

1 **Study Title**

2 Factors Associated with Good Patient Outcomes Following Convalescent Plasma in COVID-19:  
3 A Prospective Phase II Clinical Trial

4 **Authors**

5 Danyal Ibrahim, MD, MPH, Trinity Health Of New England, Hartford, Connecticut, USA

6 Latha Dulipsingh, MD, Diabetes Center, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford, Connecticut, USA

7 Lisa Zapatka, MSN, Trinity Health Of New England, Hartford

8 Reginald Eadie, MD, Trinity Health Of New England, Hartford

9 Rebecca Crowell, PhD, Research Department, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford

10 Kendra Williams, BS, Research Department, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford

11 Dorothy B. Wakefield, MS, Research Department, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford

12 Lisa Cook, BSN, Diabetes Center, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford

13 Jennifer Puff, BSN, Diabetes Center, Saint Francis Hospital, Hartford

14 Syed A. Hussain, MD Trinity Health Of New England, Hartford

15 **Corresponding author**

16 Danyal Ibrahim, M.D., M.P.H.

17 Trinity Health Of New England

18 114 Woodland Street

19 Hartford, CT 06105

20 Tel 860-794-5886

21 Fax 860-714-5769

22 Email: [dibrahim@trinityhealthofne.org](mailto:dibrahim@trinityhealthofne.org)

23

## 24 **Abstract**

25           We conducted a prospective single-arm open-label phase II clinical trial assessing the  
26 safety and efficacy of convalescent plasma in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Convalescent  
27 plasma with sufficient IgG titer (1:320) obtained from recovered donors was administered to  
28 adult patients with either severe or critical COVID-19 illness. Primary outcomes were adverse  
29 events in association with plasma administration, and hospital mortality. Secondary outcomes  
30 included disease progression, recovery, length of stay, and hospital discharge. Of the 38 patients  
31 included in the analysis, 24 (63%) recovered and were discharged, and 14 (37%) died. Patients  
32 who received convalescent plasma early in the disease course (severe illness group) as compared  
33 to the patients that received convalescent plasma later in disease progression (critical illness  
34 group) had significantly lower hospital mortality 13% vs 55% ( $p<0.02$ ) and shorter mean  
35 hospital length of stay 15.4 vs 33 days ( $p<0.01$ ). One patient experienced a transient transfusion  
36 reaction. No other adverse effects of convalescent plasma infusion were observed. Our results  
37 suggest that convalescent plasma is safe and has the potential for positive impact on clinical  
38 outcomes including recovery and survival if given to patients early in the course of COVID-19  
39 disease.

## 40 **Keywords**

41 Adult; Humans; Length of Stay; Patient Discharge; Hospital Mortality; Respiratory Distress  
42 Syndrome, Adult; Prospective Studies; COVID-19; severe acute respiratory syndrome  
43 coronavirus 2; Hospitals; Respiration; Ventilation; Plasma; Disease Progression;  
44 Immunoglobulin G; Plasma; COVID-19 serotherapy; Clinical Trial, Phase II

45

## 46 **Introduction**

47           Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a viral respiratory syndrome caused by severe  
48 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). As of July 24, 2020, this novel virus  
49 was discovered in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China, in December 2019, confirmed cases have  
50 risen to more than 14,000,000 worldwide and more than 600,000 people have died (1).  
51 Currently, no cure or standard treatment for COVID-19 exists.

52           The majority of people with COVID-19 experience an asymptomatic, mild, or  
53 manageable course of disease (2, 3). The most common symptoms include fever, cough, fatigue,  
54 dyspnea, headache, diarrhea, fatigue, myalgia, and/or loss of taste and smell (4, 5). However,  
55 19% of those who are infected with the virus become severely or critically ill (2). Life  
56 threatening illness occurs when the virus triggers a progressive hyper-immune response or  
57 “cytokine storm” progressing to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), cardiac injury,  
58 thrombotic complications, septic shock and/or organ failure (6-9). Estimated mortality among  
59 patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) with severe or critical illness ranges from  
60 34.8% to 41.6% (10, 11). Risk of death and disease severity increase with older age, obesity and  
61 chronic disease such as hypertension, diabetes and cardiovascular disease (7-9, 12-14).

62           In March of 2020, The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) solicited investigational  
63 new drug applications to test the safety and efficacy of convalescent plasma therapy for patients  
64 with severe or life-threatening COVID-19 (15). Convalescent plasma is derived from the blood  
65 of recovered patients and is a rich source of antibodies. When administered to patients who are  
66 ill with the same disease, the plasma may aid recovery by conferring passive immunity and  
67 neutralizing the pathogen (15). The therapy showed promise during outbreaks of other novel  
68 viral respiratory syndromes, including two caused specifically by coronavirus (SARS-CoV in  
69 2003 and Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) in 2012) (16, 17). Data showed that

70 convalescent plasma might be most effective when given earlier in the course of disease, but  
71 research was limited to small observational studies and much remains unknown (16, 17).

72 Preliminary data from clinical trials and observational studies targeting COVID-19  
73 suggest that administration of convalescent plasma may reduce mortality, hospital length of stay,  
74 and time on mechanical ventilation with minimal adverse side-effects in patients with severe or  
75 life-threatening disease (18-23). Consistent with earlier studies, treatment may be most  
76 efficacious for severe COVID-19 when administered closer to symptom onset (21-25). The  
77 purpose of this study is to describe the course of illness among 38 patients hospitalized with  
78 severe or life-threatening COVID-19 who received convalescent plasma as part of an FDA-  
79 approved Phase 2 clinical trial. Specifically, the study will assess their hospital course in the  
80 context of demographics, disease onset, symptomology, illness severity, and disease progression.

## 81 **Material and Methods**

82 This study is an FDA-approved prospective single-arm open-label Phase II clinical trial  
83 (NCT04343261) assessing the safety and efficacy of convalescent plasma (IND #19805) on the  
84 clinical course of adult patients hospitalized with severe COVID-19.

85 [https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04343261?term=plasma&cond=COVID-](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04343261?term=plasma&cond=COVID-19&cntry=US&draw=3&rank=19)  
86 [19&cntry=US&draw=3&rank=19](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04343261?term=plasma&cond=COVID-19&cntry=US&draw=3&rank=19)

## 87 **Patients**

88 Subjects were recruited from four regional hospitals in Connecticut and Massachusetts  
89 between period of April 20, 2020 and June 8, 2020. Patients were considered eligible for the  
90 study if they were between the ages of 18 and 90, hospitalized, severely or critically ill with  
91 confirmed COVID-19 through nasopharyngeal swab real time PCR (RT-PCR). Illness severity  
92 was defined as follows: Mild COVID-19 was defined as symptoms with no clinical signs of

93 moderate, severe, or critical disease; moderate illness was defined as respiratory rate  $\geq 20$  breaths  
94 per minute and oxygen saturation  $> 93\%$ ; severe illness was defined as any of the following:  
95 respiratory frequency  $\geq 30$ /minute, blood oxygen saturation  $\leq 93\%$ , partial pressure of arterial  
96 oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio  $< 300$ , and lung infiltrates  $> 50\%$  within 24 to 48  
97 hours; evidence of critical illness included respiratory failure, septic shock, or multi-organ  
98 dysfunction or failure (15, 26).

99         Subjects who met eligibility criteria were referred by their treating physicians. Patients  
100 were enrolled regardless of previous treatment or therapies for COVID-19, including  
101 experimental medications and therapies administered off-label. Informed consent was provided  
102 by either the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative (LAR). Once a patient or  
103 the patient's LAR provided informed consent and the patient's ABO blood type was determined,  
104 compatible convalescent plasma was administered in 2 consecutive 200 mL infusions. Each unit  
105 was transfused for the duration of 1 hour, 1 to 2 hours apart. If the patient received plasma with  
106 undetectable antibodies, the patient was re-dosed with a unit of plasma with adequate antibody  
107 titer (1:320). Recipients were monitored and all adverse reactions or events were recorded  
108 whether or not they were related to the plasma infusion. The protocol was approved by the  
109 Trinity Health Of New England Institutional Review Board (#SFH-20-23).

#### 110         **Convalescent Plasma**

111         Convalescent plasma was obtained from adult donors who were confirmed positive and  
112 had recovered from SARS-CoV-2. All donors screened negative for the virus using a nasal swab  
113 (RT-PCR) and had IgG titers  $>6.5$  arbitrary units per mL (AU/mL; equivalent to 1:320). Plasma  
114 was collected by apheresis at an established blood donation center following standard operating

115 procedures and 21 CFR 630.10 requirements. Plasma was frozen within 24 hours of collection  
116 and labeled for investigational use and ABO typing.

### 117 **Data and Data Sources**

118 Demographic, clinical and outcomes data were prospectively collected from electronic  
119 patient medical records at each of the four hospitals. Descriptive data included sex, age, race,  
120 ethnicity, smoking status, functional status, comorbidities, living situation, and means of arrival  
121 to the hospital. Initial presentation to the Emergency Department included self-reported  
122 symptoms, vital signs, degree of respiratory distress, and need for oxygen supplementation and  
123 resuscitation. Initial chest X-ray findings, and laboratory markers of sepsis, inflammatory  
124 response, immune deficiency and organ dysfunction were recorded. The clinical course during  
125 hospital stay was prospectively captured by tracking changes in oxygenation (FiO<sub>2</sub>), need for  
126 invasive ventilation, ICU level care and types of essential medications given. Patient clinical  
127 status progression and recovery were prospectively monitored by capturing days on invasive  
128 ventilation, intubation, extubation, discharge alive, and death during hospitalization.

### 129 **Outcomes and Data Analysis**

130 Primary clinical outcomes were rate of adverse events associated with convalescent  
131 plasma administration, and hospital mortality. Secondary outcomes included disease progression,  
132 recovery, length of hospital stay, and hospital discharge. Primary and secondary clinical  
133 outcomes were compared between 2 groups based on severity of illness (15, 26) at the time of  
134 plasma infusion: 1) patients with severe illness, who had not progressed to ARDS at the time of  
135 enrollment, and 2) patients whose condition had progressed to critical illness at the time of  
136 enrollment. Patients were excluded from the analysis if they were transferred to another acute

137 hospital; did not receive convalescent plasma with adequate antibody titer; or care was  
138 withdrawn and patient received comfort care only within 5 days of plasma administration.

### 139 **Statistical Analysis**

140 Descriptive statistics included means, medians and proportions as appropriate based on  
141 variable, sample size and distribution. Descriptive variables included demographic  
142 characteristics, clinical parameters, and time from illness onset and hospitalization to plasma  
143 transfusion. Due to the small sample size, both parametric and nonparametric statistics were used  
144 in the analysis as appropriate. Continuous variables were compared using t-tests, and categorical  
145 variables using Chi-square analyses and Fisher's exact test when cell-sizes were small. SAS  
146 software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) was used for analyses. Outcomes were  
147 considered statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

### 148 **Results**

#### 149 **Plasma Recipients**

150 A total of 46 patients (Figure 1) with RT-PCR-confirmed COVID-19 were enrolled in the  
151 study. Eight 8/46 (17%) patients were excluded from the analysis for the following reasons: 2  
152 received convalescent plasma with no detectable antibody titer; 1 was transferred to another  
153 hospital; 5 were made comfort care only (CMO) and medical care was withdrawn within 5 days  
154 of plasma administration. The remaining patients ( $n=38$ ) included in this analysis received  
155 convalescent plasma with adequate antibody titer of 1:320 (30 received 2 units, 5 were re-dosed  
156 with 1 unit, 1 received 1 unit).

157 Patient demographics, clinical presentation, hospital course, and clinical outcomes are  
158 shown in tables 1 through 5. Mean age was 63 years (95% CI 59–70), 53% were males, 34%  
159 black, 32% white, and 34% were Hispanic; 56% of the patients were from Connecticut, 37%

160 from Harford County, 19% New Haven County, and 42% were from Hampden County,  
161 Massachusetts (Table 1). More than 68% had been diagnosed with hypertension and nearly half  
162 (47.4%) with diabetes mellitus; overall, 31.5% had three or more comorbidities (Table 2). As  
163 shown in Table 3, mean days from onset of symptoms to hospitalization was 7.3 days (95% CI  
164 6.4-8.2), with the most common symptoms at admission being fever, cough and dyspnea. With  
165 the exception of one patient who arrived in critical condition, subjects presented initially to the  
166 hospital with moderate to severe COVID-19 pneumonia without evidence of ARDS or requiring  
167 invasive ventilation support at the time of admission (Table 4). The most common laboratory  
168 abnormalities on admission included severe rise in inflammatory markers (C-reactive protein  
169 (CRP)  $\geq 10$  mg/dL) (66%), lymphopenia (absolute lymphocyte count  $< 1,000$  per microliter)  
170 (50%), and hyponatremia (Na  $< 135$  mEq/L) (47%) – see Table 4.

#### 171 **Severe and Critical Illness Groups**

172 At the time of plasma infusion, 16 patients (42%) met criteria for severe illness. These  
173 patients were enrolled in the study and received convalescent plasma earlier in their hospital and  
174 disease course on average 4.6 days (95% CI 2.9-6.3) following hospital admission, and 12.6 days  
175 (95% CI 10-15.2) following symptoms' onset while on high-flow oxygen supplementation prior  
176 to any evidence of ARDS. The remaining 22 patients (58%) met the criteria for critical illness at  
177 the time of convalescent plasma therapy. They enrolled in the study and received convalescent  
178 plasma later in their hospital and disease course on average 16.4 days (95% CI 13-19.8) following  
179 hospital admission, and 23.1 days (95% CI 19.5-26.7) following symptoms' onset after  
180 developing ARDS and had been on ventilation support for an average of 10.6 days (95% CI 7.3-  
181 13.9).



182           The two cohorts were comparable in demographics; comorbidities and home  
183 medications; pre-illness functional status; onset of symptoms to seeking hospital care; initial  
184 clinical presentation and findings; initial disease severity; and the care they received during their  
185 hospitalization including essential medications (see Tables 1-5). Clinically, hyponatremia on  
186 initial hospital presentation was more prevalent in the severe illness group ( $p=0.047$ ).  
187 Vasopressors ( $p<0.01$ ), hydroxychloroquine ( $p<0.01$ ), and antibiotics ( $p<0.01$ ) were more  
188 frequently used during hospitalization in the critical illness group. Renal replacement therapy  
189 was utilized at higher rate in the critical illness group but did not reach statistical significance  
190 ( $p=0.05$ ).

### 191           **Primary Outcomes**

192           One patient in the severe illness group experienced a transient transfusion reaction (fever  
193 and hematuria) within 2 hours of plasma infusion. No other adverse effects of convalescent  
194 plasma infusion were observed. Of the 38 patients included in the analysis, 24 (63%) recovered  
195 and were discharged from the hospital, and 14 (37%) died. Patients who died included two in the  
196 severe illness group and 12 in the critical illness group. The difference in mortality (13% severe  
197 vs 55% critical) was statistically significant ( $p=0.02$ ). Overall, patients who survived ( $n=24$ )  
198 regardless of disease severity at time of infusion received convalescent plasma earlier in their  
199 course of disease (mean 15.3 days, SD 6.9) and hospital stay (8.4 days, SD 6.8) compared to  
200 those who died ( $n=14$ ) with mean durations of (24.5 days, SD 9.6), (16.6 days, SD 9.5)  
201 respectively.

### 202           **Secondary Outcomes**

203           Among patients with severe illness at the time of convalescent plasma therapy, 25%  
204 (4/16) progressed to ARDS after receiving convalescent plasma (Table 5). Three of the 4

205 required mechanical ventilation and 2 of the 4 died. One of those patients received convalescent  
206 plasma 18 days following onset of symptoms and died of refractory shock in ICU while on  
207 ventilator support. The other patient received convalescent plasma 16 days following symptom  
208 onset, developed respiratory failure secondary to ARDS, and was placed on comfort measures at  
209 the request of the family. The remainder (14/16, 88%) did not progress to ARDS, recovered with  
210 resolution of COVID-19 pneumonia, and were discharged from the hospital.

211 In the patients with critical illness at the time plasma therapy, 10/22 (45%) recovered  
212 with resolution of ARDS and restoration of organ function and left the hospital. Of the 12/22  
213 (55%) who died, 6 died of refractory shock while on ventilator support with evidence of  
214 pneumoperitonium in 4 of them; 3 patients died of refractory respiratory failure with terminal  
215 extubation; 2 died of complications of upper airway edema; and 1 patient died of an acute  
216 cardiac complication.

217 Mean hospital length of stay was 25.6 days (95% CI 20.8-30.4) (Table 5). Length of stay  
218 was significantly shorter in the severe illness group (15.5 days, 95% CI 9.3-21.6) compared to  
219 patients in the critical illness group (33.0 days, 95% CI 27.3-38.7) ( $p<0.01$ ). Statistical analyses  
220 showed that patients treated earlier in the course of COVID-19 disease (severe group) had  
221 significantly lower hospital mortality ( $p=0.02$ ) and shorter hospital length of stay ( $p<0.01$ ) after  
222 convalescent plasma therapy compared to patients that were treated later in their disease course  
223 in presence of ARDS (critical group) (Table 5). Other prognostic factors that were significantly  
224 associated with good clinical outcomes included shorter durations between symptoms onset and  
225 convalescent plasma administration ( $p<0.01$ ), and hospital admission and administration of  
226 convalescent plasma ( $p<0.01$ ).

## 227 **Discussion**

228           Among this group of hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 who  
229 received convalescent plasma with adequate antibody titer, only one patient experienced a  
230 transient transfusion reaction. This low rate of adverse event secondary to convalescent plasma  
231 therapy is consistent with recent published literature (22, 23). The overall hospital mortality  
232 among our patients was 37%. However, patients who received convalescent plasma early in the  
233 disease course (severe illness group) as compared to the patients that received convalescent  
234 plasma later in disease progression (critical illness group) had significantly lower hospital  
235 mortality 13% vs 55% ( $p<0.02$ ) and shorter mean hospital length of stay 15.4 vs 33 days  
236 ( $p<0.01$ ). In addition, only 4 patients (25%) in the severe illness group developed ARDS, with 3  
237 of them needing invasive ventilation support following convalescent plasma therapy. Two of the  
238 3 recovered and were discharged.

239           It is important to understand the timeline and dynamics of COVID-19 hospitalizations in  
240 Connecticut and Western Massachusetts at the time when we launched our research study. Our  
241 study patients presented initially to the hospital with an average of 7.3 days (95% CI 6.4-8.2)  
242 from symptoms' onset to hospitalization, and 97 % (37/38) of the patients had moderate to  
243 severe disease without evidence of ARDS or urgent need for invasive ventilation support upon  
244 admission. By the time we enrolled our first patient in late April 2020, hospitals participating in  
245 the study were at their peak COVID-19 census, with a large number of seriously ill patients who  
246 had been hospitalized for an average of 2 weeks, and were not improving with supportive care or  
247 medications (see Table 5). Some of those patients deteriorated and needed ICU care and  
248 ventilator support for an average of 7 days prior to enrollment. Many had severe lung damage  
249 and multi-organ failure. In the early phase of our study, physicians enrolled mostly patients in  
250 this critical illness category. In majority of cases, patients died due to secondary irreversible

251 complications of COVID-19. As our study progressed, physicians started enrolling patients  
252 earlier in their disease course and hospital stay before respiratory status deterioration.

253       Upon admission to the hospital, the two cohorts were similar in their demographic  
254 characteristics, pre-illness functional status, comorbidities, initial clinical presentation to the  
255 hospital, and initial disease severity. However, at the time of convalescent plasma administration,  
256 the groups diverged on their disease severity and duration from disease onset to plasma therapy.  
257 The patients in our study who received convalescent plasma earlier in their disease course  
258 (severe illness group) had significantly more favorable primary and secondary clinical outcomes  
259 as compared to the critical group. We speculate that convalescent plasma given earlier in the  
260 disease course arrested the progression to irreversible complications like ARDS or organ failure.  
261 In addition, we found that patients who survived in both groups had shorter times between onset  
262 of symptoms and convalescent plasma administration compared to those that died.

263       The literature suggests that convalescent plasma may be more beneficial when  
264 administered sooner to disease onset (16, 17). Data recently published on COVID-19 suggested  
265 favorable clinical outcomes when convalescent plasma is given earlier in the course of disease  
266 (21-25). Our finding is consistent with the literature that treating patient with COVID-19 disease  
267 with convalescent plasma within the first two weeks following symptom onset may promote  
268 recovery (27). Perhaps earlier treatment with convalescent plasma allows antibodies to neutralize  
269 the virus before irreversible complications (19). Vasopressor, antibiotics and renal replacement  
270 therapy were utilized at higher rate in the critical group – we speculate that these therapies were  
271 proxies for serious and refractory complications among critically ill patients that could not be  
272 reversed by administration of convalescent plasma. We also speculate that the difference in  
273 hydroxychloroquine utilization between the two groups is likely a reflection of the change of

274 evidence in association with hydroxychloroquine efficacy and safety and subsequent change in  
275 practice during our study. Important limitations in this study include open-label, no control group  
276 and modest sample size. However, this early report is important as it meaningfully contributes to  
277 the questions whether convalescent plasma is safe and it sheds light on important factors that are  
278 associated with favorable outcomes including recovery and survival.

## 279 **Conclusions**

280 For patients with severe or critical COVID-19 disease, convalescent plasma from  
281 recovered COVID-19 patients is safe and has the potential for positive impact on clinical  
282 outcomes including recovery and survival if given early in course of disease. Our study makes a  
283 strong case for the importance of pursuing a randomized placebo control trial focused on enrolling  
284 patients early in the course of their disease to further explore experimentally the efficacy and  
285 effectiveness of convalescent plasma in Covid-19.

## 286 **Acknowledgments**

### 287 **Funding**

288 This study was supported by funds from Trinity Health Of New England, a not-for-profit  
289 healthcare organization.

### 290 **Authorship**

291 All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)  
292 criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole,  
293 and have given their approval for this version to be published.

294 We thank the donors, patients and their families for contributing to this work. We also  
295 thank the physicians from the Trinity Health Of New England Hospitals who enrolled patients in  
296 this study at Johnson Memorial Hospital, Stafford, Connecticut (Ian Tucker); Mercy Medical

297 Center, Springfield Massachusetts (Robert Roose, Laurie Loiacono, and Vikram SonDI); Saint  
298 Francis Hospital and Medical Center, Hartford Connecticut (Phillip Roland, Jessica Abrantes-  
299 Figueiredo, Daniel Gerardi, Prashant Grover, and Gagandeep Singh), and St. Mary's Hospital in  
300 Waterbury, Connecticut (Paul Porter and Bethel Shiferaw); the New York Blood Center and  
301 Rhode Island Blood Center for assisting with the plasma collection process; Ernst J. Schaeffer  
302 and Margaret R Diffenderfer, Boston Heart Diagnostics in Massachusetts, for serology testing;  
303 Collen Lima, Jessica McKenzie, Lisa Cook, Jennifer Puff, Mary Onoroski, and Patricia Nabors  
304 for their work with donors, specimen collection and plasma delivery; Kelly Batch, Donna  
305 Sobinski, Cynthia Considine, Brian Masthay, Christina Maxwell and Robert Wilke from the  
306 Trinity Health Of New England EPIC team for building the study in the electronic health record  
307 and assisting with study implementation. This study was funded and supported by Trinity Health  
308 Of New England, Hartford, Connecticut.

### 309 **Disclosures**

310 The authors declare that they have conflict of interests and no competing interests.

### 311 **Compliance with ethics guidelines**

312 The study protocol was approved by the Trinity Health Of New England Institutional Review  
313 Board (#SFH-20-23). The research study was performed in accordance with the Helsinki  
314 Declaration of 1964, and its later amendments. Informed consent was provided by either the  
315 patient or the patient's legally authorized representative (LAR).

### 316 **Data availability**

317 The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the  
318 corresponding author on reasonable request.

### 319 **References**

320. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
321. Interim Clinical Guidance for Management of Patients with Confirmed Coronavirus Disease  
322 (COVID-19). 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-  
323 management-patients.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-<br/>323 management-patients.html).
324. He J, Guo Y, Mao R, Zhang J. Proportion of asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019  
325 (COVID-19): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020. Epub 2020/07/21.  
326 Accessed 7/26/2020
327. Park M, Cook AR, Lim JT, Sun Y, Dickens BL. A Systematic Review of COVID-19  
328 Epidemiology Based on Current Evidence. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(4):967.
329. Gautier JF, Ravussin Y. A New Symptom of COVID-19: Loss of Taste and Smell. *Obesity  
330 (Silver Spring)*. 2020;28(5):848.
331. Lu L, H Zhang, M Zhan, J Jiang, H Yin, DJ Dauphars, et al. Preventing Mortality in  
332 COVID-19 Patients: Which Cytokine to Target in a Raging Storm? *Front Cell Dev Biol*.  
333 2020;8:677.
334. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, Cao Y, Huang D, Wang H, et al. Clinical and immunologic features  
335 in severe and moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *J Clin Invest*. 2020;130(5):2620-9.
336. Deng Y, Liu W, Liu K, Fang YY, Shang J, Zhou L, et al. Clinical characteristics of fatal and  
337 recovered cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: a retrospective  
338 study [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 20]. *Chin Med J (Engl) [Internet]*.  
339 Accessed May 15, 2020.
340. Liu W, Tao ZW, Wang L, Yuan ML, Liu K, Zhou L, et al. Analysis of factors associated  
341 with disease outcomes in hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus disease. *Chin  
342 Med J (Engl)*. 2020;133(9):1032-8.

- 343 10. Armstrong RA, Kane AD, Cook TM. Outcomes from intensive care in patients with  
344 COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Anaesthesia*.  
345 2020. Epub 2020/06/30. Accessed 7/24/2020.
- 346 11. Quah P, Li A, Phua J. Mortality rates of patients with COVID-19 in the intensive care unit: a  
347 systematic review of the emerging literature. *Crit Care*. 2020;24(1):285.
- 348 12. Chen J, Qi T, Liu L, Ling Y, Qian Z, Li T, et al. Clinical progression of patients with  
349 COVID-19 in Shanghai, China. *J Infect* [Internet]. 2020 Mar PMC7102530]; 80(5):[e1-e6  
350 pp.].
- 351 13. Bonow RO, Hernandez AF, Turakhia M. Hydroxychloroquine, Coronavirus Disease 2019,  
352 and QT Prolongation [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 1]. *JAMA Cardiol*  
353 [Internet]. Accessed 5/15/2020.
- 354 14. Gupta S, Hayek SS, Wang W, Chan L, Mathews KS, Melamed ML, et al. Factors  
355 Associated With Death in Critically Ill Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in the US.  
356 *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020. Epub 2020/07/15. Accessed 7/24/2020.
- 357 15. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration (FDA).  
358 Investigational COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma: Emergency INDs. March 2020.  
359 [https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma-)  
360 [exemption-ide-process-cber/investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma-](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma-) (accessed April  
361 10, 2020).
- 362 16. Mair-Jenkins J, Saavedra-Campos M, Baillie JK, Cleary P, Khaw FM, Lim WS, et al. The  
363 effectiveness of convalescent plasma and hyperimmune immunoglobulin for the treatment  
364 of severe acute respiratory infections of viral etiology: a systematic review and exploratory  
365 meta-analysis. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;211(1):80-90.



3667. Sun M, Xu Y, He H, Zhang L, Wang X, Qiu Q, et al. Potential effective treatment for  
367 COVID-19: systematic review and meta-analysis of the severe infectious disease with  
368 convalescent plasma therapy. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020. Epub 2020/07/04. Accessed 7/24/2020.
3698. Zhang L, Pang R, Xue X, Bao J, Ye S, Dai Y, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 virus antibody levels  
370 in convalescent plasma of six donors who have recovered from COVID-19. *Aging (Albany*  
371 *NY).* 2020;12(8):6536-42.
3729. Duan K, Liu B, Li C, Zhang H, Yu T, Qu J, et al. Effectiveness of convalescent plasma  
373 therapy in severe COVID-19 patients. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A [Internet].* 2020 Apr;  
374 (2020;117(17) 9490-6.
3750. Shen C, Wang Z, Zhao F, Yang Y, Li J, Yuan J, et al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients  
376 With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA* 2020; 323(16):1582-1589.
3771. Li L, Zhang W, Hu Y, Tong X, Zheng S, Yang J, et al. Effect of Convalescent Plasma  
378 Therapy on Time to Clinical Improvement in Patients With Severe and Life-threatening  
379 COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2020. Epub 2020/06/03. Accessed  
380 7/23/2020.
3812. Joyner MJ, Wright RS, Fairweather D, Senefeld JW, Bruno KA, Klassen SA, et al. Early  
382 safety indicators of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in 5,000 patients. *J Clin Invest.* 2020.  
383 Epub 2020/06/11. Accessed 7/24/2020.
3843. Joyner MJ, Bruno KA, Klassen SA, Kunze KL, Johnson PW, Lesser ER, et al. Safety  
385 Update: COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma in 20,000 Hospitalized Patients. *Mayo Clinic*  
386 *Proceedings.* 2020.

- 387 24. Hartman WR, Hess AS, Connor JP. Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients treated with  
388 Convalescent Plasma in a Mid-size City in the Midwest. Res Sq. 2020. Epub 2020/07/14.  
389 Accessed 7/24/2020.
- 390 25. Salazar E, Perez KK, Ashraf M, Chen J, Castillo B, Christensen PA, et al. Treatment of  
391 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients with Convalescent Plasma. Am J Pathol.  
392 2020. Epub 2020/05/27. Accessed 7/24/2020.
- 393 26. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration (FDA).  
394 COVID-19: Developing Drugs and Biological Products for Treatment or Prevention  
395 Guidance for Industry, May 2020. <https://www.fda.gov/media/137926/download> (accessed  
396 July 26, 2020)
- 397 27. Rojas M, Rodríguez Y, Monsalve DM, Acosta-Ampudia Y, Camacho B, Gallo JE, et al.  
398 Convalescent plasma in Covid-19: Possible mechanisms of action [published online ahead  
399 of print, 2020 May 5]. Autoimmun Rev. 2020:102554. Epub 2020/05/05. Accessed  
400 6/21/2020.  
401

402 Table 1 Demographic characteristics of convalescent plasma recipients\*

	Overall, n=38	Severe, 16 (42)	Critical, 22 (58)	p value
Age, Mean (SD)	63 (12)	65 (11)	61 (13)	0.30
Age Less than 70	28 (74)	11 (69)	17 (77)	0.56
Gender (female)	18 (47)	8 (50)	10 (46)	0.78
Race				0.92
Black	13 (34)	6 (38)	7 (32)	
White	12 (32)	5 (31)	7 (32)	
Other	13 (34)	5 (31)	8 (36)	
Ethnicity (Hispanic)	13 (34)	4 (25)	9 (41)	0.31
County				0.45
Hampden County	15 (40)	7 (44)	8 (36)	
Hartford County	14 (37)	7 (44)	7 (32)	
New Haven County	8 (21)	2 (12)	6 (27)	
Tolland County	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (5)	
Insurance - Medicaid or Self-pay	8 (21)	4 (25)	4 (18)	0.19
Marital Status - Married	17 (45)	7 (44)	10 (45)	

403

404 \*Values are no. (%) except as indicated

405

406 Table 2 Comorbidities and home medications of convalescent plasma recipients\*

	Overall, n=38	Severe, 16 (42)	Critical, 22 (58)	p value
BMI, Mean (SD)	33.6 (6.5)	34.4 (7.9)	33 (5.4)	0.53
Smoking Status (Smoker)	4 (11)	2 (13)	2 (9)	0.87
ABO Blood Type - A Group	9 (24)	5 (31)	4 (18)	0.48
<b>Comorbidities</b>				
COPD/ Asthma	15 (39)	7 (44)	8 (36)	0.64
Obstructive Sleep Apnea	5 (13)	1 (6)	4 (18)	0.37
Hypertension	26 (68)	9 (56)	17 (77)	0.17
Diabetes Mellitus	18 (47)	8 (50)	10 (45)	0.78
Coronary Artery Disease	5 (13)	1 (6)	4 (18)	0.37
Chronic Kidney Disease	5 (13)	2 (13)	3 (14)	1.00
Cancer	4 (11)	2 (13)	2 (9)	1.00
VTE	3 (8)	2 (13)	1 (5)	0.56
<b>Multiple Comorbidities</b>				
0-2	26 (68)	12 (75)	14 (64)	0.46
3-7	12 (32)	4 (25)	8 (36)	
<b>Home Medications</b>				
ARB**	11 (29)	6 (38)	5 (23)	0.32
ACEi**	8 (21)	3 (19)	5 (23)	1.00
CCB**	9 (24)	2 (13)	7 (32)	0.25
NSAIDs**	14 (37)	6 (38)	8 (36)	0.94
Steroids	4 (11)	1 (6)	3 (14)	0.63

407  
 408 \*Values are no. (%) except as indicated. \*\*ARB=angiotensin II receptor blocker; ACEi=angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor;  
 409 CCB=calcium channel blocker; NSAIDs=non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

410

411 Table 3 Characteristics and symptoms at presentation to the hospital among convalescent plasma recipients\*

	Overall, n=38	Severe, 16 (42)	Critical, 22 (58)	p value
Mode of arrival – EMS**	28 (74)	11 (69)	17 (77)	0.56
Patient origin				0.68
Home	32 (84)	13 (81)	19 (86)	
Skilled nursing facility	6 (16)	3 (19)	3 (14)	
Functional status - Independent of ADLs**	33 (87)	13 (81)	20 (91)	0.63
Source of exposure to COVID-19				0.30
Family	10 (26)	3 (19)	7 (32)	
Long term care facility	5 (13)	3 (19)	2 (9)	
Work	6 (16)	1 (6)	5 (23)	
No known source	17 (45)	9 (56)	8 (36)	
Onset of symptoms (days), mean (SD)	7.3 (2.8)	8 (3.1)	6.7 (2.6)	0.17
Symptoms reported on presentation to hospital				
Fever (temperature $\geq 38^{\circ}$ C or subjective)	30 (79)	14 (88)	16 (73)	0.43
Cough	35 (92)	15 (94)	20 (91)	1.00
Dyspnea	37 (97)	15 (94)	22 (100)	0.42
Headache	9 (24)	5 (31)	4 (18)	0.45
Loss of Appetite	17 (45)	6 (38)	11 (50)	0.52
Fatigue	24 (63)	11 (69)	13 (59)	0.74
Body aches	13 (34)	5 (31)	8 (36)	1.00
Chest Pain	9 (24)	4 (25)	5 (23)	0.87
GI symptoms	17 (45)	7 (44)	10 (45)	0.92
Loss of taste or smell	3 (8)	2 (13)	1 (5)	0.56
Confusion	6 (16)	4 (25)	2 (9)	0.22

412  
 413 \*Values are no. (%) except as indicated. #Bold text = statistically significant. \*\*EMS=emergency medical services; ADLs=activities of  
 414 daily living.

415 Table 4 Clinical presentation at admission of convalescent plasma recipients\*

	Overall, n=38	Severe, 16 (42)	Critical, 22 (58)	p value
Disease severity (FDA Classification) on admission				0.14
Moderate	5	4 (25)	1 (5)	
Severe	32	12 (75)	20 (90)	
Critical	1	0 (0)	1 (5)	
RA O2Sat ≤ 85%**	18 (47)	6 (38)	12 (55)	0.30
Oxygen support on admission				0.61
Low Flow Nasal	27 (71)	11 (69)	16 (72)	
High Flow Nasal	10 (26)	5 (31)	5 (23)	
Invasive Ventilation	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (5)	
Chest X-ray with typical COVID-19 findings**	35 (92)	14 (88)	21 (95)	0.56
Febrile (temperature ≥38° C)	10 (26)	6 (38)	4 (18)	0.27
Hypotension**	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (5)	1.00
Lymphopenia**	19 (50)	9 (56)	10 (45)	0.51
Rise in sepsis markers**	13 (34)	4 (25)	9 (41)	0.31
Severe rise in inflammatory markers**	25 (66)	10 (63)	15 (68)	0.71
Transaminitis**	9 (24)	4 (25)	5 (23)	1.00
AKI**	10 (26)	7 (44)	3 (14)	0.06
Hyponatremia**	18 (47)	11 (69)	7 (32)	<b>0.047</b>
Hypokalemia**	7 (18)	1 (6)	6 (27)	0.20
Troponin leak**	7 (18)	2 (13)	5 (23)	0.68

416

417 \*Values are no. (%) except as indicated. #Bold text = statistically significant. \*\*RA O2Sat=room-air oxygen saturation; Chest X-ray  
418 with typical COVID-19 findings=multifocal peripheral consolidation and/ or multifocal founded opacities and nodules; Hypotension=  
419 mean arterial blood pressure less than 60 mm Hg; Lymphopenia=absolute lymphocyte count less than 1,000 per microliter; Rise is  
420 sepsis markers=serum lactate>2.2 mmol/L; Severe rise in inflammatory markers=C-reactive protein≥10 mg/dL; Transaminitis= 5x  
421 greater rise in serum ALT level; AKI=acute kidney injury when eGFR<60 mL/min/1.73 sq meters; Hyponatremia=serum sodium less  
422 than 135 mEq/L; Hypokalemia=serum potassium less than 3.5 mEq/L; Troponin leak=serum troponin>0.04 ng/mL.

423

424 Table 5 Patient Outcomes and Hospital Course\*

	Overall, n=38	Severe 16 (42)	Critical, 22 (58)	p value
Outcome				
Mortality	14 (37)	2 (13)	12 (55)	<b>0.02</b>
Length of stay (days), mean (SD)	26 (15)	15.4 (11.6)	33 (12.9)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Symptom onset to CP (days), mean (SD)	18.7 (9.0)	12.6 (5.3)	23.1 (8.6)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Symptom onset to CP admin ≤ 15 days	17 (45)	13 (81)	4 (18)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Hospital days prior to CP admin, mean (SD)	11.4 (8.8)	4.6 (3.4)	16.4 (8.1)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Hospital days after CP admin, mean (SD)	14.2 (11.5)	10.9 (10.5)	16.5 (11.9)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
ARDS** prior to CP admin	22 (58)	0 (0)	22 (100)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
ARDS** during hospitalization	26 (68)	4 (25)	22 (100)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Invasive mechanical ventilation	25 (66)	3 (19)	22 (100)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Ventilator days, mean (SD)	20.3 (10.3)	16 (12.1)	21 (10.2)	0.45
Other interventions and medications				
Renal Replacement Therapy	9 (24)	1 (6)	8 (36)	0.05
Antibiotics	32 (84)	10 (63)	22 (100)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Antifungals	4 (11)	0 (0)	4 (18)	0.12
Azithromycin	16 (42)	4 (25)	12 (55)	0.07
Hydroxychloroquine	17 (45)	3 (19)	14 (64)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
IL-6 Inhibitors	10 (26)	3 (19)	7 (32)	0.47
Remdesivir	4 (11)	3 (19)	1 (5)	0.29
Vasopressors	20 (53)	3 (19)	17 (77)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
Steroids	22 (58)	7 (44)	15 (68)	0.13
Anticoagulants	31 (82)	13 (81)	18 (82)	1.00
Zinc	17 (45)	6 (38)	11 (50)	0.44

425

426 \*Values are no. (%) except as indicated. #CP = convalescent plasma; \*\*ARDS = Acute respiratory distress syndrome; bold text =

427 statistically significant.

Figure 1 Flowchart of Patients and Outcomes

