Outpatient regimens to reduce COVID-19 hospitalisations: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

David J. Sullivan, Daniele Focosi, Daniel F. Hanley, Mario Cruciani, Massimo Franchini, Jiangda Ou, Arturo Casadevall, Nigel Paneth

Corresponding author: David Sullivan, 615 N. Wolfe St Rm W4606, Baltimore MD 21205. Tel 410 502 2522, fax 410 955 0105. E-mail dsulliv7@jhmi.edu.

Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Baltimore, MD USA (Prof. D J Sullivan M.D., Prof. A Casadevall M.D.PhD,); North-Western Tuscany Blood Bank, Pisa University Hospital, Pisa, Italy (Prof. D Focosi, M.D.); Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Department of Neurology, Brain Injury Outcomes Division, Baltimore, MD, USA (Prof. D F Hanley M.D., J Ou M.S.); Division of Hematology, Carlo Poma Hospital, Mantua, Italy (Prof. M Cruciani M.D., Prof. M Franchini M.D.,); Departments of Epidemiology & Biostatistics and Pediatrics & Human Development, College of Human Medicine, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA (Prof. N Paneth, M.D., M.P.H)

Keywords: small molecule antivirals; convalescent plasma; monoclonal antibody; COVID-19; outpatients; randomized controlled trial.
Abbreviations: CCP: COVID-19 convalescent plasma; mAb: monoclonal antibody. RCT: randomized controlled trial; VOC: variant of concern.

Text word count 3485

]]

Summary 300 words
Background: During pandemics, early outpatient treatments reduce the health system burden. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in COVID-19 outpatients have tested therapeutic agents, but no RCT or systematic review has been conducted comparing the efficacy of the main outpatient treatment classes to each other. We aimed in this systematic review of outpatient RCTs in COVID-19 to compare hospitalisation rate reductions with four classes of treatment: convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibodies, small molecule antivirals and repurposed drugs.
Methods: We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of all COVID-19 outpatient RCTs that included the endpoint of progression to hospitalisation. We assembled, from multiple published and preprint databases, participant characteristics, hospitalisations, resolution of symptoms and mortality from January 2020 to May 21, 2023. The risk of bias from COVID-NMA was incorporated into the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system. We measured heterogeneity with I^2. Meta-analysis by a random or fixed effect model dependent on significant heterogeneity (I^2 >50%) was performed. The protocol was registered in PROSPERO, CRD42022369181.
Findings: The search identified 281 studies of which 54 RCTs for 30 diverse interventions were included in the final analysis. These trials, performed largely in unvaccinated cohorts during pre-Omicron waves, focused on populations with at least one COVID-19 hospitalisation risk factor. Grouping by class, monoclonal antibodies (OR=0.31 [95% CI=0.24-0.40]) had highest efficacy, followed by COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP) (OR=0.69 [95% CI=0.53 to 0.90]) and small molecule antivirals (OR=0.78 [95% CI=0.48-1.33]) for hospital reduction. Repurposed drugs (OR=0.82 [95% CI- 0.72-0.93]) had lower efficacy.
Interpretation: Inasmuch as omicron sublineages (XBB and BQ.1.1) are now resistant to monoclonal antibodies, oral antivirals are the preferred treatment in outpatients where available, but intravenous interventions from convalescent plasma to remdesivir are also effective and necessary in constrained medical resource settings or for acute and chronic COVID-19 in the immunocompromised.
Funding: US Department of Defense and National Institute of Health

Research in context

Evidence before this study

We systematically searched the published and preprint data bases for outpatient randomized clinical trials of treatment of COVID-19 disease with hospitalisation as an endpoint. Previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses have confined the reviews to specific classes such as convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibodies, small molecule antivirals or repurposed drugs. Few comparisons have been made between these therapeutic classes. The trials took place both in the pre-vaccination and the vaccination era, spanning periods with dominance of different COVID variants. We sought to compare efficacy between the four classes of treatments listed above when used in outpatient COVID-19 patients as shown in randomized, placebo-controlled trials.

Added value of this study

This systematic review and meta-analysis brings together trials that assessed hospitalisation rates in diverse COVID-19 outpatient populations varying in age and comorbidities, permitting us to assess the efficacy of interventions both within and across therapeutic classes. While heterogeneity exists within and between these intervention classes, the meta-analysis can be placed in context of trial diverse populations over variant time periods of the pandemic. At present most of the world population has either had COVID-19 or been vaccinated with a high seropositivity rate, indicating that future placebo-controlled trials will be limited because of the sample sizes required to document hospitalisation outcomes.

Implications of all the available evidence

Numerous diverse therapeutic tools need to be ready for a resilient response to changing SARS-CoV-2 variants in both immunocompetent and immunocompromised COVID-19 outpatient populations. To date few head-to-head randomized controlled trials (RCTs) has compared treatment options for COVID-19 outpatients, making comparisons and treatment choices difficult. This systematic review compares outcomes among RCTs of outpatient therapy for COVID-19, taking into account time between onset of symptoms and treatment administration. We found that small-chemical antivirals, convalescent plasma and monoclonal antibodies had comparable efficacy between classes and amongst interventions within the four classes. Monoclonals have lost efficacy with viral mutation, and chemical antivirals have contraindications and adverse events, while intravenous interventions like convalescent plasma or remdesivir remain resilient options for the immunocompromised, and, in the case of CCP, in resource constrained settings with limited availability of oral drugs.

INTRODUCTION

By May 17, 2023 the world had recorded over 766 million cases and more than 6.9 million deaths from COVID-19. In the US, some 100 million cases have been recorded, with over a million deaths, while six million hospital admissions for COVID took place between August 2020 and December 2022. A pronounced spike in hospitalisations for COVID-19 in the US took place in the first two months of 2022 with the arrival of the Omicron variant of concern (VOC). Several approaches to reducing the risk of hospitalisation have been taken during the pandemic, including administering COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP), monoclonal antibodies (mAbs), small molecule antivirals or repurposed drugs. Vaccination and boosters have substantially reduced the hospitalisation and death risk, but outpatients at elevated severe COVID risk can still benefit from early treatment to avoid hospitalisation. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in outpatients have tested therapeutic agents against placebo or standard of care, but very few RCTs has been conducted that compare the main outpatient treatment classes.

The first outpatient treatments for COVID-19 authorized by the FDA were for mAbs (bamlanivimab, bamlanivimab plus etesevimab[1] or casirivimab plus imdevimab[2]), approvals that preceded the introduction of mRNA vaccines[3,4]. While many small molecules were repurposed as antivirals during the early stages of the pandemic, oral antivirals developed against SARS-CoV-2 for outpatients were not authorized and available until December 2021, when nirmatrelvir/ritonavir[5] and molnupiravir[6] were approved. The following month, intravenous remdesivir was also approved for outpatient use[7]. On December 2021, nearly two years after the first use of CCP, the FDA approved CCP outpatient use, but only for immunocompromised patients[8,9]. The mAbs have been withdrawn due to viral variants BQ.1.* and XBB.* resistance.

Here we assemble outpatient RCTs of COVID-19 different therapies, sharing either all cause or COVID-19 related hospitalisation for an endpoint. A literature search of MEDLINE (through PubMed), medRxiv and bioRxiv databases was carried out aiming to include all such RCTs published from March 2020 to October 2022 and these are summarized in the PRISMA chart (Figure 1). This systematic review and meta-analysis of outpatient COVID-19 RCTs, compared outcomes amongst CCP, mAbs, antivirals or repurposed drugs taking into account risk factors for progression, intervention dosage, time between symptom onset and treatment administration, and predominant variants of concern during RCTs.

METHODS

The protocol has been registered in PROSPERO, the prospective register of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of the University of York (protocol registration number CRD42022369181). We assembled outpatient COVID-19 RCTs with hospitalisation or a single CCP study with life-threatening respiratory distress[10] as the outcome, by searching MEDLINE (through PubMed), medRxiv and bioRxiv databases for the period of March 1, 2020 to May 22, 2022, with English language as the only restriction. The Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) and search query used were: "("COVID-19" OR "SARS-CoV-2" OR "coronavirus disease 2019") AND ("treatment" OR "therapy") AND ("outpatient") AND ("hospitalisation")" AND ("randomized clinical trial"). We also screened the reference list of reviewed articles for studies not captured in our initial search. We excluded case reports, case series, retrospective, propensity-matched studies, non-randomized clinical trials, review articles, meta-analyses, studies with fewer than 30 participants, studies that did not record or had no hospitalisations. and articles reporting only aggregate data. Trials of COVID prevention[11] were excluded, even if hospitalisations were recorded. Articles underwent a blind evaluation for inclusion by two assessors (D.S. and D.F.) and disagreements

were resolved by a third senior assessor (A.C.). Figure 1 shows a PRISMA flowchart of the literature reviewing process. The following parameters were extracted from studies: baseline SARS-CoV-2 serology status, time from onset of symptoms to treatment, study dates, recruiting countries, gender, age (including the fraction of participants over age 50, 60 and 65), ethnicity, risk factors for COVID-19 progression (systemic arterial hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and obesity), sample size, dosage type of control, hospitalisations and deaths in each arm, and time to symptom resolution. Study dates were used to infer predominant VOCs.

Assessment of risk of bias and GRADE assessment

A risk of bias assessment of each selected RCT was performed by COVID-19-NMA initiative[12,13]. Within-trial risk of bias was assessed, using the Cochrane ROB tool for RCTs[14].We explored clinical heterogeneity (e.g., risk factors for progression, time between onset of symptoms and treatment administration, and predominant variants of concern at the time of the interventions) and calculated statistical heterogeneity using τ^2, Cochran's Q and estimated this using the I^2 statistic, which examines the total variation percentage across studies due to heterogeneity rather than chance.

We used the GRADE (The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) system criteria to assess the quality of the body of evidence associated with specific outcomes, and constructed a 'Summary of Findings' table (Appendix Table 3), which defines the certainty of a body of evidence as the extent to which one can be confident that an estimate of effect or association is close to the true quantity of specific interest[14]. Publication bias was assessed by visual inspection of funnel plots.

Statistical methods

Descriptive analysis included time-to-treatment, geography (country) of the study, age, sex, race, ethnicity, seropositive, hospital type and medical high-risk conditions. The unweighted pooling ARR, RRR, NNT were calculated based on the arithmetic summation of the total hospitalisation or death numbers in each therapeutic category.

Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to show the direction of effect and its significance in comparing treatment group and control groups. The studies were weighted with the Mantel-Haenszel method. The effect heterogeneity was calculated estimating the I-squared (I^2) inconsistency index. If significant heterogeneity was detected ($I^2 > 50\%$ and Cochran's Q test for heterogeneity was significant ($p < 0.10$)), a random effect model was performed; otherwise, a fixed (common) effect model was performed. Weight, heterogeneity, between-study variance, and significance level were displayed in forest plots.

The significance level was 0.05. The figures were created in Prism software, R (version 4.2.1) and its statistical package "meta" (version 6.0-0). All the data manipulation and the analyses were performed in Excel, Prism, MedCalc (version 20.106), R and REVMAN.5.

Role of the funding source

The study sponsors did not contribute to the study design; to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; to manuscript preparation, nor to the decision to submit the paper for publication.

RESULTS

TRIAL CHARACTERISTICS

We reviewed in detail 54 distinct outpatient RCTs (30 different interventions), conducted from March 2020 to May 22, 2023, across waves sustained by different SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VOC) and different vaccination periods in diverse patient populations (Figure 2). The studies varied in reporting outcomes of hospitalisation, whether all-cause or COVID-19 related. The CCP group included 3 RCTs with all-cause hospitalisation, 2 trials with COVID-19 related hospitalisations only and one trial with life-threatening respiratory distress in elderly individuals, deemed equivalent to hospital outcome (Appendix Table 1). The mAb RCTs included 3 trials with all-cause hospitalisations and 5 that used COVID-19 related hospitalisations as the outcome. The small molecule antivirals had 6 RCTs with all-cause hospitalisations and 5 with COVID-19 related hospitalisations, while 17 RCT's of repurposed drugs used all-cause hospitalisations and 10 trials restricted to COVID-19 related hospitalisations. Here we report the hospitalisations as a composite of the hospital types. Because inclusion criteria varied across the RCTs, the power to detect a difference in hospitalisation rates varied across studies. Three CCP RCTs had higher control arm hospitalisation rates (11% - 31%) than all other antiviral RCTs, indicating that they studied sicker populations.[9] (Table 1 and Figure 3). The six mAb RCTs had hospitalisation rates in the controls of 4.6-8.9%, the same range as CSSC-004[9] (6.3%). Control hospitalisation rates in the molnupiravir-MOVE-OUT[7], nirmatrelvir/ritonavir[5] and remdesivir[15] RCTs ranged from 5.3% to 9.7%. Low hospitalisation rates were found in RCTs that had many vaccinees (metformin-COVID-OUT – 3.2%[16]) or in which most participants were seropositive (molnupiravir-PANORAMIC – 0.8%). Low control arm hospitalisation rates were also found in two mAb RCTs – the bebtelovimab trial (1.6%)[17] and REGN-CoV phase 1/2 (<2%), with the bebtelovimab RCT focusing on low-risk patients [17]

TRIAL FINDINGS

Examining RCTs by agent class, statistically significant relative risk reductions in hospitalisation were found in two of five CCP RCTs, six of nine mAb RCTs, four of 17 small molecule antiviral RCTs, but just 2 of 39 repurposed drug RCTs (Appendix Table 2). Except for the bebtelovimab RCT (2 hospitalisations in each arm[17]), mAb RCTs reduced the risk of hospitalisation by 50-80% (average 75%). Two of the three small molecule antiviral drugs (remdesivir[15] and nirmatrelvir/ritonavir[5]) showed very high levels of relative risk reduction - 87% and 88% respectively - but molnupiravir reduced risk of hospitalisation by only 30%[7] (no reduction in the PANORAMIC RCT[25]). The lopinavir/ritonavir combination was associated with a non-significant increase in risk of hospitalisation[18].

Among repurposed drug RCTs, all except metformin (58%) and sulodexide (40%), showed small and non-significant relative risk reductions of hospitalisation - ivermectin[19], colchicine[20], fluvoxamine[21] and hydroxychloroquine[18]. The nitazoxanide[22] RCT found one hospitalisation among 184 treated participants compared to five hospitalisations among 195 controls, too few events to achieve significance.

Absolute risk reductions (ARR) and number needed to treat (NNT) to avert hospitalisations varied across studies and treatment classes (Appendix Table 2). In general, except for the repurposed drugs the absolute risk difference approximated 3% if one excludes the molnupiravir-Panoramic Study from SMA. The CCP RCTs had an ARR of 3.2% (95%CI-0.9-5.6), mAbs RCTs had an ARR of 4.0% (95%CI-3.2-4.8), small molecule antivirals excluding molnupiravir-Panoramic had ARR of 2.1% (95%CI-1.3-2.9) and the repurposed drugs had a smaller ARR at

1.1% (95%CI-0.5-1.6). The number needed to treat to prevent hospitalisations approximated 30 in the trials, with a few notably low with CCP-Argentina (NNT=7) Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir (NNT=18), except those using repurposed drugs, where NNT averaged 70 (Appendix Table 2). In the pooled meta-analysis by class group, the CCP RCTs had a fixed effect OR of 0.69 (95% CI=0.53 to 0.9) with moderate heterogeneity (I^2=43%), the mAbs had a fixed effect OR of 0.31 (95% CI=0.24-0.40) with low heterogeneity (I^2=0%), the small molecule antivirals had a random effect OR of 0.78 (95% CI=0.48-1.33) with high heterogeneity (I^2=69%) and the repurposed drugs had a random effect OR of 0.82 (95% CI- 0.72-0.93) with low heterogeneity (I^2=0) (Figure 4, Appendix Table 2). A biologic reason to use a fixed model for CCP and mAbs is that both formulations have the same active agent as specific antibody and thus there is a high degree of similarity in these two antibody interventions. Both antiviral small molecules and repurposed drugs comparison involve many types and classes of drugs for which the random effect model for the group is biologically more plausible than treating them as fixed. The meta-analysis of all interventions had a random effect OR of 0.67 (95% CI=0.57-0.80) with high heterogeneity (I^2=52%) (Appendix Figure 2). Within the CCP RCTs excluding either CCP-Argentina for the nonhospital endpoint or CONV-ERT for methylene blue inactivation of antibody function only changed the OR by 0.05 with 95% CI remaining less than 1 for the fixed effect model (Appendix Figure 3A,B). Adding the 7 all-cause hospitalisations to CSSC-004, increased the OR by 0.02 and 95% CI by 0.01, essentially no change (Appendix Figure 3C).

Ten RCTs compared hospitalisation rates in early or late interventions (dated from symptom onset) that were extractable from the published papers or supplementary data as a post-hoc analysis (Figure 5). The small molecule drugs showed no significant reduction in the OR with segregation of early treatment from late treatment. In contrast, the antibody therapies showed a difference by treatment timing. Pooling the two classes of antibody treatment, the OR for early treatment was 0.65 (95%CI=0.49-0.85), while the OR for later treatment was 0.86 (95%CI=0.66-1.12).

All four trial classes showed reduced rates of hospitalisation for each group. The final certainty of the available evidence with GRADE assessment (Appendix Table 4) showed a high certainty level within CCP trials, moderate certainty with mAbs, and low certainty with small molecule antivirals and repurposed drugs. The main reason for downgrading individual and pooled studies was imprecision, related to small number of participants and the wide confidence intervals around the effect, followed by ROB (Appendix Figure 4). We did not find concerns in any of the GRADE factors for CCP RCTs so we graded them as high level of certainty. mAbs were downgraded to moderate certainty due to ROB (in 4 of the 8 included RCTs, ROB for the outcome hospitalisation was judged of some concern). In the cumulative analysis, small molecule antivirals were downgraded to low certainty of evidence because of ROB (some/high ROB in 4 RCTs) and inconsistency (due to high heterogeneity), while repurposed drugs were downgraded to low certainty due to ROB (some/high ROB in 5 of the 11 comparisons) and indirectness (due to large difference in mechanism of action of the included drugs). The ROB was independently evaluated by the COVID-19-Network Meta-Analysis (NMA) initiative for most of the RCTs (Appendix Figure 4 and full output ROB in Supplementary Information). Funnel plot analysis shows a low risk of publication bias except for the mAbs, for which either the efficacy of high dose antibodies or non-reporting bias are plausible explanations (Appendix Figure 5).

While several RCTs showed fewer deaths in the treatment arm, no outpatient study was powered to compare differences in mortality. Because of the low rate of deaths during trials the absolute

risk reductions amongst the 4 antiviral classes are all below 1% corresponding to relative risk reductions of 20%, 81%, 87% and 22% for CCP, mAbs, small molecule antivirals or repurposed drugs, respectively (Appendix Table 4).

TIME TO RESOLUTION

The two most effective CCP RCTs (Argentine[10] and CSSC-004[9]) did not compare time to symptom resolution, while the COV-Early[23] and ConV-ert[24] RCTs reported no difference in the median time of symptom resolution in the two groups[24] (Appendix Table 2). The mAbs noted faster resolution by 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 days for bamlanivimab/etesevimab[25], bebtelovimab[17], regdanvimab[26], casirivimab/imdevimab[2], or redanvimab[27] respectively. The smaller bamlanivimab-only RCT did not show a difference[1]. Of the three SMAs that noted reductions in hospitalisations, molnupiravir was associated with no difference in time of symptom resolution in MOVe-OUT[7] but improvements in both PANORAMIC[25] and Aurobindo[27] RCTs. The 3-day outpatient remdesivir RCT showed that symptoms were alleviated by day 14 nearly twice as often[15]. The nirmatrelvir/ritonavir RCT did not report on this parameter[5]. Seven of 10 RCTs in the antiviral group did not show faster symptom resolution with intervention. The three RCTs largely performed in Brazil for fluvoxamine, ivermectin[19] and hydroxychloroquine[18] noted no differences in symptom resolution. Metformin did not evidence faster symptom resolution despite reducing hospitalisations. Three of the 25 RCTs reporting symptom resolution in the repurposed drug group noted faster symptom resolution.

COSTS

mAbs and intravenous remdesivir schedules cost about 1000 to 2000 Euros per patient, respectively, while the oral drugs are much less than 1000 Euros per patient (Table 1). By comparison, the cost of CCP approximates 200 Euros per patient, and the cost for repurposed drugs is even lower. Considering the absolute risk reduction in hospitalisation, the number needed to treat to prevent a single hospitalisation is often very high, as are the associated costs. With the recently patented antivirals, costs for outpatient treatment often exceed the cost of a COVID-19 hospitalisation[28].

mAbs successively lost efficacy against Delta and Omicron, with cilgavimab (the only Omicron-active ingredient in Evusheld™) and bebtelovimab also failing against BQ.1.1 and XBB.* sublineages (Figure 6). This has led the FDA to withdraw EUAs, while EMA has not restricted usage at all. Small molecule antivirals retain *in vitro* efficacy against Omicron, but concerns remain: molnupiravir showed low efficacy *in vivo*[6] and is mutagenic for mammals *in vitro*[29], while nirmatrelvir/ritonavir has drug/drug interaction contraindications (CYP3 metabolites especially tacrolimus, anti-cholesterol, anti-migraine or many anti-depressants) and has been associated with early virological and clinical rebounds in immunocompetent patients[30]. CCP from unvaccinated donors does not inhibit Omicron, but CCP from donors having any sequence of vaccination and recent, within 6 months, COVID-19 or having had boosted mRNA vaccine doses universally has high Omicron-neutralizing activity.

DISCUSSION

The pharmaceutical industry – with well-established internal resources for trials and substantial economic support – was able to perform large outpatient trials of mAbs early in the pandemic. Inpatient services are generally more accessible to physician-scientists working in academic medical centers. The relative ease of conducting inpatient RCTs may have led most initial CCP,

small molecule antiviral and repurposed trials – which were conducted principally by academic institutions - to be based in hospitals, often in patients treated too late for antiviral treatment to be expected to work, given that antiviral therapy must be given early in disease. The constrained resources available for clinical research by academic medicine during pandemic conditions further interfered with trial work, and several potentially valuable RCT's with promising findings were terminated before they could provide definitive data. The findings of such trials are reported as null but often viewed as negative, notwithstanding trends towards effectiveness, and are rarely incorporated into clinical recommendations.

Consistent with the above, outpatient RCT data confirm that most antiviral/antimicrobial therapies are more effective when given before hospital admission. In examining the full assembly of these effective, yet molecularly disparate interventions, we note the consistent importance of early outpatient treatment for patients at risk of progression to hospitalisation[31]. Treatment within 5 days of illness onset was more effective than later treatment, as would be expected for an antiviral mechanism of action. An individual participant meta-analysis of CCP that investigated the effects of early compared to late treatment and of high compared to low dose antibody levels found that both early treatment and high levels of antibody combined to most effectively reduce risk of hospitalisations[32].

The paucity of head-to-head RCT comparisons amongst outpatient COVID-19 therapies, however, makes the choice of therapy difficult. The outpatient RCTs reviewed here were conducted during different time-periods during the pandemic, thus targeting different variants, and enrolled participants with different vaccination statuses. Further heterogeneity was contributed by variation across the 54 RCTs, in participant age, medical risk factors and serological status These limitations need to be considered in our head-to-head meta-analysis of COVID-19 outpatient placebo controlled RCTs.

The choice, however, has been narrowed in recent months, and the clinical armamentarium has been reduced to small molecule antivirals, repurposed drugs and CCP, because single and double ("cocktail") MAbs have lost effectiveness against new VOCs[33]. Both vaccine-elicited and disease-elicited antibodies are polyclonal, meaning that they include various isotypes that provide functional diversity and target numerous epitopes making variant escape much more difficult with CCP. Hence, polyclonal antibody preparations are much more resilient to the relentless evolution of variants. This is in marked contrast to mAbs, which target single epitopes of SARS-CoV-2. The exquisite mAb (and receptor binding domain) specificity renders mAbs susceptible to becoming ineffective with single amino acid changes. Plasma from individuals who have been both vaccinated and boosted is characterized by high amounts of neutralizing antibodies which can be effective against practically any existing VOC, including Omicron[34] (so-called "heterologous immunity", likely due to the well-known phenomenon of "epitope spreading"). Vaccine-boosted CCP has more than ten times the amount of total SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody and viral neutralizing activity compared to the pre-omicron CCP used in the effective outpatient CCP RCTs.

In addition to efficacy, other points to consider in an outpatient pandemic are tolerability, scalability and affordability. Repurposed drugs are generally well tolerated, widely available and relatively inexpensive, but, as we have shown, have limited efficacy. By contrast, small molecule antivirals are often plagued by contraindications and side effects, which make several classes of patients reliant on passive immunotherapies. Both small molecule antivirals and mAbs take time to develop and are unaffordable in low-and-middle income countries (LMIC). CCP is instead a

tolerable, scalable, and affordable treatment and is usually provided in a single IV session, in contrast to Remdesivir, which requires a three-day intravenous course.
On Dec. 28, 2021 the FDA expanded the authorized emergency use of convalescent plasma with high titers of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies "for the treatment of COVID-19 in patients with immunosuppressive disease or receiving immunosuppressive treatment, in either the outpatient or inpatient setting." This EUA noted that CCP was safe and effective in immunocompetent individuals and allowed under the emergency measure of the pandemic, but expanded its use in immunosuppressed individuals to outpatient use, notwithstanding the availability of oral drugs and (at that time) two remaining effective mAb treatments for the new omicron variants of concerns
The published mAbs RCTs assembled here showed better efficacy than other outpatient interventions, yet are now clinically ineffective against BQ.1.* and XBB.* Omicron variants. CCP and small molecule antivirals have comparable levels of effectiveness, but the latter have many contraindications and side effects. Repurposed drugs are either ineffective or mildly effective. That leaves CCP, which is especially important in the immunosuppressed but, as the trials show, early treatment with high levels of antibody, has value in other populations as well. Our clinical recommendation from this review is to use CCP on an out-patient basis in regions with no other therapy available regardless of vaccination status for those at high risk of progression to hospitalisation.

FUNDING
This study was supported by the U.S. Department of Defense's Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND), in collaboration with the Defense Health Agency (DHA) (contract number: W911QY2090012) (DS, AC, DH), with additional support from Bloomberg Philanthropies, State of Maryland, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases 3R01AI152078-01S1 (DS, AC), NIH National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences U24TR001609-S3 and UL1TR003098 (DH).

CONTRIBUTORS
DS wrote the first draft and extracted data verified by DF, and MF. DF curated Table 3 and 7 and revised the text. MC, JO, MF and DS performed statistical analyses. MC and DS performed GRADE assessment. AC, NP, MF and DH critically revised the manuscript. DS and DF directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported here. All authors read and agree with manuscript.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
DS, DFH, AC were investigators in the CSSC-004 study; D.F. and M.F. were investigators in the TSUNAMI RCT of CCP. DJS reports AliquantumRx Founder and Board member with stock options (macrolide for malaria), Hemex Health malaria diagnostics consulting and royalties for malaria diagnostic test control standards to Alere- all outside of submitted work. AC reports being part of the scientific advisory board of SabTherapeutics and has received personal fees from Ortho Diagnostics, outside of the submitted work. All other authors report no relevant disclosures.
DATA SHARING

Datasets used for this systematic review are publicly available in PubMed, medRxiv and bioRxiv.

REFERENCES

1. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody LY-CoV555 in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**(3): 229-37.
2. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGEN-COV Antibody Combination and Outcomes in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(23): e81.
3. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**(27): 2603-15.
4. Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, Widge AT, et al. Safety and Immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 Vaccine in Older Adults. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**(25): 2427-38.
5. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk, Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(15): 1397-408.
6. Jayk Bernal A, Gomes da Silva MM, Musungaie DB, et al. Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(6): 509-20.
7. FDA. FDA Takes Actions to Expand Use of Treatment for Outpatients with Mild-to-Moderate COVID-19. In: FDA, editor.; 2022.
8. O'Shaughnessy JA. Convalescent Plasma EUA Letter of Authorization 12282021

. FDA website (https://www.fda.gov/media/141477/download); 2021.
9. Sullivan DJ, Gebo KA, Shoham S, et al. Early Outpatient Treatment for Covid-19 with Convalescent Plasma. *N Engl J Med* 2022.
10. Libster R, Perez Marc G, Wappner D, et al. Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**(7): 610-8.
11. O'Brien MP, Forleo-Neto E, Musser BJ, et al. Subcutaneous REGEN-COV Antibody Combination to Prevent Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2021; **385**(13): 1184-95.
12. Nguyen TV, Ferrand G, Cohen-Boulakia S, et al. RCT studies on preventive measures and treatments for COVID-19. *Zenodo* 2020.
13. Boutron I, Chaimani A, Meerpohl JJ, et al. The COVID-NMA Project: Building an Evidence Ecosystem for the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; **173**(12): 1015-7.
14. JPT H, S G, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0: www.handbook.cochrane.org; 2011.
15. Gottlieb RL, Vaca CE, Paredes R, et al. Early Remdesivir to Prevent Progression to Severe Covid-19 in Outpatients. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(4): 305-15.
16. Bramante CT, Huling JD, Tignanelli CJ, et al. Randomized Trial of Metformin, Ivermectin, and Fluvoxamine for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **387**(7): 599-610.
17. Dougan M, Azizad M, Chen P, et al. Bebtelovimab, alone or together with bamlanivimab and etesevimab, as a broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibody treatment for mild to moderate, ambulatory COVID-19. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.03.10.22272100.
18. Reis G, Moreira Silva E, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Effect of Early Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Lopinavir and Ritonavir on Risk of Hospitalization Among Patients With COVID-19: The TOGETHER Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(4): e216468.
19. Reis G, Silva E, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of Early Treatment with Ivermectin among Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022.

20. Tardif JC, Bouabdallaoui N, L'Allier PL, et al. Colchicine for community-treated patients with COVID-19 (COLCORONA): a phase 3, randomised, double-blinded, adaptive, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(8): 924-32.
21. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira-Silva EA, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of early treatment with fluvoxamine on risk of emergency care and hospitalisation among patients with COVID-19: the TOGETHER randomised, platform clinical trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2022; **10**(1): e42-e51.
22. Rossignol JF, Bardin MC, Fulgencio J, Mogelnicki D, Brechot C. A randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trial of nitazoxanide for treatment of mild or moderate COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine* 2022; **45**: 101310.
23. Millat-Martinez P, Gharbharan A, Alemany A, et al. Prospective individual patient data meta-analysis of two randomized trials on convalescent plasma for COVID-19 outpatients. *Nature Communications* 2022; **13**(1): 2583.
24. Alemany A, Millat-Martinez P, Corbacho-Monne M, et al. High-titre methylene blue-treated convalescent plasma as an early treatment for outpatients with COVID-19: a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; **10**(3): 278-88.
25. Dougan M, Nirula A, Azizad M, et al. Bamlanivimab plus Etesevimab in Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(15): 1382-92.
26. Streinu-Cercel A, Sandulescu O, Preotescu LL, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Regdanvimab (CT-P59): A Phase 2/3 Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial in Outpatients With Mild-to-Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(4): ofac053.
27. Kim JY, Sandulescu O, Preotescu LL, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial of Regdanvimab in High-Risk Patients With Mild-to-Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(8): ofac406.
28. Oldenburg CE, Pinsky BA, Brogdon J, et al. Effect of Oral Azithromycin vs Placebo on COVID-19 Symptoms in Outpatients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021; **326**(6): 490-8.
29. Zhou S, Hill CS, Sarkar S, et al. beta-d-N4-hydroxycytidine Inhibits SARS-CoV-2 Through Lethal Mutagenesis But Is Also Mutagenic To Mammalian Cells. *J Infect Dis* 2021; **224**(3): 415-9.
30. Gupta K, Strymish J, Stack G, Charness M. Rapid Relapse of Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection Following Early Suppression with Nirmatrelvir/Ritonavir. *Research Square* 2022.
31. Hasan Ali O, Bomze D, Risch L, et al. Severe COVID-19 is associated with elevated serum IgA and antiphospholipid IgA-antibodies. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020.
32. Levine AC, Fukuta Y, Huaman MA, et al. COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Outpatient Therapy to Prevent Outpatient Hospitalization: A Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data From Five Randomized Trials. *Clin Infect Dis* 2023.
33. Focosi D, Quiroga R, McConnell S, Johnson MC, Casadevall A. Convergent Evolution in SARS-CoV-2 Spike Creates a Variant Soup from Which New COVID-19 Waves Emerge. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 2023; **24**(3): 2264.
34. Focosi D, Franchini M, Joyner MJ, Casadevall A. Comparative analysis of antibody responses from COVID-19 convalescents receiving various vaccines reveals consistent high neutralizing activity for SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern Omicron. 2021: 2021.12.24.21268317.
35. Gharbharan A, Jordans C, Zwaginga L, et al. Outpatient convalescent plasma therapy for high-risk patients with early COVID-19. A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022.

36. Korley FK, Durkalski-Mauldin V, Yeatts SD, et al. Early Convalescent Plasma for High-Risk Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(21): 1951-60.
37. Gupta A, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, Juarez E, et al. Early Treatment for Covid-19 with SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Sotrovimab. *N Engl J Med* 2021.
38. Norton T, Ali S, Sivapalasingam S, et al. REGEN-COV Antibody Combination in Outpatients With COVID-19 – Phase 1/2 Results. *medRxiv* 2022: 2021.06.09.21257915.
39. Montgomery H, Hobbs FDR, Padilla F, et al. Efficacy and safety of intramuscular administration of tixagevimab-cilgavimab for early outpatient treatment of COVID-19 (TACKLE): a phase 3, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; **10**(10): 985-96.
40. Butler C, Hobbs FDR, Gbinigie O, et al. Molnupiravir Plus Usual Care Versus Usual Care Alone as Early Treatment for Adults with COVID-19 at Increased Risk of Adverse Outcomes (PANORAMIC): Preliminary Analysis from the United Kingdom Randomised, Controlled Open-Label, Platform Adaptive Trial. *SSRN* 2022; **ssrn.4237902**.
41. Tippabhotla SK, Lahiri S, Rama Raju D, Kandi C, Prasad VN. Efficacy and Safety of Molnupiravir for the Treatment of Non-Hospitalized Adults With Mild COVID-19: A Randomized, Open-Label, Parallel-Group Phase 3 Trial. . *SSRN* 2022; **4042673**.
42. Reis G, Moreira Silva EAS, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Early Treatment with Pegylated Interferon Lambda for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **388**(6): 518-28.
43. Feld JJ, Kandel C, Biondi MJ, et al. Peginterferon lambda for the treatment of outpatients with COVID-19: a phase 2, placebo-controlled randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(5): 498-510.
44. Jagannathan P, Andrews JR, Bonilla H, et al. Peginterferon Lambda-1a for treatment of outpatients with uncomplicated COVID-19: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Nature Communications* 2021; **12**(1): 1967.
45. Roozbeh F, Saeedi M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, et al. Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir for the treatment of COVID-19 outpatients: a double-blind, randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2020; **76**(3): 753-7.
46. Bosaeed M, Alharbi A, Mahmoud E, et al. Efficacy of favipiravir in adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized, double-blind, multicentre, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022; **28**(4): 602-8.
47. Vaezi A, Salmasi M, Soltaninejad F, Salahi M, Javanmard SH, Amra B. Favipiravir in the Treatment of Outpatient COVID-19: A Multicenter, Randomized, Triple-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial. *Adv Respir Med* 2023; **91**(1): 18-25.
48. Lowe DM, Brown LK, Chowdhury K, et al. Favipiravir, lopinavir-ritonavir, or combination therapy (FLARE): A randomised, double-blind, 2 x 2 factorial placebo-controlled trial of early antiviral therapy in COVID-19. *PLoS Med* 2022; **19**(10): e1004120.
49. Kaizer AM, Shapiro NI, Wild J, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir for treatment of non-hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Infect Dis* 2023; **128**: 223-9.
50. Parienti JJ, Prazuck T, Peyro-Saint-Paul L, et al. Effect of Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate and Emtricitabine on nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 viral load burden amongst outpatients with COVID-19: A pilot, randomized, open-label phase 2 trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **38**: 100993.
51. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Effect of early treatment with metformin on risk of emergency care and hospitalization among patients with COVID-19: The TOGETHER randomized platform clinical trial. *Lancet Reg Health Am* 2022; **6**: 100142.

52. Lenze EJ, Mattar C, Zorumski CF, et al. Fluvoxamine vs Placebo and Clinical Deterioration in Outpatients With Symptomatic COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2020; **324**(22): 2292-300.
53. McCarthy MW, Naggie S, Boulware DR, et al. Effect of Fluvoxamine vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2023; **329**(4): 296-305.
54. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Oral Fluvoxamine With Inhaled Budesonide for Treatment of Early-Onset COVID-19 : A Randomized Platform Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2023; **176**(5): 667-75.
55. Reis G, Silva E, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of Early Treatment with Ivermectin among Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(18): 1721-31.
56. Rezai MS, Ahangarkani F, Hill A, et al. Non-effectiveness of Ivermectin on Inpatients and Outpatients With COVID-19; Results of Two Randomized, Double-Blinded, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trials. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2022; **9**: 919708.
57. Naggie S, Boulware DR, Lindsell CJ, et al. Effect of Ivermectin vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2022; **328**(16): 1595-603.
58. Naggie S, Boulware DR, Lindsell CJ, et al. Effect of Higher-Dose Ivermectin for 6 Days vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2023; **329**(11): 888-97.
59. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19 : A Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; **173**(8): 623-31.
60. Schwartz I, Boesen ME, Cerchiaro G, et al. Assessing the efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine as outpatient treatment of COVID-19: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ Open* 2021; **9**(2): E693-E702.
61. Mitja O, Reis G, Boulware DR, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for treatment of non-hospitalized adults with COVID-19: A meta-analysis of individual participant data of randomized trials. *Clin Transl Sci* 2023; **16**(3): 524-35.
62. Johnston C, Brown ER, Stewart J, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for treatment of early SARS-CoV-2 infection among high-risk outpatient adults: A randomized clinical trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **33**: 100773.
63. Spivak AM, Barney BJ, Greene T, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial Testing Hydroxychloroquine for Reduction of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Shedding and Hospitalization in Early Outpatient COVID-19 Infection. *Microbiol Spectr* 2023; **11**(2): e0467422.
64. Rodrigues C, Freitas-Santos RS, Levi JE, et al. Hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin early treatment of mild COVID-19 in an outpatient setting: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial evaluating viral clearance. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2021; **58**(5): 106428.
65. Puskarich MA, Cummins NW, Ingraham NE, et al. A multi-center phase II randomized clinical trial of losartan on symptomatic outpatients with COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **37**: 100957.
66. Cairns DM, Dulko D, Griffiths JK, et al. Efficacy of Niclosamide vs Placebo in SARS-CoV-2 Respiratory Viral Clearance, Viral Shedding, and Duration of Symptoms Among Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Phase 2 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Network Open* 2022; **5**(2): e2144942-e.

67. Connors JM, Brooks MM, Sciurba FC, et al. Effect of Antithrombotic Therapy on Clinical Outcomes in Outpatients With Clinically Stable Symptomatic COVID-19: The ACTIV-4B Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021; **326**(17): 1703-12.
68. Gonzalez-Ochoa AJ, Raffetto JD, Hernandez AG, et al. Sulodexide in the Treatment of Patients with Early Stages of COVID-19: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Thromb Haemost* 2021; **121**(7): 944-54.
69. Cools F, Virdone S, Sawhney J, et al. Thromboprophylactic low-molecular-weight heparin versus standard of care in unvaccinated, at-risk outpatients with COVID-19 (ETHIC): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 3b trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2022; **9**(8): e594-e604.
70. Barco S, Voci D, Held U, et al. Enoxaparin for primary thromboprophylaxis in symptomatic outpatients with COVID-19 (OVID): a randomised, open-label, parallel-group, multicentre, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2022; **9**(8): e585-e93.
71. Clemency BM, Varughese R, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, et al. Efficacy of Inhaled Ciclesonide for Outpatient Treatment of Adolescents and Adults With Symptomatic COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2022; **182**(1): 42-9.
72. Duvignaud A, Lhomme E, Onaisi R, et al. Inhaled ciclesonide for outpatient treatment of COVID-19 in adults at risk of adverse outcomes: a randomised controlled trial (COVERAGE). *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022; **28**(7): 1010-6.
73. Thomas S, Patel D, Bittel B, et al. Effect of High-Dose Zinc and Ascorbic Acid Supplementation vs Usual Care on Symptom Length and Reduction Among Ambulatory Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection: The COVID A to Z Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(2): e210369.
74. Adler UC, Adler MS, Padula AEM, et al. Homeopathy for COVID-19 in primary care: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (COVID-Simile study). *J Integr Med* 2022; **20**(3): 221-9.
75. Khorshiddoust RR, Khorshiddoust SR, Hosseinabadi T, et al. Efficacy of a multiple-indication antiviral herbal drug (Saliravira(R)) for COVID-19 outpatients: A pre-clinical and randomized clinical trial study. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2022; **149**: 112729.
76. Hinks TSC, Cureton L, Knight R, et al. Azithromycin versus standard care in patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 (ATOMIC2): an open-label, randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(10): 1130-40.
77. McCreary MR, Schnell PM, Rhoda DA. Randomized double-blind placebo-controlled proof-of-concept trial of resveratrol for outpatient treatment of mild coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**(1): 10978.

Figure 1
PRISMA flowchart for randomized controlled trials (RCT) selection in this systematic review.



Figure 2
Duration and calendar months of the RCT in context of dominant variant(s) of concern and seropositivity rates. Study start and end for enrollments are charted with approximate time periods for variants of concern.

TYPE	Study	months	MAR-20	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN-21	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN-22	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	Baseline Antibody Positive %
Ab-CCP	CCP-CONV-ert	9									1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9													11%
Ab-CCP	CCP-COV-early	10								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10													8%
Ab-CCP	CCP-C3PO	7						1	2	3	4	5	6	7																		NR
Ab-CCP	CCP-Argentina	5				1	2	3	4	5																						NR
Ab-CCP	CCP-CSSC-004	16				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16											NR
mAb	Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1	3							1	2	3																					NR
mAb	Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE	6							1	2	3	4	5	6																		NR
mAb	Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1	3							1	2	3																					NR
mAb	Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3	4								1	2	3	4																			23%
mAb	Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2	3					1	2	3																							38%
mAb	Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4	3															1	2	3													11%
mAb	Regdanvimab-CT-P59	2								1	2																					3%
mAb	Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2	3												1	2	3																11%
mAb	Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE	6												1	2	3	4	5	6													14%
SMA	Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT	6															1	2	3	4	5	6										23%
SMA	Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC	5										1	2	3	4	5																98%
SMA	Molnupiravir-Aurobindo	2																	1	2												NR
SMA	Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR	6																	1	2	3	4	5	6								11%
SMA	Remdesivir-PINETREE	8							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8																3%
SMA	Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER	8																	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8						NR
SMA	Interferon Lambda- ILIAD	4			1	2	3	4																								10%
SMA	Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda	2			1	2																										41%
SMA	Sofosbuvir & daclatasvir-SOVODAK	1		1																												NR
SMA	Favipiravir-Avi-Mild-19	12						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12													NR
SMA	Favipiravir-Iran	4										1	2	3	4																	NR
SMA	Favipiravir-FLARE	13								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13										62%
SMA	Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	13								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13										64%
SMA	Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	13								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13										62%
SMA	Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW	18				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18									21%
SMA	Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER	4				1	2	3	4																							NR
SMA	Tenofovir/Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA	4										1	2	3	4																	NR
RP	Metformin-COVID-OUT	13											1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13							52% FV
RP	Metformin -TOGETHER	3											1	2	3																	NR
RP	Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER	8											1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8												NR
RP	Fluvoxamine -STOP COVID	4		1	2	3	4																									NR
RP	Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT	13											1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13							56% FV
RP	Fluvoxamine-ACTIV-6	10																		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			67%
RP	Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER	6																							1	2	3	4	5	6		94%
RP	Ivermectin-TOGETHER	5														1	2	3	4	5												NR
RP	Ivermectin-COVID-OUT	13											1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13							56% FV
RP	Ivermectin Iran	7												1	2	3	4	5	6	7												NR
RP	Ivermectin-ACTIV-6	7																	1	2	3	4	5	6	7							47%
RP	Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6	5																									1	2	3	4	5	84% FV
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER	4				1	2	3	4																							NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP	2	1	2																												NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19	1			1																											NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2	2		1	2																											NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-BMG	3		1	2	3																										NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-Utah	12		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12																	NR
RP	Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil	1			1																											NR
RP	Nitazoxanide-Romark	5						1	2	3	4	5																				10%
RP	Colchicine-COLCORONA	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9																					NR
RP	Losartan-MN	8		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8																					NR
RP	Niclosamide	7								1	2	3	4	5	6	7																NR
RP	Aspirin-ACTIV-4B	10							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10														NR
RP	2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B	10							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10														NR
RP	5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B	10							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10														NR
RP	Sulodexide	2				1	2																									NR
RP	Enoxaparin-ETHIC	12									1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12										NR
RP	Enoxaparin-OVID	17						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17								NR
RP	Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS	5				1	2	3	4	5																						NR
RP	Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE	7											1	2	3	4	5	6	7													NR
RP	Zinc	6			1	2	3	4	5	6																						NR
RP	Ascorbic acid	6			1	2	3	4	5	6																						NR
RP	Zinc/Ascorbic acid	6			1	2	3	4	5	6																						NR
RP	Homeopathy-COVID-Simile	10					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10																NR
RP	Saliravira	3										1	2	3																		NR
RP	Azithromycin-Atomic2	8				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8																			NR
RP	Azithromycin-ACTION	9				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9																		NR
RP	Resveratrol	3							1	2	3																					NR
Variant	614G		614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G	614G																
Variant	Alpha												a	a	a	a	a	a														
Variant	Beta													b	b	b	b															
Variant	Delta																		d	d	d	d	d	d	d							
Variant	Omicron																							o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	

Figure 3

Percent hospitalisations in control groups sorted by therapy type and descending control hospitalisation rates.



Figure 4
Odds ratio for hospitalisations with diverse therapeutic interventions, grouped according to mechanism of action (CCP, mAbs, small molecule antivirals and repurposed drugs).

CCP- Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
CCP-CONV-ERT	22	188	21	188	1.05	[0.56; 1.99]	13.4%	19.3%
CCP-COV-Early	12	202	19	204	0.61	[0.29; 1.30]	12.9%	15.7%
CCP-C3PO	52	257	56	254	0.90	[0.59; 1.37]	32.5%	28.5%
CCP-Argentina	13	80	25	80	0.43	[0.20; 0.91]	15.1%	15.4%
CCP-CSSC-004	17	592	37	589	0.44	[0.25; 0.79]	26.1%	21.1%
Common effect model	**116**	**1319**	**158**	**1315**	**0.69**	**[0.53; 0.90]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.67**	**[0.46; 0.96]**	**--**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 43%, τ^2 = 0.0749, p = 0.13
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -2.78 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -2.15 (p = 0.03)



mAbs- Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1	5	309	9	143	0.24	[0.08; 0.74]	5.0%	5.2%
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE	6	528	30	529	0.19	[0.08; 0.46]	12.1%	8.2%
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1	11	518	36	517	0.29	[0.15; 0.58]	14.4%	13.6%
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3	18	1355	62	1341	0.28	[0.16; 0.47]	25.2%	22.8%
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2	3	533	5	266	0.30	[0.07; 1.25]	2.7%	3.1%
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4	2	125	2	128	1.02	[0.14; 7.39]	0.8%	1.6%
Regdanvimab-CT-P59	9	203	9	104	0.49	[0.19; 1.27]	4.7%	7.0%
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2	16	656	52	659	0.29	[0.16; 0.52]	20.7%	19.6%
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE	18	407	37	415	0.47	[0.26; 0.84]	14.3%	19.0%
Common effect model	**88**	**4634**	**242**	**4102**	**0.31**	**[0.24; 0.40]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.32**	**[0.25; 0.41]**	**--**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, τ^2 = 0, p = 0.67
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -9.03 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -8.82 (p < 0.01)



Small Molecule antivirals- Random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT	48	709	68	699	0.67	[0.46; 0.99]	20.9%	11.3%
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC	103	12516	96	12484	1.07	[0.81; 1.42]	31.2%	11.6%
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo	0	610	0	610			0.0%	0.0%
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR	8	1039	66	1046	0.12	[0.06; 0.24]	21.3%	9.8%
Remdesivir-PINETREE	2	279	15	283	0.13	[0.03; 0.57]	4.8%	6.3%
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER	21	931	40	1018	0.56	[0.33; 0.96]	12.2%	10.8%
Interferon Lambda- ILIAD	1	30	1	30	1.00	[0.06; 16.76]	0.3%	2.8%
Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda	2	60	2	60	1.00	[0.14; 7.34]	0.6%	4.6%
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK	1	27	4	28	0.23	[0.02; 2.21]	1.2%	3.9%
Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19	6	112	2	119	3.31	[0.65; 16.76]	0.6%	5.8%
Favipiravir-Iran	4	38	2	39	2.18	[0.37; 12.65]	0.6%	5.3%
Favipiravir-FLARE	1	59	0	60	3.10	[0.12; 77.71]	0.2%	2.3%
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	1	61	0	60	3.00	[0.12; 75.11]	0.2%	2.3%
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	1	60	0	60	3.05	[0.12; 76.39]	0.2%	2.3%
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW	7	220	6	226	1.21	[0.40; 3.64]	1.9%	8.0%
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER	14	244	11	227	1.20	[0.53; 2.69]	3.5%	9.5%
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA	2	30	1	30	2.07	[0.18; 24.15]	0.3%	3.5%
Common effect model	**222**	**17025**	**314**	**17079**	**0.70**	**[0.59; 0.84]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.78**	**[0.45; 1.33]**	**--**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 69%, τ^2 = 0.6351, p < 0.01
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -3.94 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -0.91 (p = 0.36)



Repurposed Drugs-Fixed effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Metformin-COVID-OUT	8	596	19	601	0.42	[0.18; 0.96]	3.4%	2.4%
Metformin -TOGETHER	24	215	24	203	0.94	[0.51; 1.71]	4.0%	4.6%
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER	75	741	97	756	0.77	[0.56; 1.05]	15.7%	16.1%
Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID	0	80	6	72	0.06	[0.00; 1.15]	1.2%	0.2%
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT	6	299	5	293	1.18	[0.36; 3.91]	0.9%	1.2%
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6	1	670	2	607	0.45	[0.04; 5.00]	0.4%	0.3%
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER	7	738	8	738	0.87	[0.32; 2.42]	1.4%	1.6%
Ivermectin-TOGETHER	79	679	95	679	0.81	[0.59; 1.11]	15.2%	16.2%
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT	4	374	5	356	0.76	[0.20; 2.85]	0.9%	0.9%
Ivermectin Iran	19	268	14	281	1.46	[0.71; 2.96]	2.3%	3.3%
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6	10	817	9	774	1.05	[0.43; 2.61]	1.7%	2.0%
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6	5	602	2	604	2.52	[0.49; 13.04]	0.4%	0.6%
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER	8	214	11	227	0.76	[0.30; 1.93]	1.9%	1.9%
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP	5	212	10	211	0.49	[0.16; 1.45]	1.8%	1.4%
Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19	4	111	0	37	3.14	[0.17; 59.70]	0.1%	0.2%
Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2	8	136	11	157	0.83	[0.32; 2.13]	1.7%	1.9%
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG	5	148	4	83	0.69	[0.18; 2.65]	0.9%	0.9%
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah	7	152	4	151	1.77	[0.51; 6.19]	0.7%	1.1%
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil	1	42	1	42	1.00	[0.06; 16.53]	0.2%	0.2%
Nitazoxanide-Romark	1	184	5	195	0.21	[0.02; 1.79]	0.9%	0.4%
Colchicine-COLCORONA	104	2235	131	2253	0.79	[0.61; 1.03]	22.6%	23.6%
Losartan-MN	3	58	1	59	3.16	[0.32; 31.34]	0.2%	0.3%
Niclosamide	0	33	1	34	0.33	[0.01; 8.48]	0.3%	0.2%
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B	1	144	1	136	0.94	[0.06; 15.24]	0.2%	0.2%
2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B	1	135	1	136	1.01	[0.06; 16.27]	0.2%	0.2%
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B	2	143	1	136	1.91	[0.17; 21.36]	0.2%	0.3%
Sulodexide	22	124	35	119	0.52	[0.28; 0.95]	5.3%	4.5%
Enoxaparin-ETHIC	12	105	12	114	1.10	[0.47; 2.56]	1.9%	2.3%
Enoxaparin-OVID	8	234	8	238	1.02	[0.38; 2.76]	1.4%	1.7%
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS	3	179	7	203	0.48	[0.12; 1.87]	1.2%	0.9%
Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE	14	110	12	107	1.15	[0.51; 2.63]	1.9%	2.4%
Zinc	5	58	3	50	1.48	[0.34; 6.52]	0.5%	0.8%
Ascorbic acid	2	48	3	50	0.68	[0.11; 4.27]	0.5%	0.5%
Zinc/Ascorbic acid	7	58	3	50	2.15	[0.53; 8.80]	0.5%	0.8%
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile	1	42	3	44	0.33	[0.03; 3.34]	0.5%	0.3%
Saliravira	0	87	16	56	0.01	[0.00; 0.24]	3.6%	0.2%
Azithromycin-Atomic2	15	145	17	147	0.88	[0.42; 1.84]	2.7%	3.1%
Azithromycin-ACTION	5	125	0	72	6.62	[0.36; 121.45]	0.1%	0.2%
Resveratrol	1	50	3	50	0.32	[0.03; 3.18]	0.5%	0.3%
Common effect model	**483**	**11391**	**590**	**11121**	**0.79**	**[0.70; 0.90]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.82**	**[0.72; 0.93]**	**--**	**100.0%**



Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 < 0.0001$, $p = 0.57$
Test for overall effect (common effect): $z = -3.66$ ($p < 0.01$)
Test for overall effect (random effects): $z = -3.09$ ($p < 0.01$)

Figure 5
Odds ratio for point estimates for hospitalisation in RCT subgroups treated A) within 5 days since onset of symptoms and also B) over 5 days within same trial.
A) Early treatment-Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE <=5 days	9	253	27	251	0.31	[0.14; 0.66]	14.9%	12.0%
CCP-CSSC-004 <=5 days	5	258	25	259	0.18	[0.07; 0.49]	13.9%	9.9%
CCP-COV-Early <=5 days	6	123	9	103	0.54	[0.18; 1.56]	5.3%	9.0%
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER 0-3 days	11	567	28	590	0.40	[0.20; 0.81]	15.3%	12.8%
Metformin-TOGETHER 0-3 days	14	100	9	84	1.36	[0.56; 3.31]	4.8%	10.7%
Fluvoxamine/Budesonide-TOGETHER 0-3 days	9	463	13	454	0.67	[0.28; 1.59]	7.3%	11.1%
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER 0-3 days	30	328	39	310	0.70	[0.42; 1.16]	20.7%	15.3%
Ivermectin-TOGETHER 0-3 days	41	282	35	276	1.17	[0.72; 1.90]	17.2%	15.5%
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER <=5 days	1	37	0	40	3.33	[0.13; 84.29]	0.3%	1.7%
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER <=5 days	2	34	0	40	6.23	[0.29; 134.39]	0.2%	1.9%
Common effect model	**128**	**2445**	**185**	**2407**	**0.65**	**[0.51; 0.82]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.62**	**[0.40; 0.97]**	**--**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 61%, τ^2 = 0.2682, p < 0.01
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -3.65 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -2.08 (p = 0.04)



B Late treatment-Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE >5 days	9	154	10	164	0.96	[0.38; 2.42]	5.4%	6.1%
CCP-CSSC-004 >5 days	12	134	12	130	0.97	[0.42; 2.24]	6.6%	7.5%
CCP-COV-Early >5 days	5	84	10	106	0.61	[0.20; 1.85]	4.9%	4.3%
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER 4-7 days	14	364	29	428	0.55	[0.29; 1.06]	15.2%	12.4%
Metformin-TOGETHER 4-7 days	14	72	10	77	1.62	[0.67; 3.92]	4.6%	6.8%
Fluvoxamine/Budesonide-TOGETHER 4-7 days	4	274	14	284	0.29	[0.09; 0.88]	8.0%	4.2%
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER 4-7 days	31	239	44	267	0.76	[0.46; 1.24]	21.5%	21.4%
Ivermectin-TOGETHER 4-7 days	43	242	43	241	0.99	[0.62; 1.59]	21.0%	24.3%
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER >5 days	7	177	11	187	0.66	[0.25; 1.74]	6.1%	5.6%
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER >5 days	12	210	11	187	0.97	[0.42; 2.25]	6.5%	7.4%
Common effect model	**151**	**1950**	**194**	**2071**	**0.80**	**[0.64; 1.01]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.81**	**[0.65; 1.02]**	**--**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, τ^2 < 0.0001, p = 0.46
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -1.91 (p = 0.06)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -1.77 (p = 0.08)



Figure 6
Venn diagram of mAb efficacy against Omicron sublineages. *In vitro* activity of currently approved mAbs against Omicron sublineages circulating as of October 2022. Specific Omicron Spike amino acid mutations causing baseline ≥ 4-fold-reduction in neutralization against mAbs are reported. Mutations for which the majority of studies are concordant are reported: the different fold-reductions for each mAb are identified across concordant studies as color coded numbers defining the mean median values of specific reduction in each study. Sourced from https://covdb.stanford.edu/page/susceptibility-data (accessed on January31, 2023
* L452R occurs in all BA.4/BA.5 lineages, but only in several BA.2. sublineages.
! R346X and K444X occur in a growing number of BA.2 and BA.4/5 sublineages as a result of convergent evolution.



Table 1
Hospital rates, risk reductions, NNT, numbers and symptom resolution

Study	Control hospitalizations %	hospitalizations % in intervention arm	ARR percent (95% CI)	RRR percent (95% CI)	NNT to prevent 1 hospitalization	Hospitalization (n) in control arm	total pts in control arm (n)	Hospitalization (n) in intervention arm	Total pts (n) in intervention arm	Symptom resolution: median duration-Intervention to control in days
CCP (5 RCT) % or totals	12	8.8	3.2 (0.9, 5.6)	26.8 (8.1, 41.7)	31	158	1315	116	1319	
anti-Spike mAbs (8 RCT) % or totals	5.9	1.9	4.0 (3.2, 4.8)	67.8 (59.1, 74.7)	25	242	4102	88	4634	
Small molecule antiviral (11 RCTs) total or average	1.8	1.3	0.5 (0.3, 0.8)	29.1 (15.9, 40.2)	187	314	17079	222	17025	
Small molecule antiviral (10 RCTs - w/o Mol-Pan.) total or average	4.7	2.6	2.1 (1.3, 2.9)	44.4 (30.7, 55.3)	48	218	4595	119	4509	
Repurposed drugs (20 RCTs) total or average	5.3	4.2	1.1 (0.5, 1.6)	20.1 (10.1, 28.9)	94	590	11121	483	11391	
All (47 RCTs) total or average	3.9	2.6	1.2 (1.0, 1.5)	31.8 (25.9, 37.3)	81	1304	33617	909	34369	
CCP-CONV-ert[24]	11.2	11.7	-0.5 (-7.0, 5.9)	-4.8 (-83.9, 40.3)	-188	21	188	22	188	NO difference 12 d vs 12 d
CCP-COV-Early[35]	9.3	5.9	3.4 (-1.8, 8.5)	36.2 (-27.9, 68.2)	29	19	204	12	202	NO difference 13 d vs 12 d
CCP-C3PO[36]	22.0	20.2	1.8 (-5.3, 8.9)	8.2 (-28.3, 34.4)	55	56	254	52	257	NO difference
CCP-Argentina[10]	31.3	16.3	15.0 (2.0, 28.0)	48.0 (5.8, 71.3)	7	25	80	13	80	Not reported
CCP-CSSC-004[9]	6.3	2.9	3.4 (1.0, 5.8)	54.3 (19.7, 74.0)	29	37	589	17	592	Not reported

CCP-Argentina (high titer)[10]	31.3	8.3	22.9 (9.3, 36.5)	73.3 (17.4, 91.4)	4	25	80	3	36	Not reported
CCP-CSSC-004 (<= 5 days)[9]	9.7	1.9	7.7 (3.7, 11.7)	79.9 (48.4, 92.2)	13	25	259	5	257	Not reported
Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1[1]	6.3	1.6	4.7 (0.5, 8.9)	74.3 (24.7, 91.2)	21	9	143	5	309	NO difference 11 d to 11 d
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[37]	5.7	1.1	4.5 (2.4, 6.7)	80.0 (52.3, 91.6)	22	30	529	6	528	Not reported
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1[25]	7.0	2.1	4.8 (2.3, 7.4)	69.5 (40.8, 84.3)	21	36	517	11	518	YES- 8d vs 9d p=0.007
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3[2]	4.6	1.3	3.3 (2.0, 4.6)	71.3 (51.7, 82.9)	30	62	1341	18	1355	YES- 10 d vs 14 p=0.0001
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2[38]	1.9	0.6	1.3 (-0.4, 3.1)	70.1 (-24.4, 92.8)	76	5	266	3	533	Not reported
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[17]	1.6	1.6	-0.04 (-3.1, 3.0)	-2.4 (-615.7, 85.4)	-2667	2	128	2	125	YES- 6d to 8d p=0.003
Regdanvimab-CT-P59[26]	8.7	4.4	4.2 (-1.9, 10.3)	48.8 (-25.2, 79.0)	23	9	104	9	203	YES 6 d vs 9 d p=0.01
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2[27]	7.9	2.4	5.4 (3.1, 7.8)	69.1 (46.4, 82.2)	18	52	659	16	656	8 d to 13 d
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[39]	8.9	4.4	4.5 (1.1, 7.9)	50.4 (14.3, 71.3)	22	37	415	18	407	Not reported
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT[6]	9.7	6.8	3.0 (0.1, 5.8)	30.4 (0.8, 51.2)	34	68	699	48	709	NO difference
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC[40]	0.8	0.8	-0.1 (-0.3, 0.2)	-7.0 (-41.2, 18.9)	-1853	96	12484	103	12516	YES 9 d vs 15 d
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo[41]	0.0	0.0	NC	NC	0	0	610	0	610	Yes 10 d vs 14 d p<0.001
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR[5]	6.3	0.8	5.5 (4.0, 7.1)	87.8 (74.7, 94.1)	18	66	1046	8	1039	Not reported

Remdesivir-PINETREE[15]	5.3	0.7	4.6 (1.8, 7.4)	86.5 (41.4, 96.9)	22	15	283	2	279	YES- Alleviation of symptoms by day 14 (rate ratio, 1.92; 95% CI, 1.26 to 2.94)
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER[42]	3.9	2.3	1.7 (0.1, 3.2)	42.6 (3.4, 65.9)	60	40	1018	21	931	
Interferon Lambda-ILIAD[43]	3.3	3.3	0 (-9.1, 9.1)	0 (-1426, 93.4)		1	30	1	30	No difference
Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda[44]	3.3	3.3	0 (-6.4, 6.4)	0 (-586.9, 85.4)		2	60	2	60	NO difference 20 d vs 20 d
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[45]	14.3	3.7	10.6 (-4.2, 25.4)	74.1 (-117, 96.9)	9	4	28	1	27	NO difference in 7 d symptoms
Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19[46]	1.7	5.4	-3.7 (-8.4, 1.1)	-219 (-1447, 34.3)	-27	2	119	6	112	NO difference 7d vs 7d
Favipiravir-Iran[47]	5.1	10.5	-5.4 (-17.4, 6.6)	-105.3 (-955.6, 60.1)	-19	2	39	4	38	
Favipiravir-FLARE[48]	0.0	1.7	-1.7 (-5.0, 1.6)	NA	-59	0	60	1	59	
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[48]	0.0	1.6	-1.6 (-4.8, 1.5)	NA	-61	0	60	1	61	
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[48]	0.0	1.7	-1.7 (-5.0, 1.6)	NA	-60	0	60	1	60	
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW[49]	2.7	3.2	-0.5 (-3.7, 2.6)	-19.8 (-251, 59.1)	-190	6	226	7	220	6 d to 6 d
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER[18]	4.8	5.7	-0.9 (-4.9, 3.1)	-18.4 (-155.4, 45.1)	-112	11	227	14	244	NO difference by Cox proportional HR
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA[50]	3.3	6.7	-3.3 (-14.3, 7.7)	-100 (-1989.8, 80.9)	-30	1	30	2	30	
Metformin-COVID-OUT[16]	3.2	1.3	1.8 (0.1, 3.5)	57.5 (3.8, 81.3)	55	19	601	8	596	NO difference

Metformin - TOGETHER[51]	11.8	11.2	0.7 (-5.5, 6.8)	5.6 (-60.8, 44.6)	152	24	203	24	215	not reported
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER[21]	12.8	10.1	2.7 (-0.5, 5.9)	21.1 (-4.8, 40.6)	37	97	756	75	741	NO difference- 40% resolved by day 14
Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID[52]	8.3	0.0	8.3 (1.9, 14.7)	1 (1, 1)	12	6	72	0	80	YES (100% vs 91.7% resolved on day 7) p=0.009
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT[16]	1.7	2.0	-0.3 (-2.5, 1.9)	-17.6 (-281, 63.7)	-333	5	293	6	299	No difference (14 symptoms on 4 pt scale over 14 days)
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6[53]	0.3	0.1	0.18 (-0.4, 0.7)	54.7 (-398.3, 95.9)	555	2	607	1	670	12 d to 13 d
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[54]	1.1	0.9	0.1 (-0.9, 1.1)	12.5 (-140.1, 68.1)	738	8	738	7	738	not reported
Ivermectin-TOGETHER[55]	14.0	11.6	2.4 (-1.2, 5.9)	16.8 (-9.9, 37.1)	42	95	679	79	679	NO difference- 40% resolved by day 14
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT[16]	1.4	1.1	0.3 (-1.3, 1.9)	23.9 (-181, 79.4)	299	5	356	4	374	No difference (14 symptoms on 4 pt scale over 14 days
Ivermectin Iran[56]	5.0	7.1	-2.1 (-6.1, 1.9)	-42.3 (-178, 27.2)	-47	14	281	19	268	NO difference
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6[57]	1.2	1.2	-0.1 (-1.1, 1.0)	-5.3 (-158, 57.0)	-1634	9	774	10	817	No difference (12d vs 13 d)
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6[58]	0.3	0.8	-0.5 (-1.4, 0.4)	-150.1 (-1188, 51.1)	-200	2	604	5	602	11 d vs 11 d no difference
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER[18]	4.8	3.7	1.1 (-2.7, 4.9)	22.9 (-88.1, 68.4)	90	11	227	8	214	NO difference by Cox proportional HR
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP[59]	4.7	2.4	2.4 (-1.1, 5.9)	50.2 (-43.1, 82.7)	42	10	211	5	212	NO Difference in symptom severity score over 14 days
Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19[60]	0.0	3.6	-3.6 (-7.1, -0.1)	NA	-28	0	37	4	111	NO difference 14 d vs 12 d

Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2[61]	7.0	5.9	1.1 (-4.5, 6.7)	16.0 (-103, 65.2)	89	11	157	8	136	NO difference 10 d vs 12 d
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG[62]	4.8	3.4	1.4 (-4.0, 6.9)	29.9 (-154, 80.6)	69	4	83	5	148	NO difference 11 d vs 12 d
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah[63]	2.6	4.6	-2.0 (-6.2, 2.2)	-73.8 (-481.6, 48.0)	-51	4	151	7	152	6 d to 6 d
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil[64]	2.4	2.4	0 (-6.5, 6.5)	0 (-1447, 93.5)	100	1	42	1	42	
Nitazoxanide-Romark[22]	2.6	0.5	2.0 (-0.4, 4.5)	78.8 (-79.7, 97.5)	49	5	195	1	184	Yes mild illness (13 d vs 18 d , p=0.01), NO difference for moderate illness
Colchicine-COLCORONA[20]	5.8	4.7	1.2 (-0.1, 2.5)	20.0 (-2.8, 37.7)	86	131	2253	104	2235	Not reported
Losartan-MN[65]	1.7	5.2	-3.5 (-10.1, 3.1)	-205 (-2749, 67.3)	-29	1	59	3	58	
Niclosamide[66]	2.9	0.0	2.9 (-2.7, 8.6)	1 (1, 1)	34	1	34	0	33	NO difference 12 d vs 15 d
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B[67]	0.7	0.7	0.04 (-1.9, 2.0)	5.6 (-1395, 94)	2448	1	136	1	144	Not reported
2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B[67]	0.7	0.7	-0.01 (-2.0, 2.0)	-0.7 (-1494, 93.6)	-18360	1	136	1	135	Not reported
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B[67]	0.7	1.4	-0.7 (-3.1, 1.7)	-90.2 (-1974, 82.6)	-151	1	136	2	143	Not reported
Sulodexide[68]	29.4	17.7	11.7 (1.1, 22.3)	39.7 (3.5, 62.3)	9	35	119	22	124	Not reported
Enoxaparin-ETHIC[69]	10.5	11.4	-0.9 (-9.2, 7.4)	-8.6 (-131, 49.0)	-111	12	114	12	105	Not reported
Enoxaparin-OVID[70]	3.4	3.4	-0.1 (-3.3, 3.2)	-1.7 (-166, 61.2)	-1740	8	238	8	234	Not reported
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS[71]	3.4	1.7	1.8 (-1.4, 4.9)	51.4 (-85.2, 87.2)	56	7	203	3	179	19 d to 19 d

Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE[72]	11.2	12.7	-1.5 (-10.1, 7.1)	-13.5 (-134, 45.0)	-66	12	107	14	110	NO difference 13 d vs 12 d
Zinc[73]	6.0	8.6	-2.6 (-12.4, 7.2)	-43.7 (-471.4, 63.9)	-38	3	50	5	58	11 dto 10 d
Ascorbic acid[73]	6.0	4.2	1.8 (-6.8, 10.5)	30.6 (-297.6, 87.9)	55	3	50	2	48	12 d to 10 d
Zinc/Ascorbic acid[73]	6.0	12.1	-6.1 (-16.7, 4.6)	-101.1 (-637, 45.1)	-16	3	50	7	58	10 d too 10 d
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[74]	6.8	2.4	4.4 (-4.3, 13.2)	65.1 (-222.6, 96.2)	23	3	44	1	42	
Saliravira[75]	28.6	0.0	28.6 (16.7, 40.4)	1 (1, 1)	4	16	56	0	87	YES 9d vs 14 d p<0.05
Azithromycin-Atomic2[76]	11.6	10.3	1.2 (-5.9, 8.4)	10.5 (-72.3, 53.6)	82	17	147	15	145	Not reported
Azithromycin-ACTION[28]	0.0	4.0	-4.0 (-7.4, -0.6)	NA	-25	0	72	5	125	No difference resolution day 14
Resveratrol[77]	6.0	2.0	4.0 (-3.6, 11.6)	66.7 (-210, 96.4)	25	3	50	1	50	Not reported

Table 2
Summary of historical efficacy of different therapeutics against SARS-CoV-2 VOCs. White = drug not available at that time; green = effective; orange = partially effective; red= not effective. Restriction reported refer to initial restrictions by FDA. NNT: number needed to treat.

	approximate cost per patient	average NNT (sourced from Table 2)	cost to prevent a single hospitalisation (€)	efficacy against VOC Alpha	efficacy against VOC Delta	efficacy against VOC BA.1	efficacy against VOC BA.2	efficacy against BA.4/5	efficacy against BQ.1.1
bamlanivimab+etesesevimab	2000	21	42,000		restricted 04/2021				
casirivimab+imdevimab	2000	30	60,000			restricted 01/2022			

sotrovimab	1000	22	22,000				restricted 03/2022		
tixagevimab+cilgavimab	1000	22	22,000						restricted 10/22
regdanvimab	300	23	6,900						
bebtelovimab	2000	Not calculated (low-risk pts)	Not calculated (low-risk pts)						
nirmatrelvir	635 (5 days)	18	11,435						
molnupiravir	635 (5 days))	34	21,590						
remdesivir	1600 (3 days)	22 (MOVE-Out)	35,200						
CCP	200 (600-ml)	31	6,200						
Vax-CCP									

Appendix for

Outpatient regimens to reduce COVID-19 hospitalizations: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

David J. Sullivan, Daniele Focosi, Daniel F. Hanley, Mario Cruciani, Massimo Franchini, Jiangda Ou, Arturo Casadevall, Nigel Paneth

Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Baltimore, MD USA (Prof. D J Sullivan M.D., Prof. A Casadevall M.D.PhD,); North-Western Tuscany Blood Bank, Pisa University Hospital, Pisa, Italy (Prof. D Focosi, M.D.); Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Department of Neurology, Brain Injury Outcomes Division, Baltimore, MD, USA (Prof. D F Hanley M.D., J Ou M.S.); Division of Hematology, Carlo Poma Hospital, Mantua, Italy (Prof. M Cruciani M.D., Prof. M Franchini M.D.,); Departments of Epidemiology & Biostatistics and Pediatrics & Human Development, College of Human Medicine, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA (Prof. N Paneth, M.D., M.P.H)

Corresponding author. E-mail:dsulliv7@jhmi.edu

The PDF file includes:

Description of trial participants 2

Appendix Figures

Appendix Figure 1: Symptom onset to enrollment 3
Appendix Figure 2: Odds ratio for hospitalizations from all interventions 4
Appendix Figure 3: Odds ratio for hospitalizations within CCP group 5
Appendix Figure 4: Risk of bias by RCT 6
Appendix Figure 5: Funnel plots by RCTs class 7

Appendix Tables

Appendix Table 1a: Participant characteristics Demographic and clinical characteristics 8
Appendix Table 1b: Participant characteristics Geography, age symptom onset 14
Appendix Table 2: Summary of findings table. GRADE evaluation by RCT 21
Appendix Table 2: Hospitalized Odds Ratio statistics 28
Appendix Table 4: Deaths during RCTs 31

Appendix References 35

Description of trial participants

The median age of participants was about 50 years. The CCP group had a nonweighted trial average of median age equal to 58 years, while the anti-Spike mAbs, small molecule antivirals and repurposed drug groups younger average of median age was equal to 45 to 48 years. Most RCTs had more women than men, and 84% of all RCT 60,043 participants had Caucasian ethnicity (Table 1, Appendix Table 2).

The individual RCTs differed in the percentage of participants with risk factors for progression to severe COVID-19. Of the 37 RCTs reporting aggregated hospitalization risk factors, ten had 100% of participants with at least one hospitalization risk factor, while 5 had fewer than 50%. The bebtelovimab placebo-controlled RCT explicitly focused exclusively on low-risk individuals [1]. Individual risk factors such as diabetes mellitus occurred in 10 to 20% of participants in most RCTs. Obesity with BMI over 29 averaged near 40% of RCT participants in the 4 therapy groups after excluding the large single 25,000 molnupiravir-PANORAMIC RCT with 15% of participants with BMI's over 30 (Table 1) [25].

Of 18 RCTs reporting seropositivity rates at baseline, 11 had < 25% screening seropositive (Table 1, Figure 2). The molnupiravir-PANORAMIC RCT was an outlier, with 98% participant seropositives[25]. All but one[2] of the RCTs enrolled within 8 days (median) of symptom onset. In RCTs of anti-Spike mAbs and small molecule antivirals, median time from illness onset to intervention was 3.5 to 4 days (Figure 3, Table 1, Appendix Table 2). CCP and repurposed antiviral drug RCTs enrolled within 4.5 to 5.1 days from symptom onset.

The CCP RCTs were conducted in the USA[3,4], Argentina[5], Netherlands[6] and Spain[7] (Appendix Table 2). The anti-Spike mAb RCTs all had a USA component, but were largely centered in the Americas except for the sotrovimab RCT, which took place in Spain[8]. Many of the repurposed drugs and nirmatrelvir/ritonavir RCTs recruited worldwide[9].

Four of the five CCP RCTs (COV-Early[6], CONV-ERT[7], Argentina[5] and C3PO[4]), and all eight anti-Spike mAb RCTs took place in the setting of the D614G variant and the Alpha VOC (Figure 2). By contrast, most of the molnupiravir, nirmatrelvir/ritonavir[9] and interferon lambda RCTs were conducted in the setting of the Delta VOC. The ivermectin[10] and fluvoxamine[11] RCTs ended as the Delta VOC wave began in August 2021. The remdesivir RCT spanned D614G, Alpha and Beta VOC but missed Delta[12]. The CSSC-004 RCT of CCP was the longest RCT reviewed, spanning periods characterized by D614G to Delta VOC infections[3].

Appendix Figure 1
Comparison of mean interval from symptom onset to enrollment/intervention as well as per protocol interval inclusion limit for all participants.



Appendix Figure 2: Odds ratio for hospitalizations from all interventions.
Therapeutic interventions ordered according to mechanism of action (CCP, anti-Spike mAbs, small molecule antivirals and repurposed drugs

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%–CI	Weight
CCP–CONV–ERT	22	188	21	188	1.05	[0.56; 1.99]	2.5%
CCP–COV–Early	12	202	19	204	0.61	[0.29; 1.30]	2.2%
CCP–C3PO	52	257	56	254	0.90	[0.59; 1.37]	3.0%
CCP–Argentina	13	80	25	80	0.43	[0.20; 0.91]	2.1%
CCP–CSSC–004	17	592	37	589	0.44	[0.25; 0.79]	2.6%
Bamlanivimab–BLAZE–1	5	309	9	143	0.24	[0.08; 0.74]	1.4%
Sotrovimab–COMET–ICE	6	528	30	529	0.19	[0.08; 0.46]	1.9%
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab–BLAZE–1	11	518	36	517	0.29	[0.15; 0.58]	2.3%
Casirivimab/imdevimab–REGEN–COV Ph 3	18	1355	62	1341	0.28	[0.16; 0.47]	2.7%
Casirivimab/imdevimab–REGEN–COV Ph 1/2	3	533	5	266	0.30	[0.07; 1.25]	1.0%
Bebtelovimab–BLAZE–4	2	125	2	128	1.02	[0.14; 7.39]	0.6%
Regdanvimab–CT–P59	9	203	9	104	0.49	[0.19; 1.27]	1.7%
Regdanvimab–CT–P59–2	16	656	52	659	0.29	[0.16; 0.52]	2.6%
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab–TACKLE	18	407	37	415	0.47	[0.26; 0.84]	2.6%
Molnupiravir–MOVe–OUT	48	709	68	699	0.67	[0.46; 0.99]	3.1%
Molnupiravir–PANORAMIC	103	12516	96	12484	1.07	[0.81; 1.42]	3.4%
Molnupiravir–Aurobindo	0	610	0	610			0.0%
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir–EPIC–HR	8	1039	66	1046	0.12	[0.06; 0.24]	2.2%
Remdesivir–PINETREE	2	279	15	283	0.13	[0.03; 0.57]	1.0%
Interferon Lambda–TOGETHER	21	931	40	1018	0.56	[0.33; 0.96]	2.7%
Interferon Lambda– ILIAD	1	30	1	30	1.00	[0.06; 16.76]	0.3%
Interferon Lambda–COVID–Lambda	2	60	2	60	1.00	[0.14; 7.34]	0.6%
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir–SOVODAK	1	27	4	28	0.23	[0.02; 2.21]	0.5%
Favipavir–Avi–Mild–19	6	112	2	119	3.31	[0.65; 16.76]	0.9%
Favipiravir–Iran	4	38	2	39	2.18	[0.37; 12.65]	0.8%
Favipiravir–FLARE	1	59	0	60	3.10	[0.12; 77.71]	0.3%
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir–FLARE	1	61	0	60	3.00	[0.12; 75.11]	0.3%
Lopinavir/Ritonavir–FLARE	1	60	0	60	3.05	[0.12; 76.39]	0.3%
Lopinavir/ritonavir–TREAT NOW	7	220	6	226	1.21	[0.40; 3.64]	1.5%
Lopinavir/ritonavir–TOGETHER	14	244	11	227	1.20	[0.53; 2.69]	2.0%
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine–AR0–CORONA	2	30	1	30	2.07	[0.18; 24.15]	0.4%
Metformin–COVID–OUT	8	596	19	601	0.42	[0.18; 0.96]	2.0%
Metformin –TOGETHER	24	215	24	203	0.94	[0.51; 1.71]	2.5%
Fluvoxamine–TOGETHER	75	741	97	756	0.77	[0.56; 1.05]	3.3%
Fluvoxamine–STOP COVID	0	80	6	72	0.06	[0.00; 1.15]	0.3%
Fluvoxamine–COVID–OUT	6	299	5	293	1.18	[0.36; 3.91]	1.3%
Fluvoxamine ACTIV–6	1	670	2	607	0.45	[0.04; 5.00]	0.4%
Fluvoxamine/budesonide–TOGETHER	7	738	8	738	0.87	[0.32; 2.42]	1.6%
Ivermectin–TOGETHER	79	679	95	679	0.81	[0.59; 1.11]	3.3%
Ivermectin–COVID–OUT	4	374	5	356	0.76	[0.20; 2.85]	1.2%
Ivermectin Iran	19	268	14	281	1.46	[0.71; 2.96]	2.3%
Ivermectin–ACTIV–6	10	817	9	774	1.05	[0.43; 2.61]	1.8%
Ivermectin high dose–ACTIV–6	5	602	2	604	2.52	[0.49; 13.04]	0.8%
Hydroxychloroquine–TOGETHER	8	214	11	227	0.76	[0.30; 1.93]	1.8%
Hydroxychloroquine–COVID–19 PEP	5	212	10	211	0.49	[0.16; 1.45]	1.5%
Hydroxychloroquine –AH COVID–19	4	111	0	37	3.14	[0.17; 59.70]	0.3%
Hydroxychloroquine–BCN PEP–CoV–2	8	136	11	157	0.83	[0.32; 2.13]	1.7%
Hydroxychloroquine–BMG	5	148	4	83	0.69	[0.18; 2.65]	1.1%
Hydroxychloroquine–Utah	7	152	4	151	1.77	[0.51; 6.19]	1.2%
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin–Brazil	1	42	1	42	1.00	[0.06; 16.53]	0.3%
Nitazoxanide–Romark	1	184	5	195	0.21	[0.02; 1.79]	0.5%
Colchicine–COLCORONA	104	2235	131	2253	0.79	[0.61; 1.03]	3.4%
Losartan–MN	3	58	1	59	3.16	[0.32; 31.34]	0.5%
Niclosamide	0	33	1	34	0.33	[0.01; 8.48]	0.3%
Aspirin–ACTIV–4B	1	144	1	136	0.94	[0.06; 15.24]	0.3%
2.5–mg apixaban–ACTIV–4B	1	135	1	136	1.01	[0.06; 16.27]	0.3%
5–mg apixaban ACTIV–4B	2	143	1	136	1.91	[0.17; 21.36]	0.4%
Sulodexide	22	124	35	119	0.52	[0.28; 0.95]	2.5%
Enoxaparin–ETHIC	12	105	12	114	1.10	[0.47; 2.56]	1.9%
Enoxaparin–OVID	8	234	8	238	1.02	[0.38; 2.76]	1.6%
Inhaled Ciclesonide–COVIS	3	179	7	203	0.48	[0.12; 1.87]	1.1%
Inhaled ciclesonide–COVERAGE	14	110	12	107	1.15	[0.51; 2.63]	2.0%
Zinc	5	58	3	50	1.48	[0.34; 6.52]	1.0%
Ascorbic acid	2	48	3	50	0.68	[0.11; 4.27]	0.7%
Zinc/Ascorbic acid	7	58	3	50	2.15	[0.53; 8.80]	1.1%
Homeopathy–COVID–Simile	1	42	3	44	0.33	[0.03; 3.34]	0.5%
Saliravira	0	87	16	56	0.01	[0.00; 0.24]	0.3%
Azithromycin–Atomic2	15	145	17	147	0.88	[0.42; 1.84]	2.2%
Azithromycin–ACTION	5	125	0	72	6.62	[0.36; 121.45]	0.3%
Resveratrol	1	50	3	50	0.32	[0.03; 3.18]	0.5%
Random effects model	**909**	**34369**	**1304**	**33617**	**0.67**	**[0.57; 0.80]**	**100.0%**

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 52\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2038$, $p < 0.01$
Test for overall effect: $z = -4.57$ ($p < 0.01$)



Appendix Figure 3: Odds ratio for hospitalizations within CCP group
A) All CCP trials excluding CCP-Argentina with a non hospital endpoint of severe respiratory distress or B) All CCP excluding CONV-ERT because of methylene blue inactivation of antibody function. C) all cause hospitalization for CSSC-004 to match all cause hospitalization for other CCP studies

A) Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
CCP-CONV-ERT	22	188	21	188	1.05	[0.56; 1.99]	15.8%	22.6%
CCP-CoV-Early	12	202	19	204	0.61	[0.29; 1.30]	15.2%	18.2%
CCP-C3PO	52	257	56	254	0.90	[0.59; 1.37]	38.3%	34.2%
CCP-CSSC-004	17	592	37	589	0.44	[0.25; 0.79]	30.7%	24.9%
Common effect model	**103**	**1239**	**133**	**1235**	**0.74**	**[0.56; 0.97]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.73**	**[0.49; 1.07]**	**--**	**100.0%**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 42%, τ^2 = 0.0667, p = 0.16
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -2.14 (p = 0.03)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -1.61 (p = 0.11)

B) Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
CCP-CoV-Early	12	202	19	204	0.61	[0.29; 1.30]	14.9%	19.3%
CCP-C3PO	52	257	56	254	0.90	[0.59; 1.37]	37.5%	35.5%
CCP-Argentina	13	80	25	80	0.43	[0.20; 0.91]	17.5%	19.0%
CCP-CSSC-004	17	592	37	589	0.44	[0.25; 0.79]	30.1%	26.2%
Common effect model	**94**	**1131**	**137**	**1127**	**0.64**	**[0.48; 0.85]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.60**	**[0.40; 0.90]**	**--**	**100.0%**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 41%, τ^2 = 0.0722, p = 0.17
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -3.11 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -2.47 (p = 0.01)

C) Fixed and random effect model

Study	Intervention Events	Intervention Total	Control Events	Control Total	OR	95%-CI	Weight (common)	Weight (random)
CCP-CONV-ERT	22	188	21	188	1.05	[0.56; 1.99]	13.2%	18.5%
CCP-CoV-Early	12	202	19	204	0.61	[0.29; 1.30]	12.6%	14.6%
CCP-C3PO	52	257	56	254	0.90	[0.59; 1.37]	31.9%	29.7%
CCP-Argentina	13	80	25	80	0.43	[0.20; 0.91]	14.9%	14.3%
CCP-CSSC-004	21	592	40	589	0.50	[0.29; 0.87]	27.5%	22.8%
Common effect model	**120**	**1319**	**161**	**1315**	**0.70**	**[0.55; 0.91]**	**100.0%**	**--**
Random effects model					**0.69**	**[0.50; 0.96]**	**--**	**100.0%**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 34%, τ^2 = 0.0489, p = 0.20
Test for overall effect (common effect): z = -2.68 (p < 0.01)
Test for overall effect (random effects): z = -2.20 (p = 0.03)

Appendix Figure 4: Risk of bias by RCT

TYPE	Study	Radomization process bias	Deviations from intended intervention bias	Missing outcome data bias	Mesaurement of the outcome bias	Selection of the reported results bias	Highest risk of bias	ROB Source
Ab-CCP	CCP-CONV-ert	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
Ab-CCP	CCP-COV-early	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	pending in NMA-COVID
Ab-CCP	CCP-C3PO	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
Ab-CCP	CCP-Argentina	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
Ab-CCP	CCP-CSSC-004	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Regdanvimab-CT-P59	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
mAb	Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC	Low	Some concerns	HIGH	Some concerns	Low	HIGH	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Molnupiravir-Aurobindo	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Remdesivir-PINETREE	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
SMA	Interferon Lambda- ILIAD	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Interferon Lambda-COVID	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Sofosbuvir & daclatasvir-SOVODAK	little evidence to score	little evidence to score	little evidence to score	little evidence to score	little evidence to score	little evidence to score	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Favipiravir-Avi-Mild-19	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Favipiravir-Iran	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
SMA	Favipiravir-FLARE	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
SMA	Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
SMA	Tenofovir/Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA	Low	HIGH	Low	Unclear	Low	HIGH	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Metformin-COVID-OUT	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	metformin -TOGETHER 2	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Fluvoxamine -STOP COVID	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Fluvoxamine-ACTIV-6	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Ivermectin-TOGETHER	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Ivermectin-COVID-OUT	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Ivermectin Iran	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Unclear	pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Ivermectin-ACTIV-6	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-BMG	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Hydroxychloroquine-Utah	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Nitazoxanide-Romark	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Colchicine-COLCORONA	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Losartan-MN	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Niclosamide	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Aspirin-ACTIV-4B	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Sulodexide	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Enoxaparin-ETHIC	Low	HIGH	Low	Low	Low	HIGH	pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Enoxaparin-OVID	Low	HIGH	Low	HIGH	Low	HIGH	pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Zinc	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Ascorbic acid	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Zinc/Ascorbic acid	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Homeopathy-COVID-Simile	Low	Low	HIGH	Low	Low	HIGH	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Saliravira	Low	HIGH	HIGH	Low	Low	HIGH	pending in NMA-COVID
RP	Azithromycin-Atomic2	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Azithromycin-ACTION	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	https://covid-nma.com/
RP	Resveratrol	Low	Low	HIGH	Unclear	Low	HIGH	RevMan pending in NMA-COVID

Appendix Figure 5: Funnel plots by RCTs class
A) CCP, B) anti-Spike mAbs C) small molecule antivirals and D) repurposed drugs. For anti-Spike mAbs RCTs, there is a suggestion of missing studies on the right side of the plot, where results would be unfavourable to the experimental intervention, for which either very high efficacy of high-dose anti-Spike mAbs or non-reporting bias is a plausible explanation.



Table 1a

Demographic and clinical characteristics of recruits in the RCTs analyzed in this review.

Study	mITT	median age (range)	total female n(%)	White n(%)	Black n(%)	Hispanic n(%)	1 or more medical high risk conditons for COVID-19 progession	diabetes n(%)	hypertension n(%)	obesity or BMI > 30 n(%)	median duration symptoms	Seropositive at baseline n(%)	Hospital type	Endpoint days for hosp
CCP (5 RCTs) totals or averages	**2634**	**58**	**1409 (53)**	**2213 (84)**	**266 (10)**	**862 (33)**	**2074 (79)**	**326 (15)**	**606 (33)**	**854 (38)**	**4.5**	**73 (9)**		
anti-Spike mAbs (8 RCTs) totals or averages	**7421**	**47**	**3944 (53)**	**6214 (84)**	**455 (6)**	**3113 (42)**	**6562 (88)**	**1067 (14)**	**1249 (17)**	**3197 (43)**	**3.5**	**1087 (15)**		
Small molecule antivirals (11 RCTs) totals or averages	**33148**	**45.4**	**18116 (55)**	**28726 (87)**	**399 (1)**	**2458 (7)**	**22400 (68)**	**3150 (10)**	**6954 (21)**	**6271 (19)**	**4**	**25710 (77) {710/8148=9% w/o-Mol-Pan.)**		
Repurposed drugs (27 RCTs) totals or averages	**16840**	**48**	**9595 (57)**	**14752 (89)**	**815 (5)**	**4212 (32)**	**8669 (88)**	**2174 (13)**	**4318 (27)**	**6615 (46)**	**5.1**	**2303 (51)**		
CCP-CONV-ert[7]	376	56	173 (46)	0	0	376 (100)	278 (74)	49 (13)	not reported	96 (26)	4.4	43 (11)	All cause	28-30
CCP-COV-Early[13]	406	58	187 (46)	406 (100)	0	0	278 (68)	not reported	not reported	not reported	5 (iqr4-6)	30 (8)	All cause	28-30
CCP-C3PO[4]	511	54	274 (54)	237 (46)	103 (20)	156 (31)	511 (100)	142 (28)	216 (42)	302 (59)	4	not reported	All cause	15
CCP-Argentina[5]	160	77 (65-90+)	100 (62)	0	0	160 (100)	131 (82)	36 (23)	114 (71)	12 (8)	3	not reported	hypoxia resp rate def	28-30
CCP-CSSC-004[3]	1181	43 (18-85)	675 (57)	934 (79)	163 (14)	170 (14)	470 (40)	99 (8)	276 (23)	444 (38)	6	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30

Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1[14]	452	45 (18-86)	249 (55)	389 (86)	29 (6)	198 (44)	310 (69)		not reported	201 (44)	4	not reported	COVID-19 related + ED visit	28-30
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[8]	1057	53(17-96)	571 (54)	919 (87)	42 (4)	687 (65)	1055 (99.9)	233 (23)	not reported	665 (63)	3	not reported	All cause	28-30
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1[15]	1035	54 (12-77+)	538 (52)	896 (87)	83 (8)	304 (29)	983 (95)	285 (28)	not reported	median 34 bmi	4	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3[16]	2696	50 (iqr 39-50)	1407 (52)	2297 (85)	143 (5)	935 (35)	2696 (100)	412 (15)	993 (37)	1559 (58)	3	620 (23)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2[17]	799	42 (iqr 31-52)	423 (53)	681 (85)	74 (9)	403 (50)	483 (61)			298 (37)	3	304 (38)	All cause	28-30
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[1]	253	34	135 (53)	187 (74)	48 (19)	91 (36)	0 (0)	not reported	not reported		3	27 (11)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Regdanvimab-CT-P59[18]	307	51 (iqr40-60)	166 (51)	286 (87)	0	27 (8)	226 (69)	29 (9)	not reported	52 (16)	3	9 (3)	All cause	28-30
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2[19]	1315	48 (iqr38-59)	641 (49)	1132 (86)	7 (1)	276 (21)	880 (67)	120 (9)	443 (34)	415 (32)	4	148 (11)	all cause	28
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[20]	822	46 (sd 15.2)	455 (50)	559 (62)	36 (4)	468 (52)	809 (90)	108 (12)	256 (28)	388 (43)	5	127 (14)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT[21]	1408	43 (18-90)	735 (51.3)	813 (56)	75 (5)	711 (49)	1424 (99.4)	228 (15.9)%	not reported	1056(73)	3	620 (23)	All cause	28-30
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC[22]	25000	57 (18-99)	15101 (59)	24270 (94)	155 (0.6)		17759 (69)	2195 (9)%	5782 (22)	3912 (15)%	3	25333 (98) 2+ doses of vaccine	All cause	28-30
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo[23]	1220	36 (18-60)	468 (38)	1220 (100)	0	0	90 (7.3)				3	not reported	All cause	28-30
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR[9]	2085	46 (18-88)	1098 (49)	1607 (72)	110 (4.9)	1010 (45)	2085 (100)	252 (11)	739 (33)	744 (36)	3	27 (11)	COVID-19 related	28-30

Remdesivir-PINETREE[12]	562	50 (12-77+)	269 (48)	452 (80)	42 (7.5)	235 (41)	562 (100)	346 (62)	268 (48)	310 (55)	5	9 (3)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER[24]	1949	43 (18-92)	1113 (57)	58 (3)	28 (1)	1853 (95)	1124 (58)	181 (9)	581 (30)	719 (37)	3	1107 (58) FV	COVID-19 related	28
Interferon Lambda-ILIAD[25]	60	46 (iqr32-54)	35 (60)	31	6		9			12	5	5/51 (10)	COVID-19 related	14
Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda[26]	120	36 (18-71)	50 (42)	33 (28)		74 (63)		12 (10)	14 (12)		5 (iqr3-6)	49 (41)	All cause	28-30
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[27]	55	<50	29 (53)	55 (100)							not reported	not reported	All cause	28-30
Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19[28]	231	37 (iqr32-44)	76 (33)	231 (100)	0	0		25 (11)	14 (6)	39 (17)	3	not reported	All cause	28-30
Favipiravir-Iran[29]	77	41	34	77 (100)	0	0	11 (14)	nr	nr	nr	4		all cause	28
Favipiravir-FLARE[30]	119	40	56 (47)	98 (82)			17 (14)			20 (17)	nr	74 (62)	all cause	28
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	121	40	59 (49)	99 (82)			19 (16)			20 (17)	nr	77 (64)	all cause	28
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	120	40	60 (50)	98 (82)			16 (13)			20 (17)	nr	74 (62)	all cause	28
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW[31]	446	41 (19-75)	261 (59)	354 (79)	35 (8)	33 (7)	347 (78)	17 (4)	77 (17)	149 (35)	4	93 (21)	All cause	29
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER[32]	471	53 (IQR 18-94)	255 (54)	14 (3)	11 (2)	428 (91)	471 (100)	92 (20)	137 (29)	198 (42)	6	not reported	COVID-19 related	90
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA[33]	60	42	34 (57)					2	3		4		all cause	14

Metformin-COVID-OUT[34]	1197	46 (iqr 37-55)	741 (56)	1091 (82)	90 (7)			26 (2)	353 (27) cvd	646 (49)	5	690 (52fv)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Metformin -TOGETHER[35]	418	52 (18-90)	239 (57)	8 (2)	6 (1)	381 (91)	418 (100)	61 (15)	167 (40)	188 (45)	3		All cause	28-30
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER[11]	1497	<50	862 (58)	1486 (99)	5 (1)	1486 (99)	1497 (100)	243 (16)	194 (13)	751 (50)	4	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30
Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID[36]	152	46	109 (72)	106 (70)	38 (25)	5 (3)		17 (11)	30 (20)	75 (49)	4	not reported	COVID-19 related	15 (2 noncovid after day 15 to day 28
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT[34]	592	44 (iqr37-53)	358 (54)	539 (82)	51 (8)			7 (1)	172 (26) cvd	302 (46)	5	373 (56fv)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6[37]	1288	48 (iqr39-58)	734 (57)	1038 (81)	96 (7)	221 (17)		115 (9)	304 (24)	469 (36)	5	861 (67)	All cause	28
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[38]	1476	51 (18-102)	898 (61)	36 (2)	20 (1)	1419 (96)	1476 (100)	278 (19)	656 (44)	597 (42)	3	1377 (94)	All cause	28-30
Ivermectin-TOGETHER[39]	1349	49	791 (58)	1310 (98)	12 (1)	1310 (98)	1349 (100)	180 (13)	114 (8)	675 (50)	4	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT[34]	730	46 (iqr37-56)	442 (55)	662 (82)	59 (7)			13 (2)	184 (23) cvd	383 (47)	5	449 (56fv)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Ivermectin Iran[40]	549	35 (5-87)	294 (48)	582 (100)	0	0	112 (20)	42 (7.3)	46 (7.8)	101 (21)	3	not reported	All cause	not stated
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6[41]	1591	47 (iqr39-56)	932 (59)	1286 (81)	113(7)	163 (10)		184	415	648	6	753 (fv47)	All cause	28-30
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6[42]	1206	48 (iqr38-58)	713 (59)	909 (75)	93 (8)	16013)		109 (9)	317 (27)	259 (21)	5	1008 (84)	All cause	28

Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER[32]	441	53 (IQR 18-81)	243 (55)	422 (96)	7 (1)	422 (96)	441 (100)	89 (20)	210 (48)	177 (40)	6	not reported	COVID-19 related	90
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP[43]	423	40 (iqr 32-50)	238 (56)	235 (48)	15 (3)	28 (6)		15 (3)	46 (11)		2	not reported	All cause	14
Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19[44]	148	47	66 (45)	51	12			29	41		7 (iqr5-8)	not reported	All cause	28-30
Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2[45]	293	42 (12 sd)	201 (69)				156 (53)	20 (7)			3 (iqr 2-4)	not reported	All cause	28-30
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG[46]	231	37 (18-78)	131 (57)	117 (51)	26 (11)	71 (31)	129 (56)	17 (7)	27 (12)	98 (42)	6	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah[47]	303	42	176 (48)	165 (45)	2 (1)	158 (43)	90 (25)	28 (8)	52 914)		nr	nr	all cause	28
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil[48]	84	37	34	44	5	79		nr	nr	nr	4	nr	all cause	21
Nitazoxanide-Romark[49]	379	40 (12-83)	214 (57)	233 (61)	8 (2)	130 (34)	238 (63%)				2	38 (10)	COVID-19 related	28-30
Colchicine-COLCORONA[2]	4488	54 (iqr 47-61)	2421 (54)	4182 (93)	233 (5)	<10%	4488 (100)	894 (20)	1629 (36)	2052 (46)	5.3	not reported	COVID-19 related	28-30
Losartan-MN[50]	117	38	58	84	8	10		7	9	42	2		all cause	28
Niclosamide[51]	67	36 mean	26 (39)	53 (79)	4 (6)	7 (10)			5 (8)	4 (7)	not reported	not reported	All cause	28-30
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B[52]	280	54 (iqr 46-59)	191 (58)	250 (76)	36 (11)	93 (28)		53 (16)	109 (33)	164 (50)	10 (diagnosis)	not reported	All cause	45
2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B[52]	271	54 (iqr 46-59)	191 (58)	255 (78)	38 (12)	91 (28)		60 (18)	120 (37)	164 (50)	10 (diagnosis)	not reported	All cause	45
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B[52]	279	54 (iqr	198 (6	251 (77)	36 (11)	80 (24)		55 (17)	111 (34)	164 (50)	10 (diagnosis)	not reported	All cause	45

		46-59)												
Sulodexide[53]	243	55	128 (53)	243 (100)		243 (100)		50 (21)	83 (43)		3	not reported	All cause	21
Enoxaparin-ETHIC[54]	219	59 (iqr51-66)	96 (44)	129 (59)	5 (2)	12 (5)		50/152 (33)	114/152 (75)	109 (49)	5	not reported	All cause	21
Enoxaparin-OVID[55]	572	56 (iqr53-62)	217 (38)	446 (78)	3 (1)			38 (7)	115 (20)		3 (dx)	not reported	All cause	28-30
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS[56]	400	43 (13-87)	221 (55)	345 (86)	47 (12)	172 (43)		30 (8)	89 (22)	200 (50)	NR		all cause	30
Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE[57]	217	63 (50-86)	111 (51)	217 (100)	0	0	157 (72)	33(16)	89 (41)	52 (24)	4	not reported	All cause	28-30
Zinc[58]	108	43	68	73	28			10	35	54	nr	nr	all cause	28
Ascorbic acid[58]	98	44	64	70	23			5	22	49	nr	nr	all cause	28
Zinc/Ascorbic acid[58]	108	46	62	71	32			20	41	54	nr	nr	all cause	28
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[59]	86	41	56			86 (100)		8	21		9	nr	all cause	27
Saliravira[60]	143	50 (24-80)	59 (41)	143 (100)					33 (23)		not reported	not reported	All cause	23
Azithromycin-Atomic2[61]	292	46	143 (49)	201 (68)	11 (4)		70 (24)	25 (9)	52 (18)		6	not reported	All cause	28-30
Azithromycin-ACTION[62]	197	43	130 (66)	169 (86)	9 (5)	59 (30)		24 (12)	26 (13)		6	not reported	All cause	21
Resveratrol[63]	100	55 (45-84)	62 (59)	93 (89)	4 (4)	2 (2)	32 (30)	10 (10)		50 (50)	5	not reported	All cause	21

Appendix Table 1b: Additional baseline data from RCTs-Geography, age symptom onset

Study	Enrollment Period	Study months	Geography	Enrolled	age over 65 n(%)	age over 60 n(%)	age over 50 n(%)	symptoms <= 8 days n(%)	symptoms <=7 days n(%)	symptoms <= 5 days n(%)	symptoms <= 3 days n(%)
CCP-CONV-ert[7]	Nov 10 2020 -July 28 2021	9	Spain	376			376 (100)		376 (100)		
CCP-COV-Early[13]			Netherlands	406			351 (86)		406 (100)		
CCP-C3PO[4]	Aug 2020-Feb 2021	7	USA	511			511 (100)		511 (100)		246 (48)
CCP-Argentina[5]	Jun 4 2020 – Oct 25 2020	5	Argentina	160	160 (100)						160 (100)
CCP-CSSC-004[3]	June 3 2020-Oct 2021	16	USA	1225	80 (7)		410 (35)	1181 (100)		517 (44)	
Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1[14]	June 2020-Aug 2020	3	USA	467	53 (12)					226 (50)mean	
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[8]	Aug 27 2020-March 2021	6	United States, Canada, Brazil, and Spain	1057	211(20)					1057 (100)	624 (59)
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1[15]	Sept 2020-Dec 2020	3	USA	1035	323 (31)			979 (95)			
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3[16]	Sept 24 2020-Jan 17 2021	4	USA Mexico	2696	358 (13)				2696 (100)		1489 (66)
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2[17]	June 16, 2020 - Sept 23, 2020	3	USA	799					799 (100)	599 (75)	400 (50)

Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[1]	May 2021-July 2021	3	USA	253	1 (<1)				253 (100)		
Regdanvimab-CT-P59[18]	Oct 2020-Dec 2020	2	South Korea, Romania, Spain, USA	327		85 (26)			327 (100)		
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2[19]	Jan 18 2021 to april 24 2021	3	world wide	1315			297 (23)			986 (75)	329 (25)
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[20]	Jan 28, 2021- July 22, 2021,	6	USA, Latin America, Europe, and Japan.	1014	116 (13)				910 (100)		
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT[21]	May 2021-Oct 2021	6	worldwide	1433		246 (17)				1408 (100)	674 (48)
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC[22]	Dec 8-2021 - April 27, 2022	5	UK	25783	6838 (27)					22510 (87)	
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo[23]	July 1, 2021 - Aug 24, 2021	2	India	1220							661 (54)
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR[9]	July 1 2021 - Dec 2021	6	worldwide	2246	287(12.8)					2246 (100)	1489 (66.3)
Remdesivir-PINETREE[12]	Sept 2020-Apr 2021	8	USA, Spain, Denmark UK	562		170 (30)			562 (100)		
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER[24]	Jun 24 2021-feb 7 2022	8	Brazil	1949			752 (39)		1949 (100)		1158 (59)
Interferon Lambda- ILIAD[25]	May 18, 2020-Sep 4 2020	4	Canada	60					60 (100)		

Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda[26]	Apil 25 2020-July 7 2020	2	USA	120							
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[27]	April 8 2020-May 19 2020	1	Iran	55							
Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19[28]	July 23, 2020- Aug 4 2021	12	Saudi Arabia	245			30 (13)			231 (100)	
Favipiravir-Iran[29]	Dec 5 2020-mar 31 2021	4	Iran	77					77 (100)		
Favipiravir-FLARE[30]	Oct 6 2020-Nov 4 2021	13	United Kingdom	119					119 (100)	76 (64)	
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	Oct 6 2020-Nov 4 2021	13	United Kingdom	121					121 (100)	80 (66)	
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	Oct 6 2020-Nov 4 2021	13	United Kingdom	120					120 (100)	75 (63)	
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW[31]	Jun 2020-Dec 2021	18	USA	446	13 (3)		112 (25)		446 (100)	349 (78)	124 (28)
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER[32]	June 2 2020-Oct 9 2020	4	Brazil	471			275	471 (100)		74 (16)	
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA[33]	Nov 20 2020-Mar 19 2021	4	France	60					60 (100)	45 (75)	
Metformin-COVID-OUT[34]	Dec 30 2020 - Jan 28 2022	13	USA	1323					1197 (100)		
Metformin -TOGETHER[35]	jan 15 2021-April 13 2021	3	Brazil	418			234 (56)		418 (100)		184 (44)
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER[11]	Jan 2021 - Aug 2021	8	Brazil	1497			655 (44)		1497 (100)		638 (43)

Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID[36]	April 10 2020 - Aug 5 2020	4	USA	152					152 (100)	114 (75)	
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT[34]	Dec 30 2020 - Jan 28 2022	13	USA	661					733 (100)		
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6[37]	Au 6 2021-May 27 2022	10	USA	1288			541 (42)		966 (75)	644 (50)	
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[38]	Jan 15 2022-July 6 2022	6	Brazil	1476			829 (56)		1476 (100)		917 (62)
Ivermectin-TOGETHER[39]	March 23 - Aug 2 2021	5	Brazil	1358					1358 (100)		597 (44)
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT[34]	Dec 30 2020 - Jan 28 2022	13	USA	808					592 (100)		
Ivermectin Iran[40]	Feb 19 21 - Aug 30 21	7	iran	582							291 (50)
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6[41]	June 23 2021 - Feb 4 2022	7	USA	1591			680 (43)	1193 (75)			
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6[42]	feb 16 2022-July 22 2022	5	USA	1206					905 (75)	603 (50)	302 (25)
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER[32]	June 2 2020-Oct 9 2020	4	Brazil	441			262 (59)	441 (100)		77 (17)	
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP[43]	March 22 2020 - May 20 2020	2	USA canada	491			99 (20)			423 (100)	
Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19[44]	April 15 2020 -May 22 2020	1	Canada	148							

Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2[45]	March 17 2020-May 26 2020	2	Spain	293						293 (100)	
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG[46]	April 15 2020-July 27 2020	3	USA	231		23 (10)			143 (62)	85 (37)	
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah[47]	Apr 2020-Apr 2021	12	USA	303							
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil[48]	Apr 12 2020-May 13 2020	1	Brazil	83						84 (100)	
Nitazoxanide-Romark[49]	Aug 2020-Jan 2021	5	USA Peurto rico	379							379 (100)
Colchicine-COLCORONA[2]	March 2020-Dec 2020	9	Brazil, Canada, Greece, South Africa, Spain, and the USA	4488		1122 (25)		3590 (80)			
Losartan-MN[50]	Apr 2020-Nov 2020	8	USA	117	3				117 (100)		106
Niclosamide[51]	Oct 1 2020-April 20 2021	7	USA	73							67 (100)
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B[52]	Sept 1 2020 - June 17 2021	10	USA	328		~82 (25)				82 (25)	
2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B[52]	Sept 1 2020 - June 17 2021	10	USA	329		~82 (25)				82 (25)	
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B[52]	Sept 1 2020 - June 17 2021	10	USA	328		~82 (25)				82 (25)	

Sulodexide[53]	June 5 2020 - August 5 2020	2	Mexico	243							243 (100)
Enoxaparin-ETHIC[54]	Oct 27 2020 - Nov 8 2021	12	Belgium, Brazil, India, South Africa, Spain, and the UK).	219			164 (75)			121 (50)	
Enoxaparin-OVID[55]	Aug 5 2020-Jan 14 2022	17	Switzerland and Germany	572			572 (100)			429 (dx 75)	
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS[56]	jun 11 2020-nov 3 2020	5	USA	400							
Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE[57]	Dec 29 2020-July 22 2021	7	France	217		151 (70)	217 (100)		217 (100)		
Zinc[58]	Apr 27 2020-Oct 14 2020	6	USA	108							
Ascorbic acid[58]	Apr 27 2020-Oct 14 2020	6	USA	98							
Zinc/Ascorbic acid[58]	Apr 27 2020-Oct 14 2020	6	USA	108							
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[59]	Jun 29 2020-Ap 6 2021	10	Brazil	86							
Saliravira[60]	Dec 21 2020 - March 1 2021	3	Iran	143							

Azithromycin-Atomic2[61]	June 3, 2020- Jan 29, 2021,	8	UK	292							
Azithromycin-ACTION[62]	May 22 2020 - March 16 2021	9	USA	197		18 (9)			197 (100)		
Resveratrol[63]	September 13, 2020 - December 11, 2020,	3	USA	100	16 (16)					50 (50)	

Appendix Table 2. Summary of findings table GRADE evaluation by RCT.
Patient or population: COVID-19 outpatients
Settings: Ambulatory patients with COVID-19
Intervention: COVID-19 convalescent plasma, anti-Spike mAbs, small molecule antivirals and repurposed drugs
Comparison: standard of care, placebo

Study	Assumed risk-controls Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)	Corresponding risk-Intervention Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)	Effect size: OR (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
CCP-mITT all cause hospitalization: cumulative results	120 per 1000	82 per 1000 (from 63 to 108)	0.69(0.53 /0.90)	2634 participants (5 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ high (there are no concerns in any of the GRADE factors)	CCP reduces significantly need of hospitalization compared to placebo. Most information is from results at low risk of bias or with some concerns, but unlikely to lower confidence in the estimate of effect.
Anti-spike mAbs: combined results	58.9 per 1000	18.8 per 1000 (from 14.7to 22.1)	0.32(0.25 /0.41)	8736 (9 trials)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	Anti-Spike mAbs reduce hospitalization compared to placebo
Small molecule antivirals:	18.3 per 1000	14.3 per 1000 (from 8.2 to 24.3)	0.78(0.45 /1.33)	34104 (17)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for imprecision,	-It is unclear if antivirals reduce rate of hospitalization compared to placebo

combined results					inconsistency (I^2=69) and ROB)	
Repurposed drugs combined results	53.05 per 1000	41.9 per 1000 (from 37.1 to 47.7)	0.79(0.70 /0.90)	22512 (39 arms, 21 comparisons)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	Repurposed treatments reduce rate of hospitalization compared to placebo
CCP						
CCP-CONV-ert[7]	111 per 1000	116 per 1000 (from 61 to 219)	1.05 (0.55/1.98)	376 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision-95% CI includes line of no effect)	CCP does not reduce hospitalization compared to placebo
CCP-COV-Early[13]	93 per 1000	57.6 per 1000 (from 26.9 to 120.9)	0.62 (0.29/1.30)	406 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision-95% CI includes line of no effect)	It is unclear if CCP reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
CCP-C3PO[4]	220 per 1000	198 per 1000 (from 127 to 301)	0.9 (0.58/1.37)	511 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision-95% CI includes line of no effect)	It is unclear if CCP reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
CCP-Argentina[5]	312 per 1000	133 per 1000 (from 62 to 180)	0.43 (0.20/0.91)	160 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision due to low number of participants)	CCP reduces rate of hospitalization compared to placebo
CCP-CSSC-004[3]	62.8 per 1000	27.6 per 1000 (from 15.7 to 49.6)	0.44 (0.25/0.79)	1181 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ high (there are no concerns in any of the GRADE factors)	CCP reduces rate of hospitalization compared to placebo
Anti-Spike mAbs						
Bamlanivimab[14]	62.9 per 1000	15 per 1000 (from 5 to 46.5)	0.24 (0.08/0.74)	919 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision)	Bamlanivimab reduces need of hospitalization compared to placebo

Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[23]	56.7 per 1000	10.7 per 1000 (from 4.5 to 26)	0.19 (0.08/0.46)	1061 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	Sotrovimab reduces need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab[15]	69.3 per 1000	20 per 1000 (from 10.3 to 40.1)	0.29 (0.15/0.58)	1035 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low(downgraded for imprecision and ROB)	Bamlanivimab/etesevimab in combination reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Casirivimab/imdevimab[16]	41.6 per 1000	11.6 per 1000 (from 7.0 to 19.1)	0.28 (0.17/0.46)	3495 (2 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for ROB and imprecision due to low number of events)	Casirivimab/imdevimab in combination reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[1]	15.6 per 1000	15.9 per 1000 (from 2.1 to 115)	1.02 (0.14/7.39)	253 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded twice for serious imprecision)	Bebtelovimab does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Regdanvimab[18,19]	79.9 per 1000	26.3 per 1000 (from 5.9 to 42.3)	0.33 (0.20/0.53)	1622 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	Regdanviman reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[20]	89.1 per 1000	41.8 per 1000 (from 24 to 74.7)	0.47 (0.27/0.84)	822 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision)	Tixagevimab-cilgavimab reduces hospitalization compared to placebo in unvaccinated adults
Small molecule antivirals						
Molnupiravir[21-23]	11.8 per 1000	10.8 per 1000 (from 8.6 to 13.4)	0.91 (0.73/1.14)	27628 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for inconsistency and imprecision)	It is unclear if Molnupiravir reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir[9]	63 per 1000	7.5 per 1000 (from 3.7 to 15.1)	0.12 (0.06/0.24)	2085 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for ROB and imprecision).	Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir reduces hospitalization

						compared to placebo in unvaccinated adults
Remdesivir[12]	53 per 1000	6.8 per 1000 (from 1.5 to 50.2)	0.13 (0.03/0.57)	562 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for ROB and imprecision)	Remdesivir reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Favipiravir[28-30]	18.3 per 1000	51.2 per 1000 (from 16.8 to 155.9)	2.80 (0.92/18.52)	427 (3)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	Favipiravir does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Favipiravir-Lopinavir/r-FLARE[30]	Not calculable	-	3.05 (0.12/76.39)	120 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	Favipiravir+Lopinavir/r does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Peg-interferon lambda[24-26]	38.8 per 1000	23.2 per 1000 (from 13.9 to 38.4)	0.60 (0.36/0.99)	2129 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	-Peginterferon lambda reduces hospitalization compared to placebo.
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[27]	142.8 per 1000	32.8 per 1000 (from 2.8 to 315)	0.23 (0.02/2.21)	55 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	It is unclear if sofosbuvir/daclatasvir reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Lopinavir/ritonavir[30-32]	33.1 per 1000	41.4 per 1000 (from 21.8 to 78.4)	1.25 (0.66/2.37)	1037 (3)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	Lopinavir/ritonavir does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA	33.3 per 1000	68.9 per 1000 (from 5.9 to 804.1	2.07 (0.18/24.5)	60 (1 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	TDF+Emtricitabine does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to standard of care

Repurposed						
Metformin-COVID-OUT[34,35]	53.4 per 1000	37.4 per 1000 (from 22.9 to 60.3)	0.70 (0.43/1.13	1615 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for imprecision and inconsistency (I^2=58)	It is unclear if metformin reduces hospitalization compared to placebo.
Fluvoxamine[11,34,36,37]	63.6 per 1000	46.4 per 1000 (from 34.3 to 62.9)	0.73 (0.54/0.99)	3518 (4 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	Fluvoxamine reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[38]	10.8 per 1000	9.4 per 1000 (from 3.4 to 26.1)	0.87 (0.32/2.42)	1476 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision)	It is unclear if fluvoxamine/budenoside reduces hospitalization compared to placebo.
Ivermectin[10,34,40-42]	46.3 per 1000	43.1 per 1000 (from 32.8 to 56.0)	0.93 (0.71/1.221	5434 (5 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision)	-It is unclear if Ivermectin reduces rate of hospitalization compared to placebo
Hydroxychloroquine[32,43,64-66]	44.0per 1000	38.7 per 1000 (from 22.8 to 65.1)	0.74 (0.45/1.23)	1536 (6 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision-95% CI includes line of no effect)	It is unclear if hydroxychloroquine reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin[48]	23.8 per 1000	23.8 per 1000 (from 1.42 to 39.2)	1.00 (0.06/16.5)	84 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for imprecision and ROB)	It is unclear if hydroxychloroquine/azithromycin reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Nitazoxanide-Romark[49]	25.6 per 1000	5.3 per 1000 (from 0.5 to 45.8)	0.21 (0.02/1.79)	379 (1)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	It is unclear if nitazoxanide reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Colchicine-	58.1 per 1000	45.8 per 1000 (from 35.4 to 59.8)	0.79 (0.61/1.03)	379 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded	It is unclear if colchicine reduces

COLCORONA[2]					for imprecision-95% CI includes line of no effect)	hospitalization compared to placebo
Losartan-MN[50]	16.9 per 1000	53.5 per 1000 (from 5.4 to 529.6)	3.16 (0.32/31.34)	117 (1 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	It is unclear if losartan reduces rate of hospitalization compared to placebo
Niclosamide[51]	29.4 per 1000	9.5 per 1000 (from 0.29 to 249)	0.33 (0.01/8.48)	67 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	It is unclear if niclosamide reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
aspirin[52]	7.3 per 1000	6.8 per 1000 (from 0.4 to 11)	0.94 (0.06/15.2)	280 (1)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and indirectness)	Aspirin does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
apibaxan[52]	7.3 per 1000	7.3 per 1000 (from 1 to 52)	1.0 (0.14/7.18)	414 (2 arms)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and indirectness)	Apibaxan 2.5-5 mg does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Sulodexide[53]	294 per 1000	223.4 per 1000 (from 82.3 to 279.3)	0.52 (0.28/0.95)	243 (1)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for imprecision)	Sulodexide reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Enoxaparin-LMW heparin[54,55]	56.8 per 1000	60.2 per 1000 (from 31.8 to 115.3)	1.06 (0.56/2.03)	691 (2)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	LMW heparin does not reduce hospitalization compared to placebo
Inhaled ciclesonide[56,57]	61.2 per 1000	55.1 per 1000 (from 27.5 to 105.2)	0.90 (0.45/1.72)	599 (2)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	Inhaled ciclesonide does not reduce need of hospitalization compared to placebo
Zinc[58]	60 per 1000	88.8 per 1000 (from 20.4 to 391.2)	1.48 (0.34/6.52)	108 (1)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	Zinc, ascorbic acid anc combination of both did not reduce rate of hospitalization compared with usual care .
Ascorbic acid[58]	60 per 1000	40.8 per 1000 (from 6.6 to 256.2)	0.68 (0.11/4.27)	98 (1 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	

Zinc/Ascorbic acid[58]	60 per 1000	129 per 1000 (from 31.8 to 528)	2.15 (0.53/8.80)	108 (1 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and ROB)	
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[59]	68.1 per 1000	22.5 per 1000 (from 2.0 to 227.4)	0.33 (0.03/3.34)	86 (1 RCT)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for imprecision and serious ROB)	It is unclear if homeopathy reduces hospitalization compared to placebo
Saliravira[60]	285 per 1000	133.9 per 1000 (from 82.6 to 220.2)	0.47 (0.29/0.77)	143 (1)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very-low (downgraded for serious imprecision and serious ROB)	Saliravira reduces hospitalization compared to control
Azithromycin[61,62]	77.6 per 1000	85.3 per 1000 (from 43.4 to 169.1)	1.10 (0.56/2.18)	489 (2)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	azithromycin does not reduce hospitalization compared to placebo
Resveratrol[63]	60 per 1000	19.2 per 1000 (from 1.8 to 190.8)	0.32 (0.03/3.18)	100 (1)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious imprecision)	It is unclear if resveratrol reduces hospitalization compared to placebo

*The basis for the assumed risk is the mean control group risk across studies. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect (the Risk Difference, also called ARR, absolute risk reduction)of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

Footnote: OR, Odds Ratio; CIs, confidence intervals; ROB, risk of bias. GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations

Appendix Table 3: Hospitalized Odds Ratio statistics

Study	Hospitalization Odds ratio	Hospitalization 95 CI low	Hospitalization 95 CI high	Hospitalization significance (p)	Hospitalization z statistic
Total CCP	**0.69**	**0.53**	**0.90**	**0.0035**	**2.697265**
Total mAb	**0.31**	**0.24**	**0.4**	**P<0.001**	**9.29792**
Total antivirals	**0.78**	**0.45**	**1.33**	**P<0.001**	**3.9493**
Total repurposed	**0.82**	**0.72**	**0.93**	**P<0.001**	**3.74264**
Total	**0.67**	**0.57**	**0.80**	**P<0.001**	**9.01288**
CCP-CONV-ert[7]	1.05	0.56	1.99	0.4356	0.162033
CCP-COV-Early[13]	0.61	0.29	1.30	0.1021	1.269694
CCP-C3PO[4]	0.90	0.59	1.37	0.3078	0.502004
CCP-Argentina[5]	0.43	0.20	0.91	0.0140	2.197789
CCP-CSSC-004[3]	0.44	0.25	0.79	0.0031	2.737543
CCP-Argentina (high titer)[5]	0.20	0.06	0.71	0.0132	2.478
CCP-CSSC-004 (<= 5 days) [3]	0.18	0.07	0.49	0.0007	3.38
Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1[14]	0.24	0.08	0.74	0.0066	2.479993
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[8]	0.19	0.08	0.46	0.0001	3.663844
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1[15]	0.29	0.15	0.58	0.0002	3.534471
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3[16]	0.28	0.16	0.47	0.0000	4.734662
Casirivimab/imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2[17]	0.30	0.07	1.25	0.0484	1.660556
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[1]	1.02	0.14	7.39	0.4905	0.023906
Regdanvimab-CT-P59[18]	0.49	0.19	1.27	0.0716	1.463817
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2[19]	0.29	0.16	0.52	0.00001	4.22581
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[20]	0.47	0.26	0.84	0.0057	2.528551
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT[21]	0.67	0.46	0.99	0.0223	2.00829
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC[22]	1.07	0.81	1.42	0.3156	0.479984
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo[23]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR[9]	0.12	0.06	0.24	0.0000	5.731691
Remdesivir-PINETREE[12]	0.13	0.03	0.57	0.0034	2.703067
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER[24]	0.47	0.29	0.77	0.0011	3.054966
Interferon Lambda- ILIAD[25]	1.00	0.06	16.76	0.5000	0
Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda[26]	1.00	0.14	7.34	0.5000	0
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[27]	0.23	0.02	2.21	0.1018	1.271414

Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19[28]	3.31	0.65	16.76	0.0739	1.44706
Favipiravir-Iran[29]	2.18	0.37	12.65	0.19324	0.86602
Favipiravir-FLARE[30]	3.1	0.12	77.71	0.24541	0.68902
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	3	0.12	75.11	0.25187	0.66863
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	3.05	0.12	76.39	0.24865	0.67874
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW[31]	1.21	0.4	3.64	0.37059	0.3303
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER[32]	1.20	0.53	2.69	0.3333	0.430926
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA[33]	2.07	0.18	24.15	0.28057	0.58116
Metformin-COVID-OUT[34]	0.42	0.18	0.96	0.0198	2.057
Metformin -TOGETHER[35]	0.94	0.51	1.71	0.41626	0.21147
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER[11]	0.77	0.56	1.05	0.0505	1.640023
Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID[36]	0.06	0.00	1.15	0.0310	1.866043
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT[34]	1.18	0.36	3.91	0.3935	0.270145
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6[37]	0.45	0.04	5	0.25869	0.64738
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[38]	0.87	0.32	2.42	0.39769	0.25933
Ivermectin-TOGETHER[39]	0.81	0.59	1.11	0.09724	1.29742
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT[34]	0.76	0.20	2.85	0.3414	0.408715
Ivermectin Iran[40]	1.46	0.71	2.96	0.1507	1.033341
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6[41]	1.05	0.43	2.61	0.4553	0.112309
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6[42]	2.52	0.49	13.04	0.13512	1.10252
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER[32]	0.76	0.30	1.93	0.2840	0.570928
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP[43]	0.49	0.16	1.45	0.0971	1.298164
Hydroxychloroquine -AH COVID-19[44]	3.14	0.17	59.70	0.2232	0.761332
Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2[45]	0.83	0.32	2.13	0.3486	0.389184
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG[46]	0.69	0.18	2.65	0.2945	0.54027
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah[47]	1.77	0.51	6.19	0.18429	0.89915
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil[48]	1	0.06	16.5	0.5	0

Nitazoxanide-Romark[49]	0.21	0.02	1.79	0.0766	1.428571
Colchicine-COLCORONA[2]	0.79	0.61	1.03	0.0407	1.742726
Losartan-MN[50]	3.16	0.32	31.34	0.16245	0.98443
Niclosamide[51]	0.33	0.01	8.48	0.2529	0.665353
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B[52]	0.94	0.06	15.24	0.4838	0.040562
2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B[52]	1.01	0.06	16.27	0.4979	0.005238
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B[52]	1.91	0.17	21.36	0.2988	0.527902
Sulodexide[53]	0.52	0.28	0.95	0.0167	2.128119
Enoxaparin-ETHIC[54]	1.10	0.47	2.56	0.4155	0.213485
Enoxaparin-OVID[55]	1.02	0.38	2.76	0.4862	0.034489
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS[56]	0.48	0.12	1.87	0.14459	1.05994
Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE[57]	1.15	0.51	2.63	0.3659	0.34277
Zinc[58]	1.48	0.36	6.52	0.30296	0.5159
Ascorbic acid[58]	0.68	0.11	4.27	0.34085	0.41015
Zinc/Ascorbic acid[58]	2.15	0.53	8.8	0.1435	1.06472
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[59]	0.33	0.03	3.34	0.17503	0.93449
Saliravira[60]	0.01	0.00	0.24	0.0016	2.9467
Azithromycin-Atomic2[61]	0.88	0.42	1.84	0.3694	0.333472
Azithromycin-ACTION[62]	6.62	0.36	121.45	0.1015	1.272994
Resveratrol[63]	0.32	0.03	3.18	0.1654	0.972432

Appendix Table 4: Deaths during RCTs

Cumulatively, the CCP RCTs noted 10 deaths in the control arm versus 8 in CCP arm. The anti-Spike mAbs RCTs had 21 total deaths among controls and 4 in the intervention arm. The total for all small molecule antiviral RCTs was 28 in the controls and 7 in the interventions. The repurposed drugs RCTs recorded 72 deaths in the control groups and 53 in the intervention groups.

Study	**ARR %**	**RRR %**	**95% CI ARR**	**95% CI RRR**	**Odds ratio**	**95 CI low**	**95 CI high**	**z statistic**	**significance (p)**
Total CCP	0.15	20.2	(-0.48, 0.78)	(-101.5, 68.4)	0.8	0.31	2.02	0.47848	0.31616
Total mAb	0.45	80.8	(0.21, 0.7)	(49.4, 92.7)	0.19	0.07	0.5	3.3459	0.00041
Total antivirals	0.16	87.1	(0.1, 0.23)	(63.4, 95.4)	0.13	0.05	0.37	3.85181	0.00006
Total repurposed	0.16	21.8	(-0.1, 0.4)	(-8.3, 43.5)	0.78	0.56	1.08	1.4795	0.0695
Total	0.19	44.7	(0.11, 0.28)	(27.6, 57.8)	0.55	0.42	0.72	4.29906	0.00001
Study	**Deaths control**	**Total control**	**Deaths interv ent.**	**Total interv ent.**	**Total both arms**	**% death control**	**% death interv ent.**		
Total CCP	10	1315	8	1319	2634	0.76	0.61		
Total mAb	23	4102	5	4634	8736	0.56	0.11		
Total antivirals	31	17073	4	17031	34104	0.18	0.02		
Total repurposed	81	11109	65	11396	22505	0.73	0.57		
Total	131	29680	72	30363	60043	0.44	0.24		
CCP-CONV-ert[7]	2	188	0	188	376	1.06	0		
CCP-COV-Early[13]	0	204	1	202	406	0	0.5		
CCP-C3PO[4]	1	254	5	257	511	0.39	1.95		
CCP-Argentina[5]	4	80	2	80	160	5	2.5		
CCP-CSSC-004[3]	3	589	0	592	1181	0.51	0		
Bamlanivimab-BLAZE-1[14]	0	143	0	309	452	0	0		
Sotrovimab-COMET-ICE[8]	2	529	0	528	1057	0.38	0		
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab-BLAZE-1[15]	10	517	0	518	1035	1.93	0		

Casirivimab/ imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 3[16]	3	1341	1	1355	2696	0.22	0.07		
Casirivimab/ imdevimab-REGEN-COV Ph 1/2[17]	0	266	0	533	799	0	0		
Bebtelovimab-BLAZE-4[1]	0	128	0	125	253	0	0		
Regdanvimab-CT-P59[18]	0	104	0	203	307	0	0		
Regdanvimab-CT-P59-2[19]	2	659	1	656	1315	0.3	0.15		
Tixagevimab–cilgavimab-TACKLE[20]	6	415	3	407	822	1.45	0.74		
Molnupiravir-MOVe-OUT[21]	9	699	1	709	1408	1.29	0.14		
Molnupiravir-PANORAMIC[22]	5	12484	2	12516	25000	0.04	0.02		
Molnupiravir-Aurobindo[23]	0	610	0	610	1220	0	0		
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir-EPIC-HR[9]	12	1046	0	1039	2085	1.15	0		
Remdesivir-PINETREE[12]	1	283	0	279	562	0.35	0		
Interferon Lambda-TOGETHER[24]	4	1018	1	931	1949	0.4	0.11		
Interferon Lambda-ILIAD[25]	0	30	0	30	60	0	0		
Interferon Lambda-COVID-Lambda[26]	0	60	0	60	120	0	0		
Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir-SOVODAK[27]	0	28	0	27	55	0	0		
Favipavir-Avi-Mild-19[28]	0	119	0	112	231	0	0		
Favipiravir-Iran[29]	0	39	0	38	77	0	0		
Favipiravir-FLARE[30]	0	60	0	59	119	0	0		
Favipiravir/Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	0	60	0	61	121	0	0		
Lopinavir/Ritonavir-FLARE[30]	0	60	0	60	120	0	0		
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TREAT NOW[31]	0	220	0	226	446	0	0		
Lopinavir/ritonavir-TOGETHER[32]	0	227	0	244	471	0	0		
Tenofovir Disproxil Fumarate Plus Emtricitabine-AR0-CORONA[33]	0	30	0	30	60	0	0		

Metformin-COVID-OUT[34]	1	601	1	596	1197	0.17	0.17		
Metformin - TOGETHER[35]	9	203	7	215	418	4.4	3.2		
Fluvoxamine-TOGETHER[11]	25	756	17	741	1497	3.31	2.29		
Fluvoxamine-STOP COVID[36]	0	72	0	80	152	0	0		
Fluvoxamine-COVID-OUT[34]	0	293	0	299	592	0	0		
Fluvoxamine ACTIV-6[37]	0	599	0	662	1261	0	0		
Fluvoxamine/budesonide-TOGETHER[38]	0	738	1	738	1476	0	0.14		
Ivermectin-TOGETHER[39]	24	675	21	674	1349	3.56	3.12		
Ivermectin-COVID-OUT[34]	0	356	1	374	730	0	0.27		
Ivermectin Iran[40]	1	281	1	268	549	0.36	0.37		
Ivermectin-ACTIV-6[41]	0	774	1	817	1591	0	0.12		
Ivermectin high dose-ACTIV-6[42]	0	604	1	602	1206	0	0.17		
Hydroxychloroquine-TOGETHER[32]	1	227	0	214	441	0.44	0		
Hydroxychloroquine-COVID-19 PEP[43]	1	211	1	212	423	0.47	0.47		
Hydroxychloroquine - AH COVID-19[44]	0	37	0	111	148	0	0		
Hydroxychloroquine-BCN PEP-CoV-2[45]	0	157	0	136	293	0	0		
Hydroxychloroquine-BMG[46]	0	83	0	148	231	0	0		
Hydroxychloroquine-Utah[47]	0	151	0	152	303	0	0		
Hydroxychloroquine/Azithromycin-Brazil[48]	0	42	0	42	84	0	0		
Nitazoxanide-Romark[49]	0	195	0	184	379	0	0		
Colchicine-COLCORONA[2]	9	2253	5	2235	4488	0.4	0.22		
Losartan-MN[50]	0	59	0	58	117	0	0		
Niclosamide[51]	0	34	0	33	67	0	0		
Aspirin-ACTIV-4B[52]	0	136	0	144	280	0	0		

2.5-mg apixaban-ACTIV-4B[52]	0	136	0	135	271	0	0		
5-mg apixaban ACTIV-4B[52]	0	136	0	143	279	0	0		
Sulodexide[53]	7	119	3	124	243	5.88	2.42		
Enoxaparin-ETHIC[54]	0	114	1	105	219	0	0.95		
Enoxaparin-OVID[55]	0	238	0	234	472	0	0		
Inhaled Ciclesonide-COVIS[56]	0	203	0	197	400	0	0		
Inhaled ciclesonide-COVERAGE[57]	2	107	0	110	217	1.87	0		
Zinc[58]	0	50	0	58	108	0	0		
Ascorbic acid[58]	0	50	1	48	98	0	2.08		
Zinc/Ascorbic acid[58]	0	50	2	58	108	0	3.45		
Homeopathy-COVID-Simile[59]	0	44	0	42	86	0	0		
Saliravira[60]	0	56	0	87	143	0	0		
Azithromycin-Atomic2[61]	1	147	1	145	292	0.68	0.69		
Azithromycin-ACTION[62]	0	72	0	125	197	0	0		
Resveratrol[63]	0	50	0	50	100	0	0		

Appendix References

1. Dougan M, Azizad M, Chen P, et al. Bebtelovimab, alone or together with bamlanivimab and etesevimab, as a broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibody treatment for mild to moderate, ambulatory COVID-19. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.03.10.22272100.
2. Tardif JC, Bouabdallaoui N, L'Allier PL, et al. Colchicine for community-treated patients with COVID-19 (COLCORONA): a phase 3, randomised, double-blinded, adaptive, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(8): 924-32.
3. Sullivan DJ, Gebo KA, Shoham S, et al. Early Outpatient Treatment for Covid-19 with Convalescent Plasma. *N Engl J Med* 2022.
4. Korley FK, Durkalski-Mauldin V, Yeatts SD, et al. Early Convalescent Plasma for High-Risk Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(21): 1951-60.
5. Libster R, Perez Marc G, Wappner D, et al. Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**(7): 610-8.
6. Millat-Martinez P, Gharbharan A, Alemany A, et al. Prospective individual patient data meta-analysis of two randomized trials on convalescent plasma for COVID-19 outpatients. *Nature Communications* 2022; **13**(1): 2583.
7. Alemany A, Millat-Martinez P, Corbacho-Monne M, et al. High-titre methylene blue-treated convalescent plasma as an early treatment for outpatients with COVID-19: a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; **10**(3): 278-88.
8. Gupta A, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, Juarez E, et al. Early Treatment for Covid-19 with SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Sotrovimab. *N Engl J Med* 2021.
9. Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, et al. Oral Nirmatrelvir for High-Risk, Nonhospitalized Adults with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(15): 1397-408.
10. Reis G, Silva E, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of Early Treatment with Ivermectin among Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022.
11. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira-Silva EA, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of early treatment with fluvoxamine on risk of emergency care and hospitalisation among patients with COVID-19: the TOGETHER randomised, platform clinical trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2022; **10**(1): e42-e51.
12. Gottlieb RL, Vaca CE, Paredes R, et al. Early Remdesivir to Prevent Progression to Severe Covid-19 in Outpatients. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(4): 305-15.
13. Gharbharan A, Jordans C, Zwaginga L, et al. Outpatient convalescent plasma therapy for high-risk patients with early COVID-19. A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022.
14. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody LY-CoV555 in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**(3): 229-37.
15. Dougan M, Nirula A, Azizad M, et al. Bamlanivimab plus Etesevimab in Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(15): 1382-92.
16. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGEN-COV Antibody Combination and Outcomes in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(23): e81.
17. Norton T, Ali S, Sivapalasingam S, et al. REGEN-COV Antibody Combination in Outpatients With COVID-19 – Phase 1/2 Results. *medRxiv* 2022: 2021.06.09.21257915.
18. Streinu-Cercel A, Sandulescu O, Preotescu LL, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Regdanvimab (CT-P59): A Phase 2/3 Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial in Outpatients With Mild-to-Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(4): ofac053.

19. Kim JY, Sandulescu O, Preotescu LL, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial of Regdanvimab in High-Risk Patients With Mild-to-Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(8): ofac406.
20. Montgomery H, Hobbs FDR, Padilla F, et al. Efficacy and safety of intramuscular administration of tixagevimab-cilgavimab for early outpatient treatment of COVID-19 (TACKLE): a phase 3, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; **10**(10): 985-96.
21. Jayk Bernal A, Gomes da Silva MM, Musungaie DB, et al. Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(6): 509-20.
22. Butler C, Hobbs FDR, Gbinigie O, et al. Molnupiravir Plus Usual Care Versus Usual Care Alone as Early Treatment for Adults with COVID-19 at Increased Risk of Adverse Outcomes (PANORAMIC): Preliminary Analysis from the United Kingdom Randomised, Controlled Open-Label, Platform Adaptive Trial. *SSRN* 2022; **ssrn.4237902**.
23. Tippabhotla SK, Lahiri S, Rama Raju D, Kandi C, Prasad VN. Efficacy and Safety of Molnupiravir for the Treatment of Non-Hospitalized Adults With Mild COVID-19: A Randomized, Open-Label, Parallel-Group Phase 3 Trial. . *SSRN* 2022; **4042673**.
24. Reis G, Moreira Silva EAS, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Early Treatment with Pegylated Interferon Lambda for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **388**(6): 518-28.
25. Feld JJ, Kandel C, Biondi MJ, et al. Peginterferon lambda for the treatment of outpatients with COVID-19: a phase 2, placebo-controlled randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(5): 498-510.
26. Jagannathan P, Andrews JR, Bonilla H, et al. Peginterferon Lambda-1a for treatment of outpatients with uncomplicated COVID-19: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Nature Communications* 2021; **12**(1): 1967.
27. Roozbeh F, Saeedi M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, et al. Sofosbuvir and daclatasvir for the treatment of COVID-19 outpatients: a double-blind, randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2020; **76**(3): 753-7.
28. Bosaeed M, Alharbi A, Mahmoud E, et al. Efficacy of favipiravir in adults with mild COVID-19: a randomized, double-blind, multicentre, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022; **28**(4): 602-8.
29. Vaezi A, Salmasi M, Soltaninejad F, Salahi M, Javanmard SH, Amra B. Favipiravir in the Treatment of Outpatient COVID-19: A Multicenter, Randomized, Triple-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial. *Adv Respir Med* 2023; **91**(1): 18-25.
30. Lowe DM, Brown LK, Chowdhury K, et al. Favipiravir, lopinavir-ritonavir, or combination therapy (FLARE): A randomised, double-blind, 2 x 2 factorial placebo-controlled trial of early antiviral therapy in COVID-19. *PLoS Med* 2022; **19**(10): e1004120.
31. Kaizer AM, Shapiro NI, Wild J, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir for treatment of non-hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Infect Dis* 2023; **128**: 223-9.
32. Reis G, Moreira Silva E, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Effect of Early Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Lopinavir and Ritonavir on Risk of Hospitalization Among Patients With COVID-19: The TOGETHER Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(4): e216468.
33. Parienti JJ, Prazuck T, Peyro-Saint-Paul L, et al. Effect of Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate and Emtricitabine on nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 viral load burden amongst outpatients with COVID-19: A pilot, randomized, open-label phase 2 trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **38**: 100993.

34. Bramante CT, Huling JD, Tignanelli CJ, et al. Randomized Trial of Metformin, Ivermectin, and Fluvoxamine for Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **387**(7): 599-610.
35. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Effect of early treatment with metformin on risk of emergency care and hospitalization among patients with COVID-19: The TOGETHER randomized platform clinical trial. *Lancet Reg Health Am* 2022; **6**: 100142.
36. Lenze EJ, Mattar C, Zorumski CF, et al. Fluvoxamine vs Placebo and Clinical Deterioration in Outpatients With Symptomatic COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2020; **324**(22): 2292-300.
37. McCarthy MW, Naggie S, Boulware DR, et al. Effect of Fluvoxamine vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2023; **329**(4): 296-305.
38. Reis G, Dos Santos Moreira Silva EA, Medeiros Silva DC, et al. Oral Fluvoxamine With Inhaled Budesonide for Treatment of Early-Onset COVID-19 : A Randomized Platform Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2023; **176**(5): 667-75.
39. Reis G, Silva E, Silva DCM, et al. Effect of Early Treatment with Ivermectin among Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(18): 1721-31.
40. Rezai MS, Ahangarkani F, Hill A, et al. Non-effectiveness of Ivermectin on Inpatients and Outpatients With COVID-19; Results of Two Randomized, Double-Blinded, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trials. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2022; **9**: 919708.
41. Naggie S, Boulware DR, Lindsell CJ, et al. Effect of Ivermectin vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2022; **328**(16): 1595-603.
42. Naggie S, Boulware DR, Lindsell CJ, et al. Effect of Higher-Dose Ivermectin for 6 Days vs Placebo on Time to Sustained Recovery in Outpatients With COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2023; **329**(11): 888-97.
43. Skipper CP, Pastick KA, Engen NW, et al. Hydroxychloroquine in Nonhospitalized Adults With Early COVID-19 : A Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; **173**(8): 623-31.
44. Schwartz I, Boesen ME, Cerchiaro G, et al. Assessing the efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine as outpatient treatment of COVID-19: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ Open* 2021; **9**(2): E693-E702.
45. Mitja O, Reis G, Boulware DR, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for treatment of non-hospitalized adults with COVID-19: A meta-analysis of individual participant data of randomized trials. *Clin Transl Sci* 2023; **16**(3): 524-35.
46. Johnston C, Brown ER, Stewart J, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for treatment of early SARS-CoV-2 infection among high-risk outpatient adults: A randomized clinical trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **33**: 100773.
47. Spivak AM, Barney BJ, Greene T, et al. A Randomized Clinical Trial Testing Hydroxychloroquine for Reduction of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Shedding and Hospitalization in Early Outpatient COVID-19 Infection. *Microbiol Spectr* 2023; **11**(2): e0467422.
48. Rodrigues C, Freitas-Santos RS, Levi JE, et al. Hydroxychloroquine plus azithromycin early treatment of mild COVID-19 in an outpatient setting: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial evaluating viral clearance. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2021; **58**(5): 106428.
49. Rossignol JF, Bardin MC, Fulgencio J, Mogelnicki D, Brechot C. A randomized double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trial of nitazoxanide for treatment of mild or moderate COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine* 2022; **45**: 101310.

50. Puskarich MA, Cummins NW, Ingraham NE, et al. A multi-center phase II randomized clinical trial of losartan on symptomatic outpatients with COVID-19. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **37**: 100957.
51. Cairns DM, Dulko D, Griffiths JK, et al. Efficacy of Niclosamide vs Placebo in SARS-CoV-2 Respiratory Viral Clearance, Viral Shedding, and Duration of Symptoms Among Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Phase 2 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Network Open* 2022; **5**(2): e2144942-e.
52. Connors JM, Brooks MM, Sciurba FC, et al. Effect of Antithrombotic Therapy on Clinical Outcomes in Outpatients With Clinically Stable Symptomatic COVID-19: The ACTIV-4B Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021; **326**(17): 1703-12.
53. Gonzalez-Ochoa AJ, Raffetto JD, Hernandez AG, et al. Sulodexide in the Treatment of Patients with Early Stages of COVID-19: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Thromb Haemost* 2021; **121**(7): 944-54.
54. Cools F, Virdone S, Sawhney J, et al. Thromboprophylactic low-molecular-weight heparin versus standard of care in unvaccinated, at-risk outpatients with COVID-19 (ETHIC): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 3b trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2022; **9**(8): e594-e604.
55. Barco S, Voci D, Held U, et al. Enoxaparin for primary thromboprophylaxis in symptomatic outpatients with COVID-19 (OVID): a randomised, open-label, parallel-group, multicentre, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Haematol* 2022; **9**(8): e585-e93.
56. Clemency BM, Varughese R, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, et al. Efficacy of Inhaled Ciclesonide for Outpatient Treatment of Adolescents and Adults With Symptomatic COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2022; **182**(1): 42-9.
57. Duvignaud A, Lhomme E, Onaisi R, et al. Inhaled ciclesonide for outpatient treatment of COVID-19 in adults at risk of adverse outcomes: a randomised controlled trial (COVERAGE). *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022; **28**(7): 1010-6.
58. Thomas S, Patel D, Bittel B, et al. Effect of High-Dose Zinc and Ascorbic Acid Supplementation vs Usual Care on Symptom Length and Reduction Among Ambulatory Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection: The COVID A to Z Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(2): e210369.
59. Adler UC, Adler MS, Padula AEM, et al. Homeopathy for COVID-19 in primary care: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial (COVID-Simile study). *J Integr Med* 2022; **20**(3): 221-9.
60. Khorshiddoust RR, Khorshiddoust SR, Hosseinabadi T, et al. Efficacy of a multiple-indication antiviral herbal drug (Saliravira(R)) for COVID-19 outpatients: A pre-clinical and randomized clinical trial study. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2022; **149**: 112729.
61. Hinks TSC, Cureton L, Knight R, et al. Azithromycin versus standard care in patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 (ATOMIC2): an open-label, randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**(10): 1130-40.
62. Oldenburg CE, Pinsky BA, Brogdon J, et al. Effect of Oral Azithromycin vs Placebo on COVID-19 Symptoms in Outpatients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021; **326**(6): 490-8.
63. McCreary MR, Schnell PM, Rhoda DA. Randomized double-blind placebo-controlled proof-of-concept trial of resveratrol for outpatient treatment of mild coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**(1): 10978.

64. Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Ubals M, et al. Hydroxychloroquine for Early Treatment of Adults With Mild Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Randomized, Controlled Trial. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; **73**(11): e4073-e81.
65. Schwartz I, Boesen ME, Cerchiaro G, et al. Assessing the efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine as outpatient treatment of COVID-19: a randomized controlled trial. 2021; **9**(2): E693-E702.
66. Johnston C, Brown ER, Stewart J, et al. Hydroxychloroquine with or without azithromycin for treatment of early SARS-CoV-2 infection among high-risk outpatient adults: A randomized clinical trial. *Eclinicalmedicine* 2021; **33**.