

1 **Change in Effectiveness of Sotrovimab for Preventing Hospitalization and** 2 **Mortality in COVID-19 Outpatients During the Omicron Phase**

3 Neil R. Aggarwal, MD, MHSc^{a*}; Laurel E. Beaty, MS^{b*}; Tellen D. Bennett, MD, MS^{c,e}; Nichole
4 E. Carlson, PhD, MS^{b,e}; Adit A. Ginde, MD, MPH^{d,e}

5 ^a Department of Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, 80045, USA

6 ^b Department of Biostatistics and Informatics, Colorado School of Public Health, Aurora, 80045,
7 USA

8 ^c Section of Informatics and Data Science, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado
9 School of Medicine, Aurora, 80045, USA

10 ^d Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora,
11 80045, USA

12 ^e Colorado Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, University of Colorado Anschutz
13 Medical Campus, Aurora, 80045, USA

14 * Contributed equally to this manuscript

15 See Supplement for a full list of Contributors.

16

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Neil R. Aggarwal, MD, MHSc

19 Department of Medicine

20 University of Colorado School of Medicine

21 12700 E. 19th Ave, Mail Stop C-272

22 Aurora, CO 80045, USA

23 Phone: +1-303-724-6038

24 Email: neil.aggarwal@cuanschutz.edu

25

26 **Running title:** Sotrovimab for COVID-19 Outpatients

27 **Word counts:** Abstract: 199, Manuscript text: 2924

28

29 **Summary:** Real-world evidence demonstrates that the neutralizing monoclonal antibody
30 sotrovimab was not associated with lower 28-day hospitalization and mortality rates when
31 administered to high-risk outpatients recently infected with SARS-CoV-2 during the Omicron
32 variant phase, compared to a propensity-matched cohort of untreated outpatients.

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Background:** Sotrovimab, a neutralizing monoclonal antibody (mAb) treatment authorized for
35 early symptomatic COVID-19 patients, was effective in preventing the progression of severe
36 disease and mortality following SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant infection. It is not known whether
37 sotrovimab is similarly effective for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant infection.

38 **Methods:** Observational cohort study of non-hospitalized adult patients with SARS-CoV-2
39 infection from December 26, 2021 to March 10, 2022 (>96% Omicron BA.1 variant), using
40 electronic health records from a statewide health system linked to state-level vaccine and
41 mortality data. We used propensity matching to select up to 3 patients not receiving mAbs or
42 other authorized antivirals for each patient who received outpatient sotrovimab treatment. The
43 primary outcome was 28-day hospitalization; secondary outcomes included mortality. To
44 evaluate change in sotrovimab effectiveness during the Omicron phase, we propensity matched
45 sotrovimab-treated patients from Omicron to Delta (October 1-December 11, 2021) phases to
46 each other and then to untreated controls with a treatment-variant interaction added to the logistic
47 regression model.

48 **Results:** Of 30,247 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection, we matched 1,542 receiving
49 sotrovimab to 3,663 not receiving treatment. Compared to untreated patients, sotrovimab
50 treatment was not associated with reduced odds of all-cause 28-day hospitalization (raw rate
51 2.5% versus 3.2%; adjusted OR 0.82, 95% CI 0.55, 1.19) or mortality (raw rate 0.1% versus
52 0.2%; adjusted OR 0.62, 95% CI 0.07, 2.78). In the combined analysis across Omicron and Delta
53 phases, the observed treatment OR was higher during Omicron than during Delta (OR 0.85 vs.
54 0.39, respectively; interaction $p=0.053$)

55 **Conclusion:** Real-world evidence demonstrated sotrovimab was not associated with reduced
56 hospitalization and all-cause 28-day mortality among COVID-19 outpatients during the Omicron
57 BA.1 phase and attenuated compared to the Delta phase

58

59 **Keywords:** real-world evidence, COVID-19, sotrovimab, outpatients, mortality
60

61 BACKGROUND

62 With fluctuating rates of transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2
63 (SARS-CoV-2), readily available neutralizing monoclonal antibody (mAb) products such as
64 sotrovimab for outpatients who have recently tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 has been a
65 critical, evidence-based treatment strategy to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 surges on the
66 health care system and improve COVID-19 outcomes among high-risk individuals.[1-7] Several
67 mAb products received emergency use authorization (EUA) from the US Food and Drug
68 Administration[8] based on Phase II/III randomized clinical trials conducted earlier in the
69 pandemic that demonstrated efficacy towards reduced hospitalization and disease severity among
70 high-risk outpatients,[9-11] but little randomized data is available to inform mAb efficacy
71 against new variants including Omicron lineages that have rapidly evolved.[12] As such, analysis
72 of more contemporaneous real-world data sufficiently robust to evaluate important clinical
73 differences is critical to evaluate treatment effectiveness and inform policy and practice
74 decisions, as we and others have successfully done.[3-7]

75 We previously used a real-world data platform to report on sotrovimab effectiveness
76 during the Delta variant pandemic phase,[2] adding to the evidence generated from the COMET-
77 ICE trial that found a significant reduction in risk of a composite endpoint of all-cause
78 hospitalization or death following sotrovimab treatment [10] and led to emergency use
79 authorization (EUA) for sotrovimab (May 26, 2021). Subsequently, when EUAs for other
80 authorized mAbs were revoked in January 2022, sotrovimab was the only available mAb for
81 outpatient treatment during early Omicron. However, a marked reduction in sotrovimab *in vitro*
82 neutralization against Omicron BA.2 and its sublineages [13, 14] led to the sotrovimab EUA
83 being fully revoked when Omicron BA.2 sub-variant prevalence was estimated to be greater than
84 50% in all HHS U.S. regions (April 5, 2022). In support of this determination, a report of real-

85 world clinical data suggested sotrovimab ineffectiveness in reducing rates of COVID-19
86 progression during BA.2 Omicron subvariant dominant phase in Qatar.[15] However, a recent
87 report in immunocompromised solid organ transplant recipients suggested a benefit of
88 sotrovimab in reducing severity of illness following early administration after SARS-CoV-2
89 infection during the Omicron BA.1 phase,[16] yet sotrovimab evaluation of effectiveness against
90 Omicron BA.1 or BA.1.1 in a broader population of high-risk outpatients is lacking.

91 To provide additional data on sotrovimab effectiveness against Omicron SARS-CoV-2,
92 including immunocompromised patients and other higher-risk subgroups, we used our real-world
93 data platform to assess the impact of sotrovimab treatment on hospitalization and mortality
94 among outpatients with early symptomatic COVID-19 infections during a SARS-CoV-2
95 Omicron BA.1 predominant phase in Colorado (December 26, 2021 to March 10, 2022).[17-20]

96

97 **METHODS**

98 *Study Oversight and Data Sources*

99 We conducted a propensity-matched observational cohort study, as part of a statewide
100 implementation/effectiveness pragmatic trial, in a collaboration between University of Colorado
101 researchers, University of Colorado Health (UCHealth) system leaders, and the Colorado
102 Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE). The study was approved by the
103 Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board with a waiver of informed consent. We obtained
104 data from the electronic health record (EHR; Epic, Verona, WI) of UCHealth, the largest health
105 system in Colorado with 13 hospitals around the state and 141,000 annual hospital admissions,
106 using Health Data Compass, an enterprise-wide data warehouse. EHR data were merged with
107 statewide data on vaccination status from the Colorado Comprehensive Immunization
108 Information System and mortality from Colorado Vital Records.

109 ***Patient Population***

110 Our primary cohort was patients who were diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection between
111 December 26, 2021 and March 10, 2022. Based on Colorado state-wide data [17] SARS-CoV-2
112 infections due to the Omicron variant made up at least 96% of overall cases by 12/26/2021. As
113 an update on previously published work,[2] a second cohort was selected between October 1,
114 2021 to December 11, 2021 when the Delta variant made up at least 99% of overall cases to be
115 able to investigate potential changes in effectiveness between the Delta and Omicron phases. All
116 patients had least 28 days of follow-up. Patients were identified by either a positive SARS-CoV-
117 2 test (by polymerase chain reaction or antigen) or by the date of mAb administration if the date
118 of the SARS-CoV-2 positive test was missing.

119 For our primary cohort, we excluded patients who received a medication order for any
120 anti-viral treatment except sotrovimab within 10 days of the positive SARS-CoV-2 test
121 (**Appendix Figure 1**); thereby we included only patients who were untreated (N = 31,187) or
122 who were treated with sotrovimab (N = 1,683). We excluded patients who were missing both a
123 positive SARS-CoV-2 test date and a mAb administration date (N = 605), those who were
124 already in the hospital or who were hospitalized on the same day as the positive test (N = 2,009),
125 and if more than 10 days had elapsed between the SARS-CoV-2 test and mAb administration (N
126 = 9). We did not exclude patients based on EUA eligibility due to the lack of consistently
127 available comprehensive EHR data for all patients. After exclusions, the cohort included 28,584
128 untreated patients and 1,663 sotrovimab-treated patients. We applied the same exclusions to the
129 Delta cohort, resulting in 8,901 untreated patients and 556 sotrovimab-treated patients
130 (**Appendix Figure 2**).

131 ***Outcomes***

132 The primary outcome was all-cause hospitalization within 28-days of the SARS-CoV-2 positive
133 test. Secondary outcomes included all-cause 28-day mortality and 28-day Emergency
134 Department (ED) visit were also computed. For both hospitalization and ED visit, we used the
135 index visit. For patients that were hospitalized, we evaluated disease severity based on the
136 maximum level of respiratory support required, intensive care unit (ICU) admission rate, hospital
137 and ICU length of stay (LOS) in survivors, and in-hospital mortality.

138 *Variable Definitions*

139 We used EHR data to identify all outcomes of interest. A hospitalization was defined as any
140 inpatient or observation encounter and ED visits were defined as any visit to the ED, with or
141 without an associated hospitalization. We estimated disease severity on an ordinal scale with the
142 maximum level of respiratory support used at an encounter level with the following possible
143 types (in ascending order): no supplemental oxygen, standard (nasal cannula/face mask) oxygen,
144 high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) or non-invasive ventilation (NIV), and invasive mechanical
145 ventilation (IMV). In-hospital mortality was the highest level of disease severity. Due to small
146 sample sizes, we also categorized disease severity as HFNC/NIV/IMV/Death vs. standard
147 oxygen/no supplemental oxygen.

148 We determined presence and status of comorbid conditions based on previously
149 described methods using the Charlson and Elixhauser Comorbidity Indices.[2, 20]
150 Immunocompromised status was categorized as not immunocompromised, mild
151 immunocompromised, and moderately/severe immunocompromised based on pre-hospitalization
152 use of immunosuppressive medications and immunosuppressive conditions (**Appendix Table 1**).
153 We calculated the total number of comorbidities as the sum of the presence of diabetes mellitus,
154 cardiovascular disease, pulmonary disease, renal disease, hypertension, and liver disease and
155 classified as none, one, or two or more; we analyzed immunocompromised status and obesity as

156 separate variables. We categorized vaccination status as the total number of vaccinations (0, 1, 2,
157 or ≥ 3) administered prior to the date of the SARS-CoV-2 positive test.

158 Other variables of interest include treatment status, categorical age in years, sex,
159 race/ethnicity, insurance status, obesity status, immunocompromised status, number of
160 comorbidities, vaccination status, and cohort week (**Table 1, 2**). In the statistical models,
161 Medicare and private/commercial were collapsed into one category due to collinearity of
162 Medicare with age.

163

164 *Statistical Analysis*

165 Omicron only analysis

166 We used nearest neighbor propensity matching with logistic regression to match patients
167 with treatment status as the outcome. The propensity model included age, sex, race/ethnicity,
168 insurance status, obesity status, immunocompromised status, number of other comorbid
169 conditions, number of vaccinations, and week in the study (categorical). We removed 67
170 sotrovimab treated patients who had missing covariate data and lost an additional 54 in the
171 matching process. We assessed the achieved balance using a threshold of <0.1 for the
172 standardized mean differences (SMD) and achieved a ratio of 2.38:1 (3,663:1,542) untreated to
173 treated patients. As previously,[2] patients who were missing a SARS-CoV-2 positive test date
174 (56.9%) had their test date randomly imputed test based on the distribution of observed time to
175 mAb treatment.

176 We used Firth's logistic regression to assess associations between binary outcomes (28-
177 day hospitalization, 28-day mortality, and 28-day ED visits) and treatment. Firth's logistic
178 regression (R package logistf V 1.24) addresses the issues with low event rates and complete
179 separation.[21] Each multivariable model included all variables of interest as outlined in the

180 previous section. We included cohort week as a continuous, linear term in all adjusted models
181 and constructed cumulative incidence curves to visually assess the trend across time from SARS-
182 CoV-2 positive date to 28-day hospitalization by treatment status. We also analyzed in-hospital
183 secondary outcomes related to severity of respiratory disease in a descriptive manner.

184 We focused on five subgroup analyses of clinical interest: age (<65 years vs. ≥ 65 years),
185 immunocompromised status (both binary and tri-level), number of comorbid conditions (≥ 2 vs.
186 <2), number of vaccinations (≥ 3 vs. <3), and time of study in the Omicron phase (Early vs. Late).
187 The treatment effect for each subgroup was estimated using interaction models. Each model was
188 adjusted for all variables included in the primary model.

189 Two sensitivity analyses were performed. We repeated the primary analysis including
190 only patients that we were able to verify their EUA eligibility based on available EHR data. We
191 also repeated the primary analysis using a different SARS-CoV-2 positive test date imputation
192 method. The second method imputed a 10-day difference from the observed mAb administration
193 date (the maximum difference allowed by the EUA).

194

195 Omicron and Delta analysis

196 To compare the effect of sotrovimab treatment during Omicron- or Delta-predominant COVID-
197 19 phases, we developed a second propensity matched analysis cohort. First, to address
198 imbalances in treatment cohorts due to supply, sotrovimab-treated patients during the Omicron-
199 predominant phase were nearest-neighbor propensity matched to sotrovimab treated patients in
200 Delta-predominant phase based on a logistic regression with variant as the outcome. Matching
201 variables included age, sex, race/ethnicity, obesity, immunocompromised status, number of
202 comorbid conditions, number of vaccinations, and insurance status. Then we propensity matched
203 the above matched sotrovimab-treated patient to untreated patients stratified by variant using

204 nearest-neighbor matching based on a logistic regression with treatment status as the outcome
205 and the same covariates previously described.

206 We fit Firth's logistic regression models with all-cause 28-day hospitalization as the
207 outcome: 1) the model was stratified by variant and included all variables of interest from the
208 primary analysis and 2) an analysis with both cohorts combined with a treatment-variant
209 interaction added to the logistic regression model along with the adjustment variables. The
210 second model allows us to formally test if the effect of treatment differed statistically between
211 the Delta and Omicron cohorts.

212 All statistical analyses were performed using R Statistical Software (version 3.6.0; R
213 Foundation for Statistical Computing).[22]

214

215 **RESULTS**

216 *Characteristics of sotrovimab-treated and untreated cohorts in the primary cohort*

217 Of 30,247 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in the full primary cohort, 1,663 subjects
218 received mAbs and 28,584 patients did not (**Appendix Table 2**). In the full primary cohort, the
219 sotrovimab-treated group generally reflects EUA criteria for use of mAbs. Those treated were
220 older (44.3% were age ≥ 65 years vs. 11.4% in untreated group), more likely to be obese (30.5%
221 vs. 16.5%), be immunocompromised at any severity level (40.5% vs. 12.9%) or have one or
222 more comorbid conditions (71.9% vs. 37.6%). Particularly in early Omicron cohort weeks, the
223 rate of sotrovimab treatment was lower as compared to the untreated group, due to a surge in
224 cases relative to available treatment. Propensity matching eliminated clinically meaningful
225 differences in matching variables between groups, resulting in 1,542 sotrovimab-treated patients
226 propensity matched to 3,663 untreated patients (**Appendix Figure 1**).

227 The characteristics of sotrovimab-treated and untreated patients in the matched primary
228 cohort are presented in **Table 1**. Overall, the age distribution was similar with approximately
229 40% aged ≥ 65 years, 60% female, 80% Non-Hispanic white, and 50% with private/commercial
230 insurance. Hypertension (49%) and pulmonary disease (35%) were the most common comorbid
231 conditions. Notably, 50.7% vs. 55.4% of untreated and sotrovimab-treated patients had received
232 three or more vaccine doses at the time of infection, and 24.5% vs. 21.7% had not received any
233 vaccine doses, respectively. The mean time from positive SARS-CoV-2 test to administration of
234 sotrovimab treatment was 3.0 days (SD 1.8) in those with a positive test date in the EHR.

235 *Hospitalization and Mortality*

236 Sotrovimab treatment was not associated with a lower rate of 28-day hospitalization compared to
237 matched untreated controls ((39 [2.5%] vs. 116 [3.2%]), adjusted OR (aOR) = 0.82 (95% CI
238 0.55-1.19; $p = 0.29$)) (**Table 2, Figure 1**). Covariates that were associated with increased odds of
239 28-day hospitalization included age ≥ 65 ($p = 0.04$), obesity ($p = 0.02$), moderate/severe
240 immunocompromised status ($p < 0.001$), and two or more other comorbid conditions ($p < 0.001$)
241 (**Appendix Table 3, Supplement**). Having received two ($p = 0.03$) or \geq three ($p < 0.001$)
242 vaccine doses were both associated with reduced hospitalization in comparison to having zero
243 vaccine doses.

244 Rates of all-cause 28-day mortality were not statistically different, with 1 death in
245 sotrovimab-treated group (0.1%) as compared to 7 deaths (0.2%) in the untreated group (aOR
246 0.62, 95% CI 0.07-2.78) (**Table 2**). ED visit rates were also similar between groups, 93 of 1542
247 (6.0%) in sotrovimab-treated, and 224 of 3663 (6.1%) in untreated (aOR 1.03, 95% CI 0.79-
248 1.32).

249 *Severity of Hospitalization*

250 Among hospitalized patients, 6 of 39 (15.4%) in the sotrovimab-treated group required high-flow
251 nasal cannula (HFNC), non-invasive ventilation (NIV), invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) or
252 died in the hospital, compared to 33 of 116 (28.4%) in the untreated group (**Table 2**). The data
253 also showed a higher proportion of sotrovimab-treated patients did not any require supplemental
254 oxygen (35.9% vs. 17.2%). The average hospital length of stay (LOS) for sotrovimab patients
255 was 5.2 (+/- 6.8) days in comparison to 7.3 (+/- 7.7) days in the untreated group. 4 of 39 (10.3%)
256 sotrovimab-treated patients required ICU level of care, as compared to 20 of 116 (17.2%)
257 untreated patients. Collectively, these data appear to suggest a lower severity of disease among
258 hospitalized sotrovimab-treated patients, although the sample sizes were too low for valid
259 statistical inference.

260 *Sotrovimab treatment effect in subgroups*

261 During the Omicron phase, sotrovimab treatment was associated with a lower odds of 28-day
262 hospitalization in older patients (age \geq 65 years) as compared to no treatment (OR 0.52, 95% CI
263 0.30-0.92, interaction $p=0.02$). In addition, sotrovimab treatment trended towards a lower odds of
264 28-day hospitalization among immunocompromised (OR 0.63, 95% CI 0.38-1.04, interaction
265 $p=0.04$) or having 2 or more comorbid conditions (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.42 – 1.01, interaction
266 $p=0.007$) as compared to no antiviral treatment (**Table 3**).

267 *Sotrovimab treatment effect in Omicron and Delta phases*

268 Compared to treated patients during the Delta phase, treated patients in the Omicron phase were
269 on average older, more white, more obese, more immunocompromised, had more comorbid
270 conditions, and had been vaccinated with more doses (not shown). After propensity matching
271 (**Appendix Figure 2**), these differences were no longer clinically meaningful or statistically
272 different (SMDs <0.1). In the combined analysis across Omicron and Delta phases, the observed

273 treatment OR for preventing 28-day hospitalization was higher during Omicron than during
274 Delta predominance (OR 0.85 vs. 0.39, respectively; interaction $p=0.053$; **Appendix Table 4**).

275

276 **DISCUSSION**

277 During a SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 variant-predominant phase in Colorado, sotrovimab was
278 not associated with a lower incidence of the primary outcome of 28-day hospitalization. In
279 addition, it was likely that sotrovimab treatment benefit observed during the Delta phase of the
280 pandemic [2] was markedly attenuated during the Omicron BA.1 phase. However, the lower
281 confidence boundary of 0.55 during the Omicron phase makes us interpret these results with
282 caution. Notably, COVID severity metrics including all-cause mortality, hospital length of stay,
283 as well as higher levels of respiratory support via HFNC, NIV, or invasive mechanical
284 ventilation all trended in the direction of sotrovimab benefit, but was underpowered and did not
285 reach statistical significance. Coupling these data with possible benefit from sotrovimab
286 treatment among key subgroups (age ≥ 65 years, immunocompromised status, ≥ 2 comorbid
287 conditions) that increase COVID severity, the results of our study are worthy of dissemination
288 and for future reference as the COVID landscape continues to evolve.

289 Despite evaluating a cohort predominantly infected with Omicron BA.1 sublineages, our
290 findings do not fully support observed sotrovimab neutralization of BA.1 variants *in vitro*, [23]
291 though perhaps a lower sotrovimab neutralization potency against Omicron/BA.1 and
292 Omicron/BA.1.1 as compared to ancestral strains and prior variants of concern made our
293 findings more predictable. [13, 14] Further, with ineffective *in vitro* sotrovimab neutralization
294 against Omicron BA.2 [13, 14] and among newer Omicron subvariants, [24] as well as a clinical
295 observation that sotrovimab did not mitigate disease progression during a BA.2 Omicron
296 dominant phase, [15] our findings do support the statements by the NIH guidelines committee

297 [25] and FDA [26] that sotrovimab should not be recommended as a current outpatient treatment
298 against COVID-19 among the general population of outpatients that meet EUA criteria.
299 However, with a signal towards potential sotrovimab benefit in patients ≥ 65 years old,
300 immunosuppressed, or with multiple comorbid conditions, some consideration should be given
301 towards continued treatment in highest risk individuals depending on the availability of alternate
302 treatments options, particularly if these observations continue to be made in other studies.[16]

303 Our results are of practical importance for policymakers and clinicians because there
304 needs to be iterative data to support prioritization given shortages of mAb supplies and infusion
305 capacity and other authorized antiviral treatments. As such, it is crucial to rapidly test real-world
306 effectiveness of each treatment to mitigate hospitalization and mortality against each clinically
307 relevant SARS-CoV-2 variant.[27]

308 *Limitations*

309 This study has several limitations. Even though we used statewide data for mortality and
310 vaccination status, hospitalizations were collected only within one single health system. In
311 addition, this health system is geographically limited to one US state with relatively low racial
312 and ethnic minority representation, though it serves both urban and rural populations through
313 academic and community hospitals. If untreated patients were less likely to be seen in this health
314 system, hence more likely to be hospitalized elsewhere, this may bias our results toward the null.
315 We also relied on EHR data, including manual chart reviews, which may have missing or
316 inaccurate information about the presence of chronic conditions.[28] These factors might have
317 limited our ability to detect the impact of sotrovimab treatment.

318 We only collected 28-day hospitalization and mortality data, and therefore we cannot
319 comment on sotrovimab effects over a longer phase after SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, our
320 prior study would suggest that 28-day and 90-day data yield similar results with respect to

321 hospitalization and mortality endpoints.[20] In this study, propensity scoring appropriately
322 matched sotrovimab-treated and untreated patient groups across multiple variables, but
323 unmeasured confounders may remain. Our EHR data does not contain information on SARS-
324 CoV-2 variants at the patient level. However, during Colorado’s Delta phase more than 99% of
325 sequenced SARS-CoV-2 was Delta variant and during Colorado’s Omicron phase it was more
326 than 96% of Omicron BA.1.[17]

327 Finally, this study occurred while our health system’s sotrovimab distribution criteria
328 changed due to implementation of austere measures, and as such, patients who received
329 sotrovimab may have differed over the course of the study. We accounted for this by doing a
330 subgroup analysis of early (12/26/21 – 2/5/22) and late (2/6/22 – 3/10/22) infection periods.
331 Though we observed a similar sotrovimab effect in each period, it is notable that hospitalization
332 rates among sotrovimab-treated and untreated groups appeared lower during the late period.

333 ***Conclusion***

334 This study of real-world data demonstrated sotrovimab treatment was not associated with
335 reduced 28-day hospitalization among COVID-19 outpatients during the Omicron BA.1 variant
336 phase. Outpatient sotrovimab treatment may still be beneficial in certain higher risk subgroups,
337 and may reduce respiratory severity among those subsequently hospitalized, but larger cohorts
338 are necessary to further examine these observations.

339

340

341

342

343 **FOOTNOTES**

344 1) The authors do not have a commercial or other association that might pose a conflict of
345 interest (e.g., pharmaceutical stock ownership, consultancy, advisory board membership,
346 relevant patents, or research funding)

347

348 2) This study was funded by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the
349 National Institutes of Health [grant numbers UL1TR002525, UL1TR002535-03S3 and
350 UL1TR002535-04S2].

351

352 3) This work has not been presented in part or in entirety at any meetings

353

354 4) Correspondence and reprints to:

355 Neil R. Aggarwal, MD, MHSc

356 Department of Medicine

357 University of Colorado School of Medicine

358 12700 E. 19th Ave, Mail Stop C-272

359 Aurora, CO 80045, USA

360 Phone: +1-303-724-6038

361 Email: neil.aggarwal@cuanschutz.edu

362

363

364

365

366

367 REFERENCES

- 368 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Science Brief: SARS-CoV-2 infection-
369 induced and vaccine-induced immunity. Available at:
370 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/vaccine-induced-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/vaccine-induced-immunity.html)
371 [immunity.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/vaccine-induced-immunity.html)). Accessed April 25.
- 372 2. Aggarwal NR, Beaty LE, Bennett TD, et al. Real World Evidence of the Neutralizing
373 Monoclonal Antibody Sotrovimab for Preventing Hospitalization and Mortality in COVID-
374 19 Outpatients. *J Infect Dis* **2022**.
- 375 3. Ganesh R, Pawlowski CF, O'Horo JC, et al. Intravenous bamlanivimab use associates
376 with reduced hospitalization in high-risk patients with mild to moderate COVID-19. *J Clin*
377 *Invest* **2021**; 131(19).
- 378 4. Huang DT, McCreary EK, Bariola JR, et al. Effectiveness of casirivimab and imdevimab,
379 and sotrovimab during Delta variant surge: a prospective cohort study and comparative
380 effectiveness randomized trial. *medRxiv* **2021**.
- 381 5. Jarrett M. Early Experience With Neutralizing Monoclonal Antibody Therapy For COVID-
382 19. *medRxiv* **2021**.
- 383 6. O'Horo JC, Challener DW, Speicher L, et al. Effectiveness of Monoclonal Antibodies in
384 Preventing Severe COVID-19 With Emergence of the Delta Variant. *Mayo Clin Proc*
385 **2022**; 97(2): 327-32.
- 386 7. Razonable RR, Pawlowski C, O'Horo JC, et al. Casirivimab-Imdevimab treatment is
387 associated with reduced rates of hospitalization among high-risk patients with mild to
388 moderate coronavirus disease-19. *EClinicalMedicine* **2021**; 40: 101102.
- 389 8. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
390 treatment guidelines. Available at: <https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov>.
391 Accessed April 27.
- 392 9. Dougan M, Nirula A, Azizad M, et al. Bamlanivimab plus Etesevimab in Mild or Moderate
393 Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2021**; 385(15): 1382-92.
- 394 10. Gupta A, Gonzalez-Rojas Y, Juarez E, et al. Effect of Sotrovimab on Hospitalization or
395 Death Among High-risk Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized
396 Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **2022**.
- 397 11. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGN-COV2, a Neutralizing Antibody
398 Cocktail, in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2021**; 384(3): 238-51.
- 399 12. Lynch HF, Caplan A, Furlong P, Bateman-House A. Helpful Lessons and Cautionary
400 Tales: How Should COVID-19 Drug Development and Access Inform Approaches to
401 Non-Pandemic Diseases? *Am J Bioeth* **2021**; 21(12): 4-19.
- 402 13. Iketani S, Liu L, Guo Y, et al. Antibody evasion properties of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
403 sublineages. *Nature* **2022**; 604(7906): 553-6.
- 404 14. Takashita E, Kinoshita N, Yamayoshi S, et al. Efficacy of Antiviral Agents against the
405 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Subvariant BA.2. *N Engl J Med* **2022**; 386(15): 1475-7.
- 406 15. Zaqout A. Effectiveness of the neutralizing antibody sotrovimab among high-risk patients
407 with mild to moderate SARS-CoV-2 in Qatar. *medRxiv* **2022**.
- 408 16. Solera JT, Arbol BG, Alshahrani A, et al. Impact of Vaccination and Early Monoclonal
409 Antibody Therapy on COVID-19 Outcomes in Organ Transplant Recipients During the
410 Omicron Wave. *Clin Infect Dis* **2022**.
- 411 17. Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. Treatments for Covid-19.
412 Available at: [https://covid19.colorado.gov/for-coloradans/covid-19-treatments#collapse-](https://covid19.colorado.gov/for-coloradans/covid-19-treatments#collapse-accordion-40911-4)
413 [accordion-40911-4](https://covid19.colorado.gov/for-coloradans/covid-19-treatments#collapse-accordion-40911-4). Accessed June 10.
- 414 18. ISPOR. About real-world evidence. December 2021. Available at:
415 <https://www.ispor.org/strategic-initiatives/real-world-evidence/about-real-world-evidence>.
- 416 19. Angus DC. Optimizing the Trade-off Between Learning and Doing in a Pandemic. *JAMA*
417 **2020**; 323(19): 1895-6.

- 418 20. Wynia MK, Beaty LE, Bennett TD, et al. Real World Evidence of Neutralizing Monoclonal
419 Antibodies for Preventing Hospitalization and Mortality in COVID-19 Outpatients.
420 medRxiv **2022**.
- 421 21. Georg Heinze MPaLJ. logistf: Firth's Bias-Reduced Logistic Regression. R package
422 version 1.24. **2020**.
- 423 22. Team RC. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R
424 Foundation for Statistical Computing, **2020**.
- 425 23. Cameroni E, Saliba C, Bowen JE, et al. Broadly neutralizing antibodies overcome
426 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron antigenic shift. bioRxiv **2021**.
- 427 24. Yamasoba D, Kosugi Y, Kimura I, et al. Neutralisation sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2
428 omicron subvariants to therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. Lancet Infect Dis **2022**.
- 429 25. National Institute of Health Covid treatment guidelines. Clinical spectrum of SARS-CoV-
430 2 infection. . Available at:
431 <https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/overview/clinical-spectrum>.
432 Accessed **June 16**.
- 433 26. FDA updates Sotrovimab emergency use authorization. Available at:
434 [https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-updates-sotrovimab-](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-updates-sotrovimab-emergency-use-authorization)
435 [emergency-use-authorization](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-updates-sotrovimab-emergency-use-authorization). Accessed 6/16/22.
- 436 27. Strategies to allocate scarce COVID-19 monoclonal antibody treatments to eligible
437 patients examined in new rapid response to government. January 2021. Available at:
438 [https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2021/01/strategies-to-allocate-scarce-covid-](https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2021/01/strategies-to-allocate-scarce-covid-19-monoclonal-antibody-treatments-to-eligible-patients-examined-in-new-rapid-response-to-government)
439 [19-monoclonal-antibody-treatments-to-eligible-patients-examined-in-new-rapid-](https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2021/01/strategies-to-allocate-scarce-covid-19-monoclonal-antibody-treatments-to-eligible-patients-examined-in-new-rapid-response-to-government)
440 [response-to-government](https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2021/01/strategies-to-allocate-scarce-covid-19-monoclonal-antibody-treatments-to-eligible-patients-examined-in-new-rapid-response-to-government)). Accessed April 25.
- 441 28. Bennett TD, Moffitt RA, Hajagos JG, et al. Clinical Characterization and Prediction of
442 Clinical Severity of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among US Adults Using Data From the US
443 National COVID Cohort Collaborative. JAMA Netw Open **2021**; 4(7): e2116901.

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453 **Table 1. Baseline Characteristics by Mab Treatment Status for Primary Matched Cohort**

	Untreated N=3663)	Sotrovimab Treated (N=1542)
Age Group *		
18-44 years	997 (27.2%)	387 (25.1%)
45-64 years	1219 (33.3%)	492 (31.9%)
≥65 years	1447 (39.5%)	663 (43.0%)
Female Gender *	2231 (60.9%)	916 (59.4%)
Race/Ethnicity *		
Non-Hispanic White	2974 (81.2%)	1256 (81.5%)
Hispanic	391 (10.7%)	160 (10.4%)
Non-Hispanic Black	95 (2.6%)	41 (2.7%)
Other	203 (5.5%)	85 (5.5%)
Insurance Status *		
Private/Commercial	1878 (51.3%)	759 (49.2%)
Medicare	1581 (43.2%)	699 (45.3%)
Medicaid	110 (3.0%)	48 (3.1%)
None/Uninsured	3 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)
Other/Unknown	91 (2.5%)	34 (2.2%)
Immunocompromised Status *		
None	2148 (58.6%)	902 (58.5%)
Mild	679 (18.5%)	275 (17.8%)
Moderate/Severe	836 (22.8%)	365 (23.7%)
Obesity*	1119 (30.5%)	483 (31.3%)
Number of Other Comorbid Conditions *		
None	998 (27.0%)	411 (26.7%)
One	914 (25.0%)	393 (25.5%)
Two or more	1761 (48.1%)	738 (47.9%)
Diabetes Mellitus	716 (19.5%)	371 (24.1%)
Cardiovascular Disease	1116 (30.5%)	446 (28.9%)
Pulmonary Disease	1295 (35.4%)	540 (35.0%)
Renal Disease	446 (12.2%)	268 (17.4%)
Hypertension	1812 (49.5%)	765 (49.6%)
Liver Disease	488 (13.3%)	235 (15.2%)
Number of vaccinations prior to SARS-CoV-2+ *		
0	898 (24.5%)	335 (21.7%)
1	182 (5.0%)	68 (4.4%)
2	726 (19.8%)	284 (18.4%)
3+	1857 (50.7%)	855 (55.4%)
Days to mAb Admin: mean (SD)	NA	3.004 (1.967)
Time (weeks)*		
12/26 - 1/1	704 (19.2%)	258 (16.7%)
1/2 - 1/8	353 (9.6%)	106 (6.9%)
1/9 - 1/15	382 (10.4%)	127 (8.2%)
1/16 - 1/22	500 (13.7%)	170 (11.0%)
1/23 - 1/29	393 (10.7%)	128 (8.3%)
1/30 - 2/5	442 (12.1%)	188 (12.2%)
2/6 - 2/12	291 (7.9%)	167 (10.8%)
2/13 - 2/19	211 (5.8%)	112 (7.3%)
2/20 - 2/26	181 (4.9%)	107 (6.9%)
2/27 - 3/5	116 (3.2%)	102 (6.6%)
3/6 - 3/10	90 (2.5%)	77 (5.0%)

454 ^a Variables used in the propensity matching. Abbreviations: mAb, monoclonal antibody.

456 **Table 2. Primary and Secondary Outcomes by Monoclonal Antibody Treatment Status for**
 457 **Primary Cohort**

Outcome	Sotrovimab-Treated	Untreated	Adjusted OR	95% CI
Overall Sample Size	N=1542	N=3663		
All-Cause 28-day Hospitalization <i>(primary outcome)</i>	39 (2.5%)	116 (3.2%)	0.82	(0.55, 1.19)
All-Cause 28-day Mortality	1 (0.1%)	7 (0.2%)	0.62	(0.07, 2.78)
Any ED visit to Day 28	93 (6.0%)	224 (6.1%)	1.03	(0.79, 1.32)
Hospitalized Sample Size	N=39	N=116		
Hospital LOS days, mean (SD)	5.2 (6.8)	7.3 (7.7)	--	--
HFNC/NIV, IMV or Death	6 (15.4%)	33 (28.4%)	--	--
ICU Admission	4 (10.3%)	20 (17.2%)	--	--
ICU LOS days, mean (SD)	1.5 (0.58)	8.1 (14.04)	--	--

458 All regression models adjusted for age, sex, race/ethnicity, obesity, immunocompromised status,
 459 number of comorbidities, insurance status, and vaccination status. Abbreviations: mAb,
 460 monoclonal antibody; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; ICU, intensive care unit; IMV,
 461 invasive mechanical ventilation; LOS, length of stay; SD, standard deviation; HFNC, high flow
 462 nasal cannula; NIV, non-invasive ventilation

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478 **Table 3. Treatment effects results among subgroups**
479

	Untreated	Hospitalized (#, %)	Sotrovimab -treated	Hospitalized (#, %)	OR	95% CI	Interaction P-value
Immunocompromised (binary)							0.04
No	2148	32 (1.49%)	902	18 (2%)	1.40	0.76-2.5	
Yes	1515	84 (5.54%)	640	21 (3.28%)	0.63	0.38-1.04	
Immunocompromised							0.11
No	2148	32 (1.49%)	902	18 (2%)	1.40	0.76-2.51	
Mild	679	23 (3.39%)	275	5 (1.82%)	0.64	0.24-1.74	
Moderate	836	61 (7.3%)	365	16 (4.38%)	0.60	0.33-1.07	
Co-morbidities							0.007
0-1	1902	10 (0.53%)	804	11 (1.37%)	2.52	1.05-6.09	
2+	1761	106 (6.02%)	738	28 (3.79%)	0.65	0.42-1.01	
Vaccine Doses							0.95
0-2	1806	83 (4.6%)	687	26 (3.78%)	0.85	0.52-1.33	
3+	1857	33 (1.78%)	855	13 (1.52%)	0.83	0.43-1.59	
Time of SARS-CoV-2 Infection							0.15
Early (12/26/21-2/5/22)	2774	92 (3.32%)	977	26 (2.66%)	0.80	0.50-1.24	
Late (2/6/22-3/10/22)	889	24 (2.7%)	565	13 (2.3%)	0.81	0.40-1.64	
Age							0.01
<65 years	2216	40 (1.81%)	879	23 (2.62%)	1.42	0.82-2.4	
≥65 years	1447	76 (5.25%)	663	16 (2.41%)	0.52	0.30-0.92	

480 ^a P-values shown are the result from an overall F-test for the significance of the interaction term

481 between treatment and the subgroup of interest

482

483 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

484 **Figure 1. Cumulative Incidence Plots for All-Cause Hospitalization to Day 28 by**
485 **Sotrovimab Treatment Status**

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507 **Figure 1: Cumulative Incidence Plots for All-Cause Hospitalization to Day 28 by**
 508 **Sotrovimab Treatment Status**

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

