

1 **Estimates of Actual and Potential Lives Saved in the United States from the use of**
2 **COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma**

3 Quigly Dragotakes¹, David J. Sullivan¹, Rickey E. Carter², Michael J. Joyner³, Evan Bloch⁴, Kelly
4 A. Gebo⁵, Daniel F. Hanley⁶, Jeffrey P. Henderson⁷, Liise-anne Pirofski⁸, Shmuel Shoham⁵,
5 Jonathon W. Senefeld⁹, Aaron AR Tobian⁴, Chad C. Wiggins¹⁰, R. Scott Wright¹¹, Nigel S.
6 Paneth¹², Arturo Casadevall¹

7 ¹Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins School of Public
8 Health, Baltimore, MD

9 ²Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, FL, USA

10 ³Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

11 ⁴Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
12 Maryland, USA

13 ⁵Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Johns
14 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

15 ⁶Department of Neurology, Brain Injury Outcomes Division, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Johns
16 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

17 ⁷Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Washington University School of Medicine,
18 Louis, St. Louis, MO

19 ⁸Division of Infectious Diseases, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York, NY

20 ⁹Department of Health and Kinesiology, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL

21 ¹⁰Department of Kinesiology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

22 ¹¹Departments of Cardiovascular Medicine and Human Research Protection Program, Mayo
23 Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

24 ¹²Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics and Department of Pediatrics and Human Development,
25 Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

26

27

28 **In the Spring of 2020, the United States of America (USA) deployed COVID-19**
29 **convalescent plasma (CCP) for the treatment of hospitalized patients. Over 500,000**
30 **patients were treated with CCP during the first year of the pandemic. In this study, we**
31 **used CCP weekly use, weekly national mortality data, and CCP mortality reduction data**
32 **from meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials and real-world data to estimate the**
33 **number of actual inpatient lives saved by the treatment with CCP in the USA. We also**
34 **estimate the potential number of lives saved if CCP had been deployed for 100% of**
35 **hospitalized patients or used in 15% to 75% of outpatients. Depending on the**
36 **assumptions modeled in stratified analyses, CCP was estimated to have saved between**
37 **16,187 and 66,160 lives. The ideal use of CCP might have saved as many as 215,195 lives**
38 **while preventing 1,136,880 hospitalizations. CCP deployment was a successful strategy**
39 **for ameliorating the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the USA and this experience**
40 **has important implications for convalescent plasma used in future infectious disease**
41 **emergencies.**

42 In the spring of 2020, the United States of America (USA) faced a rapidly worsening coronavirus
43 disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic caused by a novel infectious agent, SARS-CoV-2. In the
44 absence of specific therapies for COVID-19, the USA Food and Drug Administration made
45 COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP) available in 2020, first under compassionate use in late
46 March, then under an Expanded Access Program (EAP) and registry in early April, and finally
47 under Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) in late August (1). CCP was qualified initially based
48 on the donors having had a previously positive SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid test, not on specific
49 antibody levels. The EAP registry enrolled approximately 105,000 patients by late August 2020
50 (1) and produced early evidence of safety (2, 3) and efficacy (4, 5). By the Fall of 2020 as many
51 as 40% of hospitalized patients were being treated with CCP (6). However, disappointing results
52 from several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) assessing CCP efficacy in hospitalized patients
53 in India (7), Argentina (8), the United Kingdom (9), and Italy (10), combined with the availability
54 of small molecule antivirals in the form of remdesivir, led to a substantial decline in use by early
55 2021; we previously estimated this decline was associated with as many as 30,000 excess
56 deaths by mid-2021 (6).

57 In retrospect, early RCTs examining CCP efficacy in hospitalized patients were unlikely to show
58 benefit because of design flaws that included use of plasma with inadequate specific antibody
59 concentrations, inexact endpoints, late CCP administration (e.g. use during the inflammatory
60 phase rather than the viral phase of COVID-19), and/or insufficient power (11, 12). The early
61 phase of the pandemic in the USA also precluded a number of factors vital for conduct of
62 successful RCTs including: (i) training of sites and site initiation visits; (ii) precise pre-
63 deployment of CCP and a comparator placebo with regard to where the next wave of the
64 pandemic would emerge; (iii) impaired access to research staff due to work at home
65 requirements; and (iv) the lack of a national network to conduct pandemic related research
66 smoothly and seamlessly. Although not known at the time, later retrospective analysis of EAP
67 data showed that distance between CCP collection and use also reduced efficacy (13), adding
68 another variable that could have influenced the outcome of some RCTs. Subsequent trials of
69 CCP using units with high levels of spike-protein specific IgG (high titer CCP) early in disease
70 eventually established its efficacy (14, 15). However, by the time this information was available,
71 rapid acquisition of antibody immunity from natural infection and vaccination in the general
72 population, combined with the availability of small molecule antiviral agents and monoclonal
73 antibodies (mAbs), lowered the need for this passive antibody therapy. Nonetheless, CCP has

74 retained a role in the COVID-19 therapeutic armamentarium in immunosuppressed patients, in
75 whom, even in the first year of the pandemic there was evidence for efficacy (16). With the loss
76 of mAb efficacy due to continued SARS-CoV-2 evolution (17), CCP is again the only available
77 antibody-based with activity against SARS-CoV-2 (18).

78 Four lines of evidence show that CCP reduces COVID-19 inpatient mortality when used early in
79 disease: 1) registry data from the USA (5), Argentina (19) and Italy (20); 2) real world data from
80 use in the USA (21); 3) a meta-analysis of over 30 RCTs (22); and 4) epidemiologic data
81 showing a strong negative correlation between CCP use and mortality, with a reciprocal
82 relationship between weekly use and the national death rate (6). From the available
83 epidemiological data, it was estimated that had the USA not deployed CCP in 2020,
84 approximately 96,000 additional deaths would have occurred during the first year of the
85 pandemic (6). In the present analysis we revisit the question of how CCP use affected overall
86 USA mortality by combining CCP usage data with mortality statistics and efficacy measures
87 from RCTs and real-world data.

88 **Methods**

89 CCP units used and patients treated. To estimate the lives saved we developed several models
90 based on available CCP use and mortality data from 7/18/20 through 3/6/21. The number of
91 CCP units dispensed in the USA in the first year of the pandemic was obtained from the Blood
92 Centers of America Inc (BCA, West Warwick, RI), based on the reported number of units
93 shipped from all blood supplies to hospitals nationwide (6). This number does not capture CCP
94 produced by independent hospitals and transfusion centers (6) as some CCP was collected and
95 processed locally, as previously described (23, 24). Nevertheless, BCA data represents
96 approximately 90% of all units given in the US. Given that the USA FDA recommendations for
97 CCP use in 2020 were to use one unit per patient, our estimates assumed that the number of
98 units used corresponded to the number of patients treated.

99 CCP mortality reduction percentages. We made two estimates of this parameter – one based on
100 RCT's and propensity matched studies, and another based on real world data. From a meta-
101 analysis of all controlled studies through 2022 (39 RCTs with 21,529 participants; 70 propensity
102 matched cohort studies with 50,160 participants) we estimate that CCP reduced mortality by
103 13% in all hospitalized patients and by 37% in inpatients treated early with high titer units (22).

104 Using real world data, CCP was estimated to reduce mortality in all hospitalized patients by 29%
105 and by 47% when high titer units were used early in hospitalization (21). These mortality ranges
106 include the most recent RCT in hospitalized patients reporting a 21% reduction in mortality (25),
107 published after the above meta-analysis. Justification for the assumption of early in-hospital use
108 comes from Mozaffari et al (26), who reported that by Fall 2020 over 83% of a large sample of
109 patients in the United States treated with CCP were being treated in the first three days of
110 hospitalization.

111 Estimating hospitalized lives saved by deployment of CCP. The weekly number of hospitalized
112 individuals, weekly deaths associated with COVID-19 estimated as previously described (6),
113 and weekly hospital admissions were acquired from the United States Centers for Disease
114 Control and Prevention (CDC) COVID-19 reporting databases. The proportion of early
115 administered CCP was calculated according to Mozaffari et al (26) who provided the
116 percentages of individuals treated by hospital day in a database representing 20% of all USA
117 hospitals.

118 Lives saved by CCP were calculated using the four separate estimates of mortality benefit
119 conferred by CCP shown above in hospitalized patients (22), i.e. 13% or 29% for any treatment
120 in hospitals; 37% or 47% if treatment was early with high titer plasma (21).

121 **Model 1.** Evaluates the question: how many lives did CCP save in comparison to a situation
122 where CCP was never used? In this scenario:

123
$$\text{Total Deaths} = (\text{Untreated Patients} * \text{Untreated Mortality}\%) + (\text{Treated Patients} * \text{Treated}$$

124
$$\text{Mortality}\%)$$

125 We estimated the untreated mortality each week by substituting that term with [Recorded
126 Deaths / (Admissions - Treated Patients * Mortality Reduction)]. We then calculated the lives
127 saved as the difference between the above and (Admissions * Untreated Mortality) where the
128 comparison is to the absence of CCP treatment, using the four mortality reduction fractions
129 described above from trial and real-world data (i.e. 13%, 29%, 37% and 47%) obtained from
130 (21, 22).

131 **Model 2.** This model for estimating actual lives saved differs from Model 1 in that we added
132 consideration of optimal use of plasma, i.e. in the first three days of hospitalization. For this
133 estimate we used the timing of CCP administration as reported by Mozzafari (26), who reported
134 that by December 2020, in a sample of 20% of US hospitals, 83% of patients were receiving
135 CCP in the first three days of hospitalization. We used the real-world efficacy data from Arnold
136 *et al.* (21) of a 47% reduction in mortality if given in the first 3 days and no efficacy if used
137 thereafter. We assumed that post-December 2020 usage resembled rates observed in
138 December as USA physicians had apparently learned the need to use it early in the course of
139 hospitalization and CCP was plentiful. The lives saved estimated from this model was calculated
140 using the same methodology as model 1 except that the number of treated patients each week
141 were recalculated according to estimated early plasma use.

142 **Models 3 and 4** estimate the number of lives that would have been saved had CCP been
143 administered to 100% of hospitalized patients, using the four measures of efficacy in reducing
144 mortality described above. Both models are similar to model 1 except for the assumption that all
145 hospitalized patients received CCP.

146
$$\text{Total Deaths} = (\text{Admissions}) * (\text{Treated Mortality}\%)$$

147
$$\text{Model 3 Total Lives Saved} = \text{Recorded Deaths} - (\text{Admissions} * \text{Treated Mortality}\%)$$

148
$$\text{Model 4 Total Lives Saved} = (\text{Admissions} * \text{Untreated Mortality}) - (\text{Admissions} * \text{Treated}$$

149
$$\text{Mortality}\%)$$

150 Models 3 and 4 both compare the number of deaths that we estimate could have been saved if
151 all hospitalized patients had been treated in the first three days but differ in the way deaths were
152 estimated. Model 3 uses a weighted estimate of 21% average mortality based on a regression
153 analysis of weekly death rates previously established (6). Model 4 uses the actual number of
154 deaths reported by the USA CDC, synchronizing these to the number of admissions with a two-
155 week lag to allow for deaths to occur. These assumptions add different uncertainties. The
156 accuracy of Model 3 is dependent on a regression analysis estimate while in Model 4 not all
157 deaths occurred exactly two weeks after admission and the model does not account for the
158 proportion of patients who did receive CCP, since the USA CDC mortality numbers reflect all
159 who died including those treated with CCP.

160 **Model 5: Estimating potential lives saved had CCP been deployed for outpatient use.**

161 Given the greater efficacy of CCP when used early in the course of infection is likely that
162 outpatient use could have saved even more lives than inpatient use. A RCT of CCP outpatient
163 efficacy early in the pandemic reported a 48% relative risk reduction in progression to severe
164 illness likely to lead to hospitalization in elderly patients (27). Subsequently, a large RCT of
165 CCP outpatient use reported a 54.3% efficacy in reducing hospitalization (14). Consequently, we
166 estimated the potential lives saved by outpatient use based on outpatient CCP efficacy data
167 obtained during the pandemic. When CCP was given in the first five days of symptoms its
168 efficacy in reducing progression to hospitalization rose to 79.9%, similar to monoclonal
169 antibodies (28). A more conservative figure of 30% for outpatient CCP emerges from a meta-
170 analysis of five RCTs including international trials (29). We used all three estimates – 30%, 54%
171 and 80% - as shown in Table 1. Although not all patients who died of COVID-19 died in
172 hospitals, the vast majority did (30). Consequently, it is possible to estimate lives saved by
173 deployment of outpatient CCP since individuals not admitted to hospital were assumed to
174 contribute little to the overall death rate. In this estimate, the number of lives saved is seen as
175 proportional to the number of hospitalizations avoided, assuming that the mortality rate would
176 otherwise be unchanged in the hospitalized proportion of patients:

177
$$\text{Total lives saved} = \text{Recorded Deaths} * \text{proportion of patients treated} * \text{efficacy of CCP}$$

178 **Results**

179 Actual lives saved in hospitalized patients. Although most patients hospitalized with COVID-19
180 had progressed past the interval of optimal CCP efficacy, virtually all CCP used in the USA
181 involved hospitalized patients, reflecting the initial EUA restriction to inpatient use. Only in
182 December 2021, after an outpatient RCT revealed efficacy (14), did the FDA authorize
183 outpatient use, and then only in immunosuppressed patients. Using the 647,795 CCP units
184 dispensed from July 2020 to March 2021 as a measure of the number of patients treated and
185 applying the mortality reduction measures from various published studies (21, 22), CCP
186 deployment in the United States saved between 16,187 to 66,160 lives in this period of the
187 pandemic (Table 1). The range in values reflects which assumptions were used in the
188 calculation and the method for calculating the estimate. Although this range is large, all models
189 converge upon the conclusion that CCP saved lives.

190 Potential lives saved with optimal CCP deployment. We next estimated the hypothetical efficacy
191 of CCP treatment if infrastructure had already been in place to collect, manufacture, and
192 distribute high titer CCP to 100% of hospitalized patients within 3 days of admission to each
193 patient. Depending on the COVID-19 mortality estimate Models 3 and 4 yield the potential lives
194 saved as ranging from 53,025 to 215,195 and 36,838 to 149,033, respectively (Table 1).

195 Using data from five outpatient RCTs (15), it is possible to estimate the effect of CCP on
196 mortality had this therapy been authorized for outpatient use in the early days of the pandemic.
197 However, outpatient deployment would have required specialized infrastructure that was not
198 immediately available at the time. Furthermore, some physicians were concerned about
199 potential side effects such as antibody-dependent enhancement and antibody-triggered cytokine
200 storms (31). Early outpatient use of CCP would have required a monitored environment similar
201 in some ways to the inpatient environment (32). But by May 2020 (2), we had learned that CCP
202 is a safe inpatient therapy (33), and by Fall 2020 it had been used successfully in an outpatient
203 RCT (34) without safety concerns (35).

204 Although the logistics of outpatient CCP use are more complicated than in-hospital use (32),
205 successful deployment of outpatient mAb therapy and the availability of outpatient RCT data
206 (14, 27) established the feasibility of this option in the USA. Efficacy of outpatient use of CCP
207 was estimated in three ways: a 30% reduction in hospitalization based on a meta-analysis of
208 five trials (29); a 54% reduction based on findings of the largest RCT (14); and an 80%
209 reduction based on findings from the subset treated within 5 days in the largest RCT (28).
210 However, the more complex logistics of outpatient CCP use make it unlikely that everyone at
211 risk for progression would have received this therapy as only 15% of eligible patients received
212 mAb outpatient therapy (36). Had a similar percentage of high-risk individuals been treated with
213 CCP in the first year of the pandemic, we estimate that between 85,268 and 227,377
214 hospitalizations could have been avoided, depending on the efficacy estimate. Using the 21%
215 overall mortality rate for hospitalized patients at that time, this would have further prevented
216 about 17,905 to 47,749 deaths, depending on the efficacy estimate, since most deaths from
217 COVID-19 occurred in hospitals (Figure 1, Table 1).

218 Reduction in hospitalizations would have also reduced stress on the health care system, which
219 itself was associated with 2,000-80,000 additional deaths from causes other than COVID-19 in
220 the first year of the pandemic (37). These estimates suggest that the secondary effects in
221 reducing hospital stress might have saved additional lives, increasing our estimates of lives
222 saved according to Model 1 (Table 1) from a minimum of 18,187 (16,187 + 2000) to a maximum
223 of 146,160 (66,160 + 80,000). Had public health and medical authorities been able to provide
224 CCP to 75% of high-risk patients (Model 3), these numbers would have risen to between 55,025
225 (53,025 + 2000) to 295,195 (215,195 + 80,000). With 407,100 USA deaths during the first year
226 of the pandemic, such a deployment would have reduced mortality by 13-72% and greatly
227 ameliorated the impact of the pandemic in the country. Given an average hospitalization cost of
228 \$41,000 per patient (38) and an average cost of \$750 per unit of CCP, we estimate outpatient
229 deployment with treatment of only 15% of eligible patients, with a 54% reduction in progression
230 to hospitalization (14), would have saved the USA approximately \$6 billion. If given to 75% of
231 eligible patients, savings would approach \$31 billion.

232 Figure 1 shows estimated lives saved with different mortality reduction assumptions and
233 potential lives saved had universal CCP use been instituted for hospitalized patients. Because it
234 is uncertain which mortality reduction value is most accurate, we opted to present all the
235 estimates in Table 1 and the most conservative estimates only in Figure 1. Despite these
236 variations, all estimates show that thousands of lives were saved by CCP deployment.

237 Safety of CCP. Intrinsicly linked to the conclusion that CCP saved lives is the assumption that
238 transfusion of CCP is safe. Numerous observational studies and RCTs have established that
239 CCP is a safe therapy (39). However, like all generally safe drugs such as penicillin that can
240 occasionally trigger fatal reactions (40), plasma administration was associated with severe
241 reactions on rare occasions. The standard transfusion reactions - transfusion related acute lung
242 injury (TRALI) and transfusion associated circulatory overload (TACO) were very rare, and while
243 antibody-dependent enhancement was feared, it was not observed (2, 3). TRALI occurs after
244 transfusion in 1 of 2000 plasma components (41), and is fatal in 5-10% of cases (42-44). Among
245 20,000 individuals who received CCP there were 36 reports of TACO, 21 reports of TRALI and
246 21 reports of severe allergic transfusion reactions, which was similar to complication rates
247 associated with infusion of fresh frozen plasma (3), of which about 2,000,000 units are
248 transfused in the USA each year primarily to provide replacement of coagulation factors (45). At

249 least one fatal reaction to CCP infusion has been described in the literature (46). When
250 considering presumptive severe reactions from CCP administration occurring in critically ill
251 patients, it is often difficult to distinguish these from worsening of the underlying illness,
252 especially in the face of concurrent pneumonia, ARDS, ongoing mechanical ventilation,
253 ventricular dysfunction, and arrhythmias. Nevertheless, in our estimates we sought to consider
254 the worst possible scenario for CCP in contributing to COVID-19 related deaths to provide the
255 most conservative estimate of lives saved. The EAP registry recorded 63 deaths among 20,000
256 individuals transfused with CCP within 4 h of plasma infusion, of which 10 were judged as
257 possibly related to CCP. Extrapolating this mortality rate to our study, given that 647,795 units
258 were administered, would mean that 32 to 324 deaths from CCP would have to be subtracted
259 from the total number of lives saved.

260 A model for how CCP reduced mortality in COVID-19. A causal association between CCP
261 usage and lives saved is strengthened by an understanding of the CCP mechanism of action.
262 CCP administration has been shown to reduce SARS-CoV-2 viral load in macaques (47),
263 hamsters (48, 49), and mice made susceptible to this coronavirus by expressing the human
264 angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor (50, 51). In hospitalized patients,
265 administration of CCP with greater neutralizing antibody content was associated with greater
266 SARS-CoV-2 viral load reduction (52). Both animal and clinical studies thus establish CCP as
267 an antiviral therapy, consistent with the accepted view that specific antibody can neutralize viral
268 particles in vivo. For both CCP and mAb preparations, the active ingredient against SARS-CoV-
269 2 is a specific antibody. Consistent with the antiviral activity of both preparations, monoclonal
270 antibody RCTs reported increased rates of viral clearance in the intervention arms (53),
271 confirming the efficacy of specific antibody as an antiviral agent.

272 Dose response effects are powerful tools for establishing causality in science and medicine
273 (54). In this regard, several studies reported dose-response effects between CCP specific
274 antibody content and favorable clinical outcomes (5, 19, 29, 55-57). Greater viral load reduction
275 was also observed in hospitalized patients receiving greater quantities of CCP (two units) in an
276 RCT (23). Given that specific antibody is an effective antiviral, greater efficacy for CCP units
277 with higher specific antibody content can be expected to mediate stronger antiviral effects, that
278 should translate into favorable outcomes.

279 A third line of evidence for a causal association between CCP use and reduced mortality comes
280 from its effects on surrogate markers of COVID-19 severity. CCP administration was associated
281 with a reduction in markers of inflammation, including C-reactive protein (58-60) and IL-6 (58,
282 61-63). Since increased levels of IL-6 correlate with increased mortality and anti-IL-6 therapy
283 reduces COVID-19 mortality (64), CCP-associated reductions in IL-6 could have contributed to
284 its effect on mortality. The anti-inflammatory effect of CCP could be a consequence of its
285 antibody-mediated antiviral effect where reduced viral load elicits less inflammation and/or other
286 components (65). Most patients with COVID-19 die because of profuse pulmonary inflammation
287 that impairs gas-exchange (66). In a Belgian RCT, CCP transfused within 48 hours of
288 mechanical ventilation reduced deaths(25). Consequently, CCP anti-inflammatory effects can be
289 synthesized into a model for mortality reduction whereby reduced CCP reduces viral load and
290 inflammatory cytokines and thus lowers the probability of disease progression to end stage
291 pulmonary compromise (Figure 2). In this regard, viral clearance from both small molecule
292 antivirals and specific antibody is a surrogate for clinical efficacy in preventing progression of
293 disease (53). Consistent with the critical role of specific antibody in host defense, the absence of

294 antibody to SARS-CoV-2 is a poor prognostic marker associated with increased mortality in
295 COVID-19 (67, 68), which provides an additional explanation how the administration of CCP
296 reduced mortality by providing recipients with antibody to the virus.

297 **Discussion**

298 Our estimates imply that CCP deployment in the USA in 2020 saved thousands of lives. This
299 justifies the decisions made to authorize its use during a national emergency when there was a
300 great need for effective therapies and supports the use of this therapy in future infectious
301 disease outbreaks. Our results suggest that, had more CCP use been encouraged, and had its
302 availability been prioritized by medical and governmental authorities, more lives would have
303 been saved. Despite receiving emergency use authorization by the FDA in August 2020, CCP
304 use was not often recommended by guideline committees for COVID management, which held
305 out for RCT data before making recommendations, but such evidence was not available early in
306 the pandemic. Had CCP been universally deployed in hospitals, as was done for supplemental
307 oxygen in hypoxic individuals, we estimate that the total lives saved among hospitalized patients
308 would have increased ranging from 36,838 to 215,195 depending on the model used and the
309 assumed efficacy. Universal use would not have been possible in the early days of the
310 pandemic when CCP was scarce but by the Fall of 2020 supplies were plentiful and up to 40%
311 of hospitalized patients in the USA were receiving CCP (6). COVID-19 was particularly
312 devastating for residents of long-term care facilities (69). Mortality rates due to COVID-19 in
313 these facilities were particularly high (70) and CCP deployment may have had an outsized
314 impact upon this population.

315 In considering our estimates, we acknowledge several limitations of the analysis. The number of
316 CCP units used for the calculations provided by the BCA does not capture all the CCP used in
317 the USA, particularly in the early days of the pandemic when some CCP was sourced locally.
318 While the exact number of units used is unknown, the estimates used in this study capture the
319 great majority of CCP used in the USA. The mortality reduction estimates used to calculate the
320 lives saved varied widely and the extent to which they resembled use and efficacy in more
321 2,000 clinical settings that used CCP throughout the USA is uncertain. Of note, CCP efficacy
322 was found to vary with distance between donor collection to patient administration sites, with a
323 significant reduction in efficacy when the distance exceeded 150 miles, likely reflecting donor-
324 recipient mismatches arising from local viral evolution (71), a phenomenon consistent with
325 geographic antigenic variation by SARS-CoV-2 (13). We did not model this distance effect on
326 the potential of CCP for saving lives. Had all CCP been locally sourced our estimates of lives
327 saved would have been higher.

328 In a previous epidemiologic study using regression analysis of USA population data correlating
329 weekly mortality figures with CCP use, CCP deployment was estimated to have saved about
330 96,000 lives in the first year of the pandemic (6). The difference in lives saved between the
331 epidemiologic study and the modeling estimates of the present study could arise from lower
332 efficacy in hospitalized populations studied in RCTs or from trial-associated methodological
333 differences in CCP administration. For example, RCTs inevitably included enrollment and
334 randomization protocols that may have further delayed the administration of CCP, thus reducing
335 its efficacy (11). Additionally, epidemiological analyses could have overestimated the lives saved
336 if the assumptions used to correlate overall mortality with CCP usage did not account for
337 possible confounders. Nevertheless, both the prior (6) and current analyses are consistent in
338 concluding that CCP deployment saved tens of thousands of lives.

339 Despite the apparent success of CCP in lowering COVID-19 mortality in the USA, we note that
340 many aspects of its deployment were suboptimal. Early in the pandemic the ability to test
341 donated plasma for antibody content was limited and many patients received units with little or
342 no specific antibody to SARS-CoV-2 (72, 73). In a future emergency where public health
343 authorities are again confronted with a situation where it is difficult to ascertain antibody levels
344 they might consider using two plasma units from separate donors to increase the probability of
345 providing sufficient specific antibody to the recipient (74). Once antibody levels can be
346 determined, the optimal units for plasma therapy will be those in the upper 2-3 deciles of
347 geometric mean antibody levels, which after a ten-to-twenty-fold dilution are still in the protective
348 range (74). In addition, many patients in the first year of the pandemic were treated after three
349 days of hospitalization (26), when CCP administration was likely to have little or no effect on
350 outcome (5). The COVID-19 pandemic has yielded voluminous information on effective use of
351 passive antibody therapies that reinforce the historical evidence, including the importance of
352 using them early in the course of disease and the need to use units with high pathogen-specific
353 immunoglobulin content (57).

354 In less than a quarter of this new century, humanity has confronted no fewer than seven major
355 viral outbreaks with pandemic potential: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003,
356 Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) in 2008, Influenza H1N1 in 2009, Ebola virus
357 (2013), Zika virus in 2015, SARS-CoV-2 in 2019 and mPox in 2022. For SARS (75), MERS
358 (76), influenza H1N1 (77), Ebola (78), SARS-CoV-2 (this study) and mPox (79), convalescent
359 plasma (CP) was either used clinically or considered. The USA experience with CCP provides a
360 roadmap for future deployments of convalescent plasma (CP). Our models emphasize the
361 importance of pandemic preparedness and consideration of the use of CP at least as a stopgap
362 measure until additional treatments are developed and mobilized. Perhaps the most important
363 lesson from our estimates is that preparedness requires planning for a future outpatient
364 infrastructure that can facilitate early delivery of high titer CP. As happened with COVID-19, CP
365 is likely to be the only specific therapy available for new infectious disease threats until drugs,
366 mAbs and vaccines become available. The long record of serotherapy efficacy dates to its first
367 use in the 1890's for diphtheria management (80) and includes efficacy during the 1918
368 influenza pandemic (81). The availability of CP as soon there are survivors supports CP use
369 while safety and efficacy data are obtained as was permitted by the EAP in the USA (1).

370 The careful recording of the results of CP deployment in a registry such as the EAP (1) provides
371 information on this therapy which can inform the design of RCTs if necessary. RCTs of CP
372 efficacy should not be launched until the optimal dose and timing of the intervention is
373 established. Without this information, one runs the of risk of misleading negative trials using
374 suboptimal treatment, as occurred frequently in the early CCP trials (82). The argument that CP
375 deployment inhibits the conduct of RCTs is mistaken; at least five RCTs were completed in the
376 USA while CCP was available as part of the EAP and its subsequent use under the EUA (82).
377 Our analysis provides reassurance that FDA decisions on the deployment of CCP and the
378 enormous efforts made by physicians, blood bankers, and the public in securing plasma in the
379 first year of the pandemic saved thousands of lives.

380 **Table 1. Estimates of lives saved from the deployment of CCP in the USA.**

Mortality Reductions Based on Four Estimates of CCP effectiveness				
	0.13	0.29	0.37	0.47
Lives Actually Saved				
Model 1	16,187	38,170	50,146	66,160
Model 2	NA ¹	NA	NA	51,722
Lives Potentially Saved				
Model 3	53,025	124,664	163,483	215,195
Model 4	36,838	86,489	113,339	149,033
Mortality and Hospitalization Reductions Potentially Saved Based on Two Estimates of CCP Use				
	Lives Saved ⁴		Hospitalizations Avoided	
Percentage of use ²	15%	75%	15%	75%
Model 5 (30%) ³	20,755	90,669	85,268	426,331
Model 5 (54%)	34,736	160,589	153,478	767,396
Model 5 (80%)	49,880	236,328	227,377	1,136,880

381

382 ¹NA, not applicable. Model 2 used only the 47% reduction on mortality reported by (21) when
383 used in the first three days of hospitalization.

384 ²Percentage of use of 15% was estimated from the actual use of mAbs during the pandemic,
385 which was given to patients at high risk for hospitalization. The 75% estimate assumes a major
386 national effort to deploy outpatient plasma.

387 ³Model 5 used three percentages of efficacy in reducing mortality and hospitalizations: The 30%
388 value comes from a meta-analysis of five outpatient RCTs that evaluated the efficacy of CCP
389 (15); the 54% value comes from the largest RCT of outpatient CCP completed (14); and the
390 efficacy of 80% comes from use of CCP in the first five days of symptoms (28).

391 ⁴Lives Saved are calculated according to CDC recorded deaths with a two-week lag period as
392 previously described (6), while hospitalizations avoided are calculated based on hospital
393 admissions with no lag period. Hypothetically the number of lives saved would be 21% of
394 hospitalizations avoided, but observed deaths were used to reflect a real-life outcome.

395 **References**


- 396
- 397 1. Senefeld JW, *et al.* (2021) Access to and safety of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in
398 the United States Expanded Access Program: A national registry study. *PLoS Med*
399 18(12):e1003872.
 - 400 2. Joyner MJ, *et al.* (2020) Early safety indicators of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in
401 5000 patients. *The Journal of clinical investigation* 130(9):4791-4797.
 - 402 3. Joyner MJ, *et al.* (2020) Safety Update: COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma in 20,000
403 Hospitalized Patients. *Mayo Clinic proceedings* 95(9):1888-1897.
 - 404 4. Joyner MJ, *et al.* (2020) Evidence favouring the efficacy of convalescent plasma for
405 COVID-19 therapy. *medRxiv*:2020.2007.2029.20162917.
 - 406 5. Joyner MJ, *et al.* (2021) Convalescent Plasma Antibody Levels and the Risk of Death
407 from Covid-19. *The New England journal of medicine* 384(11):1015-1027.
 - 408 6. Casadevall A, *et al.* (2021) Convalescent plasma use in the USA was inversely
409 correlated with COVID-19 mortality. *Elife* 10.
 - 410 7. Agarwal A, *et al.* (2020) Convalescent plasma in the management of moderate covid-19
411 in adults in India: open label phase II multicentre randomised controlled trial (PLACID
412 Trial). *BMJ* 371:m3939.
 - 413 8. Simonovich VA, *et al.* (2021) A Randomized Trial of Convalescent Plasma in Covid-19
414 Severe Pneumonia. *The New England journal of medicine* 384(7):619-629.
 - 415 9. Anonymous (2021) Convalescent plasma in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19
416 (RECOVERY): a randomised controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*
417 397(10289):2049-2059.
 - 418 10. Menichetti F, *et al.* (2021) Effect of High-Titer Convalescent Plasma on Progression to
419 Severe Respiratory Failure or Death in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19
420 Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA network open* 4(11):e2136246.
 - 421 11. Casadevall A, *et al.* (2023) Convalescent plasma therapy in COVID-19: Unravelling the
422 data using the principles of antibody therapy. *Expert review of respiratory medicine*:1-15.
 - 423 12. Focosi D, *et al.* (2022) COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma and Clinical Trials:
424 Understanding Conflicting Outcomes. *Clin Microbiol Rev*:e0020021.
 - 425 13. Kunze KL, *et al.* (2021) Mortality in individuals treated with COVID-19 convalescent
426 plasma varies with the geographic provenance of donors. *Nature communications*
427 12(1):4864.
 - 428 14. Sullivan DJ, *et al.* (2022) Early Outpatient Treatment for Covid-19 with Convalescent
429 Plasma. *The New England journal of medicine* 386(18):1700-1711.
 - 430 15. Levine AC, *et al.* (2023) COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Outpatient Therapy to Prevent
431 Outpatient Hospitalization: A Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data From Five
432 Randomized Trials. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious*
433 *Diseases Society of America*.
 - 434 16. Thompson MA, *et al.* (2021) Association of Convalescent Plasma Therapy With Survival
435 in Patients With Hematologic Cancers and COVID-19. *JAMA oncology* 7(8):1167-1175.
 - 436 17. Focosi D, McConnell S, Sullivan DJ, & Casadevall A (2023) Analysis of SARS-CoV-2
437 mutations associated with resistance to therapeutic monoclonal antibodies that emerge
438 after treatment. *Drug resistance updates : reviews and commentaries in antimicrobial*
439 *and anticancer chemotherapy* 71:100991.
 - 440 18. Senefeld JW, *et al.* (2023) COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma for the Treatment of
441 Immunocompromised Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA network*
442 *open* 6(1):e2250647.
 - 443 19. González SE, *et al.* (2022) Timing of convalescent plasma administration and 28-day
444 mortality in COVID-19 pneumonia. *Journal of investigative medicine : the official*
445 *publication of the American Federation for Clinical Research* 70(5):1258-1264.

- 446 20. De Silvestro G, *et al.* (2022) Outcome of SARS CoV-2 inpatients treated with
447 convalescent plasma: One-year of data from the Veneto region (Italy) Registry.
448 *European journal of internal medicine* 97:42-49.
- 449 21. Arnold Egloff SA, *et al.* (2021) Convalescent plasma associates with reduced mortality
450 and improved clinical trajectory in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *The Journal of*
451 *clinical investigation* 131(20).
- 452 22. Senefeld JW, *et al.* (2023) Rates Among Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 Treated
453 With Convalescent Plasma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Mayo Clinic*
454 *Proceedings: Innovations, Quality & Outcomes* 7(5):499-513.
- 455 23. Bar KJ, *et al.* (2021) A randomized controlled study of convalescent plasma for
456 individuals hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia. *The Journal of clinical investigation*.
- 457 24. Salazar E, *et al.* (2020) Significantly decreased mortality in a large cohort of COVID-19
458 patients transfused early with convalescent plasma containing high titer anti-SARS-CoV-
459 2 spike protein IgG. *The American journal of pathology*.
- 460 25. Misset B, *et al.* (2023) Convalescent Plasma for Covid-19-Induced ARDS in
461 Mechanically Ventilated Patients. *The New England journal of medicine* 389(17):1590-
462 1600.
- 463 26. Mozaffari E, *et al.* (2022) Clinical Management of Hospitalized Coronavirus Disease
464 2019 Patients in the United States. *Open forum infectious diseases* 9(1):ofab498.
- 465 27. Libster R, *et al.* (2021) Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in
466 Older Adults. *The New England journal of medicine* 384(7):610-618.
- 467 28. Sullivan DJ, *et al.* (2023) Outpatient randomized controlled trials to reduce COVID-19
468 hospitalization: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol* 95(12):e29310.
- 469 29. Levine AC, *et al.* (2022) COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Outpatient Therapy to Prevent
470 Outpatient Hospitalization: A Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data From Five
471 Randomized Trials. *medRxiv*.
- 472 30. Pathak EB, Garcia RB, Menard JM, & Salemi JL (2021) Out-of-Hospital COVID-19
473 Deaths: Consequences for Quality of Medical Care and Accuracy of Cause of Death
474 Coding. *American journal of public health* 111(S2):S101-s106.
- 475 31. de Alwis R, Chen S, Gan ES, & Ooi EE (2020) Impact of immune enhancement on
476 Covid-19 polyclonal hyperimmune globulin therapy and vaccine development.
477 *EBioMedicine* 55:102768.
- 478 32. Bloch EM, *et al.* (2022) How do I implement an outpatient program for the administration
479 of convalescent plasma for COVID-19? *Transfusion* 62(5):933-941.
- 480 33. Joyner MJ, *et al.* (2020) Safety Update: COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma in 20,000
481 Hospitalized Patients. *Mayo Clinic proceedings*, (Elsevier).
- 482 34. Libster R, *et al.* (2020) Prevention of severe COVID-19 in the elderly by early high-titer
483 plasma. *medRxiv:2020.2011.2020.20234013*.
- 484 35. Huaman MA, *et al.* (2023) Transfusion reactions associated with COVID-19
485 convalescent plasma in outpatient clinical trials. *Transfusion* 63(9):1639-1648.
- 486 36. McCreary EK, Escobar ZK, & Justo JA (2023) Monoclonal Antibodies for the Treatment
487 of COVID-19-Every Day You Fight Like You're Running Out of Time. *JAMA network open*
488 6(4):e239702.
- 489 37. French G, *et al.* (2022) Impact of hospital strain on excess deaths during the COVID-19
490 pandemic-United States, July 2020-July 2021. *American journal of transplantation : official*
491 *journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of*
492 *Transplant Surgeons* 22(2):654-657.
- 493 38. Ohsfeldt RL, *et al.* (2021) Inpatient Hospital Costs for COVID-19 Patients in the United
494 States. *Adv Ther* 38(11):5557-5595.

- 495 39. Franchini M, *et al.* (2024) Safety and Efficacy of Convalescent Plasma Combined with
496 Other Pharmaceutical Agents for Treatment of COVID-19 in Hospitalized Patients: A
497 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Diseases* 12(3):41.
- 498 40. Rosenthal A (1954) Eight fatal anaphylactic reactions to penicillin. *New York state journal*
499 *of medicine* 54(10):1485-1487.
- 500 41. Cho MS, Modi P, & Sharma S (2024) Transfusion-Related Acute Lung Injury. *StatPearls*,
501 (StatPearls Publishing Copyright © 2024, StatPearls Publishing LLC., Treasure Island
502 (FL) companies.
- 503 42. Popovsky MA & Moore SB (1985) Diagnostic and pathogenetic considerations in
504 transfusion-related acute lung injury. *Transfusion* 25(6):573-577.
- 505 43. Bux J (2005) Transfusion-related acute lung injury (TRALI): a serious adverse event of
506 blood transfusion. *Vox Sang* 89(1):1-10.
- 507 44. Webert KE & Blajchman MA (2005) Transfusion-related acute lung injury. *Curr Opin*
508 *Hematol* 12(6):480-487.
- 509 45. Arya RC, Wander G, & Gupta P (2011) Blood component therapy: Which, when and how
510 much. *Journal of anaesthesiology, clinical pharmacology* 27(2):278-284.
- 511 46. Amrutiya V, *et al.* (2021) Transfusion-related acute lung injury in a COVID-19-positive
512 convalescent plasma recipient: a case report. *The Journal of international medical*
513 *research* 49(8):3000605211032814.
- 514 47. Carroll TD, *et al.* (2024) Vaccine-Boosted CCP Decreases Virus Replication and
515 Hastens Resolution of Infection Despite Transiently Enhancing Disease in SARS-CoV-2-
516 Infected Hamsters. *The Journal of infectious diseases*.
- 517 48. Haagmans BL, *et al.* (2021) SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Human Antibodies Protect
518 Against Lower Respiratory Tract Disease in a Hamster Model. *J Infect Dis* 223(12):2020-
519 2028.
- 520 49. Takamatsu Y, *et al.* (2022) Highly neutralizing COVID-19 convalescent plasmas potently
521 block SARS-CoV-2 replication and pneumonia in Syrian hamsters. *Journal of Virology*
522 96(4):e01551-01521.
- 523 50. Van Rompay KKA, *et al.* (2022) Early post-infection treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infected
524 macaques with human convalescent plasma with high neutralizing activity had no
525 antiviral effects but moderately reduced lung inflammation. *PLoS pathogens*
526 18(4):e1009925.
- 527 51. Deere JD, *et al.* (2021) SARS-CoV-2 Infection of Rhesus Macaques Treated Early with
528 Human COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma. *Microbiology spectrum* 9(3):e0139721.
- 529 52. Marconato M, *et al.* (2022) Antibodies from convalescent plasma promote SARS-CoV-2
530 clearance in individuals with and without endogenous antibody response. *The Journal of*
531 *clinical investigation* 132(12).
- 532 53. Elias KM, *et al.* (2024) Viral clearance as a surrogate of clinical efficacy for COVID-19
533 therapies in outpatients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet. Microbe*.
- 534 54. Hill AB (1965) THE ENVIRONMENT AND DISEASE: ASSOCIATION OR CAUSATION?
535 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 58(5):295-300.
- 536 55. Begin P, *et al.* (2021) Convalescent plasma for hospitalized patients with COVID-19: an
537 open-label, randomized controlled trial. *Nature medicine* 27(11):2012-2024.
- 538 56. Maor Y, *et al.* (2020) Compassionate use of convalescent plasma for treatment of
539 moderate and severe pneumonia in COVID-19 patients and association with IgG
540 antibody levels in donated plasma. *EClinicalMedicine* 26:100525.
- 541 57. Park HS, *et al.* (2024) Outpatient COVID-19 convalescent plasma recipient antibody
542 thresholds correlated to reduced hospitalizations within a randomized trial. *JCI insight*.

- 543 58. Pratedrat P, *et al.* (2023) Dynamics of Cytokine, SARS-CoV-2-Specific IgG, and
544 Neutralizing Antibody Levels in COVID-19 Patients Treated with Convalescent Plasma.
545 *Diseases* 11(3).
- 546 59. Duan K, *et al.* (2020) Effectiveness of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19
547 patients. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
548 *America* 117(17):9490-9496.
- 549 60. Perotti C, *et al.* (2020) Mortality reduction in 46 severe Covid-19 patients treated with
550 hyperimmune plasma. A proof of concept single arm multicenter trial. *Haematologica*.
- 551 61. Bandopadhyay P, *et al.* (2021) Nature and Dimensions of Systemic Hyperinflammation
552 and its Attenuation by Convalescent Plasma in Severe COVID-19. *The Journal of*
553 *infectious diseases* 224(4):565-574.
- 554 62. Habtehyimer F, *et al.* (2024) COVID-19 convalescent plasma therapy decreases
555 inflammatory cytokines: a randomized controlled trial. *Microbiology spectrum*
556 12(1):e0328623.
- 557 63. Acosta-Ampudia Y, *et al.* (2021) COVID-19 convalescent plasma composition and
558 immunological effects in severe patients. *Journal of autoimmunity* 118:102598.
- 559 64. Ghosn L, *et al.* (2023) Interleukin-6 blocking agents for treating COVID-19: a living
560 systematic review. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 6(6):Cd013881.
- 561 65. Focosi D, *et al.* (2021) COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Is More than Neutralizing
562 Antibodies: A Narrative Review of Potential Beneficial and Detrimental Co-Factors.
563 *Viruses* 13(8).
- 564 66. Wu M, *et al.* (2020) Transcriptional and proteomic insights into the host response in fatal
565 COVID-19 cases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*
566 *of America* 117(45):28336-28343.
- 567 67. Dispinseri S, *et al.* (2021) Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
568 symptomatic COVID-19 is persistent and critical for survival. *Nature communications*
569 12(1):2670.
- 570 68. Martin-Vicente M, *et al.* (2022) Low anti-SARS-CoV-2 S antibody levels predict
571 increased mortality and dissemination of viral components in the blood of critical
572 COVID-19 patients. *Journal of internal medicine* 291(2):232-240.
- 573 69. Bagchi S, *et al.* (2021) Rates of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff Members in
574 Nursing Homes - United States, May 25-November 22, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and*
575 *mortality weekly report* 70(2):52-55.
- 576 70. Lee D, Counard C, Tang A, Brister S, & Ezike N (2022) Notes from the Field: COVID-19-
577 Associated Mortality Risk Among Long-Term Care Facility Residents and Community-
578 Dwelling Adults Aged ≥65 Years - Illinois, December 2020 and January 2022. *MMWR.*
579 *Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 71(24):803-805.
- 580 71. Kunze KL, *et al.* (2021) Mortality in individuals treated with COVID-19 convalescent
581 plasma varies with the geographic provenance of donors.
582 *medRxiv:2021.2003.2019.21253975*.
- 583 72. Zhang S, *et al.* (2023) High-Throughput Neutralization and Serology Assays Reveal
584 Correlated but Highly Variable Humoral Immune Responses in a Large Population of
585 Individuals Infected with SARS-CoV-2 in the US between March and August 2020.
586 *mBio:e0352322*.
- 587 73. Klein SL, *et al.* (2020) Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses in a
588 COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population. *The Journal of clinical investigation*
589 130(11):6141-6150.
- 590 74. Sullivan D & Casadevall A (2023) COVID-19 Serology Data Provide Guidance for Future
591 Deployments of Convalescent Plasma. *mBio:e0042823*.


- 592 75. Cheng Y, *et al.* (2005) Use of convalescent plasma therapy in SARS patients in Hong
593 Kong. *European journal of clinical microbiology & infectious diseases : official publication*
594 *of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology* 24(1):44-46.
- 595 76. Ko JH, *et al.* (2018) Challenges of convalescent plasma infusion therapy in Middle East
596 respiratory coronavirus infection: a single centre experience. *Antiviral therapy* 23(7):617-
597 622.
- 598 77. Hung IF, *et al.* (2011) Convalescent plasma treatment reduced mortality in patients with
599 severe pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009 virus infection. *Clinical infectious diseases :*
600 *an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 52(4):447-456.
- 601 78. van Griensven J, *et al.* (2016) Evaluation of Convalescent Plasma for Ebola Virus
602 Disease in Guinea. *N Engl J Med* 374(1):33-42.
- 603 79. Bloch EM, *et al.* (2022) The Potential Role of Passive Antibody-Based Therapies as
604 Treatments for Monkeypox. *mBio* 13(6):e0286222.
- 605 80. Roux E, Martin L, & Chaillou A (1894) Trois cents cas de diphtérie traités par le sérum
606 antidiphtérique. *Ann Inst Pasteur* 8:640-661.
- 607 81. Luke TC, Kilbane EM, Jackson JL, & Hoffman SL (2006) Meta-analysis: convalescent
608 blood products for Spanish influenza pneumonia: a future H5N1 treatment? *Annals of*
609 *internal medicine* 145(8):599-609.
- 610 82. Senefeld JW, Marks P, Casadevall A, & Joyner MJ (2023) The value of observational
611 registry studies for the next infectious disease emergency. *mBio* 14(6):e0256523.
- 612



613

614 **Figure 1.** Total lives saved given various models of CCP usage and efficacy from July 2020
 615 through March 2021. **A.** Summations of estimated lives saved using the most conservative
 616 parameters of each model as a function of time throughout the entire period. **B.** Models 1 and 2,
 617 total estimated lives saved assuming every shipped dose of CCP was used effectively with the
 618 given estimates of reduction in mortality compared to the theoretical number of deaths if no
 619 plasma were used or compared to the actual observed deaths. Models 3 and 4, estimated lives
 620 saved assuming 100% of patients were given effective CCP treatment compared to actual
 621 reported deaths or estimated deaths. Model 4, lives saved considering the actual proportion of
 622 CCP which was administered in day 1-3. **C.** Model 5, estimated lives saved if outpatient CCP
 623 had been administered to 15% or 75% of the high-risk population resulting in 30, 54, or 80%
 624 fewer hospitalizations in the treated population. **D.** Estimations of total hospitalizations avoided
 625 in Model 5.

626



627

628 **Figure 2.** Proposed scheme for the reduction of COVID-19 mortality by CCP. In the USA CCP
629 was used almost exclusively in hospitalized patients, of whom the majority were admitted
630 because of some pulmonary compromise. Hence, the reduced mortality described here is
631 proposed reflect that subset that were sufficiently early in the course of disease such that the
632 administration of antibody could modify the progression of disease to result in better outcomes.
633 CCP has been shown to have antiviral activity and to be associated with reduced inflammatory
634 mediators including IL-6. According to this scheme, CCP administration led to reduced
635 inflammation that translated into lower mortality for a subset of treated hospitalized patients.