

1 **Convalescent plasma treatment of severe COVID-19: A matched control study**

2 Sean T. H. Liu, M.D., Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

3 Hung-Mo Lin, Sc.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

4 Ian Baine, M.D., Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

5 Ania Wajnberg, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

6 Jeffrey P. Gumprecht, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

7 Farah Rahman, D.O., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

8 Denise Rodriguez, A.A.S., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

9 Pranai Tandon, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

10 Adel Bassily-Marcus, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

11 Jeffrey Bander, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

12 Charles Sanky, B.A., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

13 Amy Dupper, M.A., M.P.H., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

14 Allen Zheng, M.S., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

15 Deena R. Altman, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

16 Benjamin K. Chen, M.D., Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

17 Florian Krammer, Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

18 Damodara Rao Mendu, Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

19 Adolfo Firpo-Betancourt, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

20 Matthew A. Levin, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

21 Emilia Bagiella, Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

22 Arturo Casadevall, M.D., Ph.D., Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

23 Carlos Cordon-Cardo, M.D., Ph.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

24 Jeffrey S. Jhang, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

25 Suzanne A. Arinsburg, D.O., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

26 David L. Reich, M.D., Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

27 Judith A. Aberg, M.D.* , Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

28 Nicole M. Bouvier, M.D.*† , Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

29

30 * Drs. Aberg and Bouvier contributed equally to this article. † Correspondence to nicole.bouvier@mountsinai.org.

31 **Abstract**

32 *Background*

33 Since December 2019, Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) has become a global pandemic,
34 causing mass morbidity and mortality. Prior studies in other respiratory infections suggest that
35 convalescent plasma transfusion may offer benefit to some patients. Here, the outcomes of
36 thirty-nine hospitalized patients with severe to life-threatening COVID-19 who received
37 convalescent plasma transfusion were compared against a cohort of retrospectively matched
38 controls.

39 *Methods*

40 Plasma recipients were selected based on supplemental oxygen needs at the time of enrollment
41 and the time elapsed since the onset of symptoms. Recipients were transfused with convalescent
42 plasma from donors with a SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute respiratory disease coronavirus 2) anti-
43 spike antibody titer of $\geq 1:320$ dilution. Matched control patients were retrospectively identified
44 within the electronic health record database. Supplemental oxygen requirements and survival
45 were compared between plasma recipients and controls.

46 *Results*

47 Convalescent plasma recipients were more likely than control patients to remain the same or
48 have improvements in their supplemental oxygen requirements by post-transfusion day 14, with
49 an odds ratio of 0.86 (95% CI: 0.75~0.98; $p=0.028$). Plasma recipients also demonstrated
50 improved survival, compared to control patients (log-rank test: $p=0.039$). In a covariates-adjusted
51 Cox model, convalescent plasma transfusion improved survival for non-intubated patients
52 (hazard ratio 0.19 (95% CI: 0.05 ~0.72); $p=0.015$), but not for intubated patients (1.24 (0.33~4.67);
53 $p=0.752$).

54 *Conclusions*

55 Convalescent plasma transfusion is a potentially efficacious treatment option for patients
56 hospitalized with COVID-19; however, these data suggest that non-intubated patients may
57 benefit more than those requiring mechanical ventilation.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is a positive-sense, single-
61 stranded RNA virus belonging to the family *Coronaviridae*. Humans infected with SARS-CoV-2
62 may develop Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), which manifests across a wide spectrum of
63 clinical severity ranging from a mild upper respiratory tract illness to a diffuse viral pneumonia
64 causing acute respiratory failure, with sequelae including acute lung injury, multi-organ
65 dysfunction syndrome, and death.¹⁻³ Antibody responses to coronavirus infections typically
66 appear 2-3 weeks after the onset of illness and are rarely observed earlier.⁴⁻⁶

67 Although the relationship between disease severity and antibody response has yet to be firmly
68 established,⁷ transfusion with convalescent plasma may provide a therapeutic option in the
69 current treatment-limited environment.⁸⁻¹⁰ Historical evidence supports the efficacy of
70 convalescent plasma transfusions to treat a variety of infectious diseases, including influenza,
71 Junin virus, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS).¹¹⁻¹⁴ Initial data supporting
72 convalescent plasma transfusions for COVID-19 include three case series from China of 5, 10, and
73 6 patients.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ In respiratory infections specifically, the strongest evidence suggests that the
74 benefit of passive antibody transfer is most demonstrable in patients who were treated within
75 days of symptom onset.^{12,13,18,19} Therefore, we hypothesized that treatment of patients with
76 convalescent plasma early in the disease course may reduce morbidity and mortality associated

77 with COVID-19. Presented here are preliminary outcomes for 39 patients with severe to life-
78 threatening COVID-19 who received convalescent plasma transfusions at a single academic
79 medical center, The Mount Sinai Hospital, in New York City.

80 **Methods**

81 *Patients*

82 Forty-five adult patients were identified as eligible for COVID-19 convalescent plasma transfusion
83 under the criteria established for the FDA single patient emergency investigational new drug
84 (eIND) process. FDA authorization was requested and obtained for COVID-19 convalescent
85 plasma transfusion. Four patients improved and 2 patients withdrew consent prior to receipt of
86 plasma, leaving 39 evaluable patients who received COVID-19 convalescent plasma. Patients
87 were hospitalized in a single academic medical center in New York City for COVID-19 between 24
88 March 2020 and 8 April 2020. Patients were screened by symptom duration and by severity of
89 disease on a case-by-case basis, as assessed by oxygen supplementation requirements and
90 laboratory parameters. Patients or their legally authorized representatives provided informed
91 consent prior to treatment. Both treatment and research were performed with the oversight of
92 the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai Institutional Review Board (IRB).

93 *Convalescent plasma transfusion*

94 Convalescent plasma donors were screened for SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers by a two-step Spike
95 protein-directed ELISA.^{20,21} Donors with anti-spike antibody titers $\geq 1:320$ were referred for blood
96 collection at the New York Blood Center, which performed the plasmapheresis and then returned
97 convalescent plasma units to The Mount Sinai Hospital. Plasma recipients were transfused with
98 two units of ABO-type matched convalescent plasma. Each unit, approximately 250 milliliters in

99 volume, was infused over 1 to 2 hours. Recipients were monitored every 15 minutes for signs of
100 transfusion-related reactions and then followed post-transfusion for outcomes.

101 *Statistical analysis*

102 To confirm the independent effect of convalescent plasma transfusion on improvement in
103 oxygenation and survival, we conducted a propensity score-matched analysis using The Mount
104 Sinai Hospital's COVID-19 confirmed patient pool from the same calendar period (24 March 2020
105 to 8 April 2020). A logistic regression was fit to predict the potential for plasma therapy based
106 on time series data obtained at baseline upon admission, prior to transfusion, and the day of
107 transfusion. Among the predictors, exact matching was enforced on the administration of
108 hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin, intubation status and duration, length of hospital stay,
109 and oxygen requirement on the day of transfusion. Other medications were administered too
110 infrequently to enforce exact matching. Balance was well achieved between the plasma and
111 control groups, as all predictors had a standardized mean difference less than 0.2. Details of the
112 matching method and results are described in the Supplementary Appendix. A medical data
113 team reviewed charts of the control patients to determine outcomes at 1, 7, and 14 days. The
114 data team was not informed of the recipient to whom each control patient was matched. Because
115 control patients were matched to plasma recipients by length of stay prior to transfusion, "day
116 0" was defined as the day of transfusion for the plasma recipients and as the corresponding day
117 in the hospitalization course of the control patients.

118 *Oxygen supplementation*

119 Patients were then evaluated for their supplemental oxygen requirements and survival at three
120 time points: days 1, 7, and 14 post-transfusion. Four categories of supplemental oxygen use
121 status were collected for both cases and controls. These include, in order of increasing severity:

122 room air without supplemental oxygen required; low-flow oxygen delivery by standard nasal
123 cannula; high-flow oxygen delivery, including non-rebreather mask; high-flow nasal cannula or
124 bi-level positive airway pressure (BiPAP) non-invasive ventilation; and mechanical ventilation. A
125 patient's oxygenation status at the three time points was considered to have worsened if they
126 changed from a lower- to a higher-severity category compared to Day 0, or if they had died prior
127 to the time point. A generalized estimating equations (GEE) approach with a logit link for binary
128 data was used to model the effect of plasma on the odds of oxygenation improvement on days
129 1, 7, and 14 following transfusion, controlling for oxygen status on day 0. An independent
130 working correlation structure was assumed for the patients within each cluster; however, the p-
131 values were calculated based on the empirical standard errors. Since some patients were
132 discharged with continued oxygen supplementation, the oxygen status of discharged patients
133 was assumed to be no worse than low-flow oxygen by standard nasal cannula.

134 *Survival*

135 Kaplan-Meier survival curves and the log rank test were used to depict the overall post-
136 transfusion survival. A Cox model was fit to estimate the hazard ratio for in-hospital mortality
137 for the plasma group, with matched clusters treated as random effects and onset of intubation
138 as a time-varying covariate. In addition, interactions between convalescent plasma
139 administration and intubation duration were tested to see if the plasma effects were the same
140 in subgroups.

141 Both oxygen status and survival models were adjusted for duration of symptoms prior to
142 admission and drugs administered, as these data were only ascertained after the matching was
143 completed. The initial drug list consisted of COVID-19 therapies used during the time of the

144 study that included azithromycin, broad-spectrum antibiotics, hydroxychloroquine, therapeutic
145 anticoagulants, corticosteroids, directly acting antivirals, stem cells, and interleukin 1 and
146 interleukin 6 inhibitors. Only those that had a p-value < 0.5, however, were included in the final
147 model for adjustment. A liberal p-value was used here to be inclusive of any potential
148 confounders. As a sensitivity analysis, the 1:2 matching without replacement data were also
149 analyzed, where the balance between the matched pairs was enhanced but the study power
150 was reduced. Descriptive data are reported as number (percent), mean (\pm standard deviation)
151 or median [min, max], as appropriate. Analysis was performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc.,
152 Cary, NC). All tests were 2-sided and statistical significance was defined as a p value < 0.05,
153 unless otherwise indicated.

154 **Results**

155 *Recipient characteristics*

156 The average age of the recipients of convalescent plasma transfusion was 55 (\pm 13) years (Table
157 1). The cohort was approximately two-thirds male and one-third female, similar to the
158 proportions of men and women with severe disease in prior studies.¹ Recipients generally had
159 few baseline co-morbidities: 54% were obese (body mass index \geq 30) and 18% had a current or
160 former history of tobacco use. One patient had end-stage renal disease requiring peritoneal
161 dialysis. The median duration of symptoms prior to initial presentation was 7 [0, 14] days.
162 Inflammatory markers were elevated with median d-dimer of 1.4 [0.27, >20] μ g/mL fibrinogen
163 equivalent units, median ferritin 1135 [107, 7441] ng/mL, and median C-reactive protein 159 [12,
164 319] mg/L. The median time between admission and transfusion was 4 [1, 7] days. On the day of
165 transfusion, the majority of the recipients were requiring supplemental oxygen via a non-invasive
166 delivery device (87%). Four plasma recipients (10%) were mechanically ventilated at the time of

167 transfusion. In addition to receiving convalescent plasma transfusion, many recipients received
168 a variety of inpatient pharmacotherapies throughout their hospitalizations (Table 2). There were
169 no significant differences between plasma recipients and control patients in exposures to
170 measured pharmacotherapies, except for therapeutic anticoagulation.

171 *Respiratory Status*

172 Plasma recipients and control patients were 100% matched on their supplemental oxygen
173 requirement on day 0. Of them, 69.2% were receiving high-flow oxygen and 10.3% were receiving
174 invasive mechanical ventilation. By day 14, clinical condition had worsened in 18.0% of the
175 plasma patients and 24.3% in the control patients ($p=0.167$, Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test). The
176 covariates-adjusted odds ratio for worsening oxygenation on day 14 was 0.86 (95% CI: 0.75~0.98;
177 $p=0.028$) (Figure 1). The effect of plasma appeared to be confounded by the use of therapeutic
178 anticoagulants (unadjusted vs. adjusted OR: 0.90 vs. 0.84), but not on other types of drugs or
179 duration of symptoms before admission (OR remained in the range of 0.90~0.91). On days 1 and
180 7, the plasma group also showed a reduction in the proportion of patients with worsened
181 oxygenation status, but the group difference did not reach statistical significance.

182 *Survival*

183 As of 1 May 2020, 12.8% of plasma recipients and 24.4% of the 1:4 matched control patients had
184 died (21.6% in the 1:2 matched dataset), and 71.8% and 66.7% (68.9%) had been discharged alive,
185 respectively. The median follow-up time was 11 [1, 28] days for the plasma group and 9 [0, 31]
186 days for the control group. Overall, we observed improved survival for the plasma group (log-
187 rank test: $p=0.039$) (Figure 2). In a covariates-adjusted Cox model, convalescent plasma
188 transfusion was significantly associated with improved survival in non-intubated patients (hazard
189 ratios: 0.19 (95% CI: 0.05 ~0.72); $p=0.015$), but not in intubated patients (1.24 (0.33~4.67);

190 p=0.752) (P-value for the plasma and intubation interaction term was 0.050). There is no
191 evidence that the effect of plasma depended on the duration of symptoms (p=0.19 for the plasma
192 by duration interaction). The results remain robust in the model without covariates adjustment
193 and in the 1:2 matched sample (Figure 3).

194 **Discussion**

195 The COVID-19 pandemic poses an unprecedented challenge, as physicians and scientists struggle
196 in real time to identify effective interventions against SARS-CoV-2 and its complications. This
197 initial assessment offers evidence in support of convalescent plasma transfusion as an effective
198 intervention in COVID-19. Preliminary data suggest a potential mortality benefit, but greater
199 numbers are needed to draw definitive conclusions. Interestingly, these data suggest that the
200 survival effect of convalescent plasma may begin to manifest more than 1 week after transfusion.
201 If this observation is borne out in subsequent studies, it could indicate that convalescent plasma
202 prevents longer-term complications, such as acute lung injury or multi-organ dysfunction
203 syndrome; however, this speculation awaits confirmation in a larger patient cohort.

204 This study has many unique strengths. It describes the largest cohort of COVID-19 patients
205 treated with convalescent plasma thus far worldwide. Furthermore, New York City has a large
206 and very diverse population, and its metropolitan area was among the earliest and hardest hit by
207 the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. Over this study's 16-day enrollment period (24
208 March 2020 to 8 April 2020), the Mount Sinai Health System admitted 4,152 confirmed COVID-
209 19-positive patients. This large pool from which to draw control patients permitted an aggressive
210 matching algorithm. Data from three different time frames -- baseline, prior to transfusion, and
211 day of transfusion -- informed the matching of controls to cases to maximize their similarity.

212 In addition, the efficacy of passive antibody transfer relies heavily on the quality of the donor
213 convalescent plasma. Mount Sinai rapidly developed and clinically deployed an ELISA to titrate
214 SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies in serum,¹⁸ enabling our center to refer for blood collection only
215 those convalescent donors with the highest peripheral serum antibody titers of $\geq 1:320$.²² Prior
216 smaller studies have reported on a variety of titer cutoffs,^{15,16} and at the time of this publication
217 some centers are bypassing donor antibody titer pre-collection completely.¹⁷ Although the total
218 quantity of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike antibodies were assessed, it must be noted that we have not
219 yet assessed the functionality of these antibodies in neutralizing the virus. Recent studies with
220 SARS CoV-2 have generally found a high correlation between ELISA S protein binding activity and
221 neutralization of SARS CoV-2.^{21,23}

222 Although controls were retrospectively identified by propensity matching, the conclusions drawn
223 from these data are not as robust as a prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled study.
224 Furthermore, the convalescent plasma recipient cohort is highly heterogeneous in regards to
225 oxygen needs at the time of transfusion and the duration of symptoms prior to admission. Other
226 than intubated versus non-intubated patients, the small size of this cohort lacks sufficient power
227 to permit additional subgroup analyses. We did not observe significant benefit of convalescent
228 plasma in intubated patients, consistent with past literature demonstrating that passive antibody
229 transfer therapies are most efficacious early in disease.^{12,13,18,19} However, the number of
230 intubated patients in this study is small, limiting our ability to reach any conclusions about this
231 population. Future studies that include more mechanically ventilated patients will be needed to
232 address this uncertainty.

233 No significant transfusion-related morbidity or mortality were observed in the convalescent
234 plasma recipient cohort; however, potential harms are associated with plasma transfusion. There

235 is a risk of fluid volume overload, particularly in patients with end-stage renal disease or advanced
236 heart failure. Allergic reactions to plasma are typically mild and self-limited. Plasma naturally
237 contains procoagulants, whose additive effects are unknown in this disease, which is
238 independently associated with hypercoagulability;²⁴ thus, pending more data, additional caution
239 should be exercised in patients with acute thrombotic events. Convalescent plasma transfusions
240 also have theoretical risks, such as hindering the maturation of the patient's own adaptive
241 immune memory response and antibody-dependent enhancement. While keeping these risks in
242 mind, additional studies are needed to confirm these findings and draw more definitive
243 conclusions about the efficacy of convalescent plasma transfusion for the treatment of COVID-
244 19 in different populations.

245

246 **Acknowledgements**

247 We thank all of the patients who participated in this study and their families. We also
248 acknowledge the generosity of the thousands of anonymous tri-state area residents who
249 recovered from COVID-19 and then volunteered to donate convalescent plasma for the benefit
250 of others. We thank the New York Blood Center, Liise-anne Pirofski, Thomas Schneider, Carina
251 Seah, Sindhu Srinivas, Douglas Tremblay, Freddy Nguyen, Miwa Geiger, Chaim Lebovits, and
252 Jacqueline Lustgarten. We acknowledge the assistance of Icahn School of Medicine at Mount
253 Sinai medical students: Sofia Ahsanuddin, Arence Paasewe, Ranjan Upadhyay, George
254 Mellgard, Tyler Martinson, Bhavana Patil, Cynthia Luo, Saloni Agrawal, Alina Siddiqui, Julia
255 Schwarz, Lydia Piendel, Jacqueline Emerson, Harrison Kaplan, Emma Klein, Mariely Garcia,
256 James Johnson, Luke Maillie, and Elena Baldwin. We also appreciate the clinical expertise of
257 the Mount Sinai Convalescent Plasma Squad: Nicholas Shuman, Daniela Delbeau, Donna

258 Catamero, Gillian Sanchez, Suzan Aird, Manpreet Mann, Tarashon Broome, Sonia Kleiner-Arje,
259 Louise Wolf, Angela Lee, Lisa Gaynes, and Karyn Goodman. We dedicate this work to the New
260 Yorkers who have lost their lives to COVID-19 with a special dedication to the health care
261 workers who will always be remembered for their selflessness during this pandemic.

262 **Author Affiliations**

263 From the Division of Infectious Diseases (S.T.H.L., J.P.G., F.R., A.D., D.R.A., B.K.C., J.A.A., N.M.B.),
264 and the Department of Population Health Science and Policy (H.-M.L., E.B.), and the
265 Department of Pathology, Molecular and Cell-Based Medicine (I.B., D.R.M., A.F.B., C.C.-C., J.S.J.,
266 S.A.A.), and the Department of Medicine (A.W., J.B.), and The Tisch Cancer Institute (D.R.), and
267 the Department of Surgical Critical Care (A.B.-M.), and the Department of Pulmonary and
268 Critical Care Medicine (P.T.), and the Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative and Pain
269 Medicine (M.A.L., D.L.R.), and the Department of Medical Education (C.S.), and the Department
270 of Microbiology (S.T.H.L., A.Z., F.K., N.M.B) – all at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai;
271 and the Department of Molecular Microbiology & Immunology, John Hopkins School of
272 Medicine (A.C.).

273 **Disclosures**

274 Dr. Krammer reports that patent applications have been filed for the assay used to select
275 plasma donors, and Mount Sinai has licensed its use to several companies. Dr. Aberg reports
276 grants and personal fees from Gilead, grants and personal fees from Merck, grants and personal
277 fees from Janssen, personal fees from Theratech, personal fees from Medicure, grants from
278 Regeneron, grants and personal fees from Viiv, outside the submitted work. All other authors
279 have nothing to disclose.

280 **References**

- 281 1. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and
282 Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. JAMA 2020.
283 Published online ahead of print, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775.
- 284 2. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease
285 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for
286 Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA 2020;323:1239-1242.
- 287 3. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with
288 COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020;395:1054-62.
- 289 4. Callow KA, Parry HF, Sergeant M, Tyrrell DA. The time course of the immune response to
290 experimental coronavirus infection of man. Epidemiol Infect 1990;105:435-46.
- 291 5. Ko JH, Muller MA, Seok H, et al. Serologic responses of 42 MERS-coronavirus-infected patients
292 according to the disease severity. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 2017;89:106-11.
- 293 6. Hsueh PR, Huang LM, Chen PJ, Kao CL, Yang PC. Chronological evolution of IgM, IgA, IgG and
294 neutralisation antibodies after infection with SARS-associated coronavirus. Clin Microbiol Infect
295 2004;10:1062-6.
- 296 7. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel
297 coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis 2020. Published online ahead of print,
298 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa344>.
- 299 8. Casadevall A, Pirofski LA. The convalescent sera option for containing COVID-19. J Clin Invest
300 2020;130:1545-8.
- 301 9. Chen L, Xiong J, Bao L, Shi Y. Convalescent plasma as a potential therapy for COVID-19. Lancet
302 Infect Dis 2020;20:398-400.
- 303 10. Roback JD, Guarner J. Convalescent Plasma to Treat COVID-19: Possibilities and Challenges.
304 JAMA 2020;323:1561-1562.

- 305 11. Luke TC, Kilbane EM, Jackson JL, Hoffman SL. Meta-analysis: convalescent blood products for
306 Spanish influenza pneumonia: a future H5N1 treatment? *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145:599-609.
- 307 12. Mair-Jenkins J, Saavedra-Campos M, Baillie JK, et al. The effectiveness of convalescent plasma
308 and hyperimmune immunoglobulin for the treatment of severe acute respiratory infections of viral
309 etiology: a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis. *J Infect Dis* 2015;211:80-90.
- 310 13. Hung IFN, To KKW, Lee CK, et al. Hyperimmune IV immunoglobulin treatment: a multicenter
311 double-blind randomized controlled trial for patients with severe 2009 influenza A(H1N1) infection.
312 *Chest* 2013;144:464-73.
- 313 14. Enria DA, Briggiler AM, Fernandez NJ, Levis SC, Maiztegui JI. Importance of dose of neutralising
314 antibodies in treatment of Argentine haemorrhagic fever with immune plasma. *Lancet* 1984;2:255-6.
- 315 15. Shen C, Wang Z, Zhao F, et al. Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With
316 Convalescent Plasma. *JAMA* 2020;323:1582-1589.
- 317 16. Duan K, Liu B, Li C, et al. Effectiveness of convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19
318 patients. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2020;117:9490-6.
- 319 17. Ye M, Fu D, Ren Y, et al. Treatment with convalescent plasma for COVID-19 patients in Wuhan,
320 China. *J Med Virol* 2020. Published online ahead of print, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25882>.
- 321 18. Finland M. The serum treatment of lobar pneumonia. *New Engl J Med* 1930;202:1244-7.
- 322 19. Cecil RL. Remarks on THE SERUM TREATMENT OF PNEUMONIA. *Br Med J* 1932;2:657-62.
- 323 20. Stadlbauer D, Amanat F, Chromikova V, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed
324 Protocol for a Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. *Curr Protoc Microbiol*
325 2020;57:e100.
- 326 21. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2
327 seroconversion in humans. *medRxiv* 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037713>.
- 328 22. An EU programme of COVID-19 convalescent plasma collection and transfusion: Guidance on
329 collection, testing, processing, storage, distribution and monitored use. Brussels: European Commission

330 Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety, April 4 2020.
331 ([https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/blood_tissues_organs/docs/guidance_plasma_covid19_](https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/blood_tissues_organs/docs/guidance_plasma_covid19_en.pdf)
332 [en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/blood_tissues_organs/docs/guidance_plasma_covid19_en.pdf).)

333 23. Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody responses in COVID-19
334 patients. medRxiv 2020; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038059>.

335 24. Litjos JF, Leclerc M, Chochois C, et al. High incidence of venous thromboembolic events in
336 anticoagulated severe COVID-19 patients. J Thromb Haemost 2020. Published online ahead of print,
337 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.14869>.

338

339 **Table 1. Demographics and clinical parameters of recipients prior to transfusion**

Characteristic*	Patients (N = 39)
Demographics	
Mean age \pm SD – year	55 \pm 13
Sex –	
Male / Female	25 (64) / 14 (36)
Mean Body-mass index \pm SD †	31.7 \pm 6.0
Coexisting disorder – no. (%)	
Asthma	3 (8)
Cancer¶	2 (5)
Chronic kidney disease	1 (3)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	1 (3)
Current or former smoker	7 (18)
Diabetes mellitus	8 (21)
Hemorrhagic or ischemic stroke	0
Human immunodeficiency virus	0
Obesity	21(54)
Obstructive sleep apnea	2 (5)
Median duration of symptoms before admission – days	7 [0, 14]
Presenting symptoms – no. (%)	
Fever	26 (67)
Shortness of breath	26 (67)
Cough	24 (62)
Diarrhea	8 (21)
Sputum production	3 (8)

Sore throat	2 (5)
Vital signs on admission – no. (%)	
Temperature >100.4°F or 38°C	13 (33)
Heart rate >100 beats per min	22 (56)
Respiratory rate ≥ 20 breaths per min	28 (72)
Imaging – no. (%)	
Chest radiography	38 (97)
Chest computed tomography	3 (8)

Clinical parameters

Laboratory data prior to transfusion

White-cell count

Median [range] – per mm³ 7600 [3900-22600]

Distribution – no (%)

≥10,000/mm³ 10 (26)

≤4000/mm³ 2 (5)

Aspartate aminotransferase >40 U/liter – no (%) 26 (67)

Alanine aminotransferase >40/liter – no (%) 18 (46)

Lactate ≥1.5 mmol/liter – no (%) 23 (59)

D-dimer, median [range] - µg/ml Fibrinogen Equivalent units 1.4 [0.27, >20]

Fibrinogen, mean (±S.D.) –no./total no. (mg/dl) 684±140

Ferritin, median [range] – ng/ml 1135 [107, 7441]

C-Reactive Protein, median [range] – mg/liter 159 [12, 319]

Interleukin-6, mean (\pm S.D.) – no./total no. (pg/ml)	178 \pm 348
Length of stay prior to transfusion	
Median duration [range] – days	4 [1, 7]
Supplemental oxygen requirement prior to initiation of transfusion	
Standard nasal cannula – no. (%)	7 (18)
2 liters – no. (%)	0
3 liters – no. (%)	2 (5)
4 liters – no. (%)	2 (5)
\geq 5 liters – no. (%)	3 (8)
High-flow oxygen, high-flow nasal cannula or BiPAP – no. (%)	27 (69)
Mechanical ventilation – no. (%)	4 (10)

340 *Plus-minus values are mean \pm SD. Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding.

341 †The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

342 ¶Cancer represents a patient with thyroid cancer status post resection and a patient with Gleason 6 prostate cancer.

343 ¶High-flow oxygen included venti-mask and non-rebreather mask; BiPAP = bi-level positive airway pressure.

344 *Plus-minus values are mean \pm SD. Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding.

345 **Table 2. Recipient pharmacologic interventions**


		1:4 matching	1:2 matching
	Patients	Controls	Controls
Pharmacologic interventions	(N = 39)	(N=156)	(N=74)
<hr/>			
Antimicrobial agents – no. (%)			
Azithromycin	31 (79)	133 (85)	63 (85)
Broad spectrum antibiotics	29 (74)	112 (72)	57 (77)
Hydroxychloroquine	36 (92)	148 (95)	69 (93)
Investigational antivirals	1 (3)	9 (6)	4 (5)
Therapeutic anticoagulation – no. (%)	26 (67)	64 (41)	32 (43)
Anti-inflammatory agents – no. (%)			
Corticosteroids	22(56)	90 (58)	38 (51)
Interleukin-1 inhibitors	0	0	0
Interleukin-6 inhibitors	3 (8)	13 (8)	6 (8)

* No significant differences were found between groups in both matched samples (p-values all >0.44), except for use of therapeutic anticoagulation (p <0.001 1:4 ratio and p=0.02 1:2 ratio).

347 **Figure 1. Comparison of oxygen requirements between Day 14 versus Day 0.**


348

349




* Covariates adjusted. No significant differences were observed at day 1 (p=0.444) or day 7 (p=0.425).

350 **Figure 2. Survival Probability**



351

352 **Figure 3. Hazard ratios for in-hospital mortality**



* Adjustment: Duration of symptoms prior to admission, therapeutic anticoagulant, broad spectrum antibiotics, and antivirals.

353