

1 **Poor evidence for an effect of tecovirimat in shortening recovery time in hospitalized mpox**  
2 **cases from real-world data**

3  
4 Mazzotta V\*<sup>§ 1-2</sup>, Cozzi-Lepri A<sup>§ 3</sup>, Lanini S<sup>1</sup>, Mondì A<sup>1</sup>, Carletti F<sup>4</sup>, Tavelli A<sup>5</sup>, Gagliardini R<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Vita S<sup>1</sup>, Pinnetti C<sup>1</sup>, Aguglia C<sup>1</sup>, Faccendini P<sup>6</sup>, Colavita F<sup>4</sup>, Faraglia F<sup>1</sup>, Beccacece A<sup>1</sup>, Paulicelli  
6 J<sup>1</sup>, Girardi E<sup>7</sup>, Nicastrì E<sup>1</sup>, Vaia F<sup>8</sup>, Maggi F<sup>4</sup>, Antinori A<sup>1</sup>.

7  
8 <sup>1</sup>Clinical and Research Infectious Diseases Department, National Institute for Infectious Diseases  
9 Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy;

10 <sup>2</sup>PhD course in Microbiology, Immunology, Infectious Diseases, and Transplants (MIMIT),  
11 University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy;

12 <sup>3</sup>Centre for Clinical Research, Epidemiology, Modelling, and Evaluation (CREME), Institute for  
13 Global Health, UCL, London, UK;

14 <sup>4</sup>Laboratory of Virology, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS,  
15 Rome, Italy;

16 <sup>5</sup>Clinic of Infectious Diseases, Department of Health Sciences, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo,  
17 University of Milan, Italy;

18 <sup>6</sup>Pharmacy Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome,  
19 Italy;

20 <sup>7</sup>Scientific Direction, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome,  
21 Italy;

22 <sup>8</sup>General Direction, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome,  
23 Italy.

24  
25 <sup>§</sup> These authors equally contributed

26  
27 \*Corresponding Author:

28 Valentina Mazzotta, MD

29  ORCID: 0000-0002-0240-7504

30 Clinical and Research Infectious Diseases Department, National Institute for Infectious Diseases  
31 Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS,

32 Via Portuense 292, 00149 Rome, Italy

33 Phone: +39 06 55170546

34 Fax: +39 06 55170477

35 e-mail: valentina.mazzotta@inmi.it

## 36 **Abstract**

37 **Objectives** To assess the effectiveness of tecovirimat (TPOXX) for treating mpox in terms of  
38 difference in healing time and extent of viral clearance.

39 **Design** Emulation of a target trial based on observational data.

40 **Setting** Italy

41 **Participants** Forty-one men hospitalized for mpox as of September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

42 **Main outcome measures** Main outcome was the time to clinical recovery. Secondary outcome was  
43 the variation in viral load in the upper respiratory tract (URT) after treatment.

44 **Results** The median time from symptoms onset to hospital admission and to initiation of TPOXX  
45 was 4 days (IQR 2-6) and 10 days (IQR 8-11), respectively. Fifteen patients completed a course of  
46 therapy. No deaths were observed; the overall median healing time was 21 days (IQR 17-26). We  
47 found no evidence for a significant improvement in recovery time in treated vs. untreated patients,  
48 with an estimated mean of 14.7 days for both groups. A subset of 13 patients had URT samples at  
49 T1 (median of 5 days (IQR 3-7) from symptoms onset) and T2 (median 7 days (IQR 7-9) from T1).  
50 Overall, mean viral load was 4.65 (0.30) vs. 4.91 (0.35) (log<sub>2</sub> scale of cycle threshold) at T1 and  
51 T2, respectively. In the unadjusted analysis, variation over T1-T2 was lower in the treated 0.13 log<sub>2</sub>  
52 (SD=0.53) vs. untreated 0.37 (0.50), although not statistically significant (unpaired t-test p=0.41).  
53 After controlling for confounding, there was no evidence for a difference in the potential changes  
54 over T1-T2 by treatment arm, and our estimate of the average treatment effect (ATE) was consistent  
55 with no difference by treatment group, although with large 95% CI around these estimates.

56 **Conclusions** Our analysis seems to exclude a clinically important effect of TPOXX in hospitalized  
57 mpox patients when compared to no treatment. These data are one of the valuable currently  
58 available sources of evidence to guide treatment decisions in patients hospitalized with TPOXX.  
59 Pending more robust data from randomized comparisons, the use of TPOXX should be restricted to  
60 the clinical trials setting.

61 **Trial registration** – “MpoxCohort” observational study protocol: approval number 40z, Register of  
62 Non-Covid Trials 2022.

63

64

## 65 **Introduction**

66 On July 23, 2022, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared mpox to be a Public Health  
67 Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) <sup>[1]</sup>. Among the 85,159 mpox confirmed cases  
68 registered worldwide as of January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2023, only 88 deaths occurred<sup>[2]</sup>, and usually, the disease  
69 improved without any antiviral treatment. However, complications leading to hospitalization may  
70 occur, and the illness may last for several weeks, during which patients are forced into isolation.

71 The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) suggested to consider mpox treatment in  
72 people with severe disease or involvement of anatomic areas, which might result in serious  
73 sequelae, or in immunocompromised people or at high risk for severe disease<sup>[3]</sup>. Moreover, the  
74 recommended timing for the start of therapy is early after onset.

75 However, there are currently no proven therapeutics to shorten healing times in mpox. Tecovirimat  
76 (TPOXX) was authorized in USA<sup>[4]</sup> and EU<sup>[5]</sup> for use against mpox based on promising results from  
77 initial studies in animals<sup>[6]</sup> and evidence of safety in healthy human volunteers<sup>[7]</sup>; TPOXX is also  
78 the first choice treatment for mpox suggested by CDC<sup>[3]</sup>. In recent series, oral TPOXX was reported  
79 as safe and well tolerated<sup>[8-13]</sup>, no worsening was observed in treated patients, and subjective  
80 improvement was reported after a median time of 3 days after treatment. However, the lack of a  
81 control group made it difficult to assess treatment effectiveness, and the limited supply did not  
82 allow the early use of TPOXX. Furthermore, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are still  
83 ongoing<sup>[14-16]</sup>, and there is an urgent need for robust evidence in order to guide clinical decision-  
84 making<sup>[17]</sup>. Nevertheless, the rapidly decreasing number of mpox cases worldwide will probably not  
85 allow RCTs to be concluded soon.

86 Our study aimed to assess the difference in healing time and extent of viral clearance between  
87 patients treated and untreated with tecovirimat using observational data to emulate a hypothetical  
88 target trial.

## 89 **Methods**

### 90 *Study Population*

91 We included all adult patients with laboratory-confirmed mpox admitted at the Lazzaro Spallanzani  
92 National Institute for Infectious Diseases (INMI; Rome, Italy) from May 19<sup>th</sup> to September 29<sup>th</sup> and  
93 hospitalized for mpox.

94 Demographic, epidemiological, and clinical characteristics were collected at the time of diagnosis,  
95 and diagnostic testing for the mpox virus (MPXV) was performed.

96 The patients treated with TPOXX received a course of 600 mg twice daily for 14 days: the decision  
97 regarding treatments was based on international medical consensus and the availability of drugs.  
98

99 Participants were followed-up for at least 30 days from symptoms onset until complete clinical  
100 recovery or last clinical follow-up.

101 Data on MPXV viral load in samples collected during the hospitalization from upper respiratory  
102 tract (URT), including oropharyngeal swabs and saliva, were recorded. Viral DNA was extracted  
103 by the automatic extractor QIASymphony (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), and amplified using the real-  
104 time PCR method targeting the tumor necrosis factor receptor gene, G2R. MPXV DNA  
105 concentration was measured using cycle threshold (Ct) values of the MPXV-specific PCR.

106 All patients provided written informed consent to participate in the study. The study was approved  
107 by the Ethical Committee of the Lazzaro Spallanzani Institute (MpoxCohort protocol: “*Studio di*  
108 *coorte osservazionale monocentrica su soggetti che afferiscono per sospetto clinico o*  
109 *epidemiologico di malattia del vaiolo delle scimmie (Monkeypox)*”; approval number 40z, Register  
110 of Non-Covid Trials 2022).

111

### 112 Statistical analysis

113 Because the time of symptom onset did not coincide with the date of treatment initiation, to assess  
114 the effectiveness of TPOXX, in our target population, we used a counterfactual framework  
115 accounting for immortal time bias.

116 The primary endpoint for the comparison between treated and untreated patients was the time from  
117 the date of symptom onset to achieving complete clinical recovery by day 21, defined as the healing  
118 of skin and mucosal lesions. Our secondary endpoint was the variation in Ct values in URT from a  
119 median of 6 days from the date of symptom onset (T1) to a median of 5 days after T1 (T2).

120 For the primary endpoint analysis, we aimed to emulate a parallel trial design. The treatment  
121 strategies were defined as to start or not to start TPOXX within 10 days from symptoms onset; this  
122 interval has been consequently chosen as the grace period in the analysis. The per-protocol effect of  
123 TPOXX initiation within 10 days of clinical onset on the primary outcome was quantified by the  
124 differences between strategies in (i) not achieving clinical recovery by day 21 (failure) and (ii)  
125 restricted mean survival times (survival time difference over a 21-days window)<sup>[18]</sup>. We assumed  
126 that at hospital admission all participants were equally likely to be offered treatment with TPOXX.

127 We created two clones of each participant, with one clone allocated to each strategy, hence  
128 doubling the size of our dataset. The study arms in this newly created pseudo-population were,  
129 therefore, identical with respect to demographics and clinical characteristics at the time of entering  
130 the hospital, thus minimising confounding bias at baseline. In each arm, participants’ follow-up  
131 times have been censored when their treatment was no longer compatible with the treatment  
132 strategy for the arm (e.g. when there was a deviation from the planned protocol). In our analysis,

133 this occurred for: (i) participants in the no TPOXX arm (control) who received TPOXX within 10  
134 days from symptoms onset and whose follow-up was censored at their time of starting TPOXX and  
135 (ii) participants in the treated arm who did not receive TPOXX within 10 days from symptoms  
136 onset and whose follow-up was censored at 10 days (including participants who started TPOXX  
137 after 10 days). For each participant, clinical recovery by day 21 (if achieved at all) was attributed to  
138 the arm in which the participant was still uncensored at the time of the event (i.e., the arm the  
139 participant is compliant with). Because there are common causes of the probability of treatment  
140 initiation and that of clinical recovery, the artificial censoring introduced by cloning is usually  
141 informative. For the comparison of interest, we identified the following potential confounders: age,  
142 HIV status, and disease severity, defined as the presence of more than 20 skin lesions and/or  
143 involvement of anatomic areas which might result in serious sequelae (e.g., proctitis,  
144 pharyngotonsillitis, or ocular involvement). We use inverse probability of censoring weights to  
145 control for the cloning-induced informative censoring bias. The 95% CIs were calculated using 100  
146 bootstrap replicates.

147 In the analysis of the secondary endpoint (Ct variation over time), in order to control for immortal  
148 time bias, we used a ‘matching on time’ type of analysis<sup>[19]</sup>. In this approach, participants who  
149 initiated TPOXX after hospitalisation were matched to those who did not receive TPOXX and were  
150 followed-up for the same amount of time from the date of symptom onset. For example, if a  
151 participant started TPOXX 5 days after the date of symptom onset (T1) and had a Ct value  
152 measured at T1, the patient was matched to another participant who had not received TPOXX by 5  
153 days who also had a Ct value measured at T1, and both were followed-up from T1 onwards until a  
154 second time point (T2) in which a second Ct value was available. We then compared the Ct  
155 variation over T1-T2 (in the log<sub>2</sub> scale), again by emulating a parallel trial in which TPOXX was  
156 the intervention of interest. The average causal effect of TPOXX was estimated using marginal  
157 models in which, to control for the effects of age and disease severity, we modelled both the  
158 exposure (through inverse probability weighting) and the outcome (via regression) or both (doubly  
159 robust). This secondary endpoint analysis was restricted to participants with a Ct value from  
160 samples collected from URT available at T1 and T2, and with a T1 value <35. We also conducted a  
161 sensitivity analysis controlling for age and HIV status (numerical problems prevented the  
162 adjustment for all 3 identified confounders at the same time in this analysis).

163

## 164 **Results**

165 Forty-one hospitalized subjects with mpox were included as of September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Among the 41  
166 patients enrolled, 15 completed a course of TPOXX therapy. In Table 1 main characteristics of

167 patients according to TPOXX exposure were reported. All participants were male, and 95% were  
168 self-reported as men who had sex with men. Median age was 35 years (IQR 32-39), and 78% were  
169 Caucasian. Only 3 (7.3%) received smallpox vaccine during childhood. Fifteen (36.6%) patients  
170 were living with HIV and 17% were HIV negative and received pre-exposure prophylaxis with  
171 antiretrovirals; median CD4 cells count in HIV infected was 684 cell/mm<sup>3</sup> (IQR 471, 884), with no  
172 evidence for a difference between TPOXX treated and untreated individuals (Table 1). Overall,  
173 95% of patients had systemic symptoms, and 25 (61%) were classified as having severe disease; 18  
174 (43.9%) had more than 10 mpox cutaneous lesions and main organ disease localizations were  
175 proctitis (26.8%), and pharyngotonsillitis (22%). In the original cohort, before cloning took place,  
176 the median time from symptoms onset to hospital admission was 4 days (IQR 2-6). The main  
177 reasons for hospitalization and treatment were mucosal inflammation and/or superinfection of the  
178 lesions and/or management of severe pain due to the lesions. The median time from symptoms  
179 onset to initiation of TPOXX was 10 days (IQR 8-11). No deaths were observed, and the overall  
180 median time for clinical recovery was 21 days (IQR 17-26).

181 Our emulation of a parallel trial design analysis showed that, although the risk of 21-day failure was  
182 4.1% lower in participants who were treated with TPOXX vs. those who remained untreated, the  
183 95% CI was large and did not exclude benefit or harm of treatment. Similarly, no significant  
184 improvement in recovery time was observed in treated patients, with a mean of 14.7 days estimated  
185 for both the treated and untreated groups (Table 2).

186 A total of 122 URT samples were collected from 15 treated and 19 untreated patients. Among these,  
187 a subset of 13 patients (6 treated and 7 untreated) who had a T1 value <35 and had a second sample  
188 at a following time T2, were included in the analysis. Main characteristics of these 13 patients are  
189 shown in Supplementary Table 1 and were similar to those of the full cohort. T1 was a median  
190 (IQR) of 5 days (3-7) from the date of onset of symptoms, and T2 was 7 days (7-9) from T1. As a  
191 consequence of the matching, the timing of T1 and T2 was similar in treated and untreated.  
192 Overall, mean Ct values were 25.6 (SD 5.05) and 30.7 (SD 6.6) in the raw scale and 4.65 (0.30) vs.  
193 4.91 (0.35) in the log<sub>2</sub> scale at T1 and T2, respectively. The variation over T1-T2 is expressed as  
194 the value at T2 minus the value at T1 so positive changes indicate that the participants had a  
195 decrease in viral load at T2 (increase in Ct value). In the unadjusted analysis, such increase was  
196 lower in the treated 0.13 log<sub>2</sub> (0.53) vs. untreated 0.37 (0.50) suggesting poor virological potency of  
197 treatment, although not statistically significant (unpaired t-test p=0.41). Results were confirmed by  
198 the trial emulation analysis which, after controlling for confounding, showed no evidence for a  
199 difference in the potential changes over T1-T2 by treatment arm and our estimate of the average

200 treatment effect (ATE) was consistent with no difference by treatment group, again with large 95%  
201 CI around these estimates.

202

203

## 204 **Discussion**

205 Our trial emulation analysis failed to show a clinical benefit of TPOXX on recovery time or an  
206 effect on viral replication in participants who were hospitalized with mpox. The emulation analysis  
207 was based on a couple of firm points regarding the choice of the primary outcome, and target  
208 population used. At this point in time, given the low case fatality rate of mpox and the required  
209 isolation during the presence of active skin lesions, time to recovery could be considered as the  
210 primary clinical outcome to be used also in randomized trials<sup>[16]</sup>. our target trial population was  
211 restricted to hospitalized patients because the use of TPOXX is currently only suggested for persons  
212 with severe mpox<sup>[3]</sup>. In absence of the results from randomized studies our results represent a  
213 valuable source of evidence for the effectiveness of TPOXX in this setting.

214 Similarly to other disease models<sup>[20-22]</sup>, characterizing the early stage of infection as the viral  
215 response phase, also for mpox, a timely initiation of TPOXX is believed to be critical for the  
216 effectiveness of the treatment. This is because TPOXX is an antiviral and it is reasonable to assume  
217 that a prompt reduction in viral replication would lead to quicker clinical recovery.

218 Our previous, uncontrolled, descriptive data on treated mpox patients showed a progressive decline  
219 in MPXV viral load in the course of antiviral treatment<sup>[10]</sup>; nevertheless, in other cohorts<sup>[23-24]</sup> of  
220 untreated patients, viral shedding also occurred mainly during the first two weeks of the disease  
221 after which it naturally declined. In our present analysis, there was no evidence for a difference in  
222 viral load reduction after an average of 12 days from the date of symptoms onset when comparing  
223 treated versus untreated mpox patients after controlling for potential immortal and confounding  
224 bias.

225 Our analysis has a number of limitations. First of all, treatment was not randomly allocated and was  
226 initiated a number of days after the date of clinical onset/hospitalization. The delay in treatment  
227 initiation was due, in first instance, to the fact that hospitalization typically occurred several days  
228 after clinical onset. In addition, once the patient was in the hospital, treatment initiation could have  
229 been further delayed by limited drug availability for two main reasons: i) the drug is typically  
230 available only for large stocks, and our single-center study has limited sample size; ii) the high cost  
231 of the drug. Indeed, in our cohort, the average delay in starting treatment was 10 days after the date  
232 of clinical onset. This is consistent with the data of other similar reports showing an average delay  
233 of 7-21 days for treatment initiation after hospitalization<sup>[8-10-13]</sup>. This delay in treatment initiation

234 appeared to have led to an artificial beneficial effect of TPOXX in the original cohort analysis,  
235 which indeed showed a larger difference between arms for the main outcomes of risk of failure by  
236 day 21 and length of clinical recovery. However, immortal time and confounding bias were  
237 minimized by our cloning and weighting approach to analysis, which showed a largely attenuated  
238 difference by study arm. In addition, by using a fixed grace period of 10 days for treatment  
239 initiation, our analysis cannot address the question of whether greater effectiveness of TPOXX  
240 might be achieved by, for example, initiating therapy earlier.

241 Second, our study, especially for the analysis of the virological endpoint, has a very limited sample  
242 size and, consequently had low statistical power to detect a difference between arms. Although  
243 there seems to be no evidence for a difference by arm from looking at our point estimates, there was  
244 a large uncertainty around the estimates, and both benefit and harm could not be excluded with 95%  
245 confidence. Third, URT sample collection and storage varied by participants and over time, and  
246 therefore the analysis of the virological endpoint could be conducted only on a small subset of the  
247 study population. However, the selection appeared to be fairly random, and the characteristics of the  
248 included population were similar to those of the whole cohort. Last but not least, as usual when  
249 using observational data, we cannot rule out unmeasured confounding bias.

250 In conclusion, our analysis seems to be able to exclude a clinically important effect of TPOXX in  
251 hospitalized mpox patients when compared to no treatment. Despite all the mentioned limitations,  
252 our careful analysis of observational data represents one of the valuable current sources of evidence  
253 to guide clinical decisions. In light of the fact that most patients seem to recover after a short  
254 clinical course of the disease, although a proper cost-effectiveness analysis needs to be conducted,  
255 our results, together with the high cost of the drug, appear to suggest a low cost-effectiveness of  
256 TPOXX for the treatment of mpox. For these reasons, while awaiting more solid data coming from  
257 randomized comparisons, we believe that the use of TPOXX should be restricted to patients  
258 enrolled in clinical trials.



259 **Contributors**

260 VM, ACL, and AA contributed to the study concept and design, analysis, and interpretation of data.

261 SL contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

262 AT, CA, JP, and AB acquired the data. VM and ACL drafted the manuscript. ACL did the statistical

263 analysis. AM, CP, RG, SV, and FF reviewed the manuscript. FC, FCo, and FM were responsible for

264 the virological data. VM and AA are guarantors. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

265 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others

266 meeting the criteria have been omitted.

267

268 **Ethical statement**

269 Data were recorded as part of routine activities and from database of the observational study

270 approved by the Ethical Committee of the Lazzaro Spallanzani Institute (MpoxCohort protocol:

271 "*Studio di coorte osservazionale monocentrica su soggetti che afferiscono per sospetto clinico o*

272 *epidemiologico di malattia del vaiolo delle scimmie (Monkeypox)*"; approval number 40z, Register

273 of Non-Covid Trials 2022). Data have been analysed anonymously.

274 **Funding statement**

275 Funds from the Italian Ministry of Health to INMI Spallanzani, Ricerca Corrente Linea 1 and 2.

276 **Conflicts of interests**

277 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-](http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/)

278 interest/ and declare no conflict of interest for the present study.

279• The corresponding author (CC) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent

280 account of the study being reported, no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any

281 discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

282 **Acknowledgments**

283 We acknowledge all the participants, nursing staff and the *INMI Mpox Study Group*: Isabella

284 Abbate, Alessandro Agresta, Camilla Aguglia, Alessandra Amendola, Andrea Antinori, Francesco

285 Baldini, Tommaso Ascoli Bartoli, Alessia Beccacece, Rita Bellagamba, Giulia Berno, Aurora

286 Bettini, Nazario Bevilacqua, Licia Bordi, Marta Camici, Priscilla Caputi, Fabrizio Carletti, Rita

287 Casetti, Angela Corpolongo, Stefania Cicalini, Eleonora Cimini, Francesca Colavita, Alessandra

288 D'Abramo, Angela D'Urso, Gabriella De Carli, Patrizia De Marco, Federico De Zottis, Silvia Di

289 Bari, Lavinia Fabeni, Francesca Faraglia, Valeria Ferraioli, Carla Fontana, Federica Forbici,

290 Concetta Maria Fusco, Marisa Fusto, Roberta Gagliardini, Anna Rosa Garbuglia, Saba

291 Gebremeskel Teklé, Maria Letizia Giancola, Giuseppina Giannico, Simona Gili, Emanuela  
292 Giombini, Enrico Girardi, Giulia Gramigna, Germana Grassi, Elisabetta Grilli, Susanna Grisetti,  
293 Cesare Ernesto Maria Gruber, Eleonora Lalle, Simone Lanini, Daniele Lapa, Gaetano Maffongelli,  
294 Fabrizio Maggi, Alessandra Marani, Andrea Mariano, Iaria Mastrorosa, Giulia Matusali, Silvia  
295 Meschi, Valentina Mazzotta, Sabrina Minicucci, Claudia Minosse, Klizia Mizzoni, Martina  
296 Moccione, Annalisa Mondì, Vanessa Mondillo, Giorgia Natalini, Nicoletta Orchi, Sandrine Ottou,  
297 Jessica Paulicelli, Elisabetta Petrivelli, Maria Maddalena Plazzi, Carmela Pinnetti, Silvia Pittalis,  
298 Gianluca Prota, Vincenzo Puro, Silvia Rosati, Alberto Rossi, Gabriella Rozera, Marika Rubino,  
299 Martina Rueca, Laura Scorzolini, Eliana Specchiarello, Maria Virginia Tomassi, Massimo  
300 Tempestilli, Francesco Vaia, Francesco Vairo, Beatrice Valli, Alessandra Vergori, Serena Vita.

301

## 302 **References**

- 303 [1] WHO. Second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR) Emergency  
304 Committee regarding the multi-country outbreak of monkeypox. July 23,  
305 2022. [https://www.who.int/news/item/23-07-2022-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-](https://www.who.int/news/item/23-07-2022-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-(ihr)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox)  
306 [regulations-\(2005\)-\(ihr\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-multi-country-outbreak-of-](https://www.who.int/news/item/23-07-2022-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-(ihr)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox)  
307 [monkeypox](https://www.who.int/news/item/23-07-2022-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-(ihr)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-multi-country-outbreak-of-monkeypox)
- 308 [2] Centers and Disease Control and Prevention: 2022 Monkeypox Outbreak Global Map. Data as  
309 of 29 Jan 2023 5:30 PM EDT. [https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/response/2022/world-](https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/response/2022/world-map.html)  
310 [map.html](https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/response/2022/world-map.html). Accessed January 31, 2023.
- 311 [3] Centers and Disease Control and Prevention: Interim Clinical Guidance for the Treatment of  
312 Monkeypox. Updated October 31, 2022.  
313 <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/monkeypox/clinicians/treatment.html>. Accessed January 31, 2023.
- 314 [4] Highlights of Prescribing Information (TPOXX). Food and Drug Administration (Updated May  
315 2022) Accessed January 31, 2023.  
316 [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2022/214518s000lbl.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2022/214518s000lbl.pdf)
- 317 [5] European Medicines Agency: Tecovirimat EPAR- Medicine overview. EMA/44982/2022.  
318 January 28, 2022. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/tecovirimat-siga-epar-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/tecovirimat-siga-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf)  
319 [medicine-overview\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/tecovirimat-siga-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf)
- 320 [6] Yang G, Pevear DC, Davies MH, et al. An orally bioavailable antipoxvirus compound (ST-246)  
321 inhibits extracellular virus formation and protects mice from lethal orthopoxvirus Challenge. *J*  
322 *Virol.* 2005;79(20):13139-13149. doi:10.1128/JVI.79.20.13139-13149.2005
- 323 [7] Grosenbach DW, Honeychurch K, Rose EA, et al. Oral Tecovirimat for the Treatment of  
324 Smallpox. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;379(1):44-53. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1705688

- 325 [8] Desai AN, Thompson GR 3rd, Neumeister SM, Arutyunova AM, Trigg K, Cohen SH.  
326 Compassionate Use of Tecovirimat for the Treatment of Monkeypox Infection. *JAMA*.  
327 2022;328(13):1348-1350. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.15336
- 328 [9] Mondì A, Gagliardini R, Mazzotta V, et al. Clinical experience with use of oral Tecovirimat or  
329 Intravenous Cidofovir for the treatment of Monkeypox in an Italian reference hospital. *J Infect*.  
330 2023;86(1):66-117. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2022.11.001
- 331 [10] Mbrenğa F, Nakouné E, Malaka C, et al. Tecovirimat for Monkeypox in Central African  
332 Republic under Expanded Access. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;387(24):2294-2295.  
333 doi:10.1056/NEJMc2210015
- 334 [11] Adler H, Gould S, Hine P, et al. Clinical features and management of human monkeypox : a  
335 retrospective observational study in the UK. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2022;3099:1–10.
- 336 [12] Matias WR, Koshy JM, Nagami EH, et al. Tecovirimat for the Treatment of Human  
337 Monkeypox: An Initial Series From Massachusetts, United States. *Open forum Infect Dis*  
338 2022;9:ofac377.
- 339 [13] O’Laughlin K, Tobolowsky FA, Elmor R, et al. Clinical Use of Tecovirimat (Tpoxx) for  
340 Treatment of Monkeypox Under an Investigational New Drug Protocol — United States. *MMWR*  
341 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* May-August 2022. ePub: 9 Septem- ber 2022. DOI: <http://dx.doi>.
- 342 [14] Tecovirimat for Treatment of Monkeypox Virus. *ClinicalTrials.gov* Identifier: NCT05559099
- 343 [15] Study of Tecovirimat for Human Monkeypox Virus (STOMP). *ClinicalTrials.gov* Identifier:  
344 NCT05534984
- 345 [16] Tecovirimat in Non-hospitalized Patients With Monkeypox (PLATINUM-CAN).  
346 *ClinicalTrials.gov* Identifier: NCT05534165
- 347 [17] Lindholm DA, Kalil AC. Déjà vu all over again? Monkeypox and the urgent need for  
348 randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2023;23(2):e56-e58. doi:10.1016/S1473-  
349 3099(22)00722-8
- 350 [18] Hernán MA, Sauer BC, Hernández-Díaz S, Platt R, Shrier I. Specifying a target trial prevents  
351 immortal time bias and other self-inflicted injuries in observational analyses. *J Clin Epidemiol*.  
352 2016;79:70-75. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.04.014
- 353 [19] Dekkers OM, Groenwold RHH. When observational studies can give wrong answers: the  
354 potential of immortal time bias. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2021;184(1):E1-E4. doi:10.1530/EJE-20-1124
- 355 [20] Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk,  
356 Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(15):1397-1408.  
357 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2118542

- 358 [21] Wood M. J., Kay R., Dworkin R. H., et al. Oral acyclovir therapy accelerates pain resolution in  
359 patients with herpes zoster: a meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials. *Clin. Infect.*  
360 *Dis.* 1996;22:341–347.
- 361 [22] Wallace M. R., Bowler W. A., Murray N. B. Treatment of adult varicella with oral  
362 acyclovir. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 1992;117:358–363
- 363 [23] Peiro-Mestres A, Fuertes I, Camprubi-Ferrer D, et al. Frequent detection of mon- keypox virus  
364 DNA in saliva, semen, and other clinical samples from 12 pa- tients, Barcelona, Spain, May to June  
365 2022. *Eurosurveillance* 2022;**27**. Available at [http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-](http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503)  
366 [7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503](http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503).
- 367 [24] Suñer C, Ubals M, Tarín-Vicente EJ, et al. Viral dynamics in patients with monkeypox  
368 infection: a prospective cohort study in Spain [published online ahead of print, 2022 Dec  
369 12]. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022;S1473-3099(22)00794-0. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00794-0.

**Table 1. Main characteristics of hospitalized patients with monkeypox according to the administration of tecovirimat.**

Characteristics	Treated with Tecovirimat	Untreated	p-value*	Total
	N= 19	N= 22		N= 41
Age, years, <i>median (IQR)</i>	38 (34, 46)	33 (29, 39)	0.017	35 (31, 39)
Smallpox vaccination, <i>n (%)</i>	1 (5.3%)	2 (9.1%)	0.643	3 (7.3%)
Caucasian, <i>n (%)</i>	15 (78.9%)	17 (77.3%)	0.898	32 (78.0%)
MSM <sup>a</sup> , <i>n (%)</i>	18 (94.7%)	21 (95.5%)	0.916	39 (95.1%)
Use of Chemsex, <i>n (%)</i>	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)	0.166	2 (8.7%)
HIV+, <i>n (%)</i>	7 (36.8%)	8 (36.4%)	0.975	15 (36.6%)
CD4 count <sup>b</sup> , <i>days, median (IQR)</i>	714 (471, 1323)	661 (390, 823)	0.487	684 (471, 884)
Use of PrEP <sup>c</sup> , <i>n (%)</i>	3 (15.8%)	4 (18.2%)	0.841	7 (17.1%)
Route of transmission, <i>n (%)</i>			0.373	
Recent reported sexual intercourses	18 (94.7%)	21 (95.5%)		39 (95.1%)
Household	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)		1 (2.4%)
Systemic symptoms, <i>n (%)</i>	19 (100.0%)	20 (90.9%)	0.183	39 (95.1%)
Number of skin lesions, <i>n (%)</i>			0.740	
0-4	6 (31.6%)	9 (40.9%)		15 (36.6%)
5-10	4 (21.1%)	4 (18.2%)		8 (19.5%)
11-20	6 (31.6%)	4 (18.2%)		10 (24.4%)
21+	3 (15.8%)	5 (22.7%)		8 (19.5%)
Pharyngotonsillitis, <i>n (%)</i>	6 (31.6%)	3 (13.6%)	0.172	9 (22.0%)
Proctitis, <i>n (%)</i>	6 (31.6%)	5 (22.7%)	0.529	11 (26.8%)
Ocular Lesions, <i>n (%)</i>	2 (10.5%)	1 (4.5%)	0.469	3 (7.3%)
Severity of disease <sup>d</sup> , <i>n (%)</i>	12 (63.2%)	13 (59.1%)	0.793	25 (61.0%)
Concurrent STIs <sup>e</sup> , <i>n (%)</i>	11 (73.3%)	9 (69.2%)	0.814	20 (71.4%)
Gonorrhoea	1 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)		1 (2.4%)
Syphilis	4 (21.1%)	4 (18.2%)		8 (19.5%)
Other	6 (31.6%)	5 (22.7%)		11 (26.8%)
Time from onset to hospital admission, <i>days, median (IQR)</i>	5 (2, 6)	4 (2, 6)	0.462	4 (2, 6)
Time from onset to treatment start, <i>days, median (IQR)</i>	10 (8, 11)			10 (8, 11)
Clinical recovery, <i>days, median (IQR)</i>	23 (18, 29)	20 (16, 23)	0.053	21 (17, 26)

<sup>a</sup> Men who have sex with men,

<sup>b</sup> available only in HIV+ participants,

<sup>c</sup> Pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV

<sup>d</sup> More than 20 skin lesions and/or presence of ocular lesions and/or pharyngotonsillitis and/or proctitis

<sup>e</sup> Sexually transmitted infections;

\*Chi-square or Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate

**Table 2. Results of emulation of a parallel trial design with the target population of participants admitted to the hospital for Mpox.**

It was assumed that treatment initiation was based on the following confounders: age, disease severity, and HIV status. Inverse probability of censoring weights was used to control for the cloning-induced informative censoring bias.

<b>Original cohort</b>	<b>21-day failure (%)</b>	<b>95% CI*</b>		<b>Recovery days</b>	<b>95% CI*</b>	
Tecovirimat arm <sup>§</sup>	8.3	0.0	33.3	8.4	1.9	9.2
No Tecovirimat arm	22.2	0.0	55.9	11.7	7.6	12.7
<b>Differences<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>-13.9</b>	<b>-5.2</b>	<b>+21.0</b>	<b>-3.3</b>	<b>-8.8</b>	<b>+0.4</b>
<b>Emulated cohort</b>						
	<b>21 day failure (%)</b>	<b>95% CI*</b>		<b>Recovery days</b>	<b>95% CI*</b>	
<b>Kaplan-Meier</b>						
Tecovirimat arm	12.5	0.0	50.5	14.7	12.5	14.9
No Tecovirimat arm	15.4	0.0	31.4	14.7	12.4	14.9
<b>Differences<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>-2.9</b>	<b>-29.2</b>	<b>+33.5</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>-0.11</b>	<b>+0.13</b>
<b>Weighted Kaplan-Meier</b>						
Tecovirimat arm	9.8	0.0	45.4	14.7	12.5	14.9
No Tecovirimat arm	13.9	0.0	29.3	14.7	12.4	14.9
<b>Differences<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>-4.1</b>	<b>-29.2</b>	<b>+30.8</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>-0.11</b>	<b>+0.12</b>

<sup>§</sup> Tecovirimat was administered at the dosage of 600 mg twice daily for 14 days

\* The 95% CIs were calculated using 100 bootstrap replicates

<sup>1</sup> These differences are prone to both confounding and immortal-time biases

<sup>2</sup> These differences are prone to informative censoring

<sup>3</sup> These differences account for all types of biases under the assumptions detailed in the methods.

**Table 3. Potential cycle threshold (Ct) changes (log<sub>2</sub> scale) over T1-T2 and Average treatment effect (ATE) from fitting a linear regression model.**

Potential Ct changes (log <sub>2</sub> scale) over T1-T2 <sup>§</sup> and ATE <sup>&amp;</sup> from fitting a linear regression model				
	Mean in treated with TPOXX (95% CI)	Mean in untreated (95% CI)	ATE* (95% CI)	p-value
<i>Treated vs. Untreated</i>				
IPWs	0.25 (-0.02, 0.53)	0.41 (0.08, 0.73)	-0.16 (-0.64, 0.33)	0.529
Double Robust	0.38 (0.13, 0.64)	0.41 (-0.01, 0.84)	-0.03 (-0.58, 0.53)	0.920
Regression adjustment	0.38 (0.00, 0.76)	0.37 (0.01, 0.74)	0.01 (-0.56, 0.57)	0.979

<sup>§</sup>T1 was a median of 6 days after symptoms onset; T2 a median of 5 days after T1

<sup>&</sup>Average Treatment Effect

\*weighted for age and HIV status