medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REGEN-COV® for Treatment of Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19

Selin Somersan-Karakaya, M.D.[1†*]; Eleftherios Mylonakis, M.D., Ph.D.[2*]; Vidya P. Menon, M.D.[3]; Jason C. Wells, M.D.[4]; Shazia Ali, Pharm.D.[1]; Sumathi Sivapalasingam, M.D.[1‡]; Yiping Sun, Ph.D.[1]; Rafia Bhore, Ph.D.[1]; Jingning Mei, Ph.D.[1]; Jutta Miller, B.S., R.N.[1]; Lisa Cupelli, Ph.D.[1]; Andrea T. Hooper, Ph.D.[1]; Jennifer D. Hamilton, Ph.D.[1]; Cynthia Pan, B.Pharm.[1]; Viet Pham, B.S.[1]; Yuming Zhao M.S.[1]; Romana Hosain, M.D., M.P.H.[1‡]; Adnan Mahmood, M.D.[1]; John D. Davis, Ph.D.[1]; Kenneth C. Turner, Ph.D.[1]; Yunji Kim, Pharm.D.[1]; Amanda Cook, B.S., Dip.Reg.Aff[1]; Bari Kowal, M.S.[1]; Yuhwen Soo, Ph.D.[1]; A. Thomas DiCioccio, Ph.D.[1]; Gregory P. Geba M.D., Dr.PH.[1]; Neil Stahl, Ph.D.[1]; Leah Lipsich, Ph.D.[1‡]; Ned Braunstein, M.D.[1]; Gary A. Herman, M.D.[1]; George D. Yancopoulos, M.D., Ph.D.[1]; and David M. Weinreich, M.D.[1] for the Covid-19 Phase 2/3 Hospitalized Trial Team

*Contributed equally

[‡]Former employee of Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

[1]Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Tarrytown, NY; [2]Brown University, Providence, RI; [3]NYC Health + Hospitals/Lincoln, Bronx, NY; [4]The Oregon Clinic, Portland, OR

[†]Corresponding author: Selin Somersan-Karakaya, email: selin.somersan@regeneron.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background: Hospitalized patients with Covid-19 experience high mortality rates, ranging from 10-30%. Casirivimab and imdevimab (REGEN-COV®) is authorized in various jurisdictions for use in outpatients with Covid-19 and in post-exposure prophylaxis. The UK-based platform RECOVERY study reported improved survival in hospitalized seronegative patients treated with REGEN-COV, but in most of the world, anti-spike monoclonal antibody therapy is currently not approved for use in hospitalized patients.

Methods: In this phase 1/2/3 double-blind placebo-controlled trial, patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen hospitalized with Covid-19 were randomized (1:1:1) to 2.4 g or 8.0 g REGEN-COV or placebo and characterized at baseline for viral load and SARS-CoV-2 endogenous immune response.

Results: 1336 patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen were treated. The primary endpoint was met: in seronegative patients, the LS mean difference (REGEN-COV vs. placebo) for TWA change from baseline viral load was -0.28 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL (95% CI: -0.51, -0.05; P=0.0172). The primary clinical analysis of death or mechanical ventilation from day 6-29 in patients with high-viral load had a strong positive trend but did not reach significance. REGEN-COV reduced all-cause mortality in seronegative patients through day 29 (RRR, 55.6%; 95% CI: 24.2%, 74%). No safety concerns were noted overall nor in seropositive patients.

Conclusions: In hospitalized patients with Covid-19 on low-flow or no oxygen, REGEN-COV treatment reduced viral load and the risk of death or mechanical ventilation as well as all-cause mortality in the overall population, with the benefit driven by seronegative patients and no harm observed in seropositive patients.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT04426695.)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The clinical progression of coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19), caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), is highly variable; while many cases manifest with relatively mild symptoms, others progress to severe respiratory failure requiring supplemental oxygen and/or mechanical ventilation.[1-4] Casirivimab and imdevimab (REGEN-COV®) is a monoclonal antibody combination approved or authorized for emergency use for the treatment of outpatients with mild to moderate Covid-19 and for post-exposure prophylaxis in the United States and other jurisdictions.[5-7] In outpatients with Covid-19, REGEN-COV reduced hospitalization or all-cause death, reduced viral load, and shortened symptom duration.[8-10] Data show REGEN-COV is also highly effective in preventing asymptomatic as well as symptomatic Covid-19, evidenced by a single-dose subcutaneous administration in showing ~80% lower risk of developing Covid-19 for household contacts living with an infected individual.[11] The totality of evidence suggests that benefit is greatest when treated early.[12]

Based on the potent anti-viral activity of REGEN-COV it was prospectively hypothesized that reducing viral burden as early as possible would also decrease morbidity and mortality associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in hospitalized patients. In a recent open label platform trial of hospitalized patients with Covid-19 in the United Kingdom (RECOVERY), REGEN-COV met its primary endpoint in improving overall survival in patients who had not mounted their own immune response at baseline (seronegative) by 20%, and also improved duration of hospitalization.[13] Here, we describe the final efficacy and safety results from the first

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

phase 1/2/3 double-blind placebo-controlled trial of REGEN-COV in hospitalized patients with Covid-19 on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

METHODS

TRIAL DESIGN

This was an adaptive, phase 1/2/3, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy, safety, and tolerability of REGEN-COV in hospitalized adult patients with Covid-19, conducted at 103 sites in the United States, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Moldova, and Romania (NCT04426695).

Patients were randomized 1:1:1 to 2.4 g REGEN-COV (1.2 g casirivimab and 1.2 g imdevimab), 8.0 g REGEN-COV (4.0 g casirivimab and 4.0 g imdevimab), or placebo as a single intravenous dose. Randomization was stratified by standard-of-care treatment (antiviral therapies, non-antiviral therapies; phase 1/2/3) and country (phase 2/3). The trial included a screening/baseline period (days –1 to 1), a hospitalization/post-discharge period, a monthly follow-up period, and an end-of-study visit (phase 1 day 169, phase 2/3 day 57) (Fig. S1). Trial adaptations, including pausing of enrollment and early termination, are described in the Supplementary Appendix.

PATIENTS

Patients were 18 years or older and hospitalized with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 ≤72 hours with symptom onset ≤10 days from randomization. Standard-of-care treatments for Covid-19, per the investigator, were permitted. Full inclusion and exclusion criteria are presented in the Supplementary Appendix.

Patients were enrolled in one of four cohorts based on disease severity (Fig. S1) as described in the Patient Cohorts section in the Supplementary Appendix. The trial proceeded through phase 2 for patients requiring no supplemental oxygen (cohort

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1A) and phase 3 for patients requiring low-flow oxygen (cohort 1); together, these patients are the subject of this manuscript. As phase 1/2 data from patients on low-flow oxygen was previously unblinded in an interim analysis on December 22, 2020, it was not included in the phase 3 efficacy analyses. For patients requiring high-intensity oxygen (cohort 2) or mechanical ventilation (cohort 3), enrollment was paused and data were not included due to low sample size; this is further described in the Trial Adaptations section in the Supplementary Appendix**.**

OUTCOME MEASURES

The primary virologic efficacy endpoint was the time-weighted average (TWA) daily change from baseline (day 1) viral load in nasopharyngeal samples through day 7.[10] The primary clinical efficacy endpoint was the proportion of patients who died or required mechanical ventilation from day 6-29 and day 1-29. Secondary efficacy endpoints examined all-cause mortality and discharge from/readmission to hospital. Safety endpoints included the proportion of patients with treatment-emergent serious adverse events (SAEs) and adverse events of special interest (AESIs): infusion-related reactions (IRRs) through day 4, and grade ≥2 hypersensitivity reactions through day 29.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analysis plan was finalized prior to database lock and unblinding. The full analysis set (FAS) was used for safety analyses and includes all randomized patients who received any amount of study drug. The modified FAS (mFAS) was used for efficacy analyses and excludes patients who had negative central lab SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR at baseline.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Primary endpoint analyses are described in more detail in the Supplementary Appendix. As the trial was stopped earlier than planned (due to low enrollment prior to the surge associated with the Delta variant), the sample size was smaller than anticipated and it was elected to combine the REGEN-COV dose groups and pool patients on no supplemental oxygen (phase 2) and low-flow oxygen (phase 3) for efficacy measures. To control alpha at an 0.05 level, the primary endpoints were tested hierarchically (Table S1). After virologic efficacy, the first two clinical endpoints were the proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation for REGEN-COV vs. placebo from 1) day 6-29 in high-viral load patients and 2) day 6-29 in seronegative patients. High viral load was selected based on previous experience with treatment in the outpatient setting[8,10]; it was expected that the high-viral load population would be highly correlated with the seronegative population, and assessing viral load could be easier than assessing serostatus in a clinical setting.

Safety was assessed in separate analyses for patients receiving no supplemental oxygen (phase 2) and low-flow oxygen (phase 1/2/3). Prespecified subgroup analyses using baseline serostatus and viral load were selected based on previous results.[10] Sample size calculations and missing data handling are described in the Supplementary Appendix.

TRIAL OVERSIGHT

Details are provided in the Supplementary Appendix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

DEMOGRAPHICS AND BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

As of April 9, 2021, 1364 patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen were randomized into the study, of whom 1336 were treated. Of those, 1197 (89.6%) tested positive centrally for SARS-CoV-2 (constituting the mFAS) with 406, 398, and 393 in the REGEN-COV 2.4 g, 8.0 g, and placebo groups, respectively (Fig. S2).

Baseline demographics were well-balanced. The median age was 62 years, 54.1% were male, mean body mass index was 31.1 kg/m^2, 12.1% identified as Black/African American, and 30.1% identified as Hispanic/Latino (Table 1). Covid-19 characteristics were similar except for a higher proportion of seropositive patients in the placebo group (51.1%) compared to the combined REGEN-COV group (45.9%) (Table 1). The number of days of Covid-19 symptoms, viral load, and C-reactive protein concentrations at baseline were balanced, and similar proportions of patients received remdesivir and/or systemic corticosteroids (Table 1). Demographics and baseline characteristics by serostatus are presented in Table S2.

VIROLOGIC EFFICACY

REGEN-COV significantly reduced viral load in seronegative patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen; the least-squares (LS) mean (95% confidence interval [CI]) TWA daily change in viral load from baseline through day 7 was -1.03 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL (CI: -1.22, -0.84) in the placebo group compared with –1.31 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL (CI: -1.43, -1.18) in the REGEN-COV combined dose group, with an LS mean difference vs. placebo of -0.28 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL (CI: -0.51, -0.05; P=0.0172) (Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Both doses of REGEN-COV exhibited similar viral load reductions, showing improvement over placebo starting at day 3 and reaching significance at day 7, after which viral load in the REGEN-COV groups continued to fall relative to placebo (Fig. 1, Fig S3). The maximum LS mean differences versus placebo in seronegative patients were at day 7 (described above), day 9 (–0.47 $\log_{10}$ copies /mL, CI: -0.71, -0.23), and day 11 (-0.59 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL CI: -0.85, -0.34) (Fig. 1A). The overall population LS mean fell below the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ; 2.85 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL) 2 days earlier with REGEN-COV (day 9 REGEN-COV vs. day 11 placebo) (Fig. S3). Reductions of viral load were observed in the seronegative (Fig. 1A) and the overall populations (Fig. S3), with greater reductions in seronegative patients.

CLINICAL EFFICACY

DEATH OR MECHANICAL VENTILATION

Endpoints were examined both from day 1-29 and day 6-29, and were evaluated in the seronegative, high-viral load, and overall populations, as described in the Methods. The analyses presented herein examine the pooled REGEN-COV dose group and pooled cohorts for low-flow and no supplemental oxygen (Fig. 2). Individual dose groups of 2.4 g and 8.0 g of REGEN-COV (Fig. S4) and separate cohorts by respiratory status (Fig. S5) were also examined and showed trends of benefit across all clinical endpoints.

In the statistical hierarchy (Table S1), the first test for clinical efficacy on the endpoint of death or mechanical ventilation in the high-viral load population from day 6-29 showed a numerically lower risk compared to placebo but did not reach statistical significance (relative risk reduction [RRR], 25.5%; 95% CI: -16.2%, 52.2%;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

P=0.2) (Table 2); accordingly, all subsequent clinical efficacy analyses are considered descriptive. The second test for clinical efficacy on the endpoint of death or mechanical ventilation in the seronegative population from day 6-29 showed an RRR of 47.1% (CI: 10.2%, 68.8%) (Table 2). Improvements were also observed from day 6-29 in the overall population (RRR, 24.2%; 95% CI: 10.9%, 48.2%) (Table 2).

Treatment with REGEN-COV led to a reduction in the proportions of patients who died or required mechanical ventilation, with improvement from day 1-29 in the high-viral load (RRR, 35.0%; 95% CI: 6.6%, 54.8%), seronegative (RRR, 47.0%; 95% CI: 17.7%, 65.8%), and overall (RRR, 30.9%; 95% CI, 5.4% to 49.5%) populations (Table 2). While seronegative patients exhibited the greatest benefit from REGEN-COV treatment, no meaningful benefit or harm was observed in seropositive patients (RRR, 19.5%; 95% CI: -32.8%, 51.2%) (Fig. 2A).

ALL-CAUSE MORTALITY

Treatment with REGEN-COV led to improvement in all-cause mortality through day 29 in the seronegative, high-viral load, and overall populations. The greatest reduction in the relative risk of death occurred in seronegative patients; 24/360 (6.7%) died within 28 days in the REGEN-COV group, compared to 24/160 (15.0%) in the placebo group (RRR, 55.6%; 95% CI: 24.2%, 74%) (Fig. 2B). No harm or meaningful benefit was observed in the seropositive population (Fig. 2A). For the overall population, driven by the seronegative group, a substantial reduction in death was observed in which 59/804 patients (7.3%) died within 28 days in the REGEN-COV combined dose group, compared to 45/393 patients (11.5%) in the placebo group (RRR, 35.9%; 95% CI: 7.3%, 55.7%) (Fig. 2B). The improvement in all-cause mortality with REGEN-COV persisted through study day 57 (Fig. S6). Similar results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were also observed in the secondary endpoints of hospital discharge and readmission, shown in Table S3 and Table S4 and described in the Supplementary Appendix.

SAFETY

SAEs were experienced by more patients in the placebo group compared to the REGEN-COV group for patients on low-flow oxygen (131/469 [27.9%] placebo vs. 224/941 [23.8%] REGEN-COV) and no supplemental oxygen (43/198 [21.7%] placebo vs. 61/399 [15.3%] REGEN-COV) (Table 3). More patients experienced treatment-emergent adverse events that resulted in death in the placebo group compared with REGEN-COV for both patients on low-flow oxygen (72/469 [15.4%] placebo vs. 108/941 [11.5%] REGEN-COV) (Table S5) and no supplemental oxygen (15/198 [7.6%] placebo vs. 15/399 [3.8%] REGEN-COV) (Table S6), consistent with treatment benefit of REGEN-COV. These events were generally considered by the sponsor as associated with Covid-19 and its complications.

Grade ≥2 IRRs occurred in few patients on low-flow (5/469 [1.1%] placebo vs. 18/941 [1.9%] REGEN-COV) and no supplemental oxygen (1/198 [0.5%] placebo vs. 8/399 [2.0%] REGEN-COV) (Table 3). Grade ≥2 hypersensitivity reactions also occurred in few patients on low-flow (1/469 [0.2%] placebo vs. 7/941 [0.7%] REGEN-COV) and no supplemental oxygen (1/198 [0.5%] placebo vs. 2/399 [0.5%] REGEN-COV) (Table 3). AESIs are further detailed in Table S7 and Table S8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

REGEN-COV is a potent antiviral monoclonal antibody combination shown to rapidly reduce SARS-CoV-2 viral load and modulate a patient's disease course across various populations.[8-11,14] REGEN-COV, which contains two distinct neutralizing antibodies,[15,16] retains neutralizing potency against viral variants of concern, including the Beta, Gamma, and Delta variants.[17]

Hospitalized patients with Covid-19 experience high mortality rates, ranging from 10-30%.[4,18-20] REGEN-COV has potent anti-viral activity, so it was prospectively hypothesized that reducing viral burden as early as possible would decrease morbidity and mortality associated with SARS-CoV-2 hospitalization. Until the recently released results from the RECOVERY platform trial,[21] it was unknown whether reducing viral burden in patients who were already hospitalized would be early enough to meaningfully impact clinical outcomes; RECOVERY reported a 20% reduction in 28-day mortality with REGEN-COV treatment compared to standard of care in seronegative patients. The current placebo-controlled randomized trial (with approximately half of patients receiving concomitant remdesivir) demonstrated and extended the benefit preliminarily reported in the RECOVERY trial among seronegative patients, and also documented no harm signals among seropositive patients. When added to standard of care, REGEN-COV significantly reduced all-cause mortality for patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen. While the primary clinical endpoint, which had a strong positive trend, did not reach significance, all clinical endpoints demonstrated substantial numeric improvements, predominantly driven by the robust and nominally significant results in the seronegative population. In addition, REGEN-COV improved the rates of hospital

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

discharge and death or readmission to hospital at day 29, which persisted through day 57, showing direct benefit to patients as well as the overburdened healthcare system, particularly in the context of the Delta variant which doubles the risk of hospitalization.[22]

The clinical benefits observed in the overall population of this study, including improvements in death or mechanical ventilation, all-cause mortality, and discharge from hospital, were driven by seronegative patients, but no harm was demonstrated in seropositive patients, for whom there were numerically fewer deaths through day 29 with REGEN-COV compared to placebo. In the current variant-rich world with widespread Covid-19 vaccination, the utility of serostatus is unclear; numerous publications cite that even vaccinated patients with high antibody titers may have little to no neutralizing activity to emerging variants.[23-26] Given this context, the results from this study may support the use of REGEN-COV in hospitalized patients with Covid-19, regardless of serostatus. Future studies are needed to further explore the potential clinical benefit in seropositive patients.

REGEN-COV is the first monoclonal antibody therapy, and the first SARS-CoV-2 antiviral, that significantly lowers viral load and reduces mortality in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. Very few treatments have demonstrated a mortality benefit in hospitalized Covid-19 patients. Most of these treatments are designed to modulate the immune response late in the disease course after damage has occurred, rather than to clear SARS-CoV-2. The corticosteroid dexamethasone showed a 17% improvement in 28-day mortality in the RECOVERY trial, with the greatest benefit in patients receiving mechanical ventilation.[21] Baricitinib, a Janus kinase inhibitor, improved 28-day mortality by 38% in hospitalized patients.[27] Recently, interleukin-6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

inhibitors such as tocilizumab and sarilumab were recommended by the World Health Organization for use in hospitalized patients, in which they reduced mortality by 13%.[28,29] The Food and Drug Administration-approved medication remdesivir has shown neither a reduction in viral load nor a mortality benefit in hospitalized patients.[30] REGEN-COV's mechanism of action and safety profile should allow combination approaches with any or all of these other agents.

The safety profile of REGEN-COV in patients on low-flow or no supplemental oxygen was consistent with that observed previously in outpatients and hospitalized patients with Covid-19,[10,13] showing low rates of infusion-related and hypersensitivity reactions, as expected for a fully human antibody against an exogenous target. Overall, REGEN-COV was well tolerated. The placebo group experienced a greater frequency of SAEs and adverse events leading to death than the REGEN-COV group, consistent with the clinical benefit of treatment.

The respiratory status of the population in this manuscript includes those receiving low-flow or no supplemental oxygen, as the study did not enroll sufficient numbers of patients on high-intensity oxygen or mechanical ventilation prior to pausing of these cohorts due to potential safety imbalances, which were not observed in the much larger RECOVERY trial.[21] The absence of full representation across the spectrum of hospitalized patients on varying degrees of oxygen support is a limitation of this study. Additionally, this study was prematurely terminated due to slow recruitment prior to the current surge associated with the emergence of the Delta variant. As a result of the smaller sample size, key analyses pooled the two patient cohorts as well as the two doses. Sensitivity analyses did not reveal major efficacy differences across the cohorts or doses; minor variability in the magnitude of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

risk reductions, with greater effects for the 2.4 g dose compared to the 8.0 g dose, was likely due to small numbers within each group suggesting that either dose can be utilized in hospitalized individuals requiring low-flow or no supplemental oxygen. Overall, trends for treatment benefit on mortality and other efficacy endpoints extend the observations in the larger RECOVERY trial, where benefit was seen in all patients regardless of respiratory status.

Authorized options for intervention with a monoclonal antibody anti-viral treatment have been restricted to outpatients with Covid-19 or as post-exposure prophylaxis.[5-7] Taken together with reports from the RECOVERY trial, these data support REGEN-COV representing a well-tolerated and compelling treatment option to reduce the risk of mortality in hospitalized Covid-19 patients and across the disease continuum of SARS-CoV-2, from prevention to hospitalization.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the patients who participated in this study as well as their families; the study investigators; the members of the independent data monitoring committee; Kaitlyn Scacalossi, Ph.D. and Caryn Trbovic, Ph.D. from Regeneron Pharmaceuticals for assistance with development of the manuscript; and Prime, Knutsford, UK, for formatting and copy-editing suggestions.

SUPPORTED BY

Supported by Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Certain aspects of this project have been funded in whole or in part with Federal funds from the Department of Health and Human Services; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response; Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, under OT number HHSO100201700020C.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

Qualified researchers may request access to study documents (including the clinical study report, study protocol with any amendments, blank case report form, and statistical analysis plan) that support the methods and findings reported in this manuscript. Individual anonymized participant data will be considered for sharing once the indication has been approved by a regulatory body, if there is legal authority to share the data and there is not a reasonable likelihood of participant re-identification. Submit requests to https://vivli.org/.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, et al. Clinical characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City. N Engl J Med 2020;382:2372-4.

2. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1708-20.

3. Li L, Zhang W, Hu Y, et al. Effect of Convalescent Plasma Therapy on Time to Clinical Improvement in Patients With Severe and Life-threatening COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA 2020;324:460-70.

4. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area. JAMA 2020;323:2052-9.

5. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Authorizes Monoclonal Antibody for Treatment of COVID-19. 2020. at https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-monoclonal-antibody-treatment-covid-19.)

6. FDA authorizes REGEN-COV monoclonal antibody therapy for post-exposure prophylaxis (prevention) for COVID-19. 2021. at https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-authorizes-regen-cov-monoclonal-antibody-therapy-post-exposure-prophylaxis-prevention-covid-19.)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

7. UK Authorizes Regeneron Antibody Cocktail to Prevent and Treat Acute COVID-19 Infection. 2021. at https://newsroom.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/uk-authorizes-regeneron-antibody-cocktail-prevent-and-treat.)

8. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGN-COV2, a neutralizing antibody cocktail, in outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021;384:238-51.

9. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGEN-COV antibody cocktail in outpatients with Covid-19. medRxiv 2021:2021.06.09.21257915.

10. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGEN-COV antibody combination and outcomes in outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021.

11. O'Brien MP, Forleo-Neto E, Musser BJ, et al. Subcutaneous REGEN-COV antibody combination to prevent Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021;385:1184-95.

12. Verderese JP, Stepanova M, Lam B, et al. Neutralizing Monoclonal Antibody Treatment Reduces Hospitalization for Mild and Moderate COVID-19: A Real-World Experience. Clin Infect Dis. 2021/06/25 ed2021.

13. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby PW, Mafham M, et al. Casirivimab and imdevimab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. medRxiv 2021:2021.06.15.21258542.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

14. O'Brien MP, Forleo-Neto E, Sarkar N, et al. Subcutaneous REGEN-COV Antibody Combination in Early SARS-CoV-2 Infection. medRxiv 2021.

15. Baum A, Fulton BO, Wloga E, et al. Antibody cocktail to SARS-CoV-2 spike protein prevents rapid mutational escape seen with individual antibodies. Science (New York, NY) 2020;369:1014-8.

16. Hansen J, Baum A, Pascal KE, et al. Studies in humanized mice and convalescent humans yield a SARS-CoV-2 antibody cocktail. Science (New York, NY) 2020;369:1010-4.

17. Copin R, Baum A, Wloga E, et al. The monoclonal antibody combination REGEN-COV protects against SARS-CoV-2 mutational escape in preclinical and human studies. Cell 2021.

18. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, et al. Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study. BMJ 2020;369:m1985.

19. Rieg S, von Cube M, Kalbhenn J, et al. COVID-19 in-hospital mortality and mode of death in a dynamic and non-restricted tertiary care model in Germany. PLoS One 2020;15:e0242127.

20. Finelli L, Gupta V, Petigara T, Yu K, Bauer KA, Puzniak LA. Mortality Among US Patients Hospitalized With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in 2020. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e216556.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

21. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Lim WS, et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med 2021;384:693-704.

22. Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, et al. Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk for SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) compared with alpha (B.1.1.7) variants of concern: a cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021/08/31 ed2021.

23. Planas D, Veyer D, Baidaliuk A, et al. Reduced sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta to antibody neutralization. Nature 2021;596:276-80.

24. Chen X, Chen Z, Azman AS, et al. Neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants induced by natural infection or vaccination: a systematic review and pooled meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2021/07/25 ed2021.

25. Shastri J, Parikh S, Aggarwal V, et al. Severe SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough reinfection with Delta variant after recovery from breakthrough infection by Alpha variant in a fully vaccinated health worker. Front Med (Lausanne) 2021;8:737007.

26. Sharun K, Tiwari R, Dhama K, Emran TB, Rabaan AA, Al Mutair A. Emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants: impact on vaccine efficacy and neutralizing antibodies. Hum Vaccin Immunother 2021:1-4.

27. Marconi VC, Ramanan AV, de Bono S, et al. Efficacy and safety of baricitinib for the treatment of hospitalised adults with COVID-19 (COV-BARRIER): a randomised, double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2021/09/05 ed2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

28. WHO recommends life-saving interleukin-6 receptor blockers for COVID-19 and urges producers to join efforts to rapidly increase access. 2021. at https://www.who.int/news/item/06-07-2021-who-recommends-life-saving-interleukin-6-receptor-blockers-for-covid-19-and-urges-producers-to-join-efforts-to-rapidly-increase-access.)

29. Rosas IO, Brau N, Waters M, et al. Tocilizumab in hospitalized patients with severe Covid-19 pneumonia. N Engl J Med 2021;384:1503-16.

30. Ohl ME, Miller DR, Lund BC, et al. Association of remdesivir treatment with survival and length of hospital stay among US veterans hospitalized with COVID-19. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2114741.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Demographics and Baseline Characteristics*

	Placebo (N=393)	REGEN-COV 2.4 g IV (N=406)	REGEN-COV 8.0 g IV (N=398)	REGEN-COV Combined Doses (N=804)	Total (N=1197)
Age — yr					
Median (range)	64.0 (20:97)	60.0 (20:97)	62.0 (20:98)	61.0 (20:100)	62.0 (20:100)
≥65 — no. (%)	191 (48.6)	164 (40.4)	170 (42.7)	334 (41.5)	525 (43.9)
Male sex — no. (%)	210 (53.4)	221 (54.4)	216 (54.3)	437 (54.4)	647 (54.1)
Race — no. (%)	239 (60.8)	246 (60.6)	264 (66.3)	510 (63.4)	749 (62.6)
White	46 (11.7)	57 (14.0)	42 (10.6)	99 (12.3)	145 (12.1)
Black or African American	16 (4.1)	17 (4.2)	14 (3.5)	31 (3.9)	47 (3.9)
Asian	9 (2.3)	9 (2.2)	13 (3.3)	22 (2.7)	31 (2.6)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0 (0)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.5)	3 (0.4)	3 (0.3)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	26 (6.6)	28 (6.9)	22 (5.5)	50 (6.2)	76 (6.3)
Unknown	57 (14.5)	48 (11.8)	41 (10.3)	89 (11.1)	146 (12.2)
Not reported	239 (60.8)	246 (60.6)	264 (66.3)	510 (63.4)	749 (62.6)
Ethnicity — no. (%)					
Hispanic or Latino	115 (29.3)	137 (33.7)	108 (27.1)	245 (30.5)	360 (30.1)
Not Hispanic or Latino	260 (66.2)	251 (61.8)	269 (67.6)	520 (64.7)	780 (65.2)
Not reported	18 (4.6)	18 (4.4)	21 (5.3)	39 (4.9)	57 (4.8)
Mean weight — kg	87.0±23.4	89.0±24.9	89.0±24.6	89.0±24.7	88.31±24.306
Body-mass index†					
Mean	30.8±7.5	31.2±7.9	31.2±8.2	31.2±8.1	31.06±7.876
≥30 — no. (%)	186 (47.3)	192 (47.3)	190 (47.7)	382 (47.5)	568 (47.5)
Median days Covid-19 illness prior to baseline (Q1:Q3)	5.0 (4.0:8.0)	6.0 (4.0:8.0)	6.0 (4.0:8.0)	6.0 (4.0:8.0)	6.0 (4.0:8.0)
Baseline viral load					
Median (Q1:Q3) — $\log_{10}$ copies/ml	6.3 (5.0:7.6)	6.4 (5.1:7.6)	6.5 (5.3:7.8)	6.4 (5.1:7.7))	6.4 (5.1:7.7)
$>10^4$ copies/ml — no. (%)	356 (90.6)	366 (90.1)	359 (90.2)	725 (90.2)	1081 (90.3)
$>10^6$ copies/ml — no. (%)	229 (58.3)	231 (56.9)	236 (59.3)	467 (58.1)	696 (58.1)
Baseline serology status — no. (%)					

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Negative	160 (40.7)	172 (42.4)	188 (47.2)	360 (44.8)	520 (43.4)
Positive	201 (51.1)	191 (47.0)	178 (44.7)	369 (45.9)	570 (47.6)
Other (not determined, borderline)	32 (8.1)	43 (10.6)	32 (8.0)	75 (9.3)	107 (8.9)
Presence of neutralizing antibodies for seropositive patients — no./No. (%)					
Positive	140/201 (69.7)	140/191 (73.3)	129/178 (72.5)	269/369 (72.9)	409/570 (71.8)
Negative	35/201 (17.4)	30/191 (15.7)	31/178 (17.4)	61/369 (16.5)	96/570 (16.8)
Borderline	15/201 (7.5)	10/191 (5.2)	8/178 (4.5)	18/369 (4.9)	33/570 (5.8)
Unknown/missing/ indeterminate	11/201 (5.5)	11/191 (5.8)	10/178 (5.6)	21/369 (5.7)	32/570 (5.6)
Mean C-reactive protein — mg/l	75.1±68.6	73.9±96.7	71.1±84.5	72.5±91.0	73.4±84.29
Mean neutrophils-lymphocyte ratio — NLR	5.9±5.7	2.3±2.1	8.0±4.3	5.6±4.5	5.7±4.9
Concomitant medications — no. (%)					
Remdesivir	220 (56.0)	212 (52.2)	225 (56.5)	437 (54.4)	657 (54.9)
Systemic corticosteroids	294 (74.8)	294 (72.4)	307 (77.1)	601 (74.8)	895 (74.8)
Use of supplemental oxygen — no. (%)	226 (57.5)	223 (54.9)	223 (56.0)	446 (55.5)	672 (56.1)
Non-invasive ventilation or high-flow oxygen devices	1 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.1)
Supplemental oxygen‡	225 (99.6)	223 (100)	223 (100)	446 (100)	671 (99.9)
Immunocompromised — no. (%)	85 (21.6)	87 (21.4)	85 (21.4)	172 (21.4)	257 (21.5)

*Modified full analysis set presented; plus-minus values are means ±SD. Covid-19 denotes coronavirus disease 2019; IV, intravenous; NLR, neutrophil lymphocyte ratio; and SD, standard deviation.

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

‡Not requiring high-flow oxygen devices.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Primary Virologic and Clinical Endpoints*

Hierarchy	Endpoint	Placebo	REGEN-COV 2.4 g IV	REGEN-COV 8.0 g IV	REGEN-COV Combined
	Primary Virologic Outcome†‡				
1.	**Time-weighted average change in viral load from baseline (day 1) to day 7 in seronegative mFAS**				
	Patients — no	131	150	160	310
	Least-squares mean change (SE) — $\log_{10}$ copies/mL	-1.03 (0.10)	-1.28 (0.09)	-1.34 (0.09)	-1.31 (0.06)
	95% CI	-1.22, -0.84	-1.46, -1.10	-1.51, -1.16	-1.43, -1.18
	Difference vs. placebo at day 7 — $\log_{10}$ copies/mL				
	Least-squares mean (SE)	-	-0.25 (0.13)	-0.31 (0.13)	-0.28 (0.12)
	95% CI	-	-0.51, 0.02	-0.57, -0.05	-0.51, -0.05
	P-value	-	0.0663	0.0204	0.0172
	Primary Clinical Outcome†§¶				
2.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 6 to day 29 in high-viral load mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	28/211 (13.3)	16/220 (7.3)	28/225 (12.4)	44/445 (9.9)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	45.2	6.2	25.5
	95% CI — %	-	1.7, 69.5	-52.9, 42.5	-16.2, 52.2
	P-value	-	0.0431	0.7975	0.2048
3.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 6 to day 29 in seronegative mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	22/147 (15.0)	8/162 (4.9)	19/179 (10.6)	27/341 (7.9)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	67.0	29.1	47.1%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	95% CI — %	-	28.2, 84.8	-25.9, 60.0	10.2, 68.8
4.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 6 to day 29 in overall mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	39/367 (10.6)	21/387 (5.4)	41/383 (10.7)	62/770 (8.1)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	48.9	-0.7	24.2
	95% CI — %	-	14.9, 69.4	-52.5, 33.4	-10.9, 48.2
5.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 1 to day 29 in high-viral load mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	43/229 (18.8)	23/231 (10.0)	34/236 (14.4)	57/467 (12.2)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	47.0	23.3	35.0
	95% CI — %	-	15.0, 66.9	-15.8, 49.2	6.6, 54.8
6.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 1 to day 29 in seronegative mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	31/160 (19.4)	14/172 (8.1)	23/188 (12.2)	37/360 (10.3)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	58.0	36.9	47.0
	95% CI — %	-	24.0, 76.8	-3.7, 61.6	17.7, 65.8
7.	**Proportion of patients who died or went on mechanical ventilation from day 1 to day 29 in overall mFAS**				
	No./total no. (%)	58/393 (14.8)	32/406 (7.9)	50/398 (12.6)	82/804 (10.2)
	Relative risk reduction — %	-	46.6	14.9	30.9
	95% CI — %	-	19.6, 64.5	-21.0, 40.1	5.4, 49.5

*CI denotes confidence interval; IV, intravenous; mFAS, modified full analysis set.

†Pooled phase 3 cohort 1 and phase 2 cohort 1A.

‡LS mean, 95% CI, and P-value for change from baseline on log scale for each treatment group is based on the analysis of covariance model with treatment group and the type of background standard of care (antiviral

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

therapies and non-antiviral therapies) as fixed effects, and baseline viral load and treatment*baseline as covariates. Negative changes imply improvement in viral load.

§95% CI for the relative risk and relative risk reduction (1 - relative risk) uses the Farrington-Manning method.

¶P-value is derived from the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test stratified by the type of background standard of care (antiviral therapies and non-antiviral therapies). If np ≤5 or n(1-p) ≤ 5 in any treatment group, P-value is based on Fisher's exact test. Nominally significant P-values were omitted.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Overview of Treatment-Emergent Adverse Events*

No. (%)	Placebo	REGEN-COV 2.4 g IV	REGEN-COV 8.0 g IV	REGEN-COV Combined
Low-flow oxygen	**N=469**	**N=470**	**N=471**	**N=941**
Patients with any TEAE†	132 (28.1)	118 (25.1)	131 (27.8)	249 (26.5)
Patients with any grade 3 or 4 TEAE	93 (19.8)	68 (14.5)	82 (17.4)	150 (15.9)
Patients with any treatment-emergent SAE	131 (27.9)	106 (22.6)	118 (25.1)	224 (23.8)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI	6 (1.3)	10 (2.1)	14 (3.0)	24 (2.6)
Patients with any treatment-emergent serious AESI	2 (0.4)	4 (0.9)	6 (1.3)	10 (1.1)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI of infusion-related reactions (grade ≥2) through day 4§	5 (1.1)	7 (1.5)	11 (2.3)	18 (1.9)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI of hypersensitivity reactions (grade ≥2) through day 29	1 (0.2)	3 (0.6)	4 (0.8)	7 (0.7)
Patients with any TEAE leading to study infusion interruption	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)
No supplemental oxygen	**N=198**	**N=202**	**N=197**	**N=399**
Patients with any TEAE†	48 (24.2)	31 (15.3)	37 (18.8)	68 (17.0)
Patients with any grade 3 or 4 TEAE	31 (15.7)	24 (11.9)	23 (11.7)	47 (11.8)
Patients with any treatment-emergent SAE	43 (21.7)	29 (14.4)	32 (16.2)	61 (15.3)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI	2 (1.0)	4 (2.0)	6 (3.0)	10 (2.5)
Patients with any treatment-emergent serious AESI	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	3 (1.5)	4 (1.0)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI of infusion-related reactions (grade ≥2) through day 4§	1 (0.5)	4 (2.0)	4 (2.0)	8 (2.0)
Patients with any treatment-emergent AESI of hypersensitivity reactions (grade ≥2) through day 29	1 (0.5%)	0	2 (1.0%)	2 (0.5%)
Patients with any TEAE leading to study infusion interruption	0	0	2 (1.0%)	2 (0.5%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

*AESI denotes adverse event of special interest IV, intravenous; SAE, serious adverse event; and TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event.

†TEAEs collected include treatment-emergent SAEs, AESIs, and grade 3/4 TEAEs, as well as ad-hoc/voluntarily reported TEAEs by some sites.

❑Phase 1/2/3 cohort 1.

§Deemed treatment-related as per investigator assessment.

❑Phase 2 cohort 1A.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Viral Load by Serostatus

Panel A graph shows LS mean viral load following administration of REGEN-COV (2.4 g, 8.0 g, or combined analysis of 2.4 and 8.0 g) or placebo for patients who tested negative for all SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at baseline (seronegative). Panel B shows the same but for patents who tested positive for any SARS-CoV-2 antibody at baseline (seropositive). For both panels, the lower limit of quantification is 2.85 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL.

CI denotes confidence-interval; IV, intravenous; mFAS, modified full analysis set; LS, least-squares; PBO, placebo; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SE, standard error; and TWA, time-weighted average.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656; this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Efficacy Outcomes by Serostatus for Combined Dose REGEN-COV from Day 1 though Day 29

Panel A shows a Kaplan–Meier curve for the proportion of patients who died through study day 29, after administration of REGEN-COV (combined analysis of 2.4 g or 8.0 g) or placebo. Results are analyzed separately for patients who were seronegative or seropositive at baseline. + indicates censoring. Panel B shows a forest plot of relative risk and relative risk reduction with 95% CI for REGEN-COV combined dose analysis (2.4 g and 8.0 g) vs. placebo. Parameters examined include death within 28 days, discharge alive from hospital from day 1-29, and death or mechanical ventilation from day 1-29. For all populations, the mFAS was comprised of patients who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at baseline. Populations analyzed include patients who tested negative for all SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at baseline (seronegative mFAS) patients who tested positive for any SARS-CoV-2 antibody at baseline (seropositive mFAS), those with inconclusive or missing baseline serology (other), and the overall population regardless of serostatus (overall mFAS). For the proportion of death within 28 days and the proportion of death or mechanical ventilation with 28 days, the lower bound of the CI of the relative risk reduction was -342.0% and -241.0%, respectively, which was presented as “NA” in the figure.

CI denotes confidence interval; mFAS, modified full analysis set; and SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

Figure 1. Viral Load by Serostatus

A.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656 this version posted November 19, 2021. The copyright hol
preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprin
in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Seronegative mITAS

	TWA change from baseline, LS mean (95% CI)				TWA difference REGEN-COV vs. PBO, LS mean (95% CI)		
	Placebo (N=160)	**2.4 g (N=172)**	**8.0 g (N=188)**	**Combined (N=360)**	**2.4 g (N=172)**	**8.0 g (N=188)**	**Combined (N=360)**
Day 3	–0.45 (–0.60, –0.30)	–0.48 (–0.62, –0.35)	–0.59 (–0.73, –0.46)	–0.54 (–0.64, –0.45)	–0.03 (–0.24, 0.17)	–0.15 (–0.35, 0.05)	–0.10 (–0.27, 0.08)
Day 5	–0.82 (–1.00, –0.63)	–0.89 (–1.06, –0.71)	–0.95 (–1.12, –0.78)	–0.92 (–1.04, –0.80)	–0.07 (–0.32, 0.18)	–0.13 (–0.38, 0.11)	–0.10 (–0.32, 0.12)
Day 7	–1.03 (–1.22, –0.84)	–1.28 (–1.46, –1.10)	–1.34 (–1.51, –1.16)	–1.31 (–1.43, –1.18)	–0.25 (–0.51, 0.02)	–0.31 (–0.57, –0.05)	–0.28 (–0.51, –0.05)
Day 9	–1.22 (–1.42, –1.02)	–1.67 (–1.87, –1.48)	–1.70 (–1.88, –1.51)	–1.69 (–1.82, –1.56)	–0.45 (–0.73, –0.17)	–0.48 (–0.75, –0.20)	–0.47 (–0.71, –023)
Day 11	–1.39 (–1.60, –1.17)	–1.97 (–2.17, –1.76)	–2.00 (–2.20, –1.80)	–1.98 (–2.12, –1.84)	–0.58 (–0.87, –0.28)	–0.61 (–0.90, –0.32)	–0.59 (–0.85, –0.34)
Day 13	–1.61 (–1.84, –1.38)	–2.23 (–2.44, –2.01)	–2.29 (–2.50, –2.08)	–2.26 (–2.41, –2.11)	–0.62 (–0.93, –0.30)	–0.68 (–0.99, –0.37)	–0.65 (–0.92, –0.38)



B. Placebo | REGEN-COV 2.4 g IV | REGEN-COV 8.0 g IV | REGEN-COV combined

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.05.21265656, this version posted November 19, 2021. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Seropositive mFAS

	TWA change from baseline, LS mean (95% CI)				TWA difference REGEN-COV vs. PBO, LS mean (95% CI)		
	Placebo (N=201)	**2.4 g (N=172)**	**8.0 g (N=188)**	**Combined (N=360)**	**2.4 g (N=172)**	**8.0 g (N=188)**	**Combined (N=360)**
Day 3	–0.44 (–0.58, –0.31)	–0.61 (–0.76, –0.46)	–0.56 (–0.71, –0.42)	–0.59 (–0.69, –0.48)	–0.17 (–0.37, 0.03)	–0.12 (–0.32, 0.08)	–0.14 (–0.32, 0.03)
Day 5	–0.74 (–0.90, –0.59)	–0.95 (–1.11, –0.78)	–0.85 (–1.02, –0.68)	–0.90 (–1.02, –0.78)	–0.20 (–0.43, 0.02)	–0.11 (–0.33, 0.12)	–0.16 (–0.35, 0.03)
Day 7	–0.96 (–1.11, –0.80)	–1.19 (–1.36, –1.03)	–1.14 (–1.31, –0.97)	–1.17 (–1.29, –1.05)	–0.24 (–0.46,–0.01)	–0.18 (–0.41, 0.05)	–0.21 (–0.41,–0.02)
Day 9	–1.22 (–1.39, –1.05)	–1.45 (–1.62, –1.27)	–1.39 (–1.57, –1.21)	–1.42 (–1.55, –1.30)	–0.23 (–0.47, 0.01)	–0.17 (–0.42, 0.07)	–0.20 (–0.41, 0.00)
Day 11	–1.42 (–1.60, –1.25)	–1.62 (–1.80, –1.44)	–1.55 (–1.74, –1.36)	–1.59 (–1.72, –1.46)	–0.20 (–0.45, 0.05)	–0.13 (–0.38, 0.13)	–0.17 (–0.38, 0.05)
Day 13	–1.62 (–1.80, –1.44)	–1.78 (–1.97, –1.59)	–1.73 (–1.93, –1.54)	–1.76 (–1.90, –1.62)	–0.16 (–0.43, 0.10)	–0.12 (–0.38, 0.15)	–0.14 (–0.37, 0.09)



Figure 2. Efficacy Outcomes by Serostatus for Combined Dose REGEN-COV from Day 1 though Day 29

A.



No. at Risk

Seronegative placebo	160	159	159	158	157	153	151	150	147	146	144	143	143	140	138	137	135	132	132	132	131	129	127	127	126	125	124	123	121
Seronegative REGEN-COV combined	360	358	356	353	352	348	346	343	341	338	333	331	329	325	324	324	324	323	320	316	314	313	312	311	310	310	310	308	308
Seropositive placebo	201	201	201	199	197	196	195	193	192	191	191	188	187	186	186	185	183	179	178	177	177	177	175	175	174	174	174	174	174
Seropositive REGEN-COV combined	369	367	367	364	364	364	362	357	353	349	347	345	342	340	339	336	336	336	336	335	332	329	328	327	325	324	324	324	324

B.

Relative Risk and Relative Risk Reduction from Day 1 though Day 29

	REGEN-COV Combined	Placebo	Relative risk (95% CI)	Relative risk reduction (95% CI)
Death within 28 days				
Seronegative	24/360 (6.7%)	24/160 (15.0%)		55.6% (24.2%, 74%)
Seropositive	26/369 (7.0%)	18/201 (9.0%)		21.3% (–40.0%, 55.8%)
Other	9/75 (12.0%)	3/32 (9.4%)		–28.0% (NA, 62.9%)
mFAS	**59/840 (7.3%)**	**45/393 (11.5%)**		**35.9% (7.3%, 55.7%)**
Discharge alive from hospital, day 1-29				
Seronegative	324/360 (90.0%)	130/160 (81.3%)		–10.8% (–20.2%, –2%)
Seropositive	323/369 (87.5%)	170/201 (85.6%)		–2.3% (–9.6%, 4.5%)
Other	67/75 (89.3%)	28/32 (87.5%)		–2.1 (–18.9%, 12.3%)
mFAS	**712/804 (88.8%)**	**330/393 (84.0%)**		**–5.8% (–11.1%, –0.6%)**
Death or mechanical ventilation, day 1-29				
Seronegative	37/360 (10.3%)	31/160 (19.4%)		47.0% (17.7%, 65.8%)
Seropositive	34/369 (9.2%)	23/201 (11.4%)		19.5% (–32.8%, 51.2%)
Other	11/75 (14.7%)	4/32 (12.5%)		–17.3% (NA, 59.6%)
mFAS	**82/804 (10.2%)**	**58/393 (14.8%)**		**30.9% (5.4%, 49.5%)**