

1 **The efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine in COVID19 patients**
2 **: a multicenter national retrospective cohort**

3
4 Abdulkarim Abdulrahman^{1,2}, Islam AlSayed³, Marwa AlMadhi⁴, Jumana
5 AlArayed⁵, Sara Jaafar Mohammed³, Aesha Khalid Sharif⁵, Khadija
6 Alansari³, Abdulla I AlAwadhi^{1,6}, Manaf AlQahtani^{1,6,7*}

7
8 ¹ National Taskforce for Combating the Coronavirus (COVID-19),
9 Bahrain

10 ² Mohammed Bin Khalifa Cardiac Centre, Bahrain

11 ³ King Hamad University Hospital, Bahrain

12 ⁴ School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health,
13 University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

14 ⁵ Ministry of Health, Bahrain

15 ⁶ Bahrain Defence Force hospital, Bahrain

16 ⁷ Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Bahrain

17

18

19

20 *Corresponding author: Manaf AlQahtani.

21 Email: mqahtani@rcsi-mub.com

22 Phone: +973 39766000

23

24

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 **Background**

27 Hydroxychloroquine is an antimalarial drug that received worldwide news and media
28 attention in the treatment of COVID-19 patients. This drug was used based on its
29 antimicrobial and antiviral properties despite lack of definite evidence of clinical
30 efficacy. In this study, we aim to assess the efficacy and safety of using
31 Hydroxychloroquine in treatment of COVID-19 patients who are admitted in acute
32 care hospitals in Bahrain.

34 **Methodology**

35 We conducted retrospective cohort study on a random sample of admitted COVID19
36 patients between 24 February and 31 July 2020. The study was conducted in four
37 acute care COVID19 hospitals in Bahrain. Data was extracted from the medical
38 records. The primary endpoint was the requirement of non-invasive ventilation,
39 intubation or death. Secondary endpoint was length of hospitalization for survivors.
40 Three methods of analysis were used to control for confounding factors: logistic
41 multivariate regression, propensity score adjusted regression and matched
42 propensity score analysis.

44 **Results**

45 A random sample of 1571 patients were included, 440 of which received HCQ
46 (treatment group) and 1131 did not receive it (control group). Our results showed
47 that HCQ did not have a significant effect on primary outcomes due to COVID-19
48 infection when compared to controls after adjusting for confounders (OR 1.43 95%
49 CI 0.85 to 2.37, P value=0.17). Co-administration of azithromycin had no effect on
50 primary outcomes (OR 2.7 95% CI 0.82 to 8.85 P value =0.10). HCQ was found to
51 be associated with increased risk of hypoglycemia (OR 10.9 95% CI 1.72 - 69.49, P
52 value =0.011) and diarrhea(OR 2.8, 95% CI 1.4-5.5, P value =0.003), but not QT
53 prolongation(OR=1.92, 95% CI 0.95-3.9, P value =0.06) or cardiac
54 arrhythmia.(OR=1.06, 95% CI 0.55-2.05, P value =0.85).

56 **Conclusion**

57 Our results showed no significant beneficial effect of using hydroxychloroquine on
58 the outcome of COVID-19 patients. Moreover, the risk of hypoglycemia due to
59 hydroxychloroquine would possess a significant risk for out of hospital use.

62 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2 ; COVID19 ; Hydroxychloroquine ; safety; efficacy;
63 azithromycin; respiratory failure

64

65 BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

66 An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2),
67 causing the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID19) started in December 2019, and
68 almost a year later, we seem to be at the brink of an imminent second wave. Since it
69 was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation (WHO) in March 2020 (1),
70 it infected more than 52 million people and lead to the death of 1.3 million others (2).
71 With no cure or vaccine identified yet, the health sector moved to repurposing available
72 drugs.

73 One of the first and most rapidly identified was Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), which was
74 considered due to its antiviral activity. It was initially developed as an antimalarial drug,
75 and is currently widely used to treat autoimmune diseases like systemic lupus
76 erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis (3). The efficacy of HCQ against SARS-CoV-
77 2 was first confirmed *in vitro* and was reported to mediate its inhibition through the
78 blockage of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) II receptors which facilitate SARS-
79 CoV-2 entry into cells (4). In addition, HCQ reportedly also disrupted the transport of
80 SARS-CoV-2 from endosomes to endolysosomes, which is necessary for viral release
81 (4, 5). HCQ also has immunomodulatory effects such as inhibition of antigen-
82 presenting cell activity, in turn blocking the activation of T cells (6). This prevents the
83 release of inflammatory cytokines, which causes the “cytokine storm” observed in
84 COVID19 patients (6-8). The Food and Drug Administration issued an “emergency
85 use authorization” for the use of HCQ for COVID19 patients, based on these limited
86 results (9), which lead to an increase in HCQ use. The first clinical trial studying the
87 use of HCQ to treat COVID19 was an open-label, non-randomized trial conducted in
88 France. A total of 36 patients received HCQ and 16 controls, with results showing a
89 drop in viral load amongst the HCQ group compared to the controls by day 6 of the
90 trial (10). Observational studies that followed failed to report a therapeutic advantage
91 of the magnitude seen in the French study, instead showing that HCQ has no effect
92 on intubation or mortality amongst COVID19 patients (11, 12).

93 Soon after, studies showing adverse effects of HCQ use started appearing. Concerns
94 regarding safety and efficacy increased after the infamous, and not retracted, study

95 was published in the Lancet claiming patients treated with HCQ were at a greater risk
96 of dying at the hospital (13). A retrospective cohort study of 1438 patients hospitalized
97 in metropolitan New York published in JAMA showed that patients who received HCQ
98 (along with azithromycin) were at increased risk of cardiac arrest (11). The WHO
99 discontinued the SOLIDARITY trial for HCQ after recommendation from the trial
100 steering committee, based on evidence that HCQ produced little or no reduction in the
101 mortality of hospitalized COVID-19 patients when compared to standard care (14).
102 Results from the Randomized Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy (RECOVERY) trial,
103 showed that HCQ was not effective in reducing mortality and increasing length of
104 hospital stay (15).

105 Results from HCQ trials and observational studies have yielded inconsistent results,
106 making the confirmation of its efficacy difficult. This inevitably lead to a widespread
107 confusion within the medical community and patients, with some halting its use and
108 others continuing its administration regardless.

109 An increasing number of studies also reported enhanced HCQ activity when coupled
110 with other drugs. Azithromycin, a macrolide antibiotic commonly used to treat chest
111 infections, was reported to accelerate virus elimination (10, 16, 17). It was also used
112 in the first HCQ clinical trial on 6 patients who, by day 6, tested negative (10). However,
113 this was a very small sample size, and one of the patients tested positive again on day
114 8. The results regarding the combinations of drugs have also been inconsistent and
115 there is no definitive proof of efficacy.

116 Although HCQ has a better safety clinical profile compared to chloroquine (18), the
117 drug it is derived from, there are many reported risks and side effects of HCQ usage.
118 Along with the common side effects, including nausea and headaches, the most
119 common side effect of HCQ use is QT interval prolongation and subsequent risk of
120 arrhythmia (19, 20). The mechanism by which HCQ initiates arrhythmias is yet
121 unknown, however its electrophysiological effects include blocking several currents –
122 funny current, L-type calcium current and rectifier potassium currents (21). These lead
123 to sinus bradycardia and repolarization abnormalities, the later leading to the observed
124 QT prolongation (20). A clinical trial studying the effects of different chloroquine doses

125 involving 81 COVID19 patients in Brazil was prematurely stopped after patients
126 receiving the higher dose (600mg, twice daily) developed arrhythmia within 2-3 days
127 of starting the trial (22). Although chloroquine is known to be more toxic than HCQ,
128 the study suggested that both drugs HCQ has also been associated with liver and
129 renal impairment (8), both of which have also been reported in COVID19 patients (23).
130 With suggestions that hepatic malfunctioning incidences increase with COVID-19
131 infection (24), this side effect of HCQ use could be detrimental. This, and the lack of
132 conclusive evidence for the efficacy of HCQ in treating COVID19, creates a reluctance
133 amongst the public and the healthcare sector to using it. This is a retrospective
134 observational study that aims to investigate HCQ efficacy on clinical and safety
135 outcomes amongst COVID19 patients

136

137 **METHODS**

138 **Study design and setting**

139 A retrospective cohort study was done on COVID19 patients in Bahrain. Cases that
140 were admitted at Ministry of Health COVID19 treatment facilities were included. The 4
141 hospitals included were: Ebrahim bin Khalil Kanoo COVID19 Centre, SMC 6th floor
142 COVID19 Centre, Hereditary Blood Disorder Centre (HBDC) COVID19 Centre and
143 Jidhafs COVID19 Centre. All cases who were admitted to these facilities were
144 confirmed to be infected by SARS-CoV-2 by a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test
145 of a nasopharyngeal sample. Cases admitted between 24 February to 31 July were
146 included.

147 A random sample of cases who received HCQ and a random sample of cases who
148 did not receive HCQ within the study time period were included. Patients who were
149 started on NIV, intubated, died, or transferred to a different facility within 24 hours from
150 admission were excluded from the analysis.

151 **Hydroxychloroquine exposure**

152 Labeling patients as “receiving HCQ” depended on whether they were received the
153 drug at our study baseline - defined as within 72hrs of admission.
154 The National Bahrain treatment protocol, developed by the national task force medical
155 team, was issued to all COVID19 facilities as guidance to health care workers for the
156 management of COVID19. HCQ was suggested for patients with COVID19 as a
157 therapeutic option. The suggested HCQ regimen was a loading dose of 600 mg twice
158 on day 1, followed by 400 mg daily for 4 additional days. Azithromycin at a dose of
159 500 mg on day 1 and then 250 mg daily for 4 more days in combination with HCQ was
160 an additional suggested therapeutic option. However, the suggestion of HCQ and/or
161 Azithromycin was removed in April after several manuscripts showed lack of benefit
162 from HCQ and a potential risk. Prescribing either or both medications was a decision
163 left to the judgment of the treating team based on individualization of the patient care.

164 **Data sources and variables assessed**

165 We obtained data from the “I-SEHA” electronic medical records. The I-SEHA is a
166 doctor station which provides access to patient records and has all the clinical details
167 of the hospital stay as text files. Data was manually extracted from the electronic
168 records. 5 physicians who were assisted by 10 senior medical students reviewed all
169 the cases and filled in an electronic form developed to collect data for this study. The
170 data gathered included patients’ demographic details, vital signs, laboratory test
171 results, medication lists, past medical history, clinical severity scale (as seen in the
172 supplementary table attached in the appendix), oxygenation requirement on
173 admission, the ratio of the oxygen saturation to the fraction of inspired oxygen
174 ($SpO_2:FiO_2$) at admission, requirement of ICU care, ventilator use and outcomes. A
175 complete list of variables collected is attached in Appendix A.

176 **Outcomes**

177 Primary outcome: The primary end point was the requirement of non-invasive
178 ventilation, intubation or death. When a patient died after ventilator requirement, the
179 timing of the primary end point was defined as the time of the first use of ventilator.

180 Safety outcomes: the development of any of the adverse events during hospital stay,
181 after the prescription of medications. Adverse event included were cardiac arrhythmia,
182 QT prolongation (>500ms), diarrhea and hypoglycemia (defined as glucose levels less
183 than 3.6 mmol/L)

184 Secondary outcome was length of stay in days for survivors.

185 **Statistical analysis**

186 The distribution of treatment groups was summarized. Bivariate associations between
187 the treatment group and the measured patient characteristics were analyzed using
188 Chi-squared (χ^2) tests for categorical variables and t-test for continuous variables. We
189 also assessed endpoint and adverse events and their associations with the treatment
190 group.

191 Logistic regression model was used to estimate the relationship between HCQ use
192 and the composite end point. A primary multivariable logistic regression model
193 involved demographic factors, clinical factors and medications.

194 Propensity-score methods were used as well to reduce the effects of confounding and
195 to account for the non-randomized treatment administration of HCQ. The individual
196 propensities for receipt of HCQ treatment were estimated with the use of a
197 multivariable logistic-regression model that included pre-treatment variables and
198 predictors and risk for the outcome. Variables used were demographic factors, clinical
199 factors and chronic diseases status.

200 An estimation of the association between HCQ use and the primary outcome were
201 assessed by a multivariable logistic regression models and the use of two propensity-
202 score methods: Propensity-score matching & the use of the propensity score as an
203 additional covariate in the multivariate logistic regression model for the outcome.

204 Effect modification was examined for the primary outcome for two variables; (1) HCQ
205 and the baseline severity of disease (whether or not patient was hypoxic), and (2) The
206 co-prescription of azithromycin.

207 Estimation of the safety and secondary outcome were conducted through the use of
208 the primary analysis, using multivariate regression models.

209 The STATA software, version 15.1, was used to execute the statistical analyses,
210 (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX:
211 StataCorp LLC.).

212 **Ethical approval**

213 The protocol and manuscript for this study were reviewed and approved by the
214 National COVID-19 Research Committee in Bahrain (Approval Code: CRT-
215 COVID2020-061). The National COVID-19 Research and Ethics Committee has
216 been jointly established by the Ministry of Health and Bahrain Defence Force
217 Hospital research committees in response to the pandemic, to facilitate and monitor
218 COVID-19 research in Bahrain. All methods and retrospective analysis of data was
219 approved by the National COVID-19 Research and Ethics Committee, and carried
220 out in accordance with the local guideline and ethical guidelines of the Declaration of
221 Helsinki 1975. All data used in this study was collected as part of normal medical
222 procedures. Informed consent was waived by the National COVID-19 Research and
223 Ethics Committee for this study due to its retrospective and observational nature and
224 the absence of any patient identifying information.

225 **RESULTS**

226 Sample Characteristics

227 A total of 1849 cases were reviewed. Of those, 278 were excluded; 57 due to
228 duplicates, 79 due to age less than 18 years, and 34 cases were excluded due to
229 insufficient information. A further 56 patients were excluded due to endpoint (of
230 ventilatory support or death) being achieved within 1 day, 7 were excluded due to
231 transfer/discharge within 1 day, and 45 were excluded as they received HCQ out of
232 study baseline. 1571 cases were included in the study.

233

234 Out of 1571 patients affected with COVID-19 selected in this study, 440 patients
235 received HCQ and 1131 patients did not.

236 Among the patients who received HCQ. The median time to start HCQ was 1 day from
237 admission (IQR 0-2).

238 Patients' baseline characteristics (demographic and clinical) according to HCQ
239 exposure is shown in Table 1 and 2. A propensity matched analysis was conducted to
240 balance the two groups and their characteristics are also shown in Table 1 and 2.

241 In the unmatched sample, patients who received HCQ had a significantly higher mean
242 age (43.4 years), were more likely to be Bahraini and had more comorbidities.
243 Diabetes and hypertension were more common in patients receiving HCQ. The HCQ-
244 receiving patients were more likely to be symptomatic (68.9% compared to 61.8%).
245 Symptoms of fever, cough, body ache, nausea and vomiting were more predominant
246 in patients who received HCQ. The HCQ-receiving patients were also more severely
247 ill on admission, as 12.3% received supplemental oxygen on admission (through
248 nasal cannula, face mask and Nonrebreather mask).

249

250 The Propensity score

251 The distribution of the estimated propensity scores for receiving HCQ among patients
252 who did and did not receive HCQ is shown in Appendix B. The C-statistic of the
253 propensity-score model was 0.83 . In the matched analytic sample, 223 patients were
254 exposed to HCQ and 223 were not exposed. The differences between HCQ and
255 pretreatment variables were attenuated in the propensity-score–matched samples as
256 compared with the unmatched samples.

257

258 Primary outcome

259 During the period of their admission, patients who received HCQ were more likely to
260 develop the composite outcome. 24 of 440 patients (5.45%) receiving HCQ developed
261 the primary outcome of requiring ventilatory support (invasive and non-invasive) or
262 death in comparison to the 44 of 1131 patients (3.89%) who were not treated with
263 HCQ. Table 3 summarizes outcomes in each treatment group.

264 The difference between the two groups was not significant across the different
265 methods used to control confounders. The primary analysis using multivariate model
266 showed an odds ratio of 1.43 with a 95% CI 0.85 to 2.37, P value=0.17. Other methods

267 of confounding adjustment showed similar and non-significant results. Table 4
268 summarizes the analysis results.

269

270 There was a significant effect modification in COVID-19 patients receiving HCQ and
271 requiring supplemental oxygen on admission. Significant effect modification was also
272 noted on in cases exposed to azithromycin. Appendix C shows the detailed effect
273 modification analysis.

274

275 179 patients required supplemental oxygen on admission (nasal cannula, face mask
276 or nonrebreather face mask). 75 patients received HCQ and 104 did not. Patients who
277 were treated by HCQ were less likely to develop the outcome if they required oxygen
278 on baseline. 15 patients in the HCQ group developed the primary outcome (20%),
279 compared to 30 in the control group (28.85%). The difference was non-significant in
280 the primary analysis (OR 1.09 95% CI 0.38 – 3.07).

281 1392 patients were admitted on room air and did not require supplemental oxygen. Of
282 those, 365 received HCQ and 1027 did not. 9 patient who received HCQ developed
283 the primary outcome (2.47%), while 14 patients in the control group developed the
284 outcome (1.36%). Treatment with HCQ showed a non-significant increase in odds
285 ratio to develop the primary outcome (OR 2.79 95% CI 0.92 to 8.43). Table 5
286 summarizes the results stratified by oxygen requirement at baseline.

287 The analysis showed insignificant results when stratified by azithromycin exposure. It
288 was noted that patients who received HCQ and azithromycin had an Odds ratio of 2.7
289 to develop the primary outcome (95% CI 0.82 to 8.85). Patients who were treated by
290 HCQ and did not receive azithromycin had an Odds ratio of 1.3 to develop the primary
291 outcome (95% CI 0.44 to 3.75). Results are summarized in Table 6.

292

293 Safety outcome

294 Patients who received HCQ had significantly increased odds ratio to develop
295 hypoglycemia (OR=10.9, 95% CI 1.72-69.49, P value =0.011) and diarrhea (OR=2.8,
296 95% CI 1.4-5.5, P value =0.003). Patient treated with HCQ had more patients
297 developing QT prolongation (OR=1.92, 95% CI 0.95-3.9, P value =0.06) and cardiac

298 arrhythmias (OR=1.06, 95% CI 0.55-2.05, P value =0.85) however these findings were
299 non-significant. Table 7 summarizes the safety endpoints.

300

301 Secondary outcome: Length of stay in survived cases

302 The mean length of stay of discharged patients in the study cohort was 10.0 days (+/-
303 5.54 days). The minimum stay was 2 days, and the maximum was 57. Patients who
304 received HCQ had a mean stay of 11.3 days (5.65 days) while patients in the control
305 group had mean stay of 9.5 days (5.41 days). The difference was statistically
306 significant in a two-sided t-test ($p < 0.001$). After adjustment for confounders using a
307 multivariate model, HCQ had a higher length of stay by 0.63 days, however this
308 difference was non-significant (95% CI ranged from -0.02 to 1.29). Table 8
309 summarizes these findings.

310

311 Regression models results and details are attached in Appendix C

312 **DISCUSSION**

313 The results of this study show that, for our studied sample and models used, HCQ did
314 not have a significant effect on primary outcomes (requirement for ventilation or death)
315 due to COVID-19 infection.

316 Analysis of the demographics of our studied sample showed that patients who
317 received HCQ were significantly of older age, which could be associated with a more
318 severe HCQ-requiring presentation. Although this is an extrapolation from our data,
319 age has reportedly been associated with a more severe progression of the disease
320 (25-28). However, a recent study quantifying the isolated effect of age on severity of
321 COVID-19 outcomes concluded a minimal influence of age after adjusting for
322 important age-dependent risk factors (eg: diabetes, hypertension, cardiovascular
323 disease (CVD) etc.) (29). Indeed, this was observed in our HCQ-receiving cohort,
324 which showed a higher number of associated comorbidities namely diabetes mellitus,
325 hypertension and COPD compared to the control cohort. A meta-analysis of 34 studies
326 conducted by *Zhou et al.* showed that chronic comorbidities increase the risk of severe

327 course and progression of the disease, with strong correlations with hypertension,
328 diabetes and CVD (30). However, there was no difference in rates of CVD presentation
329 between the HCQ-receiving and control groups, which may be due to increased
330 prevalence of CVD in the country (31). The HCQ receiving group had significantly less
331 G6PD deficiency, stemming from management guidelines contraindicating HCQ in
332 patients with G6PD deficiency due to increased risk of hemolytic crisis (32, 33).

333 Patients who received HCQ had a higher presentation of symptoms on admission and
334 scored significantly higher on baseline clinical severity scale. Creatinine levels were
335 significantly elevated amongst patients who received HCQ, indicating COVID-19-
336 mediated acute kidney injury (34). A significantly higher proportion of HCQ receiving
337 patients presented with chest x-ray findings of pneumonia compared to control
338 patients. All these presentations on admission indicate a more severe progression of
339 the disease that is a risk of poor prognosis (28, 34, 35), increasing risk of developing
340 composite outcome and hence indicating HCQ requirement. This may also explain the
341 higher incidence of composite outcomes seen amongst patients receiving HCQ.

342 Interestingly we found no difference in requirement of oxygenation on admission
343 between the HCQ and control groups in our studied sample. This was not expected
344 as requirement of supplemental oxygenation on admission has been associated with
345 increased risk of severe illness (36), and hence expected to be prescribed HCQ.
346 However, this could be interpreted alongside the increased G6PD deficiency amongst
347 the control groups. With a high prevalence of G6PD in Bahrain (37), it may be that
348 many severe COVID-19 admission, that potentially required oxygen on admission,
349 were contraindicated to receive HCQ. Yet, more patients required oxygenation on
350 baseline in the hydroxychloroquine group. This indicates that physicians tends to
351 prescribe HCQ in the sicker patients.

352 Almost all factors were insignificant after propensity score matching analysis.
353 However, it is important to note that to conduct matched analysis, the sample size was
354 reduced significantly. The effect of HCQ on the development of the primary outcome
355 remained insignificant using the various ways mentioned to control for confounders.

356 There was no significant difference in the clinical outcome between HCQ and control
357 groups of patients with mild to moderate disease who did not require oxygen at
358 baseline. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to suggest benefit of using HCQ to
359 treat patients with low risk of developing severe disease. This finding was consistent
360 across several reports (38, 39).

361 Patients in our study who received HCQ while on oxygen therapy had lower rates of
362 developing the primary outcome, yet this as still non-significant.

363 Our study showed no clinical benefit from using HCQ in COVID19 patients. Moreover,
364 the effect remained non-significant across different subgroups: room air/oxygen
365 therapy and with and without azithromycin cotreatment.

366 Our study showed no benefit from combination of azithromycin with HCQ. Other
367 studies done in France (10) and Brazil (38) also supported our outcome, and showed
368 no clinical benefit in using the combination of HCQ and azithromycin in the treatment
369 of COVID-19 patients.

370 Our study showed that HCQ does not affect the length of hospitalization. The raw
371 analysis showed a significantly higher length of stay compared to patients not
372 receiving HCQ, consistent with several reports (15, 40). This is explained by the
373 more severe presentation, higher comorbidities, and risk of lower prognosis leading
374 to the administration of HCQ. Hence, patients who received HCQ would be expected
375 to require a longer stay. Indeed, when these factors were adjusted for in the
376 analysis, the difference was non-significant, which is consistent with other reported
377 data (41). These findings were also reported in a randomized clinical trial conducted
378 in china on 150 COVID19 patients. The findings in the trial did not provide evidence
379 to support an increase in the probability of negative conversion of SARS-CoV-2
380 conferred by the addition of HCQ to the standard of care in patients admitted to the
381 hospital with COVID19.(39)

382 With the use of HCQ there was a significant risk of developing adverse effects,
383 specifically hypoglycemia and diarrhea. Due to their mechanism of action, it has been
384 well known that antimalarials cause hypoglycemia. A few studies showed the role of

385 HCQ in diabetic patients and showed a decreased requirement in insulin (42, 43). As
386 for diarrhea, it is a known adverse effect of HCQ as well (44). The increased risk of
387 hypoglycemia is alarming, as it would potentially be of a significant risk if patients
388 prone to hypoglycemia or are receiving HCQ outside hospital setting.

389 The surprising result was the insignificant association between QT interval
390 prolongation and the use of HCQ. It was difficult to find a study that supported our
391 result, as most studies showed frequent prolongation of the QT segment (45). Our
392 result can be explained by the local protocol used in our hospitals. As daily ECG was
393 done for all patients on HCQ. The local protocol suggests withholding HCQ once QT
394 exceed 470ms and can then be restarted once QT has decreased. Moreover patients
395 with a baseline QT >470msec or those who are at risk for developing cardiac
396 arrhythmia or QT prolongation are seldomly prescribed HCQ.

397 The findings in our study are supported by findings from multiple clinical trials and
398 observational studies. The RECOVERY trail which randomized 4716 patients across
399 176 hospitals in the United Kingdom. This trial showed that HCQ had no benefit in
400 decreasing mortality nor invasive ventilation. The findings were consistent across
401 different subgroups includes those who received and didn't receive oxygen at
402 baseline(15) . Another trail conducted in the US which randomized 479 patients to
403 determine if HCQ improved clinical outcomes at 14 days also supported our results.
404 The trail was multicentered, double blinded, placebo-controlled study. The study
405 concluded that HCQ didn't improve clinical outcomes in patient with COVID19
406 respiratory illness. These findings were consistent in all subgroups and for all
407 outcomes evaluated, including an ordinal scale of clinical status, mortality, organ
408 failures, duration of oxygen use, and hospital length of stay (46). A randomized
409 clinical trial in Brazil was conducted on 667 mild-moderate COVID19 patients to
410 measure the effect of HCQ with or without azithromycin on the clinical status at 15
411 days. The trial concluded that the use of HCQ, alone or with azithromycin, did not
412 improve clinical status at 15 days as compared with standard care (38). A large
413 observational study was conducted on 1438 hospitalized patients in COVID19
414 patients in New York State to measure the effect of HCQ, with or without
415 azithromycin on the mortality rates. The study concluded that HCQ, azithromycin, or

416 both, compared with neither treatment, was not significantly associated with
417 differences in in-hospital mortality in COVID19 patients (11).

418

419 Interpreted along with these prior studies, the results of this study provide additional
420 evidence that HCQ is not beneficial for adults hospitalized with COVID-19. Admitted
421 and on Oxygen support

422 **STRENGTHS**

423 The study has several strengths. It involved majority of hospitals which provide acute
424 care for hospitalized COVID19 cases. Moreover, our study included all hospitals that
425 use HCQ as part of the treatment regimen. The data collection process was done
426 manually and hence all patients files were reviewed carefully and all documented
427 details were collected. The outcomes and adverse were collected after the
428 medication starting date, any event occurring within 24hour of admission or prior to
429 starting the study drug were excluded.

430 **LIMITATIONS**

431 The study main limitation is its design, being a retrospective observational study.
432 Secondly, given the retrospective design, information that wasn't documented
433 weren't available for analysis, and these can be potential confounders. These
434 included : time from symptom onset, inflammatory markers. It is also likely that there
435 is still unmeasured residual confounding due to factors not included in the analysis.

436 **CONCLUSION**

437 Our results showed no significant beneficial effect of using HCQ on the outcome of
438 COVID-19 patients. Moreover, the risk of hypoglycemia due to HCQ would possess a
439 significant risk for out of hospital use.

440 REFERENCES

- 441 1. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.*
442 2020;91(1):157-60.
- 443 2. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard 2020 [7 October 2020].
444 Available from: <https://covid19.who.int>.
- 445 3. Silva JC, Mariz HA, Rocha LF, Oliveira PS, Dantas AT, Duarte AL, et al.
446 Hydroxychloroquine decreases Th17-related cytokines in systemic lupus erythematosus and
447 rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2013;68(6):766-71.
- 448 4. Liu J, Cao R, Xu M, Wang X, Zhang H, Hu H, et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic
449 derivative of chloroquine, is effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. *Cell Discov.*
450 2020;6:16.
- 451 5. Mingo RM, Simmons JA, Shoemaker CJ, Nelson EA, Schornberg KL, D'Souza RS, et al.
452 Ebola virus and severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus display late cell entry
453 kinetics: evidence that transport to NPC1+ endolysosomes is a rate-defining step. *J Virol.*
454 2015;89(5):2931-43.
- 455 6. Zhou D, Dai SM, Tong Q. COVID-19: a recommendation to examine the effect of
456 hydroxychloroquine in preventing infection and progression. *J Antimicrob Chemother.*
457 2020;75(7):1667-70.
- 458 7. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected
459 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 460 8. Schrezenmeier E, Dörner T. Mechanisms of action of hydroxychloroquine and
461 chloroquine: implications for rheumatology. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2020;16(3):155-66.
- 462 9. Lenzer J. Covid-19: US gives emergency approval to hydroxychloroquine despite lack
463 of evidence. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1335.
- 464 10. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al.
465 Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label
466 non-randomized clinical trial. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020;56(1):105949.
- 467 11. Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, Wilberschied LA, Kumar J, Tesoriero J, et al.
468 Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Azithromycin With In-Hospital
469 Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State. *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2493-502.
- 470 12. Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, Zucker J, Baldwin M, Hripcsak G, et al. Observational Study of
471 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*.
472 2020;382(25):2411-8.
- 473 13. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. RETRACTED: Hydroxychloroquine or
474 chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry
475 analysis. *Lancet*. 2020.
- 476 14. WHO. "Solidarity" clinical trial for COVID-19 treatments [9 November 2020].
477 Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-
478 2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-
479 treatments](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-treatments).
- 480 15. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, Bell JL, Staplin N, Emberson JR, et al. Effect of
481 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
- 482 16. Bacharier LB, Guilbert TW, Mauger DT, Boehmer S, Beigelman A, Fitzpatrick AM, et
483 al. Early Administration of Azithromycin and Prevention of Severe Lower Respiratory Tract
484 Illnesses in Preschool Children With a History of Such Illnesses: A Randomized Clinical Trial.
485 *JAMA*. 2015;314(19):2034-44.

- 486 17. Andreani J, Le Bideau M, Duflot I, Jardot P, Rolland C, Boxberger M, et al. In vitro
487 testing of combined hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic
488 effect. *Microb Pathog.* 2020;145:104228.
- 489 18. Marmor MF, Kellner U, Lai TY, Melles RB, Mieler WF, Ophthalmology AAO.
490 Recommendations on Screening for Chloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine Retinopathy
491 (2016 Revision). *Ophthalmology.* 2016;123(6):1386-94.
- 492 19. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Hulot JS, Amoura Z, Leroux G, Lechat P, Funck-Brentano C,
493 et al. Heart conduction disorders related to antimalarials toxicity: an analysis of
494 electrocardiograms in 85 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine for connective tissue
495 diseases. *Rheumatology (Oxford).* 2007;46(5):808-10.
- 496 20. Uzelac I, Iravanian S, Ashikaga H, Bhatia NK, Herndon C, Kaboudian A, et al. Fatal
497 arrhythmias: Another reason why doctors remain cautious about
498 chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine for treating COVID-19. *Heart Rhythm.* 2020;17(9):1445-51.
- 499 21. Capel RA, Herring N, Kalla M, Yavari A, Mirams GR, Douglas G, et al.
500 Hydroxychloroquine reduces heart rate by modulating the hyperpolarization-activated
501 current If: Novel electrophysiological insights and therapeutic potential. *Heart Rhythm.*
502 2015;12(10):2186-94.
- 503 22. Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Effect of
504 High vs Low Doses of Chloroquine Diphosphate as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients
505 Hospitalized With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
506 Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(4):e208857.
- 507 23. Rismanbaf A, Zarei S. Liver and Kidney Injuries in COVID-19 and Their Effects on Drug
508 Therapy; a Letter to Editor. *Arch Acad Emerg Med.* 2020;8(1):e17.
- 509 24. Zhang C, Shi L, Wang FS. Liver injury in COVID-19: management and challenges.
510 *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2020;5(5):428-30.
- 511 25. Liu Y, Mao B, Liang S, Yang JW, Lu HW, Chai YH, et al. Association between age and
512 clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19. *Eur Respir J.* 2020;55(5).
- 513 26. Chen T, Dai Z, Mo P, Li X, Ma Z, Song S, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of
514 Older Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: A Single-
515 Centered, Retrospective Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2020;75(9):1788-95.
- 516 27. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, Yan W, Yang D, Chen G, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113
517 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. *BMJ.*
518 2020;368:m1091.
- 519 28. Feng Z, Yu Q, Yao S, Luo L, Zhou W, Mao X, et al. Early prediction of disease
520 progression in COVID-19 pneumonia patients with chest CT and clinical characteristics. *Nat*
521 *Commun.* 2020;11(1):4968.
- 522 29. Romero Starke K, Petereit-Haack G, Schubert M, Kämpf D, Schliebner A, Hegewald J,
523 et al. The Age-Related Risk of Severe Outcomes Due to COVID-19 Infection: A Rapid Review,
524 Meta-Analysis, and Meta-Regression. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(16).
- 525 30. Zhou Y, Yang Q, Chi J, Dong B, Lv W, Shen L, et al. Comorbidities and the risk of
526 severe or fatal outcomes associated with coronavirus disease 2019: A systematic review and
527 meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;99:47-56.
- 528 31. WHO. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018 [2 November 2020].
529 Available from: https://www.who.int/nmh/countries/2018/bhr_en.pdf?ua=1.
- 530 32. Beauverd Y, Adam Y, Assouline B, Samii K. COVID-19 infection and treatment with
531 hydroxychloroquine cause severe haemolysis crisis in a patient with glucose-6-phosphate
532 dehydrogenase deficiency. *Eur J Haematol.* 2020;105(3):357-9.

- 533 33. Nabil A, Uto K, Elshemy MM, Soliman R, Hassan AA, Ebara M, et al. Current
534 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) epidemiological, diagnostic and therapeutic approaches: An
535 updated review until June 2020. *EXCLI J.* 2020;19:992-1016.
- 536 34. Cheng Y, Luo R, Wang K, Zhang M, Wang Z, Dong L, et al. Kidney disease is associated
537 with in-hospital death of patients with COVID-19. *Kidney Int.* 2020;97(5):829-38.
- 538 35. Li J, Chen Z, Nie Y, Ma Y, Guo Q, Dai X. Identification of Symptoms Prognostic of
539 COVID-19 Severity: Multivariate Data Analysis of a Case Series in Henan Province. *J Med*
540 *Internet Res.* 2020;22(6):e19636.
- 541 36. Bhargava A, Fukushima EA, Levine M, Zhao W, Tanveer F, Szpunar SM, et al.
542 Predictors for Severe COVID-19 Infection. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
- 543 37. Al Arrayed S. Campaign to control genetic blood diseases in Bahrain. *Community*
544 *Genet.* 2005;8(1):52-5.
- 545 38. Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, Azevedo LCP, Veiga VC, Avezum A, et al.
546 Hydroxychloroquine with or without Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J*
547 *Med.* 2020.
- 548 39. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, Wang Z, Chen J, Sun W, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients
549 with mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomised controlled
550 trial. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1849.
- 551 40. Almazrou SH, Almalki ZS, Alanazi AS, Alqahtani AM, AlGhamd SM. Comparing the
552 impact of Hydroxychloroquine based regimens and standard treatment on COVID-19 patient
553 outcomes: A retrospective cohort study. *Saudi Pharm J.* 2020.
- 554 41. Kalligeros M, Shehadeh F, Atalla E, Mylona EK, Aung S, Pandita A, et al.
555 Hydroxychloroquine use in hospitalised patients with COVID-19: An observational matched
556 cohort study. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist.* 2020;22:842-4.
- 557 42. Rees RG, Smith MJ. Effect of chloroquine on insulin and glucose homeostasis in
558 normal subjects and patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus. *Br Med J (Clin*
559 *Res Ed).* 1987;294(6576):900-1.
- 560 43. Blazar BR, Whitley CB, Kitabchi AE, Tsai MY, Santiago J, White N, et al. In vivo
561 chloroquine-induced inhibition of insulin degradation in a diabetic patient with severe
562 insulin resistance. *Diabetes.* 1984;33(12):1133-7.
- 563 44. Lofgren SMM, Nicol MR, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Okafor EC, Skipper CP, et al.
564 Safety of Hydroxychloroquine among Outpatient Clinical Trial Participants for COVID-19.
565 medRxiv. 2020.
- 566 45. Agstam S, Yadav A, Praveen Kumar M, Gupta A. Hydroxychloroquine and QTc
567 prolongation in patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indian*
568 *Pacing Electrophysiol J.* 2020.
- 569 46. Self WH, Semler MW, Leather LM, Casey JD, Angus DC, Brower RG, et al. Effect of
570 Hydroxychloroquine on Clinical Status at 14 Days in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19: A
571 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2020.

572

573

574 **Declarations**

575

576 Conflict of interest: The authors have declared that no conflict of interest exists.

577 Ethics approval and consent to participate: The study was approved by the National
578 COVID- 19 Research and Ethics Committee.

579 Consent for publication: All authors gave their consent for publication.

580 Availability of data and materials: All the data for this study will be made available
581 upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

582 Funding: No funding was received to perform this study.

583 Author contributions: IS, JA, KA, SJ, AKS, MA gathered the data and supervised the
584 data collection team. AA and AIA analyzed the data. AA, MA, JA, SJ wrote the
585 manuscript. AA and MQ interpreted data and edited the manuscript. All authors
586 reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript. Manaf Alqahtani is the
587 guarantor of this work.

588 Corresponding author:

589 Manaf AlQahtani

590 Email: mqahtani@rcsi-mub.com

591 Phone: +973 39766000

592

593 **Acknowledgements:**

594 We would like to express our gratitude towards our colleagues: Ammar Kheyami,
595 Mujtaba Mal Alla, Abdulla AlMuharraqi, Zeyad Mahmood, Narjis Ali AlSheala, Ola
596 Husain AlHalwachi, Maryam Ghazi Alarayedh, and Amna Mohamed Buheiji who
597 played an essential role in the data collection process related to this paper. Our
598 thanks and appreciation goes to them for their hard, dedicated work. Wishing them
599 all the best in the future. We would also like to extend our appreciation to Dr
600 Simone Perna who dedicated time and effort to review and help us improve the
601 manuscript.
602

603 **TABLES**
604
605

Factor	Level	Unmatched			Matched		
		Control	HCQ	p-value	Control	HCQ	p-value
N		1131	440		223	223	
Age, mean (SD)		44.6 (15.0)	53.4 (14.1)	<0.001	52.7 (14.4)	50.5 (13.8)	0.096
male		688 (60.8%)	245 (55.7%)	0.062	131 (58.7%)	122 (54.7%)	0.39
Bahraini		579 (51.2%)	290 (65.9%)	<0.001	107 (48.0%)	152 (68.2%)	<0.001
Number of comorbidities	0	100 (8.8%)	40 (9.1%)	<0.001	17 (7.6%)	25 (11.2%)	0.008
	1	41 (3.6%)	43 (9.8%)		10 (4.5%)	25 (11.2%)	
	2	17 (1.5%)	27 (6.1%)		7 (3.1%)	15 (6.7%)	
	3	522 (46.2%)	135 (30.7%)		83 (37.2%)	66 (29.6%)	
	4+	451 (39.9%)	195 (44.3%)		106 (47.5%)	92 (41.3%)	
Sickle Cell Disease		26 (2.3%)	6 (1.4%)	0.24	2 (0.9%)	5 (2.2%)	0.25
G6PD Deficiency		134 (11.8%)	29 (6.6%)	0.002	18 (8.1%)	22 (9.9%)	0.51
Diabetes Mellitus		273 (24.1%)	174 (39.5%)	<0.001	72 (32.3%)	74 (33.2%)	0.84
Cardiovascular Disease (CVD)		105 (9.3%)	53 (12.0%)	0.10	23 (10.3%)	27 (12.1%)	0.55
Hypertension		285 (25.2%)	176 (40.0%)	<0.001	79 (35.4%)	78 (35.0%)	0.92
Asthma		42 (3.7%)	23 (5.2%)	0.18	9 (4.0%)	12 (5.4%)	0.50
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)		2 (0.2%)	4 (0.9%)	0.035	0	0	
Obesity (BMI >=30)		33 (2.9%)	20 (4.5%)	0.11	7 (3.1%)	13 (5.8%)	0.17
Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD)		37 (3.3%)	22 (5.0%)	0.11	12 (5.4%)	13 (5.8%)	0.84
Other Chronic Lung Disease (Not asthma nor COPD)		4 (0.4%)	2 (0.5%)	0.77	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	0.56
Smoker	Current	18 (1.9%)	11 (2.6%)	0.52	3 (1.6%)	7 (3.3%)	0.30
	Exsmoker	14 (1.5%)	4 (0.9%)		3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	
	Never	921 (96.6%)	414 (96.5%)		182 (96.8%)	207 (96.3%)	

606 Table 1 : Unmatched and matched patient characteristics

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Factor	Level	Unmatched			Matched		
		Control	HCQ	p-value	Control	HCQ	p-value
N		1131	440		223	223	
Symptoms on admission:		699 (61.8%)	303 (68.9%)	0.009	154 (69.1%)	151 (67.7%)	0.76
Fever (>38C)		230 (20.3%)	118 (26.8%)	0.005	48 (21.5%)	49 (22.0%)	0.91
Cough		450 (39.8%)	218 (49.5%)	<0.001	108 (48.4%)	107 (48.0%)	0.92
Chest Pain		91 (8.0%)	49 (11.1%)	0.054	23 (10.3%)	26 (11.7%)	0.65
Shortness of Breath		210 (18.6%)	85 (19.3%)	0.73	53 (23.8%)	48 (21.5%)	0.57
Loss of smell		30 (2.7%)	18 (4.1%)	0.14	4 (1.8%)	14 (6.3%)	0.016
Loss of taste		30 (2.7%)	17 (3.9%)	0.21	6 (2.7%)	14 (6.3%)	0.067
Diarrhea		61 (5.4%)	30 (6.8%)	0.28	14 (6.3%)	16 (7.2%)	0.71
Nausea or Vomiting		46 (4.1%)	34 (7.7%)	0.003	9 (4.0%)	17 (7.6%)	0.11
Body pain		167 (14.8%)	89 (20.2%)	0.008	37 (16.6%)	49 (22.0%)	0.15
Heart Rate on admission: bpm, mean (SD)		85.8 (13.7)	86.4 (13.6)	0.44	85.4 (14.3)	86.6 (13.0)	0.35
SBP on admission: mmHg, mean (SD)		129.6 (18.4)	133.7 (18.3)	<0.001	132.4 (20.7)	133.6 (18.8)	0.50
DBP on admission: mmHg, mean (SD)		77.9 (11.5)	76.8 (11.3)	0.080	78.7 (10.9)	77.5 (11.2)	0.25
Requirement of Oxygen support on admission		104 (9.2%)	54 (12.3%)	0.069	28 (12.6%)	27 (12.1%)	0.89
Oxygenation device on admission	Nasal Canula	43 (41.0%)	36 (66.7%)	0.008	8 (29%)	17 (63%)	0.032
	Face Mask	45 (42.9%)	14 (25.9%)		16 (57%)	7 (26%)	
	Nonrebreather Face mask	17 (16.2%)	4 (7.4%)		4 (14%)	3 (11%)	
SpO2:FiO2 ratio, mean (SD)		445.08 (71.63)	439.82 (71.32)	0.19	436.17 (82.08)	438.35 (75.45)	0.77
Presence of an elevated ALT>40U/L on admission		249 (23.6%)	114 (26.8%)	0.19	49 (23.2%)	70 (32.0%)	0.043
Presence of an elevated Creatinine on admission		78 (6.9%)	52 (11.8%)	0.001	23 (10.3%)	25 (11.2%)	0.76
Chest Xray findings on admission	Pneumonia	291 (31.0%)	167 (39.5%)	0.002	59 (31.4%)	73 (33.5%)	0.65
	Normal	648 (69.0%)	256 (60.5%)		129 (68.6%)	145 (66.5%)	
Hypotension (SBP<90mmHg or DBP<60mmHg) on admission		43 (3.8%)	14 (3.2%)	0.56	7 (3.1%)	7 (3.1%)	1.00
Tachypnea (RR>22) on admission		20 (1.8%)	11 (2.5%)	0.35	5 (2.2%)	8 (3.6%)	0.40
Baseline clinical severity scale	Isolated and asymptomatic	5 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)	<0.001	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	0.33
	Isolated Mild symptomatic	4 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)		2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	
	Admitted on Room Air	1018 (90.0%)	363 (82.5%)		193 (86.5%)	182 (81.6%)	
	Admitted and on Oxygen support	104 (9.2%)	75 (17.0%)		28 (12.6%)	39 (17.5%)	
	Admitted and on NIV/HFNC	0	0		0	0	
	Admitted and on Mechanical ventilation/ECMO	0	0		0	0	
Azithromycin during hospital stay:		150 (13.3%)	236 (53.6%)	<0.001	59 (26.5%)	64 (28.7%)	0.60
Kaletra during the hospital stay		186 (16.4%)	82 (18.6%)	0.30	38 (17.0%)	39 (17.5%)	0.90
Ribavirin during the hospital stay		180 (15.9%)	45 (10.2%)	0.004	33 (14.8%)	29 (13.0%)	0.58
Steroids during hospital stay		98 (8.7%)	66 (15.0%)	<0.001	19 (8.5%)	39 (17.5%)	0.005
Tocilizumab during hospital stay		31 (2.7%)	29 (6.6%)	<0.001	6 (2.7%)	15 (6.7%)	0.044
Received Convalescent Plasma Transfusion during hospital stay		19 (1.7%)	33 (7.5%)	<0.001	3 (1.3%)	17 (7.6%)	0.001

607

608 Table 2: Unmatched and matched patient clinical characteristics

609

610

Factor	Unmatched			Matched		
	Control	HCQ	p-value	Control	HCQ	p-value
N	1131	440		223	223	
Primary outcome : Ventilation or Death	44 (3.9%)	24 (5.5%)	0.17	7 (3.1%)	12 (5.4%)	0.24
Ventilation	41 (3.6%)	24 (5.5%)	0.10	7 (3.1%)	12 (5.4%)	0.24
Invasive ventilation	18 (1.6%)	9 (2.0%)	0.53	3 (1.3%)	6 (2.7%)	0.31
Death	26 (2.3%)	8 (1.8%)	0.56	6 (2.7%)	5 (2.24%)	0.76
Cardiac Arrhythmia:	38 (3.4%)	19 (4.3%)	0.36	10 (4.5%)	9 (4.0%)	0.81
QT prolongation of more than 500msec	33 (2.9%)	22 (5.0%)	0.044	5 (2.2%)	13 (5.8%)	0.054
Adverse events: Hypoglycemia <3.9 / 70	2 (0.2%)	7 (1.6%)	<0.001	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.8%)	0.18
Adverse events: Diarrhea	23 (2.0%)	27 (6.1%)	<0.001	5 (2.2%)	14 (6.3%)	0.035

611
612
613

Table 3: Outcomes within the unmatched and matched samples

614
615

Analysis	Ventilation or Death	P Value
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	68/1571(4.3%)	-
Hydroxychloroquine	24/440 (5.45%)	-
No Hydroxychloroquine	44/1131(3.89%)	-
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.43 (0.85 – 2.37)	0.17
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.65 (0.81 – 3.32)	0.16
Propensity score Analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)		
With Matching	1.75 (0.68 – 4.54)	0.24
With Adjusted for Propensity score	0.87 (0.47 – 1.64)	0.67

616
617 Table 4: Risks for developing the primary outcome
618
619

620
621
622
623
624
625

Analysis	Requiring Oxygen at Baseline	Not Requiring Oxygen at Baseline
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	45/179 (25.14%)	23/1392 (1.65%)
Hydroxychloroquine	15/75 (20.00%)	9/365 (2.47%)
No Hydroxychloroquine	30/104 (28.85%)	14/1027 (1.36%)
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	1.09 (0.38 – 3.07)	2.79 (0.92 – 8.43)

626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637

Table 5: Risks for developing the primary outcome, in cases who required and did not require supplemental oxygen at baseline

638
639
640
641
642

Analysis	Received Azithromycin	Did not Received Azithromycin
No. of events/no. of patients at risk (%)	36/386 (9.3%)	32/1185 (2.7%)
Hydroxychloroquine	15/236 (6.36%)	9/204 (4.41%)
No Hydroxychloroquine	21/150 (14.0%)	23/981 (2.34%)
Crude analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	0.42 (0.21 – 0.84)	1.92 (0.87 – 4.21)
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	2.71 (0.82 – 8.85)	1.3 (0.44 – 3.75)
Propensity score Analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)		
With Matching	1.24 (0.26 – 5.8)	2.12 (0.62 – 7.18)
With Adjusted for Propensity score	0.59 (0.27 – 1.31)	1.38 (0.59 – 3.24)

643
644 Table 6: Risks for developing the primary outcome, in cases who received and did not receive
645 azithromycin
646

647
648
649
650

Multivariable Analysis	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Hypoglycemia	10.9 (1.72 – 69.49)	0.011
Diarrhoea	2.8 (1.4 – 5.5)	0.003
QT Prolongation	1.92 (0.95 – 3.9)	0.06
Cardiac Arrhythmia	1.06 (0.55 – 2.05)	0.85

651
652 Table 7: Safety outcomes and adverse events
653
654

655
656
657

Analysis	Value	
Overall Mean length of stay for survivors (+/- SD)	10.0 (5.54)	-
Length of stay in survivor in Hydroxychloroquine group - mean in days (SD)	11.3 (5.65)	-
Length of stay in survivor in the control group - mean in days (SD)	9.5 (5.41)	-
Two Sample T test: Difference	- 1.77	P<0.001
Multivariable analysis – Odds Ratio (95%CI)	0.63 (95% Ci : -0.02 to 1.3)	P=0.058

658
659 Table 8 : Length of stay analysis
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667