

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description
Administrative information		
Title	1	Low-field Thoracic Magnetic Stimulation Increases Peripheral Oxygen Saturation Levels in Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Patients: a Single-blind, Sham-controlled, Crossover Study
Trial registration	2a	ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04895267 Low-field Thoracic Magnetic Stimulation Increases Peripheral Oxygen Saturation Levels in COVID-19 Patients https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04895267?cond=Covid19&cntry=MX&city=Puebla&draw=2&rank=3
Protocol version	3	First Posted: May 20, 2021 Protocol version 1
Funding	4	Centro de Investigación de Micro y Nanotecnología (SMDN), National Council of Science and Technology, Mexico, CONACyT Fronteras de la Ciencia #536 (EM), Cátedra Marcos Moshinsky (EM), and VIEP-PIFI-FOMES-PROMEP-BUAP-Puebla (EM), Comité de Internacionalización and VIEP BUAP (EM), México.
Roles and responsibilities	5a	The principal investigators share all the responsibilities: Dr. Saul M Dominguez-Nicolas Centro de Investigación de Micro y Nanotecnología, Universidad Veracruzana Calzada Ruiz Cortines 455 Boca del Rio, Veracruz 94294, Mexico saudominguez@uv.mx Dr. Elias Manjarrez Instituto de Fisiología, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. 14 sur 6301, Col. San Manuel A.P. 406, C.P. 72570 Puebla, Pue., México Tels.: +5222-22-29-5500 Ext 7326, Fax: +5222-22-33-4511 elias.manjarrez@correo.buap.mx , eliasmanjarrez@gmail.com
	5b	No applicable

5c No applicable

5d No applicable

Introduction

Background and rationale	6a	The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) may cause low oxygen saturation (SpO ₂) and respiratory failure in coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients. Hence the increase of SpO ₂ levels could be crucial for the quality of life and recovery of these patients. Here we introduce an electromagnetic device termed low-field thoracic magnetic stimulation (LF-ThMS) system. This device was designed to non-invasively deliver a pulsed magnetic field from 100 to 118 Hz and 10.5 to 13.1 mT (i.e., 105 to 131 Gauss) to the dorsal thorax. Here we show that these frequencies and magnetic flux densities are safe for the patients. We also present a proof-of-concept that a single session of LF-ThMS applied for 30 minutes to the dorsal thorax of 17 COVID-19 patients significantly increases their SpO ₂ levels. We designed a single-blind, sham-controlled, cross-over study on 5 COVID-19 patients who underwent two sessions of the study (real or sham LF-ThMS) and 12 patients who underwent only the real LF-ThMS. We found a statistically significant correlation between magnetic flux density, frequency, or temperature associated with the real LF-ThMS and SpO ₂ levels in all COVID-19 patients. However, the five patients of the sham-controlled study did not exhibit a significant change in their SpO ₂ levels during sham stimulation. All the patients did not present adverse events after the LF-ThMS intervention. Our findings are relevant because they could motivate future randomized clinical trials to examine whether the LF-ThMS could be helpful as a potential therapy.
	6b	No applicable
Objectives	7	This study aimed to present a proof-of-concept that a 30 minutes single-session of dorsal LF-ThMS can be employed to increase SpO ₂ levels in COVID-19 patients. We hypothesized that the variables associated with LF-ThMS, as frequency, magnetic field density, and temperature in the dorsal thorax, might be correlated to SpO ₂ levels in these patients.
Trial design	8	We designed a single-blind, sham-controlled, cross-over study on 5 COVID-19 subjects who underwent two sessions of the study (sham or real LF-ThMS) and 12 COVID-19 subjects who underwent only the real LF-ThMS stimulation.

Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes

Study setting 9 No applicable for MedRxiv

Eligibility criteria	10	<p>The inclusion criteria were: 1) Adult patients diagnosed with mild to moderate COVID-19 disease without pneumonia. The COVID-19 disease severity was interpreted by the clinical assessment of physicians from the Mexican Institute of social security or physicians from private hospitals, who followed the interim guidance for the clinical management of COVID-19 from the world health organization 27 May 2020. 2) Patients with a SpO₂ level less or equal to 90 %, exhibiting difficulty breathing, but not intubated patients. The physicians selected this set of patients because they had a low risk of developing a severe clinical condition with pneumonia or with a chance of being intubated. 3) Patients with the same pharmacological treatment against COVID-19. All the patients were medicated with Azithromycin (500 mg), Ivermectin (6 mg), and Oseltamivir (75 mg) by physicians from the health sector. The most prevalent comorbidities in these patients were diabetes and hypertension.</p> <p>The exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory failure requiring intubation, 2) COVID-19 patients with impaired consciousness or during pregnancy, 3) patients with metallic implants or electronic medical devices such as pacemakers, and 4) children.</p>
Interventions	11a	<p>The low field thoracic magnetic stimulation (LF-ThMS) was locally applied on the dorsal thorax while the patients were kept in a prone position. The protocol for the proof of concept consisted of a single LF-ThMS session of 30 minutes. The rationale of presenting the LF-ThMS was to evaluate the hypothesis that SpO₂ levels in COVID-19 patients are significantly correlated with the magnetic flux density and temperature during 30 minutes of LF-ThMS intervention.</p> <p>We positioned the center of these LF-ThMS rings using palpable skeletal landmarks. We employed the spinous process of C7 (i.e., vertebra prominens) as zero landmarks. The center of these rings was positioned 8.5 cm below this landmark and bilaterally \pm 6 cm on the dorsal thorax (see black arrows in Figure 2A).</p> <p>The device allowed a gradual increase in the frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature. The patients rested for three hours after the session, and they did not report any discomfort during or after the magnetic stimuli. In contrast, they felt more comfortable, mainly because the LF-ThMS improved their breathing from the first minutes of the session. We checked on the health conditions of all the patients after receiving the LF-ThMS. In addition, in 11/17 patients, we monitored their SpO₂ levels at the end of six months.</p> <p>For sham exposure, the coils were positioned in the same coordinates, but the pulse generator was not turned on. Subjects were blinded for the real LF-ThMS or sham stimulation conditions.</p>
	11b	<p>The criteria for discontinuing the LF-ThMS intervention were the participant request, SpO₂ decrease or any discomfort reported by the patient.</p>

	11c	No applicable
	11d	No concomitant interventions were applied during the trial
Outcomes	12	We made a follow-up on the health conditions of all the patients after the LF-ThMS intervention up to 6 months. SpO2 levels were monitored five days after the intervention, and at the end of 6 months.
Participant timeline	13	A single intervention of 30 minutes per patient was obtained.
Sample size	14	The estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives was 17 and 5 patients for the sham-controlled trial. This sample size was determined from the statistical significant differences reached at $p < 0.001$.
Recruitment	15	The strategy for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size was the description of favourable results obtained from other patients.

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

Sequence generation	16a	There was not an allocation sequence for these patients
Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	The interventions were assigned by a request of the patients
Implementation	16c	No applicable
Blinding (masking)	17a	For sham exposure, the coil was positioned in the same coordinates, but the pulse generator was not turned on. Subjects were blinded for the real LF-ThMS or sham stimulation conditions.
	17b	Unblinding was not permissible during the single-blind, sham-controlled trial.

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

Data collection methods	18a	Data were collected for statistical analysis and questionnaires were employed for a follow-up on the health conditions of all the patients after the LF-ThMS intervention.
	18b	All patients had a follow-up
Data management	19	No applicable

Statistical methods	20a	<p>We analyzed the statistical differences among the SpO2 levels related to each LF-ThMS intensity. For data normally distributed (Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, $P>0.05$) with homogeneity of variances, we used parametric one-way repeated-measures ANOVA under the null hypothesis that the dependent variables "SpO2 levels" were the same across the different LF-ThMS intensities. We also employed Mauchly's test to verify that the assumption of sphericity was not violated. We performed a pairwise post hoc test using the corrected Bonferroni adjustment. All effects are reported as significant if $p<0.001$.</p> <p>Moreover, a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was employed to examine whether there is a statistically significant linear correlation between SpO2 levels and frequency, magnetic flux density, and temperature changes during the LF-ThMS intervention. The sample size was $n=35$ SpO2 measurements during seven LF-ThMS levels (including the control) in five patients of the sham-controlled experiment and $n=119$ SpO2 values in another 12 patients. The correlation coefficient was calculated for $n-2=33$ or $n-2=117$ degrees of freedom (DF), and the correlation was reported as significant if $p<0.001$. Data were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation in the main text and the figures.</p>
	20b	No applicable
	20c	No applicable

Methods: Monitoring

Data monitoring	21a	The data monitoring committee (DMC) was not needed given the low number of patients and the type of data generated.
	21b	No applicable
Harms	22	Researchers participating in the study directly payed special attention in possible adverse events.
Auditing	23	No applicable

Ethics and dissemination

Research ethics approval	24	Researchers participating in the study directly payed special attention in the ethics guidelines
Protocol amendments	25	No applicable
Consent or assent	26a	The patients signed an informed consent
	26b	No applicable

Confidentiality	27	The personal information about enrolled participants was confidentially collected, before, during, and after the trial
Declaration of interests	28	The principal investigators declare that there are not financial or other competing interests for the trial and study
Access to data	29	The authors confirm that all data underlying the findings are fully available without restriction upon request. All relevant data are within the paper.
Ancillary and post-trial care	30	No applicable
Dissemination policy	31a	There are not publication restrictions
	31b	No applicable
	31c	The principal investigators grant public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code

Appendices

Informed consent materials	32	No applicable for MedRxiv
Biological specimens	33	No applicable

*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](#)" license.