

Brief report

Avoided and avoidable deaths with the use of

COVID-19 convalescent plasma in Italy during the first two years of pandemic.

Massimo Franchini,¹ Arturo Casadevall,² Quigly Dragotakes,² Daniele Focosi.^{3,#}

¹Department of Transfusion Medicine and Hematology, Carlo Poma Hospital, Mantua, Italy.

²Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA ³North-Western Tuscany Blood Bank, Pisa University Hospital, Italy.

[#]corresponding author : via Paradisa 2, 56124 Pisa, Italy. daniele.focosi@gmail.com .

COI statement: the authors declare they have no conflict of interest related to this manuscript.

Data availability statement: this manuscript generated no new dataset.

Author contributions: M.F. wrote the first draft; Q.D. performed statistical analysis; D.F. and A.C revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of this manuscript.

Abstract

Italy was the first western country to be hit by the COVID-19 pandemic and suffered nearly 200,000 deaths so far during the four years of the pandemic. In March 2020, Italy first deployed COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP) to treat hospitalized patients. Despite this initial effort, the proportion of COVID-19 patients treated with CCP during the first two years of the pandemic (2020-2021) was very low (approximately 2% of individuals hospitalized for COVID-19). In this study, we estimated the number of actual inpatient lives saved by CCP treatment in Italy using national mortality data, and CCP mortality reduction data from meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials and real-world data. We also estimated the potential number of lives saved if CCP had been deployed to 100% of hospitalized patients or used in 15% to 75% of outpatients. According to these models, CCP usage in 2020-2021 saved between 385-1304 lives, but this number would have increased to 17,751-60,079 if 100% of inpatients had been transfused with CCP. Similarly, broader (15-75%) usage in outpatients could have prevented 21,187-190,689 hospitalizations (desaturating hospitals) and 6,144-81,926 deaths. These data have important implications for convalescent plasma use in future infectious disease emergencies.

Keywords:

Abbreviations: ARR : absolute risk reduction; CCP : COVID-19 convalescent plasma; RRR : relative risk reduction.

Introduction

Since 2019, the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has generated an unprecedented health and social emergency, with the world largely unprepared for a such new viral disease [1]. The first therapeutic weapon used to fight the pathogen was plasma from recovered people (COVID-19 convalescent plasma, CCP), based on historical efficacy and the *in vitro* demonstration that it contained antibodies able to neutralize viral infection [2-4]. After more than 4 years of the pandemic and nearly 50 randomized controlled trials (RCTs), the role of CCP has been finally clarified: when transfused at high titer (> 180) and early (within 7 days from symptom onset), CCP is safe and effective in both ambulatory and hospitalized patients [5-8]. Today, with most of the population having endogenous antibody from vaccination and/or SARS-CoV-2 infection the primary use of CCP is in immunocompromised patients, who are not able to produce and adequate antibody response against the virus [9,10]. In addition, due to the frequent mutations that render SARS-CoV-2 resistant to the authorized anti-Spike monoclonal antibodies, CCP is currently the only effective antibody-based antiviral therapy, being able to follow closely the natural evolution of the virus.

In a recently pre-published study from the US, where over 500,000 hospitalized COVID-19 patients were treated with CCP during the first year of the pandemic, the investigators estimated that the extensive use of CCP in hospitalized COVID-19 patients would have saved between 16,476 and 66,296 lives, while its extensive outpatient use would have prevented 1,136,880 hospitalizations and saved 215,195 lives [11].

The aim of this study was to replicate such analysis using Italian statistics and efficacy numbers, to estimate the potential impact of CCP use at reducing mortality from SARS-COV-2 in Italy during the first two years (2020-2021) of the pandemic.

Methods

To estimate the potential number of avoided and avoidable deaths with CCP use during the years 2020 and 2021 of the pandemic, the following mathematical model was developed.

CCP units transfused and patients treated

According to the official data from the Italian Ministry of Health [12], in the year 2020 6,952 plasmapheresis procedures were performed, followed by 9,301 in the year 2021. Each CCP plasmapheresis had a 600 ml volume. The number of CCP units (each ranging from 200 to 300 ml) derived from these donations were 13,731 for 2020 and 14,558 for 2021. Overall, 28,289 CCP units were collected. Of these, 1773 were discarded for reasons linked to health, technical issues and quality control. Overall, 20,438 CCP units were transfused (6,912 in 2020 and 13,526 in 2021). According to the data from Italian RCTs [13,14] and real-life studies [15,16], each patient received a median of 2 CCP units. Then a total of 10,219 COVID-19 patients (3456 in the year 2020 and 6763 in the year 2021) were transfused each with 2 CCP units during the years 2020 and 2021.

Number of COVID-19-related hospitalizations and deaths

We calculated the number of hospitalizations for COVID-19 and in-hospital COVID-19 related deaths in Italy during the years 2020 and 2021. The data were extracted from the daily report of the Italian Ministry of Health [17,18]. According to these data, during the year 2020 the number of deaths/hospitalizations was 77,871/239,963 (32.4% mortality) while in the year 2021 the number of deaths/hospitalizations was 58,627/230,874 (25.4% mortality). Overall, during the two years period there were 136,498 deaths among 470,837 hospitalized patients (29.0% mortality).

CCP mortality reduction percentages

We made 3 different estimates of the CCP mortality relative risk reduction (RRR) The first estimate was based on the Italian RCT TSUNAMI [13], who found a 23% RRR in the 30-day mortality (6.1% in the CCP group versus 7.9% in controls). The second estimate used the real-world data from the largest Italian registry (Veneto region), reporting 30-day mortality RRR of 44% during the period February 2020 and June 2021 (14% in the CCP group versus 25% in controls) [15]. We note that this 44% mortality RRR for CCP treated individuals is in the range of the 47% effect reported in a large propensity-score matched real-world study from the USA [19]. The third estimate was based on a systematic review and meta-analysis of all CCP controlled studies performed in 2022 (including 39 RCTs with 21,529 participants and 70 controlled cohort studies with 50,160 participants), which estimated that CCP reduced mortality by 13% among hospitalized patients [6].

Estimating actual and potential lives saved by CCP use in hospitalized patients

Actual lives saved by CCP were calculated using the three separate estimates of mortality benefit conferred by CCP in hospitalized patients detailed above (i.e., 23%, 44% and 13%) [6,13,15]. The formula used to calculate the number of lives saved by CCP in comparison to a situation where CCP was never used was:

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

We then calculated the lives saved as the difference between the above and (Admissions * Untreated Mortality) where the comparator was the absence of CCP treatment, using the three-mortality reduction estimated described above from trials and real-world data (i.e. 23%, 44%, and 13%).

In addition to the real-life numbers, we estimated the number of lives that would have been saved if CCP had been administered to 100% of hospitalized patients (potential lives saved), again using the three measures of efficacy in reducing mortality described above. The formula used was similar to

that previously reported, except for the assumption that all hospitalized patients would have received CCP.

Estimating potential lives saved if CCP had been deployed for outpatient use

Given the greater efficacy of CCP when used early in the course of disease [7], it is reasonable that outpatient use could have saved even more lives than inpatient use. A RCT of CCP outpatient efficacy early in the pandemic reported a 48% RRR in progression to severe illness likely to lead to hospitalization among elderly patients [20]. Subsequently, a large RCT of CCP outpatient use reported a 54.3% RRR in progression to hospitalization [21]. Consequently, we estimated the potential lives saved by outpatient use based on outpatient CCP efficacy data obtained during the pandemic. When CCP was given in the first 5 days of symptoms, RRR in progression to hospitalization rose to 79.9%, which is similar to that of anti-Spike monoclonal antibodies [7]. A more conservative figure of 30% for outpatient CCP emerges from a meta-analysis of 5 RCTs including international trials [22]. We used all these 3 estimates (i.e., 30%, 54% and 80%) in our analysis. In addition, since the great majority of COVID-19 patients died in the hospitals, it was possible to estimate the potential number of lives saved by deployment of outpatient CCP according to the following formula:

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

The prevalence of use of CCP in COVID-19 outpatients at high risk for disease progression and hospitalization was estimated from the actual use of anti-Spike monoclonal antibodies in the US (15%; Italian data are not available) [23] or from a hypothetical major national effort to deploy outpatient CCP use (75%).

Results

Table 1 reports the data used to calculate the real and potential number of lives saved by in-hospital CCP use (data retrieved from the Italian Ministry of Health) [18]. Overall, 10,219 hospitalized COVID-19 patients received 2 units of CCP during the years 2020 and 2021 (3,456 in the year 2020 and 6,763 in the year 2021), representing the 2.2% ($10,219/470,837$) of the total number of patients admitted for COVID-19 during the two-year period. Overall, 29.0% of COVID-19 hospitalized patients died for COVID-19 (32.4% [$77,871/239,963$] in the year 2020 and 25.4 [$58,627/230,874$] in the year 2021).

Table 2 and 3 report the estimates of the actual number of lives saved by in-hospital CCP use during the years 2020 and 2021, respectively. The number of lives saved by CCP use ranged from 62 in 2020 (using the 1.8% mortality RRR provided by reference 13) to 879 in 2021 (using the 13% mortality RRR provided by reference 6). If CCP would have been transfused to the whole population of hospitalized patients, the lives saved would have increased to a range from a minimum of 7,623 (year 2021, 13% mortality reduction model) up to a maximum of 34,209 (year 2020, 44% mortality reduction model).

Tables 2 and 3 also list the estimate of hospitalizations prevented and lives saved in the outpatient setting. According to this model, the number of hospitalizations avoided ranged from a conservative minimum of 10,798 (15% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients transfused, and 30% hospitalization RRR) up to a maximum 143,978 (75% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated, and 80% hospitalization RRR) in the year 2020, and from 10,389 (15% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 30% hospitalization RRR) to 138,524 (75% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 80% hospitalization RRR) in the year 2021. Accordingly, the number of lives saved ranged from 2,700 (15% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 30% RRR in hospitalization) to 35,994 (75% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 80% RRR in hospitalization) in the year 2020 and from 2,597 (15% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 30% hospitalization

RRR) to 34,631 (75% of high-risk COVID-19 outpatients treated and 80% hospitalization RRR) in the year 2021.

Considering the two-year period (Table 4), the actual real-life and 100% treated theoretically saved lives by CCP in-hospital use ranged from 385 to 1,304 (13% to 44% mortality RRR) and from 17,751 to 60,079 (13% to 44% mortality RRR), respectively. During the same period, the number of hospitalizations avoided, and lives saved by CCP outpatient use ranged from 21,188 to 282,502 (15% to 75% of outpatients treated and 30% to 80% hospitalization RRR) and from 6,144 to 81,926 (15% to 75% of outpatients treated and 30% to 80% hospitalization RRR), respectively.

Discussion

Although Italy was the first western country to be hit by COVID-19 pandemic and the first to use CCP in inpatients, only a negligible proportion (approximately 2%) of patients hospitalized for COVID-19 received this potentially life-saving biological antiviral therapy during the first two years (2020 and 2021) of the pandemic. This disappointing finding contrasts profoundly with data from the US, which by the Fall of 2020 as many as 40% of hospitalized COVID-19 patients were being treated with CCP [24]. The reasons for such a difference were multiple. First, the publication of the early Italian positive experience on CCP use in hospitalized COVID-19 patients [3] poorly stimulated further CCP collection and transfusion in Italy, and was received with caution by the Italian scientific community, in particular by the experts within the technical-scientific committee of the Italian Ministry of Health, who recommended caution with in-hospital CCP use until the Italian RCT, named TSUNAMI, had been published. The RCT was published in late 2021 [13], but its negative results were anticipated in the form of a succinct press release in early 2021 [25], which had the consequence of stopping the already low use of CCP in Italian hospitals. In addition, the Italian Society of Transfusion Medicine and Immunohematology (SIMTI) itself recommended against the administration of CCP in hospitalized COVID-19 patients [26]. However, upon careful

reading, the results of the Italian TSUNAMI RCT were not completely negative, but showed a clear trend towards efficacy ($P = 0.06$) of CCP versus standard therapy in the subgroup of patients with milder (and thus earlier) disease. Today we know from a compilation of RCT that this population can benefit from CCP [8], and that the TSUNAMI trend was almost certainly a real effect. In retrospect, this finding is not surprising for as it matched exactly what happened with other RCTs of anti-Spike monoclonal antibodies and CCP in outpatient setting [7]. Ideally, the TSUNAMI observation should have provided the basis for the design of a more modern RCT focusing on treatment of earlier phases (i.e., outpatients) of COVID-19 with CCP. Unfortunately, this did not happen, and national authorities did not support any additional investigation on CCP. Consequently, CCP has remained in Italy an experimental biological product requiring regulatory authorizations (which delayed its transfusion) before its restricted in-hospital use. The Italian experience was very different from that in the USA, where CCP was first authorized for in-hospital use (under an Expanded Access Program [EAP] in April 2020 and under Emergency Use Authorization [EUA] in August 2020) and then for outpatient use in immunosuppressed patients (December 2021). The deployment of CCP in the USA saved a significant number of lives during the pandemic, positively impacting the overall COVID-related mortality rates, which were lower in those geographical areas where CCP was used more extensively [24]. The fact that CCP has remained an experimental biological product in Italy has also prevented its outpatient use, which would have reduced hospitalizations saving further lives and desaturating the heavily crowded hospitals. It is noteworthy that in the USA the FDA has issued guidance to industry for the licensing of CCP in July 2024 [27], which attests to regulatory acceptance of its safety and efficacy and the need for continued supply of this product given its usefulness in immunocompromised individuals. As a consequence, the number of COVID-19 patients treated with CCP and the number of lives saved in Italy during the first two years of pandemic were much smaller than it could have been, while a widespread early use of CCP would certainly have contributed to reduce the nearly 200,000 deaths recorded during the four years of the pandemic [28].

But what is the goal of this study? It is not so much to criticize the efforts during the pandemic but to highlight the real and potential effectiveness that CCP therapy has had in the fight against COVID-19 and to take this information into consideration in the event of future infectious emergencies. Under such scenarios, we recommend that convalescent plasma be deployed on the basis of its historical efficacy (including COVID-19), using registries that allow the collection of efficacy data that can be exploited to inform the design of RCTs. Registries allow the therapy to be immediately available to the citizens and can provide critical information on safety, dose and timing to inform RCT design [29,30]. The argument that registries preclude the completion of RCTs is not viable given that the USA completed at least 5 RCTs while CCP was available under FDA EUA. We also encourage researchers from other nations to run similar nation-wide analyses, to obtain information that can encourage governments to include convalescent plasma therapy in their future pandemic preparedness plans.

References

1. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic.
<https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>. Accessed on February 5, 2024.
2. Shen C, Wang Z, Zhao F, Yang Y, Li J, Yuan J, Wang F, Li D, Yang M, Xing L, Wei J, Xiao H, Yang Y, Qu J, Qing L, Chen L, Xu Z, Peng L, Li Y, Zheng H, Chen F, Huang K, Jiang Y, Liu D, Zhang Z, Liu Y, Liu L. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA*. 2020 Apr 28;323(16):1582-1589.
3. Perotti C, Baldanti F, Bruno R, Del Fante C, Seminari E, Casari S, Percivalle E, Glingani C, Musella V, Belliato M, Garuti M, Meloni F, Frigato M, Di Sabatino A, Klersy C, De Donno G, Franchini M, Covid-Plasma Task Force. Mortality reduction in 46 severe Covid-19 patients treated with hyperimmune plasma. A proof of concept single arm multicenter trial. *Haematologica*. 2020 Dec 1;105(12):2834-2840. doi: 10.3324/haematol.2020.261784. PMID: 33256382; PMCID: PMC7716363.
4. Joyner MJ, Wright RS, Fairweather D, Senefeld JW, Bruno KA, Klassen SA, Carter RE, Klompas AM, Wiggins CC, Shepherd JR, Rea RF, Whelan ER, Clayburn AJ, Spiegel MR, Johnson PW, Lesser ER, Baker SE, Larson KF, Ripoll JG, Andersen KJ, Hodge DO, Kunze KL, Buras MR, Vogt MN, Herasevich V, Dennis JJ, Regimbal RJ, Bauer PR, Blair JE, Van Buskirk CM, Winters JL, Stubbs JR, Paneth NS, Verdun NC, Marks P, Casadevall A. Early safety indicators of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in 5000 patients. *J Clin Invest*. 2020 Sep 1;130(9):4791-4797. doi: 10.1172/JCI140200. PMID: 32525844; PMCID: PMC7456238.

5. Franchini M, Cruciani M, Casadevall A, Joyner MJ, Senefeld JW, Sullivan DJ, Zani M, Focosi D. Safety of COVID-19 convalescent plasma: A definitive systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Transfusion*. 2024 Feb;64(2):388-399. doi: 10.1111/trf.17701. Epub 2023 Dec 29. PMID: 38156374.
6. Senefeld JW, Gorman EK, Johnson PW, Moir ME, Klassen SA, Carter RE, Paneth NS, Sullivan DJ, Morkeberg OH, Wright RS, Fairweather D, Bruno KA, Shoham S, Bloch EM, Focosi D, Henderson JP, Juskewitch JE, Pirofski LA, Grossman BJ, Tobian AAR, Franchini M, Ganesh R, Hurt RT, Kay NE, Parikh SA, Baker SE, Buchholtz ZA, Buras MR, Clayburn AJ, Dennis JJ, Diaz Soto JC, Herasevich V, Klompas AM, Kunze KL, Larson KF, Mills JR, Regimbal RJ, Ripoll JG, Sexton MA, Shepherd JRA, Stubbs JR, Theel ES, van Buskirk CM, van Helmond N, Vogt MNP, Whelan ER, Wiggins CC, Winters JL, Casadevall A, Joyner MJ. Rates Among Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 Treated With Convalescent Plasma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes*. 2023 Oct 10;7(5):499-513. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2023.09.001. PMID: 37859995; PMCID: PMC10582279.
7. Sullivan DJ, Focosi D, Hanley DF, Cruciani M, Franchini M, Ou J, Casadevall A, Paneth N. Outpatient randomized controlled trials to reduce COVID-19 hospitalization: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2023 Dec;95(12):e29310. doi: 10.1002/jmv.29310. PMID: 38105461; PMCID: PMC10754263.
8. Franchini M, Cruciani M, Mengoli C, Casadevall A, Glingani C, Joyner MJ, Pirofski LA, Senefeld JW, Shoham S, Sullivan DJ, Zani M, Focosi D. Convalescent plasma and predictors of mortality among hospitalized COVID-19 patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2024 Jul 25:S1198-743X(24)00353-7. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2024.07.020. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 39067517.
9. Senefeld JW, Franchini M, Mengoli C, Cruciani M, Zani M, Gorman EK, Focosi D, Casadevall A, Joyner MJ. COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma for the Treatment of

- Immunocompromised Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023 Jan 3;6(1):e2250647. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.50647. PMID: 36633846; PMCID: PMC9857047.
10. Thompson MA, Henderson JP, Shah PK, Rubinstein SM, Joyner MJ, Choueiri TK, Flora DB, Griffiths EA, Gulati AP, Hwang C, Koshkin VS, Papadopoulos EB, Robilotti EV, Su CT, Wulff-Burchfield EM, Xie Z, Yu PP, Mishra S, Senefeld JW, Shah DP, Warner JL; COVID-19 and Cancer Consortium. Association of Convalescent Plasma Therapy With Survival in Patients With Hematologic Cancers and COVID-19. *JAMA Oncol*. 2021 Jun 17;7(8):1167–75. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.1799. Epub ahead of print. Erratum in: *JAMA Oncol*. 2021 Aug 1;7(8):1249. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.4099. PMID: 34137799; PMCID: PMC8377563.
 11. Dragotakes Q, Johnson PW, Buras MR, et al. Estimates of actual and potential lives saved in the United States from the COVID-19 convalescent plasma. medRxiv 2024
 12. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Italian Blood System 2021: activity data, hemovigilance and epidemiological surveillance. *Rapporti ISTISAN* 2022; 22/25: 1-88.
 13. Menichetti F, Popoli P, Puopolo M, Spila Alegiani S, Tiseo G, Bartoloni A, De Socio GV, Luchi S, Blanc P, Puoti M, Toschi E, Massari M, Palmisano L, Marano G, Chiamenti M, Martinelli L, Franchi S, Pallotto C, Suardi LR, Luciani Pasqua B, Merli M, Fabiani P, Bertolucci L, Borchini B, Modica S, Moneta S, Marchetti G, d'Arminio Monforte A, Stoppini L, Ferracchiato N, Piconi S, Fabbri C, Beccastrini E, Saccardi R, Giacometti A, Esperti S, Pierotti P, Bernini L, Bianco C, Benedetti S, Lanzi A, Bonfanti P, Massari M, Sani S, Saracino A, Castagna A, Trabace L, Lanza M, Focosi D, Mazzoni A, Pistello M, Falcone M; TSUNAMI Study group. 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*. 2021 Nov 1;4(11):e2136246. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.36246.

14. Manzini PM, Ciccone G, De Rosa FG, Cavallo R, Ghisetti V, D'Antico S, Galassi C, Saccona F, Castiglione A, Birocco N, Francisci T, Hu H, Pecoraro C, Danielle F, Labanca L, Bordiga AM, Lorenzi M, Camisasca G, Giachino O, Pagliarino M, Ottone P, Scuvera ITD, Guaschino R, Freilone R, Berti P, Pittaluga F, Avolio M, Costa C, Raso S, Nucci A, Milan M, Baffa A, Russo A, Tornello A, Maddalena L, Delios G, Marletto FP, De Micheli AG, Mattei A, Baldassano S, Canta F, Russo ML, Bergamo D, Vitale F, Liccardi MM, Chinaglia A, Calcagno A, Converso M, Aldieri C, Libanore V, Blangetti I, Benedetti V, Mitola B, Scozzari G; PLACO COVID Study Group. Convalescent or standard plasma versus standard of care in the treatment of COVID-19 patients with respiratory impairment: short and long-term effects. A three-arm randomized controlled clinical trial. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2022 Nov 22;22(1):879. doi: 10.1186/s12879-022-07716-5. PMID: 36418984; PMCID: PMC9682750.
15. De Silvestro G, Marson P, La Raja M, Cattelan AM, Guarnieri G, Monticelli J, Tiberio I, Vianello A, Gandini G, Gessoni G, Fiorin F, Sardella C, Astolfi L, Saia M; Veneto Hospitals. Outcome of SARS CoV-2 inpatients treated with convalescent plasma: One-year of data from the Veneto region (Italy) Registry. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2022 Mar;97:42-49. doi: 10.1016/j.ejim.2021.12.023.
16. Franchini M, Glingani C, Donno G, Lucchini G, Beccaria M, Amato M, Castelli GP, Bianciardi L, Pagani M, Ghirardini M, Puma G, Presciuttini B, Costantino MT, Frigato M, Crosato V, Tiecco G, Mulè A, Papalia DA, Inglese F, Spreafico F, Garuti M, Pecoriello A, Cervi G, Greco G, Galavotti V, Santini T, Berselli A, Montalto C, Bertoletti R, Bellometti SA, Capuzzo E, Benazzi D, Grisolia G, Pajola F, Stradoni R, Zani M, Verzola A, Codeluppi V, Vesentini S, Bellocchio E, Candini M, Ambrosi G, Carandina F, Scarduelli C, Reggiani A, Casari S, On Behalf Of Convalescent Plasma Study Group. Convalescent Plasma for Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients: A Single-Center Experience. *Life (Basel).* 2022 Mar 14;12(3):420. doi: 10.3390/life12030420. PMID: 35330170; PMCID: PMC8950373.

17. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Epidemia COVID-19. Aggiornamento Nazionale. January 7, 2022; 1-41.
18. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Sorveglianza integrata COVID-19: I principali dati nazionali. Available at: <https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-sorveglianza-dati> (last access: July 30, 2024).
19. Arnold Egloff SA, Junglen A, Restivo JS, Wongsckhaluang M, Martin C, Doshi P, Schlauch D, Fromell G, Sears LE, Correll M, Burris HA 3rd, LeMaistre CF. Convalescent plasma associates with reduced mortality and improved clinical trajectory in patients hospitalized with COVID-19. *J Clin Invest.* 2021 Oct 15;131(20):e151788. doi: 10.1172/JCI151788. PMID: 34464352; PMCID: PMC8516450.
20. Libster R, et al. (2021) Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. *The New England journal of medicine* 384(7):610-618.
21. Sullivan DJ, et al. (2022) Early Outpatient Treatment for Covid-19 with Convalescent Plasma. *The New England journal of medicine* 386(18):1700-1711.
22. Levine AC, Fukuta Y, Huaman MA, Ou J, Meisenberg BR, Patel B, Paxton JH, Hanley DF, Rijnders BJA, Gharbharan A, Rokx C, Zwaginga JJ, Alemany A, Mitjà O, Ouchi D, Millat-Martinez P, Durkalski-Mauldin V, Korley FK, Dumont LJ, Callaway CW, Libster R, Marc GP, Wappner D, Esteban I, Polack F, Sullivan DJ. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Convalescent Plasma Outpatient Therapy to Prevent Outpatient Hospitalization: A Meta-Analysis of Individual Participant Data From 5 Randomized Trials. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2023 Jun 16;76(12):2077-2086. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciad088. PMID: 36809473; PMCID: PMC10273382.
23. McCreary EK, Escobar ZK, Justo JA. Monoclonal Antibodies for the Treatment of COVID-19-Every Day You Fight Like You're Running Out of Time. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2023 Apr 3;6(4):e239702. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.9702. PMID: 37093604.

24. Casadevall A, Dragotakes Q, Johnson PW, Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Wright RS, Joyner MJ, Paneth N, Carter RE. Convalescent plasma use in the USA was inversely correlated with COVID-19 mortality. *Elife*. 2021 Jun 4;10:e69866. doi: 10.7554/eLife.69866. PMID: 34085928; PMCID: PMC8205484.
25. Italian Medicine Agency. COVID-19: TSUNAMI study, plasma does not reduce the risk of respiratory damage or death. April 8, 2021. Available at: [COVID-19: Tsunami Study, plasma does not reduce the risk of respiratory damage or death \(aifa.gov.it\)](https://www.aifa.gov.it/COVID-19-Tsunami-Study-plasma-does-not-reduce-the-risk-of-respiratory-damage-or-death)
26. Prati D, Fiorin F, Berti P, De Silvestro G, Accorsi P, Ostuni A; Italian Society for Transfusion Medicine and Immunohaematology (SIMTI), and the Italian Society for Haemapheresis and Cell Manipulation (SIEM). Position paper on the use of COVID-19 convalescent plasma: an update. *Blood Transfus*. 2021 Jul;19(4):277-280. doi: 10.2450/2021.0150-21. Epub 2021 May 21. PMID: 34059190; PMCID: PMC8297677.
27. FDA. Guidance document. Recommendations for investigational and licensed COVID-19 convalescent plasma. Available at: [Recommendations for Investigational and Licensed COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma | FDA](https://www.fda.gov/medical-products/clinical-trials/clinical-trials-requirements/recommendations-for-investigational-and-licensed-covid-19-convalescent-plasma) (accessed: August 10, 2024).
28. Italy COVID. Coronavirus statistics. Worldometer. Available at: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/italy/> (last access: August 9, 2024)
29. Joyner MJ, Wright RS, Fairweather D, Senefeld JW, Bruno KA, Klassen SA, Carter RE, Klompas AM, Wiggins CC, Shepherd JR, Rea RF, Whelan ER, Clayburn AJ, Spiegel MR, Johnson PW, Lesser ER, Baker SE, Larson KF, Ripoll JG, Andersen KJ, Hodge DO, Kunze KL, Buras MR, Vogt MN, Herasevich V, Dennis JJ, Regimbal RJ, Bauer PR, Blair JE, Van Buskirk CM, Winters JL, Stubbs JR, Paneth NS, Verdun NC, Marks P, Casadevall A. Early safety indicators of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in 5000 patients. *J Clin Invest*. 2020 Sep 1;130(9):4791-4797. doi: 10.1172/JCI140200. PMID: 32525844; PMCID: PMC7456238.

30. Joyner MJ, Carter RE, Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Mills JR, Johnson PW, Theel ES, Wiggins CC, Bruno KA, Klompas AM, Lesser ER, Kunze KL, Sexton MA, Diaz Soto JC, Baker SE, Shepherd JRA, van Helmond N, Verdun NC, Marks P, van Buskirk CM, Winters JL, Stubbs JR, Rea RF, Hodge DO, Herasevich V, Whelan ER, Clayburn AJ, Larson KF, Ripoll JG, Andersen KJ, Buras MR, Vogt MNP, Dennis JJ, Regimbal RJ, Bauer PR, Blair JE, Paneth NS, Fairweather D, Wright RS, Casadevall A. Convalescent Plasma Antibody Levels and the Risk of Death from Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 Mar 18;384(11):1015-1027. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2031893. Epub 2021 Jan 13. PMID: 33523609; PMCID: PMC7821984.

Table 1. Input data used for the estimation of lives saved from CCP in Italy.

Year	2020	2021	Total (2020-2021)
COVID-19 patients treated (n)¹	3,456	6,763	10,219
Hospitalizations for COVID-19	239,963	230,874	470,837
COVID-related deaths	77,871	58,627	136,498
COVID-related deaths / hospitalizations (%)	32.4	25.4	29.0

¹Each patient received two CCP units.

Table 2. Estimates of actual and potential lives saved from the deployment of CCP in Italy, year 2020.

a) Hospitalized patients

Relative risk reduction (%)¹	Untreated mortality (%)²	Lives saved (n)	
		Real-life	Theoretical³
13	32.4	146	10,107
23	32.4	258	17,882
44	32.4	493	34,209

b) Outpatients

Population treated with CCP (%)⁴	Hospitalization reduction (%)⁵	Hospitalization avoided (n)	Lives saved (n)
15	30	10,798	3,499
75	30	53,992	17,493
15	54	19,437	6,298
75	54	97,185	31,488
15	80	28,796	9,330
75	80	143,978	46,649

¹The 13% value comes from reference no. 6; the 23% value comes from reference no. 13 and the 44% value comes from reference no. 15.

²The 32.4% value comes from reference no. 18.

³Calculated if 100% inpatients were transfused with CCP.

⁴Percentage of use of 15% was estimated from the actual use of monoclonal antibodies during the pandemic, which was given to patients at high risk for hospitalization. The 75% estimate assumes a major national effort to deploy outpatient plasma.

⁵The 30% value comes from reference no. 22; the 54% value comes from reference no. 21 and the 80% value comes from reference no. 7.

Table 3. Estimates of actual and potential lives saved from the deployment of CCP in Italy, year 2021.

a) Hospitalized patients

Relative risk reduction (%) ¹	Untreated mortality (%) ²	Lives saved (n)	
		Real-life	Theoretical ³
13	25.4	223	7,623
23	25.4	395	13,488
44	25.4	756	25,802

b) Outpatients

Population treated with CCP (%) ⁴	Hospitalization reduction (%) ⁵	Hospitalization avoided (n)	Lives saved (n)
15	30	10,389	2,639
75	30	51,947	13,194
15	54	18,701	4,750
75	54	93,504	23,750
15	80	27,705	7,037
75	80	138,524	35,185

¹The 13% value comes from reference no. 6; the 23% value comes from reference no. 13 and the 44% value comes from reference no. 15.

²The 25.4% value comes from reference no. 18.

³Calculated if 100% inpatients were transfused with CCP.

⁴Percentage of use of 15% was estimated from the actual use of monoclonal antibodies during the pandemic, which was given to patients at high risk for hospitalization. The 75% estimate assumes a major national effort to deploy outpatient plasma.

⁵The 30% value comes from reference no. 21; the 54% value comes from reference no. 21 and the 80% value comes from reference no. 7.

Table 4. Estimates of actual and potential lives saved from the deployment of CCP in Italy, years 2020-2021.

a) Hospitalized patients

Relative risk reduction (%) ¹	Untreated mortality (%) ²	Lives saved (n)	
		Real-life	Theoretical ³
13	29	385	17,751
23	29	682	31,405
44	29	1,304	60,079

b) Outpatients

Population treated with CCP (%) ⁴	Hospitalization reduction (%) ⁵	Hospitalization avoided (n)	Lives saved (n)
15	30	21,187	6,144
75	30	105,939	30,722
15	54	38,138	11,060
75	54	190,689	55,300
15	80	56,501	16,385
75	80	282,502	81,926

¹The 13% value comes from reference no. 6; the 23% value comes from reference no. 13 and the 44% value comes from reference no. 15.

²The 29% value comes from reference no. 18.

³Calculated if 100% inpatients were transfused with CCP.

⁴Percentage of use of 15% was estimated from the actual use of monoclonal antibodies during the pandemic, which was given to patients at high risk for hospitalization. The 75% estimate assumes a major national effort to deploy outpatient plasma.

⁵The 30% value comes from reference no. 21; the 54% value comes from reference no. 21 and the 80% value comes from reference no. 7.