

1 **Title page**

2 **Potentially effective drugs for the treatment of COVID-19 in children: a systematic review**

3 **Zijun Wang**<sup>1,2,#</sup>, **Siya Zhao**<sup>3,#</sup>, **Yuyi Tang**<sup>4,5,6,#</sup>, **Zhili Wang**<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Qianling Shi**<sup>7</sup>, **Xiangyang Dang**<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Lidan**  
4 **Gan**,<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Shuai Peng**,<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Weiguo Li**<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Qi Zhou**<sup>1,2</sup>, **Qinyuan Li**<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Joy James Mafiana**<sup>3</sup>, **Rafael**  
5 **González Cortés**<sup>8</sup>, **Zhengxiu Luo**<sup>4,5,6</sup>, **Enmei Liu**<sup>4,5,6,\*</sup>, **Yaolong Chen**<sup>1,2,3,9,10,\*</sup>

- 6 1. Evidence-based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China;  
7 2. Lanzhou University Institute of Health Data Science, Lanzhou, China;  
8 3. School of Public Health, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China;  
9 4. Department of Respiratory Medicine, Children's Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing,  
10 China;  
11 5. National Clinical Research Center for Child Health and Disorders, Ministry of Education Key Laboratory of  
12 Child Development and Disorders, China International Science and Technology Cooperation Base of Child  
13 Development and Critical Disorders, Children's Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing,  
14 China;  
15 6. Chongqing Key Laboratory of Pediatrics, Chongqing, China;  
16 7. The First School of Clinical Medicine, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China;  
17 8. Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Calle Doctor Castelo 47,  
18 28007 Madrid, Spain  
19 9. WHO Collaborating Centre for Guideline Implementation and Knowledge Translation, Lanzhou, China;  
20 10. Lanzhou University GRADE Center.

21

22 # Contributed equally.

23 \* Correspondence to: Yaolong Chen. Evidence-based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences,  
24 Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China. Email: [chenyaolong@lzu.edu.cn](mailto:chenyaolong@lzu.edu.cn); Enmei Liu. the National Clinical  
25 Research Center for Child Health and Disorders, Children's Hospital of Chongqing Medical University,  
26 Chongqing 400014, China. Email: [emliu186@126.com](mailto:emliu186@126.com).

27

28 **Conflict of interest:** None

29 **Funding:** None

30

31

32 **Abstract**

33 **Introduction:** The efficacy and safety of using potential drugs such as remdesivir, glucocorticoid, and intravenous  
34 immunoglobulin (IVIG) in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19 is unclear. The purpose of this  
35 systematic review is to evaluate the efficacy and safety of using potential drugs such as remdesivir, glucocorticoid,  
36 and intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19. Furthermore,  
37 provide evidence to support the development of clinical practice guidelines.

38 **Methods:** We searched seven databases, three preprint platform, ClinicalTrials.gov, and Google from December  
39 1, 2019, to March 2, 2021, to collect evidence of remdesivir, glucocorticoid, and IVIG which were used in children  
40 and adolescents with COVID-19.

41 **Results:** A total of six cohort studies and one case series study were included in this systematic review. In terms  
42 of remdesivir, the meta-analysis of single-arm cohort studies have shown that, after the treatment, 37.1% (95%CI,  
43 0.0% to 74.5%) experienced adverse events, 5.9% (95%CI, 1.5% to 10.2%) died, 37.2% (95%CI, 0% to 76.0%)  
44 needed extracorporeal membrane oxygenation or invasive mechanical ventilation. As for glucocorticoids, the  
45 results of the meta-analysis showed that the fixed-effect summary odds ratio for the association with mortality was  
46 2.79 (95%CI, 0.13 to 60.87), and the mechanical ventilation rate was 3.12 (95%CI, 0.80 to 12.08) for  
47 glucocorticoids compared with the control group. In terms of IVIG, the two included cohort studies showed that  
48 for MIS-C patients with more severe clinical symptoms, IVIG combined with methylprednisolone could achieve  
49 better clinical efficacy than IVIG alone.

50 **Conclusions:** Overall, the current evidence in the included studies is insignificant and of low quality, which does  
51 not adequately demonstrate the effectiveness and safety of using remdesivir, glucocorticoids, and IVIG in treating  
52 children and adolescents with COVID-19 or MIS-C. It is recommended to conduct high-quality randomized  
53 controlled trials to provide substantial evidence for the development of guidelines.

54  
55 **Keywords:** children, COVID-19, glucocorticoids, intravenous immunoglobulin, remdesivir, systematic review  
56

57  
58 **Key summary points introduction:**

59 *Why carry out this study?*

60 The efficacy and safety of using potential drugs such as remdesivir, glucocorticoid, and intravenous  
61 immunoglobulin (IVIG) in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19 is unclear. So, we aimed to determine  
62 the efficacy and safety of using: 1. remdesivir in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19, 2.  
63 glucocorticoids in treating children and adolescents with severe COVID-19, 3. IVIG in treating children and  
64 adolescents with MIS-C. Furthermore, provide evidence to support the development of clinical practice guidelines.

65 *What was learned from the study?*

66 Overall, the current evidence can not adequately demonstrate the effectiveness and safety of using remdesivir,  
67 glucocorticoids, and IVIG in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19 or MIS-C. This result show the  
68 insignificant and low quality of current evidence, may promote the publication of high quality clinical trails and  
69 provide substantial evidence for the development of guidelines.  
70

## 71 1. Introduction

72 It is over a year and a half since the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), and during this period,  
73 studies on COVID-19 are continuously emerging [1,2]. Researchers have paid much attention to drug therapy due  
74 to the lack of safe and effective treatment to meet clinical needs [3]. Recent studies on COVID-19 drugs and  
75 clinical guidelines have focused primarily on adult patients but less attention on children and adolescents. Although  
76 children and adolescents with COVID-19 seem less susceptible and have milder symptoms once infected, they are  
77 also at risks of advancing to severe stages [4]. Children and adults are known to have physiological differences  
78 [5]; thus, many effective COVID-19 drugs for adults may not suitable for children. Among these drugs, remdesivir,  
79 glucocorticoids, and intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) in children and adolescents have been controversial.

80 Remdesivir is a broad-spectrum antiviral medication that can integrate into the RNA strand of severe acute  
81 respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) and prematurely terminate the ribonucleic acid (RNA)  
82 replication process [6]. The World Health Organization (WHO) living guideline for COVID-19 [7] and the United  
83 States guideline for pediatric COVID-19 [8] have contradicting recommendations for the treatment of children and  
84 adolescents, based on evidence from randomized controlled trials of adults. At the same time, the status of original  
85 studies of remdesivir in children and adolescents with COVID-19 is unclear.

86 Glucocorticoids are the most widely used and effective anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive agents in  
87 clinical practice. They have the potential to reduce the severity of lung inflammation in patients with severe  
88 COVID-19 [9,10]. Glucocorticoids are affordable, easy to administer, and readily available globally [11]. The  
89 WHO living guidance on glucocorticoids for COVID-19 [12] recommends systemic glucocorticoids to treat adult  
90 patients with severe COVID-19. However, the living guidance further suggests that the recommendation is  
91 underrepresented in children and adolescents with COVID-19.

92 IVIG is a recommended first-line therapy for Kawasaki disease because it produces anti-inflammatory effect,  
93 which reduces coronary artery abnormalities and myocarditis in patients with Kawasaki disease [13]. MIS-C  
94 (multi-system inflammatory syndrome in children) is a newly defined clinical syndrome associated with SARS-  
95 CoV-2 infection characterized by fever, systemic inflammation, and multiple organ dysfunction. Several case  
96 definitions of this novel inflammatory condition have been published by the WHO [14], the US Center for Disease  
97 Control and Prevention (CDC) [15], and the United Kingdom of Great Britain Royal College of Pediatrics and  
98 Child Health (RCPCH) [16]. The clinical features of MIS-C are similar to those of Kawasaki disease, toxic shock  
99 syndrome, sepsis, and macrophage activation syndrome [17]. Hence, the application of IVIG in the treatment of  
100 MIS-C is a potential drug choice [18], but the evidence of the application of IVIG in MIS-C treatment is still  
101 unclear.

102 Therefore, we aimed to determine the efficacy and safety of using: 1. remdesivir in treating children and  
103 adolescents with COVID-19, 2. glucocorticoids in treating children and adolescents with severe COVID-19, 3.  
104 IVIG in treating children and adolescents with MIS-C. Furthermore, provide evidence to support the development  
105 of clinical practice guidelines.

## 106 2. Methods

107 Six researchers in three groups of two (Group 1: Zijun Wang, Qianling Shi; Group 2: Siya Zhao, Qi Zhou; Group  
108 3: Yuyi Tang, Weiguo Li) retrieved and selected studies, extracted and analyzed data, and interpreted the results.  
109 Group 1 focused on remdesivir in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19, Group 2 focused on  
110 glucocorticoids in treating children and adolescents with severe COVID-19 and Group 3 focused on IVIG in  
111 treating children and adolescents with MIS-C.

## 112 2.1. Search strategy

113 Two researchers in each group independently searched for literature using MEDLINE (via PubMed), Web of  
114 Science, the Cochrane library, China Biology Medicine (CBM), China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI),  
115 Wanfang Data, and WHO COVID-19 database ([https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-  
2019-ncov/](https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/)), ClinicalTrials.gov (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/>), MedRxiv (<https://www.medrxiv.org/>), BioRxiv  
117 (<https://www.biorxiv.org/>), SSRN (<https://www.ssrn.com/index.cfm/en/>), and Google. The electronic search was  
118 supplemented by manually examining the reference lists of the identified studies. In addition, emails were sent to  
119 the authors of studies to request available data that may be useful for our systematic review. The data search was  
120 from December 2019 to March 2021 without language limitations.

121 The researchers in groups 1, 2, and 3 used “remdesivir,” “corticosteroids,” and “intravenous immunoglobulin,”  
122 and its derivatives as retrieval terms, respectively. The terms were also combined with "COVID-19" and its  
123 derivatives using “AND”. For question 3, "MIS-C" and its derivatives were added as retrieval terms and combined  
124 with “AND” to improve the accuracy of the search. The search strategy can be found in **Supplementary File 1**.

## 125 2.2. Eligibility criteria

### 126 2.2.1. Inclusion criteria

127 Clinical question 1 (remdesivir)

128 Randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and case series of children and  
129 adolescents ( $\leq$  18-year-old) with COVID-19 treated with remdesivir.

130 Clinical question 2 (glucocorticoids)

131 Randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and case series of COVID-19  
132 children and adolescents ( $\leq$  18 year) patients treated with glucocorticoids.

133 Clinical question 3 (IVIG)

134 1) The study population must meet the diagnostic criteria for MIS-C, and the included patients were not restricted  
135 by age, gender, disease course, race, region, and other factors.

136 2) The interventions/exposure included IVIG (intravenous immunoglobulin) vs. placebo or other treatment, or  
137 IVIG combined with other treatment vs. basic treatment.

138 3) Inclusion of studies was not restricted by the type of publication.

### 139 2.2.2. Exclusion criteria

140 Clinical question 1 (remdesivir)

141 1) Studies that failed to show the efficacy of remdesivir.

142 2) Case series that remdesivir was not administered to all the patients or subgroup comparison of remdesivir was  
143 unavailable.

144 3) Full text not available (example, studies inaccessible for download, conference abstract).

145 4) Duplications.

146 Clinical question 2 (glucocorticoids)

147 1) Studies that failed to show the efficacy of glucocorticoids.

148 2) Case series that glucocorticoid was not administered to all the patients or subgroup comparison of glucocorticoid  
149 was unavailable.

150 3) Full text not available (example, studies inaccessible for download, conference abstract).

151 4) Duplications.

152 Clinical question 3 (IVIG)

153 1) In vitro studies (example, animal experiments, in vitro experiments).

154 2) Full text not available (e.g., studies inaccessible for download, conference abstract).

155 3) Duplications.

### 156 **2.3. Study selection**

157 Two researchers in each group independently screened literature using the EndNote citation management software,  
158 and any disagreements were resolved by discussion. Before the formal screening process, researchers in each group  
159 randomly selected 50 studies to undertake a pilot study selection and ensure consistency in understanding the  
160 inclusion and exclusion criteria. Researchers used the inclusions and exclusions criteria first to screen the studies'  
161 title and abstracts and excluded irrelevant literature. Then, the full text of the literature was reviewed to include  
162 the final eligible studies. Finally, the reasons for exclusion were recorded. The details of study selection are shown  
163 in the PRISMA 2020 flow diagram ([Supplementary File 2](#)).

### 164 **2.4. Data extraction**

165 Two researchers in each group extracted data independently in pairs, using a predefined data extraction form.  
166 Disagreements regarding the data extraction were resolved by discussion. The following information was extracted  
167 from the included studies: 1) baseline characteristics: author, year of publication, country, journal, number of  
168 included patients, gender, age, study design, and medication taken for COVID-19; 2) data extracted for clinical  
169 question 1: adverse events, severe adverse events, mortality, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) or  
170 invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), length of hospital stay, hospital discharge, and symptom duration; 3) data  
171 extracted for clinical question 2: mortality, mechanical ventilation, and duration of pediatric intensive care unit  
172 (PICU) admission; and 4) data extracted for clinical question 3: number of patients who had treatment failure or  
173 secondary acute left ventricular dysfunction, number of patients who needed second-line treatment or  
174 hemodynamic support, the duration of PICU stay, isovolumic relaxation time, and the time to recovery of left  
175 ventricle ejection.

176 For dichotomous variables, the data of the number of events and the total of events were extracted. For continuous  
177 variables, mean, standard deviation, and the number of included patients were extracted. The median, quartile,  
178 maximum values, and minimum values were converted into mean and standard deviation using methods of  
179 estimating math [19]. Studies were excluded from the meta-analysis if the primary data was unavailable and  
180 showed the results of descriptive analysis of those studies.

### 181 **2.5. Risk of bias assessment**

182 Two reviewers in each group independently assessed the risk of bias of all included studies, and discrepancies  
183 were resolved by consensus. The risk of bias of the included randomized controlled trials was assessed using  
184 Cochrane's risk of bias tool [20]. Potential sources of bias are examined according to six domains (including seven  
185 items): selection bias, performance bias, detection bias, attrition bias, reporting bias, and other biases. Each item  
186 was assessed as "low risk of bias," "high risk of bias," or "unclear." The risk of bias of included non-randomized  
187 controlled trials was assessed using the tool of ROBINS-I [21], which contains seven items (confounding, selection  
188 of participants into the study, classification of the intervention, deviations from intended interventions, missing  
189 data, measurements of outcomes, and selections of the reported result), each of which was assessed as "low risk,"  
190 "moderate risk," "serious risk," "critical risk," and "no information". The Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment  
191 scale [22,23] was used to assess the risk of bias of cohort studies. The scale contains eight items in three domains:  
192 selection, comparability, and outcome. The items were rated with an asterisk. The Quality Appraisal Checklist for  
193 Case Series Studies developed by the Institute of Health Economics was used to assess the risk of bias of case  
194 series studies [24]. The checklist contains twenty items in eight domains: study objective, study population,  
195 intervention and co-intervention, outcome measure, statistical analysis, results and conclusions, competing

196 interests and sources of support, and supplement. Each item was evaluated with "yes" or "no".

## 197 **2.6. Data synthesis**

198 A meta-analysis using the STATA14 software when the outcomes of included studies were highly consistent and  
199 descriptive analyses when there was high heterogeneity of outcomes between the included studies. According to  
200 Cochrane Handbook, when the meta-analysis was conducted, a random-effects meta-analysis for all outcomes was  
201 presented [25]. For an included study with intervention group and control group, the odds ratios (ORs) and their  
202 95% confidence interval (CI) were used to describe the effect of dichotomous variables while weighted mean  
203 differences (WMD) and their 95% CI were used to describe the effect of continuous variables. However, for an  
204 included study with only an intervention group, the effect sizes (ES) and their 95% CI were used to describe the  
205 effect of dichotomous variables while mean differences (MD) and their 95% CI were used to describe the effect  
206 of continuous variables. Statistical significance was set at  $<0.05$  on both sides [26]. We used the chi-squared test  
207 and  $I^2$  statistic were used to assess the level of statistical heterogeneity between the included studies, with  $p<0.05$   
208 and  $I^2$  of less than 50% representing heterogeneity [26]. When substantial heterogeneity was detected, subgroup  
209 analyses by participant and study characteristics were used to compare pooled association estimates and  
210 heterogeneity. Furthermore, sensitivity analysis was used to detect potential outliers by omitting one estimate at a  
211 time and recalculating the pooled estimates. Publication bias was assessed through the funnel chart when the  
212 studies included in the meta-analyses were more than five [26].

## 213 **2.7. Quality of the evidence assessment**

214 Two reviewers in each group independently assessed the quality of evidence using the grading of recommendations  
215 assessment, development, and evaluation (GRADE) approach for meta-analysis. We created a "Summary of  
216 findings" table using GRADEpro to show effect estimates derived from the body of evidence (quality of evidence)  
217 by outcome [27,28]. Under the GRADE system, RCTs were initially assessed as high quality and observational  
218 studies as low quality. However, they were downgraded for reasons such as the risk of bias, inconsistency,  
219 indirectness, imprecision, publication bias, or upgraded for reasons such as the large magnitude of effect, dose-  
220 response gradient, and plausible confounding [29-34]. Thus, the quality of studies was rated as "high," "medium,"  
221 "low," and "very low," reflecting the extent to which we are confident in the effect estimates.  
222 Due to the peculiarity and public health significance of COVID-19, this study was not registered on the  
223 international registration platform PROSPERO.

## 224 **3. Results**

### 225 **3.1. Study selection and characteristics**

226 For clinical question 1, a total of 5020 records were retrieved from the databases and other methods. A total of  
227 three cohort studies were included, one of them was included from the database and two of them were unpublished  
228 studies obtained by data request [35-37]. For clinical question 2, 3937 records were retrieved. A cohort [38] and  
229 case series [39] study was included by reading the title, abstract, and full text. For clinical question 3, 3246 records  
230 were retrieved, and two cohort studies [40,41] were finally included. The detailed screening process for each  
231 clinical question is shown in [Supplementary File 2](#).

### 232 **3.2. Study characteristics**

233 A total of 330 patients from the United States, Spain, France, and China were included in this study, of which the  
234 studies on IVIG were all from France ([Table 1](#)).

235 **3.3. Risk of bias assessment**

236 The results of risk of bias are shown in [Supplementary File 3](#). The GRADE quality summary of findings for all  
237 outcomes is shown in [Supplementary File 4](#).

238 **3.4. Outcome of analysis**

239

Table 1 Basic characteristics of the included studies

Study	Region	Date	Study design	Total sample size	Sex (F/M)	Intervention		Control		Age, median (IQR), y	Drug
						Sample size	Details	Sample size	Details		
Méndez-Echevarría et al. 2020 [35]	Spain	Nov 16, 2020	Single-arm Cohort	8	3/5	8	Children who weighed 40 Kg or more at screening received a single 200 mg dose on day one, following by a daily 100-mg dose from day 2 up to 10 days. For the rest of the children, a single dose of 5 mg/kg on day one was prescribed, followed by a daily dose of 2.5 mg/kg from day 2 up to 10 days.	NA	NA	5 (0-3-11)	Remdesivir



<b>Munoz et al. 2021 [36]</b>	America	Mar 6, 2021	Single-arm Cohort	27	15/12	27	≥40 kg received RDV 200 mg IV Loading dose followed by RDV 100mg IV daily for up to total of 10 day of treatment; <40 kg received RDV 5 mg/kg loading dose followed by RDV 2.5 mg/kg IV daily for up to total of 10 day of treatment	NA	NA	10 (0.2-17) <sup>#</sup>	Remdesivir
<b>Goldman et al. 2021 [37]</b>	America	July 10, 2020	Single-arm Cohort	77	31/46	77	≥40 kg received RDV 200 mg IV Loading dose followed by RDV 100mg IV daily for up to total of 10 day of treatment; <40 kg received RDV 5 mg/kg loading dose followed by RDV 2.5 mg/kg IV daily for up to total of 10 day of treatment	NA	NA	14 (0-17) <sup>#</sup>	Remdesivir

<b>García-Salido et al. 2020<sup>§</sup> [38]</b>	Spain	Nov 26, 2020	Cohort	61	23/38	40	Glucocorticoids (Not specified)	21	No glucocorticoids	7.5 (4.9) <sup>†</sup>	Glucocorticoids
<b>Sun et al. 2020 [39]</b>	China	Mar 19, 2020	Case series	8	2/6	5	Glucocorticoids (Not specified)	3	No glucocorticoids	6.8 (6.5) <sup>†</sup>	Glucocorticoids
<b>Ouldali 2021* [40]</b>	France	Mar 2, 2021	Cohort	96	99/101	64	IVIg (2 g/kg) alone as first-line therapy	32	IVIg (2 g/kg) and methylprednisolone [0.8 to 1 mg/kg every 12 hours (maximum of 30 mg for 12 hours) for 5 days or a bolus of 15 to 30 mg/kg/d of methylprednisolone for 3 days.]	8.6 (4.7-12.1)	IVIg

<b>Belhadjer 2020</b> [41]	France	Dec 8, 2020	Cohort	40	NR	18	IVIG (2g/kg) alone as first-line therapy	22	a combination of IVIG (2g/kg once) and intravenous methylprednisolone (0.8 mg/kg/d for 5 days)	8.6 (6.7-11.2)	IVIG
-------------------------------	--------	----------------	--------	----	----	----	---	----	---	----------------	------

---

\* After propensity score matching; # Mean (Range); § Data of diagnosed patients from authors; I Mean (Standard Deviation); NA: Not Applicable; NR: Not Report

### 3.4.1. Remdesivir

One hundred and twelve patients in 3 single-arm cohort studies [35-37] reported the efficacy and safety of remdesivir in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19. The results from a published study showed (n=8) [35] that 75% of the patients were admitted to the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU), 62.5% were on mechanical ventilation, and 12.5% were on noninvasive ventilation or high-flow oxygen. In another study (n=77) [37], all the patients were diagnosed with severe COVID-19, among which 50.6% were treated with mechanical ventilation and 26.0% with noninvasive ventilation or high-flow oxygen. In another study (n=27) [36], 22% of patients received mechanical ventilation and 26% received noninvasive ventilation or high-flow oxygen. The results from an unpublished study showed that 79% (61/77) of the patients had an underlying disease. The meta-analysis of 104 children and adolescents with COVID-19 who received remdesivir showed that 12.4% (95%CI, 6.1% to 18.8%, very low quality evidence) experienced obesity, 11.4% (95%CI, 3.5 to 19.4%, very low quality evidence) experienced asthma, 6.9% (95%CI, 0.0% to 19.4%, very low quality evidence) experienced immunosuppression/immunologic diseases, 13.3% (95%CI, 6.8% to 19.8%, very low quality evidence) experienced epilepsy, 2.8% (95%CI, 0.0% to 6.0%, very low-quality evidence) experienced sickle cell disease.

The result of the meta-analysis showed that, after the treatment, 37.1% (95%CI, 0.0% to 74.5%, very low-quality evidence) experienced adverse events, like acute kidney injury (19%, 5/27), constipation (15%, 4/27), increased ALT (11%, 3/27), Hyperglycemia (11%, 3/27), Hypertension (11%, 3/27), Pyrexia (11%, 3/27) [36] and Anemia (3%, 2/77) [37]. There were 16.2% (95%CI, 1.8% to 30.5%, very low-quality evidence) of them experienced serious adverse events, 5.9% (95%CI, 1.5% to 10.2%) died, 37.2% (95%CI, 0% to 76.0%, very low-quality evidence) needed extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) or invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV).

### 3.4.2. Glucocorticoids

A retrospective cohort and case series studies [38,39] comprising of 69 children or adolescents (age 7.41±5.08) with severe COVID-19 treated with glucocorticoids were included. There was no statistically significant association between glucocorticoids therapy and mortality (OR= 2.79, 95% CI, 0.13 to 60.87, very low-quality evidence), mechanical ventilation rate (OR = 3.12, 95% CI, 0.80 to 12.08, very low-quality evidence) or the duration of PICU admission (WMD = 2.0, 95% CI, -0.95 to 4.95, very low-quality evidence).

### 3.4.3. IVIG

One cohort study [40] consisting of 96 MIS-C patients reported the effectiveness and safety of IVIG (32 patients were in the IVIG and methylprednisolone group while 64 in the IVIG group after propensity score matching). Patients who received IVIG alone as first-line therapy had a treatment success rate of 62% (treatment failure defined as the persistence of fever two days after introducing first-line therapy or recrudescence of fever within seven days after the first-line therapy). Patients with more severe initial clinical presentation (initial acute left ventricular dysfunction, initial PICU care, and hemodynamic support requirement) received a combination of IVIG and methylprednisolone as first-line therapy. The result showed that IVIG combined with methylprednisolone could decrease the treatment failure (OR=0.25, 95%CI, 0.09 to 0.70, low-quality evidence), second-line treatment (OR=0.19, 95%CI, 0.06 to 0.61, low-quality evidence), hemodynamic support (OR=0.21, 95%CI, 0.06 to 0.76, low-quality evidence), the occurrence of secondary acute left ventricular dysfunction (OR=0.20, 95%CI, 0.06 to 0.66, low-quality evidence), and duration of PICU stay (4 vs. 6,  $p=0.005$ ).

In the other cohort study [41], 22 MIS-C patients received a combination of IVIG (2 g/kg) and methylprednisolone (0.8 mg/kg/d for 5d). They had a shorter recovery time from left ventricle ejection fraction (2.9d vs 5.4 d,  $p=0.002$ ), isovolumic relaxation time (6.4d vs 20.6d,  $p < 0.0001$ ), and duration of PICU stay (3.4d vs 5.3d,  $p < 0.05$ ), in comparison with the 18 patients that received only IVIG (2 g/kg) as first-line therapy (Very low quality evidence).

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Key findings

A total of six cohort studies and one case series study were included in this systematic review. In terms of remdesivir, there was no controlled study to prove its efficacy and safety in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19. Single-arm cohort studies have shown that the incidence of adverse reactions, mortality, and mechanical ventilation rate in patients treated with remdesivir are relatively low. As for glucocorticoids, the meta-analysis results showed no statistically significant difference in the improvement of mortality and mechanical ventilation rate between the intervention and control group. In terms of IVIG, the two included cohort studies showed that for MIS-C patients with more severe clinical symptoms, IVIG combined with methylprednisolone could achieve better clinical efficacy than IVIG alone.

The use of remdesivir in COVID-19 patients is a controversial topic for both adults and children. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of adult patients based on randomized controlled trials showed that patients treated with remdesivir for 5 days had a higher rate of clinical improvement compared with placebo [OR = 1.68 (95% CI 1.18–12.40)]. The rate of discharge [10-day remdesivir versus control: OR = 1.32 (95% CI 1.09–1.60); 5-day remdesivir versus control: OR = 1.73 (95% CI 1.28–2.35)] and recovery [10-day remdesivir versus control: OR = 1.29 (95% CI 1.03–1.60); 5-day remdesivir versus control: OR = 1.80 (95% CI 1.31–2.48)] of patients treated for 5 and 10 days were higher than placebo. Nevertheless, there was no significant improvement in mortality [42]. Other systematic reviews of adult patients have reached similar conclusions [43]. Based on this, on October 22, 2020, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved Veklury (remdesivir) for the treatment of COVID-19 in children and adolescents aged at least 12 years and weighing at least 40 kg requiring hospitalization [44]. It also approved an emergency use authorization of remdesivir to treat suspected or laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 in hospitalized pediatric patients weighing at least 3.5 kg but being either aged less than 12 years or weighing less than 40 kg [45]. The results of this systematic review showed that most of the children and adolescents included in this study had severe or underlying diseases, and the adverse events, mechanical ventilation rate, and mortality of the patients after treatment with remdesivir were low, but there was a lack of control group; thus, the quality of evidence was low. As of April 26, 2021, 24 clinical studies included children with COVID-19 treated with remdesivir and registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, but few studies focused only on children or adolescents [46].

The effectiveness of glucocorticoids in the treatment of adult patients with COVID-19 has been confirmed. The RECOVERY (The Randomized Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy) Collaborative Group published an RCT on The New England Journal of Medicine, and the results of the study showed that among patients hospitalized with COVID-19, the use of dexamethasone resulted in lower 28-days mortality [9]. The WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) working group published a systematic review based on seven RCTs. The results showed that systemic glucocorticoids administered to critically ill COVID-19 patients were associated with 28-days lower mortality than usual care or placebo [47]. Based on the systematic review evidence, the WHO developed a living guideline on glucocorticoids to recommend systemic glucocorticoids in treating patients with severe COVID-19 [12]. The recommendation was intended for the average patient population. However, the evidence that supported the recommendation was unclear for the under-represented population, such as children in the considered trials, which supported the meta-analysis of the systematic review. We have also searched ClinicalTrials.gov to find registered clinical trials on the effectiveness of glucocorticoids in the treatment of COVID-19. No registered clinical trials have included or specifically targeted children or adolescents except for the RECOVERY trial. Most children with COVID-19 have only mild symptoms [5,48], so it may be challenging to recruit critically ill children or adolescents to participate in clinical trials. The two

studies included in this systematic review were observational studies with a small sample [38,39] which found that glucocorticoids could not reduce the death rate in children or adolescents with critical COVID-19. Nevertheless, high-quality randomized controlled trials are recommended to confirm the effectiveness of glucocorticoids in the treatment of critically ill children or adolescents with COVID-19.

MIS-C is a unique complication in children and adolescents with COVID-19, which has similar characteristics to those of Kawasaki disease. Admittedly, IVIG generally produces anti-inflammatory effects, mitigates coronary artery abnormalities, and serves as first-line therapy of Kawasaki disease [49]. MIS-C is theorized to be a delayed immunological response after SARS-CoV-2 infection, but based on the limited evidence, the immunopathology of MIS-C remains a challenge [50]. Several MIS-C guidelines are published, and the treatment therapy is based chiefly on Kawasaki disease, where IVIG is recommended empirically as the first-line treatment [46-48]. Besides, IVIG combined with glucocorticoids is also suggested as adjuvant therapy for severe patients or intensive therapy for patients with refractory diseases [51]. Two cohort studies included in this study showed that IVIG combined with glucocorticoids had better efficacy in MIS-C treatment than IVIG alone. In one cohort study, IVIG combined with glucocorticoids was associated with greater efficacy and safety in children with more severe symptoms than IVIG alone. The result is in agreement with the guideline recommendation of the use of IVIG in children and adolescents with COVID-19. Current guidelines also indicate a lack of high-quality studies comparing IVIG with glucocorticoids in MIS-C [51,54]. Although the two cohort studies included in this study were of high quality, the results could not be combined due to the difference in their outcome indicators. As of April 26, 2021, 11 MIS-C clinical studies were registered on ClinicalTrials.gov, but there no study investigated the efficacy of IVIG as a therapeutic agent [55].

#### **4.2. Strengths and limitations**

This study is the first systematic review accessing the remdesivir, glucocorticoids and IVIG in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19. The study highlights the current status of evidence, identifies research gaps and proffer recommendations for developing clinical practice guidelines in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19. However, there are also some limitations: 1) All the studies using remdesivir in treating children with were low-quality single-arm cohort studies; thus, its efficacy and safety could not be clearly ascertained. 2) Due to the small sample size in the studies using glucocorticoids as treatment included in the study, the results of meta-analysis may be biased to some extent, and 3) Quantitative analysis of studies on the treatment of MIS-C by IVIG was not feasible due to the heterogeneity of their outcome indicators.

#### **4.3. Further suggestions**

Based on the results of this systematic review, we recommend 1) high-quality randomized controlled trials of potentially effective drugs for children with COVID-19; 2) develop better guidelines based on substantial current evidence, provide a timely guide for clinical workers, and update them in real-time according to the evidence situation.

### **5. Conclusion**

Overall, the current evidence in the included studies is insignificant and of low quality, which does not adequately demonstrate the effectiveness and safety of using remdesivir, glucocorticoids, and IVIG in treating children and adolescents with COVID-19 or MIS-C. Therefore, it is recommended to conduct high-quality randomized controlled trials to provide substantial evidence for the development of guidelines.

## 6. Acknowledgments

### *Funding*

This work was supported by grants from the National Clinical Research Center for Child Health and Disorders (Children's Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China) (grant number NCRCCHD-2020-EP-01); special funding for prevention and control of emergency of COVID-19 from Key Laboratory of Evidence-Based Medicine and Knowledge Translation of Gansu Province (grant number No. GSEBMKT-2020YJ01); The Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (lzujbky-2020-sp14).

### *Authorship*

All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published.

### *Author contributions*

Yaolong Chen, Enmei Liu, Zhengxiu Luo, Zijun Wang, Siya Zhao and Yuyi Tang contributed to the idea for the article. Zijun Wang, Siya Zhao, Yuyi, Zhili Wang, Qianling Shi, Lidan Gan, Shuai Peng and Weiguo Li performed the literature search data selection, data collection and study evaluation. Xiangyang Dang participated in the data analysis. Rafael González Cortés provided the data of one of the include study. Zijun Wang, Siya Zhao and Yuyi Tang drafted the manuscript. Yaolong Chen, Enmei Liu, Zhengxiu Luo, Qi Zhou, Qinyuan Li and Joy James Mafiana reviewed and provided feedback on the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

### *Disclosures*

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form, and have no conflicts of interest to declare.

### *Compliance with ethics guidelines*

This article is based on previously conducted studies and does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

### *Data Availability*

The datasets used and analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

## References

- 1 Serge P. J. M. Horbach. Pandemic publishing: Medical journals strongly speed up their publication process for COVID-19. *Quantitative Science Studies*. 2020;1(3):1056-67.
- 2 Norris SL. Meeting public health needs in emergencies-World Health Organization guidelines. *J Evid Based Med* 2018;11(3):133-5.
- 3 Wadaa-Allah A, Emhamed MS, Sadeq MA, et al. Efficacy of the current investigational drugs for the treatment of COVID-19: a scoping review. *Ann Med*. 2021;53(1):318-34.
- 4 Wang Z, Zhou Q, Wang C, et al. Clinical characteristics of children with COVID-19: a rapid review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(10):620.
- 5 Shen K, Yang Y, Wang T, et al. Diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of 2019 novel coronavirus infection in children: experts' consensus statement. *World J Pediatr*. 2020;16(3):223-31.
- 6 Wang H. To investigate the application value of remdesivir in the treatment of COVID-19 patients. *J Intern Intensive Med*. 2020;26(06):513-5+528.
- 7 Siemieniuk R, Rochweg B, Agoritsas T, et al. A living WHO guideline on drugs for covid-19. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3379.
- 8 Chiotos K, Hayes M, Kimberlin DW, et al. Multicenter Interim Guidance on Use of Antivirals for Children With Coronavirus Disease 2019/Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc*. 2021;10(1):34-48.
- 9 RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Lim WS, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(8):693-704.
- 10 Carsana L, Sonzogni A, Nasr A, et al. Pulmonary post-mortem findings in a series of COVID-19 cases from northern Italy: a two-centre descriptive study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(10):1135-40.
- 11 World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Dexamethasone. Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/q-a-dexamethasone-and-covid-19>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 12 World Health Organization. Corticosteroids for COVID-19: living guidance. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/334125>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 13 McCrindle BW, Rowley AH, Newburger JW, et al. Diagnosis, Treatment, and Long-Term Management of Kawasaki Disease: A Scientific Statement for Health Professionals From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;135(17):e927-99.
- 14 World Health Organization. Multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children and adolescents with COVID-19. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-and-adolescents-with-covid-19>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 15 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Emergency preparedness and response: health alert network. Available from: <https://emergency.cdc.gov/han/2020/han00432.asp>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 16 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. Guidance: paediatric multisystem inflammatory syndrome temporally associated with COVID-19. Available from: <https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2020-05/COVID-19-Paediatric-multisystem-%20inflammatory%20syndrome-20200501.pdf> (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 17 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome (MIS-C). Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mis-c/>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 18 Hennon TR, Penque MD, Abdul-Aziz R, et al. COVID-19 associated Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C) guidelines; a Western New York approach. *Prog Pediatr Cardiol*. 2020;101232.
- 19 Furukawa TA, Barbui C, Cipriani A, Brambilla P, Watanabe N. Imputing missing standard deviations in



- meta-analyses can provide accurate results. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2006;59(1):7-10.
- 20 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2011;343:d5928.
  - 21 Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ.* 2016;355:i4919.
  - 22 Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. Newcastle–Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale--Case Control Studies. Available from: [http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp](http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp). (accessed 24 June 2020).
  - 23 Zhang Y, Huang L, Wang D, Ren P, Hong Q, Kang D. The ROBINS-I and the NOS had similar reliability but differed in applicability: A random sampling observational studies of systematic reviews/meta-analysis. *J Evid Based Med.* 2021;14(2):112-22.
  - 24 Guo B, Moga C, Harstall C, Schopflocher D. A principal component analysis is conducted for a case series quality appraisal checklist. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2016;69:199-207.e2.
  - 25 DerSimonian R, Kacker R. Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. *Contemp Clin Trials.* 2007;28:105-14.
  - 26 Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.0 (updated July 2019). Cochrane. 2019. Available online: [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook). (accessed 24 June 2020).
  - 27 Guyatt G, Oxman A D, Akl E A, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(4): 383-94.
  - 28 GRADEpro G D T. GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software]. McMaster University, 2015 (developed by Evidence Prime, Inc.). Available from: [www.grade.org](http://www.grade.org). (accessed 24 June 2020).
  - 29 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Vist G, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence—study limitations (risk of bias). *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(4):407-15.
  - 30 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Montori V, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidence—publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(12):1277-82.
  - 31 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality of evidence—imprecision. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(12):1283-93.
  - 32 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence—inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(12): 1294-302.
  - 33 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence—indirectness. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(12):1303-10.
  - 34 Guyatt G H, Oxman A D, Sultan S, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(12):1311-6.
  - 35 Méndez-Echevarría A, Pérez-Martínez A, Gonzalez Del Valle L, et al. Compassionate use of remdesivir in children with COVID-19. *Eur J Pediatr.* 2021;180(4):1317-22.
  - 36 Muñoz F, Müller W, Ahmed A et al. Safety and Efficacy of Remdesivir in a Pediatric COVID-19 Population. *Virtual CROI 2021*, March 6–10, 2021.
  - 37 Goldman DL, Aldrich ML, Hagmann SHF, et al. Compassionate Use of Remdesivir in Children With Severe COVID-19. *Pediatrics.* 2021;147(5):e2020047803.
  - 38 García-Salido A, de Carlos Vicente JC, Belda Hofheinz S, et al. Severe manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 in children and adolescents: from COVID-19 pneumonia to multisystem inflammatory syndrome: a multicentre study in pediatric intensive care units in Spain. *Crit Care.* 2020;24(1):666.
  - 39 Sun D, Li H, Lu XX, et al. Clinical features of severe pediatric patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan: a single center's observational study. *World J Pediatr.* 2020;16(3):251-9.

- 40 Ouldali N, Toubiana J, Antona D, et al. Association of Intravenous Immunoglobulins Plus Methylprednisolone vs Immunoglobulins Alone With Course of Fever in Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children. *JAMA*. 2021;325(9):855-64.
- 41 Belhadjer Z, Auriau J, Méot M, et al. Addition of Corticosteroids to Immunoglobulins Is Associated With Recovery of Cardiac Function in Multi-Inflammatory Syndrome in Children. *Circulation*. 2020;142(23):2282-4.
- 42 Lai CC, Chen CH, Wang CY, Chen KH, Wang YH, Hsueh PR. Clinical efficacy and safety of remdesivir in patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2021;dkab093.
- 43 Kaka AS, MacDonald R, Greer N, et al. Major Update: Remdesivir for Adults With COVID-19 : A Living Systematic Review and Meta-analysis for the American College of Physicians Practice Points. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;M20-8148.
- 44 U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION. FDA Approves First Treatment for COVID-19. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-treatment-covid-19>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 45 U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION. Veklury (remdesivir) EUA Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers, updated 10/22/20. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/media/137566/download>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 46 ClinicalTrials.gov. Available from: [https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=COVID-19&term=remdesivir&type=&rslt=&age\\_v=&age=0&gndr=&intr=&titles=&outc=&spons=&lead=&id=&cntry=&state=&city=&dist=&locn=&rsub=&strd\\_s=&strd\\_e=&pred\\_s=&pred\\_e=&sfpd\\_s=&sfpd\\_e=&rfpd\\_s=&rfpd\\_e=&lupd\\_s=&lupd\\_e=&sort=](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=COVID-19&term=remdesivir&type=&rslt=&age_v=&age=0&gndr=&intr=&titles=&outc=&spons=&lead=&id=&cntry=&state=&city=&dist=&locn=&rsub=&strd_s=&strd_e=&pred_s=&pred_e=&sfpd_s=&sfpd_e=&rfpd_s=&rfpd_e=&lupd_s=&lupd_e=&sort=) (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 47 WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) Working Group, Sterne JAC, Murthy S, et al. Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2020;324(13):1330-41.
- 48 Ding Y, Yan H, Guo W. Clinical Characteristics of Children With COVID-19: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Pediatr*. 2020;8:431.
- 49 McCrindle BW, Rowley AH, Newburger JW, et al. Diagnosis, Treatment, and Long-Term Management of Kawasaki Disease: A Scientific Statement for Health Professionals From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;135(17):e927-99.
- 50 Martinez OM, Bridges ND, Goldmuntz E, Pascual V. The immune roadmap for understanding multi-system inflammatory syndrome in children: opportunities and challenges. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(12):1819-1824.
- 51 Henderson LA, Canna SW, Friedman KG, et al. American College of Rheumatology Clinical Guidance for Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children Associated With SARS-CoV-2 and Hyperinflammation in Pediatric COVID-19: Version 2. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2021;73(4):e13-e29.
- 52 Harwood R, Allin B, Jones CE, et al. A national consensus management pathway for paediatric inflammatory multisystem syndrome temporally associated with COVID-19 (PIMS-TS): results of a national Delphi process. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2021;5(2):133-41.
- 53 American Academy of Pediatrics. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C) Interim Guidance. Available from: <https://services.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-coronavirus-covid-19-infections/clinical-guidance/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-mis-c-interim-guidance/>. (accessed 24 June 2020).
- 54 Cattalini M, Taddio A, Bracaglia C, et al. Childhood multisystem inflammatory syndrome associated with COVID-19 (MIS-C): a diagnostic and treatment guidance from the Rheumatology Study Group of the Italian Society of Pediatrics. *Ital J Pediatr*. 2021;47(1):24.

55 ClinicalTrials.gov. Available from: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=MIS-C&term=&cntry=&state=&city=&dist=>.(accessed 24 June 2020).