

1 **Bromhexine Hydrochloride Prophylaxis of COVID-19 for Medical Personnel:**
2 **A Randomized Open-Label Study**

3 Evgeny N. Mikhaylov, MD, PhD¹, Tamara A. Lyubimtseva, MD, PhD¹, Aleksandr D.
4 Vakhrushev, MD¹, Dmitry Stepanov, MD, DESA², Dmitry S. Lebedev, MD, PhD¹, Elena Yu.
5 Vasilieva, MD¹, Alexandra O. Konradi, MD, PhD¹, Evgeny V. Shlyakhto, MD, PhD¹

6
7 ¹ Almazov National Medical Research Centre, Saint-Petersburg, Russia;

8 ² Department of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care, Pain Management and Palliative Care,
9 Marienkrankenhaus Soest, Soest, Germany;

10 Authors ENM and TAL, and AOK and EVSh contributed equally to this manuscript

11 **Short title:** COVID-19 prophylaxis

12 **Conflicts of interest:** the authors declare no conflicts of interest in the scope of the present work

13 **Address for correspondence:**

14 Assoc. prof. Dr. Evgeny N. Mikhaylov, MD, PhD

15 Neuromodulation lab, Arrhythmia dept., Almazov National Medical Research Centre, 197341

16 Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation;

17 Tel.: 007(812) 7025164

18 e-mail: e.mikhaylov@almazovcentre.ru

19

20

ABSTRACT

21 **Background:** Bromhexine hydrochloride has been suggested as a TMPRSS2 protease blocker
22 that precludes the penetration of the SARS-CoV-2 into cells. We aimed to assess the preventive
23 potential of regular bromhexine hydrochloride intake for COVID-19 risk reduction in medical
24 staff actively involved in the evaluation and treatment of patients with confirmed or suspected
25 SARS-CoV-2 infection.

26 **Methods:** In a single-center randomized open-label study medical staff managing patients with
27 suspected and confirmed COVID-19 were enrolled and followed-up for 8 weeks. The study
28 began at the initiation of COVID-19 management in the clinic. We enrolled 50 participants
29 without a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection: 25 were assigned to bromhexine hydrochloride
30 treatment (8 mg 3 times per day), and 25 were controls. The composite primary endpoint was a
31 positive nasopharyngeal swab polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test to SARS-CoV-2 or the signs
32 of clinical infection within 28 days and at week 8. Secondary endpoints included the
33 symptomatic infection rate and positive nasopharyngeal swab (PCR) tests.

34 **Results:** The rate of the combined primary endpoint did not differ significantly between the
35 active treatment group (2/25 [8%]) and control group (7/25 [28%]); $P = 0.07$. A fewer number of
36 participants developed symptomatic infection (confirmed COVID-19) in the treatment group
37 compared to controls (0/25 vs 5/25; $P = 0.02$).

38 **Conclusion:** Bromhexine hydrochloride prophylaxis was associated with a reduced rate of
39 symptomatic COVID-19. However, the prophylactic treatment was not associated with a lower
40 combined primary endpoint rate, a positive swab PCR test and/or COVID-19. (ClinicalTrials.gov
41 number, NCT04405999)

42 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; prophylaxis; bromhexine hydrochloride; medical staff

43

44

INTRODUCTION

45 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the cause of respiratory
46 disease, COVID-19.¹ The fast SARS-CoV-2 distribution resulted in the pandemic, and the
47 number of infected subjects keeps growing.² Current strategies for threat reduction include non-
48 pharmacologic prophylactic measures, such as social distancing, masks and hand sanitizers,² as
49 well as antiviral and anti-cytokine agents.^{3, 4} In recent trials, pharmacologic preventive drugs,
50 such as anti-malaria and antibiotic medications, have failed to prevent infection, while effective
51 prevention is urgently required.^{5, 6}

52 The SARS-CoV has been shown to utilize endosomal cysteine proteases cathepsin B and
53 L (CatB/L) and the transmembrane protease serine type 2 (TMPRSS2) for binding of the S-
54 protein.⁷ It has been suggested that the SARS-CoV-2 penetrates alveolar cells using the same
55 mechanism.⁸ The viral S-protein is attached to angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) of
56 pneumocytes. Then it adheres to TMPRSS2 in S1 and S2-subunits,^{2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12} providing the
57 possibility for the virus to enter the cell. According to this mechanistic perspective, the protease
58 TMPRSS2 can be targeted for preventing the penetration of the SARS-CoV-2 into cells.^{7, 13, 14}
59 Two medications that have been shown to block the TMPRSS2 *in vitro*, camostat mesylate and
60 bromhexine hydrochloride; both block the ability of the protease to activate a zymogen precursor
61 of tissue plasminogen activator. Importantly, previous studies have demonstrated that TMPRSS2
62 is blocked by a significantly lower concentration of bromhexine hydrochloride than required to
63 inactivate other proteases in the cell culture.^{8, 13}

64 Therefore, bromhexine hydrochloride is thought to prevent the penetration of the SARS-
65 CoV-2 into cells. If this would be confirmed in clinical settings, the drug might be used as a
66 prophylactic medication in subjects with a high risk of infection, including medical staff.

67 We aimed to assess the preventive potential of regular bromhexine hydrochloride intake
68 for reduction of the risk of COVID-19 in medical staff actively involved in the evaluation and
69 treatment of patients with confirmed or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection.

70

METHODS

71 *Study design*

72 We conducted a single-centre randomized, open-label study to evaluate 8-week prophylaxis with
73 bromhexine hydrochloride during the period of regular exposure to Covid-19 (ClinicalTrials.gov
74 number, NCT04405999). We randomly assigned health care providers in a 1:1 ratio either to
75 bromhexine hydrochloride or to a control group.

76 Study enrollment started on May 13, 2020, when the Almazov Centre began the COVID-
77 19 treatment program, and lasted two weeks while new medical staff was involved in infection
78 management. The study terminated on August 9, 2020 due to the termination of infected
79 patients' admission to the hospital. The study was approved by the Almazov National Medical
80 Research Centre ethics committee (protocol #0105-20-02C from May 12, 2020) and conducted
81 in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

82 *Participants*

83 We included participants over 18 years who were employed within the emergency departments
84 where patients with confirmed/suspected COVID-19 were admitted, intensive care units, and
85 clinical departments. All participants were obliged to wear personal protective equipment (PPE)
86 as prescribed by WHO recommendations and local instructions. The PPE included respirators
87 class FFP2 or FFP3, full skin covering, and protective eyeglasses. Blood tests for SARS-CoV-2
88 antibodies were taken at baseline (serologic qualitative assessment of IgM and IgG, ELISA-
89 BEST, Vektor-Best, Novosibirsk, Russia).

90 Participants were excluded if they had symptoms of respiratory infection within the last 2
91 months or a history of COVID-19, or a positive nasopharyngeal swab polymerase chain reaction
92 (PCR) test to SARS-CoV-2 before the day of randomization, a confirmed direct contact to a
93 subject positive for SARS-CoV-2 within the last 14 days or had a positive serologic test (either
94 IgM or IgG). The additional exclusion criteria were a history of gastric ulcer or other
95 contraindications to bromhexine hydrochloride, pregnancy, and any severe chronic disease.

96 ***Setting***

97 Recruitment was performed via the institution’s electronic communication systems and via
98 personal contacts with healthcare providers. The participants provided a scanned copy of signed
99 consent. We performed follow-up phone calls and sent e-mail surveys on days 7, 14, 21, 28, and
100 at week 8. A survey asked about any follow-up testing, illness, or hospitalizations. Participants
101 who did not respond to follow-up surveys were actively contacted by text messages, and
102 telephone calls.

103 ***Interventions***

104 The study statisticians adjusted a software for randomization using the minimization method
105 weighing the following factors: age (categories: 18-45, 45-64, 65-74, 75-79 years), the type of
106 anticipated contacts with SARS-CoV-2 (confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection cases within the
107 “red” zone, working closely with colleagues who had proven contacts with SARS-CoV-2
108 patients). A study coordinator sequentially assigned participants. The assignments were open to
109 investigators and participants.

110 Bromhexine hydrochloride was dispensed and shipped to participants by the study
111 coordinator. The dosing regimen for bromhexine hydrochloride was 8 mg 3 times per day
112 starting from the day before the first contact with COVID-19 (first day of work in an infection
113 department). The dosing regimen was based on previous reports.^{8,15}

114 The control group was not prescribed any additional drug or placebo.

115 ***Outcomes***

116 The composite primary endpoint was prespecified as a positive nasopharyngeal swab SARS-
117 CoV-2 PCR test or the presence of clinical symptoms of infection within 28 days and during the
118 weeks 5 - 8 after the last contact to subjects with COVID-19. COVID-19–related symptoms were
119 assessed based on the U.S. Council for State and Territorial Epidemiologists Criteria for
120 confirmed cases (positive nasopharyngeal swab PCR test), probable cases (the presence of
121 cough, shortness of breath, or difficult breathing, or the presence of two or more symptoms of

122 fever, chills, rigors, myalgia, headache, sore throat, and new olfactory and taste disorders), and
123 possible cases (the presence of one or more compatible symptoms, which could include
124 diarrhea).¹⁶

125 Secondary endpoints included: time from the first contact with a person with
126 suspected/confirmed COVID-19 to the appearance of respiratory infection symptoms; the
127 number of days before first positive SARS-CoV-2 test; the number of asymptomatic participants
128 with a positive nasopharyngeal swab test; the number of mild, moderate and severe COVID-19
129 cases; adverse events possibly related to bromhexine hydrochloride.

130 According to the study protocol, nasopharyngeal swab SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests were
131 performed every 7 days, and additional tests were performed in a case of infection. The PCR was
132 performed by qualitative analysis (DNA-technology, Moscow, Russia).

133 Outcomes were measured at 7, 14, 28 days after study enrollment, and then at 8 weeks.
134 Outcome data including PCR, COVID-19–related symptoms, adherence to the study drug and
135 side effects were collected through participants’ reports.

136 *Sample size*

137 Considering the high incidence of COVID-19 in front-line healthcare workers (>20%),¹⁷ and a
138 trend towards a higher prevalence of COVID-19 positive subjects among medical staff reported
139 in some Russian hospitals,¹⁸ we had anticipated that a combined primary endpoint would
140 develop in 20 to 50% of participants.¹⁹ We theoretically assumed that prophylactic
141 administration of bromhexine hydrochloride would decrease the primary outcome by 30%.
142 Using Fisher’s exact test with a two-sided alpha of 0.05 and 80% power, we estimated that 24
143 subjects would need to be enrolled in each group.

144 *Statistical analysis*

145 The primary and secondary endpoints were assessed with the Mann-Whitney U test. Statistical
146 analysis was performed using STATISTICA software 13.0 (StatSoft, USA), according to the

147 intention-to-treat principle, with a P-value suggesting a statistically significant difference when
148 <0.05.

149 **RESULTS**

150 *Participants*

151 One hundred and fifty healthcare providers were initially invited, and 62 positive
152 responses were obtained. Among 62 subjects who agreed to participate, 50 persons fulfilled the
153 inclusion criteria (80.6%) (**Figure 1**).

154 The demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants are presented in **Table 1**.
155 Three (6%) of the participants were hypertensive, 2 participants had hypercholesterolemia.
156 Physicians comprised 88% of the population, and nurses 12%. The median time spent working
157 with the exposure to patients with confirmed/suspected COVID-19 was 7.5 hours per week.

158 Overall, 80% (40 out of 50) participants had a very high risk exposure (contacting with
159 aerosols from intubated COVID-19 patients) and 20% (10 out of 50) - a relatively lower risk
160 exposure (contacting with suspected/confirmed COVID-19 patients). All the participants had a
161 6-hour duration of the works with infection followed by breaches, used FFE respirators,
162 eyeglasses and skin coverings, and had direct contacts with the staff outside the “red zones”
163 without PPE.

164 Seven (14%) participants used vitamins D, C as general prevention of infection: 3
165 participants in the bromhexine group (3/25, 12%) and 4 participants in the control group (4/25,
166 16%; P>0.05). None of the participants reported any unprotected contact with COVID-19
167 patients outside the hospital.

168 There were no subject losses nor dropouts after randomization.

169 *Primary endpoint*

170 All participants completed all scheduled surveys. The primary end-point, a positive swab test
171 and/or infection symptoms, was documented in 9/50 (18%) participants: in 8 - by day 28, and in
172 1 - by week 8 (**Table 2**). The primary outcome rate did not differ significantly between the

173 treatment and control groups (2/25 (8%) vs 7/25 (28%), respectively) (P=0.07). Two
174 hospitalizations for COVID-19 pneumonia were reported in the control group (2/25, 8%), and
175 none – in the bromhexine group (0/25, P=0.16). No severe cases with intensive care unit
176 admissions or deaths occurred.

177 *Secondary endpoints*

178 There was no difference between the groups in the time since the first contact with a
179 person with suspected/confirmed COVID-19 to the appearance of respiratory infection clinical
180 symptoms or an asymptomatic positive PCR test. The first positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests in
181 the treatment group appeared at 2 and 3 weeks, and in the control groups the positive tests were
182 obtained at 2, 3, 4 weeks, and during weeks 5-8 (**Table 2**). Both SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive
183 participants in the bromhexine treatment group continued the intake of bromhexine
184 hydrochloride until two consecutive negative tests.

185 Among 9 persons with a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test, 4 were asymptomatic (2/25 –
186 in the treatment group, and 2/25 – in the control group; P>0.05). Five participants from the
187 control group had infection symptoms: only respiratory virus infection symptoms - in 3 persons;
188 pneumonia – in 2. All participants with respiratory symptoms were positive for SARS-Cov-2
189 and were compatible with confirmed COVID-19 per the U.S. case definition.

190 Taking together, symptomatic COVID-19 was diagnosed in the control group only: no
191 cases in the treatment group (0/25) vs 5/25 cases in the control group, P=0.02.

192 *Adherence and safety*

193 Missed days of bromhexine intake were reported by 4 participants, the duration of termination
194 treatment was 1-4 days. One participant who missed two days of the drug intake had a positive
195 SARS-CoV-2 PCR test (asymptomatic case). It was impossible to assess whether missed drug
196 intake and infection occurred on the same day.

197 Two participants reported adverse events possibly related to bromhexine hydrochloride
198 treatment: a short period of hot flashes at the treatment initiation and transient cough. No cases

199 of treatment termination or interruption due to adverse events were reported. There were no
200 adverse events in the control group. No statistically significant difference was found in the rates
201 of adverse events between the groups.

202 **DISCUSSION**

203 The present study shows several important facts. The primary combined endpoint, the
204 rate of positive nasopharyngeal swab PCR tests to SARS-CoV-2 and/or symptomatic COVID-
205 19, was similar in both groups. However, there was a trend towards a lower rate of the positive
206 swab PCR test in the bromhexine hydrochloride treatment group. Importantly, the rate of
207 clinically significant SARS-CoV-2 infection was statistically lower in the treatment group (0/25
208 participants) compared to the control group (5/25 participants).

209 It should be acknowledged that the risk of symptomatic and severe COVID-19 depends
210 on age and co-morbidity.²⁰ Our study population was generally younger and healthier than in the
211 majority of COVID-19 studies. However, in a recent study of post-exposure COVID-19
212 prophylaxis by hydroxychloroquine, the mean age and average health status of the participants
213 was comparable.⁵ Thus, for prevention efficacy assessment, our group can be informative.
214 Moreover, the fact, that the safe and cheap drug showed the risk reduction of symptomatic
215 infection can be important for future larger studies and practical use.

216 We used a thorough approach for detecting asymptomatic cases performing
217 nasopharyngeal swab PCR tests every week of follow-up using the approved methodology.²¹

218 Two factors increase the value of our study: good adherence, which is significantly
219 higher, compared to generally published prevention studies, and the high survey response rate.
220 This can be explained by the high motivation and high awareness of the medical staff.

221 It should be mentioned that a small number of participants used additional medications,
222 including ACE2 inhibitors/ARA, or vitamin C, D. No statistical difference in the use of
223 additional pharmacological treatment was documented between groups, and the number of
224 subjects with additional medications was very small, thus we can conclude that this aspect had

225 no impact on the study results. It is plausible that the results may be more robust with a placebo-
226 controlled group. Due to the organizational difficulties during a limited period for study
227 preparation, the provision with placebo was impossible.

228 Although all healthcare workers had been instructed to wear protective masks and
229 medical gloves outside the hospital, we cannot exclude that some of the participants might have
230 been infected outside the hospital or during direct communication within the community during
231 rest and meals. However, if bromhexine hydrochloride prevention is effective, it should be
232 effective anywhere.

233 It is generally believed that the risk of infection is lower when the staff uses PPE as
234 appropriate. Thus, further reduction of clinically significant cases can be an argument of
235 implementation of this approach into clinical practice, even before obtaining better evidence.

236 In a recently published randomized study of bromhexine hydrochloride treatment in
237 patients hospitalized with COVID-19, the authors have shown that the early administration of
238 oral bromhexine reduces the intensive care unit transfer, intubation, and mortality rate.¹⁵ In
239 another small open-label randomized study, where 18 patients with COVID-19 were included,
240 bromhexine hydrochloride treatment has been shown associated with a trend towards the
241 improvement in the need for oxygen therapy, and discharge rate within 20 days.²² Although
242 hypothesis regarding the positive effects of bromhexine on viral penetration into the cells in non-
243 infected subjects differs from the background presented in two latter studies, all these
244 investigations taken together support the assumption of positive effects of the drug against the
245 SARS-CoV-2.

246 Whether prophylactic use of bromhexine hydrochloride against SARS-CoV-2 infection in
247 the general population is effective, is a separate question that should be answered in larger-scale
248 randomized trials.

249 **Study limitations**

250 The study sample size may appear limited, however, it was enough to demonstrate the
251 significant difference in secondary outcome between the groups.

252 Another limitation is the lack of sequential serologic testing, which we considered less
253 informative due to a very short study period.

254 CONCLUSIONS

255 In this randomized single-centre open-label study, bromhexine hydrochloride prophylactic
256 treatment was associated with a reduction in the rate of symptomatic COVID-19 among medical
257 personnel. However, the primary combined outcome, the rate of a positive nasopharyngeal swab
258 PCR test and/or COVID-19, did not reach a statically significant difference.

259 This study suggests that bromhexine hydrochloride may offer clinical value when taken
260 as a prophylactic treatment.

261 FUNDING

262 The study was supported by the State assignment #A18-118042390114-2. The funders had no
263 role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
264 manuscript.

265 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

266 The authors thank all study participants for their dedication to participate and adherence to the
267 study protocol. We thank Dr. Olesya V. Melnik, MD, PhD for her invaluable help in serologic
268 data management. The research was performed using core facilities of Biobank of the Almazov
269 National Medical Centre.

270 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

271 Research idea: ENM, TAL, DS. Study design: ENM, TAL, AOK, EVSh. Data collection
272 and management: ENM, TAL, ADV, DSL, EYuV. Data interpretation and analysis: ENM, TAL,
273 ADV, DS, DSL, AOK, EVSh. Writing article draft: ENM, TAL, AOK. Critical review and
274 approval of the article final version: all authors.

275 SUPPLEMENTS

276 The full study protocol is available in supplements in both, original Russian version, and
277 translated English version.

278

STUDY HIGHLIGHTS

279 - Bromhexine hydrochloride is a TMPRSS2 protease blocker that is thought to preclude the
280 penetration of the SARS-CoV-2 into cells;

281 - Prophylactic treatment with bromhexine hydrochloride reduces the rate of clinical
282 infection among medical workers who manage patients with COVID-19

283

284

285

REFEREFENCES

286

1. Helmy YA, Fawzy M, Elasad A, Sobieh A, Kenney SP, Shehata AA. The COVID-19 pandemic: a comprehensive review of taxonomy, genetics, epidemiology, diagnosis, treatment, and control. *J Clin Med* 2020;9(4):E1225-E1225.

287

288

289

2. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, transmission, diagnosis, and treatment of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a review. *JAMA* 2020 [in press].

290

291

292

3. Gandhi RT, Lynch JB, Del Rio C. Mild or moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020 [in press].

293

294

4. Berlin DA, Gulick RM, Martinez FJ. Severe Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020[in press].

295

296

5. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Lofgren SM, Okafor EC et al. A Randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(6):517-525.

297

298

6. Qaseem A, Yost J, Etzeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, Miller MC, Abraham GM, Obley AJ et al. (2020) Update alert: should clinicians use chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine alone or in combination with azithromycin for the prophylaxis or treatment of COVID-19? Living practice points from the American College of Physicians. *Annals of internal medicine* [in press].

299

300

301

302

303

7. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S et al. SARS-CoV-2 cell entry depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and is blocked by a clinically proven protease inhibitor. *Cell* 2020;181:271–280.

304

305

306

8. Glowacka I, Bertram S, Müller MA, Allen P, Soilleux E, Pfefferle S et al. Evidence that TMPRSS2 activates the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus spike protein for membrane fusion and reduces viral control by the humoral immune response. *J Virol* 2011;85:4122-4134.

307

308

309

- 310 9. Stepanov D, Lierz P. Bromhexine hydrochloride: potential approach to prevent or treat
311 early stage COVID-19. *J Infect Dis Epidemiol* 2020;6:135.
- 312 10. Matsuyama S, Nagata N, Shirato K, Kawase M, Takeda M, Taguchi F. Efficient
313 activation of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus spike protein by the
314 transmembrane protease TMPRSS2. *J Virol* 2010;84:12658-64.
- 315 11. Shulla A, Heald-Sargent T, Subramanya G, Zhao J, Perlman S, Gallagher T. A
316 transmembrane serine protease is linked to the severe acute respiratory syndrome
317 coronavirus receptor and activates virus entry. *J Virol* 2011;85:873-82.
- 318 12. Simmons G, Gosalia DN, Rennekamp AJ, Reeves JD, Diamond SL, Bates P. Inhibitors
319 of cathepsin L prevent severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus entry. *Proc Natl*
320 *Acad Sci USA* 2005;102:11876-81.
- 321 13. Lucas JM, Heinlein C, Kim T, Lucas JM, Heinlein C, Kim T et al. The androgen-
322 regulated protease TMPRSS2 activates a proteolytic cascade involving components of
323 the tumor microenvironment and promotes prostate cancer metastasis. *Cancer Discovery*
324 2014;4:1310-25.
- 325 14. Habtemariam S, Nabavi SF, Ghavami S, Cismaru CA, Berindan-Neagoe I, Nabavi SM.
326 Possible use of the mucolytic drug, bromhexine hydrochloride, as a prophylactic agent
327 against SARS-CoV-2 infection based on its action on the transmembrane serine protease
328 2. *Pharmacol Res* 2020;157:104853.
- 329 15. Ansarin K, Tolouian R, Ardalan M, Taghizadieh A, Varshochi M, Teimouri S et al.
330 Effect of bromhexine on clinical outcomes and mortality in COVID-19 patients: a
331 randomized clinical trial. *BioImpacts* 2020;10(4):209-215.
- 332 16. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists. Interim-20-ID-01: standardized
333 surveillance case definition and national notification for 2019 novel coronavirus disease
334 (COVID-19). Available at: [https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-](https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-01_COVID-19.pdf)
335 [01_COVID-19.pdf](https://www.cste.org/resource/resmgr/2020ps/Interim-20-ID-01_COVID-19.pdf). Accessed 05 September 2020.

- 336 17. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo CG, Ma W et al. Risk of COVID-19
337 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort
338 study. *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(9):e475-e483.
- 339 18. Dyer O. Covid-19: cases rise in Russia as health workers pay the price for PPE shortage.
340 *BMJ* 2020; m1975. Available at: <https://www.bmj.com/content/369/bmj.m1975>. Accessed
341 05 September 2020.
- 342 19. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Characteristics of Health Care Personnel with COVID-
343 19 — United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020, April 17; 69(15):
344 477-481. Available at:
345 https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6915e6.htm?deliveryName=USCDC_42_5-DM25898. Accessed 05 September 2020.
- 346
- 347 20. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, Pogosjans S, Kay M, Schwartz NG et al.
348 Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a long-term care facility in King County, Washington. *N*
349 *Engl J Med* 2020;382(21):2005-2011.
- 350 21. Marty FM, Chen K, Verrill KA. How to obtain a nasopharyngeal swab specimen. *N Engl*
351 *J Med* 2020;382(22): e76.
- 352 22. Li T, Sun L, Zhang W, Zheng C, Jiang C, Chen M et al. Bromhexine hydrochloride
353 tablets for the treatment of moderate COVID-19: an open-label randomized controlled
354 pilot study. *Clin Transl Sci* 2020; [in press].
355

356

TABLES

357

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of study participants

	Bromhexine treatment group	Control group	Overall	P	
n	25	25	50	1.00	
Age, years	41.7±6.9	39.5±8.2	40.6±7.6	0.43	
Sex, n (%) of males)	11 (44%)	10 (40%)		0.78	
BMI	25.1±3.9	23.9±4.1	24.6±4.0	0.76	
Work within the “red zone”, n (%)	14 (56%)	11 (44%)	25 (50%)	0.41	
Co-morbidity, n	2	1	3	0.82	
ACEi2 inhibitors/ARA treatment, n	1	1	2	1.00	
Additional pharmacological drugs, n	Vitamin D/C 1	4	5	0.16	
Negative serologic test for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG at baseline	100%	100%	11	1.00	
Drug non-adherence					
	Missed doses of bromhexine, n	4	-	-	-
	Number of missed bromhexine doses, Median [IQR]	6 [5.25; 7.5]	-	-	-
Time spent in the “red zone”, mean±SD; Median [IQR], hours	64.1±69.5; 40 [2; 144]	66.6±78.2; 20 [3; 160]	66.1±72.6 ; 30.0 [2; 144]	0.97	
Time spent in the hospital, hours	145.1±44.5	143.2±40.6	144.2±42.2	0.66	
Participants who worked in intensive care units, n	6	6	12	1.00	
Participants who worked in re-purposed infectious wards or COVID-19 admission departments, n	12	14	28	0.58	
Participants who worked in invasive cardiology/electrophysiology departments, n	6	4	10	0.49	
Adverse events, n	2	0	2	0.16	
Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test, n	2	7	9	0.07	
	Asymptomatic	2	2	4	1.00
	Symptomatic	0	5	5	0.02
COVID-19 moderate, n	0	3	3	0.08	
COVID-19 severe with hospitalization, n	0	2	2	0.16	

358

359 n, number of participants; BMI, body mass index; ACEi2, angiotensin 2 converting enzyme
360 inhibitors; ARA, angiotensine receptor antagonists; AD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile
361 range; PCR, polymerase chain reaction
362
363


364 **Table 2.** Timeline of positive SARS-CoV-2 tests in both groups. P>0.05 for each period of time.

		Days 1-7	Days 8-14	Days 15-21	Days 22-28	Weeks 5-8
Number of participants with a positive PCR test	Treatment group	0	1	1	0	0
	Control group	0	2	3	1	1
Number of participants with clinical symptoms of respiratory infection	Treatment group	0	0	0	0	0
	Control group	0	0	2	3	0
Total number of participants with an outcome		0	3	4	1	1

365
366

367
368

FIGURES



369
370
371

Figure 1. Screening and randomization.