

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

# **Sotrovimab versus usual care in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19: a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial (RECOVERY)**

**Running title:** Sotrovimab for patients hospitalised with COVID-19  
**RECOVERY Collaborative Group\***

\*The writing committee and trial steering committee are listed at the end of this manuscript and a complete list of collaborators in the Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy (RECOVERY) trial is provided in the Supplementary Appendix.

Correspondence to: Prof Peter W Horby and Prof Martin J Landray, RECOVERY Central Coordinating Office, Richard Doll Building, Old Road Campus, Roosevelt Drive, Oxford OX3 7LF, United Kingdom.

Email: [recoverytrial@ndph.ox.ac.uk](mailto:recoverytrial@ndph.ox.ac.uk)

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 20 **SUMMARY**

21 **Background:** Sotrovimab is a neutralising monoclonal antibody that has been proposed  
22 as a treatment for patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19.

23 **Methods:** In this randomised, controlled, open-label platform trial, several possible  
24 treatments were compared with usual care in patients hospitalised with COVID-19  
25 pneumonia. In the sotrovimab comparison, eligible and consenting patients were  
26 randomly allocated to either usual care alone or usual care plus a single 1g dose of  
27 sotrovimab, using web-based unstratified randomisation. Participants were  
28 retrospectively categorised according to their baseline serum SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid  
29 antigen concentration as 'high-antigen' or 'low-antigen', using the median concentration  
30 as a cut-off. The primary outcome was 28-day mortality assessed by intention to treat.  
31 Secondary outcomes were time to discharge alive from hospital, and, among those not  
32 on invasive ventilation at baseline, progression to invasive ventilation or death.  
33 Recruitment closed on 31 March 2024 when funding ended. ISRCTN (50189673) and  
34 [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) (NCT04381936).

35 **Findings:** From 4 January 2022 to 19 March 2024, 1723 patients were recruited to the  
36 sotrovimab comparison. 720 (42%) were classified as high-antigen, 717 (42%) as low-  
37 antigen, and 286 (17%) had unknown antigen status. Over 80% of patients were  
38 vaccinated, over 80% had anti-spike antibodies at randomisation, and almost all were  
39 infected with Omicron variants. In the prespecified primary efficacy population of high-  
40 antigen patients, 82/355 (23%) allocated sotrovimab versus 106/365 (29%) allocated  
41 usual care died within 28 days (rate ratio 0.75; 95% CI 0.56-0.99;  $p=0.046$ ). In an analysis

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

42 of all randomised patients (regardless of antigen status), 177/828 (21%) allocated  
43 sotrovimab versus 201/895 (22%) allocated usual care died within 28 days (rate ratio  
44 0.95; 95% CI 0.77-1.16; p=0.60).

45 **Interpretation:** In patients hospitalised with COVID-19, sotrovimab was associated with  
46 reduced mortality in the primary analysis population of patients with a high serum SARS-  
47 CoV-2 antigen concentration at baseline, but not in the overall population.

48 **Funding:** UK Research and Innovation (Medical Research Council) and National Institute  
49 of Health Research (Grant ref: MC\_PC\_19056).

50 **Keywords:** COVID-19, sotrovimab, monoclonal antibody, clinical trial.

51

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 52 INTRODUCTION

53 Treatment with neutralising monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) targeting the SARS-CoV-2  
54 spike protein has been found to substantially reduce the risk of hospitalisation or death in  
55 patients with early COVID-19 who are at high risk of complications.<sup>1-3</sup> nMAbs were also  
56 found to reduce the risk of death among hospitalised patients, but this benefit was  
57 restricted to those who had not yet developed their own anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody  
58 response (i.e. who are seronegative).<sup>4-6</sup> The RECOVERY casirivimab-imdevimab  
59 comparison, which recruited UK patients from September 2020 to May 2021 is the largest  
60 randomised evaluation of mAb therapy in hospitalised patients. In this comparison, 28-  
61 day mortality in patients who were seronegative at randomisation was double that of  
62 seropositive patients (30% versus 15%), and mAb therapy reduced this to 24% (rate ratio  
63 0.79; 95% confidence interval 0.69-0.91; p=0.0009; number of seronegative patients  
64 treated to save one life = 16).<sup>4</sup> Following this, targeted mAb therapy for seronegative  
65 patients hospitalised with COVID-19 was adopted into routine practice in the UK and  
66 elsewhere.

67 A major limitation of mAb therapy has been the frequent emergence of new SARS-CoV-  
68 2 variants that are not effectively neutralised by existing antibodies.<sup>7,8</sup> When the first  
69 Omicron variant, BA.1, became globally dominant in December 2021, it contained spike  
70 mutations conferring high-level resistance to most mAbs in clinical use.<sup>8</sup> This included the  
71 casirivimab-imdevimab combination, leading to its withdrawal from guidelines.  
72 Sotrovimab, a mAb originally developed from an antibody recovered from a patient who  
73 had recovered from SARS-CoV-1, targets a relatively conserved spike protein epitope,

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

74 and in the COMET-ICE trial of patients with early infection conducted in 2020-21 it  
75 reduced the risk of hospitalisation or death by 79%.<sup>1</sup> The neutralisation potency of  
76 sotrovimab was modestly reduced against BA.1 (~3-5-fold) compared to wild-type virus,  
77 but it retained more activity than many other mAbs, which made it a promising candidate  
78 for continued use in hospitalised patients and prompted its evaluation in RECOVERY.<sup>9,10</sup>  
79 A further reduction in activity against BA.2 led to the withdrawal of FDA Emergency Use  
80 Authorization in the U.S. for sotrovimab in April 2022. However, it retained enough *in vitro*  
81 activity against viral variants prevalent in 2022-23 to suggest it could retain clinical benefit,  
82 either via direct neutralisation or via Fc-dependent effector mechanisms.<sup>11,12</sup> During  
83 November 2023, BA.2.86 and JN.1 SARS-CoV-2 variants became dominant in the UK  
84 and elsewhere, which have an additional spike gene mutation that confers high-level  
85 resistance to sotrovimab.<sup>13</sup>

86 The current role of therapeutic neutralising mAbs in hospitalised patients is also  
87 complicated by increasing population immunity to SARS-CoV-2, as the previous trials that  
88 identified a benefit in seronegative patients were performed before widespread  
89 vaccination and natural immunity. By the time the Omicron BA.1 variant emerged, most  
90 people hospitalised in the UK with COVID-19 had been vaccinated and many had had  
91 previous infection. In this setting, patients would be expected to have detectable anti-  
92 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at admission, but this could reflect immune responses to  
93 previous vaccination or infection that had failed to prevent the current illness, rather than  
94 adaptive immunity to the current infection. This suggests that alternative biomarkers of  
95 infection status may now be required to identify which, if any, hospitalised patients could  
96 benefit from mAb treatment.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

97 One possible biomarker is SARS-CoV-2 antigenaemia. Viral nucleocapsid antigen is  
98 detectable in the blood of most hospitalised patients, and high concentrations are strongly  
99 correlated with more severe disease and worse prognosis.<sup>14–16</sup> In most hospitalised  
100 patients, antigen levels fall rapidly in the first few days of admission as the infection is  
101 cleared.<sup>17</sup> The degree of antigenaemia is inversely correlated with specific antibody  
102 responses, but, unlike antibodies, detection of viral antigen almost certainly relates only  
103 to the current infection.

104 Here we report the results of the sotrovimab comparison in RECOVERY, a randomised,  
105 open-label platform trial evaluating treatments for patients hospitalised with COVID-19  
106 pneumonia. Recruitment occurred in the UK in a period in which Omicron variants were  
107 dominant and most people were vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2. The prespecified  
108 primary analysis population was patients who had serum SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid  
109 antigen concentration at randomisation that was above the median value of all trial  
110 participants in this comparison.

## 111 **METHODS**

### 112 **Study design and participants**

113 The Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 therapy (RECOVERY) trial is an investigator-  
114 initiated, individually randomised, controlled, open-label, adaptive platform trial to  
115 evaluate the effects of potential treatments in patients hospitalised with COVID-19.  
116 Details of the trial design and results for other treatments have been published previously  
117 and are available at [www.recoverytrial.net/results](http://www.recoverytrial.net/results).<sup>4,18–28</sup> The trial was conducted at  
118 hospital organisations in the United Kingdom and supported by the National Institute for

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

119 Health and Care Research Clinical Research Network. 107 hospitals in the UK enrolled  
120 participants in the sotrovimab comparison (appendix pp5-32). The trial is coordinated by  
121 the Nuffield Department of Population Health at the University of Oxford (Oxford, UK), the  
122 trial sponsor, and is conducted in accordance with the principles of the International  
123 Conference on Harmonisation–Good Clinical Practice guidelines and is approved by the  
124 UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and the Cambridge  
125 East Research Ethics Committee (ref: 20/EE/0101). The protocol, statistical analysis plan,  
126 and additional information are available in the appendix (pp70-186) and on the study  
127 website [www.recoverytrial.net](http://www.recoverytrial.net).

128 Patients admitted to hospital were eligible for the study if they had confirmed SARS-CoV-  
129 2 infection with a pneumonia syndrome thought to be related to COVID-19, and no  
130 medical history that might, in the opinion of the managing physician, put the patient at  
131 significant risk if they were to participate in the trial. Patients were excluded if they were  
132 aged <12 years or were aged <18 years and weighed <40kg. Pregnant women were  
133 eligible. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients, or a legal representative  
134 if patients were too unwell or otherwise unable to provide informed consent.

### 135 **Randomisation and masking**

136 Eligible and consenting patients were randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to either usual  
137 standard of care plus sotrovimab or usual standard of care alone, using web-based simple  
138 (unstratified) randomisation with allocation concealed until after randomisation (appendix  
139 pp42-44). Patients allocated to sotrovimab were to receive 1g in 100ml 0.9% saline or 5%  
140 glucose intravenously over 60 minutes as soon as possible after randomisation. This is

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

141 double the licensed dose for early infection and was selected because of reduced  
142 neutralisation activity against Omicron BA.1 compared to wild-type virus.

143 As a platform trial, and in a factorial design, patients could be simultaneously included in  
144 other concurrently evaluated treatment comparisons, each having its allocation  
145 determined by an independent 1:1 randomisation: (i) empagliflozin versus usual care, (ii)  
146 higher-dose corticosteroids versus usual care, (iii) molnupiravir versus usual care, and  
147 (iv) nirmatrelvir-ritonavir versus usual care (appendix pp42-43). Participants and local  
148 study staff were not masked to allocated treatment. Other than members of the Data  
149 Monitoring Committee, all individuals involved in the trial were masked to aggregated  
150 outcome data while recruitment and 28-day follow-up were ongoing.

### 151 **Procedures**

152 Baseline data were collected using a web-based case report form that included  
153 demographics, level of respiratory support, major comorbidities, suitability of the study  
154 treatment for a particular patient, SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status, and study treatment  
155 availability at the study site (appendix pp47). A serum sample and nose swab were  
156 collected at randomisation and sent to central laboratories for testing. Serum was tested  
157 for SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen, anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike antibodies, and anti-  
158 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antibodies using Roche Elecsys assays (Roche Diagnostics,  
159 Basel, Switzerland). Patients were classified as having high- or low- serum nucleocapsid  
160 antigen using the trial population median value, and as positive or negative for anti-spike  
161 and anti-nucleocapsid antibodies using manufacturer defined thresholds (testing was  
162 retrospective, so results were not available to the patient's medical team). Nose swabs



## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

163 were tested for SARS-CoV-2 RNA using TaqPath COVID-19 RT-PCR (Thermo Fisher  
164 Scientific, Massachusetts, US). Samples with sufficient viral RNA were sequenced using  
165 the ONT Midnight protocol (Oxford Nanopore Technologies, Oxford, UK).<sup>29</sup> Sequence  
166 data were used to detect spike protein mutations associated with >5-fold reduction in  
167 sotrovimab neutralisation, which were identified from the sotrovimab summary of product  
168 characteristics and the Stanford University Coronavirus Antiviral and Resistance  
169 Database.<sup>30</sup> Further details of laboratory analyses and the resistance mutations included  
170 are in the appendix (pp33-34, 188-203).

171 Follow-up nose swabs were collected on day 3 and day 5 (counting the day of  
172 randomisation as day 1). These were analysed in the same manner as the baseline swab  
173 described above.

174 An online follow-up form was completed when participants were discharged, had died or  
175 at 28 days after randomisation, whichever occurred earliest (appendix pp48-56).  
176 Information was recorded on adherence to allocated study treatment, receipt of other  
177 COVID-19 treatments, duration of admission, receipt of respiratory or renal support, major  
178 safety outcomes, and vital status (including cause of death). In addition, routine  
179 healthcare and registry data were obtained, including information on vital status (with date  
180 and cause of death), discharge from hospital, receipt of respiratory support, or renal  
181 replacement therapy.

### 182 **Outcomes**

183 Outcomes were assessed at 28 days after randomisation, with further analyses specified  
184 at 6 months (not reported here). The primary outcome was all-cause mortality at 28 days.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

185 Secondary outcomes were time to discharge from hospital, and, among patients not on  
186 invasive mechanical ventilation at randomisation, invasive mechanical ventilation  
187 (including extra-corporal membrane oxygenation) or death. Prespecified subsidiary  
188 clinical outcomes were use of invasive or non-invasive ventilation (including high-flow  
189 nasal oxygen) among patients not on any ventilation at randomisation, and use of renal  
190 dialysis or haemofiltration. Prespecified safety outcomes were cause-specific mortality,  
191 major cardiac arrhythmia, thrombotic and major bleeding events, non-SARS-CoV-2  
192 infections, hyper/hypoglycaemia, seizures, acute liver or kidney injury, and infusion  
193 reactions to sotrovimab. Virological outcomes were viral RNA copy number in nose swabs  
194 taken at day 3 and day 5, and the frequency of detection of resistance mutations.  
195 Information on suspected serious adverse reactions was collected in an expedited fashion  
196 to comply with regulatory requirements. Details of the methods used to ascertain and  
197 derive outcomes are provided in the appendix (pp164).

### 198 **Statistical Analysis**

199 For all outcomes, intention-to-treat analyses compared patients randomly allocated  
200 sotrovimab with patients randomly allocated usual care. For the primary outcome of 28-  
201 day mortality, the hazard ratio from a Cox model with adjustment for age in three  
202 categories (<70 years, 70-79 years, and 80 years or older) and ventilation status at  
203 randomisation in four categories (no oxygen, simple oxygen only, non-invasive ventilation  
204 and invasive mechanical ventilation) was used to estimate the mortality rate ratio. We  
205 constructed Kaplan-Meier survival curves to display cumulative mortality over the 28-day  
206 period (starting on the day of randomisation and ending 28 days later). We used the same  
207 Cox regression method to analyse time to hospital discharge and successful cessation of

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

208 invasive mechanical ventilation, with patients who died in hospital right-censored on day  
209 29.

210 Median time to discharge was derived from Kaplan-Meier estimates. For the composite  
211 secondary outcome of progression to invasive mechanical ventilation or death within 28  
212 days, and the subsidiary clinical outcomes of receipt of ventilation and use of  
213 haemodialysis or haemofiltration, the precise dates were not available and a log-binomial  
214 regression model was used to estimate the risk ratio adjusted for age and ventilation  
215 status (in the same categories as listed above). Estimates of rate and risk ratios are  
216 shown with 95% confidence intervals. SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA levels in nose-swabs were  
217 estimated with analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) using the log transformed values after  
218 adjustment for each participant's baseline value, age and level of respiratory support at  
219 randomisation. Missing baseline and follow-up values of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA levels  
220 were estimated using multiple imputation, with 20 replicate sets and combination of  
221 results across sets using the methods of Rubin.<sup>31</sup>

222 When the sotrovimab comparison was added to the protocol in December 2021, there  
223 was insufficient information to decide if anti-S or anti-N antibody status should define the  
224 primary analysis population, or if serum antigen status would be preferable. The statistical  
225 analysis plan stated that this would be determined at a future date (but prior to unblinding  
226 of the investigator team). Shortly after recruitment closed, but before the investigators  
227 were unblinded, high-antigen patients were selected as the primary analysis population  
228 because of low numbers of seronegative patients in the trial population and because  
229 antigen positivity best predicted mortality (described in the updated statistical analysis

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

230 plan, appendix pp154-156). It was hypothesised that any beneficial effect of sotrovimab  
231 would be larger among high-antigen patients and may be negligible in low-antigen  
232 patients. Formal hypothesis-testing of the effect of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day  
233 mortality was to be done firstly in high-antigen participants (the primary analysis  
234 population), and was to be done among all randomised participants only if a reduction in  
235 mortality in high-antigen patients was seen at  $2p < 0.05$ . Formal testing of secondary  
236 outcomes was only to be done if a mortality reduction among all participants was seen at  
237  $2p < 0.05$ . A prespecified comparison of the effects of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day  
238 mortality in high-antigen versus low-antigen participants was done by performing a test  
239 for heterogeneity. Tests for heterogeneity according to other baseline characteristics were  
240 also prespecified (age, sex, ethnicity, level of respiratory support, days since symptom  
241 onset, use of corticosteroids, anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody status, and  
242 immunosuppression).

243 Because trial recruitment and event rates during the COVID-19 pandemic were  
244 unpredictable, RECOVERY treatment comparisons have not had a predetermined  
245 sample size. With high levels of recruitment, the intention would have been to continue  
246 until enough primary outcomes had accrued for a 90% power to detect a proportional risk  
247 reduction of 20% at  $2p = 0.01$  (approximately 5,500 participants if mortality were 20%  
248 without treatment). Following the initial wave of Omicron infection in the UK in early 2022,  
249 the number of patients hospitalised with COVID-19 pneumonia reduced substantially in  
250 the UK, as did trial recruitment. The trial comparison closed on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024 when  
251 funding for the trial ended.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

252 The full database is held by the study team which collected the data from study sites and  
253 performed the analyses at the Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of  
254 Oxford (Oxford, UK). Analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 and R version  
255 4.0.3. The trial is registered with ISRCTN (50189673) and [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov)  
256 (NCT04381936).

### 257 **Role of the funding source**

258 Neither the study funders, nor the manufacturers of sotrovimab, had any role in study  
259 design, data collection, data analysis, or writing of the report. GSK and Vir Biotechnology  
260 supported the study through supply of sotrovimab and reviewed the draft publication for  
261 scientific consistency and completeness. The corresponding authors had full access to  
262 all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for  
263 publication.

### 264 **RESULTS**

265 Between 4 January 2022 and 19 March 2024, 1723/1824 (94%) patients enrolled into the  
266 RECOVERY trial at sites participating in the sotrovimab comparison were eligible and  
267 agreed to be included in sotrovimab comparison, of whom 1448 (84%) were recruited in  
268 2022. 828 were allocated sotrovimab and 895 were allocated usual care without  
269 sotrovimab (figure 1). The mean age of study participants was 70.7 years (SD 14.8), 1389  
270 (81%) had received a COVID-19 vaccine, and 414 (24%) were severely  
271 immunocompromised in the opinion of the managing clinician (table 1, appendix pp59-  
272 60). At randomisation, the median time since symptom onset was 6 days (IQR 3-11 days),  
273 1467 (85%) were receiving oxygen or ventilatory support, and 628 (36%) were receiving

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

274 remdesivir. Serological results were available for 1439 (84%) of patients, among whom  
275 720 (50%) had a serum concentration above the median ('high-antigen'), 1179 (82%)  
276 were anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike antibody positive, and 454 (32%) were anti-SARS-CoV-2  
277 nucleocapsid antibody positive (table 1).

278 The follow-up form was completed for 1710 (99%) patients, and among them 767/820  
279 (94%) allocated sotrovimab received the treatment, compared to 14/890 (2%) allocated  
280 usual care (figure 1). Use of other treatments for COVID-19 was similar among patients  
281 allocated sotrovimab and those allocated usual care (appendix p61). Primary and  
282 secondary outcome data are known for more than 99% of randomly assigned patients.

283 In patients who had high-antigen at baseline, allocation to sotrovimab was associated  
284 with a reduction in the primary outcome of 28-day mortality compared with usual care  
285 alone: 82/355 (23%) patients in the sotrovimab group died versus 106/365 (29%) patients  
286 in the usual care group (rate ratio 0.75; 95% CI 0.56-0.99;  $p=0.046$ ; table 2, figure 2a,  
287 figure 3). Among all patients randomised (including those with high, low, or unknown  
288 baseline antigen status), there was no significant difference in the primary outcome of 28-  
289 day mortality between the two randomised groups: 177/828 (21%) patients in the  
290 sotrovimab group died versus 201/895 (22%) patients in the usual care group (rate ratio  
291 0.95; 95% CI 0.77-1.16;  $p=0.60$ ; figure 2b, figure 3, appendix p62). There was no  
292 evidence that the proportional effects on mortality differed among any pre-specified  
293 subgroups among high-antigen patients, or among all patients (figure 4, appendix pp67-  
294 69).

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

295 Among high-antigen patients, discharge alive within 28 days did not differ between those  
296 allocated sotrovimab compared to usual care (66% versus 58%; rate ratio 1.12, 95% CI  
297 0.93-1.34; median time to being discharged alive 13 days versus 16 days) (table 2, figure  
298 3). There was also no difference in this outcome among the overall study population (68%  
299 versus 68%; rate ratio 0.96, 95% CI 0.85-1.08; median time to being discharged alive 11  
300 days versus 11 days) (figure 3, appendix p62).

301 Among high-antigen patients not on invasive ventilation at baseline, allocation to  
302 sotrovimab was not associated with a lower risk of progressing to the composite  
303 secondary outcome of invasive ventilation or death (24% versus 29%, risk ratio 0.82, 95%  
304 CI 0.64-1.03) (table 2, figure 3). There was also no difference in this outcome among the  
305 overall study population (23% versus 23%, risk ratio 0.98, 95% CI 0.84 to 1.16) (figure 3,  
306 appendix p62).

307 We found no evidence of any difference between groups in the prespecified subsidiary  
308 outcomes among high-antigen patients, or among all patients, including in use of  
309 ventilation in those not on ventilation at baseline, successful cessation of ventilation, or  
310 use of renal replacement therapy (table 2, appendix p62).

311 1479/1723 (86%) of patients had at least one nose swab available for analysis. Allocation  
312 to sotrovimab was not associated with a lower baseline-adjusted viral RNA copy number  
313 in nose swabs taken on day 3 or day 5 (table 2). 1119 (65%) patients had at least one  
314 successfully sequenced sample, and of those with at least one high quality sample ( $\geq 90\%$   
315 genome coverage), 1021/1026 ( $>99\%$ ) were identified as Omicron variants (primarily  
316 BA.1, BA.2, BA.5, and XBB). 1655/1723 (96%) patients were recruited before November

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

317 2023, and of these 14/1026 (1%) with a sequenced sample had a sotrovimab resistance  
318 mutation detected at baseline, and 3/692 (<0.5%) with sequenced baseline and follow-up  
319 samples had a new sotrovimab resistance mutation arising after trial entry, two of whom  
320 had received sotrovimab (relevant mutations are listed in appendix p34). Among the  
321 68/1723 (4%) patients recruited after 1 November 2023, 14/35 (40%) with a sequenced  
322 sample were infected with BA.2.86 variants, which are known to contain the K356T spike  
323 mutation associated with high-level sotrovimab resistance.

324 Infusion reactions were reported for 12/781 (2%) patients receiving sotrovimab. Of these,  
325 nine were mild (no intervention required), two moderate (antihistamines or steroids  
326 required) and one severe (adrenaline required). Two serious adverse reactions to  
327 sotrovimab were reported, both of which were infusion reactions included above, one of  
328 which was in a patient with suspected anaphylaxis that resolved with treatment. We found  
329 no difference between groups in other safety outcomes, including cause-specific mortality,  
330 new cardiac arrhythmia, thrombosis, bleeding, non-coronavirus infections, hypo- or  
331 hyper-glycaemia, seizures, acute kidney injury or liver injury (appendix pp63-64).

## 332 **DISCUSSION**

333 In this randomised trial including over 1700 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia,  
334 sotrovimab was associated with a reduction in 28-day mortality in those with a high serum  
335 nucleocapsid antigen concentration, although there was substantial uncertainty about the  
336 size of this apparent benefit (RR 0.75; 95% CI 0.56-0.99; p=0.046). An analysis of all  
337 patients, regardless of antigen concentration, did not show evidence of any benefit of  
338 treatment on 28-day mortality. By contrast with our previous study of monoclonal antibody



## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

339 treatment in this setting, the current study was performed during a period of Omicron  
340 infection and widespread vaccination and natural immunity.<sup>4</sup>

341 The number of patients hospitalised with COVID-19 pneumonia fell dramatically after  
342 vaccination was introduced and Omicron became dominant, so this comparison could not  
343 provide results as definitive as those of the earlier RECOVERY casirivimab-imdevimab  
344 comparison that recruited nearly 10,000 patients. However, the pattern of results from the  
345 two RECOVERY mAb comparisons are similar, despite using different markers of  
346 infection status to categorise patients. In both, a subset of patients with immune  
347 responses that were not yet adequate to clear infection were at higher risk of death than  
348 patients with more robust immune responses, and in that higher risk subset mAb therapy  
349 reduced the risk of death. During the period this comparison was recruiting, SARS-CoV-  
350 2 infection in hospitalised patients was often an incidental finding or associated with non-  
351 respiratory illness, and the benefits of antiviral therapy in these patients may be limited.  
352 In contrast, RECOVERY only included those with pneumonia thought to be related to  
353 COVID-19 and in 81% of participants this had developed despite previous COVID-19  
354 vaccination. In keeping with this, over 80% of those with known serostatus had anti-spike  
355 antibodies, although two-thirds were anti-nucleocapsid antibody negative, indicating that  
356 this was likely their first SARS-CoV-2 infection.<sup>32</sup> The risk of death from COVID-19 was  
357 high. 28-day mortality was 22% in those allocated usual care, similar to the risk among  
358 RECOVERY patients recruited in the pre-Omicron era. Since the emergence of Omicron,  
359 immunocompromised patients have made up a higher proportion of those hospitalised  
360 and dying from COVID-19 pneumonia, and in keeping with this one-quarter of the  
361 RECOVERY patients were considered severely immunocompromised.<sup>33</sup>

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

362 The benefit of mAb therapy in SARS-CoV-2 antibody negative hospitalised patients was  
363 established in previous trials, but this approach to targeting therapy was necessarily  
364 short-lived in the context of increasing population immunity.<sup>4-6</sup> In contrast, targeting  
365 therapy on the basis of antigenaemia remains possible for future hospitalised patients,  
366 and is practical using existing commercial assays (the one used in RECOVERY takes 20  
367 minutes on a widely available automated clinical laboratory platform). The ACTIV-3/TICO  
368 platform trial is the only previous trial of mAb therapy reporting outcomes by baseline  
369 blood antigen status, and this evaluated four mAb therapies, although three of these were  
370 stopped early for futility.<sup>6,14,34</sup> In the single comparison not stopped early, 1417  
371 hospitalised patients were randomised to receive tixagevimab-cilgavimab or placebo.  
372 Among patients with blood antigen above the median value, 90-day mortality was 43/340  
373 (13%) in those allocated mAb versus 51/342 (15%) in those allocated placebo (hazard  
374 ratio 0.84; 95%CI 0.56-1.26;  $p=0.39$ ); although inconclusive the point estimate is  
375 consistent with this RECOVERY result that is based on twice as many events.

376 Neutralising mAbs emerged as powerful therapeutic tools during the pandemic, which  
377 highlighted their potential uses but also their limitations, particularly the loss of activity  
378 against emergent viral variants. Despite retaining potentially valuable neutralising activity  
379 against Omicron variants prevalent in 2022-23, high-level sotrovimab resistance was  
380 identified in Omicron lineages that became globally dominant in early 2024, including  
381 BA.2.86 and JN.1, and it is no longer likely to have useful activity against currently  
382 circulating variants that have retained sotrovimab resistance mutations.<sup>35</sup> The loss of all  
383 anti-SARS-CoV-2 mAbs that were in clinical use has led to new approaches to mAb  
384 therapy, including attempts to target more highly conserved viral epitopes, new antibody

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

385 fragments or formulations that may have better potency or tissue penetration, and  
386 antibody cocktails or poly-specific antibodies that may be more robust to viral evolution.<sup>36</sup>  
387 The results of this comparison suggest that if new mAb therapies can be developed that  
388 effectively neutralise current and future SARS-CoV-2 variants then they could continue  
389 to benefit hospitalised patients.

390 Most patients in the RECOVERY sotrovimab comparison were recruited in 2022, and,  
391 other than lineage-defining Omicron mutations, there were few important sotrovimab  
392 resistance mutations identified in either baseline or follow-up samples. Because of  
393 concerns about possible reduced sotrovimab activity against BA.1, a 1g dose was used  
394 in RECOVERY rather than the 500mg dose tested previously, and this was well tolerated  
395 with no new safety concerns. The lack of any measurable effect of sotrovimab on nasal  
396 SARS-CoV-2 carriage by day 5 may be related to the early sampling timepoints used, as  
397 even in seronegative patients treated with a well-matched mAb, a reduction in carriage of  
398 viral RNA is mainly apparent from day 7 onwards.<sup>5</sup> In contrast to changes in viral RNA  
399 carriage, a large reduction in culturable SARS-CoV-2 can be seen as early as 24 hours  
400 after mAb therapy, but virological testing in RECOVERY did not extend to culture.<sup>37</sup>

401 Strengths of this trial include that it was randomised, had broad eligibility criteria, and a  
402 large sample size, being the second largest trial of mAb therapy performed in patients  
403 hospitalised with COVID-19. It includes baseline characterisation of markers of SARS-  
404 CoV-2 immune status and infection, and more than 99% of patients were followed up for  
405 the primary and secondary outcomes. The study has some limitations: the use of serum  
406 antigen to define the primary analysis population was prespecified, but this is a novel  
407 therapeutic biomarker and there is little existing evidence to support the threshold used

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

408 to classify patients. The distribution of serum antigen in our population was unimodal with  
409 no natural cut-point, so other thresholds could have been selected. In a larger trial it may  
410 have been possible to retrospectively identify an optimal antigen threshold, but this kind  
411 of sensitivity analysis would not be robust in our study given the limited number of  
412 outcome events. Use of other antiviral treatments was relatively common, with remdesivir  
413 received by one-third of patients, and it is possible that sotrovimab would have had a  
414 greater effect in the absence of other antivirals. The RECOVERY trial is open label, so  
415 participants and local hospital staff were aware of the assigned treatment. This could  
416 potentially have affected clinical management or the recording of some trial outcomes,  
417 although we found no evidence that management differed by treatment allocation  
418 (appendix p61), and the primary and secondary outcomes are unambiguous and were  
419 ascertained without bias through linkage to routine health records. Although virological  
420 outcomes were included, this did not include viral culture, and no information on  
421 radiological or physiological outcomes was collected. The RECOVERY trial only studied  
422 patients who had been hospitalised with COVID-19 and, therefore, is not able to provide  
423 any evidence on the safety and efficacy of treatments in other patient groups, such as  
424 those with early infection.

425 In summary, the results of this randomised trial suggest that some hospitalised COVID-  
426 19 patients at high risk of death could continue to benefit from mAb therapy, and that  
427 antigen testing could help to identify these patients. Although no currently available mAbs  
428 have satisfactory activity against current SARS-Cov-2 variants, these results should  
429 inform future mAb evaluation and treatment strategies.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 430 **Contributors**

431 This manuscript was initially drafted by LP, RH, PWH and MJL, further developed by the  
432 Writing Committee, and approved by all members of the trial steering committee. NS,  
433 JRE, PWH, MJL, RH and LP had access to the study data. NS and JRE accessed and  
434 verified the data. JRE did the statistical analysis. PWH and MJL vouch for the data and  
435 analyses, and for the fidelity of this report to the study protocol and data analysis plan,  
436 and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. PWH, NS, JRE, JKB,  
437 MB, SNF, TJ, EJ, KJ, MK, WSL, AMo, AMuk, AMum, KR, GT, MM, RH, and MJL designed  
438 the trial and study protocol. MM, MC, G P-A, LP, RS, DG, GC, FH, JM-C, PD, PH, JU,  
439 NE, JM, SB, the Data Linkage team at the RECOVERY Coordinating Centre, and the  
440 Health Records and Local Clinical Centre staff listed in the appendix collected the data.  
441 All authors contributed to data interpretation and critical review and revision of the  
442 manuscript.

443

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 444 **Writing Committee (on behalf of the RECOVERY Collaborative Group):**

445 Peter W Horby\*, Jonathan R Emberson\*, Leon Peto\*, Natalie Staplin, Mark Campbell,  
446 Guilherme Pessoa-Amorim, Richard Stewart, Dipansu Ghosh, Graham Cooke, Natalie  
447 Blencowe, Jeronimo Moreno-Cuesta, Purav Desai, Paul Hine, Jonathan Underwood,  
448 Nicholas Easom, Jaydip Majumdar, Sanjay Bhagani, J Kenneth Baillie, Maya Buch, Saul  
449 N Faust, Thomas Jaki, Katie Jeffery, Edmund Juszczak, Marian Knight, Wei Shen Lim,  
450 Alan Montgomery, Aparna Mukherjee, Andrew Mumford, Kathryn Rowan, Guy Thwaites,  
451 Marion Mafham†, Richard Haynes†, Martin J Landray†.

452 \*,† equal contribution

### 453 **Data Monitoring Committee**

454 Peter Sandercock, Janet Darbyshire, David DeMets, Robert Fowler, David Lalloo,  
455 Mohammed Munavvar, Janet Wittes.

### 456 **Declaration of interests**

457 The authors have no conflict of interest or financial relationships relevant to the submitted  
458 work to disclose. No form of payment was given to anyone to produce the manuscript. All  
459 authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential  
460 Conflicts of Interest. The Nuffield Department of Population Health at the University of  
461 Oxford has a staff policy of not accepting honoraria or consultancy fees directly or  
462 indirectly from industry (see [https://www.ndph.ox.ac.uk/files/about/ndph-independence-](https://www.ndph.ox.ac.uk/files/about/ndph-independence-of-research-policy-jun-20.pdf)  
463 [of-research-policy-jun-20.pdf](https://www.ctsuo.ox.ac.uk/about/ctsuo_honoraria_25june14-1.pdf)[https://www.ctsuo.ox.ac.uk/about/ctsuo\\_honoraria\\_25june14-](https://www.ctsuo.ox.ac.uk/about/ctsuo_honoraria_25june14-1.pdf)  
464 [1.pdf](https://www.ctsuo.ox.ac.uk/about/ctsuo_honoraria_25june14-1.pdf)).

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 465 **Data sharing**

466 The protocol, consent form, statistical analysis plan, definition & derivation of clinical  
467 characteristics & outcomes, training materials, regulatory documents, and other relevant  
468 study materials are available online at [www.recoverytrial.net](http://www.recoverytrial.net). As described in the protocol,  
469 the Trial Steering Committee will facilitate the use of the study data and approval will not  
470 be unreasonably withheld. Deidentified participant data will be made available to bona  
471 fide researchers registered with an appropriate institution within 3 months of publication.  
472 However, the Steering Committee will need to be satisfied that any proposed publication  
473 is of high quality, honours the commitments made to the study participants in the consent  
474 documentation and ethical approvals, and is compliant with relevant legal and regulatory  
475 requirements (e.g. relating to data protection and privacy). The Steering Committee will  
476 have the right to review and comment on any draft manuscripts prior to publication. Data  
477 will be made available in line with the policy and procedures described at:  
478 <https://www.ndph.ox.ac.uk/data-access>. Those wishing to request access should  
479 complete the form at  
480 [https://www.ndph.ox.ac.uk/files/about/data\\_access\\_enquiry\\_form\\_13\\_6\\_2019.docx](https://www.ndph.ox.ac.uk/files/about/data_access_enquiry_form_13_6_2019.docx)  
481 and e-mailed to: [data.access@ndph.ox.ac.uk](mailto:data.access@ndph.ox.ac.uk)

482

### 483 **Acknowledgements**

484 Above all, we would like to thank the patients who participated in this trial. We would also  
485 like to thank the many doctors, nurses, pharmacists, other allied health professionals, and  
486 research administrators at NHS hospital organisations across the whole of the UK,

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

487 supported by staff at the National Institute of Health and Care Research (NIHR) Clinical  
488 Research Network, NHS DigiTrials, UK Health Security Agency, Department of Health &  
489 Social Care, the Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre, Public Health  
490 Scotland, National Records Service of Scotland, the Secure Anonymised Information  
491 Linkage (SAIL) at University of Swansea, and the NHS in England, Scotland, Wales and  
492 Northern Ireland.

493 The RECOVERY trial was supported by grants to the University of Oxford from UK  
494 Research and Innovation (UKRI) and NIHR (MC\_PC\_19056), and by core funding  
495 provided by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, the Wellcome Trust, the Bill  
496 and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office,  
497 Health Data Research UK, the Medical Research Council, the NIHR Health Protection  
498 Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, and NIHR Clinical Trials Unit Support Funding.  
499 TJ is supported by grants from the UK Medical Research Council (MC\_UU\_0002/14 and  
500 MC\_UU\_00040/03). WSL is supported by core funding provided by NIHR Nottingham  
501 Biomedical Research Centre. JU is supported by a UK Medical Research Council grant  
502 (MR/T023791/1).

503 The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those  
504 of the NHS, the NIHR, or the UK Department of Health and Social Care.

505



## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 506 References

- 507 1 Gupta A, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, Juarez E, *et al.* Effect of Sotrovimab on  
508 Hospitalization or Death Among High-risk Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A  
509 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2022; **327**: 1236–46.
- 510 2 Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, *et al.* REGEN-COV Antibody  
511 Combination and Outcomes in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**: e81.
- 512 3 Montgomery H, Hobbs FDR, Padilla F, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of intramuscular  
513 administration of tixagevimab-cilgavimab for early outpatient treatment of COVID-19  
514 (TACKLE): a phase 3, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Respir*  
515 *Med* 2022; **10**: 985–96.
- 516 4 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Casirivimab and imdevimab in patients  
517 admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-  
518 label, platform trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2022; **399**: 665–76.
- 519 5 Somersan-Karakaya S, Mylonakis E, Menon VP, *et al.* Casirivimab and  
520 Imdevimab for the Treatment of Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. *J Infect Dis*  
521 2022; **227**: 23–34.
- 522 6 ACTIV-3–Therapeutics for Inpatients with COVID-19 (TICO) Study Group.  
523 Tixagevimab-cilgavimab for treatment of patients hospitalised with COVID-19: a  
524 randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; **10**: 972–84.
- 525 7 Iketani S, Ho DD. SARS-CoV-2 resistance to monoclonal antibodies and small-  
526 molecule drugs. *Cell Chem Biol* 2024; **31**: 632–57.
- 527 8 Cox M, Peacock TP, Harvey WT, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 variant evasion of  
528 monoclonal antibodies based on in vitro studies. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2023; **21**: 112–24.
- 529 9 Cao Y, Wang J, Jian F, *et al.* Omicron escapes the majority of existing SARS-  
530 CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies. *Nature* 2022; **602**: 657–63.
- 531 10 Park Y-J, Pinto D, Walls AC, *et al.* Imprinted antibody responses against SARS-  
532 CoV-2 Omicron sublineages. *Science* 2022; **378**: 619–27.
- 533 11 Wu MY, Carr EJ, Harvey R, *et al.* WHO’s Therapeutics and COVID-19 Living  
534 Guideline on mAbs needs to be reassessed. *The Lancet* 2022; **0**. DOI:10.1016/S0140-  
535 6736(22)01938-9.
- 536 12 Addetia A, Piccoli L, Case JB, *et al.* Neutralization, effector function and immune  
537 imprinting of Omicron variants. *Nature* 2023; **621**: 592–601.
- 538 13 Planas D, Saunders N, Maes P, *et al.* Considerable escape of SARS-CoV-2  
539 Omicron to antibody neutralization. *Nature* 2022; **602**: 671–5.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

- 540 14 ACTIV-3/TICO Bamlanivimab Study Group\*. Responses to a Neutralizing  
541 Monoclonal Antibody for Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 According to Baseline  
542 Antibody and Antigen Levels : A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2021;  
543 published online Dec 21. DOI:10.7326/M21-3507.
- 544 15 Wang H, Hogan CA, Verghese M, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Plasma  
545 Antigen for Diagnosis and Monitoring of COVID-19. *Clin Chem* 2021; : hvab216.
- 546 16 Favresse J, Bayart J-L, David C, *et al.* Serum SARS-CoV-2 Antigens for the  
547 Determination of COVID-19 Severity. *Viruses* 2022; **14**: 1653.
- 548 17 Jensen TO, Murray TA, Grandits GA, *et al.* Early trajectories of virological and  
549 immunological biomarkers and clinical outcomes in patients admitted to hospital for  
550 COVID-19: an international, prospective cohort study. *Lancet Microbe* 2024; **5**: e559–  
551 69.
- 552 18 RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Lim WS, *et al.* Dexamethasone in  
553 Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**: 693–704.
- 554 19 RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Mafham M, *et al.* Effect of  
555 Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**:  
556 2030–40.
- 557 20 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Lopinavir-ritonavir in patients admitted to  
558 hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform  
559 trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2020; **396**: 1345–52.
- 560 21 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Azithromycin in patients admitted to hospital  
561 with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial.  
562 *Lancet Lond Engl* 2021; **397**: 605–12.
- 563 22 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Convalescent plasma in patients admitted to  
564 hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised controlled, open-label, platform  
565 trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2021; **397**: 2049–59.
- 566 23 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital  
567 with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial.  
568 *Lancet Lond Engl* 2021; **397**: 1637–45.
- 569 24 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Baricitinib in patients admitted to hospital with  
570 COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial and  
571 updated meta-analysis. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2022; **400**: 359–68.
- 572 25 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Aspirin in patients admitted to hospital with  
573 COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*  
574 *Lond Engl* 2021; : S0140-6736(21)01825-0.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

- 575 26 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Colchicine in patients admitted to hospital with  
576 COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*  
577 *Respir Med* 2021; **9**: 1419–26.
- 578 27 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Higher dose corticosteroids in patients  
579 admitted to hospital with COVID-19 who are hypoxic but not requiring ventilatory  
580 support (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet Lond*  
581 *Engl* 2023; : S0140-6736(23)00510-X.
- 582 28 RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Empagliflozin in patients admitted to hospital  
583 with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial.  
584 *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2023; **11**: 905–14.
- 585 29 Constantinides B, Webster H, Gentry J, *et al*. Rapid turnaround multiplex  
586 sequencing of SARS-CoV-2: comparing tiling amplicon protocol performance. *medRxiv*  
587 2022; : 2021.12.28.21268461.
- 588 30 Tzou PL, Tao K, Pond SLK, Shafer RW. Coronavirus Resistance Database  
589 (CoV-RDB): SARS-CoV-2 susceptibility to monoclonal antibodies, convalescent plasma,  
590 and plasma from vaccinated persons. *PloS One* 2022; **17**: e0261045.
- 591 31 Rubin, D. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. John Wiley & Sons,  
592 Inc., 1987.
- 593 32 Torres Ortiz A, Fenn Torrente F, Twigg A, *et al*. The influence of time on the  
594 sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 serological testing. *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**: 10517.
- 595 33 Singson JRC, Kirley PD, Pham H, *et al*. Factors Associated with Severe  
596 Outcomes Among Immunocompromised Adults Hospitalized for COVID-19 - COVID-  
597 NET, 10 States, March 2020-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**:  
598 878–84.
- 599 34 ACTIV-3/Therapeutics for Inpatients with COVID-19 (TICO) Study Group.  
600 Efficacy and safety of two neutralising monoclonal antibody therapies, sotrovimab and  
601 BR11-196 plus BR11-198, for adults hospitalised with COVID-19 (TICO): a randomised  
602 controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2022; **22**: 622–35.
- 603 35 Focosi D, Casadevall A, Franchini M, Maggi F. Sotrovimab: A Review of Its  
604 Efficacy against SARS-CoV-2 Variants. *Viruses* 2024; **16**: 217.
- 605 36 Winiger RR, Perez L. Therapeutic antibodies and alternative formats against  
606 SARS-CoV-2. *Antiviral Res* 2024; **223**: 105820.
- 607 37 Boucau J, Chew KW, Choudhary MC, *et al*. Monoclonal antibody treatment  
608 drives rapid culture conversion in SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cell Rep Med* 2022; **3**:  
609 100678.
- 610

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

611 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics**

	High-antigen patients		All patients	
	Sotrovimab (n=355)	Usual care (n=365)	Sotrovimab (n=828)	Usual care (n=895)
Age, years	72.5 (13.3)	72.1 (13.7)	70.9 (14.2)	70.4 (15.4)
<70	123 (35%)	141 (39%)	342 (41%)	369 (41%)
≥70 to <80	123 (35%)	121 (33%)	251 (30%)	272 (30%)
≥80	109 (31%)	103 (28%)	235 (28%)	254 (28%)
Sex				
Male	218 (61%)	226 (62%)	490 (59%)	543 (61%)
Female	137 (39%)	139 (38%)	338 (41%)	352 (39%)
Ethnicity				
White	301 (85%)	333 (91%)	706 (85%)	779 (87%)
Black, Asian, and minority ethnic	32 (9%)	16 (4%)	64 (8%)	65 (7%)
Unknown	22 (6%)	16 (4%)	58 (7%)	51 (6%)
Number of days since symptom onset	6 (3-11)	6 (3-12)	6 (3-11)	6 (3-11)
Number of days since admission to hospital	2 (1-5)	2 (1-5)	2 (1-5)	2 (1-5)
Respiratory support received				
None	43 (12%)	54 (15%)	119 (14%)	137 (15%)
Simple oxygen	226 (64%)	213 (58%)	512 (62%)	557 (62%)
Non-invasive ventilation	71 (20%)	87 (24%)	168 (20%)	169 (19%)
Invasive mechanical ventilation	15 (4%)	11 (3%)	29 (4%)	32 (4%)
Previous diseases				
Diabetes	107 (30%)	84 (23%)	249 (30%)	219 (24%)
Heart disease	119 (34%)	113 (31%)	259 (31%)	272 (30%)
Chronic lung disease	123 (35%)	128 (35%)	327 (39%)	325 (36%)
Tuberculosis	0 (0%)	1 (<0.5%)	2 (<0.5%)	4 (<0.5%)
HIV	3 (1%)	1 (<0.5%)	6 (1%)	5 (1%)
Severe liver disease *	6 (2%)	3 (1%)	19 (2%)	16 (2%)
Severe kidney impairment †	45 (13%)	41 (11%)	84 (10%)	74 (8%)
Any of the above	242 (68%)	237 (65%)	578 (70%)	602 (67%)
Severely immunocompromised ‡	112 (32%)	112 (31%)	206 (25%)	208 (23%)
Received a COVID-19 vaccine	296 (83%)	292 (80%)	675 (82%)	714 (80%)
Use of other treatments				
Corticosteroids §	329 (93%)	334 (92%)	755 (91%)	801 (89%)
Remdesivir	144 (41%)	128 (35%)	315 (38%)	313 (35%)
Tocilizumab	66 (19%)	60 (16%)	144 (17%)	137 (15%)
Plan to use tocilizumab within the next 24 hours	28 (8%)	33 (9%)	48 (6%)	67 (7%)
Viral load in baseline nose swab				
Median level (log viral copies per ml)	6.1 (4.6-7.0)	6.1 (5.0-7.2)	5.6 (3.7-6.7)	5.6 (3.9-6.8)
Antigen status				
High	355 (100%)	365 (100%)	355 (43%)	365 (41%)
Low	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	339 (41%)	378 (42%)
Unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	134 (16%)	152 (17%)
Serostatus (anti N)				
Positive	62 (17%)	76 (21%)	214 (26%)	240 (27%)
Negative	293 (83%)	289 (79%)	481 (58%)	504 (56%)
Unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	133 (16%)	151 (17%)
Serostatus (anti S)				
Positive	252 (71%)	262 (72%)	569 (69%)	610 (68%)
Negative	103 (29%)	103 (28%)	126 (15%)	133 (15%)
Unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	133 (16%)	152 (17%)

Data are mean (SD), n (%), or median (IQR). 4 pregnant women were randomised. \* Defined as requiring ongoing specialist care. † Defined as estimated glomerular filtration rate <30 mL/min per 1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. ‡ In the opinion of the managing clinician. § Including all those randomised into the comparison of high vs low dose steroids.

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

613 **Table 2: Effect of allocation to sotrovimab on key study outcomes in patients with**  
 614 **among high-antigen levels**

	Sotrovimab (n=355)	Usual care (n=365)	RR (95% CI) or mean difference	p-value
<b>Primary outcome</b>				
28-day mortality	82 (23%)	106 (29%)	0.75 (0.56-0.99)	0.046
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>				
Median (IQR) time to being discharged alive, days	13 (7 to >28)	16 (7 to >28)		
Discharged from hospital within 28 days	236 (66%)	226 (62%)	1.12 (0.93-1.34)	
Receipt of invasive mechanical ventilation or death*	82/340 (24%)	102/354 (29%)	0.82 (0.64-1.03)	
Invasive mechanical ventilation	14/340 (4%)	11/354 (3%)	1.71 (0.81-3.61)	
Death	74/340 (22%)	100/354 (28%)	0.74 (0.58-0.95)	
<b>Subsidiary clinical outcomes</b>				
Use of ventilation†	41/269 (15%)	41/267 (15%)	0.97 (0.66-1.44)	
Non-invasive ventilation	40/269 (15%)	41/267 (15%)	0.95 (0.64-1.41)	
Invasive mechanical ventilation	6/269 (2%)	3/267 (1%)	1.82 (0.47-7.11)	
Successful cessation of invasive mechanical ventilation ‡	5/15 (33%)	3/11 (27%)	1.07 (0.25-4.65)	
Use of haemodialysis or haemofiltration §	12/347 (3%)	6/356 (2%)	1.97 (0.77-5.06)	
<b>Virological outcomes</b>				
Baseline-adjusted viral load (log copies/ml) on day 3	4.89 (0.10)	4.94 (0.10)	-0.05 (-0.32, 0.23)	
Baseline-adjusted viral load (log copies/ml) on day 5	4.26 (0.11)	4.35 (0.10)	-0.09 (-0.38, 0.20)	

Data are n (%) or n/N (%), unless otherwise indicated. RR=rate ratio for the outcomes of 28-day mortality and hospital discharge, risk ratio for other clinical outcomes, and mean difference for virological outcomes. CI=confidence interval. Estimates of the RR or mean difference and their 95% CIs are adjusted for age in three categories (<70 years, 70-79 years, and 80 years or older) and ventilation status at randomisation in four categories (none, simple oxygen, non-invasive ventilation, and invasive mechanical ventilation). P-values are not shown for the secondary, subsidiary or virological outcomes because the hierarchical testing strategy pre-specified in the statistical analysis plan stated that such tests would only be performed if null hypothesis for the primary outcome of 28-day mortality was rejected in both the antigen positive subgroup *and* in the whole population \* Excluding patients receiving invasive mechanical ventilation at randomisation. † Excluding patients receiving invasive or non-invasive ventilation at randomisation. ‡ Excluding patients not receiving invasive mechanical ventilation at randomisation. § Excluding patients receiving renal replacement therapy at randomisation.

615

## Sotrovimab for COVID-19

### 616 **Figure 1: Trial profile**

617 ITT=intention to treat. Drug unavailability and unsuitability are not mutually exclusive.

618 \*Number recruited overall at all sites participating in the sotrovimab comparison during  
619 period that this comparison was open.

### 620 **Figure 2: Effect of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day mortality in (a) high-antigen** 621 **versus low-antigen patients, and (b) all patients**

### 622 **Figure 3: Primary and secondary outcomes, overall and by baseline antigen**

623 **status.** Subgroup-specific RR estimates are represented by squares (with areas of the  
624 squares proportional to the amount of statistical information) and the lines through them  
625 correspond to the 95% CIs. Open squares represent participants with unknown status,  
626 solid squares represent participants with known status. The tests for heterogeneity  
627 compare the log RRs in high-antigen versus low-antigen patients (i.e. excluding those  
628 with unknown antigen status). All participants are included in the overall summary  
629 diamonds. RR=risk ratio for the composite outcome of invasive mechanical ventilation  
630 or death, and rate ratio for the other outcomes.


### 631 **Figure 4: Effect of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day mortality by baseline**

632 **characteristics in high-antigen participants.** Subgroup-specific rate ratio estimates  
633 are represented by squares (with areas of the squares proportional to the amount of  
634 statistical information) and the lines through them correspond to the 95% CIs. The  
635 ethnicity, days since onset and use of corticosteroids subgroups exclude those with  
636 missing data, but these patients are included in the overall summary diamond.

637


# Figure 1: Trial profile

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.01.24.25321081>; this version posted January 27, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).






**Figure 2: Effect of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day mortality in:**  
**a) participants with high vs low antigen levels; and b) all participants**





**Figure 3: Primary and secondary outcomes, overall and by baseline antigen status**



**Figure 4: Effect of allocation to sotrovimab on 28-day mortality in participants with high antigen levels, by other baseline characteristics**

