Supplemental Online Content

Di Stefano L, et al. Hydroxychloroquine/Chloroquine for the Treatment of Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis.

eMethods. Description of the Primary Outcome Model and Estimands **eTable 1.** Data Dictionary from Data Harmonization Spreadsheet

eTable 2. Risk of Bias Assessment

eTable 3. Changes to the Prespecified Statistical Analysis Plan

eTable 4. Primary, Secondary, and Safety Outcomes

eTable 5. Trial Characteristics: Treatment Groups, Participant Assessment, and Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

eTable 6. Merging Trial Arms

eFigure 1. Trial Selection/RCT Selection Process in Detail

eFigure 2. Estimated Study Coefficients

eFigure 3. Conditional Covariate Effects

eFigure 4. Estimated Mortality Rate in Subgroups Under Both Control and HCQ/CQ

eFigure 5. Posterior Predictive Check of Primary Outcomes by Site

eReferences

eAppendix. Collaborators from the 8 Studies Analyzed

eMethods. Description of the primary outcome model and estimands

Model Description

We fit a Bayesian proportional odds ordinal regression model for ordinal score measured between day 28 and day 35 post enrollment. For individuals with multiple measurements, the outcome was taken as the earliest measurement within the time window. Deaths recorded before the time window were carried forward. The following baseline covariates were included in the model: sex, age, number of comorbidities, body mass index, COVID ordinal scale). The coding and reference levels for the baseline variables are indicated in the table below.

Covariate	Coding	Reference level	Binned version
Sex	female = $+1/2$, male = $-1/2$	0 (midpoint)	n/a
Age	(age in years – 60)/10	60 years old	<18, 18-29, 30-49, 50- 69, 70-79, 80+
Number of baseline comorbidities	raw count of the following baseline comorbidities	0	0, 1, 2, 3, ≥4
Body mass index	(BMI – 25)/5	BMI of 25	≤20, 20-25, 25-30, 30- 35, ≥35
Baseline ordinal scale	indicators for levels 2-5, as well as (5 – the numeric score)	5 = hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen (the highest possible value for inpatients)	NA

Missing baseline covariate data was imputed using multiple imputation via the R package mice (version 3.12).¹ Treatment assignment and outcome were not used the imputation process. All posterior computations described below were pooled across the imputations. Individuals with missing outcome data were excluded from the model fitting; individuals with missing baseline data on a given covariate were excluded from the corresponding subgroup effect estimates.

Let *i* index an individual patient. Each patient has a vector of baseline covariates X_i and a treatment assignment T_i (1 for hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine or 0 for control). Let the primary outcome for individual *i* be denoted by Y_i with levels l = 1, ..., 7. The proportional odds model takes the form:

logit
$$P[Y_i \le l | X_i, T_i] = \theta_l - \eta_i; l = 1, ..., 6$$

where $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_6$ are cutpoints that are common to all individuals (prior - ordered Student t prior with 3 degrees of freedom and scale parameter 2.5);

$$\eta_i = Z_i^T \beta_0 + \alpha_{0,study} + \delta_{0,NCOSS} + T_i \left(\tau + Z_i^T \beta_1 + \alpha_{1,study} + \delta_{1,NCOSS}\right)$$

is the linear predictor; Z_i —a function of X_i —is a vector including sex, natural cubic splines (with 3 degrees of freedom) for age, BMI and number of comorbidities, and 5 minus ordinal score; β_0 and β_1 are fixed effects (prior - uniform); τ is a fixed effect (prior – uniform); δ_0 and δ_1 are independent normally distributed mean zero random effects (prior for standard deviation parameters — a half Student-t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom and scale parameter 10).

The model was fit using R, and the library "brms" (version 2.15).^{2,3}

Effect Estimates of Interest

We produced two kinds of effect estimates:

1. Standardized effect estimates. These represent the effect of the treatment, averaged over the empirical distribution of individual-level covariates.

We estimated two effects: a proportional odds ratio and risk difference for mortality. We produced these estimates as follows.

Let $\pi_i^l(t)$ denote the predicted probability that an individual with covariates X_i has outcome level l under treatment t. Let $\pi^l(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i^l(t)$ be the predicted probability of outcome level l under treatment t in a population with the same covariate distribution as in our study.

Proportional Odds: For each iteration of the MCMC algorithm, our estimation of the standardized effect is tantamount to estimation by simulation with the following three repetitive steps: (1) draw a vector of covariates from the empirical distribution; (2) compute the predicted outcome probabilities under treatment and under control; and (3) use these predicted probabilities to draw outcomes under treatment and control (independently). Repeat steps (1) to (3) to generate a very large dataset and fit a proportional odds model with treatment indicator as the sole covariate. The resulting regression coefficient (i.e., log proportional odds ratio) is our standardized treatment effect on this iteration of the MCMC. In practice, for each iteration of the MCMC we fit a weighted proportional odds model with treatment as the sole covariates to a dataset with seven outcome levels crossed with two treatment levels; the weights for outcome level l and treatment level t are proportional to $\pi^l(t)$.

The associated estimand is the odds ratio from the closest fitting proportional odds model (with treatment as the sole covariate) to the true outcome probabilities under treatment and under control for a population with same distribution of covariates as in our pooled dataset.

Risk Difference: We utilize the procedure above with the exception that there is no need to fit the proportional odds model; we simply utilize the predicted probabilities of death under treatment and control and compute the difference. The estimand is the true risk difference under treatment versus control for a population with same distribution of covariates as in our pooled dataset.

Subgroup effects: We apply the above estimation procedure where we restrict the covariate distribution to the specific subgroup of interest. The estimands are subgroup specific.

2. Conditional effect estimates. For each level of a given covariate of interest and within iteration of the MCMC, we compute (1) predicted probabilities of mechanical ventilation or death under treatment and under control as well as the associated relative risk and (2) difference in the values of the linear predictor under treatment and under control, with all other covariates set to their reference values. In these computations, the quantities are marginalized over the study random effects. Posterior summaries of these quantities are plotted.

Model Diagnostics and Sensitivity Analysis

To assess the within-sample fit of our model, we compared the observed outcome data with draws from the posterior predictive distribution and examined Dunn-Smyth randomized quantile residuals.⁴

To assess the sensitivity of our conclusions to modeling choices, we:

- repeated the analysis with weakly informative $N(0, 5^2)$ priors on the fixed effect coefficients, and more conservative half Student-*t* (df = 3, scale = 5) priors on the group-level standard deviations,
- explored the impact of adding to the model the additional variables (1) randomization to treatment with azithromycin and (2) time between symptom onset and enrollment, and
- (post-hoc) fit a version of the model without individual-level treatment interaction terms.

To compare the model fits, we recomputed the primary outcome and mortality estimates as well as estimated leave-one-out predictive (log) densities (LOO-ELPD) using the R package "loo."^{5,6} The results are as follows:

	Relative	Standard
	LOO-ELPD	error
Prespecified model minus interaction terms	0.0	0.0
Prespecified model with weakly informative priors	-4.2	4.0
Prespecified model	-6.1	4.6
Prespecified model with azithromycin and days since symptom onset terms	-9.6	4.8
Prespecified model fit only to the ORCHID data, and without site effects	-54.2	11.6

These results indicate that the model without interaction provides the lowest cross-validated error. See main manuscript for our interpretation of these findings.

eTable 1. Data Dictionary from Data Harmonization Spreadsheet

In addition to the variables below, we requested inclusion and exclusion criteria from each trial.

Variable	Format	Description and comments
Patient ID	(Study-specific format)	
Other ID(s)	(Study-specific format)	
Treatment group	(Study-specific format)	
Enrollment date (year)	YYYY	Year of enrollment
Enrollment date (month)	Numeric (1-12)	Month of enrollment
Symptom onset date	Numeric (days)	Enrollment date - symptom onset date
Screening date	Numeric (days)	Enrollment date - screening date
Admission date	Numeric (days)	Enrollment date - admission date
Randomization date	Numeric (days)	Randomization date - enrollment date
Date of first dose	Numeric (days)	Date of first dose - date of enrollment (numeric; days)
Date of last dose	Numeric (days)	Date of last dose - date of enrollment
Ordinal outcome scale	Ordinal scale 1 = Death 2 = Hospitalized, on invasive mechanical ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) 3 = Hospitalized, on non-invasive ventilation or high-flow oxygen devices 4 = Hospitalized, requiring supplemental oxygen 5 = Hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen 6 = Not hospitalized, limitation on activities 7 = Not hospitalized, no limitations on activities	Baseline ordinal scales as well as all available through day 30 post enrollment (Day 0, Day 7, Day 14, Day 28/30 are most important)
Date at which ordinal scale is measured	Numeric (days)	Date of ordinal outcome status – date of enrollment
Hospitalization length of stay	Numeric (days)	Duration in days between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Duration of mechanical ventilation	Numeric (days)	Duration in days between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
All-cause mortality	1 = Yes, 0 = No	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
All-cause mortality – date of death	Numeric (days)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of AEs	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of SAEs	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment

Variable	Format	Description and comments
Number of AEs for QTC Prolongation	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of SAEs for QTC Prolongation	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of AEs for elevated liver function test	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of SAEs for elevated liver function test	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of AEs for arrhythmia or cardiac arrest	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Number of SAEs for arrhythmia or cardiac arrest	Numeric (count)	Between enrollment and day 28/30 post enrollment
Age	Numeric (years)	Age rounded <i>down</i> to beginning of 5-year bracket – e.g., $43 \rightarrow 40$; $39 \rightarrow 35$
Sex	1 = Male, 2 = Female	
Race	 1 = American Indian/Alaska Native; 2 = Asian; 3 = Black/African American; 4 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; 5 = White; 6 = Multiple; 7 = Other/declined; 8 = Unknown/unavailable 	
Ethnicity	0 = Not of Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin 1 = Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin 2 = Unknown	
BMI	numeric	
On mechanical ventilation at enrollment	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
AIDS (do not include HIV- positive without AIDS criteria)	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Cerebrovascular disease	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
A prior myocardial infarction	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Congestive heart failure	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Dementia	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
COPD	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Asthma	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
History of hypertension	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
HIV positive (without AIDS)	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Solid tumor	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Liver disease	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Diabetes mellitus	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Cigarette or tobacco smoking	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Vaping	1 = Yes, 0 = No	
Concurrent corticosteroid use	1 = Yes, 0 = No	

Variable	Format	Description and comments
Concurrent azithromycin use	1 = Yes, 0 = No	

eTable 2. Risk of Bias Assessment

Trials	Bias arising from randomization process	Bias due to deviations from intended intervention	Bias due to missing outcome data	Bias in measurement of outcome	Overall risk of bias
ORCHID	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
WU352	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
NCT04335552 (Duke)	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
TEACH	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns
COVID MED	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
HAHPS	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
NCT04344444 (University Medical Center New Orleans)	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns
OAHU-COVID19	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns

We utilized the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool to rate specific risk of bias domains and "overall risk of bias." We considered the following domains of bias, using trial protocols, IPD, and other information provided by investigators: (1) bias arising from the randomization process (methods used to generate and conceal the allocation sequence), (2) bias due to deviations from intended interventions (whether participants and health professionals were masked to assigned intervention and methods used to ensure that participants received allocated intervention), (3) bias due to missing outcome data, and (4) bias in measurement of the outcome. Since we analyzed IPD, we excluded the fifth domain "risk of bias in selection of the reported result." We followed the recommended algorithms to reach an overall "risk of bias" assessment for each trial.

We assessed 6 studies at low risk of bias in the first domain of "Bias arising from the randomization process" (ORCHID, WU352, NCT04335552, TEACH, COVID MED, OAHU-COVID19); COVID MED was assessed as low risk because despite allowance for study arm shifting due to drug supply interruption, this never took place. Two studies (HAHPS, NCT0434444) did not have information on allocation concealment, and NCT04344444 had noticeably different sample sizes for each treatment group. All but two studies had low risk of bias for the second domain of "Bias due to deviations from the intended intervention"; NCT04344444 and OAHU-COVID19 elicited some concerns due to lack of information in the former and no masking in the latter. TEACH was the only study to elicit some concerns for "Bias due to missing outcome data" due to data missing for >20% of the study population. Finally, 5 studies scored "some concerns" for the domain of "Bias in the measurement of the outcome" (WU352, NCT04335552, HAHPS, NCT04344444, OAHU-COVID19). The primary reason for this rating was due to the outcome assessors being aware of the treatment each participant received; the rating was not assessed as "high risk of bias" because our primary outcome measurement is a hard endpoint for which most decision making is protocolized by objective oxygenation and ventilation respiratory status numbers. Our "Overall risk of bias" assessment was "low" for 2 and "some concerns" for 6 of the 8 studies.

eTable 3. Changes to the Prespecified Statistical Analysis Plan

When the change was made	Change	Reason
After examining baseline covariates and outcome missingness, but not outcome data themselves	We decided to extend the outcome definition from day 28-30 post-enrollment to day 28-35 post- enrollment. A patient's outcome was taken to be their earliest recorded ordinal score between day 28 and day 35 post-enrollment (inclusive).	Missingness in the outcome measurements. The change increased the number of patients with valid outcome values from 90.3% to 95.3%.
	We decided to use a simple count of those comorbidities without significant missingness in place of a weighted Charlson (or Charlson-like) comorbidity score.	Missingness in baseline comorbidity indicators; not having requested standard Charlson indicators from each site.
	We simplified the safety variables under consideration.	Extensive missingness in QTc and elevated LFTs AE/SAE results.
	We modified the form of our prespecified regression model for the primary outcome.	Following establishing the total sample size and simulating outcome data from the empirical distribution of baseline patient characteristics.
After examining/analyzing the outcome data	We decided to use superpopulation rather than finite sample standardized estimators of treatment effect for our primary outcome analysis.	For three reasons: (1) the uncertainty in the superpopulation estimator is more directly comparable to that of the maximum likelihood estimator; (2) the finite-sample estimator requires assumptions about the dependence between individual-level potential outcomes; and (3) our choice of assumption—to treat the potential outcomes as independent—potentially made the associated uncertainty intervals misleadingly narrow.
	We set as missing BMIs less than 10 and greater than 70; for the outcome analysis, these were imputed in the same step as the other baseline covariates using multiple imputation.	Extremeness of these values.
	We decided not to fit a category-specific ordinal model as a sensitivity analysis.	Time and effort; the reasonable within-sample fit of the simpler models.

When the change was made	Change	Reason
	We decided to de-emphasize our pre-specified conditional effect measure (relative risk of mechanical ventilation/ECMO or death).	The associated uncertainty intervals were extremely wide, perhaps due to the flexibility of our prespecified model.
	We decided to include model-standardized estimates of the risk difference for mortality, both overall and by subgroup.	This was considered informative and straightforward, given the model. Additionally, risk differences are considered a more interpretable measure of subgroup effects than odds ratios because of their collapsibility. ^{7,8}
	We decided to include a subgroup analysis based on quintiles of a baseline risk score.	Following recommendations of Kent et al.9
	We decided not to examine whether site × treatment interactions are associated with site-level covariates or individual-level covariates averaged within sites.	There was little very little variation in the estimated site × treatment interactions (eFigure 2).
	We replaced mortality at day 28-30 as a safety outcome with mortality at day 28-35 as a secondary outcome, and conducted an analysis of this parallel to that of our primary outcome.	We had prespecified all-cause mortality at or before day 28/30 as a safety outcome. However, we judged that an analysis of mortality parallel to that of our primary outcome would be clinically relevant.
	In the primary outcome and mortality analyses, we treated 6 extreme BMI values (<10 or >70) as missing.	We suspected that these values were mistaken or could bias our results, and were unable to definitively establish their accuracy.

Trial	Primary outcome	Secondary outcomes	Safety outcomes
ORCHID	COVID Ordinal Outcomes Scale on Study Day 15	 Time to recovery, defined as time to reaching level 5, 6, or 7 on the COVID Outcomes Scale, which is the time to the earlier of final liberation from supplemental oxygen or hospital discharge All-location, all-cause 14-day mortality (assessed on Study Day 15) All-location, all-cause 28-day mortality (assessed on Study Day 29) COVID Ordinal Outcomes Scale on Study Day 3 COVID Ordinal Outcomes Scale on Study Day 8 COVID Ordinal Outcomes Scale on Study Day 29 Composite of death or receipt of ECMO through Day 28 Oxygen-free days through Day 28 Vasopressor-free days through Day 28 ICU-free days through Day 28 Hospital-free days through Day 28 	 Seizure Atrial or ventricular arrhythmia Cardiac arrest Elevation in aspartate, aminotransferase, or alanine aminotransferase to twice the local upper limit of normal Acute pancreatitis Acute kidney injury Receipt of renal replacement therapy
WU352	Time (hours) from randomization to recovery defined as (1) absence of fever, as defined as at least 48 hours since last temperature ≥38.0°C without the use of fever-reducing medications AND (2) absence of symptoms of greater than mild severity for 24 hours AND (3) not requiring supplemental oxygen beyond pre-COVID baseline AND (4) freedom from mechanical ventilation or death	 Time to resolution of fever defined as at least 48 hours since last temperature ≥38.0°C without the use of fever-reducing medications Time to improvement in symptoms (scored as mild or absent and remained so for 24 hour) Mean improvement in symptom from baseline Duration of hospitalization Proportion requiring supplementary oxygen (above baseline usage) at any time during follow-up Duration (days) of requirement for supplementary oxygen Proportion requiring ICU admission at any time during follow-up Ventilator free days All-cause mortality 	 Serious Adverse Events that occur within 6 weeks after randomization Unanticipated problem (UP) Unexpected adverse drug event (UADE)
NCT04335552 (Duke)	WHO ordinal scale measured at 14 days after enrollment	 Death during the index hospitalization Number of days on mechanical ventilation Proportion of patients not receiving mechanical ventilation at baseline who progress to requiring mechanical ventilation 	 Arrhythmias (ventricular) Hepatic failure Bone marrow failure Aplastic anemia

eTable 4. Primary, Secondary, and Safety Outcomes

Trial	Primary outcome	Secondary outcomes	Safety outcomes		
		 during the index hospitalization WHO ordinal scale measured at 28 days after enrollment Hospital length of stay in days for the index hospitalization Days of fever (temperature ≥38.0) after randomization Days on supplemental oxygen after randomization All-cause study medication discontinuation Drug-associated adverse events of special interest 	 Prolonged QT interval Angioedema Exfoliative dermatitis Acute generalized exanthematous pustulosis (AGEP) Psychosis Suicidal ideation Seizure SAEs that occur between initial dose of study medication and day 14 		
TEACH	A severe disease progression composite endpoint defined by the occurrence of any of the following: mortality, ICU admission, invasive mechanical ventilation, ECMO, and/or hypotension requiring vasopressor support by the 14- day post-treatment evaluation	 Composite outcome (mortality, ICU admission, invasive mechanical ventilation, ECMO, and/or hypotension requiring vasopressor support) at 30 days Individual components of the composite endpoint (mortality, ICU admission, invasive mechanical ventilation, ECMO, and/or hypotension requiring vasopressor support) by EOT, PTE, and 30 days of treatment Hospital length of stay Days of fever Days of non-invasive ventilator use Days of non-rebreather mask oxygen supplementation Cytokine release syndrome grading scale Percentage of subjects reporting each severity score on 8-point ordinal scale D1 and EOT SARS-CoV-2 viral eradication from nasopharyngeal specimens at EOT, measured by RT-PCR Change from baseline AST, ALT, creatinine, glucose, white blood cell count, lymphocyte percentage, hemoglobin, platelets, total bilirubin, LDH, CRP, and IL-6 at EOT 	• Primary Safety Composite: Cumulative incidence of SAEs through day 30, grade 3 or 4 AEs through day 30, and/or discontinuation of therapy (for any reason)		
COVID MED	NIAID COVID-19 Ordinal Severity Score	 Mortality Hospital/ICU/ventilator length of stay (LOS) Reason for ventilator discontinuation (if applicable) Antibiotics use Symptoms-based COVID-19 severity score 	Complications AEs/SAEs		
HAHPS	WHO COVID Ordinal Outcomes Scale at 14 days	 Hospital-free days at 28 days (calculated as a worst-rank ordinal) Ventilator-free days at 28 days (calculated as a worst-rank ordinal) 	 Counts (proportions) of adverse events Those listed in the package insert for hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin QT interval 		

Trial	Primary outcome	Secondary outcomes	Safety outcomes
		 ICU-free days at 28 days (calculated as a worst-rank ordinal) Time to a 1-point decrease in the WHO ordinal recovery score 	• Arrythmia
NCT04344444 (University Medical Center New Orleans)	Composite incidence of death, transfer to ICU, initiation of mechanical ventilation, or initiation of ECMO	 Toxicities of the drugs SARS-CoV2 viral load over time Length of hospital stay Number of ICU days Rate of readmission after hospital discharge Duration of symptoms 	 AEs monitored daily, including drug toxicity. QTc monitoring via telemetry
OAHU-COVID19	Clinical status (on a 7-point ordinal scale) at day 15	 Time to an improvement of one category from admission using an ordinal scale Subject clinical status using ordinal scale at days 3, 5, 8, 11, and 28 Mean change in the ordinal scale from baseline to days 3, 5, 8, 11, 15, and 28 from baseline The time to discharge or to a National Early Warning Score (NEWS) of ≤2 and maintained for 24 hours, whichever occurs first Oxygenation free days in the first 28 days Incidence and duration of new oxygen use during the study Ventilator-free days in the first 28 days Incidence and duration of new mechanical ventilation use during hospitalization Duration of hospitalization (days) 	 28-day mortality Cumulative incidence of serious adverse events (SAEs) through 28-day follow-up Cumulative incidence of Grade 3 and 4 adverse events Discontinuation of hydroxychloroquine for any reason Changes in WBC, Hb, Plt, Creat, CrCl, Gluc, Tot Bili, ALT, AST over time

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
ORCHID NCT04332991, Vanderbilt University, Massachusetts General, and PETAL Network (Blinded) ¹⁰	510 hospitalized participants	≥18 years	2	5 days	HCQ: Days 1-2 400 mg twice daily; Days 3-10 200 mg twice daily; Placebo: Matching placebo enterally twice daily matching the dosing regimen for HCQ	12 months (Daily assessments Days 1-5, 8, 15, and 29, Months 3, 6, and 12)	 Age ≥18 years Currently hospitalized or in an emergency department with anticipated hospitalization. Symptoms of acute respiratory infection, defined as one or more of the following: a. Cough b. Fever (>37.5° C / 99.5° F) c. Shortness of breath (operationalized as any of the following: subjective shortness of breath reported by patient or surrogate; tachypnea with respiratory rate ≥22 /minute; hypoxemia, defined as SpO2 <92% on room air, new receipt of supplemental oxygen to maintain SpO2 ≥92%, or increased supplemental oxygen to maintain SpO2 ≥92% for a patient on chronic oxygen therapy). d. Sore throat Laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection within the past 10 days prior to randomization 	 Prisoner Pregnancy Breast feeding Unable to randomize within 10 days after onset of acute respiratory infection symptoms Unable to randomize within 48 hours after hospital arrival Seizure disorder Porphyria cutanea tarda QTc >500 ms on electrocardiogram within 72 hours prior to enrollment Diagnosis of Long QT syndrome Known allergy to hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine, or amodiaquine Receipt in the 12 hours prior to enrollment, or planned administration during the 5-day study period that treating clinicians feel cannot be substituted for another medication, of any of the following: amiodarone; cimetidine; dofetilide; phenobarbital; phenytoin; sotalol Receipt of >1 dose of hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine in the 10 days prior to enrollment Inability to receive enteral medications Refusal or inability to be contacted on Day 15 for clinical outcome assessment if discharged prior to Day 15 Previous enrollment in this trial The treating clinical team does not believe equipoise exists regarding the use of hydroxychloroquine for the treatment of this patient
WU352 NCT04341727, Washington University (Open-label)	500 non- ventilated hospitalized participants expected; 30 participants when study	≥18 years	4	5 days	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; days 2-5 200 mg twice daily HCQ + AZM: HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-	6 weeks (Daily assessments Days 1-14, Weeks 3, 4, 5, and 6)	 Hospitalization for management of SARS CoV-2 infection Positive SARS CoV-2 test Age ≥18 years Provision of informed consent Electrocardiogram (ECG) ≤48 	 Contraindication or allergy to chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin Current use hydroxychloroquine, chloroquine or azithromycin Concurrent use of another investigational agent Invasive mechanical ventilation

eTable 5. Trial Characteristics: Treatment Groups, Participant Assessment, and Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
	closed				5 200 mg twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once, Days 2-5 250 mg once daily CQ : Day 1 1,000 mg once, followed by 500 mg in 12 hours; Days 2-5 500 mg orally twice daily CQ + AZM : CQ: Day 1 1000 mg once, followed by 500 mg in 12 hours; Days 2-5 500 mg orally twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once, Days 2-5 250 mg once daily		hours prior to enrollment • Complete blood count, glucose-6 phosphate- dehydrogenase (G6PD), comprehensive metabolic panel and magnesium ≤48 hours prior to enrollment from standard of care • If participating in sexual activity that could lead to pregnancy, individuals of reproductive potential who can become pregnant must agree to use contraception throughout the study. At least one of the following must be used throughout the study: • Condom (male or female) with or without spermicide • Diaphragm or cervical cap with spermicide • Intrauterine device (IUD) • Hormone-based contraceptive	 Participants who have any severe and/or uncontrolled medical conditions such as: unstable angina pectoris; symptomatic congestive heart failure; myocardial infarction; cardiac arrhythmias or known prolonged QTc >470 males, >480 female on ECG; pulmonary insufficiency; epilepsy (interaction with chloroquine) Prior retinal eye disease Concurrent malignancy requiring chemotherapy Known Chronic Kidney disease, eGFR<10 or dialysis G-6-PD deficiency, if unknown requires G6PD testing prior to enrollment Known Porphyria Known myasthenia gravis Currently pregnant or planning on getting pregnant while on study Breast feeding AST/ALT >five times the upper limit of normal ULN Bilirubin >five times the UL Magnesium <1.4 mEq/L Calcium <8.4mg/dL >10.6mg/dL Potassium <3.3 >5.5 mEg/L Current concomitant use of contraindicated drugs including antiarrhythmics, antidepressant, anticonvulsants
NCT04335552, Duke University (Open-label)	500 hospitalized participants	≥12 years or older	2	5 days	Arm 1: Supportive care alone Arm 2: Supportive care + HCQ (Day 1 800 mg once; Days 2-5 600 mg once daily) Arm 3: Supportive care + AZM (Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily) Arm 4: Supportive care + HCQ (Day 1	45 days (Daily assessment Days 1-14, 28, and 45)	 Admitted to participating hospital with symptoms suggestive of SARS-CoV-2 infection OR develop symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 during hospitalization Subject (or legally authorized representative) can provide written informed consent (in English or Spanish) affirming intention to comply with planned study procedures prior to enrollment Male or female aged 12 years 	 Participating in any other clinical trial of an experimental agent for SARS-CoV-2 On hydroxychloroquine at any time during hospitalization, or within 180 days of hospitalization for COVID-19 regardless of indication History of cirrhosis, long QT syndrome or porphyria of any classification Most recent ECG prior to time of screening with QTc of ≥500 msec Known hypersensitivity to hydroxychloroquine or 4-aminoquinoline derivatives Weight less than 40 kg

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
					800 mg once; Days 2-5 600 mg once daily) + AZM (Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily)		or older at the time of enrollment • Has laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection determined by a validated nucleic acid amplification assay (public health or commercial) in any respiratory specimen collected within 14 days of randomization • Illness of any duration that includes: • Radiographic evidence of pulmonary infiltrates (chest X-ray or CT scan) OR • Clinical documentation of lower respiratory symptoms (cough, shortness of breath, or wheezing) OR • Any documented SpO2 ≤94% on room air OR • Any inpatient initiation of supplemental oxygen regardless of documented cause	 Death anticipated within 48 hours of enrollment Inability to obtain informed consent from the patient or designated medical decision maker
TEACH NCT04369742, New York University (Blinded) ¹¹	626 hospitalized adult and pediatric participants	>0	2	5 days	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily Placebo: Day 1 calcium citrate 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily	30 days (Baseline, End of treatment, Days 6, 14, and 30)	 Hospitalized with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 including but not limited to any of the following: fever (documented or subjective), cough, dyspnea, diarrhea, nausea, diffuse myalgias, and/or anosmia Informed consent signed by patient (if ≥18 years old) or parent (if <18 years old). Additionally, assent will be obtained from children ages 7 and older who are capable of providing assent. Adults who are unable to provide informed consent may be consented by legally authorized representative (see 13.3.3). Positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR 	 Presence of the primary endpoint (ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, ECMO, and/or vasopressor requirement) at time of randomization. Treatment with CQ or CQ within the 30 days prior to the start of the study drug treatment. Unable to take oral medications. History of allergic reaction or intolerance to CQ or CQ. Baseline corrected QTc interval (>500 milliseconds, gender neutral) history of congenital QTc prolongation, and/or history of cardiac arrest. Concomitant therapy with flecainide, amiodarone, digoxin, procainamide, propafenone, thioridazine, or pimozide History of retinal disease including a documented history of G6PD deficiency.

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
							testing (nasopharyngeal, oropharyngeal, sputum and/or bronchoalveolar lavage) The testing may: • Occur up to ≤72h prior to informed consent of participation in the study • Be undertaken either on- site or in an external laboratory certified by New York State to run testing for SARS-CoV-2	Pediatric Exclusion Criteria: • Baseline QTc >470 ms in males, >480 ms in females (post puberty) or QTc >460 ms in males, >470 ms in females (pre puberty) • History of congenital QT prolongation (LQTS) and/or history of cardiac arrest. • Family history of LQTS • Presence of Concomitant therapy QT prolongation: Medications will be checked against a list on www.CredibleMeds.com, and those on concomitant medications with significant QT-prolonging potential will be excluded • Basic metabolic panel (BMP) not performed within 72 hours of enrollment • Presence of uncorrected hypokalemia (<3.4 mmol/L), hypocalcemia (<9.0 mg/dL, and/or hypomagnesemia (<1.7 mg/dL) on most recent BMP (within 72 hours of enrollment).
COVID MED NCT04328012, Bassett Medical Center (Blinded)	4,000 hospitalized participants	≥18 years	4	Up to 14 days	Arm 1: standard care and lopinavir/ritonavir: Dosing: 400 mg/100 mg twice daily for 5-14 days Arm 2: standard care and HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-14 200 mg twice daily Arm 3: standard care and losartan •Losartan 25 mg once daily for 5-14 days •Placebo (Tic Tacs in blank capsules) once daily for 5-14 days to replicate/control for 'bid dosing' Arm 4: standard	60 days (Baseline, Day 1-7, Day 14, Day 30, Day 60)	 Hospitalized patient Age ≥18 years Able to ingest oral medication or be administered medication via gastric tube or equivalent Laboratory confirmation of SARS-CoV-2 infection within 1 week prior to randomization Randomization within 72 hr of hospital admission Negative pregnancy test for reproductive age women Patient or LAR able to provide informed consent 	General (all groups) exclusions: • End stage renal disease (ESRD) NOT undergoing renal replacement therapy • Severe hepatic insufficiency (LFTs >5 times the upper limit of normal or known ESLD or cirrhosis) • Nausea/vomiting or aspiration risk precluding oral medications unless can be given by gastric tube • Use of another SARS-CoV-2 directed medication empirically or within another clinical trial within the prior week • Pregnancy or breast feeding • Absence of dependable contraception in reproductive age women • Inability to obtain or declined informed consent Hydroxychloroquine group exclusions: • Allergy or intolerance to HCQ (or CQ) • Already taking HCQ or CQ (within 1 month)

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
					care and placebo : Placebo (Tic Tacs in blank capsules) twice daily for 5-14 days			 Recent malaria exposure (within 1 month) History or current cardiac diseases (heart failure, ventricular arrhythmias, LBBB or RBBB, QTc prolongation) History of retinopathy Severe hypoglycemia Auditory disorders Known G6PD deficiency Porphyria or psoriasis Severe active alcohol use disorder Seizure disorder Co-administration of hepatotoxic agents Co-administration with certain drugs due to CYP3A interactions if taken in <24 hr
HAHPS NCT04329832, Intermountain Health Care (Open-label) ^{12,13}	300 hospitalized participants	≥18 years	2	5 days	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily	6 months (Daily assessments Days 1-7 and 14, Month 6)	 Adult (age ≥18 years) Confirmed OR suspected COVID-19 Confirmed: Positive assay for COVID-19 within the last 10 days Suspected: Pending assay for COVID-19 WITH high clinical suspicion Scheduled for admission or already admitted to an inpatient bed 	 Allergy to hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin History of bone marrow transplant Known G6PD deficiency Chronic hemodialysis or glomerular filtration rate <20 ml/min Psoriasis Porphyria Concomitant use of digitalis, flecainide, amiodarone, procainamide, propafenone, cimetidine, dofetilide, phenobarbital, phenytoin, or sotalol Known history of long QT syndrome Current known QTc >500 msec Pregnant or nursing Prisoner Weight <35 kg Seizure disorder Severe liver disease Outpatient use of hydroxychloroquine for treatment of a disease other than COVID- 19 OR has received more than 2 days of hydroxychloroquine or azithromycin for suspected or confirmed COVID-19 Patient has recovered from COVID-19 and/or is being discharged from the hospital on day of enrollment Treating physician refuses to allow patient participation in the study

Trial (blinding)	Planned sample size	Age	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Dose by treatment group	Participant assessment	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
								Unable to obtain informed consentPrior enrollment in this study
NCT04344444, University Medical Center New Orleans (Open-label)	600 hospitalized participants	≥18 years	3	5 days	Control: Supportive Care Only HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily HCQ + AZM: HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2- 5 200 mg twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg daily	30 days (Daily assessments Days 1-14, and 30)	 Age greater than 18 years Positive SARS-CoV-2 testing or consistent clinical syndrome (based on clinical picture e.g., characteristic infiltrates on chest x-ray, laboratory findings, and with agreement by two physicians) in patients under investigation (PUIs). Oxygen saturation of >94% on room air with defined risk factors consistent with moderate disease OR oxygen saturation of <94% on room air consistent with severe disease Ability and willingness to comply with study procedures 	 QTc greater than 450 milliseconds on screening EKG or telemetry Pregnant or lactating women Inability to take oral pills or inability to use a feeding tube Inability to obtain informed consent either from the patient or from the next of kin if patient is incapacitated. For the purpose of this study obtaining a verbal consent from a family member on the phone with a witness will be considered acceptable since there is a "no visitor" policy in force at hospitals. Patients requiring ICU level care Use of azithromycin or hydroxychloroquine within 30 days prior to admission
OAHU- COVID19 NCT04345692, Queen's Medical Center -Honolulu (Open-label)	350 hospitalized participants	18-95 years	2	5 days	Usual Care + HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily Usual care	BL, Days 3, 5, 8, 11, and 28		

eTable 6. Merging Trial Arms

Trial	Treatment groups	Treatment days	Treatment or control?	Dose by treatment group
ORCHID	2	5 days	Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
			С	Placebo
WU352	4	5 days	Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
			Т	HCQ + AZM: HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily
			Т	CQ: Day 1 1000 mg once followed by 500 mg in 12 hours; Days 2-5 500 mg twice daily
			т	CQ + AZM: CQ: Day 1 1000 mg once followed by 500 mg in 12 hours; Days 2-5 500 mg twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily
NCT04335552	2	5 days	С	Arm 1: Supportive care alone
(Duke University)			Т	Arm 2: Supportive care plus HCQ (Day 1 800 mg once; Days 2-5 600 mg once daily)
			С	Arm 3: Supportive care plus azithromycin (Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily)
			Т	Arm 4: Supportive care plus HCQ (Day 1 800 mg once; Days 2-5 600 mg once daily) plus azithromycin (Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily)
TEACH	2	5 days	Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
			С	Placebo
COVID MED	4 (only Arms 2 and 4 included herein)	14 days	С	Arm 1: Standard care and lopinavir/ritonavir: Dosing: 400 mg/100 mg twice daily for 5-14 days
			Т	Arm 2: Standard care and HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
				С
			С	Arm 4: Standard care and placebo: Placebo twice daily for 5-14 days
HAHPS	2	5 days	Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
			С	AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily
NCT04344444	3	5 days	С	Control: Supportive Care Only
(University Medical Center			Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
New Orleans)			Т	HCQ + AZM: HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily; AZM: Day 1 500 mg once; Days 2-5 250 mg once daily
OAHU-COVID19	2	5 days	Т	HCQ: Day 1 400 mg twice daily; Days 2-5 200 mg twice daily
			С	Usual care

eFigure 1. Trial Selection/RCT Selection Process in Detail (see legend, next page)



eFigure 1. Two of the trials included in our analysis did not have study acronyms (only trial registration numbers). COVID MED indicates Comparison Of Therapeutics for Hospitalized Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 In a Pragmatic aDaptive randoMizED Clinical Trial During the COVID-19 Pandemic; CTSA, Clinical and Translational Science Awards; HAHPS, Hydroxychloroquine vs. Azithromycin for Hospitalized Patients With Suspected or Confirmed COVID-19; HCQ/CQ, hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine; OAHU-COVID19, A Randomized, Controlled Clinical Trial of the Safety and Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of COVID-19 in Hospitalized Patients; ORCHID, Outcomes Related to COVID-19 Treated With Hydroxychloroquine Among In-patients With Symptomatic Disease; TEACH, Treating COVID-19 With Hydroxychloroquine; WU352, Washington University 352: Open-label, Randomized Controlled Trial of Hydroxychloroquine Alone or Hydroxychloroquine Plus Azithromycin or Chloroquine Alone or Chloroquine in the Treatment of SARS CoV-2 Infection.

Starting on April 30, 2020, a Trial Innovation Network team aiming to pool RCT data completed multiple systematic outreaches to the Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) Program community. We connected with interested study teams via the COVID-19 Collaboration Platform website and additional directed outreach. Trialists were asked to upload protocols to the COVID-19 Collaboration Platform repository in an effort to promote collaboration and data aggregation and reduce duplication. We utilized this multi-pathway approach to assure the widest possible knowledge of our effort across established groups of likely investigators in the United States.

One of the sites contacted by the COVID-19 Collaboration Platform, Bassett, had initiated a collaboration registry effort and performed systematic searches of ClinicalTrials.gov using search words "COVID-19" and "hydroxychloroquine" or "chloroquine," and study status of "recruiting" on May 9, 2020, yielding 9 COVID-19 HCQ/CQ RCTs, and again on May 21, 2020; the latter search and subsequent recruiting elicited a list of 19 RCTs (18 from ClinicalTrials.gov, 1 from personal communication). Pls from 18 registered RCTs in the Bassett/COVID-19 Collaboration Platform list were invited to participate in a pooled analysis project focusing on HCQ/CQ; outreach was initiated by Bassett and subsequently completed by the Trial Innovation Network team. Eight RCTs were selected after excluding 2 that declined participation or did not respond; 3 that had differing trial designs including outpatient and prophylaxis studies; 2 that had no enrollment; 1 that was not registered on ClinicalTrials.gov; and 3 that had sites located outside the US (e.g., RECOVERY and DisCoVeRy, part of SOLIDARITY). (We sought to avoid cumbersome international data sharing regulatory delays such as the General Data Protection Regulation [GDPR].) We were able to include 93.3% of patients from the targeted list of US studies. Excluding data from the international trials in our original list, on the other hand, led to the exclusion of a large number of patients, 6,569 in total.

Simultaneously, the Trial Innovation Network team completed a systematic search of ClinicalTrials.gov using search terms "COVID-19" or "SARS-CoV-2," and USbased, on June 2, 2020, yielding 207 studies. The list was filtered to CTSA or CTSA lead sites in part because of consistent data collection at these sites, yielding 103 studies. The team surveyed this CTSA consortium; 26 expressed interest in collaboration. These searches and outreach activities, in addition to review of the studies' key variables, resulted in identifying 13 HCQ/CQ studies. A consensus investigator meeting made the decision to focus on inpatient trials. The rationale was that despite a substantial event rate occurring in inpatient trials, many were experiencing recruitment difficulty. Conversely, the outpatient trials, with lower event rates, had robust recruitment and desire to complete recruitment prior to pooling. Of the 13 trials, 10 were excluded: 4 with prophylactic trial designs, 2 outpatient trials, and 4 that had no enrollment (some were excluded for more than one reason). The outpatient studies were redirected to an outpatient pooling effort (Gates Foundation). Five of the Trial Innovation Network's list of 13 trials overlapped with the Bassett/COVID-19 Collaboration Platform list, and 3 were included in our analysis (ORCHID, WU352, COVID MED).

The list developed by Bassett and the COVID-19 Collaboration Platform was the primary driver for study inclusion/exclusion in our pooled analysis, with augmentation and refinement by the Trial Innovation Network's outreach and search efforts. None of the selected studies were published prior to selection.

eFigure 2. Estimated Study Coefficients



Estimated study coefficients from the primary outcome model, with 66% and 95% credible intervals indicated. "Control" terms represent differences in predicted outcomes between sites under control, for individuals with similar baseline covariates, on the proportional log-odds scale. Treatment effect terms represent differences in predicted treatment effect between sites, again for individuals with similar baseline covariates. Positive coefficients represent, respectively, better ordinal scale outcomes under control and benefit of HCQ/CQ at days 28-35 post-enrollment.

HCQ/CQ indicates hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine.

eFigure 3. Conditional Covariate Effects



eFigure 3 (continued)



Conditional effects from the Bayesian proportional odds model. Shown are (1) the relative risk of mechanical ventilation or death at day 28-35; (2) the estimated probabilities of mechanical ventilation or death at day 28-35 under control and HCQ/CQ; and (3) the log proportional odds ratio comparing HCQ/CQ and control. Each of these effects are shown for reference individuals with the following covariate values: age 60, BMI 25, no baseline comorbidities, baseline ordinal score of 5, and sex coefficient set between male and female values. Curves for continuous covariates are accompanied by 50% and 95% credible bands; intervals for discrete covariates are accompanied by 66% and 95% credible intervals.

BMI indicates body mass index; HCQ/CQ, hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine.

eFigure 4. Estimated Mortality Rate in Subgroups Under Both Control and HCQ/CQ



Estimated mortality rates (measured at day 28-35) by subgroup under control and HCQ/CQ. Shown are both plug-in estimates (based on the proportion of deaths in each subgroup) along with 95% confidence intervals, and model-adjusted estimates with 95% credible intervals. The model used is the same as for the primary outcome analysis.

HCQ/CQ indicates hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine.

eFigure 5. Posterior Predictive Check of Primary Outcomes by Site

Ordinal scale at day 28-35

at day 28-35	ORCHID	TEACH	HAHPS	WU352	NCT04344444	OAHU-COVID19	NCT04335552	COVID MED	
7 - no hosp, no lim - 6 - no hosp, lim -		1.12977) 1110	100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100 - 100				. : • .	·	
5 - nosp, no ox - 4 - hosp, supp ox - 3 - hosp, NIV -	de la contra		• :	·		· ·			Observed o
- hosp, mech vent - 1 - death -		the transfer			••		• •		
7 - 6 -				3				•	
5 - 4 - 3 -					:		•••		Posterior predictive draws
2 - 1 -	1947. V.V.				• • • •	•			
7 - 6 -		- 1963 ⁻ N	A Store		• • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · ·	/ · · · ·	•	
4 - 3 -	· · · · ·	·····		••	·	•			¥
2 - 1 -	estate and	a de la contra de la		•	••••	•			
7 - 6 - 5 -							A		
4 - 3 -				•					
2 - 1 -					•	· .	•		
7 - 6 -		1999 1997 1997	194 J. 1. 1. 194 - 19		• • •		· · · · ·	•	
4 - 3 -			• • •		•				
2 - 1 -	3 64 - 45 - 44.			•		•			
7 - 6 - 5 -	1000 - 1000	2040 - 20 1946 - 20 1946 - 20							
4 - 3 - 2 -					•.		•	•	
1 -	a start and a start and a start		···			•••			
7 - 6 - 5 -				- 11-				•	
4 - 3 -				•					
2 - 1 -					•	· :	•		
7 - 6 - 5 -				1997 - 1999 - 1999 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 -					
4 - 3 -	2.86			• •					
2 - 1 -	NN						•		
7 - 6 - 5 -						·····			
4 - 3 -	1. S. W. S. S.			•				•	
2 - 1 -		· · · · ·	·		••••				
7 - 6 -		ار دولای کوری مرکز در مورد میرد	34. 			14.4 M.	· · · · ·		
4 - 3 -		• • • •				•	• •		
2 -						••			

Posterior predictive check of the main analysis model. Shown are observed outcome data (first row) and draws for the posterior predictive distribution (subsequent rows) of the ordinal outcome scale at day 28-35, plotted against the expected linear predictor for each individual. Each column corresponds to one study in our analysis. Data points have been jittered for clarity.

eReferences

- 1. Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. Mice: multivariate imputation by chained equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;45:1-67. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
- 2. Bürkner PC. Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *The R Journal*. 2018;10(1):395-411. https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-017/index.html
- 3. Bürkner PC. brms: an R package for Bayesian multilevel models using stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2017;80:1-28. doi:10.18637/jss.v080.i01
- 4. Dunn PK, Smyth GK. Randomized quantile residuals. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*. 1996;5(3):236-244. doi:10.2307/1390802
- 5. Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing*. 2017;27(5):1413-1432. doi:10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4
- 6. Gabry J, Simpson D, Vehtari A, Betancourt M, Gelman A. Visualization in Bayesian workflow. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*. 2019;182(2):389-402. doi:10.1111/rssa.12378
- 7. Didelez V, Stensrud MJ. On the logic of collapsibility for causal effect measures. *Biometrical Journal Biometrische Zeitschrift*. February 2021. doi:10.1002/bimj.202000305
- 8. Greenland S. Noncollapsibility, confounding, and sparse-data bias. Part 1: the oddities of odds. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2021;138:178-181. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.06.007
- 9. Kent DM, Paulus JK, van Klaveren D, et al. The Predictive Approaches to Treatment effect Heterogeneity (PATH) statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2020;172(1):35-45. doi:10.7326/M18-3667
- 10. Self WH, Semler MW, Leither LM, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine on clinical status at 14 days in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2020;324(21):2165-2176. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.22240
- 11. Ulrich RJ, Troxel AB, Carmody E, et al. Treating COVID-19 with hydroxychloroquine (TEACH): a multicenter, double-blind randomized controlled trial in hospitalized patients. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2020;7(10):ofaa446. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofaa446
- 12. Brown SM, Peltan ID, Webb B, et al. Hydroxychloroquine versus azithromycin for hospitalized patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 (HAHPS). Protocol for a pragmatic, open-label, active comparator trial. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society*. 2020;17(8):1008-1015. doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.202004-309SD
- 13. Brown SM, Peltan I, Kumar N, et al. Hydroxychloroquine vs. azithromycin for hospitalized patients with COVID-19 (HAHPS): results of a randomized, active comparator trial. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society*. 2020;18(4):590-597. doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.202008-940OC

eAppendix. Collaborators from the 8 Studies Analyzed

ORCHID (NCT04332991)	
Samuel M. Brown, MD, MS	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Lindsay M. Leither, DO	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Jonathan D. Casey, MD, MSc	Division of Allergy, Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
Derek C. Angus, MD, MPH	Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Roy G. Brower, MD	Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland
Steven Y. Chang, MD, PhD	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Ronald Reagan-UCLA Medical Center, UCLA, California
Sean P. Collins, MD	Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
John C. Eppensteiner, MD	Department of Surgery, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
Michael R. Filbin, MD	Department of Emergency Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
D. Clark Files, MD	Section of Pulmonary, Critical Care, Allergy and Immunologic Disease, Department of Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Kevin W. Gibbs, MD	Section of Pulmonary, Critical Care, Allergy and Immunologic Disease, Department of Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Adit A. Ginde, MD, MPH	Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado
Michelle N. Gong, MD, MS	Division of Epidemiology and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, New York
Frank E. Harrell, Jr, PhD	Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee
Douglas L. Hayden, PhD	Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
Catherine L. Hough, MD, MSc	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Science University School of Medicine, Portland, Oregon
Nicholas J. Johnson, MD	Department of Emergency Medicine and Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Akram Khan, MD	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Science University School of Medicine, Portland, Oregon
Christopher J. Lindsell, PhD	Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee
Michael A. Matthay, MD	Cardiovascular Research Institute, Departments of Medicine and Anesthesia, University of California, San Francisco, California
Marc Moss, MD	Division of Pulmonary Sciences and Critical Care Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado

Pauline K. Park, MD	Department of Surgery, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Todd W. Rice MD	Division of Allergy, Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
Bryce R.H. Robinson, MD, MS	Department of Surgery, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
David A. Schoenfeld, PhD	Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
Nathan I. Shapiro MD, MPH	Department of Emergency Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts
Jay S. Steingrub, MD	Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Medical School- Baystate, Springfield, Massachusetts
Christine A. Ulysse, MS	Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
Alexandra Weissman, MD, MPH	Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Donald M. Yealy, MD	Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
B. Taylor Thompson, MD	Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts
TEACH (NCT04369742)	
Andrea B. Troxel, PhD	Department of Population Health, Division of Biostatistics, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Ellie Carmody, MD, MPH	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Jaishvi Eapen, MD	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Martin Bäcker, MD	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Long Island School of Medicine, Mineola, New York
Jack A. DeHovitz, MD, MPH, MHCDS, FACP	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, State University of New York Downstate Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, New York
Prithiv J. Prasad, MBBS	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Yi Li, PhD	Department of Population Health, Division of Biostatistics, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Camila Delgado PhD	Department of Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Morris Jrada, MD	Department of Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Gabriel A. Robbins, MD	Department of Pediatrics, Division of Pediatric Hematology-Oncology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Brooklyn Henderson, RN	Vaccine Center, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Alexander Hrycko, MD	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Dinuli Delpachitra, MBBS	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Long Island School of Medicine, Mineola, New York
Vanessa Raabe, MD	Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
	Department of Pediatrics, Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York

Jonathan S. Austrian, MD	Department of Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
Yanina Dubrovskaya, PharmD, BCIDP	Department of Medicine, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York
	Department of Pharmacy, NYU Langone Health, New York, New York
HAHPS (NCT04329832)	
Ithan Peltan, MD, MSc	Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
	Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Naresh Kumar, MPH	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Lindsay Leither, DO	Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Brandon J Webb, MD	Division of Clinical Epidemiology & Infectious Diseases, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Nathan Starr, DO	Internal Medicine, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Colin K Grissom, MD	Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
	Department of Internal Medicine, Pulmonary Division, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Rajendu Srivastava, MD, MPH	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Allison M Butler, MS	Statistical Data Center, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Danielle Groat, PhD	Center for Humanizing Critical Care, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Benjamin Haaland, PhD	Division of Biostatistics, Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Jian Ying, PhD	Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Estelle Harris, MD	Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Stacy Johnson, MD	Internal Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Robert Paine III, MD	Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Tom Greene, PhD	Study Design and Biostatistics Center and Division of Epidemiology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah
Rilee Smith, MPH	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Brent Armbruster, BS	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Katie Brown, BSN	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Valerie Aston, MBA	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Mardee Merrill, BS	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Amanda Nelson	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Diana Grant, BSN	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah

Briana Crook, BS	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Heather Maestas, BS	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Jacki Anderson	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Prathyusha Kodakandla	Office of Research, Intermountain Healthcare, Murray, Utah
Lisa Weaver, BS	Pulmonary Division, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Jorden Greer, BS	Pulmonary Division, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Macy Barrios, BS	Pulmonary Division, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
WU352 (NCT04341727)	
Charles Goss	Division of Biostatistics, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Mansi Agarwal	Division of Biostatistics, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Rachel Presti	Department of Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Andrej Spec	Department of Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Kathryn Vehe	Department of Pharmacy, Barnes-Jewish Hospital, St Louis, Missouri
Kristopher Bakos	Department of Pharmacy, Barnes-Jewish Hospital, St Louis, Missouri
Michael Klebert	Department of Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Kathleen McNulty	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Heather Wilkins	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Teresa Arb	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Rachel Cody	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Brittney Zwijack	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Zackary Jakuboski	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Jennifer Bruns	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Kelly Caplice	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Arnita Pitts	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Andrea Patterson Brown	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Tara Sattler	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
PeChaz Clark	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri

Megan Arb	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Shea Roesel-Wakeland	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Tina Nolte	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
Brittany Depp	Center of Clinical Studies, Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, Missouri
NCT04344444	
Jyotsna Fuloria, MD	University Medical Center-New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana
Andrew Chapple, PhD	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, Louisiana
Michael Hagensee, MD, PhD	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, Louisiana
	University Medical Center-New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana
Amber Trauth, MPH	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, Louisiana
Brianne Voros, MS	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, Louisiana
OAHU-COVID19 (NCT04345692)	
Todd B. Seto, MD	The Queen's Medical Center, Honolulu, Hawaii
NCT04335552	
Nicholas A. Turner, MD, MHS	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Thuy Le, MD, PhD	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Nwora L. Okeke, MD, MPH	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Arthur W. Baker, MD, MPH	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Shanti Narayanasami, MBBS	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Ahmad Mourad, MD	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Rebekah Wrenn, PharmD	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Robert J. Rolfe Jr., MD	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Susanna Naggie, MD, MHS	Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Frank W. Rockhold, PhD	Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
Sean M. O'Brien, PhD	Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina
COVID MED (NCT04328012)	
Anne M. Gadomski, MD, MPH, FAAP	Bassett Research Institute, Cooperstown, NY
	Bassett Medical Center, Cooperstown, NY