

Monoclonal antibodies therapy for Covid-19 - Experiences at a regional hospital.

Judith Pannier, Norbert Nass, Gerhard Behre*

Clinic for Internal Medicine I, Dessau Medical Center, Brandenburg Medical School Theodor Fontane,
Germany

*Corresponding author:

Gerhard Behre, Clinic for Internal Medicine I, Dessau Medical Center, Auenweg 38, D-06847 Dessau,
Germany, E-Mail: gerhard.behre@klinikum-dessau.de, phone: +49 340 501 1275, fax: +49 340 501
1210

Key words: Covid-19; monoclonal antibody therapy; hospitalisation

Abstract

Applying monoclonal antibodies against Covid-19 is a promising treatment option for avoiding severe outcomes. However, real life data, especially in regional hospitals are still scarce. We here report on our first results with this therapy in a retrospective, observational study. Indeed, compared to a risk-factor matched reference group, hospitalisation time was reduced but survival rate and kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results remained apparently unaffected.

Introduction

With the occurrence of Covid-19, a demand for the rapid development of modern approaches appeared and techniques used in oncology such as mRNA vaccination and humanized monoclonal antibodies (Buss et al. 2012) have been rapidly adapted for the use in this infectious disease (Alvi et al. 2020). The effectiveness of the monoclonal antibody (mab) cocktails Bamlanivimab/Etesevimab (Dougan et al. 2021) and Casirivimab/Imdevimab (Weinreich et al. 2021) has recently been demonstrated for patients at risk for unfavourable outcome (Taylor et al. 2021) of Covid-19 before severe symptoms appear. These mabs are directed against the SARS-CoV2-Spike Protein (Hurt et al. 2021), which facilitates the binding to the cell surface receptor ACE2. Such antibodies are either directed against highly conserved epitopes or applied in pairs to reduce the selection of S-protein mutations that would cause the development of resistant viral strains (Esmailzadeh et al. 2021). We here report on initial experiences with this therapy in our regional hospital.

Methods

Patients and ethical statement

Resident physicians and patients were informed about the monoclonal antibody (mab) therapy by mail and the media. A Covid-19 ambulance was established to survey and select patients eligible for the therapy. Patients were included within 7 days after symptom onset and positive SARS-CoV-2-RT-PCR based diagnosis as well as the presence of multiple risk factors. 34 patients were treated by either bamlanivimab alone (5) or casirivimab plus imdevimab in combination (29) from March to June 2021. Data from a reference group matched for age, sex and risk factors, and hospitalised for Covid-19 before the mab therapy became available from January to May 2021 were collected for comparison. Both patient groups were treated, applying the same guidelines. Data on symptoms, risk factors and SARS-CoV2-RT-PCR as well as routine clinical data were collected and statistically

analysed as indicated. Patients were informed about this study and gave consent for the use of their data for research purposes.

Mab treatment

Monoclonal antibodies were provided by an initiative of the German Federal Ministry of Health. The antibodies were administered as intravenous infusion over 1 hour followed by an observational period of another hour.

Statistics

Significance of dichotomized data was determined by cross tabulations applying Fisher's exact test or ordinal by ordinal correlation. Student's T-test was applied for comparison of means of metric data. All calculations were done using SPSS (IBM Corp. Released 2015. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.)

Results

The two groups did not differ significantly in most of the clinical data such as age, sex and Covid-19 risk factors (Tab. 1 and supplementary table 1). However, there were differences in the observed symptoms, especially the occurrence of coughing and dyspnoea and, consequently, arterial pO₂ and pCO₂ values, which correlates with the dissimilar time between initial positive RT-PCR result, symptom onset and time of hospitalization. The most important significant difference in the two groups was found for the time of hospitalization (9.3 days versus 17.4 days, $p < 0.001$) but not death after positive PCR based Covid-19 diagnosis (two target amplification). Also, we found no difference in the course of the Ct-values of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR during hospitalisation (Fig. 1)

Discussion

In this small retrospective observational study, we could detect a significant shortening of hospitalisation time in the mab-treated cohort, consistent with larger studies published recently (Dougan et al. 2021, Weinreich et al. 2021). This demonstrates that this treatment can be highly effective as long as patients at risk are identified early, before severe symptoms occur. This will become important to avoid a high burden of hospitalized patients when greater Covid-19 incidences will appear. To achieve this, we have encouraged residential physicians by mail and media to immediately direct their SARS-CoV-2 positive patients having significant risk factors and beginning symptoms to our hospital for early therapy. The observed differences in blood gases as well as the frequency of coughing and dyspnoe reflect the different time after first positive RT-PCR and hospitalisation. However, we were not able to reproduce the reported early decrease in RT-PCR Ct-values (Dougan et al. 2021) in the treatment group (Fig. 1). However, especially at longer times after initial PCR, only patients being still positive by RT-PCR remain in this analysis, which might skew the result. Clearly, a higher number of patients will be needed to clarify this result.

It was also disappointing that about 10 % of the patients had a fatal outcome in both groups. This result might be due to the selection of patients, having a high number of risk factors. Again, larger numbers are needed to clarify this result.

Altogether, our experiences with this mab therapy are very encouraging in terms of avoiding long hospitalisation times in risk-patients as soon as the mabs are applied early in disease progression, which is consistent with the results of larger studies published recently. Nevertheless, efficient ways to inform patients on the availability of this therapy are needed.

Funding. This work was funded by institutional funds only. The monoclonal antibodies were provided by the German Federal Ministry of Health.

Potential conflicts of interest. All authors: No conflicts of interest exist.

Acknowledgments. We thank all patients for their participation in this study.

Author contributions. J.P. and G.B: examination and treatment of patients, data collection, manuscript editing, project administration, N.N: data collection and statistics, manuscript writing and editing.

References

- Alvi MM, Sivasankaran S and Singh M. Pharmacological and non-pharmacological efforts at prevention, mitigation, and treatment for COVID-19. *Drug Target*. 2020; 28:742-754. doi: 10.1080/1061186X.2020.1793990.
- Buss NAPS, Henderson SJ, McFarlane M, Shenton JM, de Haan L. Monoclonal antibody therapeutics: history and future. *Curr Opin Pharmacol*. 2012; 12: 615-622 doi: 10.1016/j.coph.2012.08.001.
- Dougan M, Nirula A, Azizad M, Mocherla B, Gottlieb RL, Chen P et al. et al. Bamlanivimab plus Etesevimab in Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021; NEJMoa2102685. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2102685.
- Esmailzadeh A, Rostami S, Yeganeh PM, Tahmasebi S, Ahmadi M. Recent advances in antibody based immunotherapy strategies for COVID-19. *J Cell Biochem*. 2021; doi: 10.1002/jcb.30017
- Hurt AC, Wheatley AK. Neutralizing Antibody Therapeutics for COVID-19. *Viruses*. 2021; 13: 628. doi: 10.3390/v13040628
- Taylor EH, Marson EJ, Elhadi M, Macleod KDM, Yu YC, Davids R et al. Factors associated with mortality in patients with COVID-19 admitted to intensive care: a systematic review and meta131 analysis. *Anaesthesia*. 2021; 76: 1224-1232. doi: 10.1111/anae.15532.
- Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, Ali S, Gao H, Bhoire R et al. REGN-COV2, a Neutralizing Antibody Cocktail, in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021; 384: 238-251. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2035002




Figure 1: SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results from nasal swabs of the patients. Data are presented as average C_t including standard deviation (A) or $2^{(40-Ct)}$ (B) after initial positive RT-PCR diagnosis to visualize the decrease of viral load over time. Ct-values considered as negative were set to 40.

Treatment group		Reference group	
	Number / total determined (%)	Number / total determined (%)	significance
all	34/34 (100 %)	31/31 (100%)	
female	23/34 (67.6 %)	22/31 (71.0 %)	0.80
Age	74.7 ± 11.4	76.0 ± 8.0	0.60
Initial PCR1 Ct	24.8 ± 4.9	27.0 ± 5.0	0.126
Initial PCR2 Ct	25.8 ± 5.2	28.0 ± 5.4	0.133
Symptoms start after PCR (days)	3.3 ± 1.9	4.8 ± 4.9	0.171
Hospitalisation after PCR (days)	9.3 ± 7.8	17.4 ± 7.8	P < 0.001
MAB therapy, start after symptom onset (days)	4.1 ± 1.9		
Death	4/33 (11.8 %)	3 / 31 (9.7 %)	1.00
Symptoms:			
Cough	22/34 (64.7 %)	10/31 (32.3 %)	0.013
Dyspnoea	5/34 (14.7 %)	16/31 (51.6 %)	0.003

Fatigue	13/34 (38.2 %)		17/31 (54.8 %)	0.22
Pain	8/34 (23.5 %)		4/31 (12.9 %)	0.35
Loss of appetite	7/34 (20.6 %)		7/31 (22.6 %)	1.00
Loss of taste	2/34 (5.9 %)		1/31 (3.2 %)	1.00
Diarrhea	7/34 (20.6 %)		5/31 (16.1 %)	0.75
Fever > 37.5°C	8/34 (23.5 %)		12/31 (38.7 %)	0.28
Neurological deficits	3/34 (8.8 %)		2/31 (6.5 %)	1.00
Collapse	3/34 (8.8 %)		4/31 (12.9 %)	0.70
Risk Factors:				
Hypertension (RR _{sys} >140)	23/34 (67.6 %)		23/31 (%)	0.60
Diabetes	14/34 (41.2 %)		6/31 (%)	0.066
Renal insufficiency	7/34 (20.6 %)		7/31 (%)	1.00
COPD/ Asthma	8/34 (23.5 %)		13/31 (%)	0.18
Malignoma	6/34 (17.6 %)		3/31 (%)	0.48
Immunesuppressive Medication	6/34 (17.6 %)		1/31 (%)	0.107
Obesity (BMI > 35)	8/34 (28.5 %)		8/30 (%)	0.78
CHD	13/34 (38.2 %)		14/31 (%)	0.62
Hypothyreosis	10/34 (29.4 %)		9/31 (29.0 %)	1.00
Other	11/34 (32.4 %)		8/31 (%)	0.60
Average Number of Risk Factors	2.8 ± 1.1		2.7 ± 1.4	0.51 [§]
Fever >37.5°C	12/31 (38.7 %)		8/31 (25.8%)	0.42
pO ₂ kPa	10.1 ± 2		8.3 ± 1.5	P < 0.001
pCO ₂ kPa	4.3 ± 0.9		4.9 ± 0.9	0.015
Hb mmol/L	7.5 ± 1.5		8.1 ± 1.3	0.127

Table 1: Characteristics of the study cohort. Significance for cross tabulation tests was determined by Fisher's exact test or ordinal by ordinal correlation (§). Student's T-test was applied for comparison of means of metric data. Mean and standard deviation are given.

Treatment group		Reference group		
	Number / total determined (%)		Number / total determined (%)	significance
BMI	28.8 ± 6.1		27.3 ± 6.2	0.33
BMI > 30	11/32 (34.4 %)		8/31 (25.8 %)	0.59
B1.1.7 variant	11/11 (100 %)		3/3 (100 %)	
vaccinated	7/13 (53.8 %)		1/3 (33.3 %)	n.d.
Smoker	7/13 (53.8 %)		9/14 (64.2 %)	n.d.
RR sys	126.5 ± 16.6		126.7 ± 23.8	0.97
RR dia	74.8 ± 11.6		74.8 ± 10.8	0.99
Pulse rate	79.3 ± 13.4		78.1 ± 13.8	0.73
Leukocytes Gpt/L	6.1 ± 4.5		7.4 ± 4.0	0.247
Lymphocytes Gpt/L	0.9 ± 0.4		1.2 ± 0.7	0.064
Thrombocytes Gpt/L	172.3 ± 59.5		194.5 ± 100.4	0.292
CRP mg/l	51 ± 45.7		54.8 ± 63.9	0.70
CRP > 5	26/31 (83.9 %)		28/31 (90.3 %)	0.71
Pro-BNP (pg/mL)	3044.6 ± 5274.6		3928.5 ± 7243.8	0.63
Pro-BNP < 300	8/24 (33.3 %)		5/24 (20.8 %)	0.52
Troponin ng/mL	0.031 ± 0.039		0.065 ± 0.091	0.065
Glucose mmol/L	9.3 ± 5.1		7.7 ± 3.0	0.244
Creatinine µmol/L	127.2 ± 159.7		129.1 ± 92.5	0.95
Creatinine high	7/31 (22.6 %)		14 / 31 (45.2 %)	0.27
GFR ml/min/1,73	61.4 ± 25		53.8 ± 25.5	0.243
ASAT µmol/l*s	0.8 ± 0.7		1.0 ± 1.2	0.45
ALAT µmol/l*s	0.4 ± 0.3		0.5 ± 0.4	0.48
AP µmol/l*s	1.6 ± 1.1		1.7 ± 0.9	0.73
GGT µmol/l*s	0.9 ± 1.1		1.3 ± 1.4	0.29
Bilirubin µmol/l	7.8 ± 4.7		9.9 ± 7.5	0.20

Suppl. table 1: Further characteristics of the study cohort. Significance for cross tabulations was determined by Fisher's exact test or ordinal by ordinal correlation (χ^2). Student's T-test was applied for comparison of means of metric data. Mean and standard deviation are given. N.d.: not determined.

Supplement Strobe Checklist