Clinical Efficacy of Intravenous Immunoglobulin Therapy in Critical Patients with COVID-19: A multicenter retrospective cohort study

Ziyun Shao[1†], Yongwen Feng[2,3†], Li Zhong[4†], Qifeng Xie[5†], Ming Lei[6†], Zheying Liu[5], Conglin Wang[5], Jingjing Ji[5], Weichao Li[7], Huiheng, Liu[8], Zhengtao Gu[9], Zhongwei Hu[6*], Lei Su[5*], Ming Wu[2*], Zhifeng Liu[5,10*]

[1]Department of Nephrology, General Hospital of Central Theater Command of PLA, Wuhan, 430070, China.

[2]Department of Critical Care Medicine and Infection Prevention and Control, The Second People's Hospital of Shenzhen & First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Health Science Center, Shenzhen, 518035, China.

[3]Department of Critical Care Medicine, The Third People's Hospital of Shenzhen, Shenzhen, 518035, China.

[4]Department of Critical Care Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital, Guizhou University of Chinese Medicine, Guiyang, 550001, China.

[5]Department of Critical Care Medicine, General Hospital of Southern Theater Command of PLA, Guangzhou, 510010, China.

[6]Department of Nephrology, Guangzhou Eighth people's hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou,510060, China

[7]Department of Critical Medicine, Sun Yat-Sen memorial hospital, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510120, China.

[8]Department of Emergency, Zhongshan Hospital of Xiamen University, Xiamen, 361000, China.

[9]Department of Treatment Center For Traumatic Injuries, The Third Affiliated Hospital, Southern Medical University, Academy of Orthopedics Guangdong Province, Guangzhou, Guangdong, 515630, China

[10]Key Laboratory of Hot Zone Trauma Care and Tissue Repair of PLA, General Hospital of Southern Theater Command of PLA, Guangzhou, 510010, China.

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Dr. Zhifeng Liu

Department of Critical Care Medicine, General Hospital of Southern Theatre Command of PLA, Guangzhou, 510010, China. Fax: (86)20-3665-5909. Tel: (86)20-3665-3483; E-mail: Zhifengliu7797@163.com

Dr. Ming Wu

Department of Critical Care Medicine and Infection Prevention and Control, The Second People's Hospital of Shenzhen & First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Health Science Center, Shenzhen, 518035, China. Tel: (86)0755-8367-6149, E-mail: boshiyy@126.com

Prof. Lei Su

Department of Critical Care Medicine, General Hospital of Southern Theatre Command of PLA, Guangzhou, 510010. E-mail: slei_icu@163.com

Prof. Zhongwei Hu,

Department of Nephrology, Guangzhou Eighth people's hospital, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, 510060, China. E-mail: gz8hhzw@126.com

Running head: Efficacy of Intravenous Immunoglobulin Therapy in COVID-19

Declarations

- **Ethics approval and consent to participate**
- The study was approved by the Research Ethics Commission of General Hospital of Southern Theater Command of PLA and the requirement for informed consent was waived by the Ethics Commission.
- **Consent for publication**

  All authors reviewed the manuscript and approved the publication.
- **Availability of data and materials**

  The data sets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- **Funding**
- This work was supported by grants from the PLA Logistics Research Project of China [18CXZ030, CWH17L020, 17CXZ008], Sanming Project of Medicine in Shenzhen (SZSM20162011) and Clinical Research Project of Health and Family Planning Commission of Shenzhen Municipality (SZLY2017007).

Summary

Background Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has spread all over the world, causing more than 1.5 million infections and over ten thousands of deaths in a short period of time. However, little is known about its pathological mechanism, and there are still no clinical study reports on specific treatment. The purpose of this study is to determine the clinical efficacy of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) therapy on COVID-19.

Methods In this multicenter retrospective cohort study, adult critical COVID-19 patients (including severe type and critical type, according to the clinical classification defined by National Health Commission of China) in 8 government designated treatment center in China from Dec 23, 2019 to Mar 31, 2020 were enrolled. Demographic, clinical, treatment, and laboratory data, prognosis were extracted from electronic medical records, and IVIG was exposure factor. Primary outcomes were the 28 days and 60 days mortality, and secondary outcomes were the total length of in-hospital and the total duration of the disease. Meanwhile, the parameters of inflammation response and organ function were detected. The risk factors were determined by COX proportional hazards model. The subgroup analysis was carried out according to clinical classification of COVID-19, IVIG dosage and timing.

Findings 325patients were included in this study, of whom 222 (68%) were severe type, 103 (32%) were critical type. 42 (13%) died in 28 days within hospitalization, total 54 (17%) died in 60 days, and 6 (3%) died in severe type, 48 (47%) died in critical type. 174 cases were used IVIG, and 151 cases were not. Compared with the baseline characteristics between two groups, the results showed that the patients in IVIG group had higher Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHII) score, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, IL-6 and lactate level, lower lymphocyte count and oxygenation index (all $P<0.05$). The 28 day and 60 day mortality did not improve with IVIG in overall patients. The in-hospital stay and the total duration of disease were longer in IVIG group ($p<0.001$). Risk factors were clinical classification (hazards ratio 0.126, 95% confidence interval 0.039-0.413, $P=0.001$), and using IVIG (hazards ratio 0.252, 95% confidence interval 0.107-0.591, $P=0.002$) with COX regression. Subgroup analysis showed that only in patients with critical type, IVIG could significantly reduce the 28 day mortality, decrease the inflammatory response and improve some organ functions (all $p<0.05$), and 60-day mortality reduced significantly by using IVIG in the early stage (admission≤7 days) and with high dose (>15 g/d).

Interpretation Early and high dose of IVIG therapy may improve the prognosis of COVID-19 patients only in critical type, which provides the clinical basis for the choice of treatment population and method of IVIG therapy for the SARS-CoV-2 infection.
Keywords: SARS-COV-2, COVID-19, IVIG, clinical efficacy, mortality

Introduction

Coronavirus disease-2019(COVID-19) is a systemic infectious disease mainly caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), while critical COVID-19 is a life-threatening multi-organ dysfunction caused by dysregulated host response to SARS-CoV-2 and characterized refractory hypoxemia by acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)[1]. From Dec, 2019 to Apr, 2020, more than 80,000 people have been infected and more than 3,000 people have died in China, more than 1.5 million people infected and nearly 100,000 people died in the world, including a large number of health workers, which has become the most serious problem faced by all medical staff and researchers [2, 3]. According to the reports, the general mortality was about 1%-15% in all COVID-19 cases, and the incidence of critical COVID-19 (including severe and critical type defined by National Health Commission of China. Chinese recommendations for diagnosis and treatment of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV2) infection, Trial 7th version) is about 10%-20%, whereas its mortality was about 30%-60% [4, 5].

At present, it is believed that SARS-CoV-2 is primarily the pulmonary infection, which can cause systemic inflammation and immune response disorder, and then lead to multiple organ damage or even to death [6]. However, little is known for the pathogenesis and clinical features of SARS-CoV-2, and no effective therapeutic method was reported until to now.

The available clinical treatment strategies to critical COVID-19 are mainly antiviral and oxygen therapy, as well as organ and symptomatic support, including mechanical ventilation, even extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) of cardiopulmonary support, continuous renal replacement therapies (CRRT) and so on [7], but their clinical efficacy is still uncertain. Some clinical tests and autopsy results suggested that the inflammation and immune response caused by virus infection is the key factor to the progress of disease and even the poor prognosis, but the detail process is still unclear [8,9]. Targeted intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) is one of the main treatment measures [4, 7]. However, due to the lack of clinical trials, the efficacy is difficult to determine, and the controversy is great in clinical.

Human Immunoglobulin (pH4) for Intravenous Injection is a liquid preparation containing human immunoglobulins made from normal human plasma, containing IgG antibody with broad-spectrum antiviral, bacterial or other pathogens, can rapidly increase the level of IgG in the blood, and then direct neutralize exogenous antigens and regulate multiple immune functions including regulating immune media, improving the immune capacity of natural immune cells and

lymphocytes, which has been wildly used in the treatment of severe bacterial, viral infection and sepsis [10, 11]. Some high-quality studies have also confirmed its exact clinical efficacy, especially in the use of viral infectious diseases [12], but there are also many studies that believe the treatment effect is not accurate, leading to great controversy with acute respiratory virus infection in clinical [13]. According to the latest therapeutic guidelines of COVID-19 in China, IVIG is also recommended as a selective treatment method, but the use of evidence is not clear, and because of the lack of specific antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, its use has also been questioned, while the latest guidance of WHO is not recommended to use IVIG [4,7,14,15].

In order to confirm the possible therapeutic efficacy of IVIG in COVID-19, we retrospective collected the clinical and outcome data of critical (including severe type and critical type) COVID-19 patients in 8 government designated treatment center from three cities (Wuhan, Guangzhou and Shenzhen) in China, and using IVIG as an exposure factor, then analyzed the symptoms and outcomes. It is the first clinical multicenter cohort study of IVIG treatment for covid-19 with the largest number of critical ill patients so far, and it provides evidence for clinical treatment selection.

Methods

Study design and participants

This multicenter retrospective cohort study was designed by the investigators and performed at eight municipal government designated treatment center for COVID-19 patients (4 ICU and 4 general wards) from 3 cities in China, including Wuhan, Guangzhou and Shenzhen, between Dec, 2019 and Mar, 2020. The data cutoff for the study was April 3, 2020.

Inclusion Criteria: (1) Adult aged >=18years old; (2) Laboratory (RT-PCR) confirmed SARS-COV-2 infection in throat swab and/or sputum and/or lower respiratory tract samples; or conformed plasma positive of specific antibody (IgM or and IgG) against SARS-COV-2; (3) In-hospital treatment ≥72 hours; (4) Meet any of the following criteria for severe type (a-c) or critical type (d-f): (a) Respiratory rate >=30/min; or (b) Rest SPO2<=90%; or (c) PaO2/FiO2<=300 mmHg; or (d) Respiratory failure and needs mechanical ventilation; or (e) Shock occurs; or (f) Multiple organ failure and needs ICU monitoring;

Exclusion Criteria: (1) Exist of other evidences that can explain pneumonia including but not limited to influenza A virus, influenza B virus, bacterial pneumonia, fungal pneumonia,

noninfectious causes, etc.; (2) Women who are pregnant or breast-feeding; (3) Researchers consider unsuitable.

Procedures

We designed the data collection form, which includes the demographic, clinical, treatment, laboratory data and prognosis were extracted from electronic medical records. Detail clinical data before and after prescription IVIG, and the data at the corresponding time of the same period in non-IVIG group were collected, respectively. Whether and when to use IVIG, dosage and course were decided by the doctor in charge. Comparison was conducted according to whether IVIG was used or not. Primary endpoint was 28-day, 60-day in hospital mortality, and total in-hospital days and the total duration of the disease as the secondary endpoint. Meanwhile, the parameters of inflammation and organ function were detected. The influencing factors were determined by COX regression. Analysis of the outcome and the survival curves were carried out according to clinical classification of COVID-19, IVIG dosage and use timing. The study was approved by the Research Ethics Commission of General Hospital of Southern Theater Command of PLA (HE-2020-08) and the requirement for informed consent was waived by the Ethics Commission.

Definitions

"Critical COVID-19" in this ariticle is difined as combined term of "Severe type" and "Critical type" of COVID-19, classficated by National Health Commission of China, Chinese recommendations for diagnosis and treatment of novel coronavirus (SARSCoV2) infection, Trial 7th version.

IVIG represents the human Immunoglobulin (pH4) for Intravenous Injection, which is a liquid preparation containing human immunoglobulins made from normal human plasma, containing IgG antibody with broad-spectrum antiviral, bacterial or other pathogens, can rapidly increase the level of IgG in the blood of the recipient after intravenous infusion, and enhance the anti-infection ability and immune regulation function of the body.

Statistical Analysis

The categorical data were summarized as numbers and percentages, and inter-group comparisons were performed using Mann-Whitney U, $\chi 2$ tests or Fisher's exact test. Continuous variables were expressed as the arithmetic mean and standard deviation (SD) or as the median and interquartile range, depending on whether or not they showed a gaussian distribution.

Continuous data with gaussian distribution were compared with the Student's t test or one-way ANOVA and those with a non-gaussian distribution, with the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. To compare the white blood cell, lymphocytes, neutrophils and monocyte count between IGIV and non-IGIV groups. To determine the independent effect of 60 day mortality in critical COVID-19 patients after accounting for significant confounders, COX proportional hazards model was used with fully adjusted model: OR (odds ratio) and 95% confidence interval levels (95% CI). Moreover, for analysis of the 28 day and 60 day mortality, Kaplan-Meier Survival Curves and the Log-Rank Test were used. Statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS Windows version 11.0 statistical package (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL), p values (two-tailed) below 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Role of the funding source

The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Demographics and baseline characteristics

Clinical data of 338 patients were collected with confirmed critical COVID-19. After excluding 13 patients due to missing key information, 325 patients were included in the final analysis (Figure 1). The detailed demographic and clinical profile data of all critical ill patients with COVID-19 on baseline were summarized in Table 1. Patient's mean age was 58 ys (IQR 46.0-69.0), mean body temperature was 37.0 ℃ (IQR 36.5-37.8). Nearly half of the patients had comorbidity, mainly diabetes (38%), coronary heart disease (31%) and hypertension (30%). 222 (68%) were severe type, 103 (32%) were critical type. 174 cases used IVIG, and 151 cases were not. Comparisons of baseline characteristics between two group showed that the disease was more serious in IVIG group, indicated with higher levels of age, APACHII scores, SOFA scores, total bilirubin, direct bilirubin, creatinine, c-reactive protein, IL-6 and lactate, but lower platelets and lymphocyte count (all $p<0.05$), and decreased $Pa0_2/FiO_2$ ($p=0.011$, table 1).

Primary and secondary outcomes in all patients

Analysis of primary and secondary outcomes in all patients showed that 42 (13%) died in 28-day of hospitalization, total 54 (17%) died in 60-day, and 6 (3%) died in severe type, 48 (47%)

died in critical type. In IVIG group 22 (13%) died within 28-day, total 33 (19%) died in 60-day. In non-IVIG group 20 (13%) died within 28-day, total 21 (14%) died in 60-day. There was no significant difference in 28-day and 60-day mortality between the IVIG group and non-IVIG group (p =0.872 and p=0.222, respectively), and no significant difference in survival time (P= 0.225, table 2, supplementary Figure1). Analysis of secondary outcomes in all patients showed that the median time of in hospital stay was 20.0 days (IQR 14.0-28.0), and the total course of disease was 28.0 days (19.0-37.0). Compared between the two groups, the in hospital day and total duration of disease were longer in IVIG group (both p< 0.001, table 2), and the number of lymphocytes was still lower (P< 0.001), CRP was still higher (P= 0.011, supplementary table 1), which is consistent with the more serious initial condition of IVIG group.

Risk factors analysis for 60 day in-hospital mortality

In order to correct the bias of the difference between the two groups' basic conditions on the prognosis, multivariable COX regression analysis was performed with gender, age, comorbidity, APACHE II score, SOFA score, temperature, white blood cell count, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, fibrinogen, creatinine, $Pa0_2/FiO_2$, Latic acid, clinical classification of COVID-19, IVIG use, which may affect the outcome. It was found that the lower in lymphocyte count and more serious COVID-19 classification were associated with an increase in 60-day mortality, while IVIG use was significantly associated with the decreased 60-day mortality (HR 0.252; 95% CI 0.107-0.591; P=0.002, Table 3).

Primary and secondary outcomes in subgroups

According to the results of multivariate analysis, deep analysis was carried out in different subgroups. The results showed that IVIG could significantly decrease the 28-day mortality of patients in critical type (P=0.009), but had no effects on the 60-day mortality and in-hospital stay (both p>0.05, table 4). In addition, IVIG also can significantly decrease the procalcitonin(PCT) and lac levels of critical type patients (P < 0.05, supplementary table 2), suggesting that IVIG can decrease the inflammatory response and probably improve microcirculatory perfusion. However, in the patients of severe type, there was no difference in mortality between IVIG group and non IVIG group (p> 0.05), and the length of in-hospital stay in IVIG group was still long (Table 4), which was consistent with the more serious initial condition. Moreover, There was no difference in the 60 day survival rate between the two groups （supplementary Figure2, 3）。

Further subgroups were analyzed with APACHII score (> 11 and ≦11), PaO_2 / FiO_2 (> 100 and ≦100), lymphocyte count (≦0.8×10^9/L and >0.8×10^9/L), and SOFA score (≦6 and > 6), and the results showed that there were no differences in 28-day, 60-day mortality between IVIG and non IVIG groups (supplementary Table 3). In the comparison of parameters of inflammation response and organ function, IVIG can significantly decrease PCT level and improve $Pa0_2/FiO_2$ (both $p< 0.05$, supplementary Table 4) in patients with APACHII score >11 or lymphocyte count ≤0.8×10^9/L.

To further confirm the effects of dose of IVIG on the outcomes of COVID-19 patients, subgroup with different doses of IVIG (>15 g/d and ≤15 g/d) were compared, and we found that high dose IVIG (>15 g/d) could significantly reduce 28-day and 60-day mortality (p= 0.044, 0.049, respectively, table 5), and increase survival time (p= 0.045, supplementary figure 4) than that with≤ 15 g/d IVIG treatment. Deeply comparison between the subgroups with different COVID-19 types, the results showed that high dose IVIG of more than 15 g/d could significantly reduce the 28-day and 60-day mortality of patients in critical type ($p = 0.002$, $P < 0.0001$, perspective, table 6), and increase the survival time ($P < 0.0001$, supplementary Figure 5). But for patients in severe type, no therapeutic effect was observed whatever the different doses of IVIG (Table 6, supplementary Figure 6). By comparing the effects of different doses on the parameters of inflammatory response and organ functions, the results showed that high doses of IVIG (＞15g/d) could significantly decrease the lactic level and increase $Pa0_2/FiO_2$ (both $p < 0.05$, supplementary table 5), especially in patients of critical type (supplementary table 6).

To further confirm the effects of timing of IVIG treatment on the outcomes of COVID-19 patients, subgroup with the time from admission to the beginning of IVIG treatment (> 7 d and ≤ 7 d admission) were compared, and it was found that early using IVIG (≤ 7d) could significantly reduce 60-day mortality ($p = 0.008$, table 7), total in-hospital stay and total course of disease (p= 0.025, 0.005, respectively), and significantly increase survival time (supplementary figure 7). Further analysis showed that early using IVIG could also significantly decrease PCT level ($p = 0.016$) and increase pa02 / FiO2 (P= 0.022), and IL-6 and CRP also decreased (supplementary table 7), suggesting that early using IVIG could improve inflammatory response and some organ functions.

Discussion

The pandemic outbreak of COVID-19 is rapidly spreading all over the world, resulting in over one hundred thousand global death due to no any well-established treatment. To our knowledge, present study, a multicenter retrospective cohort study, is the first clinical research on the efficiency of IVIG treatment on critical COVID-19 patients and with the largest number of cases. Patients received IVIG were in more severe condition. However, for the critical COVID-19 patients, the results showed that IVIG has no effect on the 28-day mortality and 60-day mortality. Notably, multivariable regression showed that both classification of COVID-19 and IVIG using were the factors which related with hazards ratios of death. Subgroup analysis showed that only in patients with critical type, IVIG could significantly reduce the 28-day mortality rate and prolong the survival time, decrease the inflammatory response and improve some organ functions (all $P< 0.05$), and IVIG had a more significantly curative effect by using IVIG in the early stage (admission≤ 7 days) and with high dose (>15 g/d). These findings indicated that early and high dose of IVIG therapy may improve the prognosis of COVID-19 patients only in critical type, which provide the clinical basis for the choice of treatment population and method of IVIG therapy for the SARS-CoV-2 infection.

It is still controversial about the usage of immunoglobulin, but also when and how to use. According to the pharmacological effect, immunoglobulin pulse therapy, based on high dose immunoglobulin intravenous injection, could form immunocomplex with infectious antigen and further clear the immunocomplex in circulation. In addition, immunoglobulin showed antiviral and anti-inflammatory effect by increasing some cytokines secretion, such as IL-2, promoting T cell and B cell proliferation and differentiation. Therefore, immunoglobulin has been widely used in virus infectious diseases and autoimmune disease treatment, especially in viral pneumonia [12,13]. Previous studies in SARS and MERS therapy also suggested that high dose immunoglobulin could be beneficial [16,17]. Since immunoglobulin was not the specific antibody to any virus and its clinical evidence was limited, some researchers held the oppose view about immunoglobulin effect on acute virus infection [18,19]. In both China and WHO COVID-19 treatment guidance, the recommendation on immunoglobulin usage was optional. Similar with previous results, our data showed that IVIG did not improve the outcome when all critical COVID-19 patients were enrolled. However, multivariable regression and subgroup analysis showed that IVIG only could improve the prognosis in the critical type patients. One

explanation was that mild cases with lower organ injury and mortality, which is similar with previous study.

The recommendation dose of immunoglobulin is 0.5 g/kg·d for 5 days. However, in present study, the doses differed between each centers and physicians, ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 g/kg·d. The treatment time ranged from 5 to 10 days, and it could be over 15 days in some critical cases. We collected total dose in one day for analysis. Due to the limitation of knowledge and drug unit, the usage of immunoglobulin was not in strict according with the body weight. These issues not only suggested that usage of immunoglobulin was ill-formed, but also indicated that different dose might be another factor on the drug efficiency. By subgroup analysis, we found that only the dose over 15 g/d (about 0.2-0.3g/kg) could show the efficiency, consisting with previous study, in which believed that immunoglobulin has no effect until the dose over 1.5-2g/kg.d [20]. Generally, only high dose treatment could increase the immunoglobulin concentration by 3 to 6 times in rapidly and showed the antiviral and immune enhancement function. Our results suggested that the dose of immunoglobulin should be over 15 g/d (>~0.3g/kg.d), providing a reference for the clinical treatment in COVID-19 infection.

For the timing of immunoglobulin treatment, it is considered that it should be employed in early stage. Immunoglobulin affected the natural immune system and adapted immune system, and could bind to the antigen directly, which occurred in the virus infection early stage [21,22, 23]. In addition, according to the knowledge of COVID-19 pathogenesis, in late stage, the organ dysfunction and poor prognosis was blamed to the excessive inflammatory response and vicious circle [8,9], in which the targeting of immunoglobulin was lacked. Our data showed that immunoglobulin employed within 7 days could improve the prognosis.

In this multicenter retrospective study, we found that patients in IVIG group were in more severe condition, evidenced by higher APACHE II score, SOFA score, IL-6 and lactate concentration, and decreased lymphocyte count and oxygenation index. This may due to the unknown factor of COVID-19, including the limited knowledge of pathogenesis, organ dysfunction discipline and risk factors. Though lots of treatment protocol based on the cognition of SARS and MERS, researchers still found that COVID-19 showed some exceptionality, such as prolonged course of disease, potential asymptomatic hypoxia, severe lung injury, unexpected progress induced death [4,5,24]. These unfamiliar performance lead to lots of treatment became exploratory attempts. When it becomes more severe, more attempts were employed, and

immunoglobulin was one of them. Indeed, this might lead to the bias. To clarify the influence of the bias, we took the regression analysis on the potential factors. Univariate survival analysis showed that APACHE II and SOFA sore were the risk factor which related with the outcome. In further analysis, we found APACHE II and SOFA score were relatively low in most our enrolled patients. This is consisted with the characteristic of this disease, that is, only severe lung injury, with few other organ damage. COX regression confirmed that critical type in COVID-19 patients showed poor prognosis and IVIG rescued these patients. Though IVIG has no effect on the whole patients, it could be beneficial to the critical type patients. In addition, COX regression also founded that lymphopenia was the risk of poor prognosis. Previous study reported that 35%-83% COVID-19 patients showed lymphocyte count decreased, and persistent lymphopenia was related with the poor outcome [25], consist with our results. However, subgroup analysis according to the lymphocyte counts did not show that IVIG could improve the patient outcome. The explanation was not clear, potentially due to the limited cases or the unknown function of lymphocyte in this disease, and further researches are needed.

There are some limitations in present study. Firstly, cases in these four clinical centers may not with enough representativeness. Secondly, the dose and timing inconformity in each center was another limitation of present study. Thirdly, the evaluation of immunoglobulin effect was limited, especially the direct evaluation index, such as viral load, lymphocyte activation etc. With the developing recognition of COVID-19, large cases randomized control studies and more developed evaluation systems are needed to confirm the efficiency of IVIG on COVID-19 treatment.

In conclusion, present was the first clinical research on the efficiency of IVIG treatment on critical COVID-19 patients. We found that early and high dose of IVIG therapy may improve the prognosis of COVID-19 patients with critical type. These findings provide the clinical basis for the choice of treatment population and method of IVIG therapy for the COVID-19 infection and help to increase effective of treatment in this spreading disease.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. New Engl J Med 2020; 382:727-733.

2. Real-time updates: national outbreak map of new coronary virus pneumonia. Available at website: https://ncov.dxy.cn/ncovh5/view/pneumonia?from=dxmmmp. Accessed 10 Apr, 2020.
3. Ran L, Chen X, Wang Y, Wu W, Zhang L, Tan X. Risk Factors of Healthcare Workers with Corona Virus Disease 2019: A Retrospective Cohort Study in a Designated Hospital of Wuhan in China. Clin Infect Dis 2020; 17:ciaa287. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa287. Online ahead of print.
4. National Health Commission of the People`s Republic of China. Chinese recommendations for diagnosis and treatment of novel coronavirus (SARSCoV2) infection (Trial 7th version). Accessed on 3 March 2020.
5. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet. 2020; 395(10229):1054-1062. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3. Epub 2020 Mar 11.
6. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 2020; 395:497-506.
7. Alhazzani W, Møller MH, Arabi YM, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: Guidelines on the Management of Critically Ill Adults with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Crit Care Med 2020 Mar 27. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000004363. Online ahead of print.
8. Lin L, Lu L, Cao W, Li T. Hypothesis for potential pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2 infection-a review of immune changes in patients with viral pneumonia. Emerg Microbes Infect 2020; 9(1):727-732.
9. Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, Sanchez E, Tattersall RS, Manson JJ. COVID-19: consider cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. Lancet 2020; 395(10229):1033-1034.
10. Galeotti C, Kaveri SV, Bayry J. IVIG-mediated effector functions in autoimmune and inflammatory diseases. Int Immunol 2017; 29:491-498.
11. Hartung HP. Advances in the understanding of the mechanism of action of IVIg. J Neurol 2008; 255(Suppl 3):3-6.
12. Sima F. analysis of the therapeutic effect of high dose immunoglobulin impact therapy on adult patients with acute severe viral pneumonia. Drug clin 2019;16(5): 34-36

13. S T Lai. Treatment of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 2005; 24 (9): 583-591
14. World Health Organization. Global Surveillance for human infection with coronavirus disease (COVID-19) , WHO/2019-nCoV/SurveillanceGuidance/2020.6, Mar 13, 2020. Access from website: https://www.who.int/publications-detail/global-surveillance-for-human-infection-with-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)
15. Cao W, Liu X, Bai T, et al. High-Dose Intravenous Immunoglobulin as a Therapeutic Option for Deteriorating Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2020;7(3):ofaa102. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofaa102.
16. Wang JT, Sheng WH, Fang CT, et al. Clinical manifestations, laboratory findings, and treatment outcomes of SARS patients. Emerg Infect Dis 2004; 10:818-824.
17. Arabi YM, Arifi AA, Balkhy HH, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection. Ann Intern Med 2014; 160:389-397.
18. Khanna N, Widmer AF, Decker M, et al. Respiratory syncytial virus infection in patients with hematological diseases: single-center study and review of the literature. Clin Infect Dis 2008; 46:402-12.
19. Linnér A, Darenberg J, Sjölin J, Henriques-Normark B, Norrby-Teglund A. Clinical efficacy of polyspecific intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in patients with streptococcal toxic shock syndrome: a comparative observational study. Clin Infect Dis 2014; 59(6):851-857.
20. Yang Y, Yu X, Zhang F, Xia Y. Evaluation of the Effect of Intravenous Immunoglobulin Dosing on Mortality in Patients with Sepsis: A Network Meta-analysis. Clin Ther. 2019 Sep;41(9):1823-1838
21. Clarivate analytics. Current status of research on coronavirus. Chin Biotech 2020;40(1):1-20
22. Wan Y, Shang J, Sun S, et al. Molecular Mechanism for Antibody-Dependent Enhancement of Coronavirus Entry. J Virol. 2020; 94(5):e02015-19.
23. Wan Y, Shang J, Graham R, Baric RS, Li F. Receptor recognition by novel coronavirus from Wuhan: an analysis based on decade-long structural studies of SARS. J Virol 2020； in press.
24. Xu Z, Shi L, Wang Y, et al. Pathological findings of COVID-19 associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome. Lancet Respir Med 2020; 8(4):420-422.

25. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med. 2020 Feb 28:NEJMoa2002032. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032. Online ahead of print

Conflict of Interest Statements

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Acknowledgements

We thank Prof. Jie Fan (Center for Biosecurity, University of Pittsburgh, USA) for revising the english writing of this MS.

Contributors

All authors had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. LZ, WM, SL, FY and HZ were responsible for study concept and design. SZ, WM, XQ, LW, LH, GZ, LZ, LZY ZL and WC were responsible for collecting the data. WM, LZ, LZY ZL and WC were responsible for statistical analysis. LZ, WM, JJ and ZJ were responsible for drafting the manuscript.

	Total(N=325)	IVIG(N=174)	Non-IVIG(N=151)	P value
Demographics ,clinical characteristics				
Age, years	58.0(46.0-69.0)	61.0(50-69.0)	56.0(38.0-67.0)	0.009
Sex N (%)				0.015
Male	189(58%)	112(64%)	77(51%)	
Female	136(42%)	62(36%)	74(49%)	
Comorbidity N(%)	155(48%)	90(52%)	65(43%)	0.118
Hypertension	98(30%)	57(33%)	41(27%)	0.272
Coronary heart disease	31(10%)	24(14%)	7(5%)	0.005
Chronic kidney disease	5(2%)	2(1%)	3(2%)	0.541
Diabetes	38(12%)	21(12%)	17(11%)	0.821
Chronic obstructive lung	10(3%)	5(3%)	5(3%)	0.820
Stroke	16(5%)	10(6%)	6(4%)	0.461
Carcinoma	10(3%)	2(1%)	8(5%)	0.049
Other	61(19%)	40(23%)	21(14%)	0.037
Temperature(℃),median(IQR)	37.0(36.5-37.8)	37.2(36.6,38.2)	36.8(36.5-37.5)	<0.001
Pulse(beats per min), median(IQR)	88(80.0-97.0)	88.0(80.0,98.0)	87.5(79.0-96.0)	0.741
Respiratory rate(breaths per min), median(IQR)	20.0(20.0-23.0)	20.0(19.0,23.0)	20.0(20.0-22.0)	0.197
Systolic blood pressure, median(IQR)	127.0(117.0-138.0)	129.0(117.0,138.0)	125.0(115.0-139.0)	0.656
Diastolic blood pressure, median(IQR)	78.0(70.0-85.0)	78.0(70.0,83.0)	79.0(70.8-86.0)	0.096
APACH II sore, median(IQR)	6.0(4.0-9.0)	7.0(4.8-9.0)	5.0(2.0-8.0)	<0.001
SOFA sore, median(IQR)	2.0(2.0-4.0)	2.0(2.0,4.0)	2.0(1.0-3.0)	<0.001
Clinical Classifications N (%)				<0.001
Severe type	222(68%)	103(59%)	119(79%)	
Critical type	103(32%)	71(41%)	32(21%)	
Laboratory findings, median(IQR)				
WBC, (1×109/L)	5.8(4.2-8.3)	5.8(4.1-8.6)	5.6(4.3-7.8)	0.907
NEU,(1×109/L)	3.9(2.6-6.5)	4.2(2.7-7.1)	3.6(2.4-6.0)	0.089
LYM,(1×109/L)	1.0(0.6-1.4)	0.9(0.5-1.1)	1.2(0.8-1.6)	<0.001
MON,(1×109/L)	0.4(0.3-0.6)	0.5(0.3-0.6)	0.5(0.3-0.6)	0.237
PLT,(1×109/L)	178.0(144.0-233.5)	171.0(135.5-214.3)	191.0(149.8-246.3)	0.012
HGB,(g/L)	129.0(117.0-141.0)	128.5(115.8-141.0)	129.0(117.8-141.5)	0.783
FIB,(g/L)	4.1(3.4-4.8)	4.2(3.6-4.8)	3.9(3.0-4.8)	0.020
IL-6,(pg/ml)	19.1(7.7-42.8)	23.8(8.6-52.4)	12.4(6.2-23.0)	0.005
PCT,(ng/ml)	0.1(0-0.2)	0.1(0.1-0.2)	0.1(0-0.1)	0.005
CRP,(mg/L)	25.2(8.7-63.6)	34.1(13.8-77.0)	15.1(6.4-38.8)	<0.001
ALT, (U/L)	24.0(16.1-37.9)	27.3(18.3-42.0)	22.1(14.9-36.8)	0.004
TBIL, (umol/L)	11.3(7.9-15.6)	12.0(8.3-17.4)	10.3(7.4-14.3)	0.016
DBIL, (umol/L)	3.7(2.4-6.1)	4.0(2.4-6.5)	3.3(1.9-5.1)	0.007

CREA, (μmol/L)	65.0(52.5-80.9)	67.4(55.0-85.8)	63.2(50.0-76.4)	0.032
Lac, (mmol/L)	1.6(1.2-2.2)	1.8(1.3-2.4)	1.4(1.0-1.8)	<0.001
$Pa0_2/FiO_2$	237.9(164.2-285.0)	215.1(153.0-277.1)	246.9(196.8-286.9)	0.110

IQR, Inter-Quartile Range; APACHE II: Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II score; SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment; WBC: White blood cell count; NEU: Neutrophil ; LYM :Lymphocyte count ; MON: Monocytes; PLT:Platelet count; HGB: Hemoglobin; FIB: Fibrinogen; IL-6: Interleutin-6; PCT: Procalcitonin; CRP: C-reactive protein; ALT: Alanine aminotransferase; TBIL: Total bilirubin; DBIL: Direct bilirubin; CREA: Creatine; Lac: lactic acid

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of demographics, clinical and laboratory findings in IVIG group and Non-IVIG group

	Total(N=325)	IVIG(N=174)	Non-IVIG(N=151)	P value
Primary outcomes N(%)				
28-day mortality	42(13%)	22(13%)	20(13%)	0.872
60-day mortality	54(17%)	33(19%)	21(14%)	0.222
Secondary outcome，median(IQR)				
In-hospital days	20.0(14.0-28.0)	23.5(16.0-33.0)	16.0(13.0-22.0)	<0.001
Total course of disease [a]	28.0(19.0-37.0)	31.0(23.0-39.0)	23.0(17.0-31.0)	<0.001

[a] Total course of disease：Time from illness onset to death or discharge, days

Table 2: Primary and secondary outcomes in IVIG and Non IVIG groups

Variable	Univariable HR （95%Cl）	P value	Multivarate HR（95%CI）	P value
Gender	1.253（0.721-2.177）	0.424	0.867(0.414-1.815)	0.704
Age	1.057（1.038-1.077）	<0.001	1.015(0.981-1.051)	0.394
Comorbidity	2.562（1.442-4.550）	0.001	4.281(1.492-12.282)	0.007
APACHEII score	1.143（1.117-1.169）	<0.001	1.051(0.965-1.145)	0.256
SOFA score	1.186（1.151-1.221）	<0.001	1.125(0.988-1.281)	0.076
Temperature,℃	0.762（0.537-1.082）	0.129	N/A	
White blood cell count	1.157（1.116-1.200）	<0.001	N/A	
Neutrophil	1.167（1.126-1.209）	<0.001	N/A	
Lymphocyte	0.160（0.074-0.347）	<0.001	0.315(0.116-0.859)	0.024
Fibrinogen	0.955（0.742-1.228）	0.720	N/A	
Creatine	1.009（1.006-1.012）	<0.001	N/A	
$Pa0_2/FiO_2$	0.992（0.988-0.996）	<0.001	0.998(0.994-1.002)	0.395
lactic acid	1.022（0.839-1.244）	0.832	0.893(0.734-1.078)	0.260
Clinical classification	0.045（0.019-0.105）	<0.001	0.126(0.039-0.413)	0.001
IVIG	1.371（0.793-2.370）	0.258	0.252(0.107-0.591)	0.002

APACHE II：Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II score; SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment;

Table 3: Multivarate analysis for factors associated with death in hospital

	Critical type		P value	**Severe type**		**P value**
	IVIG (N=71)	Non-IVIG (N=32)		IVIG (N=103)	Non-IVIG (N=119)	
Primary outcome N(%)						
28-day mortality	19(27%)	17(53%)	0.009	3(3%)	3(3%)	0.858
60-day mortality	30(42%)	18(56%)	0.188	3(3%)	3(3%)	0.858
Secondary outcome						
In-hospital days	27.0 (15.0-35.0)	17.0 (11.5-22.0)	0.005	22.0 (18.0-30.0)	15.0 (13.0-22.0)	<0.001
Total course of disease [a]	33.0 (21.0-43.0)	29.0 (23.3-36.0)	0.272	30.0 (23.0-37.0)	20.0 (16.0-29.0)	<0.001

[a] Total course of disease：Time from illness onset to death or discharge, days

Table 4: Effects of IVIG treatment on primary and secondary outcome analysis in subgroup of critical and severe type

	Total (N=174)	IVIG>15g/d (N=74)	IVIG≤15g/d (N=100)	**P value**
Primary outcomes N(%)				
28-day mortality	22(13%)	5(7%)	17(17%)	0.044
60-day mortality	33(19%)	9(12%)	24(24%)	0.049
Secondary outcome，median(IQR)				
In-hospital days	23.5(16.0-33.0)	26.5(18.0-33.0)	22.0(16.0-31.0)	0.091
Total course of disease	31.0(23.0-39.0)	32.0(24.0-39.0)	30.0(22.0-39.0)	0.517

Table 5: Effects of different dose of IVIG treatment on primary and secondary outcomes in all patients

	Critical type		P value	Severe type		P value
	IVIG>15g/d (N=40)	IVIG≤15g/d (N=31)		IVIG>15g/d (N=34)	IVIG≤15g/d (N=69)	
Primary outcomes N(%)						
28-daymortality	5(13%)	14(45%)	0.002	0	3(4%)	0.217
60-daymortality	9(23%)	21(68%)	<0.001	0	3(4%)	0.217
Secondary outcome，median(IQR)						
In-hospital days	28.0 (18.3-36.0)	16.0 (7.0-33.0)	0.011	22.0 (18.0-30.0)	23.0 (18.0-31.0)	0.830
Total course of disease [a]	35.5 (27.342.5)	26.0 (14.0-47.0)	0.034	27.5 (23.0,35.0)	34.0 (25.0,39.0)	0.091
[a] Total course of disease：Time from illness onset to death or discharge, days						

Table 6: Effects of different dose of IVIG on primary and secondary outcome in critical and severe subgroup

	Total (N=174)	IVIG>7d (N=16)	IVIG≤7d (N=158)	**P value**
Primary outcomes N(%)				
28-day mortality	22(13%)	3(19%)	19(12%)	0.441
60-day mortality	33(19%)	7(44%)	26(17%)	0.008
Secondary outcome，median(IQR)				
In-hospital days	23.5(16.0-33.0)	31.0(23.0-39.8)	22.0(16.0-32.0)	0.025
Total course of disease [a]	31.0(23.0-39.0)	41.5(31.0-49.0)	30.0(23.0-38.0)	0.005

[a] Total course of disease：Time from illness onset to death or discharge, days

Table 7: Effects of the timing of IVIG use on the primary and secondary outcome

Figure 1



Figure 1: Flow chart of all excluded and included patients