

1 **Antiviral efficacy of fluoxetine in early symptomatic COVID-19: an** 2 **open-label, randomised, controlled, adaptive platform trial (PLATCOV)**

3
4 Podjanee Jittamala MD^{1,2+}, Simon Boyd MBBS^{1,3+}, William HK Schilling MBBS^{1,3*}, James A
5 Watson DPhil^{1,4}, Thundon Ngamprasertchai MD⁵, Tanaya Siripoon MD⁵, Viravarn Luvira MD⁵,
6 Elizabeth M Batty PhD^{1,3}, Phrutsamon Wongnak PhD¹, Lisia M Esper⁶, Pedro J Almeida⁶, Cintia
7 Cruz MD^{1,2}, Fernando R Ascencao⁷, Renato S Aguiar⁸, Najia K Ghanchi PhD⁹, James J Callery MB
8 ChB^{1,3}, Shivani Singh MBBS¹, Varaporn Kruabkontho PhD¹, Thatsanun Ngermseng MBA¹, Jarawan
9 Tubprasert Pharm.D¹, Wanassanan Madmanee BSc¹, Kanokon Suwannasin BSc¹, Amornrat
10 Promsongsil¹, Borimas Hanboonkunupakarn MD^{1,5}, Kittiyod Poovorawan MD^{1,5}, Manus
11 Potaporn MD¹⁰, Attasit Srisubat MD¹⁰, Bootsakorn Loharjun MD¹⁰, Walter RJ Taylor FRCP^{1,3},
12 Farah Qamar MBBS FRCP⁹, Abdul Momin Kazi MBBS⁹, M. Asim Beg FRCP(Edin)⁹, Danoy
13 Chommanam¹¹, Sisouphanh Vidhamaly¹², Kesinee Chotivanich PhD^{1,5}, Mallika Imwong PhD^{1,11},
14 Sasithon Pukrittayakamee MBBS^{1,5}, Arjen M Dondorp FMedSci^{1,3}, Nicholas PJ Day FMedSci^{1,3},
15 Mauro M Teixeira MD⁶, Watcharapong Piyaphanee MD⁵, Weerapong Phumratanaprapin MD⁵,
16 Nicholas J White FRS^{1,3**}, on behalf of the PLATCOV Collaborative Group.

- 17 1. Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol
18 University, Bangkok, Thailand
- 19 2. Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,
20 Bangkok, Thailand
- 21 3. Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine,
22 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
- 23 4. Oxford University Clinical Research Unit, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam
- 24 5. Department of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol
25 University, Bangkok, Thailand
- 26 6. Clinical Research Unit, Center for Advanced and Innovative Therapies, Universidade
27 Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

- 28 7. Department of Biochemistry and Immunology, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais,
29 Belo Horizonte, Brazil
- 30 8. Department of Genetics, Ecology and Evolution, Institute of Biological Sciences,
31 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil
- 32 9. Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan
- 33 10. Department of Medical Services, Ministry of Public Health, Bangkok, Thailand
- 34 11. Laos-Oxford-Mahosot Hospital-Wellcome Trust Research Unit, Microbiology Laboratory,
35 Mahosot Hospital, Vientiane, Laos P.D.R.
- 36 12. Pulmonology Department, Mahosot Hospital, Vientiane, Laos P.D.R.
- 37 13. Department of Molecular Tropical Medicine and Genetics, Faculty of Tropical Medicine,
38 Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

39

40 †: Equal contributions

41 ***Correspondence:** William HK Schilling

42 Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol
43 University, 420/6 Rajvithi Rd, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand; email william@tropmedres.ac

44 ****Alternate correspondence:** Nicholas J White

45 Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol
46 University, 420/6 Rajvithi Rd, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand; email nickw@tropmedres.ac

47

48

49

50 **Abstract**

51 **Background**

52 The selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) fluoxetine and fluvoxamine were repurposed
53 for the treatment of early COVID-19 based on their antiviral activity *in vitro*, and observational
54 and clinical trial evidence suggesting they prevented progression to severe disease. However,
55 these SSRIs have not been recommended in guidelines and their antiviral activity *in vivo* has not
56 been characterised.

57

58 **Methods**

59 PLATCOV is an open-label, multicentre, phase 2, randomised, controlled, adaptive
60 pharmacometric platform trial running in Thailand, Brazil, Pakistan, and Laos. We recruited low-
61 risk adult outpatients aged 18-50 with early symptomatic COVID-19 (symptoms <4 days). Patients
62 were assigned using block randomisation to one of eleven treatment arms including oral
63 fluoxetine (40mg/day for 7 days), or no study drug. Uniform randomisation ratios were applied
64 across the active treatment groups while the no study drug group comprised $\geq 20\%$ of patients at
65 all times.

66 The primary endpoint was the rate of oropharyngeal viral clearance assessed in a modified
67 intention-to-treat population (>2 days-follow-up). The viral clearance rate was estimated under
68 a Bayesian hierarchical linear model fitted to the log₁₀ viral densities in standardised duplicate
69 oropharyngeal swab eluates taken daily over one week (18 measurements per patient). This
70 ongoing trial is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT05041907).

71

72 **Findings**

73 Between 5 April 2022 and 8 May 2023 271 patients were concurrently randomised to either
74 fluoxetine (n=120) or no study drug (n=151). Fluoxetine was well tolerated and accelerated the
75 rate of viral clearance relative to the no study drug arm by 15% (95% credible interval (CrI): 2%
76 to 34%). In a pooled meta-analysis including all unblinded patients the antiviral activity of
77 fluoxetine was substantially less than ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir- 85% increase in rate of viral

78 clearance (95% CrI: 61 to 112%); and less than remdesivir 35% (14 to 59%), molnupiravir 37% (18
79 to 60%), and casirivimab/imdevimab 29% (10 to 48%).

80

81 **Interpretation**

82 Fluoxetine has *in vivo* antiviral activity against SARS-CoV-2. Although the level of antiviral efficacy
83 is substantially less than with other currently available antiviral drugs, fluoxetine might still be
84 useful in prophylaxis where less antiviral effect is required.

85

86 **Funding**

87 Wellcome Trust Grant ref: 223195/Z/21/Z through the COVID-19 Therapeutics Accelerator.

88

89

90 **Evidence before this study**

91 The SSRIs fluoxetine and fluvoxamine have been proposed as COVID-19 therapeutics based
92 initially on observational, randomised trial and *in vitro* evidence. The observational reports
93 suggested that patients taking SSRIs had a reduced probability of developing severe COVID-19
94 and dying. We searched PubMed and EMBASE for studies in English up until the 30th November
95 2023 using the search terms “fluoxetine”, “fluvoxamine” and “COVID-19” with the search
96 restricted to randomised controlled trials (RCTs). Eight outpatient fluvoxamine RCTs were
97 identified. There were no fluoxetine RCTs in outpatients. A meta-analysis of available RCTs is
98 compatible with a moderate reduction in hospitalisation and death in COVID-19 patients with an
99 estimated risk ratio of 0.80 (95% CI: 0.62,1.01).

100 **Added value of the study**

101 We showed that in early COVID-19 illness the SSRI fluoxetine has weak antiviral activity *in vivo*.
102 This activity is substantially less than other available antivirals such as ritonavir-boosted
103 nirmatrelvir and molnupiravir. The pharmacometric approach described here provides a
104 quantitative measure of *in vivo* antiviral effects with tractable sample sizes.

105 **Implications of available evidence**

106 Fluoxetine has weak *in vivo* antiviral activity in early COVID-19. This is insufficient for treatment
107 but, as less antiviral activity is required to prevent an infection, fluoxetine could still be beneficial
108 in prophylaxis.

109 **Introduction**

110 Repurposing of existing small molecule drugs can provide affordable and widely available
111 treatment options. At the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic there was considerable interest
112 in drug repurposing, but there was little success in demonstrating clinical efficacy apart from the
113 use of immunomodulatory drugs for severe and hospitalised patients (e.g. dexamethasone),¹ No
114 clear benefits were demonstrated for the initial antiviral candidates. Now, four years later, there
115 are several approved efficacious antiviral drugs to treat early symptomatic COVID-19, but these
116 are expensive, and they are not widely available. Ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir is currently the

117 most effective small molecule antiviral drug but, apart from its very high cost (up to \$500
118 USD/course), it has other drawbacks including drug interactions, dysgeusia, and is associated
119 with viral rebound. The only other widely available efficacious oral drug, molnupiravir, has
120 concerns over generation of mutant viruses.^{2,3} There remains a need for effective, reliable,
121 accessible, and affordable antiviral treatments for early COVID-19.

122
123 Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) are the most widely used class of antidepressants.
124 They are readily available and affordable globally. In some countries over 10% of the adult
125 population are taking SSRIs. Observational studies early in the pandemic suggested that patients
126 taking fluoxetine had reduced mortality when admitted to hospital with COVID-19.^{4,5} Subsequent
127 studies supported this observation,^{6,7} and also suggested that SSRIs confer a prophylactic
128 benefit.⁸ Another SSRI, fluvoxamine, was assessed in a meta-analysis of 8 randomised clinical
129 trials,⁹⁻¹⁶ (there were no outpatient randomised controlled trials for fluoxetine; supplementary
130 appendix subsection S12). Treatment with fluvoxamine was compatible with a moderate
131 reduction in hospitalisation or death in COVID-19 outpatients, with an estimated risk-ratio of 0.80
132 (95% CI: 0.62 to 1.01, Figure S2).

133
134 The proposed mechanism of action of SSRIs is through functional inhibition of acid
135 sphingomyelinase (so-called FIASMAs). This interferes with intracellular endolysosomal viral
136 trafficking.¹⁷ Although many drugs are classified as FIASMAs, and some of the earlier research
137 focussed on the closely related compound fluvoxamine, fluoxetine, which is on the WHO's list of
138 Essential Medications,¹⁸ was found to have the greatest *in vitro* FIASMA activity, the best
139 tolerability profile, and the most favourable pharmacokinetic properties.¹⁹ *In vitro* anti-SARS-
140 CoV-2 activity has been shown at fluoxetine concentrations approximating those during the
141 treatment of depression (20 mg daily; 0.8 µg/ml, 2.6 µM).²⁰ Pharmacokinetic modelling
142 determined that an adult dose of 40 mg per day would provide at least 85% of patients with the
143 trough target plasma concentrations needed to reach the estimated target 90% maximal
144 effective concentration (EC90) within 3 days,²¹ although the justification for the extrapolated
145 concentration target is not strong.

146 It is no longer feasible to conduct randomised trials assessing prevention of hospitalisation and
147 death in outpatients with symptomatic COVID-19, as was done earlier in the pandemic. Even in
148 high-risk patients, the proportion of patients with COVID-19 who progress to severe illness
149 and/or require hospitalisation is now very low (<1%).²² For drugs with weak or moderate antiviral
150 activity (such as fluoxetine) the sample sizes needed to show a clinical benefit have therefore
151 become prohibitively large. An alternative approach for candidate antiviral drugs in early COVID-
152 19 is to assess their *in vivo* pharmacodynamics i.e. their effects on the rate of viral clearance.
153 Acceleration in viral clearance correlates with clinical benefit.^{23,24}

154
155 PLATCOV is an adaptive platform trial in adults with acute early COVID-19. The PLATCOV trial
156 methodology can evaluate antiviral activity rapidly and compare available treatments
157 quantitatively.^{2,25-27} Here we report the results for fluoxetine and contextualise this by pooling all
158 unblinded data from the platform and comparing fluoxetine with the other assessed antiviral
159 interventions.

160 **Methods**

161 **Study design**

162 PLATCOV is an ongoing phase 2, open label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, adaptive
163 platform trial running currently in Thailand, Brazil, Pakistan, and Laos (ClinicalTrials.gov:
164 NCT05041907). The trial provides a standardised quantitative comparative methodology for *in*
165 *vivo* assessment of potential antiviral treatments in low-risk adults with early symptomatic
166 COVID-19. Potential antiviral treatments are entered into the platform when they become
167 available, and they are removed when the prespecified stopping rules are reached. Enrolled
168 patients were admitted to the study ward or managed as outpatients according to patient
169 preference (none of the admissions were for clinical reasons, but for ease of adherence with the
170 study procedures, or for self-isolation).

171
172 Standard symptomatic treatment was provided to all patients. Initially, the following drugs were
173 studied: ivermectin, favipiravir, remdesivir, and casirivimab/imdevimab (monoclonal antibody

174 cocktail). These groups have already reached the prespecified stopping rules for efficacy or lack
175 of efficacy and so have been stopped^{2,25-27} . Additional groups; ensitrelvir, molnupiravir, ritonavir-
176 boosted nirmatrelvir, and the tixagevimab/cilgavimab monoclonal antibody cocktail, were
177 introduced later. The primary analysis reported here includes the results from patients who were
178 allocated concurrently to fluoxetine or no study drug (negative control). In addition, we present
179 a meta-analysis of all small molecule drugs and monoclonal antibodies with unblinded data to
180 provide a calibration of the effect sizes observed for fluoxetine.

181
182 PLATCOV is coordinated and monitored by the Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit
183 (MORU) in Bangkok, is overseen by a trial steering committee (TSC), conducted according to Good
184 Clinical Practice principles, and approved by the local IRB/EC (see supplementary materials
185 subsection S2). The results were reviewed regularly by a data and safety monitoring board
186 (DSMB). The funders had no role in the design, conduct, analysis, or interpretation of the trial.

187

188 **Participants**

189 Previously healthy non-pregnant adults aged between 18 and 50 years were eligible for
190 enrolment in the trial if they had early symptomatic COVID-19 (i.e. symptoms for <4 days), oxygen
191 saturation $\geq 96\%$, were unimpeded in activities of daily living, and gave fully informed written
192 consent. SARS-CoV-2 positivity was defined either as a nasal lateral flow antigen test which
193 became positive within two minutes (STANDARD[®] Q COVID-19 Ag Test, SD Biosensor, Suwon-si,
194 Korea) or a positive PCR test with a cycle threshold value (Ct) <25 (all viral gene targets) within
195 the previous 24 hours. Both tests ensure the majority of recruited patients have high viral loads.
196 Exclusion criteria included taking any potential antivirals or pre-existing concomitant
197 medications, chronic illness or significant comorbidity, haematological or biochemical
198 abnormalities (haemoglobin <8 g/dL, platelet count <50,000/ μL , abnormal liver function tests,
199 and estimated glomerular filtration rate <70 mL/min per 1.73 m²), pregnancy (a urinary
200 pregnancy test was performed in females), breastfeeding, or contraindication or known
201 hypersensitivity to any of the study drugs.

202

203 **Randomisation and interventions**

204 Block randomisation was performed via a centralised web-app designed by MORU software
205 engineers using RShiny® hosted on a MORU webserver (supplementary appendix subsection S8).
206 At enrolment, after obtaining fully informed consent and entering the patient details, the app
207 provided the study drug allocation. The “no study drug” arm was allocated to a minimum
208 proportion of 20% of patients, with uniform randomisation ratios applied across the other active
209 treatment arms. The trial was open label as it was impractical to conceal the different
210 interventions. The viral densities were measured blinded to treatment allocation. Fluoxetine was
211 added to the platform on the 5th May 2022 in Thailand, and the 21st June 2022 in Brazil, Laos, and
212 Pakistan. Fluoxetine was removed on the 8th May 2023. During this period, patients were also
213 randomised to remdesivir (until 10th June 2022), casirivimab/imdevimab (Thailand only, until 20th
214 October 2022), favipiravir (until 30th October 2022), molnupiravir (until 22nd February 2023),
215 tixagevimab/cilgavimab (until 4th July 2023), nitazoxanide (Brazil, Laos and Pakistan, from 18th
216 January 2022 ongoing), ensitrelvir (Thailand and Laos only, from 17th March 2023, ongoing), and
217 ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir (from 6th June 2022, ongoing as positive control).

218

219 **Procedures**

220 All study drugs were stored under the appropriate conditions. Fluoxetine (Anzac®: Bangkok Lab
221 Cosmetic in Thailand and Laos, Prozac®: Eli Lilly in Brazil and Flux, Hilton Pharma in Pakistan) was
222 given at an oral dose of 40 mg per day for a total of seven days starting at baseline. The
223 administration of all drugs was observed directly or via video. After randomisation and baseline
224 procedures (see appendix page 9) oropharyngeal swabs (two swabs taken from each tonsil) were
225 taken as follows. A flocced swab (Thermo Fisher MicroTest [Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA, USA]
226 and later COPAN FLOQSwabs® [COPAN Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA, USA]), was rotated against the
227 tonsil through 360° four times and placed in Thermo Fisher M4RT (Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA,
228 USA) viral transport medium (3 mL). The swabs were transferred at 4–8°C, aliquoted, and finally
229 frozen at –80°C within 48 hours. Separate swabs from each tonsil were taken once daily from day

230 0 to day 7, on day 10, and on day 14. Swabs were processed and tested separately. Vital signs
231 were recorded three times daily by the patient (on the first day the initial vital signs were
232 recorded by the study team). Symptoms and any adverse effects were recorded daily.

233 The TaqCheck® SARS-CoV-2 Fast PCR Assay (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher Scientific,
234 Waltham, MA, USA) quantitated viral loads (RNA copies per mL). This multiplexed real-time PCR
235 method detects the SARS-CoV-2 N and S genes, and human RNase P gene in a single reaction.
236 RNase P was used to adjust for variation in sample human cell content (see appendix page 20).
237 Viral loads were quantified against ATCC (Manassas, VA, USA) heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2 (VR-
238 1986HK strain 2019-nCoV/USA-WA1/2020) standards. Whole genome sequencing was
239 performed to genotype strains and classify the viral variants (see supplementary appendix
240 subsection S7).

241

242 **Outcomes**

243 The primary outcome measure was the rate of viral clearance estimated from viral genome
244 densities in serial duplicate oropharyngeal viral swab eluates taken daily between days 0 and 7
245 (see statistical methods below and supplementary appendix S9 for the method of estimation).

246 Secondary endpoints were:

- 247 (i) all-cause admission to hospital for clinical deterioration (until day 28);
- 248 (ii) time-to-resolution of fever in patients febrile at admission;
- 249 (iii) time-to-resolution of symptoms.

250 These endpoints were assessed using survival methods because the data at the last visit were
251 right-censored. Patients were defined as febrile at admission if at least one axillary temperature
252 measurement within 24 hours of randomisation was $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$. Resolution of fever was defined as
253 an axillary temperature $\leq 37.0^{\circ}\text{C}$ for at least 24 hours. Symptom resolution was defined as no
254 reported symptoms. All adverse events were graded as per the Common Terminology Criteria for
255 Adverse Events version 5.0.²⁸ Summaries were generated if the adverse event was grade 3 or
256 worse, and was new or had increased in intensity. Serious adverse events were recorded

257 separately and reported to the data safety monitoring board, however there were no serious
258 adverse events during this portion of the trial.

259

260 **Sample size and analysis framework**

261 For each intervention, the sample size was adaptive, based on the prespecified futility and
262 success stopping rules. A maximum sample size of 120 patients was prespecified (this does not
263 include the no study drug arm or the positive control arm - currently ritonavir-boosted
264 nirmatrelvir). Sample size requirements and thresholds for stopping rules were determined by
265 simulation (see statistical analysis plan supplementary appendix subsection S9).

266

267 The primary outcome measure, the rate of viral clearance between day 0 and day 7, was
268 expressed as a slope coefficient and estimated under a Bayesian hierarchical linear model with
269 random effect terms for the individual patient slope and intercept.^{25,29} The model was fitted to
270 the daily \log_{10} oropharyngeal swab eluate viral densities (genomes/mL) between days 0 and 7 (18
271 measurements per patient), using weakly informative priors and treating non-detectable viral
272 loads (CT value ≥ 40) as left-censored (supplementary appendix subsection S9).²⁵ The treatment
273 effect was defined as the multiplicative change (%) in the viral clearance rate, either relative to
274 the no study drug arm (when determining if an intervention had an antiviral effect), or relative
275 to the positive control arm (ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir).²⁹ The viral clearance rate (i.e., slope
276 coefficient from the model fit) can also be expressed as a clearance half-life ($t_{1/2} = \log_{10} 0.5/\text{slope}$).
277 A 50% increase in clearance rate equals a 33% reduction in clearance half-life. All models include
278 as covariate terms on the slope coefficient the time since study commencement, the virus
279 variant, and the study site.

280

281 Because of the changing pattern of viral variants, and the substantial increase in the rate of viral
282 clearance since the beginning of the pandemic, each of the studied interventions was compared
283 only against the concurrent controls, with interim analyses planned every additional ten patients
284 recruited into each group. However, in practice, the interim analyses were less frequent than
285 planned as recruitment occurred quickly. At first, all interim analyses compared the new

286 intervention against the no study drug group. The protocol stipulated dropping the intervention
287 for futility when there is >90% probability that it accelerated viral clearance by less than 20% (this
288 threshold was increased from 12.5% in January 2023; statistical analysis plan version 3.0). If the
289 new intervention reaches the success threshold (i.e., >90% probability it accelerated viral
290 clearance >20% relative to no study drug), it is then compared with the positive control. This
291 secondary comparison terminates when the intervention is shown to be inferior, non-inferior, or
292 superior to the positive control group using a 10% non-inferiority margin. If the intervention is
293 superior, it then replaces the positive control group. All stopping decisions are made using data
294 from contemporaneously randomly assigned patients only.

295
296 All efficacy analyses were done in a modified intention-to-treat (mITT) population, comprising all
297 patients with >2 days follow-up data. Safety data were analysed in all patients who had received
298 \geq one dose of the study drug. A sensitivity analysis was performed using a non-linear model fitted
299 to the serial viral densities, which allows for an initial increase followed by a log-linear decrease
300 (Supplementary appendix subsection S9).

301
302 **Additional post hoc analyses**

303 A recent analysis of all available PLATCOV trial unblinded data (N>1200 patients) characterised
304 the substantial increase in viral clearance rates that has occurred since the beginning of the
305 platform trial 28 months ago. The average oropharyngeal viral clearance half-life in the no study
306 drug arm has shortened from ~17 hours in late 2021 to ~9 hours in October 2023.³⁰ This analysis
307 also showed that restricting the primary endpoint to the clearance rate estimated over the first
308 5 days, instead of 7 days, resulted in greater power to assess treatment effects (i.e. larger z-scores
309 between effective and ineffective or no drug arms). A post-hoc analysis of the fluoxetine data
310 was therefore added in which the estimation of the viral clearance rates was made from the first
311 5 days only.

312 **Meta-analysis**

313 To calibrate the effect sizes observed for the fluoxetine arm, an individual patient data meta-
314 analysis was conducted of all small molecule drugs and monoclonal antibodies with unblinded
315 data from the PLATCOV trial (favipiravir, remdesivir, molnupiravir, ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir,
316 casirivimab/imdevimab and ivermectin). Not all interventions were randomised concurrently, so
317 the time since study commencement was included as a covariate on the mean slope parameter
318 to control for temporal confounding.

319

320 **Statistical analysis**

321 All data analysis was done in R version 4.3.2. Posterior distributions were approximated using
322 Hamiltonian Monte Carlo in Stan via the RStan interface.³¹ 4,000 iterations were run over four
323 independent chains with 2000 iterations for burn-in. Convergence was assessed visually from the
324 trace plots (Figures S4 and S5) and using the R-hat statistic (a value <1.1 was considered
325 acceptable convergence). Goodness of fit was assessed by plotting the residuals over time and
326 comparing the daily median model predictions with the observed values (Figure S5). All point
327 estimates are reported with 95% credible intervals (CrIs), defined by the 2.5% and the 97.5%
328 quantiles of the posterior distribution. Model fits were compared using approximate leave-one-
329 out comparison as implemented in the package loo.³²

330 **Results**


331 The PLATCOV platform trial began recruitment on 30th September 2021. The fluoxetine arm was
332 added in Thailand on 5th April 2022, and in the other sites on the 21st June 2022, and was stopped
333 on 8th May 2023 after 120 patients had been randomised to fluoxetine. Of the 675 patients
334 randomised during that period, 120 patients were randomised to fluoxetine, 151 to no study
335 drug, and the remaining 404 were randomised to other interventions (casirivimab/imdevimab,
336 tixagevimab/cilgavimab, nitazoxanide, favipiravir, remdesivir, ivermectin, ensitrelvir, ritonavir-
337 boosted nirmatrelvir and molnupiravir) (Figure 1). Four patients from the fluoxetine group
338 withdrew consent. Two patients from the no study drug arm withdrew consent.

339

340 The majority of patients (89.6%) were enrolled in Bangkok, Thailand (Table 1). The median
 341 interval since symptom onset was 2 (IQR: 2 to 3) days. Most patients had high oropharyngeal
 342 eluate viral densities at presentation; average viral density of ~350,000 genomes per mL. Patients
 343 were infected with a wide variety of virus variants, the 3 most common being BA.2.75 (107/355),
 344 BA.5 (99/355) and XBB.1.5-like (63/355).

345

346



347

348 Figure 1: Study CONSORT diagram for the fluoxetine versus no study drug analysis. *In Thailand, pre-
 349 screening occurred in the Acute Respiratory Infection (ARI) unit of the Hospital for Tropical Diseases,
 350 Bangkok. Potentially eligible patients were selected by the ARI Nurses to be contacted by the study team.
 351 Therefore, a high proportion of those assessed for eligibility participated in the study.

352

	No study drug	Fluoxetine
All sites	150	116
Brazil	17 (11.3%)	12 (10.3%)
Thailand	129 (86.0%)	101 (87.1%)
Laos	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)
Pakistan	4 (2.7%)	2 (1.7%)
Age (years) (SD)	30.5 (7.8)	29.5 (7.7)
Female N (%)	98 (65.3%)	82 (70.7)
Weight (kg) (SD)	62.7 (13.4)	59.6 (11.3)
Body mass index (kg/m ²) (SD)	23.2 (4.0)	22.3 (3.5)
Baseline oropharyngeal eluate viral density (log ₁₀ copies per mL) (SD)	5.5 (1.4)	5.6 (1.3)
Symptom onset (days) (SD)	2.1 (0.8)	2.2 (0.8)
Vaccinated (%)	150 (100.0%)	116 (100.0%)
SARS-CoV-2 variants		
BA.2 (%)	30 (20.0%)	24 (20.7%)
BA.2.3.20 (%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)
BA.2.75 (%)	41 (27.3)	34 (29.3%)
BA.4 (%)	2(1.3%)	0 (0.0%)
BA.5 (%)	42 (28.0%)	31 (26.7%)
BN.1.9 (%)	2 (1.3)	0 (0.0%)
XBB (%)	10 (6.7%)	9 (7.8%)
XBB.1.5-like (%)	23 (15.3%)	15 (12.9%)
Others (%)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.7)

353 Table 1: Admission patient characteristics in the mITT population. For categorical variables, the number
 354 (%) is shown and for continuous variables the standard deviation.

355

356 **Tolerability**

357 The oropharyngeal swabbing procedures and all treatments were well-tolerated. Patients
358 allocated to the fluoxetine arm reported increased somnolence compared to the no study drug
359 arm, and so the treatment was given in the evening.

360

361 **Clinical responses**

362 There were no serious adverse events (SAEs), hospitalisations or deaths in either arms, and no
363 patients developed severe disease. There were no significant differences in times to symptom
364 resolution or fever clearance between the fluoxetine and the no study drug arms, however this
365 latter comparison had low power as only a quarter of patients were febrile at baseline
366 (supplementary appendix figures S6 and S7).

367

368 **Virological responses**


369 Rates of viral clearance were estimated in the mITT population (6,362 measurements in 355
370 patients, of which 5,062 (80%) were above the lower limit of quantification). Under the linear
371 model fluoxetine resulted in a 15% (95% CrI: 2 to 34%) faster average rate of viral clearance over
372 7 days relative to no study drug. (Figure 2). The posterior probability that the effect of fluoxetine
373 was less than the pre-specified futility margin of 20% was 0.70. The non-linear model gave very
374 similar estimates: an acceleration in viral clearance rate of 11% (95% CrI -3 to 29%) relative to the
375 no study drug. Under the linear model, the median estimated viral clearance half-lives were 14.0
376 hours (9.3–18.0) with fluoxetine, and 14.9 hours (11.5–20.8) in the concurrent no study drug
377 group (Figure 3).

378

379 An in-depth analysis of all unblinded data (not including the fluoxetine arm) from the platform
380 trial showed that viral clearance rates have increased substantially since the study began in
381 September 2021.³⁰ This analysis indicated that maximal power to detect an antiviral effect was
382 obtained from clearance rates estimated over the first 5 days (rather than 7 days). As a *post hoc*
383 sensitivity analysis, we therefore estimated the treatment effect of fluoxetine using data only

384 from the first 5 days after randomisation. Under the linear and non-linear models, the estimated
385 fluoxetine treatment effects were substantially larger: 26% (95% CrI: 5 to 50%) under the linear
386 model; and 18% (95% CrI: 2 to 39%) under the non-linear model (Figure 2B).


387



388

389 Figure 2: Antiviral effect of fluoxetine in early COVID-19. Panel A: individual viral densities data (fluoxetine:
390 dark green; no study drug: light green). Triangles show the daily median oropharyngeal eluate viral
391 densities by arm. Panel B: posterior estimates of the treatment effects of fluoxetine relative to no study
392 drug, under the linear and non-linear models (orange: viral clearance assessed over 7 days; green: viral
393 clearance assessed over 5 days). Thick and thin error bars represent the 80% and 95% CrIs, respectively.
394 The shaded area indicates the prespecified futility zone (<20% increase in viral clearance rate).

Viral clearance half-life



395

396


397 Figure 3: Estimated SARS-CoV-2 clearance half-lives (in hours) estimated over 7 days for individual patients
398 in the fluoxetine arm (dark green), and the no-study-drug arm (light green). The median estimates (circles)
399 and 80% credible intervals (error bars) are displayed. Vertical dashed lines indicate the median half-lives
400 of each group.

401

402 **Meta-analysis**

403 Under the linear model analysing viral clearance rates over 7 days, the meta-analysis including
404 all unblinded drugs (not concurrently randomised) and adjusting for calendar time and viral
405 variants, estimated that fluoxetine increased viral clearance by 16% (95% CrI 3 to 32%) compared
406 to the no study drug group (Figure 4). Fluoxetine treatment resulted in a higher viral clearance

407 rate than two interventions previously reported to have no clinical antiviral effect;
 408 ivermectin²⁵ and favipiravir.²⁷ The treatment effect of fluoxetine was lower than that of
 409 casirivimab/imdevimab,²⁶ remdesivir,²⁶ molnupiravir,² and substantially lower than ritonavir-
 410 boosted nirmatrelvir,² with the probabilities of 0.88, 0.94, 0.98, and 1.00, respectively. These four
 411 active antivirals/monoclonal antibodies increased the rates of viral clearance by 29% (95% CrI 10
 412 to 48%), 35% (95% CrI 14 to 59%), 37% (95% CrI 18 to 60%), and 85% (95% CrI 61 to 112%),
 413 respectively. Additionally, consistent with the main analysis, a post-hoc analysis of viral clearance
 414 estimated over 5 days demonstrated higher discriminating power (figure 4B) indicated that
 415 fluoxetine increased the viral clearance rate by 28% (95% CrI 11 to 49%).
 416



417
 418 Figure 4: Meta-analysis of oropharyngeal viral clearance rates in 783 patients in unblinded drug arms
 419 (ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir, molnupiravir, remdesivir, casirivimab/imdevimab, fluoxetine, favipiravir,
 420 and ivermectin relative to no study drug ; not all concurrently) (A) Daily median oropharyngeal viral
 421 loads by treatment group. (B) Posterior estimates of treatment effect on viral clearance rate relative to
 422 no study drug under a model adjusting for calendar time and virus variant (orange: viral clearance
 423 assessed over 7 days; green: viral clearance assessed over 5 days). Thick and thin error bars representing
 424 the 80% and 95% CrIs, respectively. The shaded area indicates the futility zone (<20% increase in viral
 425 clearance rate).

426 Figure 4: Meta-analysis of oropharyngeal viral clearance rates in 783 patients in unblinded drug arms
427 (ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir, molnupiravir, remdesivir, casirivimab/imdevimab, fluoxetine, favipiravir,
428 and ivermectin relative to no study drug ; not all concurrently) (A) Daily median oropharyngeal viral
429 loads by treatment group. (B) Posterior estimates of treatment effect on viral clearance rate relative to
430 no study drug under a model adjusting for calendar time and virus variant (orange: viral clearance
431 assessed over 7 days; green: viral clearance assessed over 5 days). Thick and thin error bars representing
432 the 80% and 95% CrIs, respectively. The shaded area indicates the futility zone (<20% increase in viral
433 clearance rate).

434 **Discussion**

435 This clinical pharmacodynamic evaluation shows that the widely used SSRI fluoxetine, which has
436 the same proposed FIASMA mechanism of action as fluvoxamine, does have measurable, albeit
437 weak antiviral activity against SARS-CoV-2 *in vivo*. Earlier in the pandemic, before effective
438 antivirals and before vaccines were deployed, any available drug with anti-SARS-CoV-2 activity
439 could have played a role in the management of COVID-19. Based on several observational studies
440 which reported lower mortalities in patients receiving SSRIs,⁴⁻⁷ and some evidence for
441 prophylactic activity,⁸ the SSRIs fluoxetine and fluvoxamine were proposed as treatments for
442 early COVID-19. Both drugs are interesting choices as they are inexpensive, widely available, very
443 widely used, and have excellent safety profiles. A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials
444 of fluvoxamine showed a slight, but non-significant reduction in hospitalisation +/- mortality
445 (Supplementary appendix; subsection S1). However, these results were not sufficient to change
446 treatment policies and practices. In May 2022, the US FDA rejected an emergency use
447 authorisation (EUA) for fluvoxamine maleate in outpatients with COVID-19, on the basis that
448 there was insufficient evidence that fluvoxamine can prevent progression to severe disease or
449 hospitalisation. The US FDA noted that “it is unlikely that fluvoxamine possesses a high degree of
450 activity against SARS-CoV-2”.³³ There have been no randomised controlled trials in outpatients
451 assessing fluoxetine.

452
453 In this comparative *in vivo* pharmacodynamic platform trial, carried out in low-risk adults with
454 early symptomatic COVID-19 infection, fluoxetine demonstrated significant but weak antiviral
455 activity. This was not sufficient for it to reach the prespecified success threshold of a 20%

456 acceleration of viral clearance (assessed over 7 days) compared to the contemporaneous control
457 group. This threshold was set because there are now highly effective antiviral drugs for early
458 symptomatic COVID-19, and so it is unlikely that drugs with a substantially lower potency would
459 be used in treatment. The main protease inhibitor nirmatrelvir, in combination with ritonavir, is
460 currently the most effective antiviral treatment assessed in this platform trial. In the 7-day
461 assessment its acceleration of viral clearance was over five times greater than that of fluoxetine.
462 But it has several disadvantages. Ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir is very expensive and often
463 unaffordable, it is not readily available worldwide, it produces an unpleasant taste, and ritonavir
464 is contraindicated in many patient groups due to drug interactions. So, although fluoxetine is
465 unlikely to be used in treatment now, it might still have a role in prevention where less antiviral
466 activity is required than in the treatment of an already established infection (hence why lower
467 doses are effective in prophylaxis, than in treatment).

468
469 The methodology used in this platform trial is an effective way to measure antiviral effects in
470 COVID-19. Acceleration of viral clearance reflects the *in vivo* antiviral effect and correlates with
471 prevention of hospitalisation and death.³⁴ It is becoming increasingly difficult to carry out large
472 trials with clinical endpoints. This is because the low rates of hospitalisation and death in COVID-
473 19 infections with current viral variants in an increasingly immune population mean that sample
474 sizes using these endpoints must be prohibitively large.²² Virological pharmacodynamic
475 endpoints can be used to measure antiviral effects with substantially smaller sample sizes. The
476 pharmacodynamic assessment has also become simpler. Increased rates of viral clearance since
477 the pandemic started now mean that viral clearance can be measured more accurately over 5
478 rather than 7 days.

479
480 The study has several limitations. It is open-label, which may have influenced the symptom
481 reporting in each arm. There is substantial variability in estimated serial viral densities and much
482 of the inter-subject variance in viral clearance rates is unexplained. There still remains some
483 uncertainty about the antiviral potency of fluoxetine (at the doses evaluated). Whether larger

484 doses would have greater activity is not known, although tolerability would have been reduced.

485 The applicability of this result to other SSRIs or other FIASMAs was not determined.

486

487 In summary, fluoxetine demonstrates modest *in vivo* antiviral activity in early COVID-19. It

488 accelerated viral clearance by at least 15%, but this is much less than currently available effective

489 antivirals. Given that there are more effective, albeit much more expensive drugs, fluoxetine is

490 unlikely to be used in the treatment of COVID-19 at this stage of the pandemic, but whether it

491 could have had a useful role earlier is unclear. Fluoxetine might have a role either in prophylaxis,

492 or in high-risk patients unable to access or take other treatments, or in future pandemics, but

493 further evidence will be needed before such recommendations can be made. *In vivo*

494 pharmacodynamic assessments of drugs should be more widely adopted.

495 **Acknowledgements**

496 The trial was generously supported by the Wellcome Trust Grant ref: 223195/Z/21/Z through the
497 COVID-19 Therapeutics Accelerator.

498 We thank all the patients with COVID-19 who volunteered to be part of the study. We thank the
499 data safety and monitoring board (DSMB) (Tim Peto, André Siqueira, and Panisadee Avirutnan);
500 the trial steering committee (TSC) (Nathalie Strub-Wourgaft, Martin Llewelyn, Deborah Waller,
501 and Attavit Asavisanu); Sompob Saralamba and Tanaphum Wichaita for developing the RShiny
502 randomisation app; and Mavuto Mukaka for invaluable statistical support. We also thank all the
503 staff of the Clinical Trials Unit (CTU) at MORU, PCR Expert group (Janjira Thaipadungpanit, Audrey
504 Dubot-Pérès and Clare Ling), Thermo Fisher for their excellent support with this project, and all
505 the hospital staff at the Hospital for Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, as well as
506 those involved in sample processing in MORU and the processing and analysis at the Faculty of
507 Tropical Medicine (FTM), molecular genetics laboratory. We would thank the MORU Clinical Trials
508 Support Group (CTSG) for data management, monitoring, ethics and regulatory submissions and
509 logistics, and the purchasing, administration, and support staff at MORU, and those at the Brazil
510 site who provided expert help in managing patients (Joseane Fratari, Josiane Vaz and Fátima
511 Brant). We would finally like to thank everyone who supported the Laos and Pakistan sites.

512

513 **Contributors**

514 PJ- investigation, methodology, project administration, supervision, validation, and writing-
515 original draft. SB- investigation, methodology, project administration, writing- original draft. PJ
516 and SB contributed equally. WHKS- funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project
517 administration, supervision, validation, and writing- original draft. JAW- conceptualisation, data
518 curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, methodology, visualisation, and writing- original
519 draft. TN, TS, VL- Investigation, methodology, supervision. EMB- data curation, formal analysis,
520 visualisation. PW- data curation, formal analysis, visualisation, and writing- original draft. RA, FA,
521 NG- formal analysis, investigation. LE, PA, CC, JJC, SS, VK, TN, JT, FQ, AMK - methodology,
522 investigation, project administration. WM, KS, AP- investigation, methodology. BH, KP-

523 methodology, investigation, supervision. MP, AS, BL- resources. WRJT- methodology,
524 supervision. KC, MI- formal analysis, investigation, resources, supervision. SP, AMD, AB, MMT,
525 WP, WP, DC, SV - methodology, investigation, resources, supervision. NPJD- funding acquisition,
526 methodology, investigation, resources, supervision. NJW- conceptualisation, funding acquisition,
527 methodology, supervision, validation, and writing- original draft.

528 All Authors were involved in writing- review & editing.

529 JAW, WHKS, EMB, TN, MI and NJW have directly accessed and verified the underlying data
530 reported in the manuscript.

531

532

533 **Declaration of interests**

534 We declare no competing interests

535

536 **Data sharing statement**

537 All code and de-identified participant data required for replication of the study's endpoints are
538 openly accessible via GitHub, as well as the study protocol and statistical analysis plan, from
539 publication date onwards: <https://github.com/jwatowatson/PLATCOV-Fluoxetine> Individual
540 Patient Data can be requested and may be shared according to the terms defined in the MORU
541 data sharing policy with other researchers to use in the future from the date of publication.
542 Further information on how to apply is found here: [https://www.tropmedres.ac/units/moru-
543 bangkok/bioethics-engagement/data-sharing](https://www.tropmedres.ac/units/moru-bangkok/bioethics-engagement/data-sharing).

544

545

546 References

- 547 1. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J*
548 *Med* 2021; **384**: 693-704.
- 549 2. Schilling WH, Jittamala P, Watson JA et al. Antiviral efficacy of molnupiravir versus ritonavir-
550 boosted nirmatrelvir in patients with early symptomatic COVID-19 (PLATCOV): an open-label,
551 phase 2, randomised, controlled, adaptive trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2023; **24**: 36-45
- 552 3. Sanderson T, Hisner R, Donovan-Banfield IA et al. A molnupiravir-associated mutational
553 signature in global SARS-CoV-2 genomes. *Nature*. 2023; **623**:594-600.
- 554 4. Hoertel N, Sánchez-Rico M, Vernet R et al. Association between antidepressant use and reduced
555 risk of intubation or death in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: results from an observational
556 study. *Mol. Psychiatry* 2021; **26**: 5199-5212
- 557 5. Oskotsky T, Marić I, Tang A et al. Mortality Risk Among Patients With COVID-19 Prescribed
558 Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor Antidepressants. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**:e2133090-e.
- 559 6. Hoertel N, Sánchez-Rico M, Kornhuber J et al. Antidepressant use and its association with 28-day
560 mortality in inpatients with SARS-CoV-2: support for the FIASMA model against COVID-19. *J Clin*
561 *Med* 2022; **11**:5882.
- 562 7. Hoertel N, Sánchez-Rico M, Gulbins E et al . Association between FIASMA psychotropic
563 medications and reduced risk of intubation or death in individuals with psychiatric disorders
564 hospitalized for severe COVID-19: an observational multicenter study. *Transl Psychiatry* 2022;
565 **12**: 90.
- 566 8. Clelland CL, Ramiah K, Steinberg L, Clelland JD. Analysis of the impact of antidepressants and
567 other medications on COVID-19 infection risk in a chronic psychiatric in-patient cohort. *B J Psych*
568 *Open* 2022; **8**:e6.
- 569 9. Lenze EJ, Mattar C, Zorumski CF et al. Fluvoxamine vs placebo and clinical deterioration in
570 outpatients with symptomatic COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2020; **324**: 2292-
571 2300.
- 572 10. Reis G, dos Santos Moreira-Silva EA, Silva DC et al. Effect of early treatment with fluvoxamine on
573 risk of emergency care and hospitalisation among patients with COVID-19: the TOGETHER
574 randomised, platform clinical trial. *Lancet Glob Hlth* 2022; **1**: 42-51

- 575 11. Reis G, dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Medeiros Silva DC et al. Oral Fluvoxamine with Inhaled
576 Budesonide for Treatment of Early-Onset COVID-19: A Randomized Platform Trial. *Ann Intern*
577 *Med* 2023; **176**:667-675.
- 578 12. Reiersen AM, Mattar C, Bender Ignacio RA et al. The STOP COVID 2 Study: Fluvoxamine vs
579 Placebo for Outpatients with Symptomatic COVID-19, a Fully Remote Randomized Controlled
580 Trial. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2023; **10** : ofad419
- 581 13. Stewart TG, Rebolledo PA, Mourad A et al. Higher-Dose Fluvoxamine and Time to Sustained
582 Recovery in Outpatients With COVID-19: The ACTIV-6 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2023; **24**:
583 2354-2363
- 584 14. Bramante CT, Huling JD, Tignanelli CJ et al. Randomized trial of metformin, ivermectin, and
585 fluvoxamine for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **387**: 599-610.
- 586 15. McCarthy MW, Naggie S, Boulware DR et al. Effect of fluvoxamine vs placebo on time to
587 sustained recovery in outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial.
588 *JAMA*.2023;**329**: 296-305.
- 589 16. Siripongboonsitti T, Ungtrakul T, Tawinprai K et al. Efficacy of combination therapy of
590 fluvoxamine and favipiravir vs favipiravir monotherapy to prevent severe COVID-19 among mild
591 to moderate COVID-19 patients: Open-label randomized controlled trial (EFFaCo study). *Int J*
592 *Infect Dis* 2023; **134**: 211-219.
- 593 17. Pauletto PJ, Delgado CP, da Rocha JB. Acid sphingomyelinase (ASM) and COVID-19: A review of
594 the potential use of ASM inhibitors against SARS-CoV-2. *Cell Biochem. Funct* 2023; **41**:284-95.
- 595 18. World Health Organization. WHO Model List of Essential Medicines - 23rd list, 2023
- 596 19. Fred SM, Kuivanen S, Ugurlu H et al. Antidepressant and antipsychotic drugs reduce viral
597 infection by SARS-CoV-2 and fluoxetine shows antiviral activity against the novel variants in
598 vitro. *Front. Pharmacol.* 2022; **12** :75560 0
- 599 20. Zimniak M, Kirschner L, Hilpert H et al. The serotonin reuptake inhibitor Fluoxetine inhibits
600 SARS-CoV-2 in human lung tissue. *Sci. Rep.* 2021; **1**:5890.
- 601 21. Eugene AR. Fluoxetine pharmacokinetics and tissue distribution suggest a possible role in
602 reducing SARS-CoV-2 titers. *F1000 Research.* 2021; **10**: 477.
- 603 22. Butler CC, Hobbs FDR, Gbinigie OA et al. Molnupiravir plus usual care versus usual care alone as
604 early treatment for adults with COVID-19 at increased risk of adverse outcomes (PANORAMIC):
605 an open-label, platform-adaptive randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2023; **401**: 281-293.

- 606 23. Parienti JJ, de Grooth HJ. Clinical relevance of nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 viral load reduction in
607 outpatients with COVID-19. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2022;**77**: 2038-2039.
- 608 24. Elias KM, Khan SR, Stadler E et al. Viral clearance as a surrogate of clinical efficacy for COVID-19
609 therapies in outpatients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv.* 2023;2023-06.
- 610 25. Schilling WH, Jittamala P, Watson JA et al. Pharmacometric assessment of the in vivo antiviral
611 activity of ivermectin in early symptomatic COVID-19. *eLife* 2023; **12**: e83201
- 612 26. Jittamala P, Schilling WH, Watson JA et al. Clinical antiviral efficacy of remdesivir and
613 casirivimab/imdevimab against the SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron variants. *medRxiv* 2022; Oct
614 19, DOI:2022.10.17.22281161.
- 615 27. Luvira V, Schilling W, Jittamala P et al. Clinical antiviral efficacy of favipiravir in early COVID-19
616 (PLATCOV): an open- label, randomised, controlled adaptive platform trial. *Research Square*;
617 2023 DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2675703/v1
- 618 28. NIH National Cancer Institute. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) Version
619 5.0. November 27, 2017.
620 [https://ctep.cancer.gov/protocoldevelopment/electronic_applications/docs/CTCAE_v5_Quick_R](https://ctep.cancer.gov/protocoldevelopment/electronic_applications/docs/CTCAE_v5_Quick_Reference_8.5x11.pdf)
621 [eference_8.5x11.pdf](https://ctep.cancer.gov/protocoldevelopment/electronic_applications/docs/CTCAE_v5_Quick_Reference_8.5x11.pdf)
- 622 29. Watson JA, Kissler SM, Day NPJ, Grad YH, White NJ. Characterizing SARS-CoV-2 Viral Clearance
623 Kinetics to Improve the Design of Antiviral Pharmacometric Studies. *Antimicrob Agents*
624 *Chemother.* 2022; **66**: e0019222.
- 625 30. Wongnak P, Schilling WH, Jittamala P et al. Temporal changes in SARS-CoV-2 clearance kinetics
626 and the optimal design of phase 2 antiviral studies. *MedRxiv [Preprint]* 2024
- 627 31. Stan Development Team (2023). "RStan: the R interface to Stan." R package version 2.32.3,
628 <https://mc-stan.org/>.
- 629 32. Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J. "Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-
630 validation and WAIC." *Stat Comput* 2017; **27**: 1413-1432.
- 631 33. Memorandum explaining basis for declining request for emergency use authorization of
632 flvoxamine maleate. News release. US Food and Drug Administration. Accessed Dec 15, 2023.
633 [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/EUA%20110%20Fluvoxamine%20](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/EUA%20110%20Fluvoxamine%20Decisional%20Memo_Redacted.pdf)
634 [Decisional%20Memo_Redacted.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2020/EUA%20110%20Fluvoxamine%20Decisional%20Memo_Redacted.pdf)
- 635 34. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk, Nonhospitalized
636 Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2022; **15**:1397-1408.