

Supplementary methods

Analysis of efficacy by treatment stage

To visualize the efficacy by treatment stage and outcome stage for each trial, we used the following stages for all trials:

- pre-exposure,
- peri-(post-)exposure,
- symptomatic,
- hospitalisation,
- ventilation, and
- death.

If a trial contained treatment with more than one monoclonal antibody, we considered different antibody treatments separately (e.g. ACTIV-3 sotrovimab treatment group and ACTIV-3 BR11-196 + BR11-198 treatment group). However, if a trial contained multiple doses of the same antibody treatment, then we pooled the different doses by adding the number of events and individuals in the different treatment and control groups, respectively.

For the O'Brien, RECOVERY, and Weinreich trials, data for patients who were seronegative at baseline was available and was included as a subgroup in **Fig. 1A, B** (dashed horizontal lines).

We calculated efficacy of preventing a stage transition calculated in the following way:

$$1 - \frac{\text{number events in treatment group/number of patients in treatment group}}{\text{number events in control group/number of patients in control group}}$$

with 95% Confidence Interval (CI):

$$1 - \exp\left(\log\left(\frac{e_t/n_t}{e_c/n_c}\right) \pm 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{n_t - e_t}{n_t \times e_t} + \frac{n_c - e_c}{n_c \times e_c}}\right),$$

where e_t and n_t denote the number of events and total number of patients in the treatment group and e_c and n_c denote the number of events and total number of patients in the control group, respectively. This formula for the 95% CI assumes that the natural logarithm of the risk ratio is approximately normally distributed. Note that if there are zero events in either the treatment or the control group, then efficacy would be 100% or would be undefined (and similarly the 95% CI could not be computed using the above formula). We decided to omit one study with zero cases in the treatment group¹, as zero events often either indicated a low sample size or high uncertainty. The results are visualized in **Fig. 1A and B**.

Pooling data from different trials

To look at the average effect for different treatments and stages (**Fig. 1C**), we pooled data from different trials to visualize the efficacy of monoclonal antibody or plasma treatment by stage. We classified trials using the same treatment and outcome stages as described above (pre-exposure, peri-(post-)exposure, symptomatic, hospitalisation, ventilation, and death) and pooled different trials with the same treatment type (mAb or plasma/hIVIG) and same stage transitions (e.g. symptomatic to hospitalisation). For the O'Brien trial, we included the data in the two subgroups of infection within one week of treatment (the treatment stage for this group is peri-(post-)exposure) and infections two to four weeks after treatment (for this subgroup, we assumed the treatment stage to be pre-exposure). For all other trials no subgroups were used (except for ACTIV-3 that was always analysed separately for sotrovimab and BR11-196 + BR11-198 treatment groups).

To account for differences between trials such as differences in the monoclonal antibody administered, patients' risk for progression to severe disease, or the time and location the trials were conducted, we used a mixed-effects logistic regression model with random intercepts for different trials. We used custom algorithms in the R software package (version 3.6.0)². To compute the average efficacy for different treatments at different stages we used the function *glmer* from the lme4 package³ with the binomial distribution and link function "log". Profile likelihood 95% CIs were computed using the "confint" function. We then transformed the relative risk and the corresponding 95% CI to efficacy (= 1- relative risk). The results are visualized in **Fig. 1C**.

The effect of the initial stage on efficacy

To investigate whether treatment at an earlier stage is more efficacious than at a later stage, we considered treatment with monoclonal antibodies and with plasma-products (CP or hIVIG) separately to take into account the difference in administered doses between these treatment types (**Fig. 2B**). The initial stage is the stage at which patients were treated. As for the pooling of data from different trials, we used a mixed-effects logistic regression model with random intercepts for different trials and also included the variables treatment, initial stage, and an interaction term between treatment and the initial stage. The R^2 function *glmer* from the lme4 package³ with the binomial distribution and link function "log" was used to compute relative risks, profile likelihood 95% CIs were computed using the "confint" function, and the significance of variables was tested using a chi-squared test with the function "drop1".

We considered two different ways of analysing the effect of the treatment stage on efficacy.

First, we considered progression to the next stage. We considered only the following stage transitions:

- pre-exposure to symptomatic,
- peri-(post-)exposure to symptomatic,
- symptomatic to hospitalisation, and
- hospitalisation to death

We excluded the stage "ventilation" because more data was available on "hospitalisation" and "death" and there were no transitions from "ventilation" to "death" in the data. To quantify the treatment effect by initial stage, we converted the initial stage to a continuous numerical variable from pre-exposure transformed to 0 to hospitalisation transformed to 3. For both mAb and plasma treatment, the interaction between treatment and treatment stage was significant with a higher relative risk (i.e. lower efficacy) for treatment at a later stage.

Second, we considered the effect of the treatment stage for each outcome separately, i.e. for a chosen outcome stage (e.g. symptomatic infection) we compared the treatment effect for different treatment stages (e.g. pre-exposure and peri-(post-)exposure). For each outcome stage, there were maximally two disease stages at treatment in the data, so we used treatment stage as a categorical variable for this analysis. Note that for the outcome "hospitalisation" the only treatment stage was "symptomatic" and we could thus not compare the effect of different treatment on hospitalisations. For mAb treatment, treating at an earlier stage was significantly better than at a later stage for all outcomes. For plasma treatment (CP and hIVIG), there was no significant interaction between treatment and treatment stage for the outcomes ventilation and death (note that there is also no significant effect of treatment for these outcomes for all convalescent plasma treatment studies combined, see **Fig. 1C**). The results can be found in **Tables S7** and **S8**.

Estimating the administered dose fold-convalescent for mAb trials

To compare the efficacy of treatment with different monoclonal antibodies and different doses, we normalized the dose relative to the 'mean convalescent titre' in the first months after infection. We extracted the mean SARS-CoV-2 neutralisation of convalescents and the mean neutralisation of the antibodies bamlanivimab, casirivimab, etesevimab, imdevimab, regdanvimab, and sotrovimab from McCallum et al⁴ (Fig. 2L and Fig. 3C). The extracted IC-50s for these antibodies are shown in **Table S4**. We assumed a mean plasma volume of 3 litres or 45mL/kg to convert the antibody dose to a mean antibody concentration. Dividing the antibody concentration by the respective antibody's IC-50, we obtained the fold-IC-50 for each antibody and each dose. We then calculated the dose in fold-convalescent by noting that the average convalescent subject in this study had 347.6 times the ID-50 (as extracted from McCallum et al) in their plasma, and that each mAb was administered at various levels (fold of the IC-50, **Table S4**). Thus, the fold-convalescent level for each mAb at each dose was estimated by dividing the fold-IC-50 by the mean convalescent neutralization titre of 347.6 (**Table S4**). For antibody combination treatments, we used the maximum of each individual antibody's fold-convalescent dose. The resulting fold-convalescent doses for each monoclonal antibody trial and each used dose can be found in **Table S5**.

Estimating the mAb dose in mg for different efficacies in preventing hospitalisation

To calculate the mAb dose of monoclonal antibodies that is required for different efficacies of preventing hospitalisation, we used the same approach. For each antibody we computed the dose for the EC-50, and EC-90 using the following formula:

$$\text{dose [mg]} = \text{dose [fold conv.]} \times \text{neutralization}_{\text{conv.}} \times \text{IC}_{50} \left[\frac{\text{mg}}{\text{L}} \right] \times \text{total plasma volume [L]},$$

where dose [fold convalescent] was obtained from the dose response curve for prevention of hospitalisation (corresponding to the EC-50 or EC-90 efficacy, respectively), the neutralization titre of the convalescent is 347.6 (as extracted from McCallum et al⁴), the IC-50's of each antibody were extracted from McCallum et al⁴ and can be found in **Table S4**, and we assumed again a mean total plasma volume of 3 litres.

Estimating the administered dose fold-convalescent for CP trials

Similar to the computation of the fold-convalescent dose of monoclonal antibody studies, we also calculated the fold-convalescent dose of three trials that treated symptomatic patients with convalescent plasma and reported hospitalisation as an outcome. These trials were published by Korley et al⁵, Libster et al⁶, and Sullivan et al⁷.

Korley et al treated patients with 250mL of convalescent plasma with a median ID50 of 641 as measured with the PRNT assay as described by the Broad Institute⁵. Di Germanio et al reported convalescent neutralization using the same assay⁸. We found the geometric mean of convalescent to be 551 (data extracted from Fig. 2B of Di Germanio et al⁸, first time point for each individual). As before, we assume a plasma volume of 3 litres to calculate the fold-convalescent dose of 0.097 for the Korley et al trial.

To find the dose administered in terms of fold-convalescent for the trial by Libster et al⁶, we extracted the distribution of IgG titres in plasma donors from Figure S4. If we assume that the 72 extracted titres are from 72 subjects that represent the top 28th centile⁶, then these must have been drawn from a theoretical population of 257 donors. Thus, we estimated that 185 individuals excluded from plasma donations for the trial by Libster et al because their titre was below the threshold of 1,000. With the extracted distribution of titres above the threshold of 1,000 and the number of excluded donors with titres below 1,000, we estimated the distribution of titres by fitting a normal distribution

to the \log_{10} -transformed titres. We used a maximum likelihood approach with the following loglikelihood function:

$$l(p_1, p_2) = \sum \log(N(\log_{10}(t_{extracted}), p_1, \exp(p_2))) + n_{excluded} \times \log(\Phi(\log_{10}(1,000), p_1, \exp(p_2))),$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the parameters of the normal distribution, N and Φ denote the probability density function and the cumulative distribution function of the normal distribution, respectively, $t_{extracted}$ are the extracted titers, and $n_{excluded}$ is the number of individuals excluded due to a titre below the threshold of 1,000. We obtained a mean convalescent titre of 360 (95% CI: 239 to 542). The volume of convalescent plasma used by Libster et al was 250mL and we assumed again a total recipient plasma volume of 3 litres. As Libster et al provided primary end point outcomes for recipient of donor plasma above or below the median of 3,200, we also computed the fold convalescent for these two groups separately. For the first group, who received a donor plasma with a titre between 1,000 and 3,200, we estimated the median donor titre to be 1,653 using our fitted distribution. With a dilution of 250mL in the 3 litres of recipient plasma and the median convalescent titre 360, this group has an administered dose of approximately 0.38-fold convalescent. For the second group, treated with plasma with a titre above 3,200, the median titre was estimated at 6,330 giving a dose administered of 1.47-fold convalescent.

Sullivan et al selected plasma with the highest 60 to 70% titres from unselected donors (personal communication, February 22 and 25, 2022). We assume that the \log_{10} titres follow a normal distribution (with mean 0 which corresponds to 1 dose in fold-convalescent and standard deviation 0.46⁹). Sampling 1,000,000 times from this distribution and selecting the top 65% of titres, we find that the geometric mean of the top 65% of titres is 1.84-fold convalescent. With a dilution of 250mL of donor plasma in 3 litres of total recipient plasma, the administered dose in the trial by Sullivan et al is 0.153-fold convalescent.

Dose-response curve fitting

We fitted a logistic efficacy function to the dose and efficacy data for prevention of hospitalisation after treatment of symptomatic patients to obtain a relationship between the administered dose and the level of protection.

The dose and efficacy data were extracted from mAb and CP trials with the dose converted to fold convalescent as described above. We used an efficacy function that is logistic function of \log_{10} -transformed doses, i.e.

$$E(d | m, g, d_{half}) = \frac{m}{1 + \exp\left(-g\left(\log_{10}(d) - \log_{10}(d_{half})\right)\right)},$$

where d denotes the dose, m the maximal efficacy, g the steepness of the curve, and d_{half} the dose at which the half-maximal efficacy is achieved. We fitted this efficacy function to the count data from individual studies (i.e.: we used the total number of subjects and number of events in each of the treatment and control groups, rather than simply fitting to the summary statistic of 'efficacy'). This allowed us to take into account the variance in the number of participants in different trials and thus the uncertainty in the efficacy estimates. We used a maximum likelihood approach with the following likelihood function:

$$L(p) = \prod_{trials} \text{Binom}(h_c, n_c, b) \times \text{Binom}(h_t, n_t, b \times (1 - E(d | m, g, d_{half}))),$$

where p denotes the parameters of the likelihood function, i.e. the three parameters of the efficacy function (m, g, d_{half}) and the baseline risk b for each trial, Binom is the probability mass function of

the binomial distribution, and for each trial, h_c and n_c are the numbers of hospitalisations and total number of individuals in the control group, h_t and n_t are the numbers of hospitalisations and total number of individuals in the treatment group, and b is the baseline risk which is reduced by the efficacy of treatment for the treatment group. The initial values of the trial baseline risk for optimization were h_c/n_c .

We used parametric bootstrapping to compute the 95% confidence region for the efficacy function by sampling the three parameters for the efficacy function 100,000 times using the *rmvnorm* function (with mean and covariance matrix from the parameter estimate) from the *mvtnorm* package^{10,11} in R (version 3.6.0)². For each dose, the 95% confidence region was then computed using quantiles of the efficacy functions with the different sampled parameter values.

The 95% CIs for the EC-50 and EC-90 doses were computed similarly, by bootstrapping the slope parameter and the EC-50 dose 100,000 time but using the estimated maximal efficacy. The resulting estimated efficacy function and 95% confidence region is shown in **Fig. 2B** and **Extended Data Fig. 3**.

To study the sensitivity of the results to individual trials, we performed a leave-one-out analysis. We fitted the dose response curve again as described above to the data omitting one study at a time. The resulting parameter values for the fit to all data as well as to the data omitting one study are visualized in **Extended Data Fig. 4**. We find that the estimates of the maximal efficacy are consistent at about 70% (range: 68.7 to 72.1%). The half-maximal dose (EC-50 dose) estimates vary between 0.069- and 0.38-fold convalescent which agrees well with the 95% CI of the fit to all data (0.087 to 0.395). Omitting the Korley trial had the greatest impact on the EC- 50 (0.069). The slope parameter estimates also agree with the 95% CI of the fit to all data (1.09 to 9.33), except if the Libster trial is left out (15.29).

To investigate the efficacy in preventing death after mAb treatment of hospitalised patients, we also fitted a dose response curve to data for the mAb treatment of hospitalised patients. We used the same approach as described above. As the only significant efficacy in this subset of the data is for the treatment of sero-negative patients and patients with unknown sero-status in the RECOVERY trial, we considered the sero-status subgroups of the RECOVERY trial in this analysis. The resulting fit is shown in **Extended Data Fig. 5**.

Fold increase of hospitalisations by administered mAb dose

We found that monoclonal antibodies were administered at 7.9- to more than 1000-fold the EC-90 dose (**Table S7**). Thus, we aimed to investigate how the number of hospitalisations that are averted by mAb treatment changes if the dose is reduced and if the antibody is a limited product. For a population-at-risk of N individuals with risk of hospitalisation r and n_t treated individuals that are treated with a dose d and corresponding efficacy $eff(d)$, the number of hospitalisations averted by treatment is given by

$$N \times r - [(N - n_t) \times r + n_t \times r \times (1 - eff(d))] = n_t \times r \times eff(d).$$

If the administered dose d is reduced to a new dose d_{new} , then the number of patients that can be treated increases to $n_t \times (d/d_{new})$ but the efficacy reduces from $eff(d)$ to $eff(d_{new})$. Overall, the number of hospitalizations averted under the treatment strategy with the new, lower dose compared to the current treatment strategy is given by

$$\frac{n_t \times (d/d_{new}) \times r \times eff(d_{new})}{n_t \times r \times eff(d)} = \frac{d \times eff(d_{new})}{d_{new} \times eff(d)}.$$

We visualized this fold increase in the number of hospitalizations averted with a lower dose treatment using our fitted logistic efficacy function and the currently administered doses of various mAbs (**Fig. 3**). For mAbs that are administered at various doses, we show the fold increase of

hospitalisations averted for the lowest dose currently used. We also computed the fold increase in hospitalisations averted for treatment with the EC-90 dose compared to the lowest dose currently used, the maximal fold increase in hospitalisations averted, and the dose (in milligram) for the maximal fold increase in hospitalisations averted (**Table S8**).

Efficacy of preventing hospitalisation by administered mAb dose

The efficacy of preventing hospitalisation appears to be decreasing with an increasing administered dose of monoclonal antibody, however there is also high uncertainty in the efficacy estimates as indicated by big confidence intervals (**Fig. 2B**). To quantify the effect of administered mAb dose on the efficacy of preventing hospitalisations, we used a mixed-effects logistic regression model. The model contains random intercepts for different trials, a treatment variable (“treatment” or “control”), the \log_{10} -transformed administered dose, the patient risk for progression to severe disease (“low”, “mixed”, or “high”), and the interaction of the \log_{10} -transformed administered dose and treatment. The R^2 function *glmer* from the lme4 package³ with the binomial distribution and link function “log” was used to compute relative risks, profile 95% CIs were computed using the “confint” function, and the significance of the patient risk and the interaction of the \log_{10} -transformed administered dose and treatment was tested using a chi-squared test with the function “drop1”. The results can be found in **Table S13** and indicate that there is a trend towards higher risk (i.e. lower efficacy) by administered dose in the treatment group though it is not significant.

Supplementary tables

Table S1. Data sources for efficacy data for SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibody studies

Study	Number of participants	Name of mAb	Dosage	Time of administration, median time from onset of symptoms to drug (days)	Population and disease stage	Measurement of effectiveness	Study Primary Outcome	Ref.	Data derived from
Isa	969	Casirivimab/ imdevimab	1.2g (0.6g each)	NR	Uninfected: Pre-exposure	1. Symptomatic infection	Incidence of AEs of special interest (AESIs), within 4 days of administration, concentrations of REGEN-COV in serum over time.	¹²	Figure 1
O'Brien	1505	Casirivimab/ imdevimab	1.2g	NR	Uninfected: Post- exposure (asymptomatic household contact with exposure to an individual with a diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, randomized within 96 hours of collection of the index cases' positive SARS-COV-2 diagnostic test sample)	1. Infection 2. Symptomatic infection 3. Hospitalisation 4. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Proportion of individuals with symptomatic, RT-qPCR–confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection during the 28-day EAP.	¹³	Table 2, S3, S9 in supplementary index of study reference
BLAZE-2 (Cohen)	966	Bamlanivimab	4.2g	NR	Uninfected: Post-exposure (resident or staff in a skilled nursing or assisted living facility with at least one confirmed case of direct SARS-CoV-2 detection ≤7 days prior to randomization)	1. Infection 2. Symptomatic infection 3. All-cause mortality reported at 57 days	Incidence of COVID-19, defined as the detection of SARS-CoV-2 by PCR and mild or worse disease severity within 21 days of detection, within 8 weeks of randomization.	¹⁴	Exploratory endpoints and eFigure 1, 3 of Supplementary index of study reference
Eom	327	Regdanvimab (CT-P59)	40mg/kg, 80mg/kg	3	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. Need for IMV 4. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Time to conversion to negative RT-qPCR result, time to clinical recovery	¹⁵	Table 1, 2, supplementary information

Weinreich	5398	Casirivimab/ imdevimab	1.2g, 2.4g, 8.0g	3	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. Need for IMV 4. All-cause mortality at 29 days	percentage of patients with ≥ 1 Covid-19-related hospitalization or all-cause death through day 29	¹⁶	Table 2, S7, S10, S12
BLAZE-1 (Chen)	467	Bamlanivimab	0.7g, 2.8g, 7.0g	4	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Change in SARS-CoV-2 log viral load at day 11	¹⁷	Table 3
BLAZE-1 (Dougan)	1035	Bamlanivimab/ etesevimab	2.8g/2.8g	4	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. Hospitalisation 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	COVID-related hospitalisation or death from any cause by day 29.	¹⁸	Figure 2
COMET-ICE (Gupta)	583	Sotrovimab (VIR-7831)	500mg	NR, range 3-5	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. Need for IMV 4. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Hospitalization (for >24 hours) for any cause or death within 29 days	¹⁹	Table 2
TACKLE	822	AZD7442, tixagevimab (AZD8895) and cilgavimab (AZD1061)	0.6g, 2 doses	NR (within 5 days)	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Composite of either severe COVID-19 or death from any cause through day 29	²⁰	Press release
ACTIV-3	314	Bamlanivimab	7.0g	7	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Sustained recovery during a 90-day period	²¹	Table 2
ACTIV-3 (TICO)	536	Sotrovimab (VIR-7831), BR11-196 plus BR11-198	0.5g, 1g + 1g	8	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality up to 90 days	Time to sustained clinical recovery, defined as discharge from the hospital to home and remaining at home for 14 consecutive days, up to day 90 after randomisation.	²²	Figure 3

RECOVERY	9785	Casirivimab/ imdevimab	8.0g	9	Infected: Hospitalised/ moderate to severe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All-cause mortality at 30 days 2. Need for IMV reported as a composite outcome with death 	28-day mortality at seronegative participants and all participants	²³	Table 2
----------	------	---------------------------	------	---	---	---	--	---------------	---------

Table S2. Data sources for efficacy data for convalescent plasma and hyperimmune immunoglobulin studies

Study	Number of participants	Dosage	Number of doses	Antibody levels	Time of administration, median time from onset of symptoms to drug (days)	Population and disease stage	Measurement of effectiveness	Study Primary Outcome	Ref.	Data derived from
Libster	160	250ml	1	IgG titre against SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein (COVIDAR) > 1:1000	NR (maximum 3)	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. Need for IMV 4. All-cause mortality at 30 days 	development of severe respiratory disease defined as a respiratory rate (RR) \geq 30 and/or an O2 sat < 93% when breathing room air within 15 days	⁶	Table 2
Korley	511	250ml	1	SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus reporter viral particle neutralization (RVPN) assay \geq 1:250, or PRNT50 \geq 1:250	4	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hospitalisation 2. Need for IMV 3. All-cause mortality 	Number of patients with disease progression at 15 days	⁵	Table 1, 2, Figure 3 of study reference
Lopardo	245	4mg/kg	2	NR	6	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ICU admission 2. Need for IMV 3. All-cause mortality at 30 days 	Clinical improvement on ordinal scale at 28 days, hospital discharge	²⁴	Table 2

Sullivan	1181	250ml	1	EUROIMMUN IgG ELISA \geq 1:320	6	Infected: Ambulatory/mild (symptomatic outpatients)	1. Hospitalisation 2. ICU admission 3. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Cumulative incidence of hospitalisation or death prior to hospitalisation at 28 days	⁷	Table 2
CAPSID (Körper)	105	250- 325ml	3	Neutralising antibodies by PRNT50, median (1:160, IQR 1:80-1:320)	7	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Composite endpoint of survival and no longer fulfilling criteria of severe disease at 30 days	²⁵	Figure 2 of study reference, Figure 1A, 2A of supplementary table
Kirenga	122	250- 300ml	2	Acro Biosystems Anti-SARS CoV-2 antibody IgG titre Serological ELISA (Spike protein RBD), median 139.5 (IQR 84.3–195.4) AU	7	Infected: Ambulatory/mild	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Time to viral clearance at 30 days	²⁶	Table 1, 2, Figure 2, Supplementary Table 2 of study reference
Ortigoza	941	250ml	1	Reactive on SARS-CoV-2 Microsphere Immunoassay, Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics VITROS signal to cut-off value \geq 12	7	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Clinical status based on severity rating on WHO ordinal scale for clinical improvement at 14 days	²⁷	Figure 2
Agarwal	1210	200ml	2	Microneutralization test, median 1:40 (IQR 1:30 to 1:80). NAb was tested at end of study: 63% of donors had NAb titre $>$ 1:20 with median titter 1:40	8	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Composite of progression to severe disease (PaO ₂ / FiO ₂ $<$ 100 mm Hg) or all-cause mortality at 28 days	²⁸	Table 1, 3

ITAC	593	0.4g/kg, capped at 40g	1	Sero-neutralization validated assay was calibrated against the WHO International standard for each lot of hVIG	8	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Clinical status by seven-category ordinal endpoint at 7 days	²⁹	Table 2
Simonovich	228	415-600ml	1	IgG titre against SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein (COVIDAR), median 1:3200 (IQR 1:800-1:3200)	8	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate	1. ICU admission 2. Need for IMV 3. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Clinical status based on severity rating on WHO ordinal scale for clinical improvement at 30 days	³⁰	Table 1
CONCOR1 (Bégin)	921	500ml (or 250ml)	1 (or 2)	4 assays used including ADCC ratio, anti RBC ELISA anti S IgG, PRNT50. Each had different criteria that were based on the presence of either viral neutralizing antibodies at a titre of >1:160 or antibodies against the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein at a titre of >1:100	8	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe (excluding intubated patients)	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Need for intubation or patient death at 30 days	³¹	Figure 2 of study reference
Bennett-Guerrero	74	240ml	2	NT50 were median 1:334 (IQR 1:192–1:714) in a pseudotype assay and median 1:526 (IQR 1:359–1:786) in a plaque neutralization assay (PRNT) (gold standard)	9	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days ¹	number of days patient remained ventilator-free at 28 days	³²	Figure 3 of study reference
RECOVERY (Horby)	11558	200-350ml	2	EUROIMMUN IgG enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) test targeting the spike (S) glycoprotein, sample to cut-off ratio of ≥6.0	9	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	All-cause mortality at 28 days	³³	Table 2, Webtable 1, Webfigure 1, 4 in Supplementary Index

O'Donnell		250ml	1	anti-SARS-CoV-2 total IgG antibody titre by quantitative ELISA. Neutralization titre was also determined with a SARS-CoV-2 viral neutralization assay which measured inhibition of virus growth after exposure to serial plasma dilutions using qRT-PCR, median 1:160 (IQR 1:80 to 1:320)	9	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days ²	Clinical status at 28 days following randomization using 7-point ordinal scale	³⁴	Table 2
PLACOVID (Sekine)	160	300ml	10	Neutralising antibody via cytopathic effect-based virus neutralization test (CPE-based VNT), median 1:320 (IQR 1:160 to 1:960)	10	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Clinical improvement (improvement of 2 points from randomisation in a 6-point ordinal severity scale) at 28 days	³⁵	Table 2 of study reference
Li	103	200-300ml	1	S-RBD-specific IgG titre \geq 1:640 correlating to serum neutralisation titre of 1:80	30	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Clinical improvement (patient discharged alive or reduction of 2 points on a 6-point disease severity scale) within 28 days	³⁶	Table 3
Ali	50	4 arms: 0.15g/kg, 0.20g/kg, 0.25g/kg, 0.30g/kg	1	Plasma tested, with a lower limit of 10 cut-off index (COI), measurement through electrochemiluminescence immunoassay analyzer (ECLIA)	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Mortality at 28 days, Clinical status on ordinal scale, Horowitz index	³⁷	Table 2

AlQahtani	40	200ml	2	NR	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Requirement for ventilation (non-invasive or mechanical)	³⁸	Table 3
Bajpai	51	250ml	2	S-RBD–specific IgG titre, median ≥ 640 (IQR 10, ≥ 640), SARS-CoV-2 Surrogate Virus Neutralization Test (sVNT) Kit (Genscript) median ≥ 80 (IQR 10, ≥ 80)	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 3. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Proportion of participants remaining free of mechanical ventilation at 7 days	³⁹	Table 2
Beltran Gonzalez	190	200ml	2	Presence of anti-SARS-CoV- 2 IgG by immunochemiluminescence (Architect Abbott)	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days ²	Mean hospitalization time	⁴⁰	Study text under “Outcomes”
Menichetti	487	200ml	1-3	Microneutralization test $\geq 1:160$	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	composite of worsening respiratory failure (PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio < 150 mm Hg) or death within 30 days	⁴¹	eTable 7 and eFigure 2 in Supplement 2
Parikh	60	30ml	2	NR	NR	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	mean change from day 1 to day 8 in an 8- point ordinal scale	⁴²	Figure 1
Pouladzadeh	62	500ml	1	Strong positive results of the SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM Quick Test (German) for neutralizing IgG antibodies and negative results for IgM antibodies	NR (minimum 7)	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	Improvement in the levels of cytokine storm indices	⁴³	Table 1
Ray	80	200ml	2	EUROIMMUN IgG enzyme- linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) test targeting the spike (S) glycoprotein, ≥ 1.5 for the ratio optical density between the sample and calibrator.	NR (5-10 days from initial presentation)	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe (excluding intubated patients)	1. Need for IMV 2. All-cause mortality at 30 days	All-cause mortality at 30 days	⁴⁴	Figure 4

REMAP CAP (Estcourt)	2011	200-350ml	2	Variable assays used by country, including EUROIMMUN IgG ELISA test sample to cut-off ratio of ≥ 6.0 , virus microneutralization assay using Vero E6 cell $\geq 1:80$, Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG CMIA, PRNT50 $\geq 1:160$, antibody-dependent cell cytotoxicity (ADCC), ELISA test targeting the spike (S) glycoprotein.	NR (within 48 hours of randomisation)	Infected: Hospitalised/moderate to severe	1. All-cause mortality at 30 days	All-cause mortality at 90 days, Days alive and not receiving organ support in ICU	⁴⁵	Figure 2,3
----------------------	------	-----------	---	--	---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	---	---------------	------------

¹In this study, note that the comparator arm was administered IVIG (not placebo)

²In this study, note that the comparator arm was administered standard plasma (not placebo)

Table S3. Efficacy for preventing different stage progressions for pooled data

Stage transition	Efficacy in percent (95% CI)	
	mAb treatment	CP or HIVIG treatment
pre-exposure to symptomatic	91.9 (81.3 – 97.2)	-
peri-(post-)exposure to symptomatic	52.7 (32.6 – 67.3)	-
symptomatic to hospitalisation	70.0 (60.5 – 77.5)	31.4 (11.3 – 47.2)
symptomatic to ventilation	71.2 (5.9 – 93.5)	44.8 (-58.1 – 82.9)
symptomatic to death	62.5 (39.0 – 77.8)	-5.3 (-104.8 – 45.64)
hospitalisation to ventilation	-51.7 (-230.7 – 27.4)	1.9 (-7.6 – 10.6)
hospitalization to death	5.4 (-2.2 – 12.5)	2.7 (-3.0 – 8.1)

Table S4. Dose fold-convalescent for various mAb treatments

Monoclonal Ab	Dosage	mAb conc. [mg/mL]	IC-50 [ng/mL]	Fold IC-50	Dose fold-convalescent
bamlanivimab (LY-CoV555, LY3819253)	0.7g	0.233	6.548	35,583.38	102.37
	2.8g	0.933		142,486.3	409.92
	7.0g	2.333		355,833.8	1,023.71
casirivimab	0.6g	0.2	6.895	29,006.53	83.45
	1.2g	0.4		58,013.05	166.9
	4.0g	1.333		193,328.5	556.19
etesevimab	2.8g	0.933	6.325	147,509.9	424.37
imdevimab	0.6g	0.2	22.658	8,826.90	25.39
	1.2g	0.4		17,653.81	50.79
	4.0g	1.333		58,831.32	169.25
regdanvimab (CT-P59)	40mg/kg	0.888	3.581	247,975.4	713.41
	80mg/kg	1.777		496,230.1	1,427.61
sotrovimab (VIR-7831)	0.5g	0.166	67.125	2,472.998	7.11

Table S5. Dose fold-convalescent for mAb and CP trials

Trial	Treatment	Dose/Volume	Dose [fold convalescent]
BLAZE-1 (Chen)	mAb	bamlanivimab (0.7g)	102.37
		bamlanivimab (2.8g)	409.92
		bamlanivimab (7.0g)	1,023.71
BLAZE-1 (Dougan)	mAb	bamlanivimab + etesevimab (2.8g +2.8g)	424.37
COMET-ICE	mAb	sotrovimab (0.5g)	7.11
Eom	mAb	regdanvimab (40mg/kg)	713.41
		regdanvimab (80mg/kg)	1,427.61
Isa	mAb	casirivimab + imdevimab (1.2g)	83.45
O'Brien	mAb	casirivimab + imdevimab (1.2g)	83.45
Weinreich	mAb	casirivimab + imdevimab (1.2g)	83.45
		casirivimab + imdevimab (2.4g)	166.90
		casirivimab + imdevimab (8.0g)	556.19
Korley	CP	250mL	0.097
Libster	CP	250mL (CP 1,000 to 3,200)	0.38
		250mL (CP >3,200)	1.47
Sullivan	CP	250mL	0.153

Table S6. Estimated parameters for the dose-response curve for preventing hospitalisations

Description	Estimate	95% CI
Maximal efficacy	70.2%	62.1 – 78.3%
EC-50 dose (dose for half-maximal efficacy)	0.185-fold conv.	0.087 – 0.395-fold conv.
EC-90 dose (dose for 90% of the maximal efficacy)	0.904-fold conv.	0.208 – 17.803-fold conv.
IC50 dose (dose for 50% efficacy)	0.357-fold conv.	0.132 – 1.598-fold conv.
Slope parameter of the dose-response curve	3.193	1.093 – 9.328

Table S7. MAb dose for various efficacies of preventing hospitalization

Monoclonal Ab	EC-50 [mg] (35.1%)	EC-90 [mg] (63.18%)	Doses given [mg]	Fold-differences of doses given and EC-90 dose
bamlanivimab	1.27	6.17	700, 2800, or 7000	113.5, 453.8, or 1134.5
casirivimab	1.33	6.50	600, 1200, or 4000	92.3, 184.6, or 615.4
etesevimab	1.22	5.96	2800	469.8
imdevimab	4.38	21.36	600, 1200, or 4000	28.1, 56.2, or 187.3
regdanvimab	0.69	3.38	3200 or 6400*	946.7 or 1893.5
sotrovimab	12.98	63.29	500	7.9

* Dose of 40 or 80mg/kg for an 80kg person.

Table S8. Fold increase in hospitalisations averted

Monoclonal Ab	Dose given [mg]	EC-90 dose [mg] (63.18%)	Fold-increase in hospitalisations averted with EC-90 dose	Maximal fold-increase in hosp. averted	Dose [mg] for maximal fold-increase in hosp. averted
bamlanivimab	700	6.17	101.9	305.5	0.64
casirivimab	600	6.50	83.1	249.0	0.67
etesevimab	2800	5.96	422.4	1,266.2	0.62
imdevimab	600	21.36	25.3	75.8	2.21
regdanvimab	3200	3.38	710.1	2,128.6	0.35
sotrovimab	500	63.29	7.1	21.3	6.56

Table S9. Neutralisation against Omicron BA.1 and BA.2

Monoclonal Ab	EC-90 Ancestral [mg]	Neutralisation against BA.1 [fold drop] [#]	Predicted EC-90 BA.1 [mg]	Neutralisation against BA.2 [fold drop] [#]	Predicted EC-90 BA.2 [mg]	Doses given [mg]
bamlanivimab	6.17	>5000	>30850	>5000	>30850	700, 2800, or 7000
casirivimab	6.50	>5000	>32500	2201	14307	600, 1200, or 4000
etesevimab	5.96	>1300	>7848	>2700	>16092	2800
imdevimab	21.36	>1600	>34080	253	5404	600, 1200, or 4000
regdanvimab	3.38	>5000	>16900	No data found	No data	3200 or 6400*
sotrovimab	63.29	7.8	493.7	77.0	4873	500

[#] Data is aggregated from studies by Zhou et al⁴⁶, Iketani et al⁴⁷, VanBlargan et al⁴⁸ and Takashita et al⁴⁹. The average fold drop in neutralisation of Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 compared with ancestral virus across all available studies. No detectable IC-50 has been observed for antibodies against Omicron BA.1, except for sotrovimab, thus the detected loss of

neutralisation to the LOD has been reported for other mAbs. Detectable neutralisation against Omicron BA.2 was identified for casirivimab, imdevimab and sotrovimab, but no other antibodies. Geometric mean is reported for all antibody variant combinations where neutralisation was detected in at least one study. Geometric mean was computed with censoring in the case where some studies detected neutralisation, but other studies did not. When an antibody variant combination was not reported to have any detectable neutralisation in any study the maximum drop in neutralisation across the studies was used (maximum 5000-fold reported here).

* Dose of 40 or 80mg/kg for an 80kg person.

Table S10. The effect of the treatment stage on efficacy for mAb treatment

<i>Progression to the next stage[†]</i>			
Variable		Relative risk (95% CI)	χ^2 test p-value
treatment		0.12 (0.08 – 0.19)	2.80×10^{-27}
initial stage (numerical)		1.20 (0.89 – 1.61)	-
treatment : initial stage (numerical)		1.96 (1.70 – 2.28)	6.11×10^{-23}
<i>By outcome stage</i>			
Outcome	Initial stage	Relative risk (95% CI)	χ^2 test p-value
symptomatic	peri-(post-)exposure (relative to pre-exposure)	6.26 (2.48 – 19.21)	3.57×10^{-5}
ventilation	hospitalization (relative to symptomatic)	6.08 (1.25 – 45.39)	2.40×10^{-2}
death	hospitalization (relative to symptomatic)	2.00 (1.20 – 3.45)	7.17×10^{-3}

[†] We consider the following stage transition only (to avoid a higher influence of studies that reported more outcomes): pre-exposure to symptomatic, peri-(post-)exposure to symptomatic, symptomatic to hospitalization, and hospitalization to death. All initial stages were transformed to numerical; pre-exposure was transformed to 0, peri-(post-)exposure to 1, symptomatic to 2, and hospitalization to 3.

Table S11. The effect of the treatment stage on efficacy for CP and hIVIG treatment

<i>Progression to the next stage[†]</i>			
Variable		Relative risk (95% CI)	χ^2 test p-value
treatment		0.24 (0.08 – 0.68)	0.0071
initial stage (numerical)		1.03 (0.49 – 2.15)	-
treatment : initial stage (numerical)		1.42 (1.09 – 1.86)	0.0089
<i>By outcome stage</i>			
Outcome	Initial stage	Relative risk (95% CI)	χ^2 test p-value
ventilation	hospitalization (relative to symptomatic)	1.78 (0.62 – 5.75)	0.290
death	hospitalization (relative to symptomatic)	0.76 (0.37 – 1.53)	0.445

[†] We consider the following stage transition only (to avoid a higher influence of studies that reported more outcomes): pre-exposure to symptomatic, peri-(post-)exposure to symptomatic, symptomatic to hospitalization, and hospitalization to death. All initial stages were transformed to numerical; pre-exposure was transformed to 0, peri-(post-)exposure to 1, symptomatic to 2, and hospitalization to 3.

Table S12. Number of different outcome events for symptomatic patients across all trials

Outcome	mAb treatment		CP treatment	
	Treatment group (n)	Control group (n)	Treatment group (n)	Control group (n)
hospitalization	64 (4038)	193 (3737)	80 (927)	118 (923)
ventilation	3 (2586)	10 (2484)	5 (330)	9 (328)
death	20 (4445)	54 (4165)	17 (998)	16 (990)

Table S13. Efficacy of mAb treatment for preventing hospitalization by dose

	Relative Risk (95% CI)	χ^2 test p-value
treatment	0.082 (0.018 – 0.315)	0.00013
$\log_{10}(\text{dose})$	0.998 (0.699 – 1.408)	-
mixed risk	0.651 (0.345 – 1.217)	0.17
high risk	0.567 (0.316 – 1.028)	
$\log_{10}(\text{dose})$: treatment	1.720 (0.991 – 3.155)	0.054

Table S14. Estimated parameters for the dose-response curve for treatment of hospitalised subjects preventing death

Description	Estimate	95% CI
Maximal efficacy	6.74%	-8.15 – 21.62%
EC-50 dose (dose for half-maximal efficacy)	1.016-fold conv.	0.494 – 2.081-fold conv.
Slope parameter of the dose-response curve	0.910	0.0035 – 237.977

References

1. Avendaño-Solà, C., *et al.* Convalescent Plasma for COVID-19: A multicenter, randomized clinical trial. Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.26.20182444v3> (2020).
2. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing* (2019).
3. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**, 1-48 (2015).
4. McCallum, M., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 immune evasion by the B.1.427/B.1.429 variant of concern. *Science* **373**, 648-654 (2021).
5. Korley, F.K., *et al.* Early Convalescent Plasma for High-Risk Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **385**, 1951-1960 (2021).
6. Libster, R., *et al.* Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 610-618 (2021).
7. Sullivan, D.J., *et al.* Randomized Controlled Trial of Early Outpatient COVID-19 Treatment with High-Titer Convalescent Plasma. Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.12.10.21267485v1> (2021).
8. Di Germanio, C., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 antibody persistence in COVID-19 convalescent plasma donors: Dependency on assay format and applicability to serosurveillance. *Transfusion* **61**, 2677-2687 (2021).
9. Cromer, D., *et al.* Relating in vitro neutralisation level and protection in the CVnCoV (CUREVAC) trial. *Clin Infect Dis*, ciac075 (2022).
10. Genz, A., *et al.* mvtnorm: Multivariate Normal and t Distributions. R package version 1.1-3. (2021).
11. Genz, A. & Bretz, F. Computation of Multivariate Normal and t Probabilities. *Lecture Notes in Statistics* **195**(2009).
12. Isa, F., *et al.* Repeat Subcutaneous Administration of REGEN-COV in Adults is Well-Tolerated and Prevents the Occurrence of COVID-19. Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.11.10.21265889v1> (2021).
13. O'Brien, M.P., *et al.* Subcutaneous REGEN-COV Antibody Combination to Prevent Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **385**, 1184-1195 (2021).
14. Cohen, M.S., *et al.* Effect of Bamlanivimab vs Placebo on Incidence of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff of Skilled Nursing and Assisted Living Facilities: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **326**, 46-55 (2021).
15. Eom, J.S., *et al.* Efficacy and safety of CT-P59 plus standard of care: a phase 2/3 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in outpatients with mild-to-moderate SARS-CoV-2 infection. Preprint at <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-296518/v1> (2021).
16. Weinreich, D.M., *et al.* REGEN-COV Antibody Combination and Outcomes in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **385**, e81 (2021).
17. Chen, P., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody LY-CoV555 in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 229-237 (2021).
18. Dougan, M., *et al.* Bamlanivimab plus Etesevimab in Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **385**, 1382-1392 (2021).
19. Gupta, A., *et al.* Early Treatment for Covid-19 with SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Sotrovimab. *N Engl J Med* **385**, 1941-1950 (2021).
20. AZD7442 reduced risk of developing severe COVID-19 or death in TACKLE Phase III outpatient treatment trial. (AstraZeneca press release, 11 October 2021). <https://www.astrazeneca.com/media-centre/press-releases/2021/azd7442-phiii-trial-positive-in-covid-outpatients.html> (2021).
21. ACTIV-3/TICO LY-CoV555 Study Group. A Neutralizing Monoclonal Antibody for Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 905-914 (2021).
22. ACTIV-3/Therapeutics for Inpatients with COVID-19 (TICO) Study Group. Efficacy and safety of two neutralising monoclonal antibody therapies, sotrovimab and BRII-196 plus BRII-198, for adults hospitalised with COVID-19 (TICO): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 10.1016/s1473-3099(1021)00751-00759 (2021).

23. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, *et al.* Casirivimab and imdevimab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.06.15.21258542v1>* (2021).
24. Lopardo, G., *et al.* RBD-specific polyclonal F(ab')₂ fragments of equine antibodies in patients with moderate to severe COVID-19 disease: A randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, adaptive phase 2/3 clinical trial. *EClinicalMedicine* **34**, 100843 (2021).
25. Körper, S., *et al.* Results of the CAPSID randomized trial for high-dose convalescent plasma in patients with severe COVID-19. *J Clin Invest* **131**, e152264 (2021).
26. Kirenga, B., *et al.* Efficacy of convalescent plasma for treatment of COVID-19 in Uganda. *BMJ Open Respir Res* **8**, e001017 (2021).
27. Ortigoza, M.B., *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma in Hospitalized Patients: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* **182**, 115-126 (2022).
28. Agarwal, A., *et al.* Convalescent plasma in the management of moderate covid-19 in adults in India: open label phase II multicentre randomised controlled trial (PLACID Trial). *BMJ* **371**, m3939 (2020).
29. The ITAC (INSIGHT 013) Study Group. Hyperimmune immunoglobulin for hospitalised patients with COVID-19 (ITAC): a double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3, randomised trial. *The Lancet* **399**, 530-540 (2022).
30. Simonovich, V.A., *et al.* A Randomized Trial of Convalescent Plasma in Covid-19 Severe Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 619-629 (2021).
31. Bégin, P., *et al.* Convalescent plasma for hospitalized patients with COVID-19: an open-label, randomized controlled trial. *Nat Med* **27**, 2012-2024 (2021).
32. Bennett-Guerrero, E., *et al.* Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Convalescent Plasma Versus Standard Plasma in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Infected Hospitalized Patients in New York: A Double-Blind Randomized Trial. *Crit Care Med* **49**, 1015-1025 (2021).
33. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Convalescent plasma in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised controlled, open-label, platform trial. *The Lancet* **397**, 2049-2059 (2021).
34. O'Donnell, M.R., *et al.* A randomized double-blind controlled trial of convalescent plasma in adults with severe COVID-19. *J Clin Invest* **131**, e150646 (2021).
35. Sekine, L., *et al.* Convalescent plasma for COVID-19 in hospitalised patients: an open-label, randomised clinical trial. *Eur Respir J* **59**, 2101471 (2022).
36. Li, L., *et al.* Effect of Convalescent Plasma Therapy on Time to Clinical Improvement in Patients With Severe and Life-threatening COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **324**, 460-470 (2020).
37. Ali, S., *et al.* Hyperimmune anti-COVID-19 IVIG (C-IVIG) treatment in severe and critical COVID-19 patients: A phase I/II randomized control trial. *EClinicalMedicine* **36**, 100926 (2021).
38. AlQahtani, M., *et al.* Randomized controlled trial of convalescent plasma therapy against standard therapy in patients with severe COVID-19 disease. *Sci Rep* **11**, 9927 (2021).
39. Bajpai, M., *et al.* Efficacy of Convalescent Plasma Therapy compared to Fresh Frozen Plasma in Severely ill COVID-19 Patients: A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.25.20219337v1>* (2020).
40. Gonzalez, J.L.B., *et al.* Efficacy and safety of convalescent plasma and intravenous immunoglobulin in critically ill COVID-19 patients. A controlled clinical trial. *Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.28.21254507v1>* (2021).
41. Menichetti, F., *et al.* Effect of High-Titer Convalescent Plasma on Progression to Severe Respiratory Failure or Death in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2136246 (2021).
42. Parikh, D., *et al.* Safety and efficacy of COVID-19 hyperimmune globulin (HIG) solution in the treatment of active COVID-19 infection - Findings from a Prospective, Randomized, Controlled, Multi-Centric Trial. *Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.07.26.21261119v1>* (2021).
43. Pouladzadeh, M., *et al.* A randomized clinical trial evaluating the immunomodulatory effect of convalescent plasma on COVID-19-related cytokine storm. *Intern Emerg Med* **16**, 2181-2191 (2021).

44. Ray, Y., *et al.* Clinical and immunological benefits of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19: insights from a single center open label randomised control trial. *Preprint at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.25.20237883v1>* (2020).
45. Writing Committee for the REMAP-CAP Investigators, *et al.* Effect of Convalescent Plasma on Organ Support-Free Days in Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **326**, 1690-1702 (2021).
46. Zhou, H., Tada, T., Dcosta, B.M. & Landau, N.R. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2 by Therapeutic Monoclonal Antibodies. *Preprint at <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.02.15.480166v2>* (2022).
47. Iketani, S., *et al.* Antibody Evasion Properties of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Sublineages. *Preprint at <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.02.07.479306v1>* (2022).
48. VanBlargan, L.A., *et al.* An infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 Omicron virus escapes neutralization by therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. *Nat Med*, 10.1038/s41591-41021-01678-y (2022).
49. Takashita, E., *et al.* Efficacy of Antiviral Agents against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Subvariant BA.2. *N Engl J Med*, 10.1056/NEJMc2201933 (2022).