Battling COVID-19: using old weapons for a new enemy
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Abstract

Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) has reached pandemic proportions. Most of the drugs that are being tried for the treatment have not been evaluated in any randomized controlled trials. The purpose of this review was to summarize the in-vitro and in-vivo efficacy of these drugs on Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV-2) and related viruses (SARS and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome) and evaluate their potential for re-purposing them in the management of COVID-19.
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Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), a disease caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), was first reported from Wuhan, China in December 2019 and it has already claimed more than forty thousand lives [1]. Although supportive measures and stringent infection control measures remain as the cornerstone of management, there is no known effective antiviral for this disease. After the spike (S) protein of the virus interacts with angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) receptor of the host cell, the virus enters by membrane fusion or receptor-mediated endocytosis. This is followed by replication using RNA dependent RNA polymerase, translation, virus assembly and release (Fig. 1). Several existing drugs have been identified that are postulated to act on one of these critical steps (Fig. 1). While the efforts to develop new and effective drugs are ongoing; until there are more definitive answers, effective repurposing from the existing arsenal of antivirals are being used every day. Although, Infectious disease society of America recommends the use of the repurposed drugs in the setting of clinical trials alone due to lack of evidence; data from related viruses (like SARS-CoV-1 and MERS), in-vitro studies and growing shreds of clinical evidence from this pandemic are being used to choose the drugs which can be repurposed [2]. The drugs have been discussed under the following headings: anti-parasitic drugs, protease inhibitors, polymerase inhibitors, fusion inhibitors, monoclonal antibodies and miscellaneous (Table 1 and Table 2).

Anti-parasitic drugs

Chloroquine (CQ) and hydroxychloroquine (HCQ)

Chloroquine (CQ) is a synthetic form of quinine (derived from the bark of cinchona tree) and is widely used as an anti-malarial since the last seventy years. Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) has an extra hydroxyl group at the end of the side chain and is commonly used in the management of lupus and rheumatoid arthritis. Both these drugs have shown to have some anti-viral properties and may be useful in treating patients with COVID-19. Both CQ and HCQ interfere with the glycosylation of ACE-2 receptor, which is essential for the viral entry [49, 50]. Both the drugs are a weak base, and they interfere with the acidification of lysosome. This interferes with the
pH-dependent endosome mediated viral entry [49, 50]. Both the drugs inhibit activation of cells by MAP kinase (P38 MAP kinase [49, 50] and inhibit post-translational modification of M proteins, thereby altering viral assembly and budding [49, 50]. Also, both the drugs are immunomodulatory agents and reduce pro-inflammatory cytokines [49, 50]. Compared to CQ, HCQ has a better in-vitro potency (7.6 times more potent), safety profile and lesser drug-drug interactions. HCQs have high accumulation in cells and long elimination half-life.

CQ has shown activity against various viruses in-vitro including HIV, hepatitis A/B/C, influenza A/B, dengue, chikungunya, Nipah, Hendra, Lassa and Ebola [51–53]. In-vitro data also suggests that CQ can inhibit coronaviruses (SARS-CoV-1, MERS CoV and Human corona OC43) also [54–56]. Recent studies have shown that CQ is also active in-vitro against SARS-CoV-2 [57]. CQ and HCQ decreased viral replication of SARS-CoV-2 in a concentration dependant manner. HCQ exhibits superior in-vitro anti-viral effect in comparison to CQ when the drug is added before viral challenge [58]. In-vitro synergistic effect of HCQ and azithromycin has been demonstrated in a recent study [59].

CQ has some activity in mice against human coronavirus OC43 [60]. Both CQ and HCQ reach up to 700 times higher level in lungs than in plasma [50]. According to pharmacology based pharmacokinetic modelling by Yao et al., simulated lung, blood and plasma concentration of CQ increased slowly after the first dose was given and was yet to achieve steady-state on Day 10. However, in HCQ, the concentration increased rapidly and reached a steady-state following the initial loading dose and subsequent maintenance dose [58].

Although in-vitro studies demonstrate the activity of CQ against SARS-CoV-2, this does not guarantee simultaneous in-vivo activity. For example, CQ was found to be effective in inhibiting replication of dengue, chikungunya and influenza in-vitro, but failed to show similar effects in in-vivo studies [60–62]. Preliminary reports from China in which 100 patients were given CQ showed early defervescence of fever and improvement in radiological findings. No serious adverse events were noted [63]. A French clinical trial of 36 PCR confirmed patients showed that virological clearance on Day 6 was significantly higher in HCQ arm compared to the control group (Table 1) [3]. In another study of 62 patients (31- standard treatment, 31- additional HCQ) with pneumonia associated with COVID-19 from China, additional HCQ for 5 days resulted in earlier remission of fever and cough [64]. Patients with severe/ critical illness were, however, excluded from the study. In a multicentric open labelled randomized controlled trial of 150 patients from China, there was no difference in virological conversion rate or improvement in clinical symptoms at day 10. However, the HCQ arm showed a better clinical response in posthoc analysis when the effect of
| Study                        | Number of patients | Type of study                                      | Patient population                                      | Study arms                   | Results                                                                 | Ref  |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| **Hydroxychloroquine**       |                    |                                                   |                                                          |                              | Virological clearance on Day 6–70% in HCQ vs 12.5% in controls (p = 0.001) | [3]  |
| Gautret et al., France       | 36                 | Single arm trial                                  | All positive cases                                       | HCQ-20, No HCQ-16            | Virological clearance on Day 6–70% in HCQ vs 12.5% in controls (p = 0.001) | [3]  |
| Tang et al., China           | 150                | Multi-centric open labelled randomized controlled trial | All positive cases                                       | 75-HCQ, 75-No HCQ            | No difference in virological conversion rate at day28 (p = 0.341). There was no difference in improvement in clinical symptoms at day 10. | [4]  |
| Mahevas et al., France       | 181                | Multi-centric retrospective study                 | All positive cases with pneumonia                        | 84-HCQ, 97-no HCQ            | No difference in worse clinical outcomes (transfer to ICU within 7 days and/or death) between the two arms (RR-0.93) | [5]  |
| Magagnoli et al., USA        | 368                | Retrospective case control study                  | All positive veterans                                    | HCQ-97, HCQ+ azithromycin-113, no HCQ-158 | Risk of death was found to be higher in those patients who received HCQ alone compared to no HCQ (p = 0.003) | [6]  |
| Lopinavir/ritonavir           |                    |                                                   |                                                          |                              |                                                                        |      |
| Cao et al., China            | 199                | Randomized open labelled trial                    | All positive patients with respiratory illness           | LPV/r-99, No LPV/r-100       | Did not show any decrease in time to clinical improvement, mortality or viral load after addition of LPV/r | [7]  |
| **Remdesivir**               |                    |                                                   |                                                          |                              |                                                                        |      |
| Gein et al., Multinational study | 53              | Multi-centric single-arm study                    | Patients with oxygen saturation of less than 94%        | No control arm               | Improvement in oxygen support class was demonstrated in 68% of the patients | [8]  |
| **Tocilizumab**              |                    |                                                   |                                                          |                              |                                                                        |      |
| Roumier et al., France       | 30                 | Case control study                                | Patients (< 80 years of age) with severe disease who were rapidly deteriorating | Controls matched for age and severity | Lesser ICU admission and requirement of mechanical ventilation when compared to controls (matched for age and severity) | [9]  |
| Name                  | Mechanism of action                                                                 | In-vitro studies | In-vivo studies |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
|                       | SARS | MERS | SARS-CoV-2 | Others | SARS | MERS | SARS-CoV-2 | Others |
| Alisporivir           | Cyclophilin mediated inhibition of viral replication                                | Completely blocked replication [10]. | No studies | No studies | HCoV-229E [11], hepatitis C [12], hepatitis B [13], flaviviruses [14] | Not effective in mouse model [10] | No animal model studies | No studies | Effective in HCV |
| Arbidol (Umifenovir)  | Intercalation into membrane lipids-inhibition of membrane fusion [15]               | In-vitro effectiveness | No studies | In-vitro effectiveness | Influenza, Hepatitis C, Flaviviruses [15] | No studies | No studies | Combined arbidol and LPV/r better than LPV/r alone [16] | Prophylaxis and treatment of influenza [15] |
| Auranofin             | Cellular oxidative stress and anti-inflammatory                                    | No studies | No studies | In-vitro effective | HIV | No studies | No studies | No studies | No studies | Dengue [21] |
| Dapsone               | Chelation of matrix metalloproteinase [19] Anti-inflammatory                        | No studies | No studies | In-vitro effective | Dengue, Chikungunya, Crimean Congo haemorrhagic fever, HIV | No studies | No studies | No studies | No studies |
| Isoprinosine or Inosine-pranobex | Immunomodulatory drug with antiviral activity [22, 23] | No studies | No studies | No studies | Influenza, parainfluenza virus, rhinovirus, adenovirus [22–25] | No studies | No studies | No studies | No studies | Animal and human studies-influenza [25–29] |
| Interferon            | Immunomodulatory action leading to antiviral state                                 | Potent antiviral effects seen [30, 31]. | Effective in inhibiting cytotoxic effects [32]. | No studies | Effective in inhibiting SARS related CoV [33] | Not effective [34]. | Animal model suggests benefit [35] but Clinical data does not [36, 37]. | No studies | No studies | Decreased severity of Coxsackie myocarditis [42] |
| Nitric oxide donor compounds* | Inhibits viral replication                                                        | No studies | No studies | No studies | Japanese encephalitis [39] and flaviviruses [40] | Inhaled NO improved arterial in patients with SARS [41] | No studies | No Studies | Decreased severity of Coxsackie myocarditis [42] |
| Oseltamivir           | Neuraminidase inhibitor                                                             | No studies | No studies | No studies | Influenza | No studies | No studies | No studies | No studies | Influenza |
| Teicoplanin           | Inhibits viral entry via inhibiting the enzymatic action of Cathepsin L [43]      | Blocks viral entry [43] | Blocks viral entry [45] | Blocks viral entry [44] | Ebola [43], HCV [45], Flaviviruses, Influenza, HIV [46–48] | No studies | No studies | No studies | No studies |

*Includes inhaled NO, S-Nitroso N acetyl penicillamine, Glycyrrhizin
other anti-antivirals was removed (Table 1) [4]. A small French study of 11 patients by Molina et al. failed to show beneficial effects (early clearance of virus) of combining HCQ and azithromycin in patients with COVID-19 [65]. In another multi-centric retrospective study of 181 patients with COVID pneumonia from France, there was no difference in worse clinical outcomes between the two arms (Table 1) [5]. In a quasi-randomized controlled trial by Barbosa et al., of the 63 recruited patients, 32 received HCQ while 31 received standard support. Higher respiratory support requirement was noted in the HCQ group after 5 days of therapy [66]. In a retrospective study on 368 veterans from the United States of America, risk of death was found to be higher in those patients who received HCQ alone compared to no HCQ. No difference in requirement of ventilation was found between HCQ and no HCQ group (Table 1) [6].

The dosing recommendation, according to modelling by Yao et al. recommends - Day 1–400 mg twice daily and day 2–5–200 mg twice daily [58]. However, the French group used a dosing regimen of 200 mg thrice daily for 10 days [3]. Drug-drug interactions and co-morbidities (pregnancy, chronic renal impairment) should be considered while defining the doses. Administration with food may be helpful as the bioavailability is increased with food. Although some experts are recommending routine use of CQ and HCQ as prophylaxis, there is no evidencing supporting this recommendation. CQ and HCQs have been successfully used for malarial prophylaxis, but similar results have not been observed for viral infections [61]. CQ has a narrow therapeutic window, but when appropriate dosing is used, it is relatively well tolerated. Compared to CQ, HCQs are better tolerated. Minor side effects include diarrhoea, nausea, vomiting and pruritus. Toxic doses may lead to life-threatening cardiomyopathy, macular retinopathy and neurotoxicity.

**Nitazoxanide**

Nitazoxanide is an oral anti-parasitic drug that is active against several protozoans, cestodes, helminths. It exerts its anti-parasitic activity by inhibiting pyruvate-ferreredoxin oxidoreductase (PFOR), an essential enzyme in anaerobic energy metabolism [67]. Recently, laboratory studies have suggested its role as a broad-spectrum antiviral agent [68]. In influenza, it inhibits the maturation of the viral hemagglutinin, whereas it interferes with viral morphogenesis in rotavirus [68]. It can also limit virus entry, viral release and cell-to-cell transmission. It can also interfere with host-regulated pathways and can inhibit/ suppress the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines, including IL-6 and TNF alpha [69, 70].

Nitazoxanide has been shown to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 in in-vitro studies [57, 71]. In an in-vivo study based on a mouse model, nitazoxanide was found to markedly lower plasma IL-6 levels [70]. In a clinical trial conducted by Gamino-Arroyo et al., nitazoxanide did not show any difference when compared to placebo in patients with influenza [72]. The same trial included 17 cases of coronavirus and did not show any effect of nitazoxanide on the outcome.

Although in-vitro studies indicate that there might be a potential role of nitazoxanide in management of COVID-19, there is no clear evidence that it might be useful in the clinical setting. It is generally well-tolerated, and side effects include gastrointestinal disturbances, transaminitis, elevated creatinine and enlarged salivary glands [67].

**Niclosamide**

Niclosamide is a chlorinated salicylamide used for the treatment of infection with trematodes [73]. It inhibits ATP production by uncoupling oxidative phosphorylation in the mitochondria of the parasite [74]. It is also known to have antiviral effects by blocking the endosomal acidification [73, 75]. Endosomal acidification is important for the fusion of the viral envelope protein with the host membrane [76–78].

Niclosamide inhibits replication of various viruses in-vitro including influenza, dengue, chikungunya virus, Ebola virus and Hepatitis C [75–77]. It also inhibits replication of SARS and MERS viruses [79, 80]. Niclosamide has not been evaluated yet for the treatment of viral infections (coronavirus) in animal models or clinical studies.

Niclosamide has potential activity against coronaviruses based on in vitro studies alone, but there is a lack of data for the efficacy of this drug on SARS-CoV-2. Use of niclosamide is associated with mild and infrequent side effects that include gastrointestinal disturbances, malaise, pruritus and lightheadedness.

**Ivermectin**

Ivermectin is a broad-spectrum anti-parasitic drug used commonly in the treatment of strongyloidiasis and onchocerciasis [81]. It acts by inhibiting nuclear transport activity. The in-vitro activity has been demonstrated against several viruses including HIV, dengue, West Nile virus and influenza. Recently, it has also been found to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 in cell cultures [82]. In-vivo studies for the use of ivermectin as an antiviral are scarce. In a clinical trial for the use of ivermectin in dengue, it reduced levels of NS1 antigen but had no impact on viral load and clinical outcomes [83]. It is a relatively safe drug with good tolerability [81].
Protease inhibitors

Lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r)

Lopinavir is a protease inhibitor used commonly for the treatment of HIV 1 infection. Ritonavir is used for boosting the lopinavir levels as a combination in sub-therapeutic doses for its inhibitory action on CYP3A4. In HIV, LPV inhibits the protease enzyme (aspartic protease family), thereby preventing the cleavage of Gag-Pol protein precursors. This results in the formation of immature and non-infectious virions. It is postulated that LPV has similar action on SARS-CoV-1 by inhibiting the chymotrypsin-like protease.

LPV/r has in-vitro activity against SARS-CoV-1 and MERS CoV [32, 84]. In another study, the addition of LPV/r to IFN B in MERS CoV infected cell lines did not enhance the activity of IFN B alone [85]. LPV/r was also found to have activity against Human coronavirus 229 E [32]. No in-vitro data on SARS-CoV-2 has been reported as of now. In humanized transgenic mice, LPV/r plus IFN B was not able to reduce the viral load of MERS CoV [85]. However, in non-human primate models (marmosets) infected with MERS CoV, LPV/r was able to reduce viral load and improve clinical progress [86]. In a study on health care workers exposed to MERS, lower rates of infection were noticed when they were given post-exposure prophylaxis of ribavirin and lopinavir/ritonavir for 14 days [87]. In patients of SARS-CoV-1 without ARDS, the addition of LPV/r to ribavirin and corticosteroids resulted in better clinical outcomes when compared to historical controls who received ribavirin and corticosteroids [84]. In a retrospective matched cohort study, LPV/r resulted in better clinical outcomes in patient with SARS [88]. Small case series have reported apparent benefit with LPV/r. Ten patients with COVID-19 were given sustained LPV/r with good outcomes [16]. In another study, 17 patients who received oral LPV/r alone, 52.9% of the patients showed clearance of viraemia on day 14 [16]. However, an open labelled trial of 199 COVID-19 patients did not show any decrease in time to clinical improvement, mortality or viral load after addition of LPV/r (Table 1) [7]. Although this trial failed to show any benefit of LPV/r, it can be argued that patients had already developed lung injury at the time of enrolment. The median time of enrolment in this study was 13 days [7]. It is postulated that since the viraemia is present in the early part of the illness and the lung involvement is a result of cytokine release and immune response, the drug may be effective when given in the early part of the illness. In the study by Chan et al. on patients with SARS-CoV-1, LPV/r was beneficial when given in the early part of illness but did not have any significant impact when it was given as a salvage or rescue [88].

A dose of 400/100 twice daily for up to 14 days has been tried in most studies. It has to be kept in mind that this drug has several drug-drug interactions and may require dose modification in pregnancy. No dose modification is required in patients with kidney disease or mild hepatic impairment. It is recommended to avoid LPV/r in patients with severe hepatic impairment (Child-Pugh C or Alanine transaminase >5X Upper limit of normal). Gastrointestinal side effects and hypertriglyceridemia are common in patients on LPV/r. Peripheral lipoatrophy and visceral adiposity are also noticed in patients on long-term LPV/r. Serious adverse events include pancreatitis, hepatotoxicity and QT prolongation.

Simeprevir and Paritaprevir

Simeprevir and paritaprevir are oral NS3/4A protease (chymotrypsin-like protease) inhibitors that are used for the treatment of chronic hepatitis C [89]. Chymotrypsin like protease is also present in SARS CoV-2, which is essential to cleave an 800-kDa polypeptide to generate various proteins [90]. There are no in-vitro or in-vivo studies available that have assessed the role of these drugs in coronavirus infections. However, molecular docking analysis studies indicate simeprevir and paritaprevir could fit well to the binding pocket of protease [90, 91]. The safety profile of both drugs is generally acceptable. Use of simeprevir is associated with hyperbilirubinemia [89].

Polymerase inhibitor

Remdesivir

Remdesivir is an adenosine analogue that binds to RNA-dependent RNA polymerase. It gets incorporated into nascent viral RNA chains resulting in its premature termination.

Replication inhibition has been demonstrated in a wide range of viruses in vitro and in vivo [57, 85, 92–97]. The therapeutic efficacy of remdesivir was first described in an animal model against Ebola. Subsequently, Dyer et al. described preliminary findings suggesting mortality benefit when remdesivir was given in the early stages of Ebola [94]. The drug has exhibited in vitro and in-vivo activity against SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV [85, 92, 96]. Wang et al. showed that the use of remdesivir is effective against SARS-CoV-2 in Vero E6 cell lines [57]. Case reports of success with remdesivir in patients with COVID-19 have been documented [98, 99]. In a recent multi-centric single-arm study by Grein et al., remdesivir was used in 53 patients of COVID-19, improvement in oxygen support class was demonstrated in 68% of the patients (Table 1) [8]. This drug has a long half-life and needs once-daily dosage. The trial by Grein et al. used dosing of 200 mg on day one, followed by 100 mg from day 2 to day 10 [8]. The most common side effects are transient gastrointestinal symptoms and transaminitis.
Favipiravir
Favipiravir is a promising antiviral drug which targets the viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase [100]. The drug gets converted to its active form by host enzymes and has exhibited considerable activity in influenza [100]. In a small clinical trial of COVID-19 patients, when compared to another potential drug arbidol, it showed a faster clinical recovery rate at day seven and more effectively reduced incidence of fever and cough [101]. In an open labelled trial of 70 patients in China, favipiravir had better viral clearance and improved lung imaging when compared to lopinavir/ritonavir [102]. The dosing used in the study was 1600 mg twice daily on the first day and 600 mg twice daily on day 2 to day 14. Side effects include raised serum uric acid levels, psychiatric symptoms and gastrointestinal disturbances [101].

Nucleoside analogues
Sofosbuvir is an oral nucleoside analogue (NS5B polymerase inhibitor) that is used for the treatment of Hepatitis C [103]. In vitro studies have shown its effectiveness in SARS CoV 1. Molecular docking studies have shown that sofosbuvir may be active against COVID-19 [103].

Galidesivir is another broad-spectrum antiviral drug that has exhibited efficacy against Ebola and yellow fever [104].

Ribavirin is used for the treatment of hepatitis C and viral hemorrhagic fevers. The in-vivo studies in SARS-CoV-1 and in-vitro studies in SARS-CoV-2 have not been encouraging. Besides, usual clinical dosing is associated with haematological toxicity.

Fusion inhibitors
Nafamostat mesylate and Camostat mesylate are drugs which are used to treat acute pancreatitis. These drugs act by effectively blocking the membrane fusion between the viral envelope and host cell plasma membrane. The in-vitro activity has been demonstrated for MERS-CoV [105]. Similarly, enfuvirtide and SC29EK are fusion inhibitors used for the treatment of HIV [106, 107]. These drugs have been suggested to have a possible role in SARS-CoV-2.

Monoclonal antibodies
Tocilizumab
Tocilizumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody that is used in several rheumatological conditions like rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis, Castleman’s disease, giant cell arteritis and cytokine release syndrome caused by CAR-T treatment [108]. Tocilizumab acts against the soluble and membrane-bound IL-6 receptors and inhibits the inflammatory action of IL-6 [108]. Pulmonary injury and ARDS has been postulated to be a result of hyper-inflammatory state in the latter half of the illness in COVID-19 due to increase in levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-6 [109, 110]. Similar studies from patients with influenza have shown that high IL-6 levels are associated with severity [111]. However, mice models show that IL-6 is also useful to prevent virus-induced neutrophil death and is a useful host response in early infection. Therefore, it is imperative to understand that molecules such as tocilizumab can only be used only in patients with severe disease when cytokine release syndrome is suspected as evidenced by an increased IL-6. There are no published reports of the use of tocilizumab in SARS and MERS. Preliminary case series have shown good outcomes with tocilizumab (400 mg) in 21 patients with severe or critical COVID-19. All the patients either improved (19/21) or were improving (2/21) at the time of reporting [112]. In another study of 30 patients, it was found that the use of tocilizumab was associated with lesser ICU admission and requirement of mechanical ventilation when compared to controls (Table 1) [9].

Tocilizumab is given as an intravenous infusion over 1 hour at a dose of 8 mg/kg in patients who weigh more than 30 kg (maximum dose- 800 mg). This can be repeated for three additional times, 8 hours apart. Adverse reactions include upper respiratory tract infections, headache and transaminitis [108]. In COVID-19 clinical studies, tocilizumab was shown to be safe except for a few reports of transaminitis [9].

Siltuximab
Siltuximab is another chimeric antibody that blocks the effect of IL-6 and is used for the treatment of multicentric Castleman’s disease. In a single-arm trial of 21 patients with COVID and ARDS from Italy, 33% of the patients improved, and 43% of the patients remained stable on treatment [113].

Meplazumab
The spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 binds to CD 147 of the host cell during entry. Meplazumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody that acts against CD147 and therefore has a potential role in the management of COVID-19. In a small open labelled trial from China (n = 28), use of intravenous meplazumab (n = 17) was associated with better virological (time to negativity) and clinical outcomes (lesser severity and earlier discharge) when compared to controls (n = 11) [114]. No adverse effects were reported with meplazumab.

Miscellaneous drugs
Several other drugs with anti-viral properties are being re-purposed for use in COVID-19. The details of the following drugs have been tabulated in Table 2: alisporivir,
arbidol, auranofin, doxycycline, isprinosine, interferon, nitric oxide compounds, oseltamivir and teicoplanin.

**Conclusion**

The data on these drugs are increasing every day. It is tempting to try these drugs in the name of safety or ease of availability. Some initial studies showed benefit with HCQ in early viral clearance. Subsequent studies failed to show such benefit. Lopinavir/ritonavir was shown to be ineffective when started late in patients with COVID pneumonia. However, their effectiveness in early COVID is debatable. Initial results of compassionate use of remdesivir are encouraging but the drug needs to be evaluated in well-designed randomized trials before it can be used routinely. Tocilizumab has been proposed for use in severe or life-threatening cases of cytokine release syndrome based on studies with very small sample size which have shown good results. Till the time, the data on these drugs come from well conducted clinical trials are available, judicious and well-informed use is the need of the hour.

**Acknowledgements**

None.

**Authors’ contributions**

RK, MS and NW conceived the idea. RK, NG, PK and AM were involved in literature review. RK, NG, PK and AM were involved in making th efirst draft of the manuscript. NG, MS and NW were involved in editing of the manuscript. NG was involved in making the figure. NG, RG and AK were involved in making the tables. MS is the overall guarantor of the manuscript. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Funding**

None.

**Availability of data and materials**

Not applicable.

**Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Not applicable.

**Consent for publication**

Not applicable.

**Competing interests**

None.

**Author details**

1. Department of Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi 110029, India. 2. Department of Infectious Diseases, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Karnataka 576104, India. 3. Dr Ram Manohar Lohia hospital & Post-Graduate Institute of Medical education and Research, New Delhi 110001, India.

**Received: 9 April 2020 Accepted: 8 May 2020**

**Published online: 20 May 2020**

**References**

1. Zhang X. Epidemiology of Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:382.
2. Bhimraj A, Morgan RL, Shumaker AH, Lavergne V, Baden L, Cheng VC, Edwards KM, Gandhi R, Muller WJ, O’Horo JC, Shoham S. Infectious diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.
3. Gautret P, Lagier J-C, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Mailhe M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2020;105949.
4. Tang W, Cao Z, Han M, Wang Z, Chen J, Sun W, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in patients with COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial. medRxiv. 2020;2020.04.10.20065588.
5. Mahesh M, Tran V-T, Roumier M, Chabrol A, Paule R, Guillaud C, et al. No evidence of clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 infection with oxygen requirement: results of a study using routinely collected data to emulate a target trial. medRxiv. 2020;2020.04.10.20066999.
6. Magagnoli J, Narendran S, Pereira F, Cummings T, Hardin JW, Sutton SS, et al. Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with Covid-19. medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20069920.
7. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, Liu W, Wang J, Fan G, et al. A trial of Lopinavir-ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(19):1787–99.
8. Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D, Diaz G, Asperges E, Castagna A, et al. Compassionate use of Remdesivir for patients with severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;0(0):null.
9. Roumier M, Paule R, Groh M, Valle J, Ackermann F. Interleukin-10 blockade in 24 patients treated with hydroxychloroquine for SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia: a retrospective cohort study. J Infect. 2020.
10. de Wilde AH, Falzarano D, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, Beugeling C, Fett C, Martellari C, et al. Alisporivir inhibits MERS- and SARS-coronavirus replication in cell culture, but not SARS-coronavirus infection in a mouse model. Virus Res. 2017;228:7–13.
11. de Wilde AH, Zevenhoven-Dobbe JC, van der Meer Y, Thiel V, Narayanan K, Makino S, et al. Cyclosporin A inhibits the replication of diverse coronaviruses. J Gen Virol. 2011;92(11):2542–8.
12. Watashi K, Iishi N, Hikjata M, Iroue D, Murata T, Miyani Y, et al. Cyclophilin B is a functional regulator of hepatitis C virus RNA polymerase. Mol Cell. 2005;19(1):111–22.
13. Phillips S, Chokshi S, Chatterji U, Bobardt M, Williams R, et al. Alisporivir inhibition of hepatocyte cyclophilins reduces HBV replication and hepatitis B surface antigen production. Gastroenterology. 2015;148(2):403–414.e7.
14. Qing M, Yang F, Zhang B, Zou G, Robida JM, Yuan Z, et al. Cyclosporine inhibits flavivirus replication through blocking the interaction between host Cyclophilins and viral NS5 protein. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2009;53(8):3226–35.
15. Haviernik J, Štefaník M, Fojtíková M, Kali S, Tordo N, Rudolf I, et al. Arobidol (Umifenovir): a broad-spectrum antiviral drug that inhibits medically important arthropod-borne flaviviruses. Viruses. 2018;10(4):184.
16. Deng L, Li C, Zeng Q, Liu X, Li X, Zhang H, Hong Z, Xia J. Arbidol combined with LPV/r versus LPV/r alone against Coronavirus Disease Virus: 2019 A retrospective cohort study. J Infect. 2020.
17. Roder C, Thomson MJ. Auranofin: repurposing an old drug for a Golden new age. Drugs R D. 2015;15(1):13–20.
18. Rothan H, Stone S, Natelkar J, Kumari P, Ataor K, Kumar M. The FDA-approved gold drug Auranofin inhibits novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) replication and attenuates inflammation in human cells. bioRxiv. 2020.
19. Sodhi M, Etmian M. Therapeutic Potential for Tetracyclines in the Treatment of COVID-19. Pharmacotherapy. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1002/phar.2395 [Epub ahead of print].
20. In vitro antiviral activity of doxycycline against SARS-CoV-2 – IHU. [cited 2020 Apr 23]. Available from: https://www.mediterranee-infection.com/in-vitro-antiviral-activity-of-doxycycline-against-sars-cov-2/.
21. Fredeking TM, Zavala-Castro JE, González-Martínez P, Moguel-Rodríguez W, Sanchez EC, Foster MJ, et al. Dengue patients treated with doxycycline showed lower mortality associated to a reduction in IL-6 and TNF levels. Recent Pat Antinfect Drug Discov. 2015;10(1):51–8.
22. Campbell-Richards DM, Sorkin EM, Heel RC. Isoniazid panobex. Drugs. 1986;32(5):383–424.
23. Silva J, Pantzarzi CN, Votava M. Isoniazid panobex: a key player in the game against a wide range of viral infections and non-infectious diseases. Adv Ther. 2019;36(8):1878–905.
24. Campo M, Chiavaro I, Petralia S, Bernardini A. In vitro lymphocyte sensitivity test to methisoprinol in different pathological conditions. J Immunopharmacol. 1982;4(1–2):109–26.
25. Muldoon RL, Mezly N, Jackson GG. Effect of isoprinosine against influenza and some other viruses causing respiratory diseases. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1972;23(3):224–8.

26. Pavlova EL, Simeonova LS, Gegova GA. Combined efficacy of oseltamivir, isoprinosine and elagic acid in influenza (A(H3N2)-infected mice). Biomed Pharmacother. 2018;108:29–35.

27. Longley S, Dunning RL, Waldman RH. Effect of isoprinosine against challenge with a (H3N2)/Hong Kong influenza virus in volunteers. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 1973;3(4):506–9.

28. Litzman J, Lokaj J, Krejčí M, Pešák S, Morgan G. Isoprinosine does not protect against frequent respiratory tract infections in childhood. Eur J Pediatr. 1999;158(1):122–7.

29. Beran J, Špalavá E, Spajdel M. Inosine pranobex is safe and effective for the treatment of subjects with confirmed acute respiratory viral infections: analysis and subgroup analysis from a phase 4, randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. BMC Infect Dis. 2016;16(1):648.

30. Cinatl J, Morgenstern B, Bauer G, Chandra P, Rabenei H, Doerr HW. Treatment of SARS with human interferons. Lancet. 2003;362(9380):293–4.

31. Tan ELC, Ooi EE, Lin C-Y, Tan HC, Ling AE, Lim B, et al. Inhibition of SARS-coronavirus infection in vitro by S-nitroso-N-acetylpenicillamine, a nitric oxide donor compound. Int J Infect Dis. 2004;8(4):223–6.

32. de Wilde AH, Raj VS, Oudshoorn D, Bestebroer TM, van Nieuwkoop S, alapová E, Špajdel M. Inosine pranobex is safe and effective for the treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus replication in cell culture. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014;58(8):4875–84.

33. Liu J, Cao R, Zhang L, Yang X, Liu J, Xu M, et al. Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro. Cell. 2020;203(1):269–71.

34. Gao J, Tian Z, Yang X. Breakthrough: chloroquine phosphate has shown evident efficacy in treating coronavirus infection in临床 trials of COVID-19 associated pneumonia in clinical studies. Biosci Trends. 2020;14(1):72–3.

35. Keyaerts E, Li S, Vigen L, Rysman E, Verbeek J, Van Ranst M, et al. Antiviral activity of chloroquine against human coronavirus OC43 expressing the luciferase reporter gene. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2016;60(9):492–503.

36. Keyaerts E, Li S, Vigen L, Rysman E, Verbeek J, Van Ranst M, et al. Antiviral activity of chloroquine against human coronavirus OC43 expressing the luciferase reporter gene. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2016;60(9):492–503.

37. Keyaerts E, Vijgen L, Maes P, Neyts J, Van Ranst M. In vitro inhibition of SARS coronavirus replication by arunincarboxylic acid. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2003;304(2):1199–203.

38. Keyaerts E, Vijgen L, Maes P, Neyts J, Van Ranst M. In vitro inhibition of SARS coronavirus replication by arunincarboxylic acid. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2003;304(2):1199–203.

39. Keyaerts E, Vijgen L, Maes P, Neyts J, Van Ranst M. In vitro inhibition of SARS coronavirus replication by arunincarboxylic acid. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2003;304(2):1199–203.

40. Keyaerts E, Vijgen L, Maes P, Neyts J, Van Ranst M. In vitro inhibition of SARS coronavirus replication by arunincarboxylic acid. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2003;304(2):1199–203.

41. Keyaerts E, Vijgen L, Maes P, Neyts J, Van Ranst M. In vitro inhibition of SARS coronavirus replication by arunincarboxylic acid. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2003;304(2):1199–203.
89. Izquierdo L, Helle F, François C, Castelain S, Duverlie G, Brochot E. 
75. Xu J, Shi PY, Li H, Zhou J. Broad spectrum antiviral agent niclosamide and 
93. Siegel D, Hui HC, Doerffler E, Clarke MO, Chun K, Zhang L, et al. Discovery 
92. Sheahan TP, Sims AC, Graham RL, Menachery VD, Gralinski LE, Case JB, Leist 
90. Alamri MA, Tahir ul Qamar M, Alqahtani SM. Pharmacoinformatics and 
88. Que TL, Wong VC, Yuen KY. Treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome 
2491. Post-exposure prophylaxis with lopinavir/ritonavir: a multicentre retrospective matched cohort study. J Infect Dis. 2015;212(12):1904–13. 
Park SY, Lee JS, Kim J, Joo EJ, Eom JS, Peck KR. 2049. Post-exposure prophylaxis with ribavirin plus Lopinavir/ritonavir for Middle East respiratory syndrome in healthcare workers. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2018;5(Suppl 1):S747–8. 
Que TL, Wong VC, Yuen KY. Treatment of severe acute respiratory syndrome with lopinavir/ritonavir: a multicentre retrospective matched cohort study. Hong Kong Med J. 2003;9(6):399–406. 
Izquierdo L, Helle F, François C, Castelain S, Duverlie G, Brochot E. Simprevir for the treatment of hepatitis C virus infection. Pharmacogenomics Pers Med. 2014;7:241–9. 
Alamri MA, Tahir ul Qamar M, Alqahtani SM. Pharmacoinformatics and molecular dynamic simulation studies reveal potential inhibitors of SARS-CoV-2 Main protease 3CLpro. Preprints. 2020;202002308. 
Hosseini FS, Amanlou M. Simprevir, potential candidate to repurpose for coronavirus infection: virtual screening and molecular docking study. Preprints. 2020;202002438. 
Sheahan TP, Sims AC, Graham RL, Menachery VD, Gralinski LE, Case JB, Leist SR, Pyrc K, Feng JY, Trancheva I, Bannister R. Broad-spectrum antiviral GS-5734 inhibits both epidemic and zoonotic coronaviruses. Sci Transl Med. 2017;9(396). 
Siegel D, Hui HC, Doeffler E, Clarke MO, Chun K, Zhang L, et al. Discovery and synthesis of a Phosphoramidate prodrug of a Pyrrolo[2,1-f][triazin-4-amino] adenine C-nucleoside (GS-5734) for the treatment of Ebola and emerging viruses. J Med Chem. 2017;60(5):1648–61. 
Dyer O. Two Ebola treatments halve deaths in trial in DRC outbreak. BMJ. 2019;366. 
Mulangu S, Dodd LE, Davey RT, Tshiani Mbaya O, Proschman M, Mukadi D, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of Ebola virus disease therapeutics. N Engl J Med. 2019;381(24):2293–303. 
Warenin TK, Jordan R, Lo MK, Ray AS, Mackman R, Soloveva V, et al. Therapeutic efficacy of the small molecule GS-5734 against Ebola virus in rhesus monkeys. Nature. 2016;531(7594):381–5. 
Gordon CJ, Tchesnokov EP, Feng JY, Porter DP, Gotte M. The antiviral compound remdesivir potently inhibits RNA-dependent RNA polymerase from Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. J Biol Chem. 2020;295(15):4773–9. 
Holdhue ML, DeBocht C, Lindquist S, Lohf KY, Wiesman J, Bruce H, et al. First Case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(10):929–36. 
Kujawski SA, Wong KK, Collins JP, Epstein L, Killerby ME, Midgley CM, et al. First 12 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. Public Global Health. 2020;14(3):2020032896. 
Goldhill DH, te Velthuis AJW, Fletcher RA, Langat P, Zamba M, Lackenby A, et al. The mechanism of resistance to favipiravir in influenza. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018;115(45):11613–8. 
Chen C, Huang J, Zheng C, Wu J, Chen S, Zhang Y, et al. Favipiravir versus Arbidol for COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. medRxiv. 2020;2020.03.17.20037432. 
Gai Q, Yang M, Liu D, Chen J, Shu D, Xia J, et al. Experimental treatment with Favipiravir for COVID-19: an open-label control study. Engineering. 2020;520598:8092020300631. 
Efikly AA. Anti-HCV, nucleotide inhibitors, repurposing against COVID-19. Life Sci. 2020;248117477. 
Taylor R, Kotian P, Warren T, Panchal R, Baviar J, Julerander J, et al. BCX4430 – a broad-spectrum antiviral adenosine nucleoside analog under development for the treatment of Ebola virus disease. J Infect Public Health. 2016;9(3):220–6. 
Yamamoto M, Matsuyama S, Li X, Kakaeda M, Kagawuchi Y, Inoue J, et al. Identification of Nafamostat as a potent inhibitor of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus S protein-mediated membrane fusion using the Split-protein-based cell-cell fusion assay. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2015;66(11):6532–3. 
Berkhout B, Eggink D, Sanders RW. Is there a future for antifungal fusion inhibitors? Curr Opin Virol. 2012;2(1):50–9. 
Anand K, Ziebuhr J, Wadhwani P, Mesters JR, Hilgenfeld R. Coronavirus Main proteinase (3CLpro) structure: basis for Design of Anti-SARS. Drugs. 2003;300:6. 
Scott LL. Tocilizumab: a review in rheumatoid arthritis. Drugs. 2017;77(17):1865–79. 
Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, Sanchez E, Tattersall RS, Manson JJ. COVID-19: consider cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. Lancet. 2020;395(10229):1033–4. 
Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, Jiang L, Song J. Clinical predictors of mortality due to COVID-19 based on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. Intensive Care Med. 2020;46(5):846–8. 
Teijaro JR. The role of cytokine responses during influenza virus pathogenesis and potential therapeutic options. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 2015;386:63–22. 
Xu X, Han M, Li T, Sun W, Wang D, Fu B, Zhou Y, Zheng X, Yang Y, Li X, Zhang X. Effective treatment of severe COVID-19 patients with tocilizumab. J Natl Acad Sci. 2020. 
Gritti G, Raimondo F, Ripamonti D, Riva L, Landi F, Alborgotti L, et al. Use of siltuximab in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia requiring ventilatory support. medRxiv. 2020;2020.04.01.20048561. 
Bian H, Zheng Z-H, Wei D, Zhang Z, Kang W-Z, Hao C-Q, et al. Mlaplazumab treats COVID-19 pneumonia: an open-labelled, concurrent controlled add-on clinical trial. medRxiv. 2020;2020.03.31.20046961. 

Publisher’s Note
Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.