

# Interferon Beta-1 $\alpha$ ring prophylaxis to reduce household transmission of SARS-CoV-2: the Containing Coronavirus Disease-19 randomized clinical trial

## Authors

José A. Castro-Rodriguez, PhD  
Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

Eleanor N. Fish, PhD  
University of Toronto

Tobi Kollmann, PhD  
Telethon Kids Institute

Carolina Iturriaga, RN  
Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

Yuliya Karpievitch, PhD  
Telethon Kids Institute

Casey Shannon, BSc  
Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence

Virginia Chen, BSc  
Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence

Robert Balshaw, PhD  
Centre for Healthcare Innovation, University of Manitoba

Samuel T. Montgomery, PhD  
Telethon Kids Institute

Joseph Ho, MSc  
Telethon Kids Institute

Rym Ben Othman, PhD  
Telethon Kids Institute

Radhouana Aniba, PhD  
Telethon Kids Institute

Francisca Gidi-Yunge, DDS  
Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

Lucy Hartnell, MSc  
Telethon Kids Institute

Guillermo Pérez-Mateluna, Biotech  
Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

Marcela Urzúa, RN  
Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

Scott Tebbutt, PhD  
Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence

Diego García-Huidobro, PhD

39 Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

40 Cecilia Perret, MD

41 Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

42 Arturo Borzutzky, MD

43 Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

44 Stephen M. Stick, PhD

45 Telethon Kids Institute

46

47 **Corresponding author:** Professor Stephen Stick

48 [stephen.stick@health.wa.gov.au](mailto:stephen.stick@health.wa.gov.au)

49 **Abstract (351 words)**

50 **Importance:** Evidence suggests that early, robust type 1 interferon responses to SARS-CoV-2 are  
51 critical determinants for COVID-19 disease outcomes, accelerating viral clearance and limiting viral  
52 shedding.

53 **Objective:** We undertook a ring prophylaxis study to determine whether pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  could  
54 reduce SARS-CoV-2 household transmission.

55 **Design:** A cluster randomized clinical trial of pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  conducted in Santiago, Chile.  
56 Recruitment was conducted between December 4<sup>th</sup> 2020, and 31<sup>st</sup> May 2021, with the last follow-up  
57 completed June 29<sup>th</sup> 2021.

58 **Setting:** The study was conducted across 341 households in the metropolitan area of Santiago, Chile.

59 **Participants:** Index cases were identified from databases of those with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 from  
60 COVID-19 clinics and emergency room visits in Santiago, Chile. 5,154 index cases were assessed for  
61 eligibility, 1,372 index cases were invited to participate, and 341 index cases and their household  
62 contacts (n = 831) were enrolled in the study.

63 **Intervention:** Households were cluster randomized to receive 125 $\mu$ g subcutaneous pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$   
64 (n = 172 households, 607 participants), or standard care (n = 169 households, 565 participants).

65 **Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s):** Frequentist and Bayesian analyses were undertaken to determine  
66 the effects of treatment on (i) reducing viral shedding in index cases and (ii) reducing viral  
67 transmission to treatment-eligible household contacts. Four secondary outcomes were assessed  
68 including duration of viral shedding, effects on viral transmission and seroconversion, incidence of  
69 hospitalization, and incidence and severity of reported adverse events. A post-hoc 'at risk population'  
70 was defined as households where the index case was positive at the start of the study and there was  
71 at least one treatment eligible contact in a household who tested negative for SARS-CoV-2.

72 **Results:** In total, 1172 participants in 341 households underwent randomization, with 607 assigned to  
73 receive IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  and 565 to standard care. Based on intention to treat and per protocol analyses,  
74 IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment was ineffective. However, in the ‘at risk’ population, the relative risk of infection  
75 was reduced by 23% in treated individuals and that there was a 95% probability that IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  reduced  
76 household transmission

77 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Ring prophylaxis with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  reduces the probability of SARS-CoV-2  
78 transmission within a household.

79 **Trial Registration:** Clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT04552379

80

## 81 Introduction (Words 3284)

82 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has claimed over six million lives. Despite the rapid development and  
83 deployment of vaccines in many countries, the number of new cases worldwide still exceeds 500,000  
84 daily (<https://covid19.who.int>). With each wave of the pandemic, health systems have been  
85 challenged and the likelihood of emergence of mutant strains of the virus remains. Mutated strains  
86 may be more transmissible <sup>1,2</sup>, cause more severe disease than the original pandemic strain of SARS-  
87 CoV-2 <sup>3</sup> and have the potential to evade available vaccines <sup>4,5</sup>. Whilst widespread vaccination has had  
88 success limiting the trajectory of the pandemic, the emergence of the omicron variants demonstrated  
89 that even with mutations that appear to cause less severe disease <sup>6</sup>, high transmission despite  
90 immunization could still result in significant pressures on health services <sup>7</sup>.

91  
92 The solution to halting any pandemic is ending community transmission. During the current  
93 pandemic, measures such as healthy hygiene, self-isolation when sick, physical-distancing and use of  
94 facemasks have all been effective <sup>8</sup>. Moreover, expedited public health responses such as extensive  
95 contact-tracing, testing for infection and community lockdowns have all been effective methods to  
96 curb transmission <sup>9</sup>. International and local border closures plus strict quarantine measures have  
97 reduced community transmission to zero for periods in countries such as Australia and New Zealand  
98 <sup>10,11</sup>. However, in these countries and elsewhere, as restrictions are relaxed, localized outbreaks have  
99 occurred <sup>12</sup> that have required rapid, community-wide responses to again suppress transmission.  
100 Importantly, these community constraints cause unprecedented civil disruption and come at  
101 enormous economic <sup>13,14</sup> and social costs <sup>15,16</sup>.

102

103

Since the evolution of dominant SARS-CoV-2 virus cannot be easily predicted<sup>17</sup>, there remains a need to identify interventions that can be rapidly deployed should highly pathogenic strains emerge despite high levels of community immunization. Furthermore, preparations for the next pandemic must include strategies to limit the potential for infection and transmission on first contact with pathogenic respiratory viruses.

One of the many therapeutic approaches investigated that appeared clinically useful early in the course of the pandemic was treatment with type 1 interferons (IFNs). Randomized, controlled studies suggest that IFNs offer clinical benefits in moderate<sup>18</sup> and severe disease<sup>19,20</sup> }, reduce the duration of viral shedding<sup>21</sup> and prevent infection in front-line hospital workers<sup>22</sup>. Nonetheless, IFNs are not generally recommended for treatment of proven cases of Covid-19<sup>23</sup>.

Since IFNs are sentinel innate immune signalling molecules produced early after first contact with viral pathogens<sup>24-26</sup>, we postulated that prophylactic IFN treatment might reduce susceptibility to infection of uninfected contacts of individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Such post-exposure prophylaxis could provide non-specific, antiviral protection to curb episodic viral outbreaks<sup>27</sup>, help suppress community transmission, even in vaccinated populations, and therefore reduce the risk of emergence of dangerous mutations<sup>4,28</sup>.

We therefore undertook a cluster, randomized, controlled study of sub-cutaneous pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  (Plegridy. Biogen Inc, Cambridge MA) administration to determine whether IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  therapy given to index cases and household contacts can reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

## 127 **Methods**

128 The Containing Coronavirus Disease-19 (ConCorD-19) trial was a prospective,  
129 cluster, randomized trial of subcutaneous (sc) administration of pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  ("IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  ") versus  
130 standard care (control) <sup>29</sup>. Each household of an index case was randomized to either the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$   
131 treatment or the standard care control arm. The study was approved by the Institutional Review  
132 Board of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile and was registered with clinicaltrials.gov  
133 (NCT04552379). All participants provided written informed consent.

134

### 135 *Trial population*

136 Index cases were identified from databases of those with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 from COVID-19  
137 clinics and emergency room visits in Santiago, Chile. Households were contacted by telephone to  
138 determine eligibility prior to enrolment. Individuals aged between 18 and 80 years who met inclusion  
139 and exclusion criteria were deemed as 'eligible' contacts with households only included if there was at  
140 least one eligible contact <sup>29</sup>. Enrolment and the first doses of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  - if in the intervention arm- had  
141 to be within 72 hours of the positive identification of SARS-CoV-2 by polymerase chain reaction (PCR)  
142 in index cases. A household was excluded if the index case had been in complete self-quarantine  
143 from other household members during the 48 hours prior to the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection <sup>29</sup>.  
144 Household characteristics were captured consistent with recommendations of the World Health  
145 Organization for assessing household transmission <sup>30</sup>. All participants implemented quarantine  
146 measures as mandated by local authorities and maintained a daily symptom diary which was collected  
147 and reviewed at each study visit by the study team (see online supplementary material). At any time  
148 during the trial, if a contact participant developed symptoms suggestive of COVID-19, a  
149 nasopharyngeal swab was taken by a member of a mobile health team for virus PCR testing in an

accredited SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic laboratory. Index cases were instructed to remain in isolation / quarantine for 11 days from onset of symptoms or, if asymptomatic, 11 days from the sample collection date that resulted in the COVID-19 diagnosis. Household contacts remained in isolation / quarantine for 11 days from date of the sample resulting in the diagnosis of the index case or of a newly diagnosed household member as per recommendations/rulings by local authorities.

### *Intervention*

A mobile health team conducted home visits of all participant households on study days 1 (enrolment), 6, 11, 16 and 29. Index cases and eligible household contacts in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm received three subcutaneous doses of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  (125 $\mu$ g/0.5ml x 0.5ml) on study days 1, 6 and 11. Ineligible contacts in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm, as well as index cases and all household contacts in the SOC arm, received standard care. All participating households received information regarding hygiene, isolation, social distancing and wearing of facemasks as per public health advice at the time of enrolment. The IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  injection was given by a trained member of a mobile health team and participants were recommended to take paracetamol (1000mg, 6 hourly) commencing at the same time as the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  for up to twenty-four hours, in order to mitigate predictable flu-like symptoms<sup>31</sup>.

### *Outcomes*

The primary outcomes were (i) the proportion of index cases shedding SARS-CoV-2 at study day 11 in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  compared to control arm and (ii) the proportion of household contacts shedding SARS-CoV-2 at day 11, in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  compared to the control arm. Secondary and exploratory outcomes are listed in Supplementary Methods (Supplementary Table 1). Shedding was determined by the presence of SARS-CoV-2 by PCR in saliva collected on days 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 29 (see Supplementary



Methods). A SARS-CoV-2 PCR Ct value  $\geq 40$  was considered negative. Viral load was estimated from the Ct value using a standard algorithm (Supplementary Figure 1

### *Biospecimen collections*

The full schedule of biospecimen collection is provided in the supplementary methods (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3. All consenting, non-eligible household contacts also provided biospecimens according to the schedule collection for non-eligible household contacts.

### *Adverse events*

These were classified in accordance with Good Clinical Practice <sup>32</sup>, as non-serious or serious and as related or unrelated to the trial medication.

### *Statistical considerations*

The study was designed at the start of the pandemic and there were few data to guide sample size calculations. We therefore planned both frequentist inference and Bayesian analyses based on assumptions from the available data.

Households were randomized as individual clusters using a minimization technique (biased coin,  $P=0.7$ ) in order to achieve balance between treatment arms, stratified by the number of people within the household <sup>33</sup>.

194 Sample size calculations assumed,  $\alpha=0.025$  and power 90%, a zero correlation between outcome  
195 measures and that the household-wise, type 1 error rate would be below 0.05 and power above 80%.  
196 The estimated average household size was 4, based on census data <sup>34</sup>.

197

198 Primary outcomes:

199 (i) SARS-CoV-2 shedding at study day 11 by index cases: Data from Wuhan suggested that the  
200 proportion of untreated index cases still shedding virus on study day 11 would be ~85% <sup>35</sup>. Based on a  
201 two tailed Fisher's exact test, a sample size of 278 index cases (139 per arm) would have 90% power  
202 to detect a difference in the proportion of individuals shedding virus at study day 11, if the proportion  
203 in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm was 65%.

204

205 (ii) SARS-CoV-2 shedding at study day 11 by household contacts: We estimated the secondary  
206 infection rate (transmission within the household) where there is an untreated index case would  
207 be 28% <sup>36,37</sup>. Based on a stratified Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test (two-tailed with intra-class  
208 correlation of 0.15), we estimated that a sample of 278 households (834 eligible household contacts)  
209 would have >90% power, at alpha 0.025, to detect an odds ratio of 0.5 for a reduction in transmission  
210 to a treated household contact.

211

212 Based on these assumptions and estimates, we aimed to recruit 310 households (allowing for a 10%  
213 drop-out rate) and 930 eligible household contacts.

214

215 We undertook 3 separate sets of analyses:

(A) Standard frequentist analyses based on the primary outcomes as stated in the protocol and described in the Statistical Analysis Plan (available online) and included intention to treat and per protocol approaches.

(B) Exploratory frequentist analyses based on a modified dataset that accounted for biological implausibility and effects that might only be associated with active treatment (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1 for further explanations).

Both frequentist analyses fitted linear mixed effects models using lme4<sup>38</sup> (see Statistical Analysis Plan).

(C) Exploratory Bayesian analyses using the same dataset as the exploratory frequentist analysis. Detailed methods are provided in the supplementary methods. Briefly, a generalized linear model with mixed effects was developed to estimate the probability of infection that is influenced by explanatory variables for each contact case. A stan\_glmer with binomial logit function in rstanarm R package was used<sup>39,40</sup>.

The frequentist approach allowed us to estimate the effects of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment on the risk of an *individual* becoming infected. Whereas the Bayesian analysis allowed us to determine whether the ring prophylaxis strategy using IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  reduces the probability of transmission within the household of an infected index case.

With regard to the filtered datasets, we observed, after locking the database, that a number of index cases had negative PCR results on the day of recruitment despite a previous positive diagnostic PCR test. In the exploratory analyses we therefore excluded households where the index case was unlikely to transmit virus because they were not shedding virus on days 1 and day 6 of the study. We

also excluded households where an eligible contact was already positive at recruitment and there were no other eligible negative cases in the household. We refer to the modified dataset as the population "at risk". We used the population at risk data to better understand the effects of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment on transmission of virus within households.

When undertaking these exploratory analyses, we considered effects during two time periods. Days 1-11 (Period 1) i.e., the treatment and isolation period when eligible contacts in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm were likely to have elevated IFN levels based on the known pharmacokinetics of pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  and days 12-29 (Period 2) the post-treatment and isolation period when biological effects of pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  were likely to be waning in treated individuals. Although samples were not obtained on days 12-15, we assumed that anyone who became infected during this period would likely still to have a positive PCR on day 16.

## Results

Recruitment, participation, and completion data are shown in Figure 1. Participant demographic and basic household characteristics data are shown in Table 1.

Between December 2020 and May 2021, three-hundred and forty-one households were enrolled and randomized, of which 137 (IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm) and 151 (control arm) completed the study. Of the 1172 individuals randomized (IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm = 607; Controls = 565), 53 individuals withdrew from the study, of which 15 were index cases; 35 (14 index cases) in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm and 18 (1 index case) in the control arm. The reasons for withdrawal are summarized in the supplementary results (Supplementary Table 4). One index case withdrew before being allocated to a treatment arm.

262

263 Eighty-two households where the index case had a negative salivary PCR on Day 1 and 6, or where  
264 there were no eligible contacts who tested negative at recruitment, were excluded from the  
265 exploratory analyses. The remaining households were considered as the 'at risk' population. (Figure  
266 1).

267

#### 268 *(a) Primary analyses*

269 The outcomes for the intention to treat (ITT) and per protocol (PP) frequentist analyses were similar  
270 (Supplementary Results). There was no effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment on duration of viral shedding in  
271 those treated (index cases or infected contacts) vs. controls (IC-INF: treatment OR = 0.979, 95%CI =  
272 0.647 to 1.479); IC-ITT: treatment OR = 1.106, 95%CI = 0.657 to 1.863); IC-PP: treatment OR = 1.062,  
273 95%CI = 0.622 to 1.810); Figure 2A). The observed reduction in transmission to household contacts  
274 associated with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  by day 11 was not significant (EHC-ITT: treatment OR = 0.582, 95%CI =  
275 0.271 to 1.247; HC: treatment OR = 0.577, 95%CI = 0.287 to 1.160; EHC-PP: treatment OR = 0.589,  
276 95%CI = 0.272 to 1.276; Figure 2B). Vaccination status did not affect these outcomes (Supplementary  
277 results).

#### 278 *(b) Exploratory frequentist analysis of 'At Risk Population.'*

279 Of the at risk population, 33/164 (20%) in the IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  arm became infected by day 29 of the study  
280 compared to 37/142 (26%) in the control arm (relative risk reduction in the IFN arm = 23%). The  
281 majority of the risk reduction occurred during the active treatment phase of the study (days 1 to 11).  
282 Treatment with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  was associated with a significant reduction in the odds of a positive saliva  
283 PCR for all household contacts compared to standard of care on Day 11 ( $p$  = 0.033; OR = 0.550, 95% CI

= 0.364 to 0.989). The treatment effect was not significant in the second period (days 12-29) was not significant (OR = 0.968, 95% CI = 0.405 to 2.840) (Figure 2C)

*(c) Exploratory Bayesian analysis:*

Overall, there was a 95% probability of infection reduction within a household by IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment and the credible interval for the reduction in transmission probability was in the order of 0.9 to 15.9%. During the active treatment period (days 1-11), there was a significant reduction in the odds of transmission (Bayesian analysis (OR = 0.32, 95% Credible Interval = 0.11 to 0.83). In contrast, in Period 2 (day 12-29), the 95% credible interval of *Beta* coefficients for the treatment group includes zero and therefore treatment was not effective in this period (Figure 2C, Supplementary Figure 2). The effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  on transmission was independent of household size (Supplementary Figure 3)

To determine the effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment on viral shedding in those who became infected, we examined the viral load trajectories in household contacts who became PCR positive after day 1. We did not observe any difference in viral load trajectory in those treated with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  compared to controls (Figure 3A). Furthermore, there was no difference in peak viral load between treated household contacts and controls who became infected (Figure 3B).

There were fifty-eight serious adverse events in index cases, twenty-seven hospitalizations due to COVID-19 (25 in the treatment and 32 in the control arm) and was one death in the standard care arm due to COVID-19 in an individual with significant co-morbidities. Twenty-six household contacts of index cases were hospitalized, 10 in the treatment arm and 16 in the control arm, the difference was not statistically significant.

307

## 308 Discussion

309 This prospective, household cluster randomized, ring prophylaxis trial demonstrated that IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$   
 310 may reduce household transmission of SARS-CoV-19. Pegylated IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  is an FDA approved therapy  
 311 for multiple sclerosis for which the pharmacokinetics and safety profile are well-characterized <sup>41</sup>.  
 312 The use of this formulation allowed us to predict the likely duration of activity of the three-dose  
 313 regimen in order to cover the period of peak transmissibility of the virus. Using a mobile medical  
 314 team to administer doses at home optimized adherence to therapy and allowed reasons for non-  
 315 adherence and withdrawal to be accurately documented.

316

317 Although the intention to treat and per protocol analyses failed to demonstrate a significant effect on  
 318 primary outcomes, these analyses failed to account for index cases not shedding virus at  
 319 randomization nor an absence of eligible contacts within a household. Using biologically plausible  
 320 filters to define an at risk population provided a better understanding of the effects of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  than  
 321 intention to treat or per protocol analyses. These exploratory analyses that took account of the  
 322 likelihood that transmission could occur within a household provided a pragmatic assessment of the  
 323 effects of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  therapy when given to household contacts as prophylaxis.

324

325 The frequentist analysis of the at risk populations indicated that *individuals* treated with IFN were less  
 326 likely to become infected than untreated individuals when exposed to virus with a relative risk  
 327 reduction of 23%. The Bayesian analysis revealed that the probability was 95% that transmission was  
 328 reduced in *households* randomized to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  therapy. This effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  on household  
 329 transmission was only significant during the active treatment period. This highlights the physiological

importance of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  as a sentinel molecule <sup>24</sup> and provides further evidence for post-exposure prophylaxis with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  as an antiviral strategy.

To our knowledge, only one previous study assessed ring prophylaxis in COVID-19. Labhardt et al observed that a combination of lopinavir/ritonavir for 5 days as post-exposure prophylaxis was not effective at preventing infection in close contacts of index cases <sup>42</sup>.

The overall viral load trajectory we observed was very similar to that observed in a laboratory human challenge experiment using wild-type SARS-CoV-2 virus in healthy volunteers <sup>43</sup>. Treatment with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  had no effect on viral load trajectory; therefore, reduced viral shedding by infected individuals is unlikely to explain the protective effect on household transmission of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment that we report. Given that treatment affected the probability of transmission only in the active treatment phase and appears unrelated to viral load, we speculate that the observed effects of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  were direct through protection of the at risk, exposed individual rather than indirectly through effects on the index case. The ConCoRD-19 biorepository will allow further examination of the mechanisms of action of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  on resistance to infection.

The study was undertaken prior to the emergence of the omicron strain of virus (Supplementary Figure 4). We calculated the sample size based upon known household transmission characteristics of the alpha strain which was the dominant strain of the virus early in the pandemic. Simple hygiene measures and quarantine of affected individuals within households could have contributed to lower rates of transmission than expected. Together with a smaller number of eligible household contacts than anticipated from census data, these factors may have reduced the power of the study for the



primary outcomes. The effect size observed in this study could be greater for variants with higher transmissibility such as the Omicron strains that are now the dominant worldwide. Nonetheless, the beneficial biological effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  treatment was evident in the at risk population and therefore, post-exposure or ring prophylaxis with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  warrants further investigation, particularly if additional virulent strains of SARS-CoV-2 emerge and for future pandemic virus preparedness.

In summary, although intention to treat and per protocol analyses failed to demonstrate significant effects on primary outcomes, in a biologically defined, at risk population, the relative risk of infection for an individual treated with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  was reduced by 23.0%. Moreover, this is the first study to demonstrate ring prophylaxis with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  significantly reduces the probability of household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. The effect of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  was most obvious during the active phase of treatment. In situations where there is emergence of a highly pathogenic and transmissible mutant strain of SARS-CoV-2 despite high vaccination rates, or when there is a new viral pandemic, IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  ring prophylaxis could be considered to reduce transmission in households or amongst critical workers and vulnerable communities. Ring prophylaxis with therapies that can interrupt transmission appears to be an effective strategy for highly contagious respiratory viruses.

#### **Funding.**

Biogen PTY Ltd. Supply of interferon as "Plegridy".  
The study was substantially funded by BHP Holdings Pty Ltd

## 376 **Authorship**

377 Authors Castro-Rodriguez; Fish; Kollmann; Iturriaga, Karpievitch and Shannon contributed equally to  
378 the conduct of the study and manuscript preparation as first authors. Authors Tebbutt, Diego García-  
379 Huidobro, Perret, Borzutsky and Stick contributed equally to the conduct of the study and manuscript  
380 preparation as senior authors.

381

## 382 **Acknowledgements**

383 Matthew Cooper (Telethon Kids Institute). Advice regarding protocol and establishment of  
384 randomization schedule. Alexia Foti (Telethon Kids Institute). Collating, reviewing, and editing  
385 documents. Zsuzsanna Hollander (PROOF Centre, Vancouver). Statistical advice and statistical analysis  
386 plan review. Nat Eiffler (Telethon Kids Institute). Project management, protocol development, data  
387 management. Jessica Meyer (University of Rochester). Assisting collation and formatting of tables and  
388 figures.

389

## References

1. Alizon S, Haim-Boukobza S, Foulongne V, et al. Rapid spread of the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in some French regions, June 2021. *Euro Surveill* 2021;26(28). DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.28.2100573.
2. Mishra S, Mindermann S, Sharma M, et al. Changing composition of SARS-CoV-2 lineages and rise of Delta variant in England. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;39:101064. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101064.
3. Twohig K, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, et al. Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk for SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) compared with alpha (B.1.1.7) variants of concern: a cohort study. *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00475-8.
4. Winger A, Caspari T. The Spike of Concern-The Novel Variants of SARS-CoV-2. *Viruses* 2021;13(6). DOI: 10.3390/v13061002.
5. Lyngse FP, Mortensen LH, Denwood MJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC Transmission in Danish Households. *medRxiv* 2021.
6. Nyberg T, Ferguson NM, Nash SG, et al. Comparative analysis of the risks of hospitalisation and death associated with SARS-CoV-2 omicron (B.1.1.529) and delta (B.1.617.2) variants in England: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2022;399(10332):1303-1312. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00462-7.
7. Le Rutte E, Shattock A, Chitnis N, Kelly. SL, Penny M. Assessing impact of Omicron on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics and public health burden. *medRxiv*. Online server: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2021.
8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Implementation of Mitigation Strategies for Communities with Local COVID-19 Transmission. CDC. May 23 2021.
9. Milne GJ, Xie S, Poklepovich D, O'Halloran D, Yap M, Whyatt D. A modelling analysis of the effectiveness of second wave COVID-19 response strategies in Australia. *Sci Rep* 2021;11(1):11958. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-91418-6.

- 413 10. National Incident Room Surveillance Team. COVID-19 Australia: Epidemiology Report 38  
414 Reporting period ending 28 March 2021. Commun Dis Intell (2018) 2021;45. DOI:  
415 10.33321/cdi.2021.45.19.
- 416 11. Houvessou GM, Souza TP, Silveira MFD. Lockdown-type containment measures for COVID-19  
417 prevention and control: a descriptive ecological study with data from South Africa, Germany, Brazil,  
418 Spain, United States, Italy and New Zealand, February - August 2020. Epidemiol Serv Saude  
419 2021;30(1):e2020513. DOI: 10.1590/S1679-49742021000100025.
- 420 12. Conway SR, Lazarski CA, Field NE, et al. SARS-CoV-2-Specific T Cell Responses Are Stronger in  
421 Children With Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome Compared to Children With Uncomplicated SARS-  
422 CoV-2 Infection. Front Immunol 2021;12:793197. DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.793197.
- 423 13. Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus. JAMA  
424 2020;324(15):1495-1496. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.19759.
- 425 14. Verschuur J, Koks EE, Hall JW. Global economic impacts of COVID-19 lockdown measures stand  
426 out in high-frequency shipping data. PLoS One 2021;16(4):e0248818. DOI:  
427 10.1371/journal.pone.0248818.
- 428 15. Chemen S, Gopalla YN. Lived experiences of older adults living in the community during the  
429 COVID-19 lockdown - The case of mauritius. J Aging Stud 2021;57:100932. DOI:  
430 10.1016/j.jaging.2021.100932.
- 431 16. Mamun MA. Suicide and Suicidal Behaviors in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic in Bangladesh:  
432 A Systematic Review. Psychol Res Behav Manag 2021;14:695-704. DOI: 10.2147/PRBM.S315760.
- 433 17. Callaway E. Beyond Omicron: what's next for COVID's viral evolution. Nature 2021;600(7888):204-  
434 207. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-021-03619-8.

- 435 18. Rahmani H, Davoudi-Monfared E, Nourian A, et al. Interferon  $\beta$ -1b in treatment of severe COVID-  
436 19: A randomized clinical trial. *Int Immunopharmacol* 2020;88:106903. (In eng). DOI:  
437 10.1016/j.intimp.2020.106903.
- 438 19. Alavi Darazam I, Shokouhi S, Pourhoseingholi MA, et al. Role of interferon therapy in severe  
439 COVID-19: the COVIFERON randomized controlled trial. *Sci Rep* 2021;11(1):8059. (In eng). DOI:  
440 10.1038/s41598-021-86859-y.
- 441 20. Davoudi-Monfared E, Rahmani H, Khalili H, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial of the Efficacy and  
442 Safety of Interferon  $\beta$ -1a in Treatment of Severe COVID-19. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2020;64(9)  
443 (In eng). DOI: 10.1128/aac.01061-20.
- 444 21. Feld JJ, Kandel C, Biondi MJ, et al. Peginterferon lambda for the treatment of outpatients with  
445 COVID-19: a phase 2, placebo-controlled randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021;9(5):498-510. (In  
446 eng). DOI: 10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30566-x.
- 447 22. Meng Z, Wang T, Chen L, et al. The Effect of Recombinant Human Interferon Alpha Nasal Drops to  
448 Prevent COVID-19 Pneumonia for Medical Staff in an Epidemic Area. *Curr Top Med Chem*  
449 2021;21(10):920-927. (In eng). DOI: 10.2174/1568026621666210429083050.
- 450 23. National Institutes of Health. Covid-19 Treatment Guidelines. In: Health NIH, ed.: United States  
451 Government; 2021.
- 452 24. Lee AJ, Ashkar AA. The Dual Nature of Type I and Type II Interferons. *Front Immunol* 2018;9:2061.  
453 DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2018.02061.
- 454 25. Mazewski C, Perez RE, Fish EN, Plataniias LC. Type I Interferon (IFN)-Regulated Activation of  
455 Canonical and Non-Canonical Signaling Pathways. *Front Immunol* 2020;11:606456. DOI:  
456 10.3389/fimmu.2020.606456.

- 457 26. Wang BX, Fish EN. Global virus outbreaks: Interferons as 1st responders. *Semin Immunol*  
458 2019;43:101300. DOI: 10.1016/j.smim.2019.101300.
- 459 27. World Health Organization. Informal consultation on the role of therapeutics in COVID-19  
460 prophylaxis and post-exposure prophylaxis. . Worl Health Organization.
- 461 28. Gentile I, Maraolo AE, Piscitelli P, Colao A. COVID-19: Time for Post-Exposure Prophylaxis? *Int J*  
462 *Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17(11):3997. (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/ijerph17113997.
- 463 29. Iturriaga C, Eiffler N, Aniba R, et al. A cluster randomized trial of interferon ss-1a for the reduction  
464 of transmission of SARS-Cov-2: protocol for the Containing Coronavirus Disease 19 trial (ConCorD-19).  
465 *BMC Infect Dis* 2021;21(1):814. DOI: 10.1186/s12879-021-06519-4.
- 466 30. World Health Organization. Household transmission investigation protocol for 2019-novel  
467 coronavirus (COVID-19) infection. Epidemiological protocol. Geneva: World Health Organization,  
468 February 28th 2020 2020. (WHO/2019-nCoV/HHtransmission/2020.4)  
469 ([https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/household-transmission-investigation-protocol-for-2019-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/household-transmission-investigation-protocol-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-infection)  
470 [novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)-infection](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/household-transmission-investigation-protocol-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-infection)).
- 471 31. Reess J, Haas J, Gabriel K, Fuhlrott A, Fiola M. Both paracetamol and ibuprofen are equally  
472 effective in managing flu-like symptoms in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis patients during  
473 interferon beta-1a (AVONEX) therapy. *Mult Scler* 2002;8(1):15-8. DOI: 10.1191/1352458502ms771sr.
- 474 32. National Health and Medical Research Council. Guidance: Safety monitoring and reporting in  
475 clinical trials involving therapeutic goods. Canberra: National Health and Medical Research Council;  
476 2016.
- 477 33. Hofmeijer J, Anema PC, van der Tweel I. New algorithm for treatment allocation reduced  
478 selection bias and loss of power in small trials. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(2):119-24. DOI:  
479 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.04.002.


- 480 34. National Institute of Statistics. Chile Population and Housing Census 2017. Santiago, Chile:  
481 National Institute of Statistics (Chile), 2021. ([http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/chile-population-and-](http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/chile-population-and-housing-census-2017)  
482 [housing-census-2017](http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/chile-population-and-housing-census-2017)).  
483 35. World Health Organisation. Situation report - 50. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) 50. World  
484 Health Organisation, 2020. ([https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)  
485 [2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)).  
486 36. Yi B, Fen G, Cao D, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 214 families with COVID-19  
487 in Wuhan, China. Int J Infect Dis 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.02.021.  
488 37. Curmei M, Ilyas A, Evans O, Steinhardt J. Constructing and adjusting estimates for household  
489 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from prior studies, widespread-testing and contact-tracing data. Int J  
490 Epidemiol 2021;50(5):1444-1457. DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyab108.  
491 38. Bates DM, M.; Bolker, B.; Walker, S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of  
492 Statistical Software 2015;67(1):1-48. DOI: doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.  
493 39. Goodrich B, Gabry J, Ali I, S. B. Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan. R package version  
494 2.21.1. rstanarm 2020 (<https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm>).  
495 40. Brilleman SL, Crowther MJ, Moreno-Betancur M, Bueros Novik J, Wolfe R. Joint longitudinal and  
496 time-to-event models via Stan. StanCon 2018. 10-12 Jan 2018. Pacific Grove C, USA.  
497 [https://github.com/stan-dev/stancon\\_talks/](https://github.com/stan-dev/stancon_talks/). Joint longitudinal and time-to-event models via Stan. .  
498 StanCon 2018. Pacific Grove, CA, USA2018.  
499 41. Hu X, Seddighzadeh A, Stecher S, et al. Pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and safety of  
500 peginterferon beta-1a in subjects with normal or impaired renal function. J Clin Pharmacol  
501 2015;55(2):179-88. DOI: 10.1002/jcph.390.

- 502 42. Labhardt ND, Smit M, Petignat I, et al. Post-exposure Lopinavir-Ritonavir Prophylaxis versus  
503 Surveillance for Individuals Exposed to SARS-CoV-2: The COPEP Pragmatic Open-Label, Cluster  
504 Randomized Trial. EClinicalMedicine 2021;42:101188. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101188.
- 505 43. Ben K, Alex M, Mariya K, et al. Nature Portfolio 2022. DOI: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-1121993/v1.  
506  
507




	Full study population		At risk population	
	SOC (n = 565)	IFN (n = 607)	SOC (n = 246)	IFN (n = 293)
<b>Age (years)</b>				
Mean (SD)	35.0 (19.4)	33.2 (18.7)	29.2 (21.0)	29.0 (20.0)
<b>Sex</b>				
Female, n (%)	294 (52.0%)	323 (53.2%)	133 (54.1%)	171 (58.4%)
Male, n (%)	271 (48.0%)	284 (46.8%)	113 (45.9%)	122 (41.6%)
<b>Household occupants</b>				
Mean (SD)	4.10 (1.31)	4.51 (2.02)	4.28 (1.30)	4.86 (2.24)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>				
No, n (%)	380 (67.3%)	438 (72.2%)	167 (67.9%)	217 (74.1%)
Yes, n (%)	103 (20.3%)	169 (27.8%)	79 (32.1%)	76 (25.9%)
<b>Cancer</b>				
No, n (%)	559 (98.9%)	598 (98.5%)	245 (99.6%)	290 (99.0%)
Yes, n (%)	5 (0.9%)	9 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.0%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Diabetes</b>				
No, n (%)	542 (95.9%)	583 (96.0%)	238 (96.7%)	285 (97.3%)
Yes, n (%)	22 (3.9%)	24 (4.0%)	7 (2.8%)	8 (2.7%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Heart disease</b>				
No, n (%)	533 (94.3%)	578 (95.2%)	236 (95.9%)	281 (95.9%)
Yes, n (%)	31 (5.5%)	29 (4.8%)	9 (3.7%)	12 (4.1%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Asthma</b>				
No, n (%)	524 (92.7%)	581 (95.7%)	230 (93.5%)	282 (96.2%)
Yes, n (%)	40 (7.1%)	26 (4.3%)	15 (6.1%)	11 (3.8%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>				
No, n (%)	564 (99.8%)	606 (99.8%)	245 (99.6%)	292 (99.7%)
Yes, n (%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic kidney disease</b>				
No, n (%)	564 (99.8%)	604 (99.5%)	245 (99.6%)	292 (99.7%)
Yes, n (%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>				
No, n (%)	562 (99.5%)	602 (99.2%)	245 (99.6%)	290 (99.0%)
Yes, n (%)	2 (0.4%)	5 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.0%)
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Smoker</b>				
No, n (%)	502 (88.8%)	519 (85.5%)	227 (92.3%)	255 (87.0%)
Yes, n (%)	63 (11.2%)	88 (14.5%)	19 (7.7%)	38 (13.0%)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)


**Table 1: Full study population demographics at baseline, and at risk population demographics at baseline.**



**Figure 1: CONSORT diagram describing participant screening, enrolment, randomisation, and analysis.**



**Figure 2: Forrest plots describing primary and exploratory study outcomes. (A)** odds ratios for index case populations in Primary Analysis 1 and associated sensitivity analyses, to compare the probability of being SARS-CoV-2 negative vs positive on study day 11 in either treatment or standard of care arms. **(B)** odds ratios for household contact populations in Primary Analysis 2 and associated sensitivity analyses, to compare the probability of household contacts being SARS-CoV-2 negative vs positive on study day 11 in either treatment of standard of care arms. **(C)** odds ratios for the exploratory frequentist and Bayesian analysis, to determine if IFN is associated with a reduction in the number of positive COVID-19 tests in household contacts across study period 1 (days 1-11) and study period 2 (days 12-29). Treatment with IFN is associated with a significant reduction in the odds of a positive COVID-19 test for all household contacts compared to standard of care; frequentist analysis ( $p = 0.033$ ; OR = 0.550, 95% CI = 0.364 to 0.989), Bayesian analysis (OR = 0.32, 95% CrI = 0.11 to 0.83). IC-INF = Infected case population (main analysis), IC-ITT = Index case – intention to treat population (sensitivity analysis 7.1.3.2), IC-PP = Index case – per protocol population (sensitivity analysis 7.1.3.3). EHC-ITT = Treatment-eligible household contact – intention to treat population (main analysis), HC = Household contact (eligible + non-eligible contacts) population (sensitivity analysis 7.2.3.2), EHC-PP = Treatment-eligible household contact – per protocol population (sensitivity analysis 7.2.3.3). \*  $p < 0.05$ .



**Figure 3: Log<sub>10</sub> viral load in study participants who test positive for COVID-19 after visit 1. (A)** No significant difference in median viral load at each study visit between SOC and IFN arms. **(B)** No significant difference in peak viral load between SOC and IFN arms. SOC = standard of care arm, IFN = interferon arm, cp/mL = copies/mL. n = 57 (IFN) & n = 61 (SOC) participants per group.

## **Supplementary Materials**

## Table of Contents

List of Study Investigators .....	3
Supplementary Methods .....	5
Real-time Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR) for SARS-CoV-2.....	5
Viral load calculation.....	5
Populations used for analyses.....	5
Bayesian statistical analysis.....	5
Bayesian model.....	6
Computation of difference in probability of infection in IFN vs SOC arms .....	6
Supplementary Results.....	7
Bayesian analysis of infection reduction .....	7
Supplementary Figures .....	8
Supplementary Figure 1: Standard curve for calculation of SARS-CoV-2 viral load .....	8
Supplementary Figure 2: Distribution of the difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms by household size.....	9
Supplementary Figure 3: Distribution of the difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms. ....	9
Supplementary Figure 4: COVID-19 variants detected in Santiago, Chile during study recruitment. ....	10
Supplementary Tables.....	11
Supplementary Table 1: Primary, secondary, and exploratory outcomes for the Containing Coronavirus Disease-19 clinical trial.....	12
Supplementary Table 2: Schedule of laboratory assessments for index cases and treatment eligible household contacts. ....	13
Supplementary Table 3: Schedule of laboratory assessments for treatment ineligible household contacts. ....	14
Supplementary Table 4: Study withdrawal reasons by treatment arm. ....	15
Supplementary Table 5: Reasons for exclusion from study participation during screening and reasons for declined participation following invitation to participate in ConCorD-19. ....	16
Supplementary Table 6: Study populations used for analysis, and reasons for exclusion from analysis. ....	17
Supplementary Table 7: Bayesian estimated beta coefficients and odds ratio for treatment with IFN, with average values and 95% credible intervals. ....	18
Supplementary Table 8: Difference in probability of infection in each study period irrespective of household size.....	18
Supplementary Table 9: Difference in probability of infection in each study period, stratifying by household size.....	18
Supplementary Table 10: Number of contacts at each household size. ....	19
Supplementary References.....	20
Supplementary Appendices.....	21

## **List of Study Investigators**

### **Jose A. Castro-Rodriguez**

Department of Pediatric Pulmonology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

### **Eleanor N. Fish**

Department of Immunology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada  
Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada

### **Tobias Kollman**

Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

### **Carolina Iturriaga**

Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile  
Millennium Institute on Immunology and Immunotherapy, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

### **Yuliya Karpievitch**

Wal-yan Respiratory Research Centre, Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia  
School of Biomedical Sciences, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

### **Casey Shannon**

Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence, Vancouver, Canada  
Centre for Heart Lung Innovation, Providence Health, St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, Canada

### **Virginia Chen**

Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence, Vancouver, Canada  
Centre for Heart Lung Innovation, Providence Health, St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, Canada

### **Robert Balshaw**

Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence, Vancouver, Canada  
Centre for Heart Lung Innovation, Providence Health, St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, Canada

### **Samuel T. Montgomery**

Wal-yan Respiratory Research Centre, Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia  
School of Population Health, Curtin University, Bentley, Australia

### **Joseph Ho**

Wal-yan Respiratory Research Centre, Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

### **Rym Ben Othman**

Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

### **Radhouana Aniba**

Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

### **Francisca Gidi-Yunge**

School of Dentistry, Faculty of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

**Lucy Hartnell**

Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia

**Guillermo Pérez-Mateluna**

Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica De Chile, Santiago, Chile

**Marcela Urzúa**

Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica De Chile, Santiago, Chile

**Scott Tebbit**

Prevention of Organ Failure (PROOF) Centre of Excellence, Vancouver, Canada  
Centre for Heart Lung Innovation, Providence Health, St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, Canada

**Diego García-Huidobro**

Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, University of Minnesota, United States of America

**Cecilia Perret**

Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

**Arturo Borzutzky**

Department of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Millennium Institute on Immunology and Immunotherapy, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

**Stephen M. Stick**

Wal-yan Respiratory Research Centre, Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia  
Perth Children's Hospital, Nedlands, Australia



## **Real-time Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR) for SARS-CoV-2**

RNA extraction and RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection was performed at the Infectiology and Molecular Virology Laboratory, Red Salud UC Christus, Santiago, Chile. RNA was extracted in parallel from saliva using the MagBind RNA extraction kit (#GN7101907, Maccura Biotechnology, Rockville, MD, USA) with the Auto-Pure 32A Nucleic Purification System (Maccura Biotechnology, Rockville, MD, USA), and using the RNA/DNA Purification Magnetic Bead Kit (#DA0630, DaAnGene, Guangzhou, CN) with the Smart32 Nucleic Acid Extraction Instrument (DaAnGene, Guangzhou, CN) according to manufacturer specifications. Real-time PCR amplification was performed using the LightMix Modular Wuhan CoV RdRP-gene kit (#53-0777-96, TIB MolBiol, Roche, Berlin, DE) targeting the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRP) gene, targeting SARS-CoV-2, but not other SARS-like viruses (CoVNL63, CoV229E, HKE, OC43, MERS), with a positive control containing three separate diagnostic targets (E gene, N gene, RdRP). The reverse transcription and PCR processes occur in a single step in a real-time thermocycler (Lightcycler 480 II, Roche, Berlin, DE) with an analytical sensitivity of 10.6 copies per reaction. A cycle threshold (Ct) value of  $\leq 37$  was considered positive for SARS-CoV-2.

## **Viral load calculation**

The viral load of SARS-CoV-2 detected in saliva was calculated using a standard curve. A commercial SARS-CoV-2 standard (#COV019, Exact Diagnostics, Fort Worth, TX, USA) at a concentration of 200,000 copies per mL (cp/mL) was extracted in triplicate using the RNA/DNA Purification Magnetic Bead Kit (#DA0630, DaAnGene, Guangzhou, CN) with the Smart32 Nucleic Acid Extraction Instrument (DaAnGene, Guangzhou, CN) according to manufacturer specifications. Following extraction, serial dilutions (1:10; 200,000cp/mL to 20cp/mL & 1:5; 200,000cp/mL to 64cp/mL) were used in triplicate for reverse transcription and RT-qPCR using the LightMix Modular Wuhan CoV RdRP-gene kit (#53-0777-96, TIB MolBiol, Roche, Berlin, DE) with the Lightcycler 480 II thermocycler (Roche, Berlin, DE), resulting in 9 replicates at each concentration. SARS-CoV-2 was detectable in all nine replicates at 200,000cp/mL, 40,000cp/mL, 20,000cp/mL, 8,000cp/mL, 2000cp/mL, and 1,600cp/mL, and a standard curve was generated using the mean Ct values for these concentrations (Supplementary Figure 1) to calculate SARS-CoV-2 viral load in samples of unknown titre, resulting in a lower limit of quantification of 1,600cp/mL.

## **Populations used for analyses**

Participants were excluded for analysis as outlined in the statistical analysis plan, or as outlined in the exploratory analysis (Supplementary Appendix B). Total households and participants excluded and used in each population are described in Supplementary Table 6. Briefly, participants were excluded from the populations used in the primary analyses (IC-INF, IC-ITT, EHC-ITT, HC) if the study visit was not performed, or was performed outside the  $\pm 1$  day window either side of the scheduled visit date (Statistical Analysis Plan 6.5). Participants who didn't complete the full course of the treatment were excluded from the Per Protocol populations used in the primary analyses (IC-PP, EHC-PP). In the exploratory analysis, whole households were excluded if the index case was SARS-CoV-2 negative via salivary PCR at study days 1 & 6, and if there were no SARS-CoV-2 negative eligible or ineligible contacts in the household at study day 1. Participants were then excluded from the exploratory analysis if they were SARS-CoV-2 positive via salivary PCR at study day 1. Participants were further excluded from the Bayesian analysis where household size was greater than 7, as these household sizes were unable to be modelled using Bayesian modelling.

## **Bayesian statistical analysis**

Bayesian analysis was included in the original statistical analysis plan. The goal was to test the null hypothesis that treatment of household contacts with IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$  does not reduce the probability of transmission from an infected index case to household contacts. As outlined in the analysis plan, we used data to develop a data generating process governed by probabilities that a household contact of an index case would test positive to COVID-19, and non-informative prior was used.

**Bayesian model**  
A generalized linear model with mixed effects was developed to estimate the probability of infection for each contact. A `stan_glm` with binomial logit function from the `rstanarm` package (1) was run using R (version 4.1.1) to obtain Beta coefficients for 4,000 simulated samples to estimate the probability of infection using the following model:

$$p_{cr} \sim (1 | index) + vacc + viral + infected + eligible + sex + age + arm$$

where: *p<sub>cr</sub>*: binary COVID-19 test result, *index*: index case in the household – treated as a random effect, *vacc*: number of vaccinated household members, *viral*: log<sub>10</sub> viral load of the index case at the beginning of the period, *infected*: number of COVID-19 positive household members at the beginning of the period, *eligible*: whether the household contact was eligible for treatment, *sex*: sex of the household contact, *age*: age of the household contact, and *arm*: study arm (i.e. SOC/IFN) of the household were the fixed explanatory variables.

The features of the model were the same as the exploratory frequentist analysis, with the exception of adding the treatment period as a feature. Instead, the Bayesian analysis split the data into two periods (Period 1: study days 1–11, Period 2: study days 12–29) with analysis conducted separately. For period 2, COVID-19 positivity at day 11 was used to determine COVID-19 positive household members at the beginning of the period. The population used for analysis was the same as the “At-risk” population used in the exploratory frequentist analysis (Supplementary Table 6), with the additional exclusion of participants in households with a size larger than 8.

### Computation of difference in probability of infection in IFN vs SOC arms

In each simulation, we obtained a PCR outcome for each contact from the Bayesian model by applying the `posterior_predict` function in the `rstanarm` package to the observed data (1). We further computed the percent of infections in each treatment arm irrespective of household size (Supplementary Table 8) and for each household size (Supplementary Table 9). Furthermore, we computed the difference in probability of infection by subtracting the probability of infection in IFN arm from the probability of infection in SOC arm. As a results, we obtained 4000 differences (irrespective of household size) and 4000 differences for each household size

Significance of the treatment effect was determined by 95% credible interval (CrI) for the treatment Beta coefficient. If 0 was included in the CrI, the effect of treatment group was considered not significant. Average Beta coefficient and odds ratio for the effect of the IFN treatment as compared to SOC were computed in each study period. The average odds ratio of being infected with SARS-CoV-2 on IFN treatment vs. SOC was calculated by exponentiating the values of the average of the coefficients (Supplementary Table 7).

## Supplementary Results

### Bayesian analysis of infection reduction


Treatment with IFN had a significant effect in study period 1 as the 95% CrI for treatment coefficient did not include zero (Supplementary Table 7). However, IFN treatment did not have a significant effect in period 2 as the 95% CrI did include zero (Supplementary Table 7).

In study period 1, there was 95% probability of infection reduction between 0.9% to 15.9% due to the IFN treatment, with 8.5% median and mean infection reduction (Supplementary Table 8). In study period 2, there are 95% probability of infection reduction -6.7% to 4.8% due to the IFN treatment, with -9% of median and mean of infection reduction (Supplementary Table 8).


When we stratified the infection reduction by household size, only households' size 3 and 4 in period 1 had a 95% CrI without zero (Supplementary Table 9).

As the distribution of Bayesian estimated differences in probabilities of infection in study period 1 is centred to the right of 0 (Supplementary Figure 3A), IFN treatment had an effect on reducing SARS-CoV-2 transmission within households. However, as the distribution in study period 2 is centred around 0, it suggests IFN has no effect on SARS-CoV-2 transmission within households (Supplementary Figure 3B).


## Supplementary Figures




**Supplementary Figure 1: Standard curve for calculation of SARS-CoV-2 viral load.** Mean cycle threshold (Ct) values are plotted on the y-axis, and  $\log_{10}$  SARS-CoV-2 copies per mL (cp/mL) are plotted on the x-axis. Linear regression resulted in an  $R^2$  value of 0.9972, to fit the equation  $y = -3.719x + 48.83$ .



**Supplementary Figure 2: Distribution of the difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms by household size. (A)** Distribution in study period 1, and **(B)** Distribution in study period 2. Vertical dashed black line represents zero difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms.



**Supplementary Figure 3: Distribution of the difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms. (A)** Distribution in study period 1, and **(B)** Distribution in study period 2. Vertical black line represents zero difference in probability of infection between SOC and IFN arms.



**Supplementary Figure 4: COVID-19 variants detected in Santiago, Chile during study recruitment.** Data represents COVID-19 variants detected as a percentage of the total infections detected during this period.

## Supplementary Tables

Primary Objectives	Outcome & Outcome Measure
To determine whether IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ treatment reduces the proportion of infected cases shedding SARS-CoV-2 at day 11 after randomization.	The proportion of index cases shedding SARS-CoV-2 at day 11 in the active arm compared to the standard of care arm
To determine whether IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ treatment reduces the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 transmission from index cases to treatment-eligible household contacts, as measured by any positive upper airway infection evidenced by real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR), in contacts at day 11 after randomization.	The proportion of household contacts shedding SARS-CoV-2 at day 11 in the active arm compared to the standard of care arm
Secondary Objectives	Outcome & Outcome Measure
To determine whether in index cases infected with SARS-CoV-2, IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ treatment compared with standard of care reduces the duration of SARS-CoV-2 upper airway virus shedding over 28 days following randomization.	Duration (in days) of SARS-CoV-2 measured by PCR of samples taken on study days 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 29
To determine whether IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ treatment affects the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 upper airway infection or serological conversion by study day 29 in household contacts.	Number of household contacts of participants in the IFN arm with positive upper airway PCR compared to that in the standard of care arm at day 1 & 11, and seroconversion (IgM) over the study period up to day 29
To determine whether IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ treatment compared with standard of care reduces the proportion of infected cases that require hospital admission or die due to COVID-19	The proportion of infected cases in the active arm that are hospitalized or die due to COVID-19, as compared to the proportion in the standard of care arm
To determine the safety of IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ in the treatment and prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infection	Incidence and severity of reported adverse events in the active arm compared to the standard of care arm
Exploratory Objectives	Biological samples and associated data will be stored for later access for ethically approved research relevant to the exploratory objectives
Assess the impact of participant demographic and clinical metadata on the viral transmission dynamics and response to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ in the household using unbiased systems epidemiology	

Assess the impact of hostbiology on the viral transmission dynamics and response to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ in the household using unbiased systems biology
Integrate the demographic and clinical data with the biological host data to decipher potential interactions relevant to outcome of infection or exposure, as well as response to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ intervention
Integrate the demographic and clinical data with the biological host data to decipher potential interactions relevant to outcome of infection or exposure, as well as response to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ intervention
Estimate the secondary infection rate, serial interval, incubation period, duration of infectiousness, duration of detected shedding
<i>Individual level:</i> SARS-CoV-2 shedding as determined by PCR of upper respiratory samples analyzed as a function of time of exposure relative to the start of the intervention
<i>Household/Community level:</i> While each study arm will be assessed independently of each other as secondary objectives, we will assess the impact of any intervention on the entire household. When demographic and/or biological variables
Host immune response (anti SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, blood cytokines and chemokines), as well as blood and nasal mucosal host response (including but not limited to transcriptomics, metabolomics, proteomics, and epigenomics) to IFN $\beta$ -1 $\alpha$ intervention, SARS-CoV-2 infection and their interaction
<b>Supplementary Table 1: Primary, secondary, and exploratory outcomes for the Containing Coronavirus Disease-19 clinical trial</b>



	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visit 4	Visit 5	Visit 6	Extra Visit – Suspected COVID-19
Study Day	1 Dose 1	6 Dose 2	11 Dose 3	16	21	29	
<b>Blood Samples</b>							
Complete Blood count/ ESR	X					X	X
SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (IgGAM)	X					X	
Study sample 1	X	X	X			X	X
Study sample 2	X	X	X			X	X
Study sample 3	X	X	X			X	X
<b>Airway samples</b>							
Nasal brush	X						
Nasal lining fluid	X	X	X				
Airway Swab for COVID-19 diagnosis							X
<b>Saliva Samples</b>							
Saliva	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Supplementary Table 2: Schedule of laboratory assessments for index cases and treatment eligible household contacts.**

	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visit 4	Visit 5	Visit 6	Extra Visit – Suspected COVID-19
Study Day	1 Dose 1	6 Dose 2	11 Dose 3	16	21	29	
<b>Blood Samples</b>							
Complete Blood count/ ESR							X
SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (IgGAM)						X	
Study sample 1						X	X
Study sample 2						X	X
Study sample 3						X	X
<b>Airway samples</b>							
Nasal brush	X						
Nasal lining fluid	X	X	X				
Airway Swab for COVID-19 diagnosis							X
<b>Saliva Samples</b>							
Saliva	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Supplementary Table 3: Schedule of laboratory assessments for treatment ineligible household contacts.**

Interferon arm										Standard of Care arm									
Withdrawal reason	Days since enrolment									Withdrawal reason	Days since enrolment								
	3	4	5	10	11	14	15	21	28		3	4	5	10	11	14	15	25	28
Family withdrew	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	Family withdrew	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interpersonal problems	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	Interpersonal problems	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of time	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Lack of time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parental decision	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Parental decision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor health	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	Poor health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sample collection problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Sample collection problems	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Side effects of drug	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	Side effects of drug	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uninterested	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	Uninterested	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unspecified	4	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	Unspecified	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	5	0
Work commitments	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	Work commitments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Supplementary Table 4: Study withdrawal reasons by treatment arm.**

<b>Reasons for exclusion from ConCorD-19 during screening</b>		<b>Participants (n)</b>
Unable to be contacted		736
Days of symptoms > 5		777
Asymptomatic		306
Isolating from household contacts		219
Hospitalized		177
Confirmation of COVID-19 took longer than 72 hours		35
Deceased		2
Ineligible medical condition or treatment		67
Less than 18 years old		54
Pregnant, or plans on becoming pregnant		32
Previously infected with COVID-19		36
Greater than 80 years old		3
All eligible household contacts currently infected		514
Does not live with eligible household contact		412
Not the first infection in the household		392
Does not live in the Santiago metropolitan area		20
<b>Reasons for not participating in ConCorD-19</b>		
Index case declined		835
Eligible household contact declined		196
<b>Total</b>		<b>4813</b>

**Supplementary Table 5: Reasons for exclusion from study participation during screening and reasons for declined participation following invitation to participate in ConCorD-19.**

Analyses outlined in SAP		Exclusions			Participants (n) included for analyses		
Analysis	Population	Reason	Participants (n)		IFN	SOC	
	Full study population			IC	172	169	
				EHC	177	165	
				CP-HC	80	81	
				IHC	178	150	
Primary 1 - Main	IC-INF at day 11	No visit	22	IC	159	164	
		Visit outside window	3	CP-HC	69	76	
Primary 1 – Sensitivity 1	IC-ITT at day 11	No visit	12	IC	159	164	
		Visit outside window	2				
Primary 1 – Sensitivity 2	IC-PP at day 11	No visit or protocol deviation	26	IC	146	164	
		Visit outside window	1				
Primary 2 – Main	EHC-ITT at day 11	No visit	20	EHC	166	156	
Primary 2 – Sensitivity 1	HC at day 11	No visit	37	EHC	166	156	
				IHC	168	143	
Primary 2 – Sensitivity 2	EHC-PP at day 11	No visit or protocol deviation	30	EHC	156	156	
Exploratory Analyses		Exclusions					
Analysis	Population	Reason	Households (n)	Participants (n)			
Frequentist	Household contacts, COVID-19 negative at study day 1	COVID-negative index case	33		EHC	164	142
		No household contacts at risk	49				
		Household contact COVID positive		43	IHC	129	104
Bayesian	Frequentist population, household size ≤ 7	Household size > 7	5	61	EHC	152	139
					IHC	113	104

**Supplementary Table 6: Study populations used for analysis, and reasons for exclusion from analysis.** IC: index case, EHC: Treatment eligible household contacts, CP-HC: COVID-19 positive household contacts, IHC: Treatment ineligible household contacts, IC-INF: IC & CP-HC, IC-ITT: Index case – intention to treat population, IC-PP: Index case – per protocol population, EHC-ITT: Treatment eligible household contacts – intention to treat population, HC: EHC and IHC, EHC-PP: Treatment eligible household contact – per protocol population.

<b>Coefficient for treatment with IFN</b>				
Study period	Mean	Standard Deviation	<b>95% Credible Intervals</b>	
			Lower limit (2.5%)	Upper limit (97.5%)
1	-1.17	0.52	-2.23	-0.19
2	0.27	0.55	-0.80	1.36

<b>Odds ratio for treatment with IFN</b>			<b>95% Credible Intervals</b>	
Study period	Mean	Standard Deviation	Lower limit (2.5%)	Upper limit (97.5%)
1	0.32	1.68	0.11	0.83
2	1.31	1.73	0.45	3.90

**Supplementary Table 7: Bayesian estimated beta coefficients and odds ratio for treatment with IFN, with average values and 95% credible intervals.**

Study period	2.5%	25%	50%	Mean	75%	97.5%
1	0.009	0.059	0.085	0.085	0.110	0.159
2	-0.067	-0.028	-0.009	-0.009	0.010	0.048

**Supplementary Table 8: Difference in probability of infection in each study period irrespective of household size.** Data is the mean, median, and 95% CrI difference in probability of infection in each study period, computed as probability of infection in the SOC arm minus the probability of infection in the IFN arm.

Study period	Household size	2.5%	25%	50%	Mean	75%	97.5%
1	2	-0.143	0.000	0.286	0.053	0.143	0.286
1	3	0.000	0.092	0.276	0.139	0.184	0.276
1	4	0.003	0.087	0.249	0.128	0.170	0.249
1	5	-0.146	-0.046	0.158	0.005	0.058	0.158
1	6	-0.120	0.030	0.326	0.103	0.189	0.326
1	7	-0.231	-0.077	0.308	0.024	0.077	0.308
2	2	-0.118	-0.059	0.075	-0.008	0.000	0.075
2	3	-0.085	-0.021	0.090	0.001	0.028	0.090
2	4	-0.130	-0.068	0.059	-0.037	-0.006	0.059
2	5	-0.128	-0.052	0.103	-0.013	0.027	0.103
2	6	-0.129	-0.015	0.254	0.059	0.117	0.254
2	7	-0.154	0.000	0.154	0.016	0.077	0.154

**Supplementary Table 9: Difference in probability of infection in each study period, stratifying by household size.** Data is the mean, median, and 95% CrI difference in probability of infection in each study period, computed as probability of infection in the SOC arm minus the probability of infection in the IFN arm.

Household size	Number of households	Eligible Contacts	Inteligible Contacts
2	42	42	0
3	61	64	27
4	80	84	89
5	46	58	59
6	19	29	30
7	6	14	12

**Supplementary Table 10: Number of contacts at each household size.**

## Supplementary References

1. Goodrich B GJ, Ali I, Brilleman S. rstanarm: Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan. R package version 2.21.3 ed2022.



## Supplementary Appendices

## Supplementary Appendices A

### Containing Coronavirus Disease 19 Trial (CONCORD-19): Statistical Analysis Report

# Containing Coronavirus Disease 19 Trial (CONCORD-19)

## Statistical Analysis Report

<b>Design</b>	Cluster randomised clinical trial
<b>ClinicalTrials.gov identifier</b>	NCT04552379
<b>Protocol version</b>	3.1
<b>Statistical Analysis Plan version</b>	2.5

### Principal Investigators

Stephen Stick, MB BChir PhD MRCP FRACP

Perth Children's Hospital

15 Hospital Avenue, Nedlands WA 6009, Australia

Jose Antonio Castro-Rodriguez, MD PhD

School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Diagonal Paraguay 367, Santiago, Chile

### Author

Virginia Chen, MA

Senior Data Scientist

PROOF Centre of Excellence

Vancouver, BC, Canada

## Signatures

### Statistician (Author)

Virginia Chen

### Statistician (Reviewer)

Robert Balshaw

## Statistician (Reviewer)

Casey P. Shannon

---

# Table of Contents

- 1 [Abbreviations](#)
- 2 [Introduction](#)
  - 2.1 [Document Purpose](#)
  - 2.2 [Trial Objectives](#)
  - 2.3 [Executive Summary](#)
  - 2.4 [Deviations from the SAP](#)
  - 2.5 [Other Details](#)
- 3 [Analysis Populations and Participant Disposition](#)
  - 3.1 [Full Analysis Population](#)
  - 3.2 [Index Case - Intention-to-treat Population IC-ITT](#)
  - 3.3 [Index Case - Per Protocol Population IC-PP](#)
  - 3.4 [Infected Case Population IC-INF](#)
  - 3.5 [Treatment-eligible Household Contact - Intention-to-treat Population EHC-ITT](#)
  - 3.6 [Treatment-eligible Household Contact - Per Protocol Population EHC-PP](#)
  - 3.7 [Household Contact Population HC](#)
  - 3.8 [Safety Population](#)
- 4 [Withdrawals](#)
  - 4.1 [Overall](#)
  - 4.2 [By Treatment Arm](#)
- 5 [Missing Data](#)
- 6 [Baseline Characteristics](#)
  - 6.1 [Full Analysis Population](#)
  - 6.2 [IC-ITT Population](#)
  - 6.3 [IC-INF Population](#)
  - 6.4 [EHC-ITT Population](#)
  - 6.5 [HC Population](#)
- 7 [Primary Analyses SAP 6.10](#)

- 7.1 Primary Analysis 1 SAP 6.10.1
- 7.2 Primary Analysis 2 SAP 6.10.2
- 8 Secondary Analyses
  - 8.1 Secondary Analysis 1 SAP 6.10.3
  - 8.2 Secondary Analysis 2 SAP 6.10.4
  - 8.3 Secondary Analysis 3 SAP 6.10.5
  - 8.4 Secondary Analysis 4 SAP 6.10.6
- 9 Safety Analysis SAP 6.11
- 10 Additional Analyses SAP 6.12
  - 10.1 Dose-response and Recovery SAP 6.12.1
  - 10.2 Dose-response and Transmission SAP 6.12.2
  - 10.3 Viral Load SAP 6.12.3
- 11 Optional Analyses
  - 11.1 Bayesian Analysis
  - 11.2 Exploratory Two-period Generalized Mixed Effects Model

# 1 Abbreviations

<b>AE</b>	adverse event
<b>AR</b>	absolute risk
<b>ARR</b>	absolute risk reduction
<b>GLM</b>	generalized linear model
<b>GLMM</b>	generalized linear mixed model
<b>HR</b>	hazard ratio
<b>IFN</b>	interferon beta 1alpha (Biogen)
<b>ITT</b>	intention-to-treat
<b>OR</b>	odds ratio
<b>PCR</b>	polymerase chain reaction
<b>RR</b>	risk ratio
<b>SAE</b>	serious adverse event
<b>SAP</b>	statistical analysis plan
<b>SARS-CoV-2</b>	severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
<b>SD</b>	standard deviation
<b>SOC</b>	standard of care
<b>SOP</b>	standard operating procedure

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Document Purpose

This document contains the results of the analyses described in the CONCORD-19 Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP). Descriptions of the analyses are omitted where the analysis proceeded as planned in the SAP. Any details or clarifying text are intended to be read in the context of the SAP.

### 2.2 Trial Objectives

#### 2.2.1 Primary Objectives

1. To determine whether IFN therapy reduces the number of infected cases still shedding SARS-CoV-2 in saliva at day 11 following randomisation.
2. To determine whether IFN therapy reduces the incidence of SARS CoV-2 transmission from index cases to treatment-eligible household contacts, as measured by any positive upper airway PCR in treatment-eligible household contacts at day 11 after randomisation

#### 2.2.2 Secondary Objectives

1. To determine whether in index cases infected with SARS-CoV-2, IFN therapy compared with SOC reduces the duration of a saliva positive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) SARS-CoV-2 test over 28 days following randomisation.
2. To determine if IFN affects the incidence of saliva positive PCR SARS-CoV-2 tests or serological conversion by study day 29 in household contacts, compared with SOC.
3. To determine if IFN therapy, compared with SOC, reduces the proportion of infected cases that require hospital admission or die due to COVID-19.
4. To determine the safety of IFN treatment.

#### 2.2.3 Exploratory Objectives

Exploratory objectives were not pursued at this stage.

### 2.3 Executive Summary

#### Primary objective 1

- Results do not suggest an effect

#### Primary objective 2

- Results suggest that IFN may reduce transmission to household contacts by study day 11, but statistical significance was not achieved in any analysis

### Secondary objective 1

- Results do not suggest an effect

### Secondary objective 2

- Results do not suggest an effect

### Secondary objective 3

- Results suggest that IFN may increase duration of hospital stay, but statistical significance was not achieved in the main analysis
- IFN was statistically significant for reducing incidence of hospitalization in the sensitivity analyses
- IFN was statistically significant for increasing duration of hospital stay, in the sensitivity analyses

### Secondary objective 4

- IFN was statistically significant for increasing incidence of treatment-related adverse events, but not for adverse events or serious adverse events in general

## 2.4 Deviations from the SAP

1. Two unplanned sensitivity analyses were added that take into account days between symptom onset and visit date for index cases. See “Adjusted for Days Between Symptom Onset and Visit Date” sections under “Sensitivity Analyses” for each Primary Objective.
2. Index cases occasionally had a negative PCR result on study day 1, despite testing positive prior to enrollment and testing positive at study day 6, 11, or 16. In these cases, their study day 1 viral load was imputed as 50% of their first non-negative viral load recorded during the study. These imputed values were used only in sensitivity analyses and additional analyses. Additionally, a sensitivity analysis will be performed for primary analysis 1, by excluding index cases that tested negative at *both* study day 1 and 6.
3. **An additional exploratory analysis into treatment effect during (D1-D11) and after (D12-29) discontinuation of treatment/household isolation is included (under Optional Analyses at the end of the report).**

## 2.5 Other Details

For inclusion as a covariate, age was discretised by quartile. The breakdown is as follows:

SOC IFN

Age < 18	139	162
18 < Age <= 34	135	163
34 < Age <= 48	135	155
48 <= Age	156	127

## 3 Analysis Populations and Participant Disposition

### 3.1 Full Analysis Population

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	172	162	160	159	158	162	Index case	169	165	165	162	159	165
Treatment-eligible household contact	177	171	166	162	163	163	Treatment-eligible household contact	165	159	156	154	150	154
COVID-positive household contact	80	74	70	67	69	69	COVID-positive household contact	81	78	76	72	77	78
Treatment-ineligible household contact	178	173	168	169	169	167	Treatment-ineligible household contact	150	144	143	143	140	143

IFN

	Reason for no visit			
	Withdrawal	Household request	Research team decision	Other
Index case	37	3	0	19
Treatment-eligible household contact	45	1	0	14
COVID-positive household contact	44	0	0	7
Treatment-ineligible household contact	30	0	0	14

SOC

Reason for no visit



	Withdrawal	Household request	Research team decision	Other
Index case	12	7	0	10
Treatment-eligible household contact	32	5	0	15
COVID-positive household contact	6	1	0	17
Treatment-ineligible household contact	24	5	0	8

## 3.2 Index Case - Intention-to-treat Population IC-ITT

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	172	162	160	159	158	162	Index case	169	165	165	162	159	165
Treatment-eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment-eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
COVID-positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	COVID-positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment-ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment-ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0

## 3.3 Index Case - Per Protocol Population IC-PP

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	146	146	146	145	143	145	Index case	169	165	165	162	159	165
Treatment-eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment-eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
COVID-positive	0	0	0	0	0	0	COVID-positive	0	0	0	0	0	0

household  
contact

Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

household  
contact

Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

### 3.4 Infected Case Population IC-INF

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	172	162	160	159	158	162	Index case	169	165	165	162	159	165
Treatment- eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment- eligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
COVID- positive household contact	80	74	70	67	69	69	COVID- positive household contact	81	78	76	72	77	78
Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0

### 3.5 Treatment-eligible Household Contact - Intention-to-treat Population EHC-ITT

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0	Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment- eligible household contact	177	171	166	162	163	163	Treatment- eligible household contact	165	159	156	154	150	154
COVID- positive household	0	0	0	0	0	0	COVID- positive household	0	0	0	0	0	0

Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---

### 3.6 Treatment-eligible Household Contact - Per Protocol Population EHC-PP

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0	Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment- eligible household contact	156	156	156	152	154	153	Treatment- eligible household contact	165	159	156	154	150	154
COVID- positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	COVID- positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment- ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0

### 3.7 Household Contact Population HC

IFN							SOC						
# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day						
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0	Index case	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treatment- eligible household contact	177	171	166	162	163	163	Treatment- eligible household contact	165	159	156	154	150	154
COVID- positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	COVID- positive household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0

Treatment-eligible household contact 178 173 168 169 162 167 159 144 143 143 140 143

ineligible household contact

## 3.8 Safety Population

IFN							SOC						
	# Visits conducted at study day							# Visits conducted at study day					
	1	6	11	16	21	29		1	6	11	16	21	29
Index case	172	162	160	159	158	162	Index case	169	165	165	162	159	165
Treatment-eligible household contact	177	171	166	162	163	163	Treatment-eligible household contact	165	159	156	154	150	154
COVID-positive household contact	80	74	70	67	69	69	COVID-positive household contact	81	78	76	72	77	78
Treatment-ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0	Treatment-ineligible household contact	0	0	0	0	0	0

## 4 Withdrawals

### 4.1 Overall

	Days since enrollment									
	3	4	5	10	11	14	15	21	28	
Family withdrew	0	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Interpersonal problems	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Lack of time	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parental decision	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Poor health	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Sample collection problems	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Uninterested	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Unspecified	4	4	4	2	1	0	1	5	0
Work	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0

## 4.2 By Treatment Arm

IFN										SOC									
Days since enrollment										Days since enrollment									
	3	4	5	10	11	14	15	21	28		3	4	5	10	11	14	15	21	28
Family withdrew	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	Family withdrew	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interpersonal problems	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	Interpersonal problems	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of time	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Lack of time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parental decision	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Parental decision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor health	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	Poor health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sample collection problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Sample collection problems	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Side effects of drug	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	Side effects of drug	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uninterested	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	Uninterested	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unspecified	4	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	Unspecified	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	5	0
Work	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

All participants consented to the use of their collected data.

## 5 Missing Data

No imputation was performed.

## 6 Baseline Characteristics

## 6.1 Full Analysis Population

	Overall (N=1172)
<b>Age (years)</b>	
Mean (SD)	34.1 (19.0)
<b>Sex</b>	
Female	617 (52.6%)
Male	555 (47.4%)
<b>Household occupants</b>	
Mean (SD)	4.31 (1.73)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>	
No	818 (69.8%)
Yes	354 (30.2%)
<b>Cancer</b>	
No	1157 (98.7%)
Yes	14 (1.2%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Diabetes</b>	
No	1125 (96.0%)
Yes	46 (3.9%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Heart disease</b>	
No	1111 (94.8%)
Yes	60 (5.1%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Asthma</b>	
No	1105 (94.3%)
Yes	66 (5.6%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>	
No	1170 (99.8%)
Yes	1 (0.1%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Chronic kidney disease</b>	
No	1168 (99.7%)
Yes	3 (0.3%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>	
No	1164 (99.3%)
Yes	7 (0.6%)
Missing	1 (0.1%)
<b>Smoker</b>	
No	1021 (87.1%)
Yes	151 (12.9%)

## 6.2 IC-ITT Population

	SOC (N=169)	IFN (N=172)
<b>Age (years)</b>		

<b>Sex</b>		
Female	82 (48.5%)	79 (45.9%)
Male	87 (51.5%)	93 (54.1%)
<b>Household occupants</b>		
Mean (SD)	3.74 (1.29)	3.90 (1.64)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>		
No	106 (62.7%)	116 (67.4%)
Yes	63 (37.3%)	56 (32.6%)
<b>Cancer</b>		
No	166 (98.2%)	169 (98.3%)
Yes	3 (1.8%)	3 (1.7%)
<b>Diabetes</b>		
No	162 (95.9%)	163 (94.8%)
Yes	7 (4.1%)	9 (5.2%)
<b>Heart disease</b>		
No	158 (93.5%)	165 (95.9%)
Yes	11 (6.5%)	7 (4.1%)
<b>Asthma</b>		
No	157 (92.9%)	167 (97.1%)
Yes	12 (7.1%)	5 (2.9%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>		
No	169 (100%)	172 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic kidney disease</b>		
No	169 (100%)	172 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>		
No	169 (100%)	172 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Smoker</b>		
No	147 (87.0%)	138 (80.2%)
Yes	22 (13.0%)	34 (19.8%)

## 6.3 IC-INF Population

	<b>SOC (N=250)</b>	<b>IFN (N=252)</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		
Mean (SD)	42.2 (13.1)	40.5 (13.5)
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	129 (51.6%)	117 (46.4%)
Male	121 (48.4%)	135 (53.6%)
<b>Household occupants</b>		
Mean (SD)	3.83 (1.28)	3.98 (1.65)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>		
No	158 (63.2%)	170 (67.5%)
Yes	92 (36.8%)	82 (32.5%)
<b>Cancer</b>		
No	246 (98.4%)	248 (98.4%)
Yes	4 (1.6%)	4 (1.6%)

No	237 (94.8%)	237 (94.0%)
Yes	13 (5.2%)	15 (6.0%)
<b>Heart disease</b>		
No	232 (92.8%)	236 (93.7%)
Yes	18 (7.2%)	16 (6.3%)
<b>Asthma</b>		
No	230 (92.0%)	239 (94.8%)
Yes	20 (8.0%)	13 (5.2%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>		
No	250 (100%)	252 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic kidney disease</b>		
No	250 (100%)	252 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>		
No	249 (99.6%)	251 (99.6%)
Yes	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)
<b>Smoker</b>		
No	215 (86.0%)	205 (81.3%)
Yes	35 (14.0%)	47 (18.7%)

## 6.4 EHC-ITT Population

	<b>SOC (N=165)</b>	<b>IFN (N=177)</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		
Mean (SD)	41.6 (15.5)	38.0 (14.8)
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	93 (56.4%)	107 (60.5%)
Male	72 (43.6%)	70 (39.5%)
<b>Household occupants</b>		
Mean (SD)	4.00 (1.37)	4.54 (2.18)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>		
No	80 (48.5%)	107 (60.5%)
Yes	85 (51.5%)	70 (39.5%)
<b>Cancer</b>		
No	165 (100%)	176 (99.4%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)
<b>Diabetes</b>		
No	160 (97.0%)	169 (95.5%)
Yes	5 (3.0%)	8 (4.5%)
<b>Heart disease</b>		
No	160 (97.0%)	170 (96.0%)
Yes	5 (3.0%)	7 (4.0%)
<b>Asthma</b>		
No	157 (95.2%)	170 (96.0%)
Yes	8 (4.8%)	7 (4.0%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>		
No	165 (100%)	177 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)



No	165 (100%)	177 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>		
No	165 (100%)	175 (98.9%)
Yes	0 (0%)	2 (1.1%)
<b>Smoker</b>		
No	140 (84.8%)	145 (81.9%)
Yes	25 (15.2%)	32 (18.1%)

## 6.5 HC Population

	<b>SOC (N=315)</b>	<b>IFN (N=355)</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		
Mean (SD)	29.3 (21.5)	28.0 (20.2)
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	165 (52.4%)	206 (58.0%)
Male	150 (47.6%)	149 (42.0%)
<b>Household occupants</b>		
Mean (SD)	4.31 (1.29)	4.89 (2.18)
<b>Fully vaccinated for SARS-CoV-2</b>		
No	222 (70.5%)	268 (75.5%)
Yes	93 (29.5%)	87 (24.5%)
<b>Cancer</b>		
No	313 (99.4%)	350 (98.6%)
Yes	1 (0.3%)	5 (1.4%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Diabetes</b>		
No	305 (96.8%)	346 (97.5%)
Yes	9 (2.9%)	9 (2.5%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Heart disease</b>		
No	301 (95.6%)	342 (96.3%)
Yes	13 (4.1%)	13 (3.7%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Asthma</b>		
No	294 (93.3%)	342 (96.3%)
Yes	20 (6.3%)	13 (3.7%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic lung disease</b>		
No	314 (99.7%)	354 (99.7%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic kidney disease</b>		
No	314 (99.7%)	352 (99.2%)
Yes	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)
Missing	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Chronic neurological disease</b>		
No	313 (99.4%)	351 (98.9%)
Yes	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.1%)

<b>Smoker</b>		
No	287 (91.1%)	314 (88.5%)
Yes	28 (8.9%)	41 (11.5%)

## 7 Primary Analyses SAP 6.10

### 7.1 Primary Analysis 1 SAP 6.10.1

#### 7.1.1 Main Analysis

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.1 (Primary Analysis 1). Primary analysis 1 is carried out on participants from the IC-INF population, to compare the probability of index cases being SARS-CoV-2 negative vs positive per saliva PCR on the study day 11 saliva sample ("Not Shedding vs. Shedding") in either the treatment or soc arm of the study.

A total of 468 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.199	[0.0284, 0.8756]
Age (bin 2)	1.519	[ 0.342, 10.616]
Age (bin 3)	1.129	[0.254, 7.891]
Age (bin 4)	1.504	[ 0.336, 10.552]
Male	2.138	[1.414, 3.263]
IFN treatment	0.979	[0.647, 1.479]

#### 7.1.2 Supporting Analyses

##### 7.1.2.1 Absolute Risk per Treatment Arm

A total of 468 participants were used in this analysis.

Treatment	N	AR	ARR	95% CI
SOC	237	0.287		
IFN	225	0.289	-0.00197	[-0.0846, 0.0806]

##### 7.1.2.2 GLM with a Log Link

A total of 468 participants were used in this analysis.

This analysis did not converge.

#### 7.1.3 Sensitivity Analyses

A total of 468 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.202	[0.0289, 0.8893]
Age (bin 2)	1.654	[0.372, 11.570]
Age (bin 3)	1.352	[0.302, 9.494]
Age (bin 4)	1.884	[0.416, 13.333]
Male	2.119	[1.398, 3.241]
Vaccinated	0.604	[0.376, 0.956]
IFN treatment	0.963	[0.635, 1.459]

#### 7.1.3.2 IC-ITT Population

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.1 (sensitivity analysis B). Sensitivity analysis B is carried out on participants from the IC-ITT population.

A total of 323 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.115	[0.00566, 0.81281]
Age (bin 2)	1.961	[0.284, 39.261]
Age (bin 3)	1.272	[0.184, 25.425]
Age (bin 4)	2.453	[0.351, 49.321]
Male	2.224	[1.315, 3.833]
IFN treatment	1.106	[0.657, 1.863]

#### 7.1.3.3 IC-PP Population

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.1 (sensitivity analysis C). Sensitivity analysis C is carried out on participants from the IC-PP population (excluding participants randomized to the IFN arm that received <3 doses; shown below).

A total of 310 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.122	[0.006, 0.865]
Age (bin 2)	1.935	[0.280, 38.738]
Age (bin 3)	1.178	[0.169, 23.638]
Age (bin 4)	2.361	[0.337, 47.531]

IFN treatment 1.062 [0.622, 1.810]

## 7.1.4 Unplanned Analyses

### 7.1.4.1 Adjusted for Days between Symptom Onset and Visit

A total of 468 participants were used in this analysis.

This is an unplanned analysis. Days between symptom onset and visit date was included as a covariate.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.294	[0.0246, 2.7823]
Age (bin 2)	1.519	[0.342, 10.629]
Age (bin 3)	1.138	[0.256, 7.959]
Age (bin 4)	1.539	[0.343, 10.807]
Male	2.114	[1.397, 3.229]
Days between symptom onset and visit date	0.973	[0.866, 1.090]
IFN treatment	0.987	[0.652, 1.494]

### 7.1.4.2 Excluding PCR Negative Index cases

A total of 427 participants were used in this analysis.

This is an unplanned analysis. Index cases that were PCR negative at both study day 1 and study day 6 were excluded.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.208	[0.0298, 0.9172]
Age (bin 2)	1.771	[0.398, 12.384]
Age (bin 3)	1.151	[0.259, 8.044]
Age (bin 4)	1.573	[0.352, 11.037]
Male	2.071	[1.350, 3.209]
IFN treatment	0.938	[0.612, 1.436]

Below, I repeat the above, excluding **households** where the index case was PCR negative at both study day 1 and 6.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.229	[0.0319, 1.0685]
Age (bin 2)	1.708	[0.364, 12.208]
Age (bin 3)	1.227	[0.260, 8.789]

Age (bin 1)	1.758	[0.97, 12.99]
Male	2.128	[1.383, 3.307]
Vaccinated	0.573	[0.349, 0.924]
IFN treatment	0.953	[0.619, 1.466]

## 7.2 Primary Analysis 2 SAP 6.10.2

### 7.2.1 Main Analysis

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.2 (primary analysis 2). Primary analysis 2 is carried out on participants from the EHC-ITT population, to compare the probability of eligible household contacts being SARS-CoV-2 negative vs positive per saliva PCR on study day 11 ("Not Shedding vs. Shedding") in either the treatment or soc arm of the study.

A total of 322 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.505	[0.120, 2.129]
Age (bin 2)	0.749	[0.190, 2.948]
Age (bin 3)	0.276	[0.063, 1.214]
Age (bin 4)	0.195	[0.0411, 0.9215]
Male	0.755	[0.357, 1.598]
IFN treatment	0.582	[0.271, 1.247]

### 7.2.2 Supporting Analyses

#### 7.2.2.1 Absolute Risk per Treatment Arm

A total of 322 participants were used in this analysis.

Treatment	N	AR	ARR	95% CI
SOC	156	0.154		
IFN	165	0.115	0.0387	[-0.036, 0.113]

#### 7.2.2.2 GLMM with a Log Link

A total of 322 participants were used in this analysis.

This analysis did not converge.

### 7.2.3 Sensitivity Analyses

#### 7.2.3.1 Adjusted for Risk Factors

A total of 322 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.00983	[0.000358, 0.269579]
Age (bin 2)	1.04996	[0.193, 5.718]
Age (bin 3)	0.37843	[0.055, 2.605]
Age (bin 4)	0.28665	[0.0384, 2.1416]
Male	0.84879	[0.353, 2.039]
Participated in any chores (study day 1-11)	1.24159	[0.252, 6.112]
Vaccinated	0.98930	[0.378, 2.586]
Seropositive at baseline	0.36852	[0.0885, 1.5344]
# Household occupants / # bedrooms	1.42006	[0.578, 3.491]
Household positivity rate	7.70447	[0.618, 95.992]
Log10(Baseline viral load of index case)	1.53349	[1.077, 2.183]
IFN treatment	0.49202	[0.202, 1.199]

### 7.2.3.2 HC Population

A total of 633 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.194	[0.0679, 0.5543]
armNE	2.274	[0.917, 5.640]
Age (bin 2)	1.432	[0.499, 4.109]
Age (bin 3)	0.883	[0.292, 2.665]
Age (bin 4)	0.314	[0.105, 0.941]
Male	0.818	[0.464, 1.443]
IFN treatment	0.577	[0.287, 1.160]

### 7.2.3.3 EHC-PP Population

A total of 312 participants were used in this analysis.

Covariate	OR	95% CI
Intercept	0.574	[0.133, 2.487]
Age (bin 2)	0.670	[0.166, 2.705]
Age (bin 3)	0.257	[0.0572, 1.1555]
Age (bin 4)	0.174	[0.0359, 0.8411]

IFN treatment 0.589 [0.272, 1.276]

## 7.2.4 Unplanned Analyses

### 7.2.4.1 Adjusted for Days between Symptom Onset and Visit

A total of 322 participants were used in this analysis.

This is an unplanned analysis. Days between symptom onset *of the index case* and visit date was included as a covariate. The analysis did not converge.

## 8 Secondary Analyses

### 8.1 Secondary Analysis 1 SAP 6.10.3

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.3 (secondary analysis 1). This analysis is carried out on the IC-INF population, using discrete time survival analysis to assess whether IFN treatment has an effect on the duration for which participants had SARS-CoV-2 positive saliva PCR.

Note that a higher hazard ratio is better, as it indicates a faster time to discharge from hospital.

#### 8.1.1 Main Analysis

A total of 502 participants (totalling 2807 visits) were used in this analysis.

Covariate	HR	95% CI
Intercept	0.286	[0.179, 0.443]
Age (bin 2)	0.836	[0.540, 1.330]
Age (bin 3)	0.799	[0.517, 1.271]
Age (bin 4)	0.833	[0.537, 1.327]
Male	0.818	[0.728, 0.918]
Days since enrollment	1.110	[1.102, 1.118]
IFN treatment	1.083	[0.964, 1.217]

#### 8.1.2 Sensitivity Analyses

##### 8.1.2.1 IC-ITT Population

A total of 341 participants (totalling 1927 visits) were used in this analysis.

Covariate	HR	95% CI
-----------	----	--------

Intercept	0.938	[0.196, 0.570]
Age (bin 2)	0.830	[0.491, 1.460]
Age (bin 3)	0.800	[0.474, 1.405]
Age (bin 4)	0.686	[0.403, 1.213]
Male	0.888	[0.773, 1.021]
Days since enrollment	1.108	[1.099, 1.118]
IFN treatment	1.018	[0.886, 1.171]

#### 8.1.2.2 IC-PP Population

A total of 315 participants (totalling 1830 visits) were used in this analysis.

Covariate	HR	95% CI
Intercept	0.341	[0.192, 0.580]
Age (bin 2)	0.839	[0.497, 1.471]
Age (bin 3)	0.816	[0.484, 1.431]
Age (bin 4)	0.692	[0.407, 1.223]
Male	0.909	[0.789, 1.048]
Days since enrollment	1.106	[1.096, 1.115]
IFN treatment	1.026	[0.890, 1.183]

## 8.2 Secondary Analysis 2 SAP 6.10.4

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.4 (secondary analysis 2). This analysis is carried out on participants from the HC population.

### 8.2.1 Main Analysis

#### 8.2.1.1 Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Positive Saliva PCR on Study Day 1

The HC population consists of only household contacts that were PCR negative at visit 1, so this comparison is not applicable.

#### 8.2.1.2 Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Positive Saliva PCR on Study Day 11

A total of 633 participants were used in this analysis.

Incidence (SOC)	Incidence (IFN)	Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel p-value
0.208	0.173	0.329

#### 8.2.1.3 Seroconversion at Study Day 29

A total of 594 participants were used in this analysis.



This analysis is comparing the proportion of seropositive participants at study day 29, stratified by baseline immune status.

Incidence (SOC)	Incidence (IFN)	Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel p-value
0.537	0.415	0.0558

## 8.3 Secondary Analysis 3 SAP 6.10.5

This corresponds to SAP section 6.10.5 (secondary analysis 3). This analysis is carried out on participants from the IC-ITT population.

For this analysis, households with size greater than 8 were combined with the households of size 8, as there were not many of the former.

### 8.3.1 Main Analysis

#### 8.3.1.1 Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19

A total of 299 participants were used in this analysis.

Outcome	Overall incidence in SOC	Overall incidence in IFN	Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel p-value
Hospitalized	0.101	0.0938	0.820

#### 8.3.1.2 Incidence of Death Due to COVID-19

No deaths occurred in this analysis population.

#### 8.3.1.3 Incidence of Hospitalization and/or Death Due to COVID-19

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, the results are the same as “Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19”.

#### 8.3.1.4 Duration of Hospital Stay Due to COVID-19

A total of 29 participants were used in this analysis.

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, a Cox proportional-hazards model was used instead. Note that a higher hazard ratio is better, in this case, as it indicates a faster discharge from the hospital.

Covariate	HR	95% CI
IFN	0.522	[0.237, 1.152]

### 8.3.2 Sensitivity Analyses

#### 8.3.2.1 IC-INF Population

##### 8.3.2.1.1 Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19

A total of 437 participants were used in this analysis.

Outcome	Overall incidence in SOC	Overall incidence in IFN	Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel p-value
Hospitalized	0.109	0.0929	0.570

#### 8.3.2.1.2 Incidence of Death Due to COVID-19

No deaths occurred in this analysis population.

#### 8.3.2.1.3 Incidence of Hospitalization and/or Death Due to COVID-19

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, the results are the same as “Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19”.

#### 8.3.2.1.4 Duration of Hospital Stay Due to COVID-19

A total of 43 participants were used in this analysis.

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, a Cox proportional-hazards model was used instead. Note that a higher hazard ratio is better, in this case, as it indicates a faster discharge from the hospital.

Covariate	HR	95% CI
IFN	0.452	[0.233, 0.877]

**Note discrepancy in number of hospitalizations reported (n = 44 vs. 43 reported) is caused by 1 participant where hospital duration could not be derived (CE 183 04 - no discharge date)**

#### 8.3.2.2 IC-PP Population

##### 8.3.2.2.1 Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19

A total of 275 participants were used in this analysis.

Outcome	Overall incidence in SOC	Overall incidence in IFN	Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel p-value
Hospitalized	0.101	0.0294	0.0312

#### 8.3.2.2.2 Incidence of Death Due to COVID-19

No deaths occurred in this analysis population.

#### 8.3.2.2.3 Incidence of Hospitalization and/or Death Due to COVID-19

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, the results are the same as “Incidence of Hospitalization Due to COVID-19”.

#### 8.3.2.2.4 Duration of Hospital Stay Due to COVID-19

A total of 18 participants were used in this analysis.

As there were no deaths in this analysis population, a Cox proportional-hazards model was used instead. Note that a higher hazard ratio is better, in this case, as it indicates a faster discharge from the hospital.

IFN 2.006 [0.601, 6.690]

## 8.4 Secondary Analysis 4 SAP 6.10.6

### 8.4.1 Main Analysis

A total of 844 participants (totalling 6784 visits) were used in this analysis.

#### 8.4.1.1 Incidence of Adverse Events

Treatment	Rate of AE per participant	Incidence of any AE	Fisher's exact test
SOC	1.824	0.280	
IFN	2.117	0.235	0.156

#### 8.4.1.2 Incidence of Adverse Events Related To Treatment

Treatment	Rate of related AE per participant	Incidence of any related AE	Fisher's exact test
SOC	0.00964	0.00964	
IFN	0.287	0.235	2.31e-27

#### 8.4.1.3 Incidence of Serious Adverse Events

Treatment	Rate of SAE per participant	Incidence of any SAE	Fisher's exact test
SOC	0.0627	0.0578	
IFN	0.0559	0.0559	1.000

## 9 Safety Analysis SAP 6.11

See Secondary Analysis 4.

## 10 Additional Analyses SAP 6.12

### 10.1 Dose-response and Recovery SAP 6.12.1

	PCR negative at study day 11	PCR positive at study day 11
1 dose	3	1
2 doses	5	3
3 doses	109	37

The p-value for the Fisher's exact test is 0.756.

## 10.2 Dose-response and Transmission SAP 6.12.2

	PCR negative at study day 11	PCR positive at study day 11
1 dose	6	0
2 doses	3	1
3 doses	137	18

The p-value for the Fisher's exact test is 0.481.

## 10.3 Viral Load SAP 6.12.3

Growth rate is undefined (i.e. is missing) for participants whose peak viral load occurred on study day 1. Duration of infection is undefined. for participants whose last PCR result was positive. Decay is undefined for participants if their duration of infection is undefined.

	SOC (N=209)	IFN (N=209)
<b>Peak viral load</b>		
Mean (SD)	28,913,933 (196,793,258)	6,591,476 (33,775,900)
95% CI	[-364,672,583; 422,500,449]	[-60,960,324; 74,143,277]
Median [Q1; Q3]	220,461 [28,079; 1,741,659]	220,461 [32,374; 1,411,196]
<b>Days to peak viral load</b>		
Mean (SD)	1.87 (4.52)	1.40 (3.02)
95% CI	[-7.17; 10.92]	[-4.64; 7.44]
Median [Q1; Q3]	0.00 [0.00; 0.00]	0.00 [0.00; 0.00]
<b>Growth rate</b>		
Mean (SD)	262,111 (951,800)	431,891 (1,431,385)
95% CI	[-1,641,490; 2,165,711]	[-2,430,878; 3,294,661]
Median [Q1; Q3]	15,083 [2,003; 100,240]	4,747 [456; 40,673]
Missing	163 (78.0%)	163 (78.0%)
<b>Duration of infection</b>		
Mean (SD)	8.88 (6.89)	8.38 (6.29)
95% CI	[-4.90; 22.66]	[-4.19; 20.95]
Median [Q1; Q3]	6.00 [1.00; 16.00]	6.00 [6.00; 11.00]
Missing	31 (14.8%)	26 (12.4%)
<b>Decay rate</b>		
Mean (SD)	1,376,272 (4,574,811)	948,980 (4,379,841)
95% CI	[-7,773,350; 10,525,894]	[-7,810,702; 9,708,662]
Median [Q1; Q3]	58,102 [10,146; 294,797]	43,171 [11,186; 268,371]
Missing	33 (15.8%)	26 (12.4%)
<b>Area under the curve</b>		
Mean (SD)	75,272,876 (494,951,264)	19,688,768 (91,915,780)

Median [Q1; Q3]	698,934 [103,353; 6,628,988]	782,976 [127,664; 3,900,093]
Missing	2 (1.0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Baseline viral load</b>		
Mean (SD)	28,590,599 (196,824,913)	6,090,935 (33,614,342)
95% CI	[-365,059,226; 422,240,425]	[-61,137,749; 73,319,620]
Median [Q1; Q3]	144,737 [10,562; 1,270,280]	133,549 [18,435; 870,885]

Repeat including p-values for the comparisons between the groups (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test).

	SOC (N=209)	IFN (N=209)	p
Peak viral load			
Mean (SD)	28,913,933 (196,793,258)	6,591,476 (33,775,900)	0.761
95% CI	[-364,672,583; 422,500,449]	[-60,960,324; 74,143,277]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	220,461 [28,079; 1,741,659]	220,461 [32,374; 1,411,196]	
Days to peak viral load			
Mean (SD)	1.87 (4.52)	1.40 (3.02)	0.855
95% CI	[-7.17; 10.92]	[-4.64; 7.44]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	0.00 [0.00; 0.00]	0.00 [0.00; 0.00]	
Growth rate			
Mean (SD)	262,111 (951,800)	431,891 (1,431,385)	0.416
95% CI	[-1,641,490; 2,165,711]	[-2,430,878; 3,294,661]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	15,083 [2,003; 100,240]	4,747 [456; 40,673]	
Duration of infection			
Mean (SD)	8.88 (6.89)	8.38 (6.29)	0.618
95% CI	[-4.90; 22.66]	[-4.19; 20.95]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	6.00 [1.00; 16.00]	6.00 [6.00; 11.00]	
Decay rate			
Mean (SD)	1,376,272 (4,574,811)	948,980 (4,379,841)	0.59
95% CI	[-7,773,350; 10,525,894]	[-7,810,702; 9,708,662]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	58,102 [10,146; 294,797]	43,171 [11,186; 268,371]	
Area under the curve			
Mean (SD)	75,272,876 (494,951,264)	19,688,768 (91,915,780)	0.856
95% CI	[-914,629,653; 1,065,175,405]	[-164,142,792; 203,520,328]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	698,934 [103,353; 6,628,988]	782,976 [127,664; 3,900,093]	
Baseline viral load			
Mean (SD)	28,590,599 (196,824,913)	6,090,935 (33,614,342)	0.883
95% CI	[-365,059,226; 422,240,425]	[-61,137,749; 73,319,620]	
Median [Q1; Q3]	144,737 [10,562; 1,270,280]	133,549 [18,435; 870,885]	

## 11 Optional Analyses

### 11.1 Bayesian Analysis

## 11.2 Exploratory Two-period Generalized Mixed Effects Model

This analysis is detailed in a separate document.

## **Supplementary Appendices B**

### **Containing Coronavirus Disease 19 Trial (CONCORD-19): Exploratory Analyses**

# Containing Coronavirus Disease 19 Trial (CONCORD-19)

Exploratory analysis, two-period glmer to explore treatment effect during and after treatment period in study-eligible and ineligible household contacts.

---

Casey P. Shannon (PROOF Centre of Excellence, University of British Columbia) , true , Robert Balshaw (Centre for Healthcare Innovation, University of Manitoba)  
2022-05-19

---

## Introduction

Primary analysis 2 was carried out on participants from the EHC-ITT population, to compare the probability of eligible household contacts being SARS-CoV-2 negative vs positive per saliva PCR on study day 11 ("Not Shedding vs. Shedding") in either the treatment or soc arm of the study.

A planned sensitivity analysis adjusting for various risk factors had promising results (reduction of risk in the IFN arm), though this effect did not reach the pre-specified statistical significance threshold.

**Here we revisit primary analysis 2, adopting a slightly modified approach incorporating treatment periods, and additionally considering non-eligible household contacts.**



## 1. New outcome measure

Rather than counting participants as positive based on their study day 11 sample SARS-CoV-2 saliva PCR, we count participants as PCR-positive according to whether they have had their first positive SARS-CoV-2 saliva PCR on any study day during period 1 (**during treatment and isolation; D1-D11 inclusive**) or period 2 (**after treatment and isolation; D12-D29**), or not at all.

**Participants who test positive in period 1 are *not* counted in period two. Effectively, they are censored at their first positive saliva PCR as they are no longer at risk of becoming positive for the first time.**

## 2. Inclusion of additional covariates

### Household-level (hh\_cov)

- Number of individuals in the household
- Number of vaccinated individuals in the household
- Viral load (log10 viral count) of the household index case on study day 1
- Number of individuals in the household with positive saliva PCR *by* the start of the period

**These household level counts consider all household members (index cases and all treatment-eligible and treatment ineligible individuals in the household).**

### Individual-level (indv\_cov)

- Participant eligibility (CE; eligible household contact/NE; non-eligible household contact)
- Participant age
- Participant sex

## 3. Models

- $\text{pcr} \sim (1 \mid \text{household}) + \text{hh\_cov} + \text{indv\_cov} + \text{period}$
- $\text{pcr} \sim (1 \mid \text{household}) + \text{hh\_cov} + \text{indv\_cov} + \text{period} + \text{trt}$
- $\text{pcr} \sim (1 \mid \text{household}) + \text{hh\_cov} + \text{indv\_cov} + \text{period} + \text{trt} + \text{period:trt}$

We test the hypothesis of an overall treatment effect by comparing model 2 to model 1 using the likelihood ratio test (LRT).

We test the hypothesis of an interaction between period and treatment (i.e., does treatment effect differ between the two periods) by comparing model 3 to model 2 using the likelihood ratio test (LRT).

**P-values less than 0.05 are described as “significant”, as is conventional, but the post-hoc nature of this analysis must be remembered.**

## 4. Defining eligibility

Following internal discussion, we elected to exclude households from the analysis if:

- The index case subsequently tested negative (by saliva PCR) on both study day 1 AND study day 6 (negative index case)
- There were no negative household members (eligible OR non-eligible) at study day 1 (population at risk = 0)

Show code

Show code

Table 1: Starting number of households per treatment arm.

trt	n
SOC	169
IFN	172

Show code

Table 2: Breakdown of corresponding participants.

trt	IC	CEP	CE	NE
SOC	169	81	165	150
IFN	172	80	177	178

Show code

Table 3: Number of households with a PCR positive index case.

trt	n
SOC	149
IFN	159

Show code

Table 4: Breakdown of corresponding participants.

trt	IC	CEP	CE	NE
SOC	149	77	142	134
IFN	159	76	164	164

Show code

Table 5:  
Households with a PCR positive index case and population at risk > 0 at start of period 1.

trt	n
SOC	123
IFN	136

Analysis is carried out using this latter number of households.

Show code

## Analysis

Show code

Table 6: Breakdown of corresponding participants.

trt	IC	CEP	CE	NE
SOC	123	42	142	125
IFN	136	49	164	151

While **eligible** contacts (CE) that were PCR(+) at the start of the study are tabulated separately above (as CEP), **ineligible** contacts (NE) that were PCR(+) at the start of the study were not explicitly identified in the same manner. Our analysis considers only the at risk population (at the start of each period), so we further exclude these participants below.

Show code

Table 7: Analysis population: Household contact population excluding those that were PCR(+) on study day 1.

trt	CE	NE
SOC	142	104
IFN	164	129

## Incidence of infection

**Finally**, in order to provide some context, we report the incidence of infection in each study arm during the first period (on treatment; D1-11 inclusive), for eligible and non-eligible household contact populations.

Show code

Table 8: Incidence of infection in the eligible household contact population during treatment.

arm	trt	uninfected	infected
CE	SOC	107	35
CE	IFN	135	29

Show code

Table 9. Incidence of infection in the non-eligible household contact population during treatment.

arm	trt	uninfected	infected
NE	SOC	79	25
NE	IFN	103	26

## Model 2 vs. Model 1

This comparison answers the following question:

Is treatment with IFN associated with a reduction in the number of incident positive saliva PCR in household contacts, adjusting for individual risk factors (age, sex, and treatment eligibility) and household risk factors (num. individuals in household, num. vaccinated individuals, num. infected at start of period, viral load of index case), as well as treatment period (D1-11 vs. D11-29)?

Show code

term	npar	AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	statistic	df	p.value
mod0	12.000	622.676	681.117	-299.338	598.676			
mod1	13.000	620.136	683.446	-297.068	594.136	4.541	1.000	0.033

Show code

coef	2.5 %	OR	97.5 %
(Intercept)	0.024	0.061	0.596
hh_size	0.803	1.002	1.177
hh_num_vacc	0.859	1.094	1.323
hh_viral_log10	1.022	1.346	1.614
hh_inf_start	0.896	1.212	1.529
armNE	0.398	0.928	2.021
sexM	0.365	0.490	0.810
age2	0.457	1.213	2.932
age3	0.417	1.065	2.512

age4	0.291	0.471	1.257
period(11,30]	0.108	0.141	0.266
trtIFN	0.364	0.550	0.989

## Conclusion

Treatment with IFN is associated with a significant reduction in the odds of a positive saliva PCR for all household contacts compared to standard of care ( $p = 0.033$ ; OR = 0.550, 95% CI = 0.364 to 0.989).

## Model 3 vs. Model 2

This comparison answers the following question:

Does the effect of treatment on the number of incident positive saliva PCR in household contacts change between study periods?

Show code

term	npar	AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	statistic	df	p.value
mod0	12.000	618.151	676.592	-297.076	594.151			
mod1	13.000	619.077	682.387	-296.538	593.077	1.075	1.000	0.300

Show code

coef	2.5 %	OR	97.5 %
(Intercept)	0.031	0.060	0.520
hh_size	0.811	1.006	1.188
hh_num_vacc	0.866	1.093	1.332
hh_viral_log10	1.021	1.347	1.579
hh_inf_start	0.851	1.193	1.501
sexM	0.347	0.489	0.812
age2	0.738	1.299	2.124
age3	0.631	1.136	1.960
age4	0.297	0.498	1.023
period(11,30]	0.055	0.098	0.237

trtIFN	0.334	0.505	0.980
period(11,30]:trtIFN	0.710	1.917	4.703

## Conclusion

**Inconclusive: the effect of treatment does not appear to change between period 1 and period 2 ( $p = 0.300$ ).**

Show code

**The point estimate for the treatment effect in the second period is OR = 0.968 (95% CI = 0.405 to 2.840) compared to OR = 0.550 (95% CI = 0.364 to 0.989) in the first period.**

## Summary Statement

In this **exploratory** analysis of the PCR results during periods 1 and 2 using the larger HC study population (eligible plus ineligible household contacts), and additionally considering treatment periods (during treatment, D1-D11; after treatment, D12-D29), IFN given to treatment eligible household contacts (and the COVID(+) index case) significantly reduced the odds of positive PCR results for all (non-positive at study day 1) household contacts (IFN likelihood ratio test  $p = 0.033$ ; OR = 0.550, 95% CI = 0.364 to 0.989). Positive PCR tests are significantly less common in the second period (OR = 0.141, 95% CI = 0.108 to 0.266). The results for treatment and period summarized above were taken from the second model which excluded the treatment by period interaction as the interaction term was not significant (interaction LRT  $p = 0.300$ ).

# Figures




Figure 1: Treatment eligible (left) or ineligible (right) household contact population at risk over time stratified by randomization (red, treatment [IFN]; blue, standard of care).