

Supplementary Material*

Qaseem A, Yost J, Etxeandia-Ikobaltzeta I, et al; Scientific Medical Policy Committee of the American College of Physicians. Update alert 2: should remdesivir be used for the treatment of patients with COVID-19? Rapid, living practice points from the American College of Physicians (version 2). Ann Intern Med. 5 October 2021. [Epub ahead of print]. doi:10.7326/L21-0607

Table of Contents

- Key Questions
- Practice Points Development Process
- Supplement Table 1: Evidence Gaps
- Supplement Table 2: Clinical Considerations
- Supplement Figure: Updated Evidence Description for Studies
- Supplement Table 3: Updated Evidence Summary
- Supplement Table 4: Thresholds for Determining Magnitude of Effect

^{*} This supplementary material was provided by the authors to give readers further details on their article. The material was reviewed but not copyedited.

Key Questions

Key Question 1. What are the effectiveness and harms of remdesivir in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)?

Key Question 2. Do effectiveness and harms in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 vary by symptom duration, disease severity, and treatment duration?

Development Process for Living Practice Points Based on a Rapid Evidence Review

For details on the development process of living practice points based on a rapid evidence review, please see the ACP's recently published methods paper (1).

Supplement Table 1: Evidence Gaps



Evidence Gaps

- Additional studies are needed to assess the optimal treatment duration with remdesivir (i.e., 5-d vs. 10-d course) and to determine if there is variation in the optimal duration of treatment with remdesivir across different subgroups of patients.
- Additional studies are needed to assess if the effectiveness of remdesivir treatment for COVID-19 varies by severity (e.g., respiratory support requirements) of COVID-19.
- There is a need for studies assessing whether remdesivir treatment outcomes vary by symptom duration in patients with COVID-19.
- Studies are needed to determine the effectiveness of extending an initial 5-d course of remdesivir to 10-d and to identify subpopulations of patients with COVID-19 who may benefit from longer treatment.
- Future studies should consider evaluating additional critical and important clinical outcomes, such as respiratory failure or duration of invasive ventilation.

COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019.

Supplement Table 2: Clinical Considerations



Clinical Considerations

- *UPDATED+:* Remdesivir should only be administered by IV infusion in a hospital or healthcare setting capable of providing care similar to an inpatient hospital setting (2).
- 5-d course in adults is 200 mg IV on day 1 followed by 100 mg/d for a total of 5 d (5 doses).
- 10-d course in adults is 200 mg IV on day 1 followed by 100 mg/d for a total of 10 d (10 doses).
- The practice points do not apply to pregnant women or patients with severe hepatic dysfunction because they were excluded from the studies included in the evidence review.
- The decision to initiate treatment with remdesivir in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 should be based on clinical judgment; remdesivir should not necessarily be initiated in patients hospitalized for a primary diagnosis unrelated to COVID-19 who have incidentally tested positive for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

- For hospitalized patients with COVID-19 whose condition worsens within a 5-d course to require oxygen but not invasive ventilation extending the use of remdesivir should be based on clinical judgment and the balance of benefits and harms, because current evidence is insufficient to determine whether treatment beyond 5 d improves mortality among patients who are receiving noninvasive ventilation or supplemental oxygen or who are breathing ambient air* (3).
- The effectiveness of a 10-d course of remdesivir in reducing mortality (4) and time to recovery (5) may not vary by age, sex, or race in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.
- There was not enough information to determine what other treatment interventions, including experimental or off-label medications, were given in the trials.
- UPDATED+: It is recommended that clinicians monitor kidney and hepatic function at baseline and during remdesivir treatment. Use is not recommended in patients with an estimated glomerular filtration rate <30 mL/min and discontinuation should be considered if alanine aminotransferase levels (ALT) increase to >10 times the upper limit of normal or should be discontinued if alanine aminotransferase elevation is accompanied by signs or symptoms of liver inflammation (2).
- *UPDATED+:* Common adverse events include nausea and serious adverse effects include cardiac arrest, hypersensitivity and other infusion reactions (including infusion-related and anaphylactic reactions), increased serum alanine aminotransferase levels, increased aspartate aminotransferase levels, and hepatoxicity (2).

COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; IV = intravenous; VA = U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. *Invasive ventilation is administering supplemental oxygen with positive pressure to the lungs via an endotracheal or tracheostomy tube. Non-invasive ventilation is administering supplemental oxygen with positive pressure to the lungs to deliver a fixed amount of oxygen, independent of the patient's breathing pattern [e.g. continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), bi-level positive airway pressure (BIPAP), or high-flow oxygen]. Supplemental oxygen is administering oxygen without positive pressure to the lungs [e.g. low-flow nasal cannula, simple face mask].

[†] Minor modifications to reflect the new information since the last practice points update alert was published (2).

Supplement Figure: Updated Evidence Description*

7 studies (7 RCTs) [1 new study]

7 RCTs (3-9)

Interventions

Remdesivir (5-day course) 200 mg on Day 1 followed by 100 mg on Days 2–5 (3, 6, 7)

Remdesivir (10-day course) 200 mg on Day 1 followed by 100 mg on Days 2 to 10 (4, 5, 7, 9) or for up to 10 days or until hospital discharge (8) Countries

Multinational: 4 studies (including sites in Africa, Asia, Central America, Europe, Middle East, North America, South America) (3-5, 7)

China: 1 study (8)

India: 1 study (6)

Norway: 1 study (9)

7,879 Participants

COVID-19 positive

hospitalized

approximately 63% male, 37% female

Risk of Bias of Individual Studies†

Low (4, 5, 7, 8)

Moderate (3)

High (6)

RCT: randomized controlled trial.

^{*}Evidence search and assessment conducted by the Veterans Administration (VA) Evidence Synthesis Program, Minneapolis, Minnesota (10). Updated search for evidence updated through August 9, 2021 aimed to identify RCTs evaluating remdesivir for treatment of individuals with COVID-19.

^{†1} sub-study (9) not rated for risk of bias because it is a sub-analysis of a primary study (4) that was already included in the evaluation of evidence in the last major update of the practice points.

Supplement Table 3: Updated Evidence Summary for the Use of Remdesivir as Treatment for Patients With COVID-19: What Information Does the Evidence Provide?

What has changed in the evidence since the last version?

- No changes
 - 10-day course vs. standard of care: 1 new publication was identified (9). Because the new publication was not
 sufficiently powered to evaluate clinical outcomes of interest and is a sub-analysis of a primary study (4) that was
 already included in the evaluation of evidence, the results from the new publication are not incorporated into
 existing findings reflected in the table below.

Outcome	Study Design (Patients, n): Quality*	Evidence	Certainty of Evidence [†]
All-cause mortality			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	2 RCTs (461): 1 RCT good quality (7); 1 RCT poor quality (6)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may slightly reduce mortality compared with standard care (6, 7)	Low
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	4 RCTs (7142): 4 RCTs good quality (4, 5, 7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) probably does not reduce mortality compared with placebo/standard care (4, 5, 7, 8) Note: The effect of remdesivir (10-d course vs. placebo/standard care) may vary by baseline respiratory support requirements (4, 5, 7, 8). A 5-d course may not reduce mortality in patients not requiring supplemental oxygen at baseline, may result in a small reduction in mortality in patients requiring supplemental oxygen but not ventilation (non-invasive or invasive) at baseline, and may result in a modest increase in mortality in patients requiring ventilation (non-invasive or	Moderate
		invasive)/ECMO at baseline. Note: The effect of remdesivir (10-d course vs. placebo) may not vary by symptom duration (\leq 10 vs. >10 d) § (8).	
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may slightly reduce mortality compared with a 10-d course (3, 7) Note: The evidence is very uncertain about the effect of remdesivir (5-d course) in patients who progress to requiring invasive ventilation/ECMO at day 5 (3): A 5-d course vs. a 10-d course may result in a large increase in mortality for patients who progressed to requiring invasive ventilation/ECMO at day 5, and there may not be a reduction in mortality for patients who were receiving non-invasive positive-pressure ventilation or high- or low-flow oxygen or who were breathing ambient air at day 5 (insufficient certainty of evidence).	Low

Recovery			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may result in a modest increase in the proportion of patients who recovered compared with standard care (7)	Low
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	3 RCTs (1682): 3 RCTs good quality (5, 7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) probably results in a modest increase in the proportion of patients who recovered compared with placebo/standard care (5, 7, 8)	Moderate
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may result in a modest increase in the proportion of patients who recovered compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low
Hospital length of stay¶			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	NA	No evidence	NA
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	2 RCTs (1299): 2 RCTs good quality (5, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may result in a modest reduction in hospital length of stay compared with placebo (5, 8)	Low
5-d vs. 10-d course	NA	No evidence	NA
Serious adverse events**			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may slightly reduce serious adverse events compared with standard care (7)	Low
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	3 RCTs (1674): 3 RCTs good quality (5, 7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) probably results in a modest reduction in serious adverse events compared with placebo/standard care (5, 7, 8)	Moderate
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may result in a modest reduction in serious adverse events compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low
		Note: The effect of remdesivir 5-d course compared with a 10-d course may vary by baseline respiratory support requirements ^{‡§} (3, 7): There may be a large reduction in severe adverse events for patients hospitalized with reduced oxygen levels who did not require invasive ventilation at baseline (3), but there may not be a reduction in severe adverse events in patients without reduced oxygen levels on room air (7).	
Time to recovery			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may slightly reduce time to recovery compared with standard care (7)	Low

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT: ACP Living, Rapid Practice Points on the Use of Remdesivir

10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	2 RCTs (1455): 2 RCTs good quality (5, 7)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may result in a large reduction in time to recovery compared with placebo (5), but the effect is uncertain for remdesivir (10-d course) compared with standard care (7) Note: The effect of remdesivir (10-d course) may not vary by symptom duration or baseline respiratory support requirements§ (5).	Low
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may slightly reduce time to recovery compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low
Clinical improvement ^{††}			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may result in a modest increase in clinical improvement compared with standard care (7)	Low
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	2 RCTs (629): 2 RCTs good quality (7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may result in a modest increase in clinical improvement compared with placebo/standard care (7, 8)	Low
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may result in a modest increase in clinical improvement compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low
Time to clinical improven	nent††		
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	NA	No evidence	NA
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (237): 1 RCT good quality (8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may result in a modest reduction in time to clinical improvement compared with placebo (8) Note: The effect of remdesivir (10-d course) may not vary by symptom duration (≤10 vs. placebo) [§] (8).	Low
5-d vs. 10-d course	NA	No evidence	NA
Invasive ventilation/ECM	O [‡]		
		December in /C al course) were slightly reduce	Law
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may slightly reduce the proportion of patients on invasive ventilation/ECMO [‡] at follow-up compared with standard care (7)	Low
	1 RCT (70): 1 RCT poor quality (6)	Very uncertain about the effect of remdesivir (5-d course) on the new need for invasive ventilation [‡] compared to standard care (6)	Insufficient
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	3 RCTs (1686): 3 RCTs good quality (5, 7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may slightly reduce the proportion of patients on invasive ventilation/ECMO [‡] at follow-up compared with placebo/standard care (5, 7, 8)	Low

5-d vs. 10-d course	1 RCT (4964): 1 RCT good quality (4)	Remdesivir (10-d course) probably does not reduce the proportion of patients with a new need for ventilation (non-invasive or invasive) or ECMO) [‡] in those not ventilated at baseline compared with standard care (4)	Moderate
5-a vs. 10-a course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may slightly reduce the proportion of patients on invasive ventilation/ECMO [‡] at follow-up compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low
		Note: The effect of a 5-d course of remdesivir compared with a 10-d course may vary by baseline respiratory support requirements ^{‡§} (3, 7): There may be a modest reduction in the proportion of patients on invasive ventilation/ECMO among patients hospitalized with reduced oxygen levels who did not require invasive ventilation at baseline (3) but there may not be a reduction in the proportion of patients on invasive ventilation/ECMO among patients without reduced oxygen levels on room air at baseline (3, 7).	
Any adverse events			
5-d course vs. placebo/standard care	1 RCT (391): 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir (5-d course) may slightly increase any adverse events compared with standard care (7)	Low
10-d course vs. placebo/standard care	3 RCTs (1674): 3 RCTs good quality (5, 7, 8)	Remdesivir (10-d course) may not reduce any adverse events compared with placebo/standard care (5, 7, 8)	Low
5-d vs. 10-d course	2 RCTs (781): 1 RCT fair quality (3); 1 RCT good quality (7)	Remdesivir 5-d course may modestly reduce any adverse events compared with a 10-d course (3, 7)	Low

COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; NA = not applicable; RCT = randomized controlled trial.

§ The certainty of evidence was not assessed for this comparison determined from a subgroup analysis.

^{*} Good quality: methodologically sound study with low risk of bias. Fair quality: methodologically questionable study with moderate risk of bias. Poor quality: methodologically flawed study with a high risk of bias.

[†] Insufficient certainty of evidence: confidence is inadequate to assess the likelihood of benefit (benefit minus harm) of an intervention or its effect on a health outcome. Low certainty of evidence: confidence in the effect is limited because the true effect may be substantially different from the estimated effect. Moderate certainty of evidence: confidence in the effect is moderate because the true effect is likely close to the estimated effect, but there is a sizable possibility that it is substantially different. High certainty of evidence: confidence that the true effect is close to the estimated effect.

[‡] Invasive ventilation is administering supplemental oxygen with positive pressure to the lungs via an endotracheal or tracheostomy tube. Non-invasive ventilation is administering supplemental oxygen with positive pressure to the lungs to deliver a fixed amount of oxygen, independent of the patient's breathing pattern [e.g. continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), bilevel positive airway pressure (BIPAP), or high-flow oxygen]. Supplemental oxygen is administering oxygen without positive pressure to the lungs [e.g. low-flow nasal cannula, simple face mask].

^{||} Recovery was defined as discharge from the hospital or hospitalization for infection control purposes only in 1 RCT (5) and as discharge from the hospital or hospitalized but not requiring supplemental oxygen or ongoing medical care in 3 RCTs (7, 8).

[¶] Remdesivir (5-d and 10-d courses) may not decrease the percentage of persons hospitalized between days 11 and 14 (11, 12).

^{**} Serious adverse events reported in studies included in the evidence review (3, 5, 7, 8) were acute coronary syndrome, acute kidney injury, acute respiratory distress syndrome, acute respiratory failure, increased aminotransferase levels, atrial

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT: ACP Living, Rapid Practice Points on the Use of Remdesivir

fibrillation, bronchitis, cardiac arrest, cardiopulmonary failure, increased D-dimer level, deep venous thrombosis, diabetic ketoacidosis, dyspnea, endotracheal intubation, decreased glomerular filtration rate, hemorrhage of the lower digestive tract, hypotension, hypoxia, ileus, lung abscess, mechanical ventilation, multiple organ dysfunction syndrome, respiratory distress, respiratory failure, pneumothorax, pulmonary embolism, pulmonary failure, recurrence of COVID-19, septic shock, sepsis, shock, tachycardia, thrombocytopenia, and viral pneumonia. *Any adverse events* reported in the studies included in the evidence review (3, 5, 7, 8) were acute kidney injury, acute respiratory failure, increased alanine aminotransferase level, anemia, increased aspartate aminotransferase level, increased blood glucose level, increased blood lipid levels, increased blood urea nitrogen level, constipation, hyperlipidemia, hypoalbuminemia, hypokalemia, hypotension, insomnia, nausea, increased neutrophil count, rash, respiratory failure, increased serum potassium level, reduced serum sodium level, thrombocytopenia, increased total bilirubin level, vomiting, and increased leukocyte count. 1 study included in the review stated that remdesivir did not reduce the frequency of nausea, vomiting, and increase in liver enzymes or creatinine (6) and any adverse events were not identified in 1 study included in the evidence review (4).

††Clinical improvement was defined as a 2-point reduction in patients' admission status on a 6-point ordinal scale (1 = live discharge to 6 = death) or live discharge from the hospital (whichever came first) in 1 study (8) and as an improvement of at least 2 points from baseline on a 7-point ordinal scale (1 = death to 7 = discharged from hospital) in 2 studies (3, 7).

Supplement Table 4: Thresholds for Determining Magnitude of Effect*

Outcome	Little/No Effect	Small Effect†	Modest Effect‡	Large Effect§
Critical outcomes				
All-cause mortality, %	<1	1 to 2.9	3 to 4.9	≥5
Recovery, %	<2	2 to 4.9	5 to 9.9	≥10
Length of stay, d	<1	≥1 to 2	>2 to <3	≥3
Severe adverse event, %	<1	1 to 4.9	5 to 9.9	≥10
Important outcomes				
Time to recovery, d	<1	≥1 to 2	>2 to <3	≥3
Clinical improvement, %	<2	2 to 4.9	5 to 9.9	≥10
Time to clinical improvement, d	<1	≥1 to 2	>2 to <3	≥3
Invasive ventilation or ECMO, %	<1	1 to 4.9	5 to 9.9	≥10
Any adverse event, %	<2	2 to 4.9	5 to 19.9	≥20

ECMO = extracorporeal membrane oxygenation.

^{*} Measured as absolute risk difference (when not otherwise specified).

[†] Described as "slight increase or decrease."

[‡] Described as "modest increase or decrease."

[§] Described as "large increase or decrease."

References

- Qaseem A, Yost J, Forciea MA. The development of living, rapid practice points: summary of methods from the Scientific Medical Policy Committee of the American College of Physicians. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2021;174(0):1126-32. [PMID: 34029483] doi:10.7326/m20-7641 %m 34029483
- DynaMed [Internet] IMEIS. Record No. T1591991469608, Remdesivir. 2021. Accessed at https://www.dynamed.com/topics/dmp~AN~T1591991469608 on 14 September 2021. Registration and login required.
- 3. Goldman JD, Lye DCB, Hui DS, Marks KM, Bruno R, Montejano R, et al. Remdesivir for 5 or 10 days in patients with severe COVID-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(19):1827-37. [PMID: 32459919] doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2015301
- 4. Pan H, Peto R, Henao-Restrepo AM, et al; WHO Solidarity Trial Consortium. Repurposed antiviral drugs for COVID-19—interim WHO SOLIDARITY trial results. N Engl J Med. 2021;384:497-511. [PMID: 33264556] doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2023184
- 5. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, et al. Remdesivir for the treatment of Covid-19 final report. N Engl J Med. 2020; 383:1813-1826. [PMID: 32445440] doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2007764
- 6. Mahajan L, Singh AP, Gifty. Clinical outcomes of using remdesivir in patients with moderate to severe COVID-19: A prospective randomised study. Indian J Anaesth. 2021;65(Suppl 1):S41-S46. [PMID: 33814589] doi:10.4103/ija.IJA 149 21
- 7. Spinner CD, Gottlieb RL, Criner GJ, Arribas López JR, Cattelan AM, Soriano Viladomiu A, et al. Effect of remdesivir vs standard care on clinical status at 11 days in patients with moderate COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2020;324(11):1048-1057. [PMID: 32821939] doi:10.1001/jama.2020.16349
- 8. Wang Y, Zhang D, Du G, Du R, Zhao J, Jin Y, et al. Remdesivir in adults with severe COVID-19: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. Lancet. 2020;395(10236):1569-78.
- 9. Barratt-Due A, Olsen IC, Nezvalova-Henriksen K, et al. NOR-Solidarity trial. Evaluation of the effects of remdesivir and hydroxychloroquine on viral clearance in COVID-19: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med. 2021;174:1261-1269. [PMID: 34251903] doi:10.7326/M21-0653
- 10. Kaka AS, MacDonald R, Linskens EJ, et al. Update alert 2: remdesivir for adults with COVID-19. Ann Intern Med. 5 October 2021. [Epub ahead of print]. doi:10.7326/L21-0600
- 11. Wilt TJ, Kaka AS, MacDonald R, al et. Rapid Response: COVID-19: Remdesivir for hospitalized adults. Washington, DC: Evidence Synthesis Program, Health Services Research and Development Service, Office of Research and Development, Department of Veterans Affairs; 2020. VA ESP Project #09-009.
- 12. Wilt TJ, Kaka AS, MacDonald R, et al. Remdesivir for adults with COVID-19: a living systematic review for American College of Physicians Practice Points. Ann Intern Med. 2021;174:209-20. [PMID: 33017170] doi:10.7326/M20-5752