

1 **Impact of monoclonal antibody treatment on hospitalization and mortality among non-**
2 **hospitalized adults with SARS-CoV-2 infection**

3

4 **Authors:** J. Ryan Bariola MD¹, Erin K. McCreary PharmD¹, Richard J. Wadas MD², Kevin E.
5 Kip PhD³, Oscar C. Marroquin MD³, Tami Minnier MSN, RN⁴, Stephen Koscumb BS³, Kevin
6 Collins BS³, Mark Schmidhofer MD⁵, Judith A. Shovel BSN RN⁴, Mary Kay Wisniewski, MT
7 MA COM⁴, Colleen Sullivan MHA⁶, Donald M. Yealy MD², David A Nace MD MPH⁷, David
8 T. Huang MD MPH^{2,8,9}, Ghady Haidar MD¹, Tina Khadem PharmD¹, Kelsey Linstrum MS^{6,9},
9 Christopher W. Seymour MD MSc^{6,9}, Stephanie K. Montgomery MS^{6,9}, Derek C. Angus MD
10 MPH FRCP^{6,8,9}, Graham M. Snyder MD SM¹

11 1. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of
12 Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

13 2. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine,
14 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

15 3. Clinical Analytics, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

16 4. Wolff Center, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

17 5. Division of Cardiology, Dept of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine,
18 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

19 6. UPMC Health System Office of Healthcare Innovation, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

20 7. Division of Geriatric Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh,
21 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

22 8. Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine,
23 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

24 9. Clinical Research Investigation and Systems Modeling of Acute Illness (CRISMA) Center,
25 Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine,
26 Pittsburgh, PA, USA

27

28 **Corresponding Author:**

29 Graham M. Snyder, MD SM

30 Address: 3601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 150, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

31 Phone/Fax: 412-647-6718/412-692-2768

32 Email: snydergm3@upmc.edu

33 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, monoclonal antibodies, bamlanivimab, etesevimab,
34 casirivimab, imdevimab

35

36 **ABSTRACT**

37 **Background:** Monoclonal antibody (mAb) treatment may prevent complications of COVID-19.

38 We sought to quantify the impact of bamlanivimab monotherapy on hospitalizations and
39 mortality, as well as Emergency Department (ED) visits without hospitalization, among
40 outpatients at high risk of COVID-19 complications.

41 **Methods:** We compared patients receiving mAb to patients who met criteria but did not receive
42 mAb from December 2020 through March 2021. The study population selection used propensity
43 scores to match 1:1 by likelihood to receive mAb. The primary outcome was hospitalization or
44 all-cause mortality within 28 days; the secondary outcome was hospitalization or ED visit
45 without hospitalization within 28 days. Odds ratios (OR) calculation used logistic regression
46 modeling including propensity score and mAb receipt predictors.

47 **Results:** The study population included 234 patients receiving mAb and 234 matched
48 comparator patients not receiving mAb. Patients receiving mAb were less likely to experience
49 hospitalization or mortality (OR 0.31, 95% confidence interval [95%CI] 0.17-0.56, $p=0.00001$)
50 and hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization (OR 0.50, 95%CI 0.43-0.83, $p=0.007$).
51 The impact of mAb was more pronounced in prevention of hospitalization (among all age
52 groups, OR 0.35, 95%CI 0.19-0.66, $p=0.001$) than mortality or ED visit without hospitalization,
53 and most strongly associated with patients age 65 years and older (primary outcome OR 0.28,
54 95%CI 0.14-0.56, $p=0.0003$).

55 **Conclusions:** Bamlanivimab monotherapy was associated with reduction in the composite
56 outcome of hospitalizations and mortality in patients with mild-moderate COVID-19. The
57 benefit may be strongest in preventing hospitalization in patients ages 65 years or older.

58 INTRODUCTION

59 Monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) bind to the SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein and block viral
60 entry into host cells, neutralizing the virus.¹⁻⁵ Between November 2020 and February 2021 four
61 mAbs provided as three treatments received Food and Drug Administration Emergency Use
62 Authorization (EUA) for treatment of patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 within 10 days
63 of symptom onset: bamlanivimab 700mg (LY-coV555; Eli Lilly), etesevimab 1,400mg (LY-
64 CoV016; Eli Lilly), casirivimab 1,200mg (REGN10933; Regeneron), imdevimab 1,200mg
65 (REGN10987). Several clinical trials currently evaluate mAbs for prevention or treatment of
66 COVID-19; however, real-world data are limited, and the role of mAbs for patients with
67 COVID-19 remains controversial.^{3, 5}

68 Use of mAb therapy is low in the United States despite widespread drug availability due
69 to lack of robust efficacy data, operational challenges with outpatient infusions, and patient
70 access issues.⁶ Our health system established a mAb program in November 2020 to decrease
71 COVID-19-related complications for patients with mild-moderate illness and expand access to
72 care for underserved patients with COVID-19. Initially, only bamlanivimab monotherapy was
73 available; our evaluation and distribution process has been described elsewhere.⁷ This study
74 quantifies the impact of bamlanivimab monotherapy on hospitalizations, mortality, and
75 Emergency Department (ED) visits among outpatients at high risk of progressing to severe
76 COVID-19. We also explored whether patient age, body mass index, and timing of infusions
77 relative to initial diagnosis had any association with response to therapy.

78

79 METHODS

80 Study Setting

81 UPMC is a 40-hospital integrated academic healthcare system providing care principally
82 within central and western Pennsylvania (USA). After the November 2020 EUA was granted for
83 bamlanivimab, UPMC rapidly established 16 outpatient infusion centers across all served
84 geographical areas. We also infused mAb at our UPMC Senior Communities (i.e., long-term care
85 facilities), patient homes (via collaboration with a home infusion company), and behavioral
86 health units. Physicians referred patients via outpatient and oncology electronic medical records
87 (EMR) or paper order including non-UPMC providers. A centralized team with pharmacists and
88 physicians reviewed orders daily to confirm EUA criteria; decentralized nursing teams then
89 contacted and scheduled eligible patients for infusions. This study was approved by the UPMC
90 Quality Improvement Review Committee (Project ID 2882 and Project ID 3116).

91 We used the EMR to access all key clinical data, including detailed sociodemographic
92 and medical history data, diagnostic and clinical tests conducted, surgical and other treatment
93 procedures performed, prescriptions ordered, and billing charges on all outpatient and in-hospital
94 encounters, with diagnoses and procedures coded based on the International Classification of
95 Diseases, Ninth and Tenth revisions (ICD-9 and ICD-10, respectively).

96 We linked the deidentified primary data sources using common variables within the
97 UPMC data systems aggregated in its Clinical Data Warehouse that include: (i) *Medipac*, the
98 admit, discharge and transfer registration and hospital-based billing system; (ii) *Cerner*, the
99 inpatient EMR for relevant clinical information for bedded patients at a UPMC inpatient
100 hospital; (iii) *Epic*, the UPMC EMR for ambulatory office visits owned by UPMC; and (iv) *Aria*,
101 the EMR utilized in most ambulatory Cancer Centers at UPMC for both radiation oncology and
102 medical oncology.⁸

103 **Study Population**

104 The study population was derived from patients who received bamlanivimab from
105 December 9, 2020 to March 3, 2021. Patients were candidates for therapy based on criteria
106 consistent with EUA criteria including: recently diagnosed mild to moderate COVID-19 (with a
107 positive polymerase chain reaction or antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 virus within 10 days of the
108 date the test was obtained); body mass at least 40 kg; age ≥ 65 years or age ≥ 12 years with a
109 medical condition conferring high risk of COVID-19 progression to severe disease and/or
110 hospitalization.⁹ Patients were included in the study population if they completed the mAb
111 infusion and had attainment of one of the study outcomes of interest within 28 days of infusion,
112 or had 28 days of follow-up without an outcome.

113 We also derived a comparator group from the same at-risk population by identifying non-
114 hospitalized patients with a positive polymerase chain reaction or antigen test for SARS-CoV-2
115 during the same time period who were eligible for mAb infusion based on our modified EUA
116 criteria but not infused. Similar to the group receiving mAb, comparator patients were included
117 in the study population if they had attainment of one of the study outcomes of interest within 28
118 days or had 28 days of follow-up without an outcome. For infused patients, the 28-day follow-up
119 period commenced on the date of their infusion. For comparator patients, the follow-up period
120 commenced two days after their SARS-CoV-2 test result date, which corresponded to the earliest
121 time from test positivity to initiation of treatment for infused patients.

122 **Study Outcomes**

123 The primary outcome was hospitalization or all-cause mortality within 28 days of
124 meeting study eligibility (day of infusion for the group receiving mAb, 30 days after test
125 positivity for the non-infused group). We assessed in-hospital mortality using the discharge
126 disposition of “Ceased to Breathe” sourced from the inpatient EMR and out-of-hospital deaths

127 from the Social Security Death Index. The secondary outcome was hospitalization or 28-day
128 Emergency Department (ED) visit without hospitalization. To understand the contribution of
129 individual elements of the primary and secondary composite outcomes, we also analyzed the
130 frequency of individual events: ED visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, and mortality
131 within 28 days.

132 **Statistical Methods**

133 After identifying patients in the study population receiving mAb, we selected from the at-
134 risk comparator population individuals matched by propensity score.^{10, 11} Age is a strong
135 predictor for complications of COVID-19 and the prevalence of high-risk medical conditions
136 vary substantially by patient age.^{12, 13} We anticipated that differences in patient profiles between
137 infused and non-infused patients would vary by age because of the age-specific criteria for
138 bamlanivimab contained in the EUA. Moreover, immunosenescence occurs with aging, so we
139 anticipated age to be a potential effect modifier in the relationship between mAb receipt and
140 study outcomes.¹⁴ Therefore, we planned *a priori* to select non-infused patients using propensity
141 scores within age strata consistent with the EUA criteria: less than 55 years, 55 years to less than
142 65 years, and 65 years of age and older.⁹ Patients receiving mAb infusion and the selected
143 comparator patients across all age strata were then combined to constitute the study population.
144 We used this approach, rather than initially running a single model from the full dataset, to
145 optimize selection of appropriate controls. To illustrate, in the full dataset, the prevalence of
146 history of morbid obesity was 27.4% versus 24.9% (p=0.37) in infused vs. non-infused patients,
147 respectively, whereas in the subset of patients age 55 to < 65 years, the respective prevalence
148 was 66.7% vs. 22.4% (p<0.00001). Thus, we believe that more robust matching of infused to

149 non-infused patients was achieved by capturing and adjusting for the important differences in
150 presenting profiles within each age-specific cohort.

151 Propensity scores were derived using logistic regression models fit from a multitude of
152 variables in separate age-stratified groups with treatment with mAb as the response variable and
153 forward stepwise selection of measured pre-treatment explanatory variables at $p < 0.15$ (see
154 **Supplemental Table 1** for listing of variables used in the propensity score models). We included
155 variables deemed biologically relevant (e.g. age, gender, Charlson Comorbidity Index score) into
156 all models prior to stepwise selection. We used 1:1 propensity score matching with a maximum
157 propensity score probability difference of 0.01 to construct equal size matched infused and non-
158 infused groups within age strata. We did not impute missing values for variables used in deriving
159 the propensity scores but did assess whether patients with propensity scores (i.e., full covariate
160 data) versus those with missing propensity scores were similar in terms of age, gender, and race
161 distributions (to assess randomness of missing data).

162 We compared characteristics of infused versus non-infused patients using student *t*-tests
163 for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. Because in this
164 observational study we must infer the time at risk for non-infused patients (starting at the time
165 they *would have* received mAb had they been referred for care, conservatively using two days
166 after SARS-CoV-2 testing), we compared the distribution of time from beginning of follow-up to
167 study outcome among patients receiving mAb infusion and those who did not, both in the at-risk
168 and matched populations (**Supplemental Table 2**). Crude 28-day rates of the study outcomes
169 were described by infusion status. For the propensity matched patient analysis of primary and
170 secondary outcomes, as well as individual elements of the composite outcomes (ED visit without
171 hospitalization, hospitalization, mortality) we fit logistic regression models with the derived

172 propensity scores (i.e., predicted probability of being treated with mAb) as a continuous variable
173 to control for confounding, with mAb receipt as the predictor of interest in the model.

174 We also performed one sensitivity and three exploratory analyses. As a sensitivity
175 analysis, we used the propensity score (i.e., predicted probability of being treated with mAb) as a
176 continuous variable to control for confounding and evaluate study outcomes in a larger
177 unmatched cohort of patients who did and did not receive mAb. We did not employ the use of
178 inverse probability weighting given the very large imbalance of eligible bamlanivimab treated
179 versus not infused patients. We postulated that mAb may be more efficacious in the potentially
180 immunosenescent older population. Thus, we evaluated the study outcomes within the pre-
181 defined age strata. In the second exploratory analysis among the larger unmatched cohort, an
182 interaction term of mAb x BMI was created to examine potential effect modification of treatment
183 with mAb by BMI.¹⁵ To identify a potential benefit of prompt (versus delayed) administration of
184 mAb, as a third exploratory analysis we compared the rates of three outcomes – ED visit without
185 hospitalization, hospitalization, and mortality – within the analysis group stratified by time from
186 diagnosis to infusion: 0 to 2 days, 3 to 4 days, 5 to 7 days, and 8 to 10 days.

187 Study outcomes are described with effect estimate (odds ratio [OR]) and 95% confidence
188 interval (95%CI). We set the alpha error at 0.05 for univariate comparisons of baseline
189 characteristics by infusion status as well as for adjusted odds ratios. All analyses were performed
190 using the SAS System (Cary, NC), version 9.4. Methods and results are reported in accordance
191 with The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data
192 (RECORD) statement (see **Supplemental Table 3**).¹⁶

193

194 **RESULTS**

195 **Study Population**

196 During the study period (December 9, 2020 through March 3, 2021), 636 patients
197 received mAb. Four hundred and sixty-three (72.8%) patients achieved a study outcome or
198 completed 28-day follow-up time and are in the analysis group, with the last infused patient who
199 did not die treated on February 3, 2021. The non-infused at-risk population included 17,599
200 COVID-19 non-hospitalized patients potentially eligible for mAb according to modified EUA
201 criteria, of which 16,565 (94.1%) achieved study outcome or had sufficient follow-up time.

202 **Table 1** shows a comparison of baseline characteristics of the infused versus non-infused
203 patients both in the unmatched at-risk population and matched study population. The unmatched
204 populations are significantly different on most characteristics with patients receiving mAb
205 infusion demonstrating higher frequencies of these medical conditions. After propensity score
206 matching within age strata, 234 patients receiving mAb infusion and 234 patients not receiving
207 mAb were included in the study population. After propensity matching, all matched and selected
208 unmatched variables did not differ statistically between patients who received versus did not
209 receive mAb infusion.

210 **Primary and Secondary Outcomes**

211 Among the 234 propensity-matched patients receiving mAb infusion, 15 (6.4%) were
212 hospitalized, 4 (1.7%) died, and 16 (6.8%) had an ED visit without hospitalization (**Table 2**).
213 Among the 234 propensity-matched patients not receiving mAb infusion, 38 (16.2%) were
214 hospitalized, 12 (5.1%) died, and 15 (6.4%) had an ED visit without hospitalization. **Figure 1a**
215 shows the frequency of the primary outcome (28-day hospitalization or mortality) and the
216 secondary outcome (hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization) among the matched
217 patients receiving mAb versus those not receiving mAb infusion. In the propensity adjusted

218 analyses (**Table 2**), patients receiving mAb had an estimated 69% lower odds of hospitalization
219 or mortality (OR 0.31, 95% CI 0.17-0.56) and estimated 50% lower odds of hospitalization or
220 ED visit without hospitalization (OR 0.50, 95% CI 0.43-0.83). **Figure 1b** shows the frequency
221 of the individual elements of the composite primary and secondary outcomes (ED visit without
222 hospitalization, hospitalization, mortality) among the matched patients receiving mAb versus
223 those not receiving mAb infusion, and **Table 2** lists the corresponding ORs and 95% confidence
224 intervals.

225 **Sensitivity and Exploratory Analyses**

226 **Supplemental Table 4** provides risk estimates for the composite primary and secondary
227 outcomes, and outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, in an unmatched cohort of patients
228 receiving monoclonal antibody infusion and an at-risk population of patients not receiving
229 monoclonal antibody infusion, adjusted for propensity to receive mAb. The 236 patients with
230 non-missing covariate data who received mAb had an estimated 59% lower odds of
231 hospitalization or mortality than the 16,565 patients who did not receive mAb (propensity-score
232 adjusted OR 0.41, 95% CI 0.24-0.70). Thus, study results were consistent between the matched
233 and unmatched group analyses.

234 **Table 2** provides adjusted ORs for the primary and secondary outcomes, plus individual
235 outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, stratified by age. In propensity score adjusted
236 analyses for the 28-day rate of hospitalization or mortality, there was no differential treatment
237 effect by BMI. P-values for the interaction term of mAb x BMI were 0.55, 0.81, 0.38, and 0.84
238 for all patients and in the age groups less than 55 years, 55 to less than 65 years, and 65 years
239 and older, respectively. **Supplemental Figure 1** indicates among patients aged 65 years and
240 older lower composite hospitalization or mortality event rates comparing mAb infused to non-

241 infused patients across all BMI categories. **Figure 2** indicates that among patients in the study
242 population receiving mAb infusion, those who received their infusion within 4 days of their
243 positive SARS-CoV-2 test result had lower 28-day rates of ED visit without hospitalization and
244 hospitalization than patients who received their infusion 5 days or more after their positive
245 SARS-CoV-2 test result. Rates of mortality were low and similar by timing of infusion.

246 Finally, age, gender, and race distributions between patients with full covariate data and
247 those with missing data were similar (data not shown).

248

249 **DISCUSSION**

250 Our observational study suggests a benefit of mAb treatment in reducing the risk of
251 COVID-19 complications for patients at higher risk of severe disease. Initial reports of
252 bamlanivimab 700 mg in outpatients showed improvement of symptoms at day 11 for the entire
253 study population³ and numerically fewer hospitalizations and ED visits at day 29 (1.6% vs
254 6.3%).¹⁷ A post hoc analysis in BLAZE-1 of those 65 or older or with BMI of 35 kg/m² or
255 greater demonstrated a larger numerical benefit, 2.7% vs 13.5%.³ In this report of our
256 experience, we identified a similar association between bamlanivimab monotherapy and
257 hospitalization or mortality in a propensity matched analysis with an OR of 0.31, or a 69%
258 lower odds of hospitalization or mortality.

259 In our health system, rates of hospitalizations and ED visits in patients aged 65 years or
260 older were higher than the clinical trial, yet a benefit to mAb treatment was nonetheless
261 observed. This benefit occurred through decreased hospitalizations and mortality (OR 0.28) as
262 well as for hospitalizations alone (OR 0.32) and for hospitalizations or ED visits without

263 hospitalization (OR 0.43). We also identified a tendency of mortality benefit in this age group
264 (OR 0.35), although our sample size and event limit declaring an association.

265 Cumulatively our report shows benefit for patients across several possible outcomes, and
266 we consider this highly relevant from a clinical standpoint. While we did not observe statistically
267 significant differences in the primary or secondary outcomes in younger age groups, the odds
268 ratios in the group aged 55 to less than 65 years, and few outcomes in those age less than 55
269 years suggest an effect may exist though potentially smaller in magnitude.

270 We identified greater benefits with administration within 4 days of symptom onset,
271 particularly regarding rates of hospitalization. While the EUA allows for use within 10 days of
272 symptom onset, the median duration of symptoms prior to receiving bamlanivimab 700 mg was
273 5 days in BLAZE-1³. As with other passive antibody therapies, this is consistent with the
274 supposition that earlier treatment is better, and health systems may reasonably evaluate a shorter
275 window of eligibility for mAb therapy. Our analysis shows that benefits in the elderly are
276 independent of BMI. The potential differential benefit of mAb therapy for COVID-19 in patients
277 with this and other co-morbidities warrants more focused analysis.

278 There are several limitations of our study. Given our design, it is not surprising that there
279 were several baseline differences between those infused and not infused in other age groups. We
280 mitigated confounding with propensity score modeling of closely matched groups of patients,
281 and a sensitivity analysis using propensity-score adjusted unmatched patients not receiving mAb
282 infusion affirmed the findings. Furthermore, the group receiving mAb had more comorbid
283 conditions predisposing to the primary and secondary outcomes, which may underestimate the
284 magnitude of the treatment effect if there was residual confounding. We cannot reliably
285 distinguish the presence, extent, or severity of symptoms in our data set, all of which may impact

286 effectiveness. Additionally, viral loads in blood or any site were not measured in our data set,
287 limiting any insights based on this variable. The time to event in both treated and untreated
288 groups were similar, suggesting that ED visit or hospitalization did not account for why the
289 untreated population did not receive mAb. Viral loads in blood or any site were not measured in
290 our data set, limiting any insights based on this variable.

291 We did not have information regarding variant strains of SARS-CoV-2 prior to or after
292 bamlanivimab monotherapy. While reported rates of clinically concerning variants were low in
293 Pennsylvania during much of this time frame, there is concern that use of bamlanivimab
294 monotherapy will lead to escape variants and/or that variants are underreported.¹⁸ We were
295 unable to evaluate any such existing prevalence or emergence in our patients. Finally, during the
296 time of this study, we utilized bamlanivimab monotherapy exclusively, so we are unable to
297 comment on any comparison to the other available monoclonal antibodies for treatment of mild-
298 moderate COVID-19 infection. On March 24th, the United States Department of Health and
299 Human Services announced they would no longer supply sites with bamlanivimab alone due to
300 concern about increased rates of resistant variants.¹⁹ Many of our patients received bamlanivimab
301 when the rates of resistant variants in this country was low, thus explaining why we still saw
302 benefit with bamlanivimab monotherapy. Going forward it will be critical to better define the
303 roles of the various available therapies and where each may be best utilized, including possibly a
304 continued role for bamlanivimab monotherapy.

305 In our non-experimental design, we observed that bamlanivimab monotherapy is
306 associated with decreased hospitalization rates and mortality in patients with mild-moderate
307 COVID-19 infection, particularly among those 65 years or older, and may likely extend to
308 younger patients as well. This benefit appears more likely when administered early after

309 diagnosis. Further study can confirm our observations and investigate the role of mAb treatment
310 in other high-risk subgroups and the use of various mAb regimens.

311 **Acknowledgements:** The authors thank the clinical staff of the UPMC monoclonal antibody
312 infusion centers as well as the support and administrative staff behind this effort, including but
313 not limited to: Debbie Albin, Jennifer Dueweke, Robert Shulik, Amy Lukanski, Rozalyn Russell,
314 Debra Rogers, Jesse Duff, Kevin Pruznak, Jennifer Zabala, Trudy Bloomquist, Daniel Gessel,
315 LuAnn King, Jonya Brooks, Libby Shumaker, Betsy Tedesco, Sarah Sakaluk, Kathleen Flinn,
316 Susan Spencer, Le Ann Kaltenbaugh, Michelle Adam, Meredith Axe, Melanie Pierce, Debra
317 Masser, Theresa Murillo, Sherry Casali, Jim Krosse, Jeana Colella, Rebecca Medva, Jessica
318 Fesz, Ashley Beyerl, Jodi Ayers, Hilary Maskiewicz, Mikaela Bortot, Amy Helmuth, Heather
319 Schaeffer, Janice Dunsavage, Erik Hernandez, Ken Trimmer, Sheila Kruman, Teressa Polcha,
320 and their entire teams. We also thank the U.S. federal government and Pennsylvania Department
321 of Health for the provision of monoclonal antibody treatment.

322 **Funding Statement:** This work received no external funding.

323 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** None of the authors received any payments or influence from a
324 third-party source for the work presented, and none report any potential conflicts of interest.

325

326 **References**

- 327 1. Jones BE, Brown-Augsburger PL, Corbett KS, et al. LY-CoV555, a rapidly isolated
328 potent neutralizing antibody, provides protection in a non-human primate model of SARS-CoV-2
329 infection. *bioRxiv*. Oct 1 2020;doi:10.1101/2020.09.30.318972
- 330 2. Myron S. Cohen¹, Ajay Nirula², Mark Mulligan³, Richard Novak⁴, Mary Marovich⁵,
331 Alexander Stemer⁶, Andrew C. Adams², Andrew E. Schade², Jack Knorr², Jay L. Tuttle²,
332 Janelle Sabo², Paul Klekotka², Lei Shen², Daniel M. Skovronsky², for BLAZE-2 study team
333 (Lilly/NIAID/CoVPN). Bamlanivimab prevents COVID-19 morbidity and mortality in nursing-
334 home setting. Oral abstract #121. Presented at Virtual CROI 2021. .
- 335 3. Gottlieb RL, Nirula A, Chen P, et al. Effect of Bamlanivimab as Monotherapy or in
336 Combination With Etesevimab on Viral Load in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A
337 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*. Feb 16 2021;325(7):632-644. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.0202
- 338 4. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGN-COV2, a Neutralizing
339 Antibody Cocktail, in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 17
340 2020;doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2035002
- 341 5. Webb BJ, Buckel W, Vento T, et al. Real-World Effectiveness and Tolerability of
342 Monoclonal Antibodies for Ambulatory Patients with Early COVID-19. 3/17/2021
343 2021;doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253646>
- 344 6. Ault A. Rollout of COVID Monoclonal Antibodies Lacked Unified Plan: Expert Panel.
345 Accessed 23 Mar 2021. Available at: <https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/945223>.
- 346 7. Bariola JR, McCreary EK, Khadem T, Snyder GM, Wadas RJ, Nace DA, White DB,
347 Yealy DM, Schmidhofer M. Establishing a Distribution Network for COVID-19 Monoclonal

- 348 Antibody Therapy Across a Large Health System During a Global Pandemic. *Open Forum Infect*
349 *Dis.* 2021. In press.
- 350 8. Reitz KM, Marroquin OC, Zenati MS, et al. Association Between Preoperative
351 Metformin Exposure and Postoperative Outcomes in Adults With Type 2 Diabetes. *JAMA Surg.*
352 Jun 1 2020;155(6):e200416. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2020.0416
- 353 9. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes monoclonal
354 antibody for treatment of COVID-19. Published November 9, 2020. Accessed November 13,
355 2020. <https://bit.ly/2HesBBs>.
- 356 10. Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of
357 Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivariate Behav Res.* May 2011;46(3):399-424.
358 doi:10.1080/00273171.2011.568786
- 359 11. Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The central role of the propensity score in observational
360 studies for causal effects. *Biometrika.* 1983; 70: 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/70.1.41>.
- 361 12. Lim ZJ, Subramaniam A, Ponnappa Reddy M, et al. Case Fatality Rates for Patients with
362 COVID-19 Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation. A Meta-analysis. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
363 *Med.* Jan 1 2021;203(1):54-66. doi:10.1164/rccm.202006-2405OC
- 364 13. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities,
365 and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area.
366 *JAMA.* May 26 2020;323(20):2052-2059. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775
- 367 14. Bajaj V, Gadi N, Spihlman AP, Wu SC, Choi CH, Moulton VR. Aging, Immunity, and
368 COVID-19: How Age Influences the Host Immune Response to Coronavirus Infections? *Front*
369 *Physiol.* 2020;11:571416. doi:10.3389/fphys.2020.571416

- 370 15. Tartof SY, Qian L, Hong V, et al. Obesity and Mortality Among Patients Diagnosed With
371 COVID-19: Results From an Integrated Health Care Organization. *Ann Intern Med.* Nov 17
372 2020;173(10):773-781. doi:10.7326/m20-3742
- 373 16. Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttman A, et al. The REporting of studies Conducted using
374 Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) statement. *PLoS Med.* Oct
375 2015;12(10):e1001885. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001885
- 376 17. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody LY-CoV555 in
377 Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* Jan 21 2021;384(3):229-237.
378 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2029849
- 379 18. Liu H, Wei P, Zhang Q, et al. 501Y.V2 and 501Y.V3 variants of SARS-CoV-2 lose
380 binding to Bamlanivimab in vitro. *bioRxiv.* Feb 16 2021;doi:10.1101/2021.02.16.431305
- 381 19. US Department of Health and Human Services. Update on COVID-19 variants and
382 impact on bamlanivimab distribution. Available from:
383 [https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-](https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx)
384 [MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx). Accessed March 24th, 2021.
385

387 Table 1. Comparison of Characteristics of Unmatched and Propensity Matched Patients

Characteristic	Age Group Matching*	Unmatched			Propensity Matched		
		Infused (N=463)	Not infused (N=16565)	p-value	Infused (N=234)	Not infused (N=234)	p-value
Age, mean, SD	A,B,C	66.3, 14.4	55.3, 19.2	<.0001	67.2, 13.0	66.1, 15.0	0.4079
Female gender, %	A,B,C	53.3	59.6	0.0065	53.4	50.9	0.5788
Black race, %	B,C	5.7	9.3	0.0099	5.1	8.5	0.1429
Charlson Comorbidity Index Score, mean, SD	A,B,C	1.7, 1.8	0.9, 1.3	<.0001	1.6, 1.7	1.5, 1.7	0.5540
Allegheny as county of residence, %	A,B,C	49.7	34.8	<.0001	51.3	46.6	0.3091
History of cirrhosis, %	B	3.0	0.9	<.0001	3.0	1.3	0.2010
History of adrenal insufficiency, %	A	7.6	3.6	0.0012	7.7	5.1	0.2575
History of end stage renal disease, %	A,B,C	3.0	0.9	0.0008	3.0	3.8	0.6109
History of morbid obesity, %	A,B,C	27.4	24.9	0.3701	26.9	22.2	0.2376
History of hypertension, %	C	68.2	49.8	<.0001	73.5	75.2	0.6720
DOACS, %	B	11.8	5.6	<.0001	11.1	14.1	0.3296
Hydroxychloroquine, %	B	3.8	1.5	0.0051	3.8	3.0	0.6109
Immunomodulators, %	B	3.8	1.5	0.0043	3.4	2.1	0.3988
Statins, %	B	59.1	36.9	<.0001	58.5	61.1	0.5716
Current tobacco use, %	Not matched	7.2	9.0	0.3302	6.8	4.3	0.2303
Alcohol use, %	Not matched	53.8	51.7	0.5193	54.1	46.5	0.1025
Illicit drug use, %	Not matched	1.5	2.8	0.0952	2.6	2.6	1.0000
History of diabetes, %	Not matched	30.3	22.1	<.0001	32.9	31.6	0.7667
History of hyperlipidemia, %	Not matched	75.5	51.2	<.0001	75.6	71.4	0.2949
History of atrial fibrillation, %	Not matched	15.0	6.0	<.0001	14.5	12.8	0.5905
History of coronary artery disease, %	Not matched	19.5	11.8	<.0001	19.7	26.1	0.0987
History of congestive heart failure, %	Not matched	13.5	6.5	<.0001	14.5	15.8	0.6991
History of COPD, %	Not matched	24.9	17.4	<.0001	25.6	22.2	0.3861
History of obstructive sleep apnea, %	Not matched	30.5	18.7	<.0001	30.3	29.9	0.9197

History of pulmonary hypertension, %	Not matched	4.9	1.7	<.0001	6.4	5.1	0.5520
ACE Inhibitors, %	Not matched	21.9	18.0	0.1133	21.4	20.1	0.7323
Antidepressants, %	Not matched	32.5	32.6	0.9794	32.5	35.0	0.5575
Beta blockers, %	Not matched	38.0	23.9	<.0001	37.2	41.9	0.2983
Corticosteroids, %	Not matched	38.4	45.4	0.0052	36.8	40.2	0.4472

388

*A: Age < 55 years; B: Age 55 to < 65 years; C: Age 65 years and older.

Table 2. Propensity Matched Event Rates and Odds Ratios of Study Outcomes Overall and Stratified by Age Group

Outcome	Number of Events		28-Day Event Rate (%)		Odds Ratio Estimates		
	Infused (n=234)	Not Infused (n=234)	Infused	Not Infused	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p-value
All Patients							
Hospitalization or mortality	16	45	6.8	19.2	0.31	0.17, 0.56	0.00001
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	28	50	12.0	21.4	0.50	0.43, 0.83	0.007
ED visit without hospitalization	16	15	6.4	6.4	1.07	0.52, 2.22	0.85
Hospitalization	15	38	6.4	16.2	0.35	0.19, 0.66	0.001
Mortality	4	12	1.7	5.1	0.32	0.10, 1.01	0.05
Age < 55 years	(n=42)	(n=42)					
Hospitalization or mortality	2	3	4.8	7.1	0.65	0.10, 4.10	0.65
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	7	5	16.7	11.9	1.48	0.43, 5.10	0.53
ED visit without hospitalization	6	4	14.3	9.5	1.58	0.41, 6.08	0.50
Hospitalization	2	3	4.8	7.1	0.65	0.10, 4.10	0.65
Mortality	0	0	0.0	0.0	-----	-----	-----
Age 55 to < 65 years	(n=34)	(n=34)					
Hospitalization or mortality	2	6	5.9	17.6	0.29	0.05, 1.56	0.15
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	2	7	5.9	20.6	0.24	0.05, 1.26	0.09
ED visit without hospitalization	1	2	2.9	5.9	0.49	0.04, 5.61	0.56
Hospitalization	2	5	5.9	14.7	0.36	0.06, 2.01	0.25
Mortality	0	1	0.0	2.9	0.0	-----	-----
Age 65 years and older	(n=158)	(n=158)					
Hospitalization or mortality	12	36	7.6	22.8	0.28	0.14, 0.56	0.0003
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	19	38	12.0	24.0	0.43	0.24, 0.79	0.006
ED visit without hospitalization	9	9	5.7	5.7	1.00	0.39, 2.59	1.0
Hospitalization	11	30	7.0	19.0	0.32	0.15, 0.66	0.002
Mortality	4	11	2.5	7.0	0.35	0.11, 1.11	0.08

391 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

392

393 **Figure 1a.** Frequency of 28-day hospitalization or mortality (primary outcome), and
394 hospitalization or Emergency Department visit without hospitalization (secondary outcome)
395 among the matched patients receiving monoclonal antibody (orange bars) versus those not
396 receiving monoclonal antibody infusion (blue bars). P-values are from the logistic regression
397 models.

398

399 **Figure 1b.** Frequency of the individual elements of the composite primary and secondary
400 outcomes including Emergency Department visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, and
401 mortality among the matched patients receiving monoclonal antibody (orange bars) versus those
402 not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion (blue bars). P-values are from the logistic regression
403 models.

404

405 **Figure 2.** Among all study patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion, comparison of
406 crude 28-day outcome rates by timing of infusion. Blue bars (0 to 2 days), orange bars (3 to 4
407 days), grey bars (5 to 7 days), yellow bars (8 days or more).

408

409 **FIGURES**




Figure 1a.

410

411




Figure 1b.

412




Figure 2.

413

414 **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

415

416 **Supplemental Table 1.** Variables selected for propensity score adjustment

Analysis Group	Variables
Age < 55 years	Age Gender Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of renal insufficiency History of end stage renal disease History of irritable bowel syndrome Charlson Comorbidity Index score Model c-statistic: 0.826
Age 55 to < 65 years	Age Gender Race Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of cirrhosis History of end stage renal disease Charlson Comorbidity Index score Medications: direct oral anticoagulants, hydroxychloroquine, immunomodulators, statins Model c-statistic: 0.852
Age ≥ 65 years	Age Gender Race Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of hypertension Charlson Comorbidity Index score Model c-statistic: 0.670

417

418 **Supplemental Table 2.** Comparison of days to individual outcomes between patients receiving
 419 monoclonal antibody infusion and patients not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion, in both
 420 the at-risk population and matched study population.

	Outcome	Infused			Not Infused			p-value
		N	Median	IQR	N	Median	IQR	
At-risk population	ED visit without hospitalization	30	7	4, 15	1040	4	2, 10	0.04
	Hospitalization	31	8	2, 15	1379	5	2, 11	0.40
	Mortality	7	13	5, 23	301	11	7, 16	0.38
Matched study population	ED visit without hospitalization	16	7	2.5, 14	15	4	2, 8	0.20
	Hospitalization	15	5	1, 21	38	8.5	3, 16	0.66
	Mortality	4	18	8.5, 24	12	9.5	9, 11	0.16

421 Note: ED, Emergency Department; IQR, interquartile range

422 **Supplemental Table 3.** RECORD statement

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items	Location in manuscript where items are reported
Title and abstract					
	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 3; Lines 41-46	RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be included. RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract. RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.	Page 3; Lines 41-46
Introduction					
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4; Lines 65-67, 73-77		
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4; Lines 70-72 (hypothesis), Lines 73-77 (objectives)		
Methods					
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 6; Lines 110-121		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 5; Lines 81-84 (Setting/locations) Page 6; Lines 104-105 (relevant dates of exposure), Lines 110-112		

			Page 10; 196-199 (follow up)		
Participants	6	<p>(a) <i>Cohort study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants</p> <p>(b) <i>Cohort study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case</p>	<p>Page 6; Lines 104-110 (eligibility), Lines 113-121 (comparator group and period of follow up)</p> <p>Page 8; Lines 151-161 (PS matching process)</p>	<p>RECORD 6.1: The methods of study population selection (such as codes or algorithms used to identify subjects) should be listed in detail. If this is not possible, an explanation should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.2: Any validation studies of the codes or algorithms used to select the population should be referenced. If validation was conducted for this study and not published elsewhere, detailed methods and results should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.3: If the study involved linkage of databases, consider use of a flow diagram or other graphical display to demonstrate the data linkage process, including the number of individuals with linked data at each stage.</p>	Page 5; Lines 96-102 (database)
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.	<p>Page 6-7; Lines 123-131 (outcomes)</p> <p>Page 7-8; Lines 142-150, 151-161 (addressing confounders)</p>	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.	<p>Page 6-7; Lines 123-131 (Codes for primary outcomes)</p> <p>Supplemental Table 1 (PS variables for confounding)</p>
Data sources/ measurement	8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	<p>Page 5; Lines 91-102 (sources of data)</p> <p>Page 7-9; Lines 133-134, 140-192 (method of assessment and data analysis)</p>		

Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 7-9; Lines 132-192		
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 10; Lines 196-209		
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	Page 8; Lines 162-163		
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) <i>Cohort study</i> - If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> - If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 7-9; Lines 132-192		
Data access and cleaning methods		..		RECORD 12.1: Authors should describe the extent to which the investigators had access to the database population used to create the study population. RECORD 12.2: Authors should provide information on the data cleaning methods used in the study.	Page 5; Lines 91-102
Linkage		..		RECORD 12.3: State whether the study included person-level, institutional-level, or other data linkage across two or more databases. The methods of linkage and	Page 5; Lines 91-102

				methods of linkage quality evaluation should be provided.	
Results					
Participants	13	(a) Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (<i>e.g.</i> , numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Page 10; Lines 196-209	RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study (<i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and linkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/or by means of the study flow diagram.	Page 10; Lines 196-209
Descriptive data	14	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (<i>e.g.</i> , demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> - summarise follow-up time (<i>e.g.</i> , average and total amount)	(a) Page 10, Lines 202-209 Pages 20-21, Lines 287-288, Table 2 (b) Page 8, Lines 158-161 Page 12, Lines 246-247 (c) Page 6, Lines 110-112 and 116-121. Time to event data not analyzed by study design.		
Outcome data	15	<i>Cohort study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Page 10, Lines 213-214 Page 22, Lines 389-390, Table 2 Page 24, Lines 409-412 Page 27, Lines 418-412, Supplemental Table 2 Page 34, Lines 424-427, Supplemental Table 4		

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	(a) Page 10, Lines 202-209 (unadjusted) Pages 10-11, Lines 210-224 (adjusted) Page 22, Lines 389-390, Table 2 (both) (b) N/A, all variables are continuous or binary. Subgroup age categories are defined. (Page 7, Lines 140-142) (c) N/A		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Pages 11-12, Lines 225-247		
Discussion					
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 12, Lines 250-258 Pages 14-15, Lines 305-309		
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 13, Lines 278-290	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	Page 8, Lines 151-161 Pages 13-14, Lines 278-290
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Pages 14-15, Lines 305-310		

Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 14, Lines 291-298		
Other Information					
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 16, Line 322 (no external funding source)		
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code		..		RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how to access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	Not available/provided


423 *Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution ([CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)) license.

424 **Supplemental Table 4.** Composite primary and secondary outcomes, and outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, in an
 425 unmatched cohort of patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion and an at-risk population of patients not receiving monoclonal
 426 antibody infusion

	All Patients				Patients with Propensity Score				Odds Ratio Estimates		
	Number of Events		Event Rate (%)		Number of Events		Event Rate (%)		Adj. OR	95%CI	P-value
	Infused (n=463)	Not Infused (n=16,565)	Infused	Not Infused	Infused (n=236)	Not Infused (n=16,515)	Infused	Not Infused			
Hospitalization or mortality	33	1516	7.1	9.1	17	1507	7.2	9.1	0.41	0.24, 0.70	0.001
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	56	2254	12.1	13.6	29	2244	12.3	13.6	0.60	0.40, 0.91	0.02
ED visit without hospitalization	30	1040	6.5	6.3	16	1037	6.8	6.3	1.05	0.63, 1.77	0.85
Hospitalization	31	1379	6.7	8.3	16	1371	6.8	8.3	0.44	0.25, 0.77	0.004
Mortality	7	301	1.5	1.8	5	300	2.1	1.8	0.37	0.12, 1.16	0.29

427 Note: ED, Emergency Department; OR, odds ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval

428 **Supplemental Figure 1.** Frequency of composite hospitalization or mortality outcome among
429 study population aged 65 years and older, by treatment received and BMI category



430 **Supplemental Figure 1.**

431 Note: BMI, body mass index in units of kilograms per meter squared.