

Kent Academic Repository

van der Togt, Vicky, Mcfarland, Sammie, Esperti, Marta, Semper, Elizabeth, Citrenbaum, Sara and Rossman, Jeremy S. (2021) *Promotion of non-evidence-based therapeutics within patient-led Long COVID support groups*. Nature Medicine, 27 (12). pp. 2068-2069. ISSN 1078-8956.

Downloaded from <u>https://kar.kent.ac.uk/101354/</u> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01589-y

This document version Publisher pdf

DOI for this version

Licence for this version UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title* of *Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact <u>ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk</u>. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our <u>Take Down policy</u> (available from <u>https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies</u>).

of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. ⁵Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), London, UK. ⁶Patient partner, Toronto, Canada. ⁷Health Data Research UK, London, UK. ⁸NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK. ⁵²⁸e-mail: s.rivera@bham.ac.uk

Published online: 16 November 2021

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01546-9

References

- Council of the European Communities (CED). Council Directive 93/42/EEC of 14 June 1993 Concerning Medical Devices. http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/1993/42/oi (CEC, 1993)
- US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims. http://www.fda.gov/downloads/ Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ UCM193282.pdf (FDA, 2009).
- Independent Medicines and Medical Devices Safety Review (IMMDSReview). First Do Not Harm—The Report of the

Independent Medicines and Medical Devices Safety Review (IMMDSReview, 2020).

- FDA. Draft Guidance: Principles for Selecting, Developing, Modifying, and Adapting Patient-Reported Outcome Instruments for Use in Medical Device Evaluation (FDA, 2020).
- Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). CDRH Strategic Priorities 2016-2017: Value and Use of Patient Reported Outcomes (PROs) in Assessing Effects of Medical Devices (CDRH, 2017).
- 6. FDA. 2020 Device Approvals (FDA, 2020).
- 7. Calvert, M. et al. JAMA 319, 483-494 (2018).
- Chalmers, I. & Glasziou, P. *The Lancet* **374**, 86–89 (2009).
 International Society for Quality of Life Research (ISOQOL).
- User's Guide to Implementing Patient-Reported Outcomes Assessment in Clinical Practice (ISOQUOL, 2011). 10. Calvert, M. et al. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes* **11**, 184 (2013).

Author contributions

S.C.R., A.P.D. and M.J.C. conceived the idea for this article; S.C.R. developed the first draft; and all authors made substantial revisions and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

O.L.A. receives funding from the NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, NIHR Applied Research Centre, West Midlands, at the University of Birmingham and University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation, Innovate UK (part of UK Research and Innovation), Gilead Sciences Ltd. and Janssen Pharmaceuticals. Inc. O.L.A. declares personal fees from Gilead Sciences Ltd., GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) and Merck outside the submitted work. M.J.C. is director of the Birmingham Health Partners Centre for Regulatory Science and Innovation, director of the Centre for Patient Reported Outcomes Research and a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Senior Investigator. M.J.C. receives funding from the NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, the NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre and NIHR ARC West Midlands at the University of Birmingham and University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Health Data Research UK, Innovate UK (part of UK Research and Innovation), Macmillan Cancer Support, UCB and GSK Pharma. M.J.C. has received personal fees from Astellas, Takeda, Merck, Daiichi Sankyo, Aparito Ltd., CIS Oncology, Glaukos, GSK and the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) outside the submitted work. The other authors declare no competing interests. The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or the MHRA

Check for updates

Promotion of non-evidence-based therapeutics within patient-led Long COVID support groups

To the Editor — Long COVID support groups began as a patient-led movement, providing safe spaces for patients (including children and their parents and caregivers) to discuss the disease and collectively advocate for awareness, research and support. However, in many groups, individuals and organizations have been promoting experimental treatments, ongoing clinical trials and for-profit treatment plans (examples are included in Table 1). Given the current lack of understanding of the disease etiology of Long COVID and lack of any proven treatment options, patients are desperate for any offered hope. The net result can be an unethical situation that endangers patient health and wellbeing and decreases the integrity and effectiveness of the patient-led movement.

There is a clear and pressing need for treatment options for Long COVID. One of the most expedient options for new treatments is the repurposing of existing therapeutics and natural products. However, new treatment options need to be scientifically evaluated to ensure that they are safe and effective. There is currently no consensus understanding of the molecular mechanisms driving Long COVID, the diagnostic criteria needed to identify Long COVID disease, or whether the diverse collection of symptoms seen reflect different disease processes that may not respond comparably to the same therapeutic. In addition, many Long COVID patients have symptoms that fluctuate in severity or improve over time, making causal associations with experimental therapeutics difficult. Thus, the evaluation of potential therapeutics needs to take place in carefully controlled clinical trials.

One therapeutic that is being consistently promoted within patient-led groups is ivermectin. Ivermectin is an affordable, widely used anti-parasitic drug that showed some early promise as a therapeutic to prevent or treat acute COVID-19. Based on these initial studies, larger clinical trials were launched to evaluate the drug's effectiveness. Recent meta-analyses have shown that ivermectin is not beneficial for the prevention or treatment of COVID-19¹. In addition, the largest clinical trial showing a benefit of ivermectin was recently withdrawn by the preprint organization that had posted it, due to discrepancies identified in individual patient data^{2,3}

Unfortunately, the use of ivermectin has been widely promoted based on flawed data and without regard for the analyses of subsequent studies³. This is similar to the situation with hydroxychloroquine in 2020, in which the use of the drug was widely promoted based on a limited number of small-scale studies showing a potential benefit in acute COVID-19 disease. Based on the early studies of hydroxychloroquine, full clinical trials were initiated that later proved that hydroxychloroguine had no beneficial effect, and could potentially worsen COVID-19 disease^{4,5}. Just as with hydroxychloroquine, misuse of ivermectin can have dangerous side effects and has been associated with illness and death, especially when patients resort to using readily available high-dose ivermectin designed for animals⁶. The use of ivermectin for protection against COVID-19 may also have contributed to infections, as some people reduced other precautions believing that they were protected from infection7. The promotion of ineffective therapeutics, such as ivermectin, is dangerous, and the promotion of such therapeutics within vulnerable patient support groups is unethical.

Long COVID support groups play an essential role in advocacy, patient support and research development. However, patient-led support groups are vulnerable to people joining the group who then use their access to promote experimental, unproven or ineffective therapeutics and treatments. The combination of potential adverse effects and the often false hope offered by these non-evidence-based therapeutics can be

Table 1 | Examples of the promotion of non-evidence-based therapeutics seen in Long COVID patient support groups

Type of person	Suggested action	Method
Administrator	Use of ivermectin to treat Long COVID	Promotion in online support groups and social media accounts.
Researcher	Use of a specific nutritional treatment plan (via for-profit company) to treat Long COVID	Promotion in online support groups and social media accounts. Marketing directly to group administrators to encourage secondary promotion.
Medical doctor	Use of a treatment plan including montelukast (via for-profit company) to treat Long COVID	Promotion in online support groups and marketing directly to patients and group members.
Pharmaceutical company representative	Use of montelukast to treat Long COVID	Promotion in online support groups and marketing directly to patients and group members.
Big data company representative	Sharing of patient data with a for-profit data company.	Promotion in online support groups and marketing directly to patients and group members.
An administrator and an anonymous member	Diagnostic test for Long COVID (via for-profit company)	Promotion on support group video call. Marketing directly to patients within the support group and to members of other support groups.
Anonymous member	Use of ivermectin to treat Long COVID	Specific promotion in online support groups in response to another member expressing a specific concern or symptom.
Anonymous member	Use of a treatment plan including ivermectin and therapeutics currently in clinical trials (via for-profit company) to treat Long COVID	Promotion in online support groups and social media accounts.
Anonymous member	Donation of funding to organizations promoting and running Long COVID treatment plans	Promotion in online support groups and social media accounts.

The promotion of these treatments, for which there is no peer-reviewed scientific evidence supporting use, is especially concerning, but the promotion of any treatment in a patient support group is inappropriate. Due to the nature of the online patient support groups, it is not possible to know whether the members in question are patients or represent outside interests, and so these are labeled 'anonymous member'.

damaging to patient health and wellbeing. The promotion of these therapeutics also suggests that there are existing treatment options for Long COVID patients, diminishing the ability of groups to advocate for new Long COVID research that may lead to actual evidence-based therapeutics.

The identification and evaluation of therapeutics for new diseases is unfortunately a slow process; however, this process is necessary for the ethical conduct of research and to ensure the health and safety of patients. Although there are no shortcuts, drug approval has been greatly accelerated during the pandemic. Long COVID patient support groups need to be aware that the promotion of non-evidence-based treatments is occurring within their groups and ensure the proper vetting and integrity of their membership. Sharing personal experiences is an important component of many support groups. However, there needs to be a code of conduct in place to ensure clear divisions between the sharing of patient experiences and promotion of non-evidence-based therapies.

A code of conduct for Long COVID support groups should enable members to share their own experiences, including with treatments, but prohibit members suggesting or promoting treatments for others to use. For example, a member discussing their use of an experimental treatment could give valuable information to other members and researchers, but the discussion should include a disclaimer that this is an individual experience, not proof that this treatment would work similarly for others, and a suggestion to consult a doctor before using any treatments or therapeutics. In addition, the general promotion of treatments, the advertisement of commercial or fee-for-service programs

and the solicitation of donations for other groups or programs should be prohibited. The conduct of members should be moderated to ensure adherence to the code while also ensuring that any research and data posted within the group are drawn from reputable sources.

Long COVID support groups provide important and essential services, supporting patients and advocating for recognition and care. Through the establishment of an administrator-moderated code of conduct, it would be possible to eliminate dangerous misinformation and the promotion of non-evidence-based therapeutics, ensuring the safety and integrity of patient-led Long Covid support groups, as well as patient-led support groups for other medical conditions.

Vicky van der Togt^{1,2 ⊠}, Sammie Mcfarland³, Marta Esperti⁴, Elizabeth Semper⁵, Sara Citrenbaum¹ and Jeremy S. Rossman ¹D^{1,6 ⊠}

¹Research-Aid Networks, Chicago, IL, USA. ²Long Covid Nederland (patient advocacy and support group). ³Long Covid Kids and Friends (UK-registered charity, patient advocacy and support group). ⁴Long Covid Italia (association, patient advocacy and support group). ⁵Asociación Covid Persistente España (association, patient advocacy and support group). ⁶School of Biosciences, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK.

[™]*e-mail:* vicky@researchaidnetworks.org; jeremy@researchaidnetworks.org

Published online: 10 November 2021 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01589-y

References

- Popp, M. et al. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 7, 1465–1858 (2021).
 Elgazzar, A. et al. Research Square. Preprint at https://doi.
- org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-100956/v4 (2021); retracted (2021). 3. Lawrence, J. M. et al. *Nat. Med.* https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-
- 021-01535-y (2021). 4. Singh, B. et al. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2, 1465–1858 (2021).
- Singh, B. et al. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. 2, 1465–1858 (2021).
 Roden, D. et al. Circulation 141, e906–e907 (2020).
- Kotch, D. et al. Christianov 147, Code Cov (2020).
 US Food and Drug Administration. https://www.fda.gov/ consumers/consumer-updates/why-you-should-not-useivermet/in-treat-or-prevent-covid-19 (accessed 8 November 2021).
- Ash, P. Sowetan Live https://www.sowetanlive.co.za/amp/news/ south-africa/2021-07-20-they-think-they-are-safe-doc-issues-c hilling-warning-as-people-taking-ivermectin-continue-to-die/ (2021).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank members of the support and advocacy groups for bringing these issues to our attention. No funding was received for the authorship or publication of this article.

Author contributions

V.v.d.T. and J.S.R. designed the article. All authors wrote, edited and reviewed the article.

Competing interests

V.v.d.T., S.C. and J.S.R. work with Research-Aid Networks, a US 501(c)3 non-profit public benefit charity that provides support services to Long COVID groups. V.v.d.T., S.M., M.E. and E.S. are co-founders and members of Long COVID patient support and advocacy groups.