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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Supplementary Table 1** Embase search strategy | |
| Search number | Search terms |
| 1 | coronavirus disease 2019/ or (covid-19 or covid19 or corona-virus or sars-cov-2 or sars-cov2 or coronavirus disease or ncov or n-cov).ti,ab. or (alpha or beta or gamma or delta or omicron).ti. |
| 2 | sotrovimab/ or (sotrovimab or GSK-4182136 or GSK4182136 or UNII-1MTK0BPN8V or VIR-7831 or VIR7831 or Xevudy).ti,ab. |
| 3 | 1 and 2. |
| 4 | exp Clinical trial/ or exp Randomized controlled trial/ or Randomization/ or Single blind procedure/ or Double blind procedure/ or Crossover procedure/ or Placebo/ or Randomi?ed controlled trial$.tw. or Rct.tw. or Random allocation.tw. or Randomly allocated.tw. or Allocated randomly.tw. or (allocated adj2 random).tw. or Single blind$.tw. or Double blind$.tw. or ((treble or triple) adj blind$).tw. or Placebo$.tw. |
| 5 | exp longitudinal study/ or exp retrospective study/ or exp prospective study/ or exp cohort analysis/ or exp cross-sectional study/ or exp cohort analysis/ or exp observational study/ or (longitudinal study or retrospective study or prospective study or cohort$ or follow up or cross-sectional study or cross sectional study or followup study or observational study or registry or registries or real world or cross sectional or claims database or electronic health record$ or EHR or electronic medical record$ or EMR$ or RWE).ti,ab. |
| 6 | meta-analysis/ or systematic review/ or meta-analysis as topic/ or "meta analysis (topic)"/ or "systematic review (topic)"/ or exp technology assessment, biomedical/. |
| 7 | ((systematic\* adj3 (review\* or overview\*)) or (methodologic\* adj3 (review\* or overview\*))).ti,ab. |
| 8 | ((quantitative adj3 (review\* or overview\* or synthes\*)) or (research adj3 (integrati\* or overview\*))).ti,ab. |
| 9 | ((integrative adj3 (review\* or overview\*)) or (collaborative adj3 (review\* or overview\*)) or (pool\* adj3 analy\*)).ti,ab. |
| 10 | (data synthes\* or data extraction\* or data abstraction\*).ti,ab. |
| 11 | (handsearch\* or hand search\*).ti,ab. |
| 12 | (mantel haenszel or peto or der simonian or dersimonian or fixed effect\* or latin square\*).ti,ab. |
| 13 | (meta analy\* or metanaly\* or technology assessment\* or HTA or HTAs or technology overview\* or technology appraisal\*).ti,ab. |
| 14 | (meta regression\* or metaregression\*).ti,ab. |
| 15 | (meta-analy\* or metaanaly\* or systematic review\* or biomedical technology assessment\* or bio-medical technology assessment\*).mp,hw. |
| 16 | (medline or cochrane or pubmed or medlars or embase or cinahl).ti,ab,hw. |
| 17 | (cochrane or (health adj2 technology assessment) or evidence report).jw. |
| 18 | (comparative adj3 (efficacy or effectiveness)).ti,ab. |
| 19 | (outcomes research or relative effectiveness).ti,ab. |
| 20 | ((indirect or indirect treatment or mixed-treatment) adj comparison\*).ti,ab. |
| 21 | or/4-20. |
| 22 | 3 and 21. |
| 23 | limit 22 to (conference abstract and yr="2022-current"). |
| 24 | limit 22 to (yr="2022-current" and (article or article in press)). |
| 25 | 23 or 24. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Supplementary Table 2** NOS cohort studies quality assessment of studies included in the SLR | | | | | | | |
| Bias domain | Questions | Response options (\* = response scores a point) | Cheng et al. 2022 [1] | Harman et al. 2022 [2] | Mazzotta et al. 2023 [3] | Zaqout et al. 2022 [4] | Zheng et al. 2022 [5] |
| Selection | 1. Representativeness of the exposed cohort | 1. Truly representative of the average high-risk COVID-19 patient in the community\* | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 1. Somewhat representative of the average high-risk COVID-19 patient in the community\* |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| 1. Selected group of users (e.g. nurses, volunteers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No description of the derivation of the cohort |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Selection of non-exposed cohort | 1. Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort\* | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1. Drawn from a different source |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ascertainment of exposure | 1. Secure record (e.g. surgical records)\* | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1. Structured interview\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Written self-report |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No description |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 1. Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study | 1. Yes\* | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1. No |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |
| Comparability | 1. Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis | 1. Study controls for immunodeficiency (by disease and/or treatment)\* | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 1. Study controls for any additional factor\* | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Outcome | 1. Assessment of outcome | 1. Independent blind assessment\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Record linkage\* | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1. Self-report |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No description |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 1. Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur | 1. Yes\* | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| 1. No |  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 1. Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts | 1. Complete follow up – all subjects accounted for\* |  | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 1. Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias – small number lost – >80% follow up, or description provided of those lost\* |  |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 1. Follow up rate <80% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. No statement | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |
| Total score (max. 9) | | | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 8 |

*NOS* Newcastle Ottawa Scale, *SLR* systematic literature review

Ticked boxes represent a score of 1, while empty boxes represent a score of 0
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