

A Journal Club Article Review on the Study: Remdesivir in Adults with Severe COVID-19: A Randomised, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Multicentre Trial. Wang *et al.*, 2020

Ekpe, Godwin Polycarp¹, Arinola Joda², Akwaowoh Akpabio Elijah¹, Kehinde Ganiyu³, Chioma Igwe¹, Obo Okokon Ita⁴, Unyime I. Eshiet¹, Ekaette Orebisi⁵, Abatur Suleiyol Charity⁶, Amina B Mukhtar⁷, Ifiok Okon Udoubak⁸, Yonwul Jacqueline Dakyen⁹, Kingsley Nnamah¹⁰, John Ekpe¹¹, Victor C. Anagwu¹², Ogbonna Amara Peace¹³, Kufre Nyong Mkpese¹⁴, Uduak U. Iwok¹⁵, Edidiong Udofa¹⁶, Adekoya Omobolanle Fausat¹⁷, Inemesit Simon¹⁸

Abstract: *The study reported the results of the first of its kind placebo controlled randomised trial of Remdesivir in patients with severe COVID-19. The references used were recent and looked at other articles where Remdesivir was used whether in vivo or for compassionate use which gave some background to the study. In the above title study, the randomised controlled trials (RCTs) conceptual framework was carried out, that is; assigning patients equally to the two different treatment groups. This trials has unequal ratio as 2:1 and such unequal allocations need justification, but the rationale was not stated in this publication. Such a randomisation needs to overcome scientific and ethical problems and should always publicly declare why unequal randomisation was chosen which was not done in this study. The statistics are not simple to design and power correctly they are complex statistical concerns, and harder for non-experts to assess the statistical validity of the design. The study found that i.v. Remdesivir did not significantly improve the time to clinical improvement, mortality, or time to clearance of virus and adverse effects in patients with COVID-19 compared with placebo, though this outcomes may be affected by the unequal distribution of Comorbidities amongst the groups, gender disparity and limited Pharmacokinetics knowledge of Remdesivir in the severely ill COVID-19 patients. This study shows that Remdesivir in vivo has no clinical significance on the management of severely ill COVID-19 patients.*

Keywords: Comorbidities, COVID-19, Journal club, Randomised controlled trials, Remdesivir, Clinical improvement

1. Description of the Study

The Lancet is a weekly peer-reviewed general medical journal. It is among the world's oldest and best-known general medical journals first published in 1823. *The Lancet* is a world leading medical journal with a Journal Impact Factor of 59.102® (2018 Journal Citation Reports®, Clarivate Analytics 2019) and are currently ranked second out of 160 journals in the Medicine, General & Internal subject category. The study reported the results of the first of its kind a placebo controlled randomised trial of in patients with severe COVID-19. This trial was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT04257656.No. The research objectives were not stated anywhere in the article. The journal clearly stated that all authors who represented the 10 hospitals used in the study contributed to the conducting of the trial. Specific authors were involved in various aspects of data handling, analysis and manuscript writing.

2. Literature Review Evaluation

This paper provides the first peer reviewed, scrutable, multicentre, randomised trial of Remdesivir, and for patients with COVID-19 in hospital (but not necessarily intensive care), fails to demonstrate a clinically meaningful improvement. This is despite a plausible mechanism of action and in vitro evidence of its antiviral efficacy. news of its findings were largely eclipsed by the widely publicised, but as yet unpublished positive results of an interim safety analysis of the similarly designed, but larger, US National Institute of Health (NIH) funded

multicentre trial (Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial; ACTT), which were released to the press on the same day as this trial was published in the Lancet (29 April). The literature review for this study does take into account other drug trials in COVID-19 Management although some of those drug trials have been inconclusive so it needs an updated review although recent, more findings about COVID-19 are being churned out daily.

3. Conceptual Framework

The concept for this work was a randomized controlled trial which ensured that patients were randomly assigned to either a treatment group or a placebo group in order to assure that any documented effects in the treatment group are indeed due to the treatment and not to chance. An unequal randomization formula (2:1) was adopted probably to encourage more people to consent to the study because of the higher chance of being placed in a treatment group rather than the placebo group. (Brody, 2016; Tal, 2011). Appropriately, a statistician was employed to carry out the randomization which means both the participants and the researchers are not aware of the group a patient is placed in (double-blind study).

4. Sample and Sampling Methods

In Wang *et al.*'s trial, 237 hospitalised patients with PCR-confirmed COVID-19 at 10 sites in Wuhan, China, were randomly assigned in a 2:1 ratio to receive either Remdesivir 200mg intravenously on day 1 followed by 100mg IV daily on day 2-10, or placebo. (Wang *et al.*,

2020) Patients had symptom onset within 12 days, radiographic features of pneumonia, and an oxygen saturation of <94% on room air, or a P:F ratio of <300mmHg. Patients who were pregnant, or with liver dysfunction or severe renal impairment were excluded. Inclusion/exclusion criteria were specified. Patient's recruitment could not reach their target enrolment. The used population was less than the projected or anticipated population; hence the report could not be generalized due to the small size of population. (Wang *et al.*, 2020). Frequent use of corticosteroids in the patient group might have promoted viral reported prolongation of the detection of viral RNA, not infectious virus. There is no answer to whether longer treatment course and higher dose of Remdesivir would be beneficial in patients with severe COVID-19. This trial has unequal ratio as 2:1 and such unequal allocations need justification, but the rationale was not stated in this publication. (Dumville *et al.*, 2006).

5. Method and Design

The study setting was ten hospitals in Wuhan, Hubei, China where adults admitted to hospital with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) infection between February 06 and March 12, 2020 were recruited. All patients of child-bearing age were made to adopt effective contraceptive measures during and for ≥ 7 days after the last study drug administration. The design was a Investigator-initiated, individually randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial and the patients were randomly assigned (2:1) to: Remdesivir group (who received intravenous Remdesivir 200 mg on day 1 followed by 100 mg on days 2–10 in single daily infusions) and placebo group (who received 200 mg placebo infusion on day 1 followed by 100 mg on days 2–10). (Wang *et al.*, 2020). Randomisation was stratified according to level of respiratory support viz.: (1) no oxygen support or oxygen support with nasal duct or mask; or (2) high-flow oxygen, non-invasive ventilation, invasive ventilation, or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. The Outcomes measures were clinical endpoint i.e. time to clinical improvement within 28 days after randomization, then safety outcomes i.e. treatment-emergent adverse events, serious adverse events, and premature discontinuations of study drug (Wang *et al.*, 2020). The method and design was appropriate although allocating more patients to the arm with a high drop-out rate allowed greater power for a "per-protocol" analysis and will not interfere with an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.

6. Statistical Analysis

The selected statistical tests were appropriate for the data obtained and the study objectives. Comparative analysis between the Remdesivir and Placebo treatment groups did not show any statistically significant difference in time to clinical improvement. Thus, suggesting that the use of Remdesivir in patients with severe COVID-19 would not yield significant clinical benefits. For the same power a trial that is randomised 2:1 needs 12% more patients and a 3:1 randomisation scheme requires 33% more patients.

7. Results and Interpretations

The study found that i.v. Remdesivir did not significantly improve the time to clinical improvement, mortality, or time to clearance of virus and adverse effects in patients with COVID-19 compared with placebo, though this outcomes may be affected by the unequal distribution of Comorbidities (Cheng *et al.*, 2020) amongst the groups, gender disparity and limited Pharmacokinetics knowledge of Remdesivir in the severely ill COVID-19 patients (Jorgensen *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2020). The median age of participants was 65, and this age bracket predisposes to co-morbidities. When compared with a previous study (Grein *et al.*, 2020), the study population was less ill and was treated somewhat earlier in their disease course. This is contrary to Beigel *et al.*, 2020 preliminary results which concluded that Remdesivir was superior to placebo in shortening the time to recovery in severely ill adults hospitalized with COVID-19. The study could not reach their target enrolment because of the public health strategies put in place in China which resulted in fewer hospitalized patients by Mid-March. Thus, the sampled population was less than the projected or anticipated population which meant that the statistical power had to be reduced. The result is therefore, not generalizable due to the small size of the population.

8. Clinical Significance and Implications

Clinical researches are geared toward therapy fundamental to generate new knowledge and validate therapies. The evaluation of researches findings is crucial to clinical decision making and to help comply the principles of evidence based-practice. (Armijo-Olive, 2018; Armijo-Olive *et al.*, 2011). From the study, the results shows that the dose of Remdesivir was adequately tolerated by all the participants but the clinical outcomes in terms of improve time for clinical improvement, mortality, and clearance time for the virus, remdesivir did not show any significant advantage over the placebo.

9. Conclusion

The experimental drug-Remdesivir did not provide significant clinical or antiviral effects in seriously ill patients with COVID-19, nonetheless, clinically meaningful differences and numerical reductions in some clinical parameters cannot be excluded. The place of ongoing studies is encouraged to promote better understanding of the intervention effect in larger sample sizes of severely ill COVID-19 patients.

References

- Armijo-Olive S (2018) "The importance of determining the clinical significance of research results on physical therapy clinical research. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy*: 22 (3) 175-176. (Accessed June 7, 2020)
- Armijo-Olive S; Warren S; Fuentes J and Mages D (2011) "Clinical relevance vs. statistical significance: using neck outcomes in patients with TDM as example. *Man Ther.* 16 (6): 563-572. (Accessed June 7, 2020).

Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, et al. Remdesivir for the Treatment of COVID-19 - Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med.* May 22, 2020;10.1056/NEJMoa2007764. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2007764. (Accessed June 6, 2020)

Brody T. (2016): *Clinical Trials* 2nd ed. Elsevier (Accessed June 6, 2020)

Cheng, P., Zhu, H., Witteles, R.M. et al. (2020): Cardiovascular Risks in Patients with COVID-19: Potential Mechanisms and Areas of Uncertainty. *Curr Cardiol Rep* 22, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11886-020-01293-2> (Accessed June 6, 2020)

Dumville JC et al. (2006) *Contemporary Clinical*; 27: 1-12

Grein J, Ohmagari N, Shin D, Diaz G, Asperges E, Castagna A, et al. (2020): Compassionate use of Remdesivir for patients with severe COVID-19. *N Engl J Med.* <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2007016>. (Accessed June 6, 2020)

Jorgensen SC, Kebriaei R, Dresser LD. (2020): Remdesivir: Review of pharmacology, pre-clinical data and emerging clinical experience for COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 23]. *Pharmacotherapy*;10.1002/phar.2429. doi:10.1002/phar.2429. (Accessed June 6, 2020)

Tal J. (2011). *Strategy and Statistics in Clinical Trials*. Elsevier

Yeming Wang, Dingyu Zhang, Guanhua Du, Ronghui Du, Jianping Zhao, Yang Jin, Shouzhi Fu, Ling Gao, Zhenshun Cheng, Qiaofa Lu, Yi Hu, Guangwei Luo, Ke Wang, Yang Lu, Huadong Li *et al.* (2020). Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *The Lancet*; 395: 1569–78. Published Online April 29, 2020 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31022-9). (Accessed: 2nd June, 2020)

Authors Abbreviations

Ekpe, Godwin Polycarp-EGP¹, Arinola Joda-AJ², Akwaowoh Akpabio Elijah-AAE¹, Kehinde Ganiyu-KG³, Chioma Igwe-CI¹, Obo Okokon Ita-OOI⁴, Unyime I. Eshiet-UIE¹, Ekaette Orebiyi-EO⁵, Abatur Suleiyol Charity-ASC⁶, Amina B Mukhtar-ABM⁷, Ifiok Okon Udoubak-IOU⁸, Yonwul Jacqueline Dakyen-YJD⁹, Kingsley Nnamah-KN¹⁰, John Ekpe-JE¹¹, Victor C. Anagwu-VCA¹², Ogbonna Amara Peace-OAP¹³, Kufre Nyong Mkpese-KNM¹⁴, Uduak U. Iwok-UUI¹⁵, Edidiong Udofa-EU¹⁶, Adekoya Omobolanle Fausat-AOF¹⁷, Inemesit Simon-IS¹⁸

Affiliate Institutions

1. Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Biopharmacy, University of Uyo, Nigeria. Phone No: 08067144471, Email: polyekpe@yahoo.com
2. Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Biopharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Lagos, Idiaraba, Lagos. Phone No: 2348023073233, Email: arinolaj@gmail.com
3. Niger Delta Univeristy, Bayelsa State. Phone No: 07031380705. Email: pharmkenny@gmail.com
4. Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Technology, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Calabar, Calabar. Phone No: 08153129932, Email: obookokon@yahoo.com

5. Department of Pharmaceutical Services. University of Uyo Teaching Hospital in Uyo, Uyo. Phone: 08023291871. Email: eorebiyi@yahoo.com
6. Department of Pharmaceutical Services, Federal Medical Center, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. Phone No: 08035902741, Email: uadoopolycarpaba2@gmail.com
7. Department of pharmaceutical services, BarauDikko Teaching Hospital Kaduna (KASU).Phone No: 08033294315, 09018373574.Email:AminamukhtLKar23@gmail.com
8. Gratis Pharmacy Ltd, LAKwaIbom State. Email: Ifiokpharm@gmail.com. Phone no: 08067726247
9. National Primary Healthcare Development Agency, Plot 681/682, Port Harcourt crescent, off Gimbiya Street, Area 11. P.M.B 367, Garki Abuja, Phone No : 08035767181, Email : ydakyen@gmail.com
10. University of Portharcourt teaching hospital, Portharcourt, Rivers State.. Email: 8drkslyexcel@gmail.com. Phone no:08064130271
11. Department of Economics, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Enugu-Nigeria. Email: ekpe.john.pg87166@unn.edu.ng. Phone no: 08168287635.
12. I&M Department. Pharmacist Council of Nigeria-Head Office. Email: vchiemezie@yahoo.com. Phone no: 08036050413
13. Babcock University. Phone: 08134449278. Email: ogbonnaamarachukwu05@gmail.com
14. Drug Zone Pharmacy. Email: Kennyz.pharm16@gmail.com. Email: 0806877571
15. Akwalbom State Hospitals Management Board, Uyo, Akwalbom State. Email: uduakj2002@yahoo.co.uk. Phone no: 08033882720
16. Pharmaceutical Microbiology and Biotechnology/Public Health Pharmacist. Department of Pharmaceutical Microbiology/Biotechnology Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Uyo. Phone No: 08067435007. Email: edjudofa2710@gmail.com
17. University College Hospital Ibadan. Phone No: 08032292185. Email: omoboladekoya@yahoo.comeorebiyi@yahoo.com
18. General Hospital Oruko, Akwalbom State. Email: inemsimon01@gmail. Com. Phone no: 08038367020

Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally

Description of the Study: AJ/UII

Literature Evaluation: CI/KN/EU

Conceptual Framework: EO/JE/ABM

Sample and sampling methods: OAP/AOF/IS

Method and Design: KG/IOU

Analysis: UIE/YJD

Results and Interpretation: EGP/OOI/VCA

Clinical Significance: AAE/ASC/KNM

Abstract: EGP/AJ

For correspondence: Dr. E. G. Polycarp, Clinical Pharmacist and Global health expert, Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Biopharmacy, University of Uyo, Nigeria. Phone No: 08067144471, Email: polyekpe@yahoo.com