

1 TITLE

2 Intranasal lavage with hypochlorous acid safely reduces the symptoms in the
3 ambulatory patient with COVID-19.

4 AUTHOR

5 Monique Lisa Abner, MD, CWSP

6 Tower Health Medical Group

7 2603 Keiser Blvd, Suite 204

8 Wyomissing, PA 19610

9 Email: abne7048@yahoo.com

10 Phone: (704) 617-6680

11 The manuscript has not been previously submitted

12 KEYWORDS: Hypochlorous acid, Vashe Wound Solution, intranasal lavage, COVID-19.

13 CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

14 Dr. Abner serves on the speaker's bureau for Urgo Medical North America, LLC.

15 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

16 Dr. Monique L. Abner was responsible for the concept, execution, and data collection.

17 SPONSORSHIP: No financial compensation

18 Urgo Medical North America, LLC. provided the Vashe Wound Solution

19 NeilMed, Pharmaceuticals Inc. provided the NasaFlo Neti Pot.

20 ABSTRACT

21 OBJECTIVE

22 This study was designed to investigate intranasal lavage with a hypochlorous acid
23 solution in the reduction of symptoms in the ambulatory COVID-19 patient.

24 STUDY DESIGN

25 Study approval granted by the Institutional Review Board of Reading Hospital (IRB 036-
26 20), with informed consent obtained from all adult participants(age>18 years).

27 SETTING

28 All enrollees, taken from the same ambulatory testing facility, received nasopharyngeal
29 swabs for COVID-19 testing by reverse transcription polymerase chain (RT-PCR) or the
30 COVID-19 antigen specific test (Binax NOW, Abbott Lab)

31 METHODS

32 Convenience sampling methodology was utilized. Each enrollee was provided with the
33 study devices which included a Nasaflo Neti Pot (NeilMed Pharmaceutical, Inc.), and
34 the hypochlorous acid solution (Vashe Wound Solution, Urgo Medical North America,
35 LLC). Participants were instructed to irrigate each nostril with 120 cc (four ounces) of
36 the solution for ten consecutive days, and record the presence or absence of symptoms
37 in a scripted diary log.

38 RESULTS

39 The study included 88 patients of which 74 (84.1%) completed the ten days of nasal
40 lavage. All data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 25.0.

41 Chi square test of association found no significant difference related to gender, age
42 group race, ethnicity, residence, or living arrangements (all p-values > 0.05). There
43 were no statistical differences in any of the co-morbid conditions. Mild adverse
44 reactions included burning, epistaxis, and oral metallic taste. No enrollees required
45 mechanical ventilation. There were no deaths.

46 CONCLUSION

47 This study suggests the feasibility and safety of using intranasal lavage with a
48 hypochlorous acid solution in relieving symptoms in the ambulatory Covid-19 patient.

49 INTRODUCTION

50 The coronavirus, COVID-19, has a high affinity for the angiotensin-converting
51 enzyme 2 receptor (ACE 2).¹ There is a high expression of the ACE2 receptors
52 in the goblet cells of the nasoepithelium which has been the basis for obtaining
53 nasal and nasopharyngeal swabs for diagnostic purposes.^{2,3} Hypochlorous Acid is a
54 weak acid that has been used clinically as a wound cleanser with favorable, non-
55 cytotoxic activity against bacteria, virus, and some fungi.^{4,5,6} The proposed use of a
56 hypochlorous acid nasal lavage would be to inactivate the viral particles within the nasal
57 tract. This study was designed to investigate the feasibility of intranasal lavage with
58 hypochlorous acid as a therapeutic intervention in the reduction of symptoms of severe
59 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the ambulatory patient.

60 METHODS

61 Study Design and Participants

62 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Reading Hospital (IRB
63 036-020) with informed consent obtained from all adult participants. Convenience
64 sampling methodology was utilized for those who met the study criteria inclusive to all
65 gender at ages 18 years old and/or older. Excluded participants were those who
66 expressed the desire to not use nasal lavage, women with known pregnancies, and
67 children aged 17 years old and/or younger. The source of enrollees was generated
68 from patients presenting to an ambulatory testing facility for nasopharyngeal swabs for
69 COVID-19. Swab analysis was obtained by reverse transcription-polymerase chain
70 reaction until the COVID-19 antigen specific test (Binax NOW, Abbott Lab) became
71 available for use which allowed a more lenient process for including the Covid-19
72 positive patients. Each enrolled participant was given a Nasaflo Neti Pot (NeilMed
73 Pharmaceuticals, Inc) with instructions to irrigate each nostril once a day for ten days
74 with the provided hypochlorous solution Vashe Wound Solution (Urgo Medical North
75 America, LLC). Each participant began the daily 120 cc (four -ounce) nasal lavage
76 intervention within 72 hours of their testing. Each participant was given a scripted diary
77 log in which they recorded daily the presence/absence of clinical symptoms such as
78 elevated temperature, fatigue, headache, chills, nausea, and anosmia by noting “yes” or
79 “no.” After completing the ten days of nasal lavage, each log was returned to the
80 principal investigator via mail. The participants remained quarantined for the
81 recommended time period of 14 days, and adhered to social distancing, handwashing,
82 and donning of face masks. Throughout the study, each participant was urged to not
83 share their devices with any other individuals. After thirty days from the start of their
84 nasal intervention, participants were telephoned for a follow-up review.

85 RESULTS

86 A total of 88 patients were enrolled in the study, of which 74 (84.1%) completed the ten
87 days of intranasal lavage. The reasons for the 14 patients withdrawing included the
88 following: complaints of nasal burning, coughing, and inexperience with the nasal
89 lavage (n=8); discouragement by another family member, being too busy to comply
90 (n=2); and, negative Covid test and no specific reason given (n=4). No patients required
91 hospital admission for mechanical ventilation. Due to the smaller than expected sample
92 size, responders were grouped into 2 groups, those that felt their symptoms had stayed
93 the same or worsened, and those who felt that their symptoms had improved. One
94 patient felt that symptoms had both improved and worsened, and was placed into the
95 worsened cohort. Small samples within certain age groups allowed for clustering of
96 ages into 2 groups youngest to age 49, 50 years of age and older. Two patients did not
97 respond to the question of race, and three patients did not respond to the question of
98 living arrangements; for those items they were left out of the analysis.

99 All data analysis for this research was conducted using SPSS version 25.0. Since all
100 variables in this analysis were categorical comparisons on patient perceived condition
101 (worsened/stayed the same versus improvement) as the dependent variable, data were
102 compared against comorbidities and demographic variables using chi-square test of
103 association. An a priori p-value required for significance was set at 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Due
104 to the exploratory nature of this research, there were no corrections applied to the p-
105 value's due to multiple comparisons.

106 Within the 74 patients that completed the course of treatment, 56.8% of the sample
107 were females, age was evenly distributed among 6 age groups. 69.4% of the sample

108 was Caucasian with the majority of those evaluating themselves as non-Hispanic.
109 90.5% of the sample resided in a single-family home with 85.9% of the sample
110 indicating they lived with a spouse or significant other. Results of the demographic
111 analysis can be found in Table 1.

112 Chi-square test of association found no significant difference in patient condition related
113 to patient gender, age group race, ethnicity, residence or living arrangements, (all p-
114 values were greater than 0.05). A significant association (difference) was found for the
115 recoded age variable, finding that 65.2% of the youngest through age 49 cohort
116 reported improved condition as compared to only 34.8% of those in the 50 through
117 oldest years of age cohort ($p = 0.028$). These results can be found in Table 2.

118 Table 3 presents the results for the response to treatment by smoking status and other
119 drug use. No significant differences were found by smoking status, marijuana, vaping,
120 or other intranasal drug use. No members of the sample reported IV drug use.

121 Table 4 presents the results of treatment efficacy as related to other comorbid
122 conditions. There were no statistical differences in any of the comorbid conditions as
123 associated with treatment efficacy indicating that the treatment is well tolerated across
124 all of these conditions that were collected.

125 **DISCUSSION**

126 The world has suffered from the coronavirus, COVID-19 pandemic. The primary mode
127 of viral transmission has been the respiratory droplet, with the appreciation of the high
128 affinity of the SARS-CoV-2 virus to the ACE 2 receptors of the nasal mucosa.³ Infected
129 patients may continue to be carriers of the virus, and it is uncertain if the nasoepithelium

130 serves as a potential reservoir of viral infection.^{3, 7} Moreover, patients infected with the
131 virus may continue to pose a potential risk as evidence of viral shedding has been noted
132 during asymptomatic infection as well as post recovery.⁷ An infected individual with
133 coronavirus may be asymptomatic during the incubation period, or exhibit non-severe
134 symptoms, or progress to life-threatening illness and death. Attempts to correlate
135 clinical disease with SARS-CoV-2 viral loads from respiratory secretions, blood, and
136 tissue have yielded conflicting results, as some patients with advanced disease have
137 high viral loads while others do not.² The use of nasal irrigation has been
138 demonstrated to be effective at reducing symptoms of upper respiratory condition with
139 hypertonic saline.⁸ The use of povidone iodine has been shown to reduce viral load in
140 the Covid positive patient, however, in a small study, 42% of the participants
141 experienced thyroid dysfunction during treatment.⁹ Nasal saline irrigations have been
142 shown to be beneficial for COVID-19, however viral contamination of the rinse bottles
143 and contact-induced transmission were of concern.⁷

144 Hypochlorous acid is an effective agent in vitro and in vivo. In vitro, the antiviral effect
145 is dependent on the availability of the chloride ions, and its impact upon the viral nucleic
146 acids DNA or RNA.^{10,11} In vivo, hypochlorous acid is naturally produced by the activated
147 neutrophil during the oxidative burst phase by the enzyme myeloperoxidase. The
148 activated neutrophil is estimated to produce 1.6×10^{-6} molecules of hypochlorous acid
149 per second.¹² Hypochlorous acid is FDA-approved as a preservative for saline
150 solutions.⁵ Distinctive from other antiseptics such as povidone-iodine, ethanol, hydrogen
151 peroxide, and chlorhexidine gluconate, hypochlorous acid cleansers are favorably

152 non cytotoxic making them useful agents in wound care. Clinically, hypochlorous acid
153 washes have been safely utilized in pediatric and adult wound care, involving skin, oral,
154 and ocular usages.^{4,5,6} Its use in nasal lavage may potentially reduce viral load with the
155 potential advantage of reducing the risk of surface contamination due to its antiseptic
156 properties.

157 This study has demonstrated the safe utilization of hypochlorous acid solution (Vashe
158 Wound Solution, Urgo Medical North America, LLC) for intranasal lavage in the
159 ambulatory patient testing positive for the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Participants of this study
160 demonstrated improvement in their clinical symptoms, and there were no statistical
161 differences in any of the co-morbid conditions as associated with the intranasal lavage.
162 Mild adverse reactions include nasal burning sensation, mild self-limited epistaxis, and
163 metallic taste associated with one participant with titanium dental implants. At 30-day
164 follow up, no patients had required mechanical ventilation, and there were no deaths.

165 **LIMITATIONS:**

166 This study has several limitations: The sample size of the study was small. Although all
167 patients were offered to participate, some declined to consider the option due to
168 apprehensions associated with nasal rinsing. Because of the varied clinical
169 presentations, the correlation of the start date of the nasal lavage with the presumed
170 initial infection date was inconsistent. This was especially true for the patients who
171 were asymptomatic or had very mild symptoms. In households with many occupants, it
172 remains unclear if true isolation were achieved, especially in cases with young children

173 or teenagers, both of whom were unable to participate due to the age-based inclusion
174 criterion. No data was tabulated with regards to the number of participants who
175 concurrently received outpatient monoclonal antibody therapy. No follow up nasal
176 swabs or additional tests were performed after the nasal irrigation intervention.
177 Throughout the enrollment, no participants had received the COVID vaccine, and it
178 remains uncertain how vaccination might impact clinical outcomes.

179 **CONCLUSIONS**

180 This study does suggest the feasibility of using intranasal lavage with a hypochlorous
181 acid solution for the COVID-19 positive ambulatory patient, however, further research is
182 needed to appreciate its value and larger clinical strategy for prevention, relief, and
183 treatment of disease. The potential effects of Vashe Wound Solution nasal lavage as a
184 therapeutic agent in reducing viral load would need to be more thoroughly investigated
185 as this is a novel application of this solution.

186 **Author Affiliation:** TowerHealth Medical Group, Reading, PA

187 **Acknowledgement:** The author acknowledges and thanks senior principal
188 biostatistician Thomas E. Wasser PhD, MEd, CIM who performed the statistical data
189 analysis. Additional thanks for the assistance of Dr. Ziad Osman, Medical Director of
190 the TowerHealth Liggett Avenue Urgent Care Facility, and Alison Muller MLS (ASCP),
191 MSPH, Trauma Research Coordinator.

192

193

194 **REFERENCES**

- 195 1. Spinato G, Fabbris C, Polesel J et.al. Alterations in Smell or Taste in Mildly Symptomatic
196 Out-Patients with SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA*. April 2020.
- 197 2. Joynt GM, Wu WK. Understanding COVID-19. What does viral RNA load really mean?
198 *Lancet InfectDis*.2020.Mar.27.
- 199 3. Waradon S, Ni H, Christophe B, Marjijn B. SARS-CoV-2 Entry Genes Are Most Highly
200 Expressed in Nasal Goblet and Ciliated Cells Within Human Airway.*Nature Medicine*. 2020.
201 Mar.arXiv.org.
- 202 4. Wang L, Bassiri M, Najafi R. et.al Hypochlorous acid as a potential wound care agent. Part I
203 Stabilized hypochlorous acid: a component of the inorganic armamentarium of innate immunity.
204 *J Burns and Wounds*.2007;April: 65-79.
- 205 5. Robson MC, Payne W, Ko F, et.al Hypochlorous acid as a potential wound care agent. Part
206 II Stabilized hypochlorous: its role in decreasing tissue bacterial bioburden and overcoming the
207 inhibition of infection on wound healing. *J Burns and Wounds*. 2007; April:80-90.
- 208 6. Stroman DW, Mintun K, Epstein A, et.al. Reduction in bacterial load using hypochlorous
209 acid solution on ocular skin. *Clin Ophthal*. 2017;11:707-714.
- 210 7. Farrell NF, Klatt-Cromwell C, Schneider JS. Benefits and safety of nasal saline irrigations in a
211 pandemic-washing COVID-19 away.*JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*.2020;146(9):787-
212 788.doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2020.1622.
- 213 8. Ramalingam S, Graham C, Dove J, Morrice L, Sheikh A. A pilot, open labelled, randomized
214 controlled of hypertonic saline nasal irrigation and gargling for the common cold . *Sci,Rep*.2019.
215 Jan31;9(1):1015.
- 216 9. Guenezan J, Garcia M, Strasters D. et.al. Povidone Iodine Mouthwash, Gargle, and Nasal
217 Spray to Reduce Nasopharyngeal Viral Load in Patients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical

218 Trial. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2021; 147(4):400-01.doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2020.5490.

219 10. Hakimullah H, Chanathip T, Kazuaki T. Evaluation of sprayed hypochlorous acid solutions
220 for their virucidal activity against avian influenza virus through in vitro experiments. *J. Vet Med*
221 *Sci.*2015.Feb 77(2):211-215.

222 11. Ramalingam S, Cai B, Wong J. et.al Antiviral innate immune response in non-myeloid
223 cells is augmented by chloride ions via an increase in intracellular hypochlorous acid levels. *Sci.*
224 *Rep.*2018:8:13630.

225 12. Wang G, Chloride flux in phagocytes. *Immunol Rev.* 2016;273:219-231.

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics of completing patients (n=74).

Variable	Category	Count	Percent
Gender	Female	42	56.8
	Male	32	43.2
Age group	Youngest – 30	15	20.3
	31-39	15	20.3
	40-49	15	20.3
	50-60	14	18.9
	61-70	11	14.9
	71-80	4	5.4
Race*	African American	3	4.2
	Asian	2	2.8
	Caucasian	50	69.4
	Multiple	4	5.6
	Other	13	18.1
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic	46	62.2
	Hispanic	28	37.8
Residence	Apartment	2	2.7
	Condo	2	2.7
	Multigenerational	3	4.1
	Single Family Home	67	90.5
Lives with**	Alone	4	5.6
	Spouse/Significant other	61	85.9
	Parent	4	5.6
	Other	2	2.8

239 *There were two non-responders. **Three non-responders

240

241 **Table 2:** Response to treatment and demographic variables

Variable	Category	Improved		No change or Worsened		p-value
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Gender	Female	37	56.1	5	62.5	0.728
	Male	29	43.9	3	37.5	
Age group	Youngest – 30	14	21.2	1	12.5	0.364
	31-39	15	22.7	0	0.0	
	40-49	14	21.2	1	12.5	
	50-60	11	16.7	3	37.5	
	61-70	9	13.6	2	25.0	
	71-80	3	4.5	1	12.5	
Recoded Age	Youngest -49	43	65.2	2	25.0	0.028
	50-Oldest	23	34.8	6	75.0	
Race	African American	3	4.7	0	0.0	0.374
	Asian	1	1.6	1	12.5	
	Caucasian	45	70.3	5	62.5	
	Multiple	4	6.3	0	0.0	
	Other	11	17.2	2	25.0	
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic	40	60.6	6	75.0	0.428
	Hispanic	26	39.4	2	25.0	
Residence	Apartment	2	3.0	0	0.0	0.284
	Condo	1	1.5	1	12.5	
	Multigenerational	3	4.5	0	0.0	
	Single Family Home	60	90.9	7	87.5	
Lives with	Alone	3	4.8	1	12.5	0.678
	Spouse/Significant other	54	85.7	7	87.5	
	Parent	4	6.3	0	0.0	
	Other	2	3.2	0	0.0	

242

243 **Table 3:** Response to treatment by smoking and drug use.

Variable	Category	Improved		No change or Worsened		p-value
		Count	%	Count	%	
Smoking	No	57	86.4	8	100.0	0.335*
	Yes	9	13.6	0	0.0	
Marijuana	No	58	87.9	8	100.0	0.381*
	Yes	8	12.1	0	0.0	
Vaping	No	59	89.4	8	100.0	0.433*
	Yes	7	10.6	0	0.0	
IV drug use	No	66	100.0	8	100.0	N/A
	Yes	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	
Intranasal	No	55	83.3	7	87.5	0.616*
	Yes	11	16.7	1	12.5	

244 *Fishers Exact test

245 **Table 4:** Response to treatment by comorbid conditions.

Variable	Category	Improved		No change or Worsened		p-value
		Count	%	Count	%	
Nasal surgery	No	61	92.4	6	75.0	0.112
	Yes	5	7.6	2	25.0	
Sinus infections	No	32	48.5	6	75.0	0.156
	Yes	34	51.5	2	25.0	
Hx nasal facial fractures	No	58	87.9	7	87.5	0.975
	Yes	8	12.1	1	12.5	
Diabetes	No	58	87.9	7	57.5	0.975
	Yes	8	12.1	1	12.5	
Lupus	No	66	100.0	8	100.0	N/A
	Yes	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Kidney	No	58	87.9	8	100.0	0.381*
	Yes	8	12.1	0	0.0	
Hypertension	No	48	72.7	4	50.0	0.184
	Yes	18	27.3	4	50.0	
Heart failure	No	64	97.0	7	87.5	0.200
	Yes	2	3.0	1	12.5	
Headaches	No	38	57.6	4	50.0	0.683
	Yes	28	42.4	4	50.0	
Cancer	No	57	87.7	7	87.5	0.988
	Yes	8	12.3	1	12.5	
Asthma	No	49	74.2	8	100.0	0.110*
	Yes	17	25.8	0	0.0	
Bronchitis	No	50	75.8	6	75.0	0.962
	Yes	16	24.2	2	23.5	
Emphysema	No	64	98.5	8	100.0	0.892*
	Yes	1	1.5	0	0.0	
Hepatitis	No	66	100.0	7	87.5	0.108*
	Yes	0	0.0	1	12.5	
HIV	No	66	100.0	8	100.0	N/A
	Yes	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Fever	No	38	57.6	4	50.0	0.683
	Yes	28	42.4	4	50.0	
Breathing Problems	No	46	69.7	7	87.5	0.292
	Yes	20	30.3	1	12.5	
Fatigue	No	13	19.7	2	25.0	0.725
	Yes	53	80.3	6	75.0	
Headache	No	14	21.2	1	12.5	0.563
	Yes	52	78.8	7	87.5	
Chills	No	38	42.4	2	25.0	0.363
	Yes	38	57.6	6	75.0	
Nausea	No	39	60.0	6	75.0	0.410
	Yes	26	40.0	2	25.0	

246