JHMI Clinical Recommendations for Pharmacologic Treatment of COVID-19

Updated 4/5/2021, and replaces the version of March 2, 2021; COVID-19 Treatment Guidance Writing Group of Johns Hopkins University and The Johns Hopkins Hospital COVID-19 Treatment Guidance Working Group

New in the 4/5/2021 Update | Go to current Writing Group recommendations

- Bamlanivimab alone is no longer recommended. The updated recommendation is for use of bamlanivimab in combination with etesevimab.
- Updated discussion of the following: Novel variants and convalescent plasma, the GLUCOVID trial, aspirin, azithromycin, and ivermectin.
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I. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide clinicians at The Johns Hopkins Hospital (JHH) and the Johns Hopkins Health System (JHHS) with guidance for pharmacologic treatment of inpatient and outpatient care of patients diagnosed with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). This guidance is based on current knowledge, experience, and expert opinion. The goal is to establish and promulgate a standard approach to using pharmacologic agents to treat patients diagnosed with COVID-19.

Available non-JHH-specific guidelines include those of the Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19 (which include a systematic assessment of available evidence) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines.

Current approved therapeutic protocols for COVID-19: See Johns Hopkins Institute for Clinical and Translational Research: Ongoing COVID-19 Research, including Expanded Access

Available non-JHH-specific guidelines: See Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19 (which include a systematic assessment of available evidence) and the NIH Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines.

Box 1: Resources for Johns Hopkins Clinicians

- VTE Prophylaxis for Symptomatic COVID Positive Patients (intranet or uCentral app)
- Clinical Guidance for Critical Care Management of Patients with COVID-19 Infection
- JHH and JHBMC Discharge Guidelines for COVID Positive Patients Still on COVID Isolation (intranet)
- Johns Hopkins Medicine COVID-19 Clinical Resources (intranet)
- Johns Hopkins Institute for Clinical and Translational Research: Ongoing COVID-19 Research, including Expanded Access Protocols
- JHMI Lab Testing Guidance for COVID-19 Inpatients

II. Natural History of COVID-19 Disease

The natural history of COVID-19 varies considerably among those infected with SARS-CoV-2, most likely due to multiple factors, including, but likely not limited to a patient’s health and comorbidities when infected, the exposure inoculum, and potentially, viral genetics. Between 8% and 50% of individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 have asymptomatic or subclinical infection. 1 Onset of symptomatic infection typically occurs within 4 to 5 days (median) of exposure. It appears that the peak level of viremia is reached at about the time of symptom onset, with high viremia lasting from 2 days prior until approximately 5 days after symptom onset, with no detectable viable virus 8 to 10 days after symptom onset in normal hosts 2-6 Infectivity parallels high viral carriage, with the period of contagiousness starting 2 to 5 days before symptom onset and extending to approximately 5 days after symptom onset.

Symptomatic infection: Headache, myalgia, and upper respiratory symptoms, including sore throat, are typical initially. They may be followed a few days later by fever, cough, diarrhea, and anosmia. Overall, any one of these symptoms is observed in between 20% and 80% of patients. The majority of symptomatic patients appear to have mild disease and do not require hospitalization. Patients with mild disease often recover after 7 days of symptoms.
Severe disease: More severe disease leading to hospitalization occurs at a mean of 7 days after symptom onset. A marker of more severe disease is the onset of COVID-19 pneumonia, characterized by fever, cough, fatigue, myalgia, dyspnea, and dyspnea on exertion. Radiographic findings typically include ground-glass opacities in the lungs; lymphocytopenia is also commonly observed. Imaging is characterized by diffuse, bilateral, ground-glass opacities. Patients with severe disease may become severely hypoxic and require high-flow oxygen support or mechanical ventilation to maintain oxygen saturation levels >92%.

Progression to severe COVID-19 and hospitalization are associated with multiple risk factors, including advanced age, obesity, hypertension, diabetes, chronic lung disease, tobacco use, immune deficiencies, cancer, limited access to health care, and possibly residence in a long-term care facility.

Hyperinflammatory syndrome: Some patients progress to disease characterized by hyperinflammation that can include acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and may occur approximately 5 to 10 days after symptom onset. Fevers characterize the COVID-19 hyperinflammatory syndrome along with rapid worsening of respiratory status; alveolar filling pattern on imaging; often marked elevations in laboratory markers associated with specific inflammatory pathways, such as interleukin-6 (IL-6); and nonspecific markers of inflammation, including D-dimer, C-reactive protein (CRP), and ferritin. Patients typically have increased levels of cytokines, including IL-6, IL-2R, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF), and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α), all of which decline as patients recover. Lymphopenia has also been reported, with declines in CD4+ T cells and CD8+ T cells. These cytokine and lymphocyte profiles have some similarities to those seen in the cytochrome release syndrome (CRS) associated with chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy (CAR-T).

Patients may progress to multiorgan failure as a result of the cytokine-mediated hyperinflammation.

Vascular disease: Microvascular thrombosis and venous thromboembolism also occur with severe COVID-19.

Goals and optimal timing of treatment: In this guidance, the timing for administration of pharmacologic agents is based on the type of medication and the potential for direct antiviral effect, modulation of an excessive inflammatory response, or a nonspecific adjuvant effect on the host, as illustrated in the figure below.

- **Outpatient treatment:** The primary goal of outpatient treatment is to limit disease progression, which requires treatment initiation early in the disease course, either before symptom onset or shortly thereafter.

- **Inpatient treatment:** The 2 goals for inpatient treatment are limiting disease progression through antiviral activity and limiting COVID-19-related inflammation.

Figure. Schematic of Clinical Course of Severe COVID-19

Representation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels, common symptoms, and possible timing of therapeutics with the greatest benefit.
III. Current Writing Group Recommendations for JHMI

Current writing group recommendations for pharmacologic treatment are summarized in Box 2, below. Links are provided to the sections of the document in which additional information and supporting evidence are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2: Summary of Clinical Recommendations for Pharmacologic Treatment of COVID-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical trial participation:</strong> Participation in available clinical trials is strongly recommended for patients who meet inclusion criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infectious diseases consultation:</strong> Prescribing clinicians should consult with infectious diseases clinicians to treat any solid organ or bone marrow transplant recipient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remdesivir:</strong> This writing group recommends that clinicians prescribe RDV for the treatment of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 who meet the JHHS Formulary COVID Drug Approval Committee criteria (<a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19 convalescent plasma:</strong> Based on available evidence, if convalescent plasma is considered for use in a hospitalized patient with COVID-19 who is at higher risk for clinical progression, early treatment with a “high-titer” unit, based on cut-points defined by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for each assay, is advised--within 3 days (ideal) of symptom onset to 3 days after hospitalization (see below for additional parameters and <a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamlanivimab/etesevimab, and casirivimab/imdevimab: These medications are available only for outpatient treatment of COVID-19 in patients at risk of developing severe disease. Used alone, bamlanivimab has reduced in vitro activity against several viral variants; therefore, this agent must now be used in combination with etesevimab. Bamlanivimab is no longer being distributed for use alone. [See FDA authorizes revisions to fact sheets to address SARS-CoV-2 variants for monoclonal antibody products under emergency use authorization and CDC &gt; Variant Proportions in the U.S.] In Baltimore, monoclonal antibody treatment is provided by referral at the Baltimore Convention Center Field Hospital, J H Weinberg Infusion Unit (available only to cancer patients), or at Hatzalah of Baltimore, which offers infusions on Sundays (<a href="#">more information</a>). Additional locations for infusion may become available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corticosteroids:</strong> Dexamethasone is recommended for the treatment of COVID-19 in patients who have either a persistent need for non-invasive supplemental oxygen to maintain SaO2 ≥94% or who require mechanical ventilation (<a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baricitinib:</strong> Baricitinib is recommended only for the treatment of patients with COVID-19 who meet the criteria of the JHHS Formulary COVID-19 Drug Approval Committee, namely patients for whom dexamethasone is not advisable (<a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tocilizumab:</strong> Tocilizumab should be used outside of a clinical trial only with careful consideration. Its use may be considered for hospitalized patients who are receiving dexamethasone and require high-flow oxygen or are in their first 24-hours of intensive care for organ support, including mechanical ventilation. Patients who may benefit generally have elevated inflammatory markers (e.g., CRP or ferritin). Interleukin-6 levels are not required for the assessment of tocilizumab eligibility. To prescribe tocilizumab, clinicians must secure approval from the JHHS Formulary COVID-19 Committee (<a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agents to avoid for treatment of COVID-19 outside of a clinical trial:</strong> Because there is no or inadequate evidence of efficacy or effectiveness, the following agents are not recommended for treatment of COVID-19 specifically in hospitalized patients (but they may be administered in clinical trials). There is no evidence that any of these agents are harmful when prescribed for the treatment of other conditions in patients with COVID-19: ACE inhibitors, ARBs, azithromycin, baloxavir marboxil, colchicine, darunavir/ritonavir, famotidine, favipiravir [a], fluvoxamine, hydroxychloroquine, NSAIDs, ivermectin, lopinavir/ritonavir, nitazoxanide, oseltamivir, ribavirin, umifenovir [not FDA-approved or available in the United States], vitamin C, vitamin D, zinc (<a href="#">more information</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 2: Summary of Clinical Recommendations for Pharmacologic Treatment of COVID-19

Abbreviation key: ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; ALT, alanine transaminase; ARB, angiotensin II receptor blocker; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; EUA, Emergency Use Authorization; FDA, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; JHHS, Johns Hopkins Health System; IVIG, intravenous immune globulin; NSAID, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; P&T, Johns Hopkins Medicine Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee; RDV, remdesivir; SaO2, oxygen saturation; ULN, upper limit of normal

IV. Approaches to Pharmacologic Treatment of COVID-19

A. Viral Suppression

Approaches for suppression of SARS-CoV-2 infection include direct antiviral activity through inhibition of viral replication (antiviral molecules), viral neutralization through the introduction of exogenous antibodies (neutralizing monoclonal antibodies and convalescent plasma), and upregulation of the immune response (interferon).

Remdesivir

Remdesivir (RDV) is an intravenous antiviral medication that has in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses.31,32 The ACTT-1 clinical trial (double-blind, placebo-controlled; sites in North America, Europe, and Asia) randomized 1,062 participants with severe COVID-19 pneumonia, defined as infiltrates on imaging or SaO2 <94%, to receive either 10 days of RDV or placebo. RDV was stopped for participants who were ready for discharge before completing 10 days of treatment. Through 28 days of observation following randomization, participants in the RDV arm had a median time to recovery of 10 days compared to 15 days among those in the placebo arm (p<0.001).33 Results suggested a trend, though not significant, toward reduced mortality among those receiving RDV, with Kaplan-Meier 29-day estimates of 11.4% for the RDV arm and 15.2% for the placebo arm. Subgroup analysis found that participants who required supplemental oxygen but not mechanical ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) had the greatest reduction in time to recovery. There was no difference in outcomes among those who were mechanically ventilated or receiving ECMO. In addition, there was a significant 60% reduction in 29-day mortality among individuals who required supplemental oxygen but not ventilation or ECMO and received RDV.

An RCT of 5- versus 10-day RDV treatment included 596 participants with evidence of mild COVID-19 pneumonia (pulmonary infiltrates and SaO2 ≥94% on room air); exclusion criteria included mechanical ventilation or ECMO.34 The study reported no difference in clinical outcomes based on treatment duration arm. On day 14, 60% of participants in the 5-day arm were discharged from the hospital compared to 52% in the 10-day arm, and 8% of the 5-day arm participants compared to 17% of the 10-day arm participants were receiving mechanical ventilation or ECMO. By day 14, 8% in the 5-day arm had died, compared to 11% in the 10-day arm. Participants who received 10-day treatment were more likely to experience SAEs than those in the 5-day treatment arm (35% compared to 21%) and to discontinue treatment due to adverse events (10% compared to 4%). On day 11, when compared with the standard of care group, there was a significant difference in clinical status in the 5-day RDV treatment group.35 However, the authors of the study questioned whether there was clinical significance to findings for 5-day RDV treatment compared to standard of care. Moreover, the 5-day RDV group fared better than the 10-day RDV treatment group, and it does not appear that
the difference is attributable to a much greater number of adverse events in the 10-day RDV group. This raises concerns about the findings from the comparison of 5-day RDV to the standard of care.

The SOLIDARITY study is a pragmatic, open-label RCT of RDV, hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir, and subcutaneous interferon beta 1a. The study was conducted in 405 hospitals in 30 countries and depended on use of medications routinely available in each hospital. A total of 11,266 hospitalized adults were randomized to receive 10 days of RDV (2,750), or hydroxychloroquine (954), lopinavir/ritonavir (1,411), lopinavir/ritonavir plus interferon (651), interferon alone (1,412), or no study drug (4,088). Only 2% to 6% of participants were reported to cross over from the allocated arm to another arm. Day 28 mortality was 12%. There was no reduction in death among those who received RDV compared to standard of care (risk ratio 0.95, p=0.5). There was also no difference in the need for mechanical ventilation or time to discharge. This study did not include clinical improvement assessments in comparison to the ACTT-1 study. Fewer data points were collected in the SOLIDARITY trial. It is unclear why no benefit was seen in this study in contrast to the reduced time to recovery and signal for decreased mortality seen in the ACTT-1 study.

Analysis of the experience at JHMI suggests improved outcomes among participants who received RDV compared to similar participants who did not.

On October 22, 2020, the FDA-approved RDV for the treatment of adult and pediatric patients ≥12 years who require inpatient care for treatment of COVID-19 (see FDA > Highlights of Prescribing Information for RDV).

Who is likely to benefit from RDV treatment? The ACTT-1 study reported no significant difference in RDV effect among study participants who entered with ≤10 days or >10 days of symptoms. An RCT from China reported a trend toward improved outcomes among participants with a shorter duration of symptoms (<10 days). The 5-day versus 10-day RDV treatment study reported that 62% of participants with <10 days of symptoms at the time of first RDV dose were discharged from the hospital compared to 49% of those with ≥10 days of symptoms. Taken together, these data and the proposed mechanism of RDV action (inhibition of viral replication) suggest that RDV is likely to be most useful when given to patients earlier in the course of COVID-19 disease, possibly within the first 7 to 10 days of symptoms.

The ACTT-1 study found no difference in the primary outcome of median time to recovery among participants on mechanical ventilation or ECMO (rate ratios 0.95; 95% confidence interval 0.64-1.42). Based on oxygen requirement at enrollment, subgroup analysis found the greatest 14-day mortality difference in the group requiring supplemental oxygen via nasal cannula (95% confidence interval). Kaplan-Meier 14-day mortality estimates by subgroup found that the number needed to treat to prevent 1 death is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illness Score at Enrollment (ACTT-1 category assignment)</th>
<th>Number Needed to Treat to Prevent 1 Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4: No supplemental oxygen needed</td>
<td>No difference (hazard ratio: 0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Supplemental oxygen via nasal cannula</td>
<td>12 (hazard ratio: 0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: High-flow O2 or non-invasive ventilation</td>
<td>No difference (hazard ratio 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO</td>
<td>No difference (hazard ratio 1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the currently available evidence, it appears that the COVID-19 patients most likely to benefit from RDV treatment are those with more recent symptom onset and who need supplemental oxygen but not mechanical ventilation or ECMO.
Adverse events: In the 5-day versus 10-day RDV treatment study, SAEs were reported in 21% of participants in the 5-day group and 35% in the 10-day group; adverse events leading to discontinuation of RDV were reported in 4% (5-day) and 10% (10-day group).

Adverse events (from RDV or COVID-19) reported in clinical trials\(^{34,38}\) include acute respiratory failure, anemia, gastrointestinal (constipation, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea), hypoalbuminemia, hypokalemia, increased bilirubin, infusion-related reactions (hypotension, nausea, vomiting, diaphoresis, shivering), and thrombocytopenia. Rare or occasional side effects reported in clinical trials\(^{34,38}\) include hypoglycemia, insomnia, elevated prothrombin time (without a change in INR), pyrexia, rash, and transaminase elevation.

Optimal treatment duration: The optimal RDV treatment duration is unclear. Ten days of treatment were studied in both the ACTT-1 RCT and the RCT from China.\(^{39}\) The 5-day vs. 10-day RDV treatment study found no significant difference in effectiveness between the 2 duration groups. The 5-day treatment arm did have a higher proportion of participants discharged from the hospital and a higher proportion with an improved symptom scale by day 14. The 10-day arm had more SAEs (35% versus 21% of patients), some of which may have been due to RDV. Given the lack of data suggesting a clear benefit and the increase in adverse events with >5 days of RDV, it appears that a 5-day course of RDV treatment is the most reasonable approach.

Discharge before completion of treatment course: RDV administration should not delay hospital discharge. If a patient has received less than a complete course of RDV and meets discharge criteria, RDV should be discontinued.

Dosing: See FDA > Highlights of Prescribing Information for RDV.

Drug-drug interactions: RDV is a substrate for CYP2C8, CYP2D6, CYP3A4, and OATP1B1 and an inhibitor of CYP2A4, OATP1B1, and OATP1B3. The antagonism between hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) and RDV led the FDA to recommend against concomitant use of RDV and HCQ or chloroquine phosphate in a letter issued on June 15, 2020. Note that drug-drug interactions have not been fully assessed with RDV. Patients who are taking multiple medications with CYP metabolic pathways may be at increased risk for adverse drug-drug interactions. There are currently no firm recommendations for dose adjustment; however, concomitant use with strong cyp3A4 inducers such as rifampin may reduce RDV levels. Clinicians are advised to review potential drug-drug interactions with a clinical pharmacologist.

Considerations for use with impaired kidney function: RDV is eliminated primarily (49%) in the urine as an active metabolite, GS-441524, and only 10% as RDV (see FDA > Highlights of Prescribing Information for RDV). Clinical trials of COVID-19 treatment have excluded participants with an eGFR <30 mL/min/m² or receiving renal replacement therapy. Concerns with use in patients with kidney impairment include the lack of data on the pharmacokinetics of RDV in this population and the excipient sulfobutylether-\(\beta\)-cyclodextrin sodium salt (SBECD) in RDV. SBECD is cleared by the kidneys and may accumulate in patients with decreased kidney function. The FDA does not recommend using RDV in patients with eGFR <30 mL/min/m² unless the potential benefit outweighs the potential risk (see FDA fact sheet).

At J HMI, no decline in kidney function was found in recipients of solid organ transplants with serum creatinine levels between 1.0 and 2.5 mg/dL when treated with RDV. A case series of 46 patients with endstage renal disease (ESRD) on dialysis or a range of chronic kidney disease (CKD) stages who received RDV did not identify any increased risk of side effects or further renal impairment. In addition, IV voriconazole, another medication

\(^{*}\)Author personal communication with Robin Avery, MD; November 5, 2020
that contains SBECD, has been extensively used and evaluated in patients with varying degrees of severe kidney disease and kidney impairment without evidence of harm.42-48

**Treatment monitoring:** Clinicians should monitor patients who are receiving RDV treatment as follows:

- **Alanine transaminase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) daily:** If the ALT or AST rises to >10 times the ULN or the patient develops symptoms of drug-induced liver injury, RDV should be discontinued and should not be restarted during the hospital admission.

- **Creatinine daily:** Clinicians should discontinue RDV if there is a decline ≥50% in eGFR while evaluating for causes of acute kidney injury.

**Box 3: JHHS Formulary Management and Medication-Use Policy Committee Restriction for Remdesivir (updated 1/7/2021)**

- Also see Appendix B: JHH Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee Memo: Remdesivir Formulary Restriction and Order Review Process (December 11, 2020; effective December 15, 2020).

**Formulary restriction:** Patients must meet all of the following criteria to initiate remdesivir. All courses are restricted to 5 days of therapy.

- RNA or antigen test indicating active COVID-19 infection (not serology)
- ≤10 days since COVID-19 symptom onset
- Presence of respiratory compromise at the time of clinical evaluation defined by one or more of the following:
  - SaO2 ≤ 94% on room air for ≥1 hour
  - Requiring supplemental oxygen to maintain SaO2 >94% for ≥1 hour
  - Documented sustained RR ≥24 breaths per minute
- Not receiving mechanical ventilation or ECMO, unless these modalities were initiated for the first time within the past 24 hours
- ALT ≤10 times the ULN

**Formulary Comments:**

- The above criteria apply to all patients, including those with immune compromise, malignancy, or solid organ transplant history.
- Renal dysfunction is not a contraindication to remdesivir therapy. The package labeling does not recommend use in patients with renal impairment. If a patient has an eGFR <30 mL/min there must be documentation in the record that the prescriber has discussed with the patient both the FDA package insert recommendation and their assessment that the benefits of remdesivir therapy outweigh the potential harms, and the patient has agreed to continue with remdesivir therapy.
- If ALT increases to >10 times the ULN or the patient develops other signs or symptoms of hepatotoxicity, remdesivir must be discontinued.
- Remdesivir is a substrate of CYP3A4. At this time, no drug-drug interaction studies have been performed. Use caution when giving remdesivir with CYP3A4 inhibitors (e.g., azole antifungals) or inducers (e.g., rifampin).
- Patients transferred to JHHS from an outside hospital on remdesivir can complete their 5-day course of therapy (without formulary review).
- Patients well enough for discharge home can be discharged without completing their current course of remdesivir.

Criteria for exceptional situations for RDV use >14 days after symptom onset:
Box 3: JHHS Formulary Management and Medication-Use Policy Committee Restriction for Remdesivir (updated 1/7/2021)

- Use is restricted to approval by the JHHS Formulary COVID Drug Approval Committee. Patients must meet all of the following criteria to use remdesivir. Information is based on limited information such as case reports.
  - Qualifying patients must have a severely immunosuppressive illness or significant iatrogenic immunosuppression that may influence control of SARS-CoV-2 viral replication (such as chronic prednisone use >20 mg daily, rituximab within 6 months, CLL).
  - The patient must have evidence of potential ongoing viral infection (positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2, fever, new pulmonary infiltrates, worsening organ dysfunction) >14 days after symptom onset.
  - Alternative infectious explanations ruled out through testing or lack of response to antimicrobials.
  - All courses are restricted to 5 days of therapy but may be repeated upon reapplication.
  - If remdesivir is approved, combination therapy with convalescent plasma or SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibody therapies could be considered.

Convalescent Plasma

**Rationale:** The use of convalescent plasma as a treatment for COVID-19 is based on the principle of passive antibody therapy, which has been used as post-exposure prophylaxis and treatment for hepatitis A and B, mumps, polio, measles, rabies, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and Ebola. The underlying mechanism of activity of convalescent plasma is principally antibody-mediated. Convalescent plasma contains antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 that may bind to and inactivate the virus. It may also augment innate immunity through complement activation and contribute to antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity of infected cells. To be most effective, convalescent plasma should be administered as soon after infection as possible.

**RCTs of convalescent plasma:**

- An open-label RCT from China conducted from mid-February through April 1, 2020, included 103 hospitalized participants with a median duration of 30 days of symptoms who were randomized 1:1 to receive convalescent plasma or standard treatment. At the time of randomization, 94% of participants in the convalescent plasma arm had experienced >14 days of symptoms. The primary outcome, clinical improvement within 28 days, was similar in the 2 arms.

- An RCT from the Netherlands was halted early after a safety review reported no difference in mortality or time to clinical improvement by study arm among 86 hospitalized participants. At the time of enrollment, participants had experienced a median of 10 days of symptoms. Most had high levels of neutralizing antibodies, which may explain the reported similar overall outcomes between treatment and control groups.

- A placebo-controlled RCT from Argentina randomized 333 hospitalized patients with severe COVID-19 2:1 to convalescent plasma or placebo at a median of 8 days from the time of symptom onset. Day 30 outcomes were similar between trial arms; overall mortality was 11% in both the convalescent plasma arm and placebo arms.

- A different placebo-controlled RCT from Argentina randomized 160 ambulatory patients with <48 hours of COVID-19 signs and symptoms 1:1 to convalescent plasma and placebo. The participants met the additional inclusion criteria of age ≥75 years or 65 to 74 years with comorbidities. Treatment was initiated <72 hours from symptom onset. At day 15, more participants in the placebo arm (31%) compared to the convalescent plasma arm (16%) developed severe respiratory disease (p=0.02); 2 convalescent plasma and 4 placebo arm participants died.
The results of these RCTs suggest that early use of convalescent plasma (<72 hours after symptom onset) may reduce the progression of respiratory disease, and later use (e.g., >7 days after symptom onset) does not improve clinical outcomes (among populations without humoral immunodeficiency).

Analyses of convalescent plasma administered through the open-label U.S. FDA expanded access program (EAP) indicated overall relative safety (though not compared to placebo) and suggested reduced mortality with transfusion soon after diagnosis (≤3 days); plasma with higher antibody titers improved outcomes. The safety study identified a low risk of adverse events among 21,987 patients (see below). A mortality analysis included 35,322 participants with severe COVID-19 who were transfused between April 4 and July 4, 2020. Slightly lower 7- and 30-day mortality were reported in those who received convalescent plasma ≤3 days from COVID-19 diagnosis as compared with >3 days from diagnosis, even after adjustment for the effects of some potential confounders. Further analysis compared outcomes of a subgroup of 3,082 participants with low, medium, and high SARS-CoV-2 spike sub-unit antibody titers (measured after transfusion). Among those who received a high-titer unit (SARS-CoV-2 IgG signal to cut-off [S/Co] ratio ≥18.45), 30-day mortality was 16% compared to 25% in those who received a low-titer unit (SARS-CoV-2 IgG S/Co ≤4.62). Further results from this retrospective study confirm the initial finding of improved outcomes among participants who received higher- rather than lower-titer convalescent plasma. The study's limitations include the lack of a non-convalescent plasma comparator arm, potential prognostic differences between individuals transfused earlier and later, changes in clinical practice over time, and increased availability of high-titer units over time.

**Novel variants and convalescent plasma:** It is unclear whether novel variants will diminish any potential in vivo benefit of convalescent plasma. A small in vitro study reported a 15-fold decrease in the neutralization of a novel strain by plasma from an individual infected with an earlier SARS-CoV-2 strain.

**Benefits and risks:** As noted above, the benefit is most likely to be achieved with high-titer convalescent plasma administered early, within 7 days of symptom onset (or possibly 3 days, as in one study that found a statistically significant benefit and, possibly, before hospitalization (although the FDA EUA does not currently allow administration of convalescent plasma in ambulatory patients).

The risks associated with the use of convalescent plasma include a very low risk of pathogen transmission (~1 in 2 million units), allergic transfusion reactions, transfusion-associated circulatory overload (TACO), and transfusion-related acute lung injury (TRALI), all of which are rare. A review of convalescent plasma therapy for severe or life-threatening COVID-19 in 5,000 participants in the U.S. found that SAEs at 4 hours post-administration occurred in <1%. An updated analysis of safety among 21,987 participants who received convalescent plasma in the U.S. as part of the FDA’s EAP reported low rates of SAEs, most of which were judged not to be related to the plasma. Venous thromboembolic disease was reported in <1%, cardiac events in 3%, and transfusion events in <1%, including 0.18% cases of TRALI and 0.10% cases of TACO. These analyses provide evidence for the safety, not efficacy, of convalescent plasma therapy for patients with severe COVID-19.

Standardization of neutralizing antibodies has not yet been established, and required antibody labeling is not specifically for neutralizing antibodies. Current testing is not specific to neutralizing antibodies, so some proportion of donor convalescent plasma may lack sufficient titers of neutralizing antibodies.

**FDA EUA:** Convalescent plasma had been accessible via one of the following mechanisms: a clinical trial, individual eIND, or EAP. The FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) on August 23, 2020, which was updated most recently on February 4, 2021, to state that only high-titer units should be administered; however, the FDA has granted a “grace period” that gives blood collection centers (e.g., American Red Cross, New York Blood Center, etc.) until June 2021 to label units.
The FDA EUA specifies the following:

- Only high-titer plasma units are now allowed for administration. COVID-19 convalescent plasma must be tested for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with 1 of 9 available kits. However, blood banks have until June 2021 to comply with the requirement of labeling the titer of units.

- Use should be initiated with the administration of 1 unit (200 mL). Additional convalescent plasma units may be administered based on a patient’s clinical response.

- Physicians should consider use of COVID-19 convalescent plasma among patients with impaired humoral immunity.

- Healthcare providers must make the FDA Fact Sheet for Patients and Parents/Caregivers available to prior to use.

The FDA has published a patient information leaflet. JHMI has issued consent for use of convalescent plasma under the EUA (see Appendix A: Johns Hopkins Medicine Investigational COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma: A Guide for Patients & Families).


Procuring high-titer units: JHH has a small inventory of “high-titer” plasma available for blood groups A, B, and O, which should be available for administration within about 1 hour of ordering. High-titer convalescent plasma will be offered for as long as the inventory can be maintained. Blood group AB (<5% of the population) must be special-ordered (and will have a 2- to 3-hour delay if available; the delay may be longer during evenings or weekends).

To request high-titer convalescent plasma at JHH:

- Complete the consent form specific to convalescent plasma; this can be found in “Forms on Demand.”

- Complete the thawed order set in EPIC, and add “Emergency Use Authorization” in the comments section.

- Call the blood bank to inform them of the request for high-titer convalescent plasma. Units should be available in about 1 hour.

- If high-titer convalescent plasma is not available, a non-titer unit can be administered with a request post-infusion to have the blood bank sent an aliquot to the Immunology Lab. The Lab will use the FDA-approved Euroimmune assay to measure the plasma titer. If the unit is low-titer, the clinician can then consider administration of a second unit. Second units are not routinely administered if the first unit is known to be high-titer.

Box 4: Convalescent Plasma Access

- Clinical trials: This writing group strongly advises that clinicians refer patients to a clinical trial, as early in the course of the illness as possible, when treatment with convalescent plasma is most likely to be effective. This is especially the case for patients who are critically ill. As of this writing, 2 clinical trials (one outpatient and one for critically ill patients) are enrolling at Johns Hopkins to study convalescent plasma treatment in cases of confirmed COVID-19 (also see JH ICTR > Current Approved Therapeutic Protocols for COVID-19 for updates as they become available; a third trial of convalescent plasma is not for treatment but prevention of infection following close exposure.

Box 4: Convalescent Plasma Access

- Ambulatory patients: *Convalescent Plasma to Limit Coronavirus Associated Complications: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Controlled, Phase 2 Study Comparing the Efficacy and Safety of Human Coronavirus Immune Plasma (HCIP) vs. Control (SARS-CoV-2 non-immune) Plasma Among Outpatients with Symptomatic COVID-19.*

**Use outside of a clinical trial:** High-titer convalescent plasma may be considered for the treatment of hospitalized patients who have mild COVID-19 symptoms, are at higher risk of clinical progression (≥65 years of age), and are within 3 days of symptom onset or 3 days of hospitalization or have underlying humoral immunodeficiency. Available clinical trial data demonstrated benefit when high-titer convalescent plasma was administered within 3 days of symptom onset in elderly patients with mild to moderate COVID-19.57 Observational data suggest a possible benefit that wanes if high-titer convalescent plasma is received later than 3 days after hospitalization.57,58 At present, as long as supply is available, the blood bank will use high-titer convalescent plasma except for blood type AB. Administration of subsequent units should be considered based on clinical response, per the FDA EUA, or the titer of units should be calculated post-infusion as described above. Available (low-quality) data do not support the use of convalescent plasma in other populations, including patients at low risk of clinical progression or with severe COVID-19.

- **Access:** If a suitable clinical trial is not available, clinicians may contact the blood bank or their institution JHUcovidplasma@jhmi.edu. See the information above regarding procurement of high-titer units at JHH.

- **Plasma donation:** Recovered patients who wish to be screened to donate convalescent plasma for clinical trial use at JHH should email JHUcovidplasma@jhmi.edu or contact the American Red Cross.

B. Antibody Mediation or Neutralization

Theoretically, monoclonal antibodies and convalescent plasma will neutralize SARS-CoV-2 before a patient develops high titers of neutralizing antibodies.

**Monoclonal and Polyclonal Neutralizing Antibodies**

Although their mechanism of action is much the same as that hypothesized for convalescent plasma, monoclonal (mAbs) or polyclonal antibodies (pAbs) are synthetic. Those currently furthest along in development, bamlanivimab and REGN-COV2, are directed at the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.

**Bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555), bamlanivimab/etesevimab:** A phase II clinical trial randomized 452 outpatients to receive a low, medium, or high dose of the mAb or placebo, with a change in SARS-CoV-2 RNA at day 11 compared to baseline as the primary endpoint.64 Participants had confirmed COVID-19 and at least 1 COVID-19-related symptom but no need for supplemental oxygen. When compared with placebo, a significant difference was found only in the medium-dose bamlanivimab arm. The day-3 RNA was a half log lower in the pooled mAb arms than in the placebo arm (a decline of 1.35 log compared to the 0.85 log). More clinically relevant was a reduction in emergency department visits and (predominantly) hospitalization in the pooled mAb arms (1.6%) compared to the placebo arm (6.3%), with the greatest difference reported in subgroup analysis with participants aged ≥65 years or with a BMI ≥35kg/m² (4% compared to 15%). Of note, the median time from onset of symptoms to time of administration was 4 days. Any potential benefit of the mAb is likely achieved with early administration. Adverse events were similar in the 2 groups, and there were no serious adverse events in either group. For more information, see the FDA EUAs for bamlanivimab (November 10, 2020) and bamlanivimab/etesevimab (February 9, 2021). The criteria and logistics for the use of these medications are described below.

Analysis of subsequent data from this same trial (BLAZE-1) included a fifth arm of bamlanivimab (2,800 mg) plus etesevimab (2,800 mg) and found that the change in SARS-CoV-2 RNA at day 11 compared to placebo was
greatest for the combination mAbs arm (-0.57 log10 copies). Day-29 hospitalization was also reduced in this fifth arm, most notably in participants ≥65 years or with a BMI ≥35. Day-29 hospitalization for that group was 2.7% (700 mg dose), 3.3% (2,800 mg dose), 5.9% (7,000 mg dose), 0% (bamlanivimab/etesevimab), and 13.5% (placebo).

Casirivimab/imdevimab: Preliminary analysis included 275 outpatients with NAT-confirmed COVID-19 who were enrolled and randomized 1:1:1 to receive a low or high dose of REGN-COV2 or placebo. Prior to receiving the Ab, 45% of patients were seropositive, and 41% were seronegative; serostatus was not determined for 14% of participants. REGN-COV2 reduced SARS-CoV2 PCR levels in samples from the nasopharynx through day 7. The reduction was most notable for participants who were seronegative on enrollment and had the highest viral loads. A 95% reduction in viral load was found in this group when compared to the placebo group. Symptom resolution occurred in 13 days in the placebo group, in 8 days in the high-dose group (p=0.22), and in 6 days in the low-dose group (p=0.09). These findings led the FDA to issue an EUA on November 21, 2020.

An RCT of REGN-COV2 for hospitalized patients with varying illness severity found that treatment may be more harmful than beneficial. As a result, enrollment in this trial has been put on hold.

Use of bamlanivimab/etesevimab, and casirivimab/imdevimab: These medications are not FDA-approved for the treatment of COVID-19; they can be accessed only through clinical trials and the FDA EUAs for outpatients (see hyperlinks above). Any use of these products in hospitalized patients requires an individual eIND application. To maximize any potential benefit, clinicians who decide to treat individual patients with either of these regimens should aim for use early after infection or disease onset (<7 days).

Used alone, bamlanivimab has reduced in vitro activity against several viral variants; therefore, this agent must now be used in combination with etesevimab. Bamlanivimab is no longer being distributed for use alone [see FDA authorizes revisions to fact sheets to address SARS-CoV-2 variants for monoclonal antibody products under emergency use authorization and CDC > Variant Proportions in the U.S.]

Outpatient treatment (per EUA): Early clinical trial data suggest that patients with severe COVID-19 (i.e., hospitalization is required) may be harmed by treatment with either of these regimens. Clinicians may consider using this medication for outpatient treatment of patients with mild symptomatic COVID-19 disease who do not require supplemental oxygen, have experienced 2 to 10 days of symptoms, and are at high risk for severe COVID-19, the criteria for which are described in the EUA. The EUA specifies that a patient must meet 1 of the following criteria:

- BMI ≥35 kg/m²
- CKD (eGFR <60 mL/min/mm²)
- Diabetes
- Immunosuppressive disease with ongoing immune deficiency
- Currently receiving immunosuppressive treatment
- ≥65 years old
- ≥55 years old AND cardiovascular disease OR hypertension OR chronic respiratory disease
- Are 12 to 17 years of old AND have at least 1 of the following comorbidities:
  - BMI ≥85th percentile for their age and gender (based on growth charts from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] growth charts)
  - Sickle cell disease
  - Congenital or acquired heart disease
  - Neurodevelopmental disorder (e.g., cerebral palsy)
- Medical-related technology-dependent (e.g., tracheostomy)
- Asthma or other chronic respiratory diseases that requires daily medication

**Dosing and administration:** Bamlanivimab 700 mg/etesevimab 1,400 mg is administered as a 1-time intravenous infusion over at least 30 minutes with the agents mixed in a single saline bag. The administration must take place in a staffed setting equipped to respond to and treat severe infusion reactions (e.g., anaphylaxis) and monitor patients for 1 hour post-infusion.

Casirivimab 1,200 mg/imdevimab 1,200 mg is administered as a 1-time intravenous infusion (over at least 60 minutes) of each of the 2 regimen components. The administration must take place in a staffed setting equipped to respond to and treat severe infusion reaction (e.g., anaphylaxis) and monitor patients for 1 hour post-infusion.

**Current availability:** These agents are being administrated at the following State of Maryland locations: Baltimore Convention Center Field Hospital (see BCC COVID Infusion Center–Provider Referrals), University of Maryland Laurel 3-4-5 Alternative Care Site, Howard County General Hospital, Sibley Memorial Hospital, Title Health Peninsula, and Western Maryland Medical Center. Additional venues may be available in certain emergency departments, the JH Weinberg Infusion Center (available only for cancer patients), and Hatzalah of Baltimore (which offers infusions on Sundays). Agent selection is based on availability.

**For more information:** See Bamlanivimab and Etesevimab Fact Sheet, Casirivimab/Imdevimab EUA Letter of Authorization, and Frequently Asked Questions on the Emergency Use Authorization for Casirivimab and Imdevimab.

**Interferon Beta-1b**
Interferon (IFN) beta-1b is known to have an antiviral effect through immune response upregulation, inhibition of mRNA translation (likely), and promotion of viral RNA degradation. It also has immunomodulatory activity and is FDA-approved for relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. IFN beta-1b has modest activity *in vitro* against SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV.68,69 An open-label RCT of 127 participants compared IFN beta-1b plus ribavirin (RBV) plus lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/RTV) with LPV/RTV alone in adult patients with <7 days of symptoms and RBV plus LPV/RTV with LPV/RTV alone in patients with 7 to 14 days of symptoms.70 Participants with <7 days of symptoms who received IFN beta-1b had a shorter time to reverse transcription PCR results for SARS-CoV-2 and symptom resolution.70 IFN beta-1b likely provided most of the clinical benefit observed in this study; however, a placebo-controlled Phase III trial would help confirm findings.

**C. Immune Modulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5: Recommendations for the Use of Immune Modulatory Agents to Treat COVID-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ <strong>Corticosteroids:</strong> Clinicians should not prescribe dexamethasone or other steroids for the management of COVID-19 among patients with a room air SaO2≥94%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ <strong>Dexamethasone:</strong> Clinicians should prescribe dexamethasone for the treatment of COVID-19 only to patients who have either a persistent need for non-invasive supplemental oxygen to maintain SaO2≥94% or who require mechanical ventilation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Dosing:</strong> Dexamethasone should be dosed as 6 mg IV or by mouth once daily for up to 10 days; it should be discontinued at the time of hospital discharge if less than a 10-day course has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Use in pregnancy:</strong> Because dexamethasone readily crosses the placenta,71,72 the agents recommended for pregnant patients are prednisolone 40 mg daily by mouth or hydrocortisone 80 mg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 5: Recommendations for the Use of Immune Modulatory Agents to Treat COVID-19

| IV twice daily. Both of these medications have lower fetal concentrations as a result of either limited placental crossing (prednisolone) or rapid placental metabolism (hydrocortisone). |
| This recommendation is based on the RECOVERY RCT, a multicenter open-label trial that compared several arms, including a dexamethasone arm, to standard care in the United Kingdom. In this study, there was a 35% reduction in mortality with dexamethasone among the subgroup receiving mechanical ventilation. There was also a reduction in mortality among those receiving supplemental oxygen and a trend toward increased mortality among the subgroup not receiving supplemental oxygen. |

- **Baricitinib**: can be used only with approval by the J HHS Formulary COVID Drug Approval Committee. The Committee membership includes Brent Petty (JHH), Amy Knight (JHBMC), Ayesha Kahlil (HCGH), Leo Rotello (SH) and Mark Abbruzzese (SMH). When seeking approval for use, the clinician should ensure that the patient meets the minimum criteria outlined in the JHMI Clinical Guidance for Available Pharmacologic Therapies for COVID-19 (updated January 7, 2021).
  - Patients eligible for consideration must have confirmed COVID-19, meet EUA criteria, and require high-flow oxygen or non-invasive ventilation.
  - Patients are not eligible if they are taking dexamethasone or if they require mechanical ventilation.
  - The recommended regimen for patients approved for treatment is 14 days of baricitinib plus up to 10 days of remdesivir; however, both medications should be discontinued if the patient is discharged before completing treatment.
  - Clinicians may request an additional 5-day course of remdesivir (to equal 10 days total) if indicated.

- **Tocilizumab**: Tocilizumab should be used outside of a clinical trial only with careful consideration. Its use may be considered for hospitalized patients who are receiving dexamethasone and require high-flow oxygen or are within the first 24 hours of intensive care for organ support, including mechanical ventilation. Patients who may benefit generally have elevated inflammatory markers (e.g., CRP and ferritin). Interleukin-6 levels are not required for assessment of tocilizumab eligibility. To prescribe tocilizumab, clinicians must secure approval from the J HHS Formulary COVID-19 Committee (more information).

- **Other immune modulators**: Use of the following agents as treatment for COVID-19 is recommended only in the setting of a clinical trial, partly because of uncertainties about combined immune suppression when used with dexamethasone:
  - Anti–GM-CSF mAb
  - Anti-IL1
  - Colchicine
  - Convalescent plasma or serum-containing neutralizing antibodies
  - Cyclosporine A
  - Hydroxymethylglutaryl coenzyme A (HMG-CoA) reductase inhibitors (statins)
  - Intravenous immune globulin (IVIG)
  - TNF-α inhibitors

**Corticosteroids**

The recommendation for the use of dexamethasone is based on findings from the RECOVERY trial and results of earlier studies of corticosteroid treatment for other types of viral pneumonia. The RECOVERY study’s critical findings are that dexamethasone benefit was greatest among those who were most severely ill (mechanical ventilation) and only after an initial phase of symptoms. The study completed a pre-specified subgroup-compared 28-day mortality analysis by time from symptom onset to initiation of dexamethasone. The
investigators reported a reduction in 28-day mortality among participants with >7 days of symptoms but not among those with ≤7 days of symptoms. Because this finding is from a subgroup time-to-treatment analysis without adjustment for oxygenation requirement, a symptom duration recommendation is not included in this guidance.

**Note:** Because the RECOVERY trial specifically used dexamethasone, the recommendations here are for the use of dexamethasone rather than any alternative corticosteroid such as methylprednisolone.

**RECOVERY trial:** This unblinded open-label, multi-site, multi-arm RCT conducted in the United Kingdom included a dexamethasone treatment arm. In this study, all patients hospitalized with COVID-19 were eligible to participate unless the attending clinician determined that participation would be inappropriate. The 2,104 participants randomized to the dexamethasone arm received 6 mg by mouth or IV daily for up to 10 days. Those who required mechanical ventilation at the time of randomization had a median of 13 days of symptoms. Participants receiving non-invasive supplemental oxygen had a median of 9 days of symptoms, and those who were not receiving supplemental oxygen had a median of 6 days of symptoms. When their results were compared to those of 4,321 patients who received standard care, the 28-day primary endpoint for mortality yielded dexamethasone 482/2104 (22.9%) v. placebo 1110/4321 (25.7%) RR 0.83 (0.75-0.93). When subgroups were examined, mortality was 0.65 (p=0.0003) for those on mechanical ventilation, 0.8 (p=0.002) for those receiving non-invasive supplemental oxygen, and 1.22 (p=0.1; a statistically non-significant increase in mortality) for participants who were not receiving supplemental oxygen. The benefit was reported only for participants who had >7 days of COVID-19-related symptoms in the age-adjusted analysis. In participants with ≤7 days of symptoms, neither benefit nor harm was associated with dexamethasone treatment.

The RECOVERY trial findings may not be generalizable to corticosteroid use overall for the treatment of COVID-19. Dexamethasone has minimal mineralocorticoid activity, leading to less effect on the sodium balance and potentially fewer problems with fluid retention, which is a common complication of viral pneumonitis/ARDS. Thus, at present, dexamethasone is the preferred glucocorticoid for the treatment of non-pregnant patients. As noted above, to achieve lower fetal glucocorticoid concentrations, prednisolone or hydrocortisone are reasonable alternatives for pregnancy.

Despite the multi-arm, open-label design of the trial, the use of a 28-day mortality endpoint and large enrollment makes this finding important. The study does have several limitations for direct comparison to the current epidemic in the U.S. Most notably, this study's mortality rate was higher than what has been reported in the U.S. In addition, the use of 28-day mortality endpoints may obscure later complications as secondary infections related to dexamethasone.

The GLUCOCOVID trial, a small open-label study that included 86 participants in the analysis, compared results in the group prescribed a glucocorticoid (methylprednisolone) with a group randomized to receive either glucocorticoid or no glucocorticoid. Participants included in the analysis had ≥7 days of COVID-19 symptoms, pneumonia, hypoxia, elevated inflammatory markers, and were not receiving mechanical ventilation. Methylprednisolone was dosed as 40 mg every 12 hours for 3 days, then as 20 mg every 12 hours for 3 days. In the unadjusted intention-to-treat analysis, a composite score of death/intensive care unit admission/non-invasive ventilation found no significant difference by methylprednisolone use. In a per protocol analysis, adjusting for age, methylprednisolone prescription was associated with a 24% reduction in the relative risk of the composite endpoint. The lack of a randomized design and the primary benefit appearing to be delayed or reduced transfer to intensive care are substantial limitations of this study.

**Meta-analysis of corticosteroid RCTs:** A meta-analysis that included 7 trials (1,703 patients, 59% of whom were participants in the RECOVERY trial) examined whether corticosteroids reduced 30-day mortality among critically ill patients with COVID-19. Six of the trials were open-label, and one was placebo-controlled. Overall, steroids reduced mortality with an odds ratio of 0.66 (95% confidence interval 0.53 – 0.82). There was also
reduced mortality with corticosteroid use by all assessed subgroups: with or without mechanical ventilation, age ≤ or > 60 years, sex, and ≤ or > 7 days of symptoms. There was no apparent difference between the use of dexamethasone and hydrocortisone.

**Risks and adverse effects:** Potential serious adverse effects of short-term corticosteroid use include hyperglycemia, increased risk of infection, fluid retention, and anxiety. Short-term corticosteroid use is associated with *Strongyloides* hyperinfection among individuals with risk of infection (e.g., immigrants from endemic countries); testing and treatment should be considered for those at high risk.77

**Targeted Immune Modulators**

**Recommendation:** This writing group recommends the use of this class of agents for COVID-19 therapy only for patients who are enrolled in a clinical trial. RCT results reported to date have found no or limited difference in outcomes when treatment with targeted immune modulators is compared with placebo or standard of care.

RCTs results have been reported to date for several immune modulators, including for those directed toward the IL-6 and IL-6 receptors (tocilizumab, sarilumab), the Janus Kinase pathway (JAK; baricitinib), and IL-1 pathway (anakinra). Clinical trials of other agents, including Bruton tyrosine kinase inhibitors (BTK; acalabrutinib), are underway. These agents have the theoretical appeal of reducing what appears to be a COVID-19-associated hyperinflammation syndrome.

**IL-6 inhibitors:** The most favorable results for IL-6 inhibitors come from case series and cohort studies, with mixed results from RCTs.25,78-81

A placebo-controlled RCT that included 242 participants with fever, pneumonia, and laboratory evidence of inflammation randomized to receive tocilizumab or placebo found no difference in clinical worsening or death at day 14 and day 28 endpoints.82

Two open-label RCTs that included participants with COVID-19 pneumonia or pneumonia and fever and elevated CRP reported no difference in survival at 28 days83 or clinical progression at 14 days84; the later trial was halted early due to perceived futility.

In a press release (7/29/20), Roche announced that an RCT that included 450 participants with COVID-19 pneumonia and SpO2<94% found no significant difference in clinical status or mortality but did report a significantly shorter time to discharge among those who received tocilizumab (20 vs 28 days).85,86

The Roche EMPACTA study of tocilizumab reported a reduction in mechanical ventilation in a double-blind RCT of 389 participants with COVID-19 pneumonia.87 The hazard ratio of the primary outcome of progression to mechanical ventilation or death was 0.56 (p=0.04) among those randomized to the tocilizumab arm compared to the placebo arm. However, the time to improvement was not significantly different between arms, and mortality was similar (10.4% in the tocilizumab arm and 8.6% in the placebo arm). The most significant contribution to the primary outcome was time to progression of mechanical ventilation rather than just mechanical ventilation itself, raising questions about the clinical relevance of this finding. The incidence of infections was similar in both arms. A trial of sarilumab did not find a difference between arms in its primary or secondary endpoints.88,89

The REMAP-CAP study, an international adaptive clinical trial platform for testing multiple COVID-19 therapeutics, included tocilizumab or sarilumab compared to standard care (i.e., no placebo arm).90 Data have been released as a preprint pending peer review. Participants were adults admitted to an intensive care unit with COVID-19 who were receiving respiratory or cardiovascular support in the form of high-flow oxygen, non-invasive or invasive mechanical ventilation or pressor drug therapies (19%); 77% received a corticosteroid. In a preliminary analysis, the median organ support-free days within 21 days of randomization were 10 for
tocilizumab and 0 for standard care. Hospital mortality was 28% in the tocilizumab arm and 36% in the standard care arm. Both outcomes were considered significant based on Bayesian statistical analysis. These preliminary results, which lack a full description of the study populations, details about randomization changes over time-based on the adaptive design, and subgroup analyses, imply that individuals with an acute decline in status who require intensive care might benefit from tocilizumab treatment.

The RECOVERY trial, a multi-site factorial design RCT in the United Kingdom, included tocilizumab. Participants were first randomized to one of the following: usual care, dexamethasone, lopinavir-ritonavir, hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, or colchicine. Participants were subsequently considered for randomization to tocilizumab or no-tocilizumab if they had clinical progression as indicated by SpO2 <92% on room air, requiring oxygen therapy, or CRP ≥75 mg/L. A total of 4,116 participants were randomized 1:1 to tocilizumab or no-tocilizumab. Of these, 55% were receiving high-flow oxygen or invasive or non-invasive mechanical ventilation, and 45% were receiving supplemental oxygen via nasal cannula. The primary endpoint, 28-day mortality, occurred among 29% of the tocilizumab group and 33% of the no-tocilizumab group (p=0.007). In subgroup analysis, tocilizumab was found to be most effective when used concomitantly with corticosteroids and when given within 7 days of symptom onset.

An RCT conducted in Brazil enrolled 129 adult participants with COVID-19 to receive tocilizumab or standard care. At enrollment, participants received supplemental oxygen or had received ≤24 hours of mechanical ventilation and had elevated inflammatory markers. The primary outcome, clinical status 15 days after enrollment, was not improved: in the tocilizumab arm, 28% of participants required mechanical ventilation or died compared with 20% in the standard care arm. The study was halted early out of concern for potential harm to those remaining in the tocilizumab arm as mortality at day 15 occurred in 11 (17%) of tocilizumab recipients and in only 2 (3%) of the standard of care/placebo group (OR 6.42, 95% CI 1.59-43.2).

Due to conflicting data, the risks and possible benefits of tocilizumab use should be weighed carefully and considered only in limited clinical circumstances, as described above.

**JAK inhibitors:** JAK inhibitors such as baricitinib, ruxolitinib, and fedratinib are FDA-approved for use in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, myelofibrosis, or polycythemia vera. Ruxolitinib results in the downregulation of TNF-α, IL-5, IL-6, and IL-1B in T cells *in vitro* and *in vivo*. Hence, these inhibitors may be useful against uncontrolled inflammation, such as that seen with COVID-19. The ACTT-2 study, which compared baricitinib and remdesivir to placebo and remdesivir, reported a statistically significant difference in the primary outcome of time to recovery. Participants in the baricitinib arm reached hospital discharge one day earlier than placebo patients. The effect of combined immune suppression from both dexamethasone, a recommended COVID-19 therapeutic agent, and baricitinib is unclear. As a result, baricitinib is not recommended for use with COVID-19 outside of clinical trials despite an FDA EUA for use with COVID-19.

**Anti-IL1:** Anakinra is an IL-1 receptor antagonist that blocks the biologic activity of IL-1. Given the role of monocyte-derived IL-1 and IL-6 in CAR-T–associated CRS, anakinra has been used off-label for the treatment of COVID-19. A retrospective cohort study from Italy found that 3 of 29 (10%) patients who received anakinra died, compared with 7 of 16 (44%) patients who did not receive anakinra. No RCTs have been reported for anakinra.

**HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors (statins):** In addition to altering cholesterol synthesis, these agents have an anti-inflammatory role. Statins may modify SARS-CoV-2–mediated inflammation.

**TNF-α inhibitor:** Etanercept is a TNF-α blocker with limited experience in CAR-T–associated CRS. One reported case of CAR-T–associated CRS did not improve with etanercept use. Based on this limited experience, etanercept is not presently recommended for the treatment of COVID-19.
**BTK inhibitors:** BTK inhibitors, such as ibrutinib, acalabrutinib, and zanubrutinib, are FDA-approved for treating certain lymphomas. BTK is involved in macrophage activation, a phenomenon seen in COVID-19 that may play a role in the cytokine hyperinflammatory syndrome through a pathway of the toll-like receptors (TLRs) TLR3, TLR7, and TLR8. When used in an animal model of influenza, BTK inhibitors rescued mice from lethal lung injury. A case series report on patients who developed COVID-19 while receiving ibrutinib for Waldenstrom macroglobulinemia suggested no worsening in the outcome and possibly less of an inflammatory response. A case series of 19 patients with COVID-19 treated with acalabrutinib suggested overall safety and a reduction in inflammatory markers.

**GM-CSF inhibitors:** Lenzilumab neutralizes human GM-CSF. *In vitro* data suggest it may limit CRS. Given the role of GM-CSF in inflammation and COVID-19, lenzilumab may be useful in the management of COVID-19. RCTs are in progress.

**Intravenous Immune Globulin (IVIG)**

IVIG (non-convalescent) modulates immune response by interacting with antibodies and complement and blocking receptors on immune cells. IVIG has been used to treat multiple conditions, including SARS and COVID-19, to control pathogenic inflammation. A case series of 3 patients reported using IVIG at the point of clinical deterioration and presumed shift to cytokine dysregulation. All 3 patients were admitted to the hospital with mild COVID-19 symptoms but deteriorated clinically several days after admission. Within 1 to 2 days of IVIG administration, all 3 patients had clinical improvement. More robust clinical data are needed to determine whether IVIG has a therapeutic role in COVID-19.

**V. Agents With Speculative Effect to Avoid as COVID-19 Treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 6: Recommendations for Agents to Avoid as Treatment for COVID-19 Specifically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Because there is no or inadequate evidence of their efficacy or effectiveness or evidence of a lack of efficacy, the following agents are not recommended for treatment of COVID-19, specifically, in hospitalized patients, except when administered in a clinical trial. There is no evidence that any of the following agents are harmful when prescribed for the treatment of other conditions in patients with COVID-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors or angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARBs) (either initiation or discontinuation of use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Aspirin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Azithromycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Baloxavir marboxil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Colchicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Darunavir/ritonavir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Famotidine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Favipiravir (not FDA-approved or available in the United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Fluvoxamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Indomethacin or other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Ivermectin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Lopinavir/ritonavir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Nitazoxanide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 6: Recommendations for Agents to Avoid as Treatment for COVID-19 Specifically

- Oseltamivir
- Ribavirin
- Umifenovir (not FDA-approved or available in the United States)
- Vitamin C
- Vitamin D
- Zinc

*Use of HCQ for treatment or prophylaxis of COVID-19 is prohibited at JHHS unless it is part of a clinical trial. Patients who may have been prescribed HCQ for prophylaxis as an outpatient should not continue therapy for prophylaxis as an inpatient unless part of a clinical trial.

There is no plausible evidence of *in vitro* activity for the agents listed above, or there is reported *in vitro* activity, or there are limited clinical data (described below).

**ACE inhibitors or ARBs:** Host cell entry by SARS-CoV-2 appears to depend on the ACE2 receptor.\(^{106}\) ACE inhibitors block the ACE1 receptor but not the ACE2 receptor. Chronic use of ACE inhibitors and ARBs upregulates ACE2 expression,\(^{107}\) leading to concerns of a theoretical risk with the use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs. At present, no clinical data have indicated an increased risk of severe disease among individuals receiving either class of agent, and the time from agent discontinuation to downregulation of ACE2 is likely measured in days.\(^{108}\)

The best evidence suggests similar or improved outcomes among people on chronic ACE or ARB therapy who develop COVID-19.\(^{109}\)

There is no need to discontinue ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy in patients diagnosed with COVID-19; it is appropriate to follow existing clinical recommendations for discontinuing treatment with ACE inhibitors or ARBs when appropriate.

**Aspirin:** Aspirin has a potential benefit in COVID-19 through its antithrombotic activity. A retrospective record review from multiple hospitals in the United States was used to compare 98 inpatients with COVID-19 who received aspirin to 314 who did not receive aspirin.\(^{110}\) In an adjusted analysis, patients who received aspirin were less likely to require mechanical ventilation. Although the authors sought to adjust for multiple factors, the nature of this study cannot rule out the possibility that the association between aspirin and less mechanical ventilation was a result of confounding.

**Azithromycin:** Dosed as 500 mg daily for 3 days did not improve outcomes in 540 participants randomized to receive this medication in an adaptive trial.\(^{111}\) Data suggest no benefit and potential harm with the use of HCQ plus azithromycin. A retrospective study of patients who did not have COVID-19 who received chronic HCQ (for rheumatologic reasons) and short courses of azithromycin for acute conditions identified an increased risk of cardiovascular mortality within 30 days of adding azithromycin.\(^{112}\) No clinical efficacy was found in a study of azithromycin against MERS-CoV.\(^{113}\)

**Baloxavir marboxil:** Baloxavir marboxil is licensed for use as a treatment for influenza within 48 hours of symptom onset. The question of its use for treating COVID-19 has been raised; however, as of this writing, the national clinical trials database, [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov), does not include any studies of baloxavir marboxil as an agent against SARS-CoV-2.

**Colchicine:** Colchicine has been of interest for the management of COVID-19 due to its anti-inflammatory properties. A small RCT of 72 hospitalized participants reported a more rapid time to discontinuation of supplemental oxygen among participants who received 10 days of treatment with colchicine (4.0 days to O2 discontinuation) compared to placebo (6.5 days).\(^{114}\) Another RCT, with 4,488 ambulatory COVID-19 patients,
compared 30 days of colchicine treatment to placebo and found no substantial difference in the primary endpoint of death or hospitalization within 30 days of randomization, with 4.7% in the colchicine arm and 5.8% in the placebo arm meeting that composite endpoint.115

**Darunavir/ritonavir (DRV/RTV):** An in vitro study of DRV/RTV and remdesivir against SARS-CoV-2 reported no activity for DRV/RTV compared to potent activity for remdesivir.116 Given the similar mechanism of action of DRV and lopinavir (LPV; see below), it is unlikely that DRV would provide benefit if LPV does not.116

**DAS 181:** DAS181 is a recombinant sialidase fusion protein. It cleaves sialic acid, an important part of viruses binding to cell surfaces in the respiratory tract, potentially decreasing viruses' ability to enter cells. DAS181 has potential antiviral activity against parainfluenza, metapneumovirus, enterovirus, and influenza. Because coronaviruses also have a sialic acid-binding domain, DAS181 may have activity against SARS-CoV-2.117 There are anecdotal reports of DAS181 use in non-research settings in China for treatment of COVID-19.

DAS181 is administered via a nebulizer once daily for 7 to 10 days. The drug has been studied in Phase I and Phase II clinical trials and in compassionate use, and all have shown good tolerability.118 Reported adverse effects include bronchospasm; dysgeusia; diarrhea; throat irritation; and elevations in alkaline phosphatase, transaminases, creatinine phosphokinase, lactate dehydrogenase, and prothrombin time.

**Famotidine:** Famotidine is hypothesized to bind to SARS-CoV-2 papain-like protease and inhibit replication. Unpublished anecdotes have suggested possible value of this agent in treating COVID-19, and a trial of high-dose intravenous famotidine for COVID-19 is underway.119

**Favipiravir:** This inhibitor of RNA-dependent RNA polymerase has been used in China to treat patients with COVID-19.120,121 An open-label, non-randomized clinical trial comparing favipiravir with LPV/RTV suggested that favipiravir reduced the duration of viral shedding and led to a more rapid improvement in chest computed tomography findings.121 An RCT comparing favipiravir with umifenovir (brand name Arbidol; a fusion inhibitor approved for use to treat influenza in Japan and Russia) reported a 7-day "clinical recovery rate" of 61% for favipiravir and 52% for umifenovir (P=.1). A statistically significant reduction in duration of fever was reported for favipiravir.120 This drug is not approved by the FDA and is not available in the United States.

**Fluvoxamine:** It has been hypothesized that this selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor may modulate the immune response through the sigma-1 receptor agonism. A placebo-controlled outpatient RCT randomized 152 adults with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection to receive 15 days of escalating doses of fluvoxamine (n=80) or placebo (n=72). The primary endpoint was clinical deterioration. Clinical deterioration occurred in 0 of the participants in the fluvoxamine arm and in 6 (8.3%) of those who received a placebo. Pneumonia and gastrointestinal adverse events occurred more often in the placebo arm than the active arm. More data are required to understand the potential use of this agent in patients with COVID-19.

**Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ):** Although HCQ has in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2 and some other viruses,122,123 it has not translated into efficacy in the treatment of any viral infection and this writing group recommends against off-label use of hydroxychloroquine for the treatment of COVID-19. Notable studies have reported failure in animal models for Ebola virus and failure in human trials for influenza and HIV.124-126 A retrospective study in France compared viral shedding in 36 patients treated with HCQ, HCQ plus azithromycin, or neither. Reduced viral shedding was found in the HCQ and HCQ plus azithromycin groups.127 The lack of pairwise comparisons and exclusion of patients on HCQ who had disease progression (i.e., death or admission to intensive care) are 2 of the many limitations of this study. A follow-up study assessed viral shedding in 80 patients who received HCQ plus azithromycin. Most patients had a negative viral load test by day 8.128 In another study from France, viral clearance was measured in 11 patients treated with HCQ plus azithromycin. Of the 9 patients who remained under observation on day 5 or 6, 80% still had positive PCR test results.129 In an RCT from China that included 30 patients, 86% of those treated with HCQ and 93% of controls had cleared viral
shedding at day 7. In a larger, open-label RCT from China that included 150 patients, negative PCR test results at day 28 were reported in 85% of those who received HCQ and in 81% of those who did not receive HCQ (seroconversion was similar between groups at days 4, 7, 10, 14, and 21 as well).

An open-label RCT from China evaluated 62 patients with mild illness who were randomized to receive HCQ or usual care. Fever resolved more rapidly (2.2 days vs. 3.2 days), and there was greater radiographic improvement in pneumonia (81% vs. 55%; P=.05) in the HCQ group. The value of these results is limited by the quality of the study endpoints and open-label design. A retrospective study of HCQ that used propensity weighting to compare patients who did and did not receive HCO within 48 hours of hospitalization reported no difference in death or ARDS within 7 days. A retrospective study of HCQ use across the United States Veterans Health Administration system reported on 368 patients who received HCQ, HCQ plus azithromycin, or neither. Patients who received only HCQ had the highest rate of mortality; mortality was lower and similar among those who received HCQ plus azithromycin or neither drug. Although the researchers adjusted for various factors, they included patients who received HCQ at any time during hospitalization for COVID-19, increasing the chance of confounding by indication. Retrospective studies from New York State and multinational sites have reported similar findings of no convincing benefit from HCQ when used to treat patients with COVID-19. Mortality may have been increased with HCQ; however, study limitations prevent making any strong conclusions regarding harm. On March 28, 2020, the FDA issued an EUA to use HCQ to treat COVID-19. This EUA was revoked on June 15, 2020, in response to increasing evidence (including from RCTs) that HCQ has no effect against COVID-19. Multiple RCTs, including those sponsored by the NIH, have been halted because of the futility of HCQ treatment or under-enrollment.

**Indomethacin or other NSAIDs:** Indomethacin (INDO) has been suggested as a possible therapeutic agent for COVID-19, given the hypothesis that prostaglandins have antiviral activity. In vitro studies of INDO against canine coronavirus (CCoV) suggested viral inhibition; treatment with INDO reduced viral titers in dogs with CCoV, and INDO reduced growth of SARS-CoV-1 in vitro. These findings are intriguing, but correlation with clinical outcomes in humans is required before the use of INDO can be recommended for the treatment of COVID-19.

A March 11, 2020, letter published in The Lancet hypothesized a potential worsening of COVID-19 with the use of ibuprofen and has caused concern about the potential risk of ibuprofen if used to treat patients with COVID-19. Similar to ACE inhibitors and ARBs, ibuprofen has been reported to upregulate ACE2 receptors. However, no published clinical data currently suggest an increased risk in patients with COVID-19 using NSAIDs. In general, acetaminophen is preferred for the treatment of fever in patients with COVID-19, but therapy should be individualized for hospitalized patients, considering kidney and liver function.

**Ivermectin:** There is in vitro evidence that ivermectin inhibits SARS-CoV-2 replication. Several retrospective cohort studies have compared outcomes among patients who received ivermectin to those who did not, with mixed results regarding ivermectin’s effect on outcomes. The largest RCT, which included 400 participants with mild disease and <7 days of symptoms, reported no difference in time to symptom resolution between participants who received 5 days of ivermectin (300 ug/kg body weight/day) compared to those who received placebo. A small RCT of 72 participants in 3 arms reported no difference in primary outcomes between study arms but reported more rapid clearance of viral RNA in the ivermectin arms. A study conducted in Iraq among 118 participants with mild to severe COVID-19 compared 2 or 3 days of ivermectin plus doxycycline to standard therapy. The time to recovery was 10.6 days in the ivermectin arm compared to 17.9 in the standard therapy arm (p<0.05). A (non-randomized) study conducted in Bangladesh compared 72 participants hospitalized with mild COVID-19 who received either 5 days of ivermectin, 5 days of ivermectin plus doxycycline, or standard treatment. There was no difference in symptom resolution between study arms. Additional retrospective and prospective studies have been summarized in a systematic review (preprint).

**LPV/RTV:** This combination has weak in vitro activity against SARS-CoV-2. An RCT from China reported no clinical benefit among patients hospitalized with COVID-19 who were given LPV/RTV (starting a median of 13 days...
into illness). Another RCT of 120 patients in China suggested that LPV/RTV treatment ≤10 days from symptom onset reduced the duration of viral shedding. A non-randomized retrospective study from China described fever resolution and laboratory findings from 42 patients who received LPV/RTV and 5 who did not. The timing of LPV/RTV treatment was not described. Among a subset (number not provided) of patients with fever, there was no difference in the rate of temperature decline. The very small sample size of patients not treated with LPV/RTV limits the value of this report. A small clinical trial that randomized 86 patients with mild COVID-19 to 1 of 3 arms—LPV/RTV, umifenovir, or control—reported no difference in the rate of nucleic acid clearance, resolution of fever, resolution of cough, or improvement in chest x-ray. The large UK RECOVERY trial reported no reduction in 28-day mortality, duration of hospital stay, or disease progression among 1,616 patients randomized to receive LPV/RTV compared to 3,424 patients who received usual care.

Nitazoxanide: This agent has been tested in vitro against MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 and found to have activity. There are no animal or human data from studies of use against SARS-CoV-2.

Oseltamivir: Coronaviruses are not known to use neuraminidase in viral replication; therefore, oseltamivir is not likely to be of any therapeutic value. One case series from China reported that, of 138 hospitalized patients with COVID-19, 124 (89.9%) received oseltamivir, with no reported evidence of benefit.

Umifenovir: This agent was routinely used in China to treat patients with COVID-19. There are no data to support its effectiveness. This drug is not approved by the FDA and is not available in the United States.

RBV: In a systematic review, RBV was not found to be beneficial against SARS-CoV-1. In a multicenter observational study of RBV plus interferon-alpha against MERS-CoV, this combination was not found to reduce mortality.

Vitamin C: Vitamin C has been suggested as a treatment option for COVID-19. This is based on a prospective randomized trial of intravenous vitamin C in patients with sepsis and ARDS. In that trial, there was no difference in the primary endpoint of sequential organ failure assessment (SOFA) score between the vitamin C and placebo groups. Differences were found in several of the 46 secondary endpoints, including 28-day mortality, although these differences were not statistically significant if accounting for multiple comparisons.

Vitamin D: Patients with low vitamin D levels appear to be at increased risk for several infections, and vitamin D has been proposed to play a role in ARDS. It has been suggested that vitamin D supplementation may reduce the severity of COVID-19. In an open-label RCT of vitamin D supplementation among patients with COVID-19 pneumonia, 76 patients were randomized 2:1 to receive vitamin D or standard care alone. Vitamin D was dosed as 0.532 mg calcifediol (a D3 analog) on day 1, 0.266 mg on days 3 and 7, and then weekly until discharge. Intensive care was required for 50% (n = 13) of the standard care group compared to 2% (n = 1) of the vitamin D group (p<0.001). This pilot study results suggest a possible role for vitamin D supplementation, which must be confirmed through additional, larger RCTs. However, an RCT of 240 patients randomized to a single administration of 200,000 IU of vitamin D3 found no difference in the 7-day hospital length of stay in either arm. Clinical trials have found that patients with other diseases who had vitamin D levels <20 ng/mL benefited from supplementation; however, in this COVID-19 study, no benefit was found in the subset with levels less than 20 ng/mL.

Zinc: Zinc lozenges may reduce symptoms of upper respiratory tract infections. There are no clinical data to suggest that zinc benefits patients with COVID-19–associated viral pneumonia.
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VI. Development of This Guidance

**Process:** Paul Auwaerter, MD, Clinical Director of Johns Hopkins Medicine Division of Infectious Diseases, convened a working group of Johns Hopkins clinical experts in infectious diseases, pulmonary and critical care medicine, clinical pharmacology, and pharmacy to review and weigh the available evidence regarding treatment of COVID-19.

**Box 7: COVID-19 Pharmacologic Treatment Guidance Writing Group**

- **Chair:** Paul G. Auwaerter, MD, MBA, Clinical Director, Division of Infectious Diseases; Professor of Medicine
- **Lead author:** Christopher J. Hoffmann, MD, MPH, Associate Professor of Medicine, Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases
- **Contributing members:**
  - Robin K. Avery, MD, Professor of Medicine
  - Richard F. Ambinder, MD, PhD, Director, Division of Hematologic Malignancies; Professor of Oncology
  - Andrew M. Cameron, MD, PhD, Chief, Division of Transplantation; Professor of Surgery
  - Larry W. Chang, MD, MPH, Associate Professor of Medicine, Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases
  - Natasha M. Chida, MD, MSPH, Associate Director, Infectious Diseases Fellowship Program; Assistant Professor of Medicine
  - Franco R. D’Alessio, MD, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine
  - Kate Dzintars, PharmD, Clinical Pharmacy Specialist, Division of Infectious Disease
  - Brian T. Garibaldi, MD, Director, Johns Hopkins Biocontainment Unit; Associate Professor of Medicine
  - Elisa Ignatius, MD, MSc, Fourth Year Fellow, Infectious Diseases, Clinical Pharmacology
  - Tania Jain, MBBS, Assistant Professor of Oncology
  - Andrew Karaba, MD, PhD, Fourth Year Fellow Infectious Diseases
  - Kieren Marr, MD, MBA, Director, Transplant and Oncology Infectious Diseases; Vice-Chair for Innovation in Healthcare Implementation, DOM; Professor of Medicine
  - Christian A. Merlo, MD, MPH, Director of Outpatient Clinical Operations, Associate Professor of Medicine
  - Pali D. Shah, MD, Medical Director, Johns Hopkins Lung Transplantation; Assistant Professor of Medicine
  - R. Scott Stephens, MD, Director, Oncology and Bone Marrow Transplant Critical Care; Assistant Professor of Medicine
  - David J. Sullivan Jr, MD, Professor, Molecular Microbiology and Immunology; Joint appointment in Medicine
  - Ethel D. Weld, MD, PhD, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Pharmacology, and Molecular Sciences; Clinical Pharmacology, Infectious Diseases

From the larger working group, a smaller writing group was convened to develop guidance. The group meets regularly by conference call (beginning March 19, 2020) to define the evolving scope of the guidance, review evidence as it becomes available, review draft documents, and ensure consensus.

**Ongoing updates:** New information and experience are reviewed regularly, and the guidance is updated as needed. The JHHS community should feel free to provide comments to C19Workgrp@jhu.edu.
Guiding principles:

- The writing group strongly recommends that patients who meet inclusion criteria participate in clinical trials when they are available.

- Guidance is based on expert opinion, and when available, randomized, controlled clinical trials. The body of available clinical data is growing rapidly, and RCTs with strong study design and adequate sample size are considered the best possible source of data on which to base specific recommendations.

- Recognizing that knowledge of and experience with COVID-19 is evolving rapidly, the writing group is committed to updating guidance regularly as new evidence or experience is available. The writing group recognizes the controversial nature of providing advice that draws upon minimal data. Opinions do range from providing drugs only within the context of a therapeutic trial to providing drugs with theoretical but possible benefit if risks of adverse reactions are deemed acceptable.

- Infectious diseases consultation for specific patients at high risk is advised. The writing group recommends that prescribing clinicians consult with infectious diseases clinicians for treatment of any recipient of or candidate for solid organ or bone marrow transplant. Consultation with infectious diseases clinicians for evaluation or management of any hospitalized patient with suspected (person under investigation [PUI]) or confirmed COVID-19 is otherwise up to the judgment and needs of the primary care team.

Ongoing updates: New information and experience are reviewed regularly, and the guidance is updated as needed. The JHHS community should feel free to provide comments to C19Workgrp@jhu.edu.
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Convalescent plasma is the liquid part of blood that is collected from healthy blood donors who have already recovered from COVID-19 disease. It is currently believed that convalescent plasma contains a part of the donor’s immune system that could help you to fight COVID-19 disease. Although the effectiveness of treatment with convalescent plasma is not known, available information shows that the plasma may be helpful, especially for people who are treated early in the course of COVID-19 disease. Treatment with convalescent plasma means you are getting a blood transfusion.

Convalescent plasma is not approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). However, on August 23, 2020, the FDA issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for emergency use of COVID-19 convalescent plasma for the treatment of hospitalized patients with COVID-19.

At the current time, COVID-19 convalescent plasma that meets all requirements of the EUA is not routinely available. As a result, on September 2, 2020 the FDA announced a temporary enforcement discretion, which allows us to offer COVID-19 convalescent plasma which meets all of our usual safety standards, but is considered to be investigational by the FDA. This is temporary - eventually plasma that meets the EUA requirements will be available. This type of transfusion is not research, and is not part of an Institutional Review Board (IRB) study.

The purpose of this form is to explain the risks, benefits and alternatives of investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma.

Risks: Tens of thousands of patients across the United States have already been transfused with investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma. According to the best information that we have, the plasma is safe and very few people have had a problem with the transfusion. In fact, it is currently believed that investigational convalescent COVID-19 plasma is just as safe as standard plasma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks of Administration Vary, but Include:</th>
<th>Steps Taken to Reduce the Risk May Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion Reaction: (less than 6%)</td>
<td>• Before being given,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fever, itching and hives are the most common mild symptoms</td>
<td>o except in life-threatening emergencies, donated plasma is matched with your blood type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low blood pressure, difficulty breathing, and organ injury are more serious but also much less common</td>
<td>o you may be given medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection: (less than 0.1%)</td>
<td>• You will be monitored for any symptoms and the administration will be stopped if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bacteria</td>
<td>• Donors are screened prior to being allowed to give blood and all donated blood is carefully tested by suppliers before being sent to the hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viruses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parasites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits: Although the benefits of COVID-19 convalescent plasma are not known for certain, it is possible that this treatment will help you to recover from COVID-19 disease.

Alternatives: You can choose to continue with other medical therapies, such as pills or medications that are given through your veins. Your doctor or nurse can explain in detail what those treatments are for you. However, at this time, investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma is the only way for you to be treated with the blood plasma of people who have already recovered from COVID-19.
CONSENT

INVESTIGATIONAL COVID-19 CONVALESCENT PLASMA TRANSFUSION

CONSENT OR REFUSAL

Patient Full Name (Print if not listed above)

I understand that my doctor has recommended that I be transfused with investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma during my hospitalization for COVID-19.

I understand how and why the investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma will be administered, as well as the benefits and potential risks. These risks include fever, allergic reactions, transmission of infectious disease, fluid overload, acute lung injury and death. I understand that risks exist despite testing of donor blood and precautions taken during administration.

I have been informed about reasonable medical alternatives to transfusion and their common foreseeable risks and benefits.

Therefore –

CONSENT

☐ I consent to administration of investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma

REFUSAL

☐ I refuse administration of investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma

I understand the risks of my refusal or the limitations placed on my treatment may include serious injury, disability or death. Knowing the risks, I accept full responsibility for this decision.

By signing on page 2, I acknowledge / agree that:

- I have received investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma administration patient education.
- The indication(s) for administration of investigational COVID-19 convalescent plasma have been explained to me, as well as the benefits, risks and alternatives (if any, with their benefits and risks), and all of my questions have been answered.
- No guarantee has been made concerning the outcome, as the practice of medicine is not an exact science.
- I understand that the convalescent plasma that I am being treated with is considered to be investigational by the FDA.
- My treatment decision is accurately reflected above.

Date

Patient Signature

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2
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Original - Medical Record
INVESTIGATIONAL COVID-19
CONVALESCENT PLASMA TRANSFUSION
CONSENT OR REFUSAL

**********************************************************************************

Legally Authorized Health Care Decision-Maker:

Date
Print Name
Signature (N/A if Telephone Consent)

If the patient would otherwise be consenting on his/her own behalf, but is unable to consent & consent is being obtained from a surrogate decision-maker, refer to Epic Capacity & Advance Care Planning Activity to validate/identify the health care agent (HCA) or primary surrogate decision-maker and confirm documentation of incapacity (N/A for a minor not legally able to consent).

**ONLY COMPLETE BELOW IF PERSON GIVING CONSENT IS NOT THE HCA / PRIMARY SURROGATE DECISION-MAKER**

The HCA/primary surrogate decision-maker: (check all that apply)

☐ Could not be reached to provide consent
☐ Did not respond to requests for assistance with obtaining consent
☐ Was incapacitated
☐ Was unwilling to make decisions
☐ Other (describe):

**********************************************************************************

Date
Time
Signature of Provider Obtaining Consent
Title or ID# 

Print Provider 1st Name
Print Provider Last Name

Date
Time
Witness Signature
(Relationship/Title)

Print Witness Name

☐ Telephone Consent (for telephone consent, witness must be member of the clinical staff)

Interpreter (Complete only if applicable) ☐ Remotely via video ☐ Remotely via telephone ☐ In-person

Date
Time
Print Interpreter Name
Interpreter Signature (if in person)

JHM-E00014 (5/20) Original - Medical Record
MEMORANDUM

December 11, 2020

To: JHH Medical Staff
From: JHH Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee
Re: Remdesivir Formulary Restriction and Order Review Process

Staff,

This memo is to inform you that JHH is implementing new formulary restriction criteria and ordering process for remdesivir on Tuesday, December 15th. These criteria were approved by the JHH Formulary Management and Medication Use Policy Committee (FMMPC) and reviewed by the COVID-19 Treatment Guidance Writing Group. This effort will ensure that remdesivir is initiated in patients meeting specific clinical criteria. The memo summarizes the revised formulary restriction criteria and the ordering process within Epic.

Overview:
- For initiation of remdesivir, patients must meet all clinical criteria within the formulary restriction in order to obtain medication.
- The medication order within Epic contains the formulary restriction criteria, and requires providers to answer a series of questions prior to signing the order.
- Once an order is placed for remdesivir, the pharmacist verifying the medication order must review the order to ensure the patient meets the clinical criteria.
  - If a prescriber is requesting use of remdesivir outside of the formulary restriction, the prescriber must contact the P&T Chair (Dr. Brent Petty) directly for review, preferably between 7 a.m. and 11 p.m.
- The use of remdesivir for pediatric patients is still under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for those weighing 3.5 kg to less than 40 kg or those less than 12 years of age weighing at least 3.5 kg. See the last page for additional detail.

Formulary Restriction:
Patients must meet all of the following criteria to initiate remdesivir. Patients are limited to one course of 5 days of therapy:
- An RNA or antigen test indicating active COVID-19 infection (not serology)
- ≤10 days since COVID-19 symptoms began
- Presence of respiratory compromise at the time of clinical evaluation defined by one or more of the following:
  - \( \text{SaO}_2 \leq 94\% \) on room air for \( \geq 1 \) hour
  - \( \text{SaO}_2 > 94\% \) for \( \geq 1 \) hour
  - Documented sustained RR ≥ 24 breaths per minute
- Not receiving mechanical ventilation or ECMO, unless these modalities were initiated for the first time within the past 24 hours
- ALT ≤ 10 times the upper limit of normal
• If patients have an eGFR less than 30 mL/min, the attending physician will be required to enter a note indicating that the patient has been informed that use in patients with eGFR less than 30 mL/min is not recommended per the package label but the patient has agreed to receive remdesivir. This must be documented in the EHR. The smartphrase .REMLESS30 can be used.
  o .REMLESS30:

  I am treating my patient who has documented COVID-19 infection with remdesivir because he/she meets the criteria set forth by JHHS for this therapy. The patient has an eGFR less than 30 mL/min. Working in the FDA package insert notes that remdesivir is not recommended in patients with eGFR less than 30 mL/min. I believe that the benefits of treating this patient with remdesivir outweigh the potential harms because to date, there have not been reported renal or hepatic side effects associated with five days of remdesivir treatment in patients with an eGFR less than 30 mL/min. I will monitor my patient's renal and hepatic function while he/she is receiving remdesivir. I have discussed with the patient/legally authorized representative the benefits and risks of remdesivir therapy, including but not limited to the FDA package insert language. I have also counseled the patient/legally authorized representative on any potential alternative treatments. I have given the patient/legally authorized representative a chance to have all of his/her questions answered. The patient/legally authorized representative has elected to receive remdesivir therapy.

Pediatric Patients who fall under the EUA:
• The use of remdesivir for pediatric patients is still under an EUA for those weighing 3.5 kg to less than 40 kg or those less than 12 years of age weighing at least 3.5 kg. The JHHS clinical restriction criteria also apply.
  o Providers will be required to answer the above clinical questions verifying the patient meets JHHS restriction criteria and EUA criteria.
  o Providers must also answer all questions related to the EUA prior to signing order (in addition to the clinical questions):

  I have given the "Fact Sheet for Patients and Parents/Caregivers" to the patient/patient caregiver and informed the patient/patient caregiver of alternatives to remdesivir and that remdesivir is an unapproved drug that is authorized for use under EUA.

  Yes No

  All serious adverse events considered to be potentially related to remdesivir must be reported to MedWatch and Gilead within 7 days of the event. All medication errors and serious adverse events should also be reported through HERO

  I agree to the requirement.
Formulary Comments:

- The above criteria apply to all patients, including those with immune compromise, malignancy or history of solid organ transplant.
- According to the package label, remdesivir is not recommended in patients with eGFR < 30 mL/minute, but it is not listed in the package label as contraindicated. If a JHHS patient with eGFR < 30 mL/minute is ordered to receive remdesivir, there must be documentation in the medical record that the attending physician has informed the patient that the medication is not recommended per the package labeling and that the patient has agreed to receive remdesivir anyway, expecting the benefits to outweigh any risks.
- If ALT increases to > 10 times the upper limit of normal or the patient develops other signs or symptoms of hepatotoxicity, remdesivir must be discontinued.
- Remdesivir is a substrate of CYP3A4. At this time, no drug-drug interaction studies have been performed. Use caution when giving remdesivir with CYP3A4 inhibitors (e.g., azole antifungals) or inducers (e.g., rifampin).
- Patients who are transferred to JHHS from an outside hospital on remdesivir can complete their 5-day course of therapy.
- Patients well enough for discharge home can be discharged without completing their current course of remdesivir.

Allocation strategy outlined in the JHMI Clinical Recommendations for Available Pharmacologic Therapies for COVID-19 will be followed when demand exceeds supply.

Epic ordering:

- Providers are required to go through a series of questions ensuring patients meet all clinical criteria prior to signing the order.