. Xin SY, Cheng XQ, Zhu B, et al. Clinical retrospective study on the efficacy of Qingfei Paidu

460 decoction combined with Western medicine for COVID-19 treatment. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2020;

461 129: 110500.

462 18. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. Diagnosis and Treatment

463 Protocol for COVID-19 (Trial Version 6.0). 2020. Available from:

464 [http://www.nhc.gov.cn/yzygj/s7653p/202002/8334a8326dd94d329df351d7da8aefc2/files/b218cfeb1b](http://www.nhc.gov.cn/yzygj/s7653p/202002/8334a8326dd94d329df351d7da8aefc2/files/b218cfeb1bc54639af227f922bf6b817.pdf)

465 [c54639af227f922bf6b817.pdf](http://www.nhc.gov.cn/yzygj/s7653p/202002/8334a8326dd94d329df351d7da8aefc2/files/b218cfeb1bc54639af227f922bf6b817.pdf). Accessed Sep 02 2020.

466 19. Austin PC, Stuart EA. Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment

467 weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational

468 studies. *Stat Med* 2015; 34:3661-3679.

469 20. Sterne JAC, White IR, Carlin JB, et al. Multiple imputation for missing data in epidemiological

470 and clinical research: potential and pitfalls. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2009; 338: b2393-b.

471 21. Group RC, Horby P, Lim WS, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19

472 Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2021436.

473 22. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, et al. Pathophysiology, Transmission, Diagnosis, and

474 Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. *JAMA* 2020. 324:782-793.

475

476

477

478 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients by Qingfei Paidu Tang use**

479

	No QPT N=6371	QPT N=2568	SMD before IPTW	SMD after IPTW
Demographic				
Women	3401 (53.4)	1370 (53.3)	-0.0007	0.0115
Age, years			0.1081	0.0263
< 60	3626 (56.9)	1594 (62.1)		
60-70	1511 (23.7)	555 (21.6)		
> 70	1234 (19.4)	419 (16.3)		
Prior history/Comorbidities				
Hypertension	2191 (34.4%)	825 (32.1%)	-0.0481	0.0175
Diabetes	1014 (15.9%)	343 (13.4%)	-0.0724	0.0130
Coronary heart disease	475 (7.5%)	211 (8.2%)	0.0283	0.0284
Stroke	469 (7.4%)	140 (5.5%)	-0.0781	0.0602
Chronic kidney disease	159 (2.5%)	57 (2.2%)	-0.0182	0.0265
COPD	116 (1.8%)	41 (1.6%)	-0.0173	0.0312
Cancer	201 (3.2%)	84 (3.3%)	0.0066	0.0190
Clinical characteristics at admission				
SBP, median (IQR), mmHg	130(120, 140)	128(120, 140)	-0.0308	0.0466
DBP, median (IQR), mmHg	80(74, 89)	80(74, 88)	0.0256	0.0316
HR, median (IQR), breaths per min	84(78, 95)	84(78, 96)	0.0077	0.0340
RR >24 breaths per min	592 (9.3%)	195 (7.6%)	-0.0611	0.0713
Critical state at admission	274 (4.3%)	116 (4.5%)	0.0105	-0.0019
Medication				
Antiviral				
Arbidol	3447 (54.1%)	1969 (76.7%)	0.4884	0.2971
Ribavirin	1150 (18.1%)	585 (22.8%)	0.1175	-0.0707
Oseltamivir	1347 (21.1%)	666 (25.9%)	0.1131	-0.0627
Ganciclovir	323 (5.1%)	183 (7.1%)	0.0860	-0.1166
Lopinavir/Ritonavir	777 (12.2%)	371 (14.4%)	0.0663	-0.0494
Traditional Chinese medicine				
Lianhua Qingwen	3172 (49.8%)	1563 (60.9%)	0.2242	0.1008
Xuebijing	624 (9.8%)	503 (19.6%)	0.2793	0.0284
Diammonium glycyrrhetate	996 (15.6%)	315 (12.3%)	-0.0973	0.0253

	No QPT N=6371	QPT N=2568	SMD before IPTW	SMD after IPTW
Corticosteroids				
Methylprednisolone	1251 (19.6%)	490 (19.1%)	-0.0140	-0.1184
Dexamethasone	334 (5.2%)	133 (5.2%)	-0.0029	-0.0077
Immunomodulator				
Interferon-alpha	2242 (35.2%)	857 (33.4%)	-0.0383	-0.1823

Abbreviations: QPT, Qingfei Paidu Tang; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting; SMD, standardized mean difference; IQR, inter-quartile range; HR, heart rate; RR, respiratory rate; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

480

481

482 **Table 2. Associations between Qingfei Paidu Tang use and mortality in the crude**
 483 **analysis, multivariable analysis, and propensity-score analyses**

484

Analysis	Mortality
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	
Qingfei Paidu Tang	30 (1.2)
No Qingfei Paidu Tang	304(4.8)
Crude analysis-hazard ratio (95% CI)	0.17(0.11-0.26)
Multivariable analysis- hazard ratio (95% CI)	0.23(0.15-0.36)
Propensity-score analysis- hazard ratio (95% CI)	
With inverse probability weighting	0.50(0.37-0.66)
With matching	0.42(0.24-0.74)
Adjusted as a covariant	0.24(0.15-0.37)

Abbreviations: 95% CI, 95% confidence interval

485

486

487

488

489 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

490 **Figure 1. Flowchart of the study cohort**

491 COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; QPT, Qingfei Paidu Tang

492 **Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier survival curves for in-hospital mortality in inverse**
 493 **probability treatment weighting analysis**

494 QPT, Qingfei Paidu Tang

495 **Figure 3. Hazard ratios of in-hospital mortality across subgroups in inverse**
 496 **probability treatment weighting analysis**

497 HR, hazard ratio; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval.

498





