

Effect of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin on the mortality of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Thibault Fiolet, Anthony Guihur, Mathieu Edouard Rebeaud, Matthieu Mulot, Nathan Peiffer-Smadja, Yahya Mahamat-Saleh

▶ To cite this version:

Thibault Fiolet, Anthony Guihur, Mathieu Edouard Rebeaud, Matthieu Mulot, Nathan Peiffer-Smadja, et al.. Effect of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin on the mortality of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 2021, 27 (1), pp.19-27. 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.08.022 . hal-03127508

HAL Id: hal-03127508 https://hal.science/hal-03127508

Submitted on 2 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1198743X2030505X Manuscript_8e718b614164d989e4fde0c4f641bfb7

- 1 CLM-20-18519.R1
- 2 Title: Effect of hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin on the mortality of COVID-19
- 3 patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis
- 4
- 5 Thibault Fiolet^{1, 2*}, Anthony Guihur³, Mathieu Rebeaud³, Matthieu Mulot⁴, Nathan Peiffer-Smadja^{5,6,7},
- 6 Yahya Mahamat-Saleh^{1, 2}
- 7
- 8 ¹CESP (Center for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health), Fac. de médecine Univ. Paris-
- 9 Sud, Fac. de médecine UVSQ, INSERM, Université Paris Saclay, 94 805, Villejuif, France
- 10 ²Gustave Roussy, F-94805, Villejuif, France
- ³Department of Plant Molecular Biology, Faculty of Biology and Medicine, University of Lausanne,
- 12 Switzerland
- ⁴Laboratory of Soil Biodiversity, Faculty of Science, University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- ⁵Université de Paris, IAME, INSERM, F-75018 Paris, France.
- 15 ⁶National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated
- 16 Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance, Imperial College London, London, UK.
- ¹⁷ ⁷Infectious and Tropical Diseases Department, Bichat-Claude Bernard Hospital, AP-HP, Paris, 75018,
- 18 France.
- 19

20 Corresponding author:

- 21 *Thibault Fiolet, MSc, PhD candidate in Epidemiology
- 22 Center for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health
- 23 Inserm U1018 "Health across Generations" Team and Paris-Sud 11 University/Paris-Saclay University
- 24 114 rue Edouard Vaillant
- 25 94805 Villejuif Cedex
- 26 Tel: (+33) 1-42-11-56-45 / Mobile: (+33) 6-79-50-91-19
- 27 E-mail: Thibault.fiolet@gustaveroussy.fr
- 28 Twitter: @T_Fiolet

29	
30	Word count of Abstract: 313
31	Word count (without Abstract, Materials, References, Figures and tables): 3 451
32	Number of figures: 3
33	Number of tables: 1
34	Supplemental material:
35	Supplementary Figures: 10
36	Supplementary Tables: 6
37	Supplementary Texts: 2
38	Supplementary File: 1 Excel file
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	

5	7
J	1

57	
58	Abstract
59	Background
60	Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without azithromycin have been widely promoted to treat
61	COVID-19 following early in vitro antiviral effects against SARS-CoV-2
62	Objective
63	The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to assess whether chloroquine or
64	hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin decreased COVID-19 mortality compared to the
65	standard of care
66	Data sources
67	Pubmed, Web of Science, Embase Cochrane Library, Google Scholar and MedRxiv were searched
68	until 25 July 2020
69	Study eligibility criteria
70	We included published and unpublished studies comparing the mortality rate between patients treated
71	with chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin and patients managed with
72	standard of care
73	Participants
74	Patients ≥ 18 years old with confirmed COVID-19
75	Interventions
76	Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin
77	Methods
78	Effect sizes were pooled using a random-effects model. Multiple subgroup analyses were conducted to
79	assess the drug safety
80	Results
81	The initial search yielded 839 articles, of which 29 articles met our inclusion criteria. All studies
82	except one were conducted on hospitalized patients and evaluated the effects of hydroxychloroquine
83	with or without azithromycin. Among the 29 articles, 3 were randomized controlled trials (RCT), one

84 was a non-randomized trial and 25 were observational studies, including 10 with a critical risk of bias

and 15 with a serious or moderate risk of bias. After excluding studies with critical risk of bias, the
meta-analysis included 11,932 participants for the hydroxychloroquine group, 8,081 for the
hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin group and 12,930 for the control group. Hydroxychloroquine
was not significantly associated with mortality: pooled Relative Risk RR=0.83 (95% CI: 0.65-1.06,
n=17 studies) for all studies and RR=1.09 (95% CI: 0.97-1.24, n=3 studies) for RCTs.
Hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin was associated with an increased mortality: RR=1.27 (95%
CI: 1.04-1.54, n=7 studies). We found similar results with a Bayesian meta-analysis.

92 Conclusion

Hydroxychloroquine alone was not associated with reduced mortality in hospitalized COVID-19
patients but the combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin significantly increased
mortality.

<sup>Abbreviations: HCQ: Hydroxychloroquine; AZI: Azithromycin; CI: Confidence Interval; RR:
Relative Risk; HR: Hazard Ratio, OR: Odds Ratio; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; US FDA: US
Food and Drug Administration; EMA: European Medicine Agency</sup>

113 Introduction

On December 31, 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) identified an unknown pneumonia 114 caused by a new coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, in Wuhan, China. By July 30, 2020, WHO confirmed 115 more than 17 million cases and 667,935 deaths [1]. Chloroquine (CQ) and its derivative 116 hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) were rapidly identified as potential drug candidates since CQ had an 117 antiviral activity against Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) and severe acute respiratory 118 119 syndrome (SARS) in vitro [2]. An *in vitro* antiviral activity of the aminoquinolines HCQ and CQ was confirmed against SARS-CoV-2 and a study reported a synergistic effect of the HCQ with 120 azithromycin (AZI) against SARS-CoV-2 [3]. These drugs appeared as potential low-cost treatments 121 122 for COVID-19 patients [4-7] and received wide and speculative coverage by the international press 123 and the United States President [8].

124

Subsequently, HCQ and AZI were tested in a study where macaques were infected by SARS-CoV-2 and received either a high dose of HCQ (90 mg/kg on day 1 then 45 mg/kg) or a low HCQ dose (30 mg/kg on day 1 then 15 mg/kg) [9]. HCQ with or without AZI did not improve the time to viral clearance regardless of the stage of disease: prophylaxis, early treatment or late treatment.

129

Among the on-going trials, CQ or HCQ are among the most studied drugs [10,11]. Until today, most of the published studies on HCQ with a comparative group (standard care) were observational and non-randomized with inconsistent results [12–18]. Given the magnitude of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need for effective therapeutics, timely meta-analyses can play an important role in assessing the impacts of CQ and HCQ comparatively with standard of care on reliable clinical outcomes such as mortality. Previous meta-analyses on COVID-19 included a limited number of studies and used unadjusted risk ratios [19–21].

137 The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to assess whether chloroquine or
138 hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin decreased the mortality of COVID-19 compared to
139 standard of care.

140 Methods

141 The research question was: in patients with confirmed COVID-19, is the addition of 142 hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without azithromycin to the standard of care, effective in 143 improving survival?

144 **PICO question:**

- 145 **Population**: patients with confirmed COVID-19
- 146 Intervention: HCQ or CQ, with or without AZI
- 147 **Comparison**: a standard of care
- 148 **Outcomes**: the survival rate of COVID-19 patients
- 149 Data sources, search strategy

A search was performed using PubMed, Web of Science, Embase and Cochrane Review up to July 25, 150 2020 with the following string search: (COVID-19 OR SARS-CoV-2) AND (MORTALITY OR 151 DEATH) AND (HYDROXYCHLOROQUINE OR HCQ) (Supplementary text S1). Given that the 152 number of articles about HCQ and COVID-19 is rapidly growing, we also manually searched for 153 154 additional references on the MedRxiv preprint server and on Google Scholar with the same terms. An additional search on PubMed, Web of Science and Cochrane Review was conducted for chloroquine 155 with the search terms described in Supplementary materials S1: (COVID-19 OR SARS-CoV-2) AND 156 157 (MORTALITY OR DEATH) AND (CHLOROQUINE OR CQ). This meta-analysis was conducted 158 following PRISMA statements in Supplementary text S2. This study has been recorded on the international database of prospectively registered systematic reviews, PROSPERO (Registration 159 160 number: CRD42020190801).

161 Study selection:

Study selection was conducted by two investigators (TF and YM) who screened the titles and the abstracts. Discrepancies were resolved by a third investigator (AG). Inclusion criteria were 1) reports containing original data with available risk estimates (Hazard Ratios, Odds Ratios, Relative Risk and/or with data on the number of deaths in HCQ/CQ and control groups; 2) any publication dates; 3) comparative studies with a control group without HCQ nor CQ; and 4) COVID-19 confirmed cases by 167 RT-PCR. Studies reporting no deaths, reviews and meta-analyses, commentaries, editorials and *in vitro* and *in vivo* animal studies were excluded.

169

170 Data extraction

Two investigators (TF and YM) extracted the following data for each study: study design, publication date, journal, location, number of participants and deaths (in treatment and control groups), HCQ or CQ doses when available, effect size (Hazard Ratio, Odds Ratio or Relative Risk) and 95% confidence intervals for reported risk estimates. The estimates from the model, adjusted for the maximum number of covariates were used to control potential confounders, according to Cochrane Methodology [22]. For each study, risk factors associated with higher mortality were taken into account through the reported adjusted effect sizes.

When studies did not report an effect size for mortality risk [17,23,24], we used the number of deaths
per group to calculate an unadjusted relative risk using *metabin* function in *meta* package in R
Software [25].

181 For all the other studies, reported adjusted OR, RR or HR were used.

182 Individual risk of bias

- 183 The quality of each study was assessed with ROBIN-I tool following Cochrane guidelines for non-
- randomized studies and with Rob2 for randomized studies [26,27].

185 Outcome

186 The outcome was the mortality of COVID-19 patients.

187

188 Statistical analysis

189 Effect of CQ/HCQ alone and HCQ + AZI

190 A primary meta-analysis was performed to compare the survival rate (or mortality) between patients

191 treated with CQ or HCQ and standard of care. Then, the relationship between HCQ associated with

AZI and mortality was assessed. HRs, ORs and RRs were treated as equivalent measures of mortality risk. Pooled RRs were determined by using a random effect model with inverse variance weighting (DerSimonian-Laird method) [28]. Significance was checked using a Z-test, where p<0.05 is considered as significant. The absolute risk difference was calculated from the UK baseline hospital mortality risk of 26% (according to ISARIC WHO CCP-UK cohort based on 20,133 patients) using the formula RD = BR×(RR-1) [29].

198

199 Heterogeneity was assessed by the Cochrane Q test and I² test [30]. $30\% < I^2 < 60\%$ was interpreted as 200 moderate heterogeneity and $I^2>60$ as substantial heterogeneity. A funnel plot was constructed to assess the publication bias. Begg's and Egger's tests were conducted to assess the publication bias [31,32]. 201 RR or HR were used to assessed mortality risk within a 95% confidence interval. In the main analysis, 202 203 studies with critical bias were excluded. A sensitivity analysis including these studies, was conducted. A Bayesian meta-analysis was performed to test the robustness of our results, allowing incorporation 204 205 of full uncertainty in all parameters [33]. The traditional random-effect model has fixed parameters for 206 the distribution of the true treatment effect RR with an unknown mean θ , within-study variance σ^2 and 207 between study variance τ^2 . The Bayesian random-effect model assumes these parameters are random 208 with a probability distribution. Two prior distributions were tested μ ~Normal (1,100) with a large 209 variance and $\tau \sim$ Half-Cauchy (0,0.5) and a second scenario with $\mu \sim$ Normal (1,1) and $\tau \sim$ Half-Cauchy 210 (0,0.5). The Bayesian analysis was conducted with the R package "brms" [34].

211

212 Subgroup analysis

Subgroup analyses were further conducted according to the quality assessment to explore the source of heterogeneity among observational studies. We performed stratified analyses by type of article (peerreviewed vs unpublished), use of an adjustment on confounding factors (studies with RR_{unadjusted} vs RR_{adjusted}), mean daily dose of HCQ or CQ (continuous), median population age across the studies, level of bias risk identified with ROBIN-I (moderate/serious/critical) [26] and when we excluded studies with cancer and dialysis patients. Mean daily dose of HCQ or CQ was the daily average between the loading dose and the maintenance doses. Additionally, influence analysis was conducted by omitting each study to find potential outliers [34]. Influence analysis is used to detect studies which influence the overall estimate of a meta-analysis the most, omitting one study at a time (leave-one-out method).

223

A two-sided p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analysis were conducted using
R version 3.6.1 with *meta* package and *robvis* package [35].

226 **Results**

227 Literature Search

A flow chart is presented in Figure 1. After searching Pubmed, Cochrane Review and Web of Science, 228 229 839 articles were identified. After screening the title and the abstract, only 21 articles about 230 hydroxychloroquine and COVID-19 were included for further consideration. We excluded 564 articles that did not meet the inclusion criteria. We did not find any non-English articles meeting our inclusion 231 criteria. Two duplicate studies on the same cohort were excluded [12,36]. Two Chinese randomised 232 233 controlled trials on hydroxychloroquine reported zero deaths in both treatment and control groups [37,38] and thus their results were not included in our meta-analysis. Ten articles from 234 Medrxiv/Google Scholar were added. Thus, 29 articles were included, of which 25 were observational 235 236 studies, one was an interventional non-randomized study and three were randomized controlled trials 237 (RCT). These studies included27 articles for HCQ [14-19,23,24,36,39-56] and 12 articles for HCQ+AZI [18,36,41,42,47,48,50,51,57-60]. For CQ, after searching Pubmed, Cochrane Review, 238 239 Embase and Web of Science, 449 articles were identified. After screening the title and the abstract, only 1 Brazilian RCT and 3 observational studies studied chloroquine and COVID-19. However, 240 241 among these studies, Gabriela Silva Borba et al. and Saleh et al. studies did not have a standard of care 242 comparative group [61,62]. Khamis et al. did not report death data related to chloroquine and Huang et al. did not report any death [63,64]. Consequently, no study on chloroquine met our inclusion 243 criteria. 244

245

246 Study characteristics

247 This meta-analysis included 15,190 patients in the HCQ group, 8081 patients in the HCQ with AZI and 14,060 patients in the standard of care group with 3,152 deaths, 1,063 deaths and 2,857 deaths, 248 249 respectively. Individual studies are described in Tables S1 and S2. All included studies except one 250 (Skipper et al.) were carried out on hospitalized patients [39]. Mean (\pm SD) age of participants was 251 62.1 ± 8.5 years. Ten studies were conducted in the USA [15,18,23,41,42,49,50,53,56,58], 4 in Spain [16,17,44,57], 7 in France [13,24,46,48,54,59,60], one in the UK [40], two in Italy [43,65], one in 252 China [14], one in Brazil [51] and three in several other countries (USA, Canada, Italy and 253 254 Spain)[39,47,52]. Twenty-two articles were published [13-15,17,18,24,39,41,43,44,46,49-54,56,57,59,60,65], and 6 articles were preprints [16,23,40,42,48,58]. Mean daily dose of HCQ ranged 255 from 333 mg/j to 945 mg/j. Few studies precisely described concomitant use of corticosteroids (Table 256 257 S3) [15–17,44,48,50–52,65]. Only the RECOVERY trial precisely reported the use of dexamethasone 258 (8% vs 9% in both arms) [40].

259

260 Study quality

261 Risk of bias was assessed with ROBIN-I for non-randomised studies (n=26) and Rob2 for RCT (n=3) 262 (Figures S1-S2). Three RCT had some concerns [39,40,51] and one interventional non-randomized 263 study had critical risk of bias [24]. Among the observational studies, fifteen articles had a moderate or serious risk of bias [13-18,41,42,44,46-48,56,58] and ten studies had a critical risk of bias 264 265 [23,43,49,50,52–54,59,60,65]. Eleven observational studies did not report adjusted effect sizes to 266 control confusion and selection bias [23,24,43,44,49,53,54,57,59,60,65]. Quality of studies was 267 lowered by the lack of information about the assignment of treatment, the time between start of follow-up and start of intervention), some unbalanced co-intervention with other antiviral and 268 269 antibiotic drugs and imbalance between groups for confounders such as comorbidities and age.

270

271 Hydroxychloroquine and mortality

After excluding studies with critical bias, the pooled RR for COVID-19 mortality was 0.83 (95%CI:
0.65-1.06, n=17 studies) indicating no significant association between HCQ and COVID-19 mortality
(Figure 2). Under the hypothesis of having a baseline mortality risk of 26% (based on ISARIC WHO

275 CCP-UK cohort [29]), these pooled relative risk values would correspond to a non-significant risk 276 difference of -4.4% [29] (Table 1). There was a significant subgroup difference between RCT and 277 non-randomized studies (Pheterogeneity between = 0.03) with respectively $RR_{RCT}=1.09$ (95%CI: 0.97-1.24) 278 and RR_{non-randomized}= 0.79 (95%CI: 0.60-1.04) (Figure 2). Among observational studies with a moderate risk of bias, we found no association between HCQ and mortality RRmoderate bias=1.03 (95%CI: 0.91-279 1.17, I²=0%, n=7 studies) with no subgroup heterogeneity (Table S4, Figure S3). Results remained 280 281 nonsignificant with influence analysis (Figure S4). The Bayesian meta-analysis led to similar results with a pooled RR for mortality of 0.93 (95%CI: 0.72-1.14, n=17 studies) (Table S5, Figure S5). In 282 sensitivity analysis, after inclusion of studies with critical risk of bias, the global RR was marginally 283 284 not significant 0.80 (95%CI: 0.65-1.00) (Table S6).

285

Outcome: all-cause	Number of	Pooled Relative Risk	Risk difference
mortality	studies		
Hydroxychloroquine			
alone			
All studies	17	0.83 [0.65-1.06]	-4.4% [-9% ; +1.5%]
Non-randomized studies	14	0.79 [0.60-1.04]	-5.5% [-10% ; +1%]
Randomized studies	3	1.09 [0.97-1.24]	+2.3% [-0.8%;+6.2%]
Hydroxychloroquine with			
azithromycin			
All studies	7	1.27 [1.04-1.54]	+7% [+1%;+14%]
Non-randomized studies	6	1.29 [1.06-1.58]	+7.5% [+1.6%;+15%]
Randomized studies	1	0.64 [0.18-2.24]	-9% [-21%;+32%]

Table 1: Relative risk and risk difference for mortality associated with hydroxychloroquine with or
without azithromycin, assuming a UK mortality rate in hospital of 26% according to ISARIC WHO
CCP-UK cohort.

289

There was a significant higher heterogeneity among non-randomised studies as compared to RCT (I^2 =84%, P _{heterogeneity within}<0.01). In fact, heterogeneity was null for RCT. Egger's test (p= 0.68) and Begg's test (P=0.13) were not significant for asymmetry of the funnel plot indicating that there was no major publication bias for non-randomized studies (Figure S6).

- 294
- 295

296 Hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin and mortality

297 After exclusion of studies with critical bias, the pooled RR for COVID-19 mortality was 1.27 (95%CI: 298 1.04-1.54, n=7) indicating an increased mortality linked to the use of hydroxychloroquine with 299 azithromycin. With a baseline hospital mortality of 26%, we identified a significant absolute risk 300 difference of +7%. We found an increased risk of mortality in patients treated with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin compared to standard of care (RR: 1.29 (95%CI: 1.06-1.58, 301 302 n=6)) among non-randomized studies but this relationship was not found in the single Brazilian RCT, 303 with no heterogeneity observed across the study design ($P_{heterogeneity between} = 0.28$) (Figure 3). There was a low heterogeneity across the included studies ($I^2 = 38\%$, p=0.14). Egger's test (p= 0.70) and Begg's 304 305 test (p=0.65) were not significant but the asymmetry in the funnel plot indicates that a publication bias 306 could be present (Figure S7). However, the number of included studies was small. Subgroup analyses 307 are described in supplementary material (Table S4, Figure S8). The Bayesian meta-analysis led to similar results with a pooled RR for mortality of 1.32 (95%CI: 0.97-1.68, n=7 studies) (Table S5, 308 309 Figure S9). The increase in mortality was also significant with influence analysis (Figure S10).

310

311 Discussion

This meta-analysis summarized the results of 25 observational studies, three randomised controlled 312 313 trials and one interventional non-randomised study on the effect of hydroxychloroquine with or 314 without azithromycin on the mortality of COVID-19 patients (Table 1). Despite our inclusion criteria 315 that did not specify the stage of the disease, all the studies were conducted with hospitalized patients 316 except the RCT by Skipper et al. RCT [39]. Our results show that while hydroxychloroquine alone was not associated with reduced mortality in COVID-19 patients, the combination of 317 hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin significantly increased mortality. We found similar results with 318 319 a Bayesian analysis.

Our meta-analysis reported a high heterogeneity for hydroxychloroquine alone, but this heterogeneity was lowered among RCT, studies with moderate risk of bias and for the association of HCQ+AZI. The various quality of studies (not reporting HCQ dose, the lack of adjustment in reported estimates) may explain one part of the heterogeneity observed according to our subgroup analysis (Table S4).

324

A previous systematic review only included 8 studies on all-cause mortality in COVID-19 patients 326 327 [13–16,23,38,41,66] and concluded that the level of evidence for hydroxychloroquine effect was very 328 weak[67]. A preprint meta-analysis, using routinely collected records from clinical practice in 329 Germany, Spain, the UK, Japan, and the USA, compared the use of HCQ with sulfasalazine [68]. This 330 study observed an increased risk of 30-day cardiovascular mortality (HR=2.19 [1.22-3.94]), although 331 the study lacked a standard of care comparative group. Some previous meta-analyses were also 332 conducted on hydroxychloroquine and various health endpoints including mortality. However these studies did not report all the published and unpublished literature, including a very limited number of 333 studies: from 3 articles[19,20] to 6 articles[21]. These previous meta-analyses did not perform 334 subgroup and sensitivity analysis to test the effect of pooling RCT and observational study, nor did 335 336 they study the source of heterogeneity. They used unadjusted risk ratio (calculated with the number of 337 events in each group) whereas in our meta-analysis, we used adjusted relative risk [69] and we ran 338 sensitivity analysis on the adjustment of effect size. Statistical adjustments for key prognostic 339 variables limit confusion bias, especially in observational studies which are not randomised. This meta-analysis confirmed the partial preliminary results of these other meta-analyses about the absence 340 341 of effect for HCQ on survival and found an increased mortality with the use of the combination of 342 HCQ with AZI in COVID-19 patients. These results confirm the preliminary findings of several observational studies which have shown that the combination of hydroxychloroquine and 343 azithromycin might increase the risk of acute, life-threatening cardiovascular events [70]. A first study 344 found that, among patients treated with this combination, 6 out of 18 (33%) developed a significant 345 346 increase in the QTc interval.[71] Another work found that in 84 patients treated with HCQ + AZI, 9 347 had a severe prolongation of QTc [72]. The combination of HCQ + AZI was associated with a greater 348 variation in the QTc interval compared to hydroxychloroquine alone in a study with 90 patients [73]. 349 In a study conducted in New York on 1438 patients cardiac arrest was significantly more likely in 350 patients receiving hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin compared to patients receiving neither of the 351 two drugs (adjusted OR, 2.13 [95% CI, 1.12-4.05]) [18]. Finally, a study conducted on the WHO

database bringing together more than 167,000 patients found an increased risk of potentially fatal acute cardiac events in patients treated with azithromycin alone or with hydroxychloroquine alone [74]. The combination of the two drugs posed an even greater risk of life-threatening acute cardiac effects [18,73,74].

356

Several national health organisations (US FDA Food and Drug Administration[75], French Agency for 357 the Safety of Health Products ANSM [76], European Medicine Agency EMA [77]) raised concerns 358 359 about using unapproved drugs for COVID-19. ANSM and US FDA removed the authorization for the use of HCQ outside of clinical trials. The Indian Council of Medical Research took the opposite 360 position and recommended chemoprophylaxis with hydroxychloroquine for asymptomatic cases [78]. 361 Finally, in the comparative peer-reviewed studies, a clear conclusion on hydroxychloroquine is not 362 363 possible due to the small sample size, the lack of well-performed randomised controlled trials (mainly non-randomised and retrospective studies) and inconsistent results. Many preprints without a 364 comparative group and without randomization added to confusion surrounding this highly politicised 365 topic[79]. There is a gap between the speed of clinical research and the expectation of a clear solution 366 to treat COVID-19 patients. Indeed, producing robust clinical trials is necessarily time-consuming. In 367 a press communication, on 20 June 2020, US National Institutes of Health (NIH) stopped the clinical 368 369 trial of hydroxychloroquine since this drug was very unlikely to be efficient to treat COVID-19 patients [80]. Based on SOLIDARITY trial results, WHO previously undertook the same decision 370 371 [81].

372

A Bayesian meta-analysis confirmed our findings from classical random-effect meta-analysis. We included several unpublished papers to minimize the publication bias. Our subgroup analysis by published studies (vs unpublished studies) found that the inclusion of preprints did not change the results. Exclusion of grey literature (unpublished studies, with limited distribution) could lead to an exaggeration of the intervention effect by 15% [82]. There is limited evidence to identify whether grey studies have a poorer methodological quality than published studies[83]. 379

A major limitation is the inclusion of patients at different levels of COVID-19 severity. However, we 380 381 could not conduct subgroup analysis for severity since most of studies reports do not use the same definition of severity and do not report the same biological and clinical outcomes. We also noted a 382 high level of heterogeneity in the administration of HCQ (dosing, timing between hospital 383 administration and intervention, duration...). In some studies, these data were not reported at all. 384 385 Another limitation comes from the studies which did not report adjusted effect size when mortality 386 was not the primary endpoint, leading to a high risk of confounding bias. As is usually done, this 387 meta-analysis was based on aggregated data, without access to original patient data. Most of the 388 included studies were observational which are not adapted to identify a causal association. Indeed, some of the included studies had very low quality of evidence (missing data, small sample size, 389 390 confusion bias, bias in classification of intervention and selection bias), although our supplementary 391 analyses and the exclusion of these articles did not change the results. Finally, this meta-analysis did 392 not include results from the European DisCoVeRy trial and the WHO Solidarity trial that are not yet published or communicated [81]. 393

394

395 In conclusion, this meta-analysis clearly shows that hydroxychloroquine alone is not effective for the treatment of COVID-19 patients and that the combination of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin 396 397 increases the risk of mortality. These data support current clinical recommendations such as those of the NIH [84] which do not recommend the use of HCQ alone or in combination with azithromycin for 398 399 COVID-19 patients. There is already a great number of studies that have evaluated HCQ alone or in 400 combination [10] and it seems unlikely at this stage that any efficacy will ever emerge. Our results 401 suggest that there is no need for further studies evaluating these molecules, and the European 402 DisCoveRy clinical trial or the WHO international Solidarity clinical trial have already discontinued 403 treatment arms using hydroxychloroquine [81,85].

404

405 Conflict of interests: All authors declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work
406 other than that described above; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an

407 interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could

408 appear to have influenced the submitted work.

- 409
- 410 **Funding**: There was no specific funding for this meta-analysis.

411 Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Dominique Meroux for proofreading the

412 manuscript. We also thank Drifa Belhadi for her helpful comments on the manuscript.

413

414 Contribution: TF designed the research. TF, MR, AG, MM, NPS and YMS conducted the research.

415 TF did the statistical analysis. TF wrote the first draft of the paper. MR, AG, MM, NPS and YMS

- 416 contributed to the writing of the paper. All authors contributed to the data interpretation, revised each
- 417 draft for important intellectual content, and read and approved the final manuscript.
- 418
- 419
- 420 References

421

- World Health Organization (WHO). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Situation Report 153. n.d.
 Dyall J, Gross R, Kindrachuk J, Johnson RF, Olinger GG, Hensley LE, et al. Middle East Respiratory
 Syndrome and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome: Current Therapeutic Options and Potential
 Targets for Novel Therapies. Drugs 2017;77:1935–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40265-0170830-1.
- 427 [3] Andreani J, Le Bideau M, Duflot I, Jardot P, Rolland C, Boxberger M, et al. In vitro testing of
 428 combined hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on SARS-CoV-2 shows synergistic effect.
 429 Microb Pathog 2020;145:104228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpath.2020.104228.
- 430 [4] Hill A, Wang J, Levi J, Heath K, Fortunak J. Minimum costs to manufacture new treatments for
 431 COVID-19. J Virus Erad 2020;6:61–9.
- Yao X, Ye F, Zhang M, Cui C, Huang B, Niu P, et al. In Vitro Antiviral Activity and Projection of
 Optimized Dosing Design of Hydroxychloroquine for the Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory
 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Clin Infect Dis n.d. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa237.
- Liu J, Cao R, Xu M, Wang X, Zhang H, Hu H, et al. Hydroxychloroquine, a less toxic derivative of
 chloroquine, is effective in inhibiting SARS-CoV-2 infection in vitro. Cell Discovery 2020;6:1–4.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41421-020-0156-0.
- 438 [7] Maisonnasse. Hydroxychloroquine in the treatment and prophylaxis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
 439 non-human primates 2020. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-27223/v1.
- 440 [8] DeJong C, Wachter RM. The Risks of Prescribing Hydroxychloroquine for Treatment of COVID-441 19—First, Do No Harm. JAMA Intern Med 2020.
- 442 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1853.
- 443 [9] Maisonnasse P, Guedj J, Contreras V, Behillil S, Solas C, Marlin R, et al. Hydroxychloroquine use
 444 against SARS-CoV-2 infection in non-human primates. Nature 2020:1–8.
- 445 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2558-4.

446 [10] Fragkou PC, Belhadi D, Peiffer-Smadja N, Moschopoulos CD, Lescure F-X, Janocha H, et al. 447 Review of trials currently testing treatment and prevention of COVID-19. Clinical Microbiology 448 and Infection 2020;26:988–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.019. 449 [11] Peiffer-Smadja N, Lescure F-X, Sallard E, Ravaud P, Vegreville B, Zeitoun J-D. Anticovid, a 450 comprehensive open-access real-time platform of registered clinical studies for COVID-19. J 451 Antimicrob Chemother n.d. https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkaa223. 452 [12] Kuderer NM, Choueiri TK, Shah DP, Shyr Y, Rubinstein SM, Rivera DR, et al. Clinical impact of 453 COVID-19 on patients with cancer (CCC19): a cohort study. Lancet 2020. 454 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31187-9. 455 [13] Mahévas M, Tran V-T, Roumier M, Chabrol A, Paule R, Guillaud C, et al. Clinical efficacy of 456 hydroxychloroquine in patients with covid-19 pneumonia who require oxygen: observational 457 comparative study using routine care data. BMJ 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1844. [14] Yu B, Li C, Chen P, Zhou N, Wang L, Li J, et al. Low dose of hydroxychloroquine reduces fatality 458 459 of critically ill patients with. Sci China Life Sci 2020:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-020-460 1732-2. 461 [15] Geleris J, Sun Y, Platt J, Zucker J, Baldwin M, Hripcsak G, et al. Observational Study of 462 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2020. 463 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2012410. 464 [16] Membrillo FJ, Ramírez-Olivencia G, Estébanez M, Dios B de, Herrero MD, Mata T, et al. Early Hydroxychloroquine Is Associated with an Increase of Survival in COVID-19 Patients: An 465 466 Observational Study 2020. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202005.0057.v2. 467 [17] Ayerbe L, Risco C, Ayis S. The association between treatment with heparin and survival in 468 patients with Covid-19. J Thromb Thrombolysis 2020:1-4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11239-469 020-02162-z. 470 [18] Rosenberg ES, Dufort EM, Udo T, Wilberschied LA, Kumar J, Tesoriero J, et al. Association of 471 Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Azithromycin With In-Hospital Mortality in Patients 472 With COVID-19 in New York State. JAMA 2020. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.8630. 473 [19] Singh AK, Singh A, Singh R, Misra A. "Hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: A 474 Systematic Review and meta-analysis.". Diabetes Metab Syndr 2020;14:589–96. 475 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2020.05.017. 476 [20] Sarma P, Kaur H, Kumar H, Mahendru D, Avti P, Bhattacharyya A, et al. Virological and clinical 477 cure in COVID-19 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine: A systematic review and meta-478 analysis. J Med Virol 2020;92:776-85. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25898. 479 [21] Patel TK, Barvaliya M, Kevadiya BD, Patel PB, Bhalla HL. Does Adding of Hydroxychloroquine to 480 the Standard Care Provide any Benefit in Reducing the Mortality among COVID-19 Patients?: a 481 Systematic Review. J Neuroimmune Pharmacol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11481-020-482 09930-x. 483 [22] Cochrane Training. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Part 3: Special 484 topics. 13.6.2.2 Combining studies (version 6) 2019. https://handbook-5-485 1.cochrane.org/chapter_13/13_6_2_2_combining_studies.htm (accessed July 28, 2020). 486 [23] Barbosa Joshua, Kaitis Daniel, Freedman Ryan, Le Kim, Lin Xihui. Clinical Outcomes of 487 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: a Quasi-Randomized Comparative 488 Study. Dropbox 2020. https://www.dropbox.com/s/urzapkyij542qx5/NEJM_Clinical%20Outcomes%20of%20Hydroxyc 489 hlorquine%20in%20Patients%20with%20COVID19.pdf.pdf.pdf.pdf.pdf.pdf.pdf?dl=0 490 491 (accessed June 8, 2020). 492 [24] Gautret P, Lagier J-C, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and 493 azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. 494 International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents 2020:105949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949. 495 496 [25] Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. 497 Evid Based Ment Health 2019;22:153–60. https://doi.org/10.1136/ebmental-2019-300117.

- 498 [26] Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: a
 499 tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ 2016;355.
 500 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919.
- 501 [27] Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool
 502 for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 2019;366.
 503 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898.
- 504 [28] DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled Clinical Trials 1986;7:177–88.
 505 https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2.
- 506 [29] Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L, et al. Features of 20 133
 507 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol:
 508 prospective observational cohort study. BMJ 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1985.
- 509 [30] Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med
 510 2002;21:1539–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186.
- [31] Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias.
 Biometrics 1994;50:1088–101.
- 513 [32] Al-Bari MdAA. Targeting endosomal acidification by chloroquine analogs as a promising
 514 strategy for the treatment of emerging viral diseases. Pharmacol Res Perspect 2017;5:e00293.
 515 https://doi.org/10.1002/prp2.293.
- [33] Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Spiegelhalter DJ. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. J
 R Stat Soc Ser A Stat Soc 2009;172:137–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00552.x.
- 518 [34] Viechtbauer W, Cheung MW-L. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. Res Synth
 519 Method 2010;1:112–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11.
- [35] McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web app
 for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. Res Synth Methods 2020.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1411.
- [36] Wang A-L, Zhong X, Hurd Y. Comorbidity and Sociodemographic determinants in COVID-19
 Mortality in an US Urban Healthcare System. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2020.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.11.20128926.
- 526 [37] Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, Wang Z, Chen J, Sun W, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with
 527 mainly mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019: open label, randomised controlled trial.
 528 BMJ 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1849.
- [38] CHEN Jun LD, CHEN Jun LD. A pilot study of hydroxychloroquine in treatment of patients with
 moderate COVID-19. J Zhejiang Univ (Med Sci) 2020;49:215–9.
 https://doi.org/10.3785/j.issn.1008-9292.2020.03.03.
- 532 [39] Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, Bangdiwala AS, Abassi M, Lofgren SM, et al.
 533 Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19. Annals of Internal
 534 Medicine 2020. https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-4207.
- [40] Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, Bell JL, Staplin N, Emberson JR, et al. Effect of
 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: Preliminary results from a multicentre, randomized, controlled trial. MedRxiv 2020:2020.07.15.20151852.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.15.20151852.
- [41] Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, Cummings TH, Hardin JW, Sutton SS, et al. Outcomes of
 hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. Med 2020;0.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2020.06.001.
- [42] Ip A, Berry DA, Hansen E, Goy AH, Pecora AL, Sinclaire BA, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and
 Tocilizumab Therapy in COVID-19 Patients An Observational Study. Infectious Diseases (except
 HIV/AIDS); 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.21.20109207.
- [43] Alberici F, Delbarba E, Manenti C, Econimo L, Valerio F, Pola A, et al. A report from the Brescia
 Renal COVID Task Force on the clinical characteristics and short-term outcome of hemodialysis
 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Kidney Int 2020.
- 548 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kint.2020.04.030.

- 549 [44] Sánchez-Álvarez JE, Fontán MP, Martín CJ, Pelícano MB, Reina CJC, Prieto ÁMS, et al. Status of
 550 SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients on renal replacement therapy. Report of the COVID-19
 551 Registry of the Spanish Society of Nephrology (SEN). Nefrología (English Edition) 2020.
 552 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nefroe.2020.04.002.
- [45] Wilkinson E. RECOVERY trial: the UK covid-19 study resetting expectations for clinical trials. BMJ
 2020;369. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1626.
- [46] Paccoud O, Tubach F, Baptiste A, Bleibtreu A, Hajage D, Monsel G, et al. Compassionate use of
 hydroxychloroquine in clinical practice for patients with mild to severe Covid-19 in a French
 university hospital. Clin Infect Dis n.d. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa791.
- [47] Rivera DR, Peters S, Panagiotou OA, Shah DP, Kuderer NM, Hsu C-Y, et al. Utilization of COVID19 treatments and clinical outcomes among patients with cancer: A COVID-19 and Cancer
 Consortium (CCC19) cohort study. Cancer Discov 2020. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD20-0941.
- 562 [48] Sbidian E, Josse J, Lemaitre G, Mayer I, Bernaux M, Gramfort A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with 563 or without azithromycin and in-hospital mortality or discharge in patients hospitalized for 564 COVID-19 infection: a cohort study of 4,642 in-patients in France. MedRxiv
- 565
 2020:2020.06.16.20132597. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132597.
- 566[49]Luo J, Rizvi H, Preeshagul IR, Egger JV, Hoyos D, Bandlamudi C, et al. COVID-19 in patients with567lung cancer. Ann Oncol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.06.007.
- [50] Arshad S, Kilgore P, Chaudhry ZS, Jacobsen G, Wang DD, Huitsing K, et al. Treatment with
 hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, and combination in patients hospitalized with COVID-19.
 International Journal of Infectious Diseases 2020;97:396–403.
- 571 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.099.
- 572 [51] Cavalcanti AB, Zampieri FG, Rosa RG, Azevedo LCP, Veiga VC, Avezum A, et al.
 573 Hydroxychloroquine with or without Azithromycin in Mild-to-Moderate Covid-19. New England
 574 Journal of Medicine 2020;0:null. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2019014.
- 575 [52] Cravedi P, Suraj SM, Azzi Y, Haverly M, Farouk S, Pérez-Sáez MJ, et al. COVID-19 and Kidney
 576 Transplantation: Results from the TANGO International Transplant Consortium. American
 577 Journal of Transplantation n.d.;n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.16185.
- 578 [53] Gupta S, Hayek SS, Wang W, Chan L, Mathews KS, Melamed ML, et al. Factors Associated With
 579 Death in Critically III Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in the US. JAMA Intern Med 2020.
 580 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3596.
- [54] Lecronier M, Beurton A, Burrel S, Haudebourg L, Deleris R, Le Marec J, et al. Comparison of
 hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, and standard of care in critically ill patients with SARSCoV-2 pneumonia: an opportunistic retrospective analysis. Crit Care 2020;24:418.
 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-020-03117-9.
- 585 [55] Fontana F, Giaroni F, Frisina M, Alfano G, Mori G, Lucchi L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in dialysis
 586 patients in northern Italy: a single-centre experience. Clin Kidney J 2020;13:334–9.
 587 https://doi.org/10.1093/ckj/sfaa084.
- 588 [56] Mikami T, Miyashita H, Yamada T, Harrington M, Steinberg D, Dunn A, et al. Risk Factors for
 589 Mortality in Patients with COVID-19 in New York City. J Gen Intern Med 2020:1–10.
 590 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-05983-z.
- [57] Rogado J, Obispo B, Pangua C, Serrano-Montero G, Martín Marino A, Pérez-Pérez M, et al.
 Covid-19 transmission, outcome and associated risk factors in cancer patients at the first
 month of the pandemic in a Spanish hospital in Madrid. Clin Transl Oncol 2020:1–5.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12094-020-02381-z.
- 595 [58] Singh S, Khan A, Chowdhry M, Chatterjee A. Outcomes of Hydroxychloroquine Treatment
 596 Among Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients in the United States- Real-World Evidence From a
 597 Federated Electronic Medical Record Network. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2020.
 598 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.12.20099028.
- 599[59]Lagier J-C, Million M, Gautret P, Colson P, Cortaredona S, Giraud-Gatineau A, et al. Outcomes of6003,737 COVID-19 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin and other regimens in

- 601 Marseille, France: A retrospective analysis. Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease 602 2020:101791. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101791.
- [60] Bousquet G, Falgarone G, Deutsch D, Derolez S, Lopez-Sublet M, Goudot F-X, et al. ADLdependency, D-Dimers, LDH and absence of anticoagulation are independently associated with
 one-month mortality in older inpatients with Covid-19. Aging (Albany NY) 2020;12:11306–13.
 https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.103583.
- [61] Borba MGS, Val FFA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M, et al. Effect of High vs Low
 Doses of Chloroquine Diphosphate as Adjunctive Therapy for Patients Hospitalized With Severe
 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial.
 JAMA Netw Open 2020;3:e208857–e208857.
- 611 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.8857.
- 612 [62] Saleh M, Gabriels J, Chang D, Kim BS, Mansoor A, Mahmood E, et al. The Effect of Chloroquine,
 613 Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin on the Corrected QT Interval in Patients with SARS-CoV614 2 Infection. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCEP.120.008662.
- [63] Huang M, Li M, Xiao F, Pang P, Liang J, Tang T, et al. Preliminary evidence from a multicenter
 prospective observational study of the safety and efficacy of chloroquine for the treatment of
 COVID-19. Natl Sci Rev n.d. https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwaa113.
- [64] Khamis F, Al-Zakwani I, Al Naamani H, Al Lawati S, Pandak N, Omar MB, et al. Clinical
 characteristics and outcomes of the first 63 adult patients hospitalized with COVID-19: An
 experience from Oman. Journal of Infection and Public Health 2020.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.06.002.
- [65] Fontana F, Alfano G, Mori G, Amurri A, Tei L, Ballestri M, et al. COVID-19 pneumonia in a kidney
 transplant recipient successfully treated with tocilizumab and hydroxychloroquine. American
 Journal of Transplantation 2020;20:1902–6. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.15935.
- [66] Mallat J, Hamed F, Balkis M, Mohamed MA, Mooty M, Malik A, et al. Hydroxychloroquine is
 associated with slower viral clearance in clinical COVID-19 patients with mild to moderate
 disease: A retrospective study. MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.27.20082180.
 bttps://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.27.20082180.
- 628 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.27.20082180.
- [67] Hernandez AV, Roman YM, Pasupuleti V, Barboza JJ, White CM. Hydroxychloroquine or
 630 Chloroquine for Treatment or Prophylaxis of COVID-19: A Living Systematic Review. Ann Intern
 631 Med 2020. https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-2496.
- [68] Lane JCE, Weaver J, Kostka K, Duarte-Salles T, Abrahao MTF, Alghoul H, et al. Safety of
 hydroxychloroquine, alone and in combination with azithromycin, in light of rapid wide-spread
 use for COVID-19: a multinational, network cohort and self-controlled case series study.
 Rheumatology; 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.08.20054551.
- 636 [69] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4.
 637 Rating the quality of evidence—study limitations (risk of bias). Journal of Clinical Epidemiology
 638 2011;64:407–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.07.017.
- [70] Bessière F, Roccia H, Delinière A, Charrière R, Chevalier P, Argaud L, et al. Assessment of QT
 Intervals in a Case Series of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Infection
 Treated With Hydroxychloroquine Alone or in Combination With Azithromycin in an Intensive
 Caro Unit IAMA Cordial 2020, https://doi.org/10.1001/jamacardia.2020.1787
- 642 Care Unit. JAMA Cardiol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1787.
- [71] Bessière F, Roccia H, Delinière A, Charrière R, Chevalier P, Argaud L, et al. Assessment of QT
 Intervals in a Case Series of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Infection
 Treated With Hydroxychloroquine Alone or in Combination With Azithromycin in an Intensive
 Care Unit. JAMA Cardiol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1787.
- [72] Chorin E, Wadhwani L, Magnani S, Dai M, Shulman E, Nadeau-Routhier C, et al. QT Interval
 Prolongation and Torsade De Pointes in Patients with COVID-19 treated with
 Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin. Heart Rhythm 2020.
- 650 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2020.05.014.
- [73] Mercuro NJ, Yen CF, Shim DJ, Maher TR, McCoy CM, Zimetbaum PJ, et al. Risk of QT Interval
 Prolongation Associated With Use of Hydroxychloroquine With or Without Concomitant

- 653 Azithromycin Among Hospitalized Patients Testing Positive for Coronavirus Disease 2019 654 (COVID-19). JAMA Cardiol 2020. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1834.
- [74] Nguyen LS, Dolladille C, Drici M-D, Fenioux C, Alexandre J, Mira J-P, et al. Cardiovascular
 Toxicities Associated With Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin: An Analysis of the World
 Health Organization Pharmacovigilance Database. Circulation 2020;142:303–5.
- 658 https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.048238.
- [75] Commissioner O of the. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Revokes Emergency Use
 Authorization for Chloroquine and Hydroxychloroquine. FDA 2020. https://www.fda.gov/newsevents/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-revokes-emergency-useauthorization-chloroquine-and (accessed June 15, 2020).
- [76] Agence Nationale de Sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé (ANSM). COVID-19 :
 l'ANSM souhaite suspendre par précaution les essais cliniques évaluant l'hydroxychloroquine
 dans la prise en charge des patients Point d'Information ANSM : Agence nationale de
 sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé n.d. https://ansm.sante.fr/S-informer/Pointsd-information-Points-d-information/COVID-19-I-ANSM-souhaite-suspendre-par-precaution-lesessais-cliniques-evaluant-l-hydroxychloroquine-dans-la-prise-en-charge-des-patients-Point-dInformation (accessed June 15, 2020).
- 670 [77] DIMITROVA EK. COVID-19: reminder of risk serious side effects with chloroquine and 671 hydroxychloroquine. European Medicines Agency 2020.
- 672 https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-19-reminder-risk-serious-side-effects-673 chloroquine-hydroxychloroquine (accessed June 15, 2020).
- [78] Rathi S, Ish P, Kalantri A, Kalantri S. Hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis for COVID-19 contacts in
 India. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2020;0. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30313-3.
- 676 [79] Alexander PE, Debono VB, Mammen MJ, Iorio A, Aryal K, Deng D, et al. COVID-19 coronavirus
 677 research has overall low methodological quality thus far: case in point for
 678 chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine. J Clin Epidemiol 2020.
- 679 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.04.016.
- [80] NIH halts clinical trial of hydroxychloroquine. National Institutes of Health (NIH) 2020.
 https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/nih-halts-clinical-trial-hydroxychloroquine
 (accessed June 22, 2020).
- [81] WHO (World Health Organization). "Solidarity" clinical trial for COVID-19 treatments n.d.
 https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel coronavirus-2019-ncov/solidarity-clinical-trial-for-covid-19-treatments (accessed June 8, 2020).
- 686 [82] McAuley L, Pham B, Tugwell P, Moher D. Does the inclusion of grey literature influence
 687 estimates of intervention effectiveness reported in meta-analyses? The Lancet 2000;356:1228–
 688 31. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02786-0.
- [83] Hopewell S, McDonald S, Clarke MJ, Egger M. Grey literature in meta-analyses of randomized
 trials of health care interventions. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000010.pub3.
- 692[84]US NIH. Hydroxychloroquine plus Azithromycin | Coronavirus Disease COVID-19. COVID-19693Treatment Guidelines 2020. https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/antiviral-
- therapy/hydroxychloroquine-plus-azithromycin/ (accessed August 10, 2020).
- [85] INSERM. Discovery stopping inclusions in two treatment groups 2020.
 https://presse.inserm.fr/en/discovery-stopping-inclusions-in-two-treatment-groups/40087/
 (accessed August 10, 2020).
- 697 698

CLM-20-18519.R1

List of figures

Figure 1: Flow diagram of study selection process

Figure 2: Forest plot of the association between hydroxychloroquine alone and COVID-19 mortality* Figure 3: Forest plot of the association between hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin and COVID-19 mortality*



Figure 1: Flow diagram of study selection process

Figure 2: Forest plot of the association between hydroxychloroquine alone and COVID-19 mortality*

*Excluding studies with critical risk of bias RR=Risk Ratio 95%-CI= 95% Confidence Interval

Study	TE	seTE	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Type of study = non-randomised						
Averbe et al, 2020 - Spain	-0.86	0.1323		0.42	[0.33; 0.55]	8.1%
Geleris et al, 2020 - USA	0.04	0.1214	and an and a second sec	1.04	[0.82; 1.32]	8.2%
Rivera et al, 2020 - USA/Canada/Spain	0.10	0.2287		1.11	[0.71; 1.74]	6.9%
lp et al, 2020 - USA	-0.01	0.1077		0.99	[0.80; 1.22]	8.3%
Magagnoli et al, 2020 - USA	0.60	0.2329		1.83	[1.16; 2.89]	6.8%
Mahevas et al, 2020 - France	0.18	0.5400		1.20	[0.42; 3.45]	3.4%
Membrillo et al, 2020 - Spain	-2.66	0.8958		0.07	[0.01; 0.41]	1.6%
Mikami et al, 2020 - USA	-0.63	0.1253		0.53	[0.41; 0.68]	8.2%
Paccoud et al, 2020 - France	-0.12	0.6923		0.89	[0.23; 3.46]	2.4%
Rosenberg et al, 2020 - USA	0.08	0.2748		1.08	[0.63; 1.85]	6.2%
Sanchez-Alvarez et al, 2020 - Spain	-0.75	0.2652		0.47	[0.28; 0.79]	6.4%
Sbidian et al, 2020 - France	0.05	0.1394		1.05	[0.80; 1.38]	8.0%
Singh et al, 2020 - USA	-0.05	0.1300	11	0.95	[0.74; 1.23]	8.1%
Yu et al, 2020 - China	-1.02	0.3641		0.36	[0.18; 0.73]	5.1%
Random effects model			\$	0.79	[0.60; 1.04]	87.5%
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 84\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2021$, $p < 0.1$	01					
Type of study = RCT						
Cavalcanti et al, 2020 - Brazil	0.39	0.5726	·	1.47	[0.48; 4.52]	3.1%
Horby et al, 2020, RECOVERY Trial - UK	0.09	0.0632	T	1.09	[0.96; 1.23]	8.7%
Skipper et al, 2020 - USA/Canada	0.01	1.4264		1.01	[0.06; 16.54]	0.7%
Random effects model			Þ	1.09	[0.97; 1.24]	12.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.87$						
Random effects model			•	0.83	[0.65; 1.06]	100.0%
Prediction interval					[0.33; 2.12]	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 83\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1768$, $p < 0.1768$	01				780789060000000787	
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 82\%$, $p < 0.01$			0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure 3: Forest plot of the association between hydroxychloroquine with azithromycin and COVID-19 mortality*

*Excluding studies with critical risk of bias RR=Risk Ratio 95%-CI= 95% Confidence Interval

