1 OBJECTIVE

The aim of this EUnetHTA Rolling Collaborative Review is

- to inform health policy at the national/regional and at the European level at an early stage in the life-cycle of therapies which interventions are currently undergoing clinical trials,
- to monitor (ongoing studies and their results) permanently - in the format of a Living Document - potential therapies against covid-19,
- to present comparative data on effectiveness and safety of potential therapies and
- to support preparations for an evidence-based purchasing of regional/ national health politicians, if necessary.

To avoid redundancies and duplication, the EUnetHTA Rolling Collaborative Review will reuse sources from international initiatives to collect information and data on Covid-19 treatments.

The scope of the Rolling Collaborative Review is of descriptive nature. These **EUnetHTA Rolling Collaborative Reviews are not meant to substitute a joint Relative Effectiveness Assessment (REA)** adhering to the agreed procedures and aiming at critical appraisal of the clinical evidence based on the Submission Dossier submitted by the (prospective) Marketing Authorization Holder (MAH).

2 METHODS

This Rolling Collaborative Review is prepared according to the project plan ("Rolling Collaborative Review (RCR) on Covid-19 treatments: Project description and planning", published on the EUnetHTA website) and will be updated monthly. Monthly updates are published on the EUnetHTA Covid-19 Website (https://www.eunethta.eu/covid-19-treatment/) and on the EUnetHTA Rolling Collaborative Review Sharepoint page each 15th of the month.

2.1 Scope

Table 2-1 Scope of the RCR

Description	Project Scope
Population	**Disease** • SARS-CoV-2 is a novel coronavirus causing a respiratory illness termed Covid-19. The full spectrum of Covid-19 ranges from mild, self-limiting respiratory tract illness to severe progressive pneumonia, multi-organ failure, and death. **ICD-Codes** (https://www.who.int/classifications/icd/covid19/en) • An emergency ICD-10 code of 'U07.1 COVID-19, virus identified' is assigned to a disease diagnosis of COVID-19 confirmed by laboratory testing. • An emergency ICD-10 code of 'U07.2 COVID-19, virus not identified' is assigned to a clinical or epidemiological diagnosis of COVID-19 where laboratory confirmation is inconclusive or not available. • Both U07.1 and U07.2 may be used for mortality coding as cause of death. See the International guidelines for certification and classification (coding) of COVID-19 as cause of death following the link below. • In ICD-11, the code for the confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19 is RA01.0 and the code for the clinical diagnosis (suspected or probable) of COVID-19 is RA01.1. **MeSH-terms** • COVID-19, Coronavirus Disease 2019 **Target population** (https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/overview/management-of-covid-19/)

	• Asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic Infection: Individuals who test positive for SARS-CoV-2 by virologic testing using a molecular diagnostic (e.g., polymerase chain reaction) or antigen test, but have no symptoms. • Mild Illness: Individuals who have any of the various signs and symptoms of COVID 19 (e.g., fever, cough, sore throat, malaise, headache, muscle pain) without shortness of breath, dyspnoea, or abnormal chest imaging. • Moderate Illness: Individuals who have evidence of lower respiratory disease by clinical assessment or imaging and a saturation of oxygen (SpO2) ≥94% on room air at sea level. • Severe Illness: Individuals who have respiratory frequency >30 breaths per minute, SpO2 <94% on room air at sea level, ratio of arterial partial pressure of oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen (PaO2/FiO2) <300 mmHg, or lung infiltrates >50%. • Critical Illness: Individuals who have respiratory failure, septic shock, and/or multiple organ dysfunction.
Intervention	[Intervention reviewed in the respective RCR]
Comparison	Any active treatment, placebo, or standard of care. **Rationale**: Since there is no gold standard treatment any comparator is acceptable as well as the above listed interventions.
Outcomes	Main outcome: • All-cause Mortality (Survival) Additional Outcomes: Efficacy: • Length of hospital stay, • Viral burden (2019-nCoV RT-PCR negativity), • Clinical progression (WHO Clinical Progression Scale measured daily over the course of the study), • Rates of hospitalization and of patients entering ICU, • Duration of mechanical ventilation, • Quality of life. Safety: • Adverse events (AE), • Severe adverse events (SAE), • Withdrawals due to AEs, • Most frequent AEs, • Most frequent SAEs. **Rationale:** We will give priority according to the Core Outcome Set for Clinical Trials on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7102592/pdf/main.pdfc) and a minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical research from the WHO Working Group on the Clinical Characterisation and Management of COVID-19 infection.
Study design	Efficacy: randomised controlled trials (RCT) Safety: observational studies (comparative or single-arm prospective studies and registries)

2.2 Sources of information

According to the project plan, this Rolling Collaborative Review is based on two main mandatory sources and one optional source of information, as described below:

1. Summary of findings(SoF) table for published RCTs related to effectiveness and safety:

This section is mandatory and is based on the living systematic review and Network Meta-Analysis (NMA) created by the partnering institute of DEPLazio: find the PROSPERO protocol here. DEPLazio provided until the 31st of May 2021 updates for the SoF table on a monthly basis to the EUnetHTA partners authoring the respective Rolling CR documents and who have integrated this information accordingly.

From June on the Authoring team has updated the SoF table monthly with the use of covid-nma.com. (COVID-NMA initiative: find the living review protocol here).

From June 2021, the literature search is used from COVID-NMA initiative according living review protocol, or is conducted by authors of this RCR in the following databases:

The literature search is conducted in the following databases:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), in the Cochrane Library
- MEDLINE, accessed via OVID
- Embase, accessed via OVID

Population	People affected by COVID-19, as defined by the authors of the studies. No limits in terms of gender or ethnicity.
	SARS-CoV-2 is a novel coronavirus causing a respiratory illness termed Covid-19. It started spreading in December 2019, and was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation on 11th March 2020. The full spectrum of Covid-19 ranges from mild, self-limiting respiratory tract illness to severe progressive pneumonia, multi-organ failure, and death.
Intervention	Interventions for the treatment of people affected by COVID-19, including pharmacological interventions (e.g. antibiotics, antibodies, antimalarial, antiviral, antiretroviral, immune-suppressors/modulators, kinase inhibitors) and their combinations.
Comparison	Any active treatment, placebo, or standard of care.
Outcomes	All-cause mortality
	Additional outcomes: Length of hospital stay, 2019-nCoV RT-PCR negativity, PaO2/FiO2, Duration of mechanical ventilation, radiological imaging, Adverse events, Severe adverse events.
Study design	Randomised controlled trials (RCT); no restriction on language of publication

To identify preprints of preliminary reports of work that have not been peer-reviewed, the following sources are searched:

- medRxiv Health Sciences
- bioRxiv Biology

In addition to the sources and strategies described above, registers of ongoing studies are screened. Key conferences and conference proceedings are considered.

Data extraction, Risk of bias assessment, data synthesis:

The search results are screened, full texts of studies are assessed and study characteristics and outcome data are extracted according to pre-defined criteria.

Risk of bias is assessed using the criteria outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [1] or reused from one living SR/MA source [2]. Each study was presented with the Cochrane Risk of bias 2 (RoB 2) tool for RCTs [3].

Dichotomous outcomes are analysed by calculating the relative risk (RR) for each trial with the uncertainty in each result being expressed by its 95% confidence interval (CI).Continuous outcomes are analysed by calculating the mean difference (MD) with the relative 95% CI when the study used the same instruments for assessing the outcome.

The standardised mean difference (SMD) is applied when studies used different instruments. Pairwise meta-analyses is performed for primary and secondary outcomes using a random-effects model in RevMan for every treatment comparison [4]. Network meta-analysis (NMA) is performed for the primary outcome. For rating the certainty of the evidence, the GRADE approach is being used [5].

From June 2021, if new RCTs are published, certainty of evidence have been reused from already published living systematic reviews/meta-analysis (SRs/MA) source from the international COVID-NMA initiative.

- Sources: http://deplazio.net/farmacicovid/index.html or https://covid-nma.com/ for SoF

2. Table(s) on published (peer reviewed) observational studies for safety results:

This section is optional. Therefore this section will be excluded and a rationale will be provided if the Authoring team does not include observational studies in the RCR.

The literature search is conducted on a monthly basis using the following sources:

- https://www.fhi.no/en/qk/systematic-reviews-hta/map/

Population	See project Scope
Intervention	[Intervention reviewed in the respective RCR]
Comparison	Any active treatment, placebo, or standard of care.
Outcomes	See project Scope
Study design	Inclusion criteria: Prospective non-randomised controlled trials, prospective case series (i.e. comparative or single-arm prospective studies), registries
	Exclusion criteria: retrospective studies, case studies/ case reports, observational studies that do not report safety data

Two researchers from NIPHNO carry out title and abstract screening and assess the full texts of all potentially eligible studies.
One researcher of the authoring team extracts the data and assesses the risk of bias using Robins-I (https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-25).

Results are presented in tabular form for all included studies.

3. Table(s) on ongoing trials:

This section is mandatory and the following clinical trial registries are searched on a monthly basis:

- ClinicalTrials.gov: https://clinicaltrials.gov/
- ISRCTN: https://www.isrctn.com/
- European Clinical Trials Registry: https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/

Inclusion criteria: Randomised controlled trials, Controlled trials

One researcher of the authoring team is searching and extracting the data for the eligible studies. At the drafting stage of each update, the author team verifies whether the status of previously identified studies has changed. This is done by verifying the date of the last update posted in the trial registers. In addition, trial register IDs of all previously identified studies are entered in both PubMed and

Google (google.com) to verify if previously identified studies have been published since the last update. In Google, the first 10 hits are screened for this purpose.

Data are presented in tabular form.

3 REFERENCES

1. Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.0 (updated July 2019): Cochrane; 2019. Available from: http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

2. Boutron I., Chaimani A., Devane D., Meerpohl J. J., Rada G., Hróbjartsson A., et al. Interventions for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19: a living mapping of research and living network meta-analysis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2020(11).

3. Sterne J. A. C., Savović J, Page M. J., Elbers R. G., Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. Bmj. 2019;366:l4898.

4. DerSimonian R LN. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Controlled Clinical Trials 1986;7:177-88.

5. Balshem H HM, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Meerpohl J, Norris S, Guyatt GH. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 2011;64:401-6.