COVID-19 convalescent plasma for the treatment of immunocompromised patients: a systematic review.

Jonathon W. Senefeld[1,#]

Massimo Franchini[2]

Carlo Mengoli[2]

Mario Cruciani[2]

Matteo Zani[2]

Ellen K.Gorman[1]

Daniele Focosi[3,#]

Arturo Casadevall[4]

Michael J Joyner[1]

[1]Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA; .

[2]Division of Transfusion Medicine, Carlo Poma Hospital, 46100 Mantua, Italy;

[3]North-Western Tuscany Blood Bank, Pisa University Hospital, Pisa, Italy.

[4] Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA;

[#]corresponding author: Senefeld.Jonathon@mayo.edu

Abbreviations: CCP: COVID-19 convalescent plasma; nAb: neutralizing antibodies; VOC: variant of concern.

Keywords: convalescent plasma; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; immunosuppression.

Author contributions: J.W.S. and M.Z. performed literature searches; C.M. and M.C. performed statistical analyses; M.F. and D.F. wrote the first draft; A.C. and M.J.J. revised the final version.

Abstract

Immunosuppressed patients have increased risk for morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 because they less frequently mount antibody responses to vaccines and often cannot tolerate small-molecule antivirals. The Omicron variant of concern of SARS-CoV-2 has progressively defeated anti-Spike mAbs authorized so far, paving the way to a return to COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP) therapy. In this systematic review we performed a metanalysis of 8 controlled studies (totaling 469 treated patients and 1305 controls and including 3 randomized controlled trials), an individual patient data analysis of 125 case reports/series (totaling 265 patients), and a descriptive analysis of 13 uncontrolled large case series without individual patient data available (totaling 358 patients). The metanalysis of controlled studies showed a risk ratio for mortality of 0.63 (0.58 in randomized controlled trials) in treatment with CCP versus standard of care for immunosuppressed COVID-19 patients. On the basis of this evidence, we encourage initiation of high-titer CCP from vaccinees (‘hybrid plasma’) in immunocompromised patients.

Introduction

In December 2019, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) emerged in Wuhan (China)[1,2], causing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). It rapidly spread across the globe leading to a pandemic with currently nearly 577 million infected people worldwide and 6.4 million deaths [3]. A number of treatments, including antiviral, anticoagulant and anti-inflammatory agents have been tested in COVID-19 patients, with often controversial results [4]. The passive transfer of anti-SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies (nAb) from plasma of recently recovered individuals (COVID-19 convalescent plasma, CCP) to patients with severe COVID-19 was among the first therapies used [5-7]. Nowadays we know that such antibody-based treatment, when administered early (within 72 hours since onset of symptoms) and with high titers of neutralizing antibodies (nAb), leads to clinical benefit [8,9].

In spite of the marketing of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) against COVID-19 since February 2021, the high mutation rate of SARS-CoV-2 (approximately a novel variant of concern (VOC) every 6 months) progressively escaped most, if not all, mAbs [10]. By contrast, thanks to the prompt availability of CCP against emerging VOCs, CCP maintained its efficacy over time by following the ongoing Spike protein evolution. As a result, since the beginning of 2022 there has been a renewed interest toward CCP use, particularly for immunocompromised patients, who are not able to mount a sufficiently protective antibody response against the virus and have contraindications or side effects from small molecule antivirals [11,12]. These patients are at higher risk for morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 [13]. A few controlled studies and a number of case reports and case series have shown a clinical benefit from CCP use for COVID-19 patients with hematological or solid cancer or other underlying causes of immunosuppression. For such reasons, on January 2022 the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) revised the Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of CCP to include those hospitalized with impaired humoral immunity [14].

To further summarize the heterogeneous literature data on the CCP use in immunocompromised patients, possibly identifying factors involved in more favorable outcomes, we have performed here a systematic literature review.

Materials and methods

Search criteria

In this systematic review, we investigated the impact of CCP on COVID-19 mortality in patients with primary (i.e., inheritable) or secondary immunosuppression (i.e., related to haematological or solid cancers, autoimmune disorders or organ transplants). For this purpose, an electronic literature search through the online PubMed and MEDLINE databases was initiated for articles published from January 1, 2020 to August 12, 2022, using English language as the only restriction. The Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) and keywords used were: ("COVID-19" OR "SARS-CoV-2" OR "coronavirus disease 2019") AND ("convalescent plasma" OR "immune plasma" OR "hyperimmune plasma") AND ("immunosuppression" OR "immunodeficiency" OR "immunocompromised" OR "cancer" OR "transplant" OR "malignancy" OR "hematological" OR "oncologic" OR "lymphoma" OR "leukemia" OR "myeloma" OR "agammaglobulinemia" OR "hypogammaglobulinemia" OR "common variable immunodeficiency" OR "autoimmune disorder"). Relevant articles and data were also identified through non-systematic searches in Google Scholar and medRxiv, including abstracts of congress presentations which were not published yet. We also screened the reference list of reviewed articles for additional studies not captured in our initial systematic literature search. To be considered eligible for inclusion, studies must include: 1) patients with primary or secondary immunosuppression with a confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19; 2) CCP as a COVID-19 treatment; and 3) information on patients' outcome. To perform a comprehensive analysis, the retrieved literature was grouped into three different strata, according to information characteristics: 1) controlled trials underwent a quantitative analysis

(meta-analysis); 2) large case series with aggregated data underwent a descriptive analysis; and 3) case reports and case series with individual patient data underwent a single patient analysis.

Articles underwent a reciprocally blind evaluation for inclusion by two assessors (J.W.S. and M.F.) and disagreements were resolved by a third senior assessor (D.F.). A PRISMA flowchart for this review is available in Figure 1. The following data, when available, were searched for each case: patient's sex and age, the underlying primary or secondary immunodeficiency, the 11-point WHO COVID-19 disease severity score [15], the need for mechanical ventilation, survival at the end of follow-up, the number of CCP units transfused, the volume of each CCP unit, the total CCP volume transfused, the antibody level (either nAb titer or anti-Spike IgG levels) and the antibody test used, time from admission to CCP transfusion, time from symptom onset to CCP transfusion, rapid clinical improvement (defined as a reduction in supplemental oxygen requirements $\leq$ 5 days post-CCP transfusion), duration of follow-up (days), need for admission to intensive care unit (ICU), ICU length of stay (days; total and after CCP transfusion), concomitant COVID-19 antiviral treatments (intravenous immunoglobulins, remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, anti-Spike mAbs), and specific immunosuppressive drugs (anti-CD20 mAbs).

Systematic review of comparative studies

We have considered both RCTs and non-RCT. Two review authors (MF, MC) independently assessed the risk of bias (ROB) of each included study following the domain-based evaluation described in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. [Higgins, J.P., Green, S. (eds.): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions – Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration http://www.cochranehandbook.org.].

Within-trial ROB was assessed, using the Cochrane ROB tool for RCTs and the ROBINS-I tool for non-RCTs.[Higgins, J.P., Green, S. (eds.): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of

Interventions – Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration http://www.cochranehandbook.org.]. The Cochrane 'Risk of bias' tool for RCTs addresses six specific domains: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete data, selective outcome reporting, and other issues relating to bias. The methodological quality of observational studies was assessed with the ROBINS-1 tool [16]. This tool includes seven specific bias domains, pre-intervention and post-intervention. The domains are: (1) confounding; (2) selection of participants; (3) classification of intervention; (4) deviation from interventions (o biases that arise when there are systematic differences between the care provided to experimental intervention and comparator groups, beyond the assigned interventions); (5) missing outcome; (6) measurement of outcomes; (7) selection of reported result overall. For both RCTs and non-RCTs we have presented our assessment of risk of bias using two 'Risk of bias' summary figures: 1) a summary of bias for each item across all studies; and 2) a cross-tabulation of each trial by all the 'Risk of bias' items.

Effect of intervention

Measures of treatment effect were risk ratio (RR) and mean difference (MD). The study weight was calculated using the Mantel-Haenszel method. We assessed statistical heterogeneity using t^2, Cochran's Q and I^2 statistics [17]. The I^2 statistic describes the percentage of total variation across trials due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error. In the case of no heterogeneity (I^2=0), studies were pooled using a fixed-effects model. Where values of I^2 were >0, a random-effects analysis was undertaken.

'Summary of findings' tables

For the outcome mortality, we used the principles of the GRADE system to assess the quality of the body of evidence associated with specific outcomes and constructed 'Summary of findings' tables using REVMAN 5.4 [18,19]. These tables present key information concerning the certainty of the evidence, the magnitude of the effects of the interventions examined, and the sum of available

data for the main outcomes. The 'Summary of findings' tables also include an overall grading of the evidence related to each of the main outcomes using the GRADE approach, 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. The certainty of a body of evidence involves consideration of within-trial risk of bias (methodological quality), directness of evidence, heterogeneity, precision of effect estimates, and risk of publication bias.

Statistical analysis of individual patient data

In the descriptive statistics of individual patient data, continuous variables were reported as mean (±SD) or median (range) as appropriate according to distribution, while categorical variables were reported as numbers and percentages.

An exploratory analysis on the main theme was done on the mortality after discretizing the total volume, as <= 200 ml to 1800 ml with serial increases of 200 ml. Then, a breakpoint at 600 ml of CCP was tentatively posed, allowing to compare the mortality when the CCP was under or over the level by Fisher exact test.

The basic model consisted in a logistic regression using mortality as dependent variable, and total volume as predictor. The CCP total volume was expressed in units of 100 ml ("totvol100"), for ease of interpretation. The potential additive independent effects of "Age", "Sex", "Time from admission to transfusion", "Rapid improvement (within 5 days)", "ICU length of stay", "Steroids", "Remdesivir", "(Hydroxy)chloroquine", "Antibiotics", "Anti-CD20", and "Category" were evaluated.

In power analysis, the total sample size was calculated in order to detect an experimental-group proportion of 0.06 as death rate, with the control-group proportion of 0.08, assuming a one-sided hypothesis test with a 5% significance level, focusing a desired power of 80%, and if both groups

(treated and untreated) had the same number of observations. This would correspond to the prevention of 25% of the basal deaths, or a risk ratio (RR) of 0.75.

Stata 17.0 was used for all statistical calculations.

Results

The literature search yielded 146 eligible studies, of which 8 controlled trials (3 randomized trials [20-22] and 5 cohort studies [23-27]) were selected for meta-analysis, 13 uncontrolled large case series without individual patient data but totaling 358 patients were selected for descriptive analysis [28-40], and 125 case reports/series totaling met the eligibility criteria for individual patient data analysis, providing information on 265 patients [34,41-164]. Reference [34] was included in both the descriptive analysis and the individual patient data analysis because individual patient data were available only for a subgroup of patients.

In the metanalysis of the 8 controlled trials (totaling 469 patients treated with CCP and 1305 controls), the main findings are summarized in Table 1. As shown in Figure 2 the level of evidences was generally moderate because of a moderate ROB (Figure 2). Despite this, there is a high level of concordance among study outcomes, with a risk difference of -0.10, and a risk ratio of 0.63, which improve at -0.12 and 0.58, respectively, when the analysis is limited to RCTs (Figure 3). We note that several cohort studies, despite being defined as propensity-score matched[27], did not match for concomitant antivirals (potentially masking CCP efficacy) or B-cell depleting agents. In sensitivity analysis, exclusion of individual studies did not affect significantly the effect size.

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the individual patient data are summarized in Table 3 and are available individually in Supplementary Table 1. The median age was 55 years (range 1-88 years). The male/female ratio was 1.5 (161 males and 105 females). Mean WHO disease severity score was 4.4, with approximately one quarter of patients (51/218) being in ICU on mechanical

ventilation. The reported mortality rate was 11.6% (31/265). Forty-seven patients (17.7%) had a primary immunosuppression, mostly agammaglobulinemia (20/47, 42.6%) or common variable immunodeficiency (22/47, 4.8%). The remaining 219 patients had secondary immunosuppression, related to hematological malignancies (134/219, 61.2%), solid cancers (6/219, 2.7%), solid organ transplants (65/219, 29.7%), autoimmune disorders (12/219, 5.5%) or other chronic infectious disease (2/219, 0.9%) (see Table 1). Regarding treatments, the majority of patients (142/265, 53.4%) received steroids as part of the anti-COVID-19 therapy, while 41.7% of them (111/265) received remdesivir and 47% antibiotics (125/265). Approximately one fifth of patients (45/265) also received intravenous immunoglobulin, while a minority of them (11/265, 4.1%) were treated with anti-Spike mAbs: interestingly, in 7 of such cases (7/11, 63.6%), CCP was given as rescue therapy after mAb failure and all 7 patients survived. Nearly 20% of patients (47/265) were under chemotherapy, which in the majority of the cases (35/47, 74.5%) included anti-CD20 mAbs (i.e., rituximab or obinutuzumab), responsible for prolonged B-cell depletion and impaired humoral immune responses. Table 4 summarizes the CCP treatment-related data. The mean number of CCP units transfused per patient was 2.3 ($\pm$1.7), while the mean cumulative CCP volume transfused per patient was 460 ml ($\pm$372 ml). Unfortunately, it was not possible to calculate the mean nAb titer or to correlate the patients' outcome with nAb titers due to the wide heterogeneity of tests used (virus neutralization or high-throughput serology). No adverse reactions to CCP were reported. The median time between symptom onset and CCP therapy was 17 days (range 1-132 days), while the median time between hospital admission and CCP therapy was 11 days (0-120 days). The median follow-up period of the patients included in this single patients' analysis was 19 days (range 4-263 days; data available for 69 patients). Fifty-six percent of the 114 evaluable patients had a rapid ($\leq$ 5 days) clinical improvement following CCP transfusion. Thirty-one death events were observed (22 male and 9 females). On 126 cases where mortality and total volume were known, 7 death events were found (6 males and 1 female). These data are reported in Table 5 and Figure 4. The 7 death events were observed in the group of 92 patients where the CCP total volume did not exceed 600

ml. The comparison of the mortality when the CCP was under (7 events, 92 patients) or over this level (zero events, 34 patients), however, was not significant. The coefficients of the basic logistic model are reported in Table 6. No inferential significance was obtained. However, the coefficient of "totvol100" had a negative sign, suggesting a decrease of approximately 5% of the starting probability of death for each 100 ml unit added. If the dose-response effect was real, with 600 ml of CCP the mortality reduction would be 26.64%, with 1200 ml would be 46.48%, and with 1800 ml would be 61.12%. Of course, this would need confirmation by a more extended number of observations. Adding to the basic model the above listed covariates, "Age", "Mechanical Ventilation", "Category=autoimmune", "Category=solid cancer", and "Anti-Spike mAbs" appeared to predict a significant increase of mortality. By logistic model, the evaluation of the role of anti-CD20 was impossible since anti-CD20 = "yes" predicted failure (survival) perfectly (nobody died if treated with anti-CD20 if CCP total volume information was available). This happened with "Rapid improvement", "(Hydroxy)chloroquine", "Category=common", "Category=humoral" as well. In contrast, failure to receive steroids or antibiotics predicted survival perfectly; in other words, deaths were found only in treated people.

The total sample size calculated by power analysis for RR = 0.75 was 4,024, for RR = 0.5 was 870.

Discussion

Several scientific societies (e.g., ECIL-9 [165], CDC/IDSA[166] and AABB [167] have recently revised their guidelines to recommend usage of CCP in immunocompromised patients, expecially after Omicron sublineages progressively defeated mAb therapies authorized so far.

The hypothesis of a significant beneficial effect of CCP on mortality in immunocompromised patients cannot be definitively demonstrated with the present data, but very strong elements support its efficacy. The efficacy of antibody-based therapies for immunocompetent individuals is

predicated on early administration with sufficient dosage [168]. This principle was validated by the experience of CCP in COVID-19 [9]. While several immunocompromised cases have been treated with CCP derivatives (hyperimmune immunoglobulins) [169], CCP is superior in turnaround times and inclusion of classes other than IgG [170]. However, we note that the immunosuppressed patients in this study were treated relatively late after the initial symptoms (17 d) and hospital admission (11 d) and yet our analysis suggests a benefit for CCP. For life-threatening COVID-19 the pathogenesis involves exuberant tissue-damaging inflammatory responses that follow an initial viral phase. Antibody-based therapies function primarily as antiviral agents and are much less likely to be affected in individuals who are in the inflammatory phase. However, immunocompromised individuals are generally unable to mount strong antibody or inflammatory responses and often cannot clear SARS-CoV-2. Hence, immunosuppressed patients represent a biologically different population from the immunocompetent population where antibody-based therapies may retain efficacy late into the course of disease.

The efficacy of CCP in immunosuppressed patients that had reported symptoms for weeks or months paves the way to the hypothesis that CCP retains clinical efficacy until the recipient is seronegative and there is no irreversible parenchymal damage. The recently reopened CCP arm of the REMAP-CAP randomized controlled trial in UK will specifically target immunocompromised patients in ICU focusing on CCP from vaccinated donors (so-called VaxCCP or “hybrid” plasma) [171]. While most studies reported in this systematic review used CCP from unvaccinated donors (with a few exceptions [124,151]), it is noteworthy that VaxCCP is nowadays widely available from regular donors, retains higher nAb titers and efficacy against most Omicron sublineages than standard CCP [172].

COI statement: We declare we don’t have any conflict of interest related to this manuscript.

Data availability statement: This secondary research did not generate original data, which remain available at the cited references.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Dr.Thomas Hueso who contributed to data analysis.

Figure 1

PRISMA flow chart for the current study.



Figure 2

Risk of bias summary for the controlled studies: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias (ROB) item according to ROBIN-1 tool for each included study. Left: RCTs, analysis according to ROB assessment tool. Right Non-RCTs. Note that although the 3 RCTs were judged at high risk of performance bias because they were open label trials, masking has unclear importance for the outcome mortality, because the risk of ascertainment bias is limited.



Figure 3

Risk difference (top panel) and risk ratio (bottom panel) for mortality in randomized or cohort-controlled studies included in this systematic review.





Figure 4

Mortality under different levels of CCP treatment in 265 individual patients, as total volume from <= 200 ml to >1800 ml. Blue bars: death incidence. Orange bars: number of patients at risk at each level of CCP.



Figure 5

Predicted probability of death at various levels of CCP total volume, after logistic regression, basic model. The CCP total volume ("totvol100") is expressed as 100 ml units. The large confidence intervals pinpoint the need for a confirmation by a more extended number of observations.



Table 1

Summary of findings for the 6 controlled studies included in the metanalysis.

Patient or population: Immunocompromised patients

Settings: Hospitalized patients with COVID-19

Intervention: COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP)

Comparison: standard of care (SOC)

Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	Controls (standard of care)	Intervention (convalescent plasma)				
All cause mortality						
- All studies (RCTs and non-RCTs)	265 per 1000	172 per 1000 (from 132 to 207)	RR 0.63 (95% CIs, 0.50 to 0.78)	1774 patients (8 trials, 3 RCTs and 5 non-RCTs)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious ROB)	Mortality was observed more commonly among SOC recipients compared to CP
-RCTs only	284 per 1000	165 per 1000 (from 97 to 278)	RR 0.58 (95 % CIs, 0.34/0.98)	214 participants (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate (downgraded for ROB)	CP reduces mortality compared to SOC
-Cohort studies only	264 per 1000	169 per 1000 (from 132 to 216)	RR 0.64 (95 % CIs, 0.50/0.82)	1774 participants (5 trials)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low (downgraded for serious risk of bias)	Mortality was observed more commonly among SOC recipients compared to CP. In sensitivity analysis, exclusion of individual studies did not affect the effect size of intervention.

*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 of the intervention (and its 95% CI). CI: Confidence interval; MD: Mean Difference; RR: risk ratio
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.

RR, risk ratio; CIs, confidence intervals; ROB, risk of bias.

Table 2

Summary of uncontrolled studies with aggregated results on the CCP use in immunocompromised patients.

First author, reference	Population	Diagnosis	COVID-19	CCP regimen	Days between symptoms and CCP	Previous/concomitant therapies	Outcome	Notes/Conclusions
Betrains [30]	5 F, median age 37 y (range 19-67 y)	5 NHL	Severe COVID-19	4 high-titer (≥1:160 VNT) CCP units	N/A	1 steroids, 3 HCQ, 1 antibiotics, 2 remdesivir	Increase in nAb titer following CCP Overall mortality rate 1/5 (20%)	Patients with B-cell-depleted lymphomas are ideal candidates for CCP therapy
Gharbharan [28]	25 (15 M, 10 F), median age 53 y (IQR 44-66 y)	12 NHL 1 AL 8 AID 2 CLL 1 MS 1 AGG	19 severe COVID-19, 6 mild-moderate COVID-19	21 patients 1 CCP unit, 4 patients 2 CCP units	Median 26 d (IQR 15-34 d)	N/A	Overall mortality rate 4/25 (16%)	24/25 anti-CD20 therapy. The CCP benefit in B-cell depleted patients is present regardless of symptom duration.
Greenbaun[29]	44 (M 25, 19 F),	17 SC	Severe	42 patients 1	N/A	32 remdesivir, 20	Overall	Shorter time from COVID-

	median age 60 (range 37-48 y)	27 HM	COVID-19	CCP unit, 2 patients 2 CCP units		tocilizumab, 11 steroids, 1 anakinra	mortality 12/44 (27.3%)	19 diagnosis to CCP administration (≤3 days) was associated with better survival
Hueso[40]	17 (12 M, 5 F), median age 58 y (range 35-77 y)	11 NHL 3 CLL 1 WM 1 CVID 1 MS	WHO score 4-7	CCP units ≥1:40 (VNT) or > 5.6 (ELISA)	Median 56 d (range 7-83 d)	8 steroids, 5 HCQ, 4 tocilizumab, 3 remdesivir, 2 antivirals	Rapid viral clearance following CCP Overall mortality rate 1/15 (6.7%)	15/17 previous treatment with anti-CD20 therapy. CCP is a promising therapy for COVID-19 B-cell depleted patients
Jasuja[31]	22 (N/A)	22 KTR	N/A	N/A	N/A	HCQ, steroids, antibiotics, remdesivir, tocilizumab	Overall mortality rate 7/22 (31.8%)	CCP was associated with no clinical benefit in KTR
Jeyaraman[32]	33 (23 M, 10 F), median age 62 y (range 7-80 y)	18 NHL 4 AL 7 MM 2 MPD 2 MDS	Severe COVID-19	CCP units >1:640 18 patients 1 CCP unit, 15 patients 2 CCP units	Median 4 d (range 2-25 d)	HCQ, steroids, antibiotics, remdesivir, tocilizumab	Overall 42.day mortality rate 15/33 (45.5%). No mortality difference between early (<7 days)	Study with methodological limitations (retrospective case series)

							versus late CCP transfusion	
Levy [33]	50 (N/A)	23 NHL 9 MM 8 CLL 1 MPD 6 AL 2 MDS 1 HCL	40 severe/critical COVID-19; 10 mild/moderate COVID-19	N/A	N/A	Steroids, remdesivir	Overall mortality rate 16/50 (32%)	CCP was associated with no clinical benefit
Ljunquist [34]	28 (13 M, 15 F), median age 56 (range 16-84 y)	13 HM 5 SOT 2 PI	Severe COVID-19	76 CCP units transfused (median nAb titer 1:141). 21 patients received 3 CCP units	Median 26 d (range 6-68 d)	23 steroids, 18 remdesivir	Overall 30 days mortality rate 6/28 (21.4%)	50% (14/28) of patients received rituximab. Data not conclusive.
Magyari [35]	20 (13 M, 7 F), median age 56 y (range 27-76 y)	10 NHL, 1 MM 4 CLL 4 AL	18 moderate COVID-19 (WHO score 4-5)	Median 4 CCP units (range 1-15 units)	Median 13.5 d (range 3-44 d)	17 patients received concomitant remdesivir, 20 steroids, 9 antivirals	No COVID-19 related deaths were recorded	Anti-CD20 therapy in 13/20 patients (65.0%). Clinical benefit of early combined administration of remdesivir

		1 MPD	2 severe COVID-19 (WHO score 8-9)					and CCP
Tremblay [36]	24 (14 M, 10 F), median age 69 y (range 31-88 y)	5 NHL 4 MM 2 AL 1 HL 1 MPD 1 CLL 10 SC	Severe COVID-19	High titer (≥1:320) CCP units	N/A	16 HCQ, 15 antibiotics, 2 remdesivir, 1 tocilizumab	Overall mortality rate 41.2% (10/24)	Clinical benefit of CCP when administered early in the COVID-19 disease course
Rodionov [37]	14 (7 M, 7 F), median age 65 y (IQR 58-70 y)	8 SOT 4 HSCT 2 HM	Median WHO score 5 (range 4-6)	Titer ≥1:40 CCP units (VNT) 1 patient 1 CCP unit, 2 patients 2 CCP units, 11 patients 3 CCP units	N/A	N/A	Overall mortality 2/14 (14.3%). 8/14 (57.0%) showed clinical improvement on day 5 after CCP	Immunosuppressed patients are candidates for CCP treatment

Sait [38]	44 (N/A)	SOT	Median WHO score 4 (IQR 3-5)	N/A	N/A	Steroids, remdesivir, antibiotics	Overall mortality 3/44 (6.8%)	The use of CC is encouraged in SOT inpatients
Weinbergerova [39]	32 (19 M, 13 F), median age 57.7 y (range 25-86 y)	10 NHL 10 AL 6 MM 3 CLL 2 MPD 1 AID	16/32 (50.0%) severe COVID-19	2 units high titer (≥1:160) CCP units	N/A	Steroids, remdesivir	3/32 (9.4%)	Early COVID-19 treatment with remdesivir + high titer CCP is effective in hematological patients

Abbreviations: AL, acute leukemia; AID, autoimmune disorder; AGG, agammaglobulinemia; CCP, COVID-19 convalescent plasma; CLL, chronic lymphocytic leukemia; CVID, common variable immune deficiency; d, days; ELISA, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; F, females; HCL, hairy cell leukemia; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; HL, Hodgkin's lymphoma; HM, hematological malignancy; HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplantation; IQR, interquartile range; KTR, kidney transplant recipients; M, males; MDS, myelodysplastic syndrome; MM, multiple myeloma; MPD, myeloproliferative disorders; MS, multiple sclerosis; N/A, not available; nAb, neutralizing antibody; NHL, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; PI, primary immunodeficiency; SC, solid cancers; SOT, solid organ transplant; VNT, viral neutralization test; WHO, World Health Organization; WM, Waldenstrom macroglobulinemia; y, years;.

Table 3

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the 265 patients included in the individual patients' analysis.

Parameters	Results
Median age, years (range)	55 (1-88)
Males/females (n)	161/105
Male/female (ratio)	1.5
Mortality, n (%)	31/265 (11.6)
COVID-19 severity	
- **WHO disease severity score, mean (±SD)**[1]	4.4 (±1.8)
- **Mechanical ventilation, n (%)**	51/218 (23.4)
- **ICU length of stay, median days (range)**[2]	33 (6-271)
Condition, n (%)	
- **Primary immunosuppression**	47/265 (17.7)
Agammaglobulinemia	20/47 (42.6)
Common variable immunodeficiency	22/47 (46.8)
Others	5/47 (10.6)
- **Secondary immunosuppression**	219/265 (82.3)

Hematological malignancies	134/219 (61.2)
Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma	75/134 (56.0)
Chronic lymphocytic leukemia	17/134 (12.7)
Multiple myeloma	5/134 (3.7)
Myelodysplastic syndrome	2/134 (1.5)
Acute leukemia	13/134 (9.7)
Myeloproliferative disorders	3/134 (2.2)
HSCT	4/134 (3.0)
PHLH	1/134 (0.7)
Not specified	14/134 (10.4)
Solid cancers	6/219 (2.7)
Sarcoma	1/6 (16.7)
Wilm's tumor	1/6 (16.7)
Thymoma	2/6 (33.2)
Lung cancer	1/6 (16.7)
Prostate cancer	1/6 (16.7)
Solid organ transplants	65/219 (29.7)

Kidney	43/65 (66.1)
Liver	14/65 (21.5)
Heart	7/65 (10.8)
Not specified	1/65 (1.5)
Autoimmune disorders	12/219 (4.5)
Systemic lupus erythematosus	2/12 (16.7)
Sjogren syndrome	1/12 (8.3)
Rheumatoid arthritis	2/12 (16.7)
MCVD	2/12 (16.7)
Others	5/12 (41.7)
Infective	2/219 (0.9)
HIV	2/2 (100)
Concomitant therapies, n (%)	
- **Remdesivir**	111/265 (41.7)
- **IVIG**	45/265 (16.9)
- **Hydroxychloroquine**	40/265 (15.0)
- **Steroids**	142/265 (53.4)

- **Anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibodies**	11/265 (4.1)
Casirivimab + imdevimab	3/11 (27.3)
Bamlanivimab	4/11 (36.4)
Bamlanivimab + etesivimab	3/11 (27.3)
Not specified	1/11 (9.0)
- **Antibiotics**	125/265 (47.0)
- **Other therapeutics**[3]	25/265 (9.4)
- **Chemotherapy**	47/265 (17.7)
Anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies[4]	35/47 (74.5)
CAR-T	3/47 (6.4)
Others	9/47 (19.1)
- **Immunosuppressive agents**[5]	11/265 (4.1)

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; ICU, intensive care unit; HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplantation; MCVD, mixed collagen vascular disorder; IVIG, intravenous immunoglobulin; LMWH, low molecular weight heparin; Chimeric Antigen Receptor T-cell therapies; PHLH, primary hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis.

[1]Data available in 40 patients.

[2]Data available in 27 patients.

[3]Including protease inhibitors, antivirals, anti-IL-1 and anti-IL-6 drugs.

[4]Rituximab or obinutuzumab.

[5]Azathioprine, tacrolimus, methotrexate, mycophenolate, infliximab.

Table 4

COVID-19 convalescent plasma treatment-related data in 265 individual patients.

Parameters	Information available for no. patients	Results
CCP transfused units, mean (±SD; range) [1]	153	2.3 (±1.7; 1-11)
CCP total transfused volume (ml)[2]	126	460 (±372.0; 200-1800)
Days between symptom onset and CCP therapy, median (range)[3]	188	17 (1-132)
Days between hospital admission and CCP therapy, median (range)[4]	101	11 (0-120)
Post-CCP rapid improvement in oxygen supplementation (≤ 5 days), n (%)	114	64/114 (56.1)

Table 5

Mortality under different levels of CCP treatment, as total volume from <= 200 ml to >1800 ml. Seven death events (5.56%) were observed on 125 patients with available CCP total volume information.

Total Volume	Mortality	Patients
<= 200	0	19
>200-400	3	43
>400-600	4	29
>600-800	0	12
>800-1000	0	12
>1000-1200	0	1
>1200-1400	0	0
>1400-1600	0	4
>1600-1800	0	4
>1800	0	1
Total	7	125

Table 6

Logistic regression, table of coefficients. Mortality was the dependent variable, CCP total volume was the predictor. The CCP total volume was expressed in units of 100 ml ("totvol100"). Number of obs = 125, log likelihood = -26.896492, LR chi2(1) = 0.28, P = 0.5994, Pseudo R2 = 0.0051.

Mortality	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P	95% conf. interval	
totvol100	-0.0551	0.1156	-0.48	0.634	-0.2818	0.1716
_cons	-2.5370	0.6998	-3.63	0.000	-3.9086	-1.1654

References

1. Mahase E. Covid-19: WHO declares pandemic because of "alarming levels" of spread, severity, and inaction. Bmj 2020;368:m1036. (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m1036.
2. Peeri NC, Shrestha N, Rahman MS, et al. The SARS, MERS and novel coronavirus (COVID-19) epidemics, the newest and biggest global health threats: what lessons have we learned? International journal of epidemiology 2020;49(3):717-726. (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/ije/dyaa033.
3. World Health Organization (WHO). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Accessed July 10, 2022. Available at: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019.
4. WHO. Therapeutics and COVID-19: living guideline. Accessed online at https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-therapeutics-2022.4 on August 1, 2022.
5. Casadevall A, Pirofski L-a. The convalescent sera option for containing COVID-19. The Journal of clinical investigation 2020;130(4). DOI: 10.1172/JCI138003.
6. Franchini M, Focosi D, Corsini F, Cruciani M. Safety and efficacy of convalescent plasma in COVID-19: an overview of systematic reviews. Diagnostics 2021;11(9):1663. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics11091663.
7. Franchini M, Liumbruno GM, Piacentini G, Glingani C, Zaffanello M. The Three Pillars of COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Therapy. Life (Basel, Switzerland) 2021;11(4) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/life11040354.
8. Focosi D, Franchini M. COVID-19 convalescent plasma therapy: hit fast, hit hard! . Vox sanguinis 2021.
9. Focosi D, Franchini M, Pirofski LA, et al. COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma and Clinical Trials: Understanding Conflicting Outcomes. Clinical microbiology reviews 2022:e0020021. (In eng). DOI: 10.1128/cmr.00200-21.
10. Focosi D, McConnell S, Casadevall A, Cappello E, Valdiserra G, Tuccori M. Monoclonal antibody therapies against SARS-CoV-2. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2022;22:S1473-3099:00311-5. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00311-5.
11. Focosi D, Franchini M. Potential use of convalescent plasma for SARS-CoV-2 prophylaxis and treatment in immunocompromised and vulnerable populations. Expert review of vaccines 2021:1-8. (In eng). DOI: 10.1080/14760584.2021.1932475.
12. Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Ford SK, et al. Use of convalescent plasma in COVID-19 patients with immunosuppression. Transfusion 2021;61(8):2503-2511. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/trf.16525.
13. Khoury E, Nevitt S, Madsen WR, Turtle L, Davies G, Palmieri C. Differences in Outcomes and Factors Associated With Mortality Among Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Cancer Compared With Those Without Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5(5):e2210880. (In eng). DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.10880.
14. US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Clinical memorandum Re: EUA 26382. Product: COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma. Issued on December 27, 2021 at https://www.fda.gov/media/141477/download.
15. A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical research. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20(8):e192-e197. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30483-7.
16. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. Bmj 2016;355:i4919. (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.i4919.
17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Bmj 2003;327(7414):557-60. (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.
18. Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Higgins JP, Vist GE, Glasziou P, Guyatt GH. Chapter 11: Presenting results and 'Summary of findings' tables. In: Higgins JP, Green S, editor(s). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

19. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann HJ. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? Bmj 2008;336(7651):995-8. (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.39490.551019.BE.
20. Bar K, Shaw P, Choi G, et al. A Randomized, Controlled Study of Convalescent Plasma for Individuals Hospitalized with COVID-19 Pneumonia. The Journal of clinical investigation 2021;131(24):e155114. DOI: 10.1172/JCI155114.
21. Müller-Tidow C, Janssen M, Schäkel U, et al. A randomized controlled clinical trial demonstrates that plam from convalescent and vaccinated donors improves outcome o COVID-19 in patients with hematological disease, cancer or immunosuppression. European Hematology Association. Vienna2022.
22. Lacombe K, Hueso T, Porcher R, et al. Efficacy and safety of convalescent plasma to treat hospitalised COVID-19 patients with or without underlying immunodeficiency: a randomized clinical trial. 2022:2022.08.09.22278329. DOI: 10.1101/2022.08.09.22278329 %J medRxiv.
23. Biernat MM, Kolasińska A, Kwiatkowski J, et al. Early Administration of Convalescent Plasma Improves Survival in Patients with Hematological Malignancies and COVID-19. Viruses 2021;13(3) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/v13030436.
24. Cristelli MP, Junior DML, Viana LA, et al. Efficacy of Convalescent Plasma to Treat Mild to Moderate COVID-19 in Kidney Transplant Patients: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis. Transplantation 2021 (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/tp.0000000000003962.
25. Thompson MA, Henderson JP, Shah PK, et al. Association of Convalescent Plasma Therapy With Survival in Patients With Hematologic Cancers and COVID-19. JAMA oncology 2021 (In eng). DOI: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.1799.
26. Hueso T, Godron AS, Lanoy E, et al. Convalescent plasma improves overall survival in patients with B-cell lymphoid malignancy and COVID-19: a longitudinal cohort and propensity score analysis. Leukemia 2022;36(4):1025-1034. (In eng). DOI: 10.1038/s41375-022-01511-6.
27. Lanza F, Monaco F, Ciceri F, et al. Lack of efficacy of convalescent plasma in COVID-19 patients with concomitannt hematological malignancies : an Italian retrospective study. Hematological oncology 2022 (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/hon.3060.
28. Gharbharan A, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Jordans CCE, et al. Effects of treatment of COVID-19 with convalescent plasma in 25 B-cell depleted patients. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021 (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciab647.
29. Greenbaum U, Klein K, Martinez F, et al. High levels of common cold coronavirus antibodies in convalescent plasma are associated with improved survival in COVID-19 patients. Frontiers in immunology 2021:675-679. (https://www.medrxiv.org/content/medrxiv/early/2021/03/10/2021.03.08.21252775.full.pdf).
30. Betrains A, Godinas L, Woei AJF, et al. Convalescent plasma treatment of persistent severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection in patients with lymphoma with impaired humoral immunity and lack of neutralising antibodies. British journal of haematology 2021;192(6):1100-1105. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/bjh.17266.
31. Jasuja S, Sagar G, Bahl A, Verma S. COVID-19 Infection Clinical Profile, Management, Outcome, and Antibody Response in Kidney Transplant Recipients: A Single Centre Experience. International journal of nephrology 2021;2021:3129411. (In eng). DOI: 10.1155/2021/3129411.
32. Jeyaraman P, Agrawal N, Bhargava R, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy for severe Covid-19 in patients with hematological malignancies. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2021:103075. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2021.103075.
33. Levy I, Lavi A, Zimran E, et al. COVID-19 among patients with hematological malignancies: a national Israeli retrospective analysis with special emphasis on treatment and outcome. Leukemia & lymphoma 2021;62(14):3384-3393. (In eng). DOI: 10.1080/10428194.2021.1966782.
34. Ljungquist O, Lundgren M, Iliachenko E, et al. Convalescent plasma treatment in severely immunosuppressed patients hospitalized with COVID-19: an observational study of 28 cases. Infectious diseases (London, England) 2021:1-9. (In eng). DOI: 10.1080/23744235.2021.2013528.

35. Magyari F, Pinczés LI, Páyer E, et al. Early administration of remdesivir plus convalescent plasma therapy is effective to treat COVID-19 pneumonia in B-cell depleted patients with hematological malignancies. Annals of hematology 2022:1-9. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s00277-022-04924-6.
36. Tremblay D, Seah C, Schneider T, et al. Convalescent Plasma for the Treatment of Severe COVID-19 Infection in Cancer Patients. Cancer medicine 2020;9(22):8571-8578. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/cam4.3457.
37. Rodionov RN, Biener A, Spieth P, et al. Potential benefit of convalescent plasma transfusions in immunocompromised patients with COVID-19. The Lancet Microbe 2021;2(4):e138. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/s2666-5247(21)00030-6.
38. Sait AS, Chiang TP, Marr KA, et al. Outcomes of SOT Recipients With COVID-19 in Different Eras of COVID-19 Therapeutics. Transplantation direct 2022;8(1):e1268. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/txd.0000000000001268.
39. Weinbergerova B, Mayer J, Kabut T, et al. Successful early treatment combining remdesivir with high-titer convalescent plasma among COVID-19-infected hematological patients. Hematological oncology 2021;39(5):715-720. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/hon.2908.
40. Hueso T, Pouderoux C, Péré H, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy for B-cell-depleted patients with protracted COVID-19. Blood 2020;136(20):2290-2295. (In eng). DOI: 10.1182/blood.2020008423.
41. Abid MB, Chhabra S, Buchan B, et al. Bronchoalveolar lavage-based COVID-19 testing in patients with cancer. Hematology/oncology and stem cell therapy 2021;14(1):65-70. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.hemonc.2020.09.002.
42. Adedoyin O, Brijmohan S, Lavine R, Lisung FG. Undetectable SARS-CoV-2 active adaptive immunity-post-vaccination or post-COVID-19 severe disease-after immunosuppressants use. BMJ case reports 2021;14(11) (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bcr-2021-246308.
43. Antony SJ, Singh J, de Jesus M, Lance J. Early use of tocilizumab in respiratory failure associated with acute COVID -19 pneumonia in recipients with solid organ transplantation. IDCases 2020;21:e00888. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.idcr.2020.e00888.
44. Avanzato VA, Matson MJ, Seifert SN, et al. Case Study: Prolonged Infectious SARS-CoV-2 Shedding from an Asymptomatic Immunocompromised Individual with Cancer. Cell 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.10.049.
45. Bakhsh A, AlSaeed M, Ibrahim MA, et al. Recovery From COVID-19 Pneumonia in a Heart Transplant Recipient: A Case Report. Infectious diseases in clinical practice (Baltimore, Md) 2021;29(6):e401-e403. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/ipc.0000000000001004.
46. Balashov D, Trakhtman P, Livshits A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 convalescent plasma therapy in pediatric patient after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2020:102983. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2020.102983.
47. Basheer M, Saad E, Laskar O, et al. Clearance of the SARS-CoV-2 Virus in an Immunocompromised Patient Mediated by Convalescent Plasma without B-Cell Recovery. International journal of molecular sciences 2021;22(16) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/ijms22168902.
48. Bayrak M, Çadirci K. Successful pulsed methylprednisolone and convalescent plasma treatment in a case of a renal transplant recipient with COVID-19 positive pneumonia: a case report. The Pan African medical journal 2021;38:273. (In eng). DOI: 10.11604/pamj.2021.38.273.28577.
49. Bošnjak B, Odak I, Ritter C, et al. Case Report: Convalescent Plasma Therapy Induced Anti-SARS-CoV-2 T Cell Expansion, NK Cell Maturation and Virus Clearance in a B Cell Deficient Patient After CD19 CAR T Cell Therapy. Frontiers in immunology 2021;12:721738. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.721738.
50. Bronstein Y, Adler A, Katash H, Halutz O, Herishanu Y, Levytskyi K. Evolution of spike mutations following antibody treatment in two immunocompromised patients with persistent COVID-19 infection. Journal of medical virology 2022;94(3):1241-1245. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/jmv.27445.
51. Bruiners N, Guerrini V, Ukey R, et al. Biologic correlates of beneficial convalescent plasma therapy in a COVID-19 patient reveal disease resolution mechanisms. medRxiv 2022 (In eng). DOI: 10.1101/2022.02.03.22269612.

52. Casarola G, D'Abbondanza M, Curcio R, et al. Efficacy of convalescent plasma therapy in immunocompromised patients with COVID-19: A case report. Clinical infection in practice 2021;12:100096. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.clinpr.2021.100096.
53. Chen L, Zody MC, Mediavilla JR, et al. Emergence of multiple SARS-CoV-2 antibody escape variants in an immunocompromised host undergoing convalescent plasma treatment. mSphere 2021;6(4):e0048021. DOI: 10.1128/mSphere.00480-21.
54. Choudhury A, Reddy GS, Venishetty S, et al. COVID-19 in Liver Transplant Recipients - A Series with Successful Recovery. Journal of clinical and translational hepatology 2020;8(4):467-473. (In eng). DOI: 10.14218/jcth.2020.00061.
55. Christensen J, Kumar D, Moinuddin I, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Viremia, Serologies, and Clinical Course in a Case Series of Transplant Recipients. Transplantation proceedings 2020;52(9):2637-2641. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2020.08.042.
56. Çınar OE, Sayınalp B, Aladağ Karakulak E, et al. Convalescent (immune) plasma treatment in a myelodysplastic COVID-19 patient with disseminated tuberculosis. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2020;59(5):102821. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2020.102821.
57. Clark E, Guilpain P, Filip IL, et al. Convalescent plasma for persisting COVID-19 following therapeutic lymphocyte depletion: a report of rapid recovery. British journal of haematology 2020;190(3):e154-e156. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/bjh.16981.
58. Colombo D, Gatti A, Alabardi P, et al. COVID-19-Associated Pneumonia in a B-Cell-Depleted Patient With Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma: Recovery With Hyperimmune Plasma. Journal of hematology 2022;11(2):77-80. (In eng). DOI: 10.14740/jh845.
59. Cusi MG, Conticini E, Gandolfo C, et al. Hyperimmune plasma in three immuno-deficient patients affected by non-severe, prolonged COVID-19: a single-center experience. BMC Infect Dis 2021;21(1):630. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s12879-021-06321-2.
60. D'Abramo A, Vita S, Maffongelli G, et al. Clinical Management of Patients With B-Cell Depletion Agents to Treat or Prevent Prolonged and Severe SARS-COV-2 Infection: Defining a Treatment Pathway. Frontiers in immunology 2022;13:911339. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.911339.
61. Dale M, Sogawa H, Seyedsaadat SM, et al. Successful Management of COVID-19 Infection in 2 Early Post-Liver Transplant Recipients. Transplantation proceedings 2021;53(4):1175-1179. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2021.03.010.
62. Delgado-Fernández M, García-Gemar GM, Fuentes-López A, et al. Treatment of COVID-19 with convalescent plasma in patients with humoral immunodeficiency - Three consecutive cases and review of the literature. Enfermedades infecciosas y microbiologia clinica (English ed) 2021 (In eng spa). DOI: 10.1016/j.eimc.2021.01.013.
63. Dell'Isola GB, Felicioni M, Ferraro L, et al. Case Report: Remdesivir and Convalescent Plasma in a Newly Acute B Lymphoblastic Leukemia Diagnosis With Concomitant Sars-CoV-2 Infection. Frontiers in pediatrics 2021;9:712603. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fped.2021.712603.
64. Deveci B, Saba R. Prolonged viral positivity induced recurrent coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pneumonia in patients receiving anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody treatment: Case reports. Medicine 2021;100(52):e28470. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/md.0000000000028470.
65. Di Palma M, Gentilini E, Masucci C, et al. Management of Relapsed/Refractory All with Inotuzumab During COVID-19. A Case Report. Mediterranean journal of hematology and infectious diseases 2022;14(1):e2022043. (In eng). DOI: 10.4084/mjhid.2022.043.
66. Erber J, Wiessner JR, Huberle C, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy in B-cell-depleted and B-cell sufficient patients with life-threatening COVID-19 - A case series. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2021;60(6):103278. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2021.103278.
67. Ferrari S, Caprioli C, Weber A, Rambaldi A, Lussana F. Convalescent hyperimmune plasma for chemo-immunotherapy induced immunodeficiency in COVID-19 patients with hematological malignancies. Leukemia & lymphoma 2021;62(6):1490-1496. (In eng). DOI: 10.1080/10428194.2021.1872070.

68. Fung M, Nambiar A, Pandey S, et al. Treatment of immunocompromised COVID-19 patients with convalescent plasma. Transplant infectious disease : an official journal of the Transplantation Society 2021;23(2):e13477. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/tid.13477.
69. Furlan A, Forner G, Cipriani L, et al. Dramatic Response to Convalescent Hyperimmune Plasma in Association With an Extended Course of Remdesivir in 4 B Cell-Depleted Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma Patients With SARS-Cov-2 Pneumonia After Rituximab Therapy. Clinical lymphoma, myeloma & leukemia 2021;21(9):e731-e735. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.clml.2021.05.013.
70. Gattuso G, Schiavello E, Oltolini C, et al. Prolonged COVID-19 infection in a child with lymphoblastic non-Hodgkin lymphoma: which is the best management? Tumori 2021:3008916211067825. (In eng). DOI: 10.1177/03008916211067825.
71. Gordon O, Brosnan MK, Yoon S, et al. Pharmacokinetics of high-titer anti-SARS-CoV-2 human convalescent plasma in high-risk children. JCI insight 2022;7(2) (In eng). DOI: 10.1172/jci.insight.151518.
72. Gupta A, Kute VB, Patel HV, et al. Feasibility of Convalescent Plasma Therapy in Kidney Transplant Recipients With Severe COVID-19: A Single-Center Prospective Cohort Study. Experimental and clinical transplantation : official journal of the Middle East Society for Organ Transplantation 2021;19(4):304-309. (In eng). DOI: 10.6002/ect.2020.0479.
73. Halfmann PJ, Minor NR, Haddock LA, et al. Evolution of a globally unique SARS-CoV-2 Spike E484T monoclonal antibody escape mutation in a persistently infected, immunocompromised individual. 2022:2022.04.11.22272784. DOI: 10.1101/2022.04.11.22272784 %J medRxiv.
74. Hanssen JLJ, Stienstra J, Boers SA, et al. Convalescent Plasma in a Patient with Protracted COVID-19 and Secondary Hypogammaglobulinemia Due to Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia: Buying Time to Develop Immunity? Infectious disease reports 2021;13(4):855-864. (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/idr13040077.
75. Hartman W, Hess A, Connor J. Use of COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma as Prophylaxis in a Patient with New Onset All. Clin Oncol Case Rep 2021;4.
76. Honjo K, Russell RM, Li R, et al. Convalescent plasma-mediated resolution of COVID-19 in a patient with humoral immunodeficiency. Cell reports Medicine 2021;2(1):100164. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100164.
77. Hovey JG, Tolbert D, Howell D. Burton's Agammaglobulinemia and COVID-19. Cureus 2020;12(11):e11701. (In eng). DOI: 10.7759/cureus.11701.
78. Hughes CM, Gregory GP, Pierce AB, et al. Clinical illness with viable severe acute respiratory coronavirus virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) virus presenting 72 days after infection in an immunocompromised patient. Infection control and hospital epidemiology 2022;43(6):820-822. (In eng). DOI: 10.1017/ice.2021.120.
79. Iaboni A, Wong N, Betschel SD. A Patient with X-Linked Agammaglobulinemia and COVID-19 Infection Treated with Remdesivir and Convalescent Plasma. Journal of clinical immunology 2021;41(5):923-925. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s10875-021-00983-y.
80. Jamir I, Lohia P, Pande RK, Setia R, Singhal AK, Chaudhary A. Convalescent plasma therapy and remdesivir duo successfully salvaged an early liver transplant recipient with severe COVID-19 pneumonia. Annals of hepato-biliary-pancreatic surgery 2020;24(4):526-532. (In eng). DOI: 10.14701/ahbps.2020.24.4.526.
81. Jassem J, Marek-Trzonkowska NM, Smiatacz T, et al. Successful Treatment of Persistent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a B-Cell Depleted Patient with Activated Cytotoxic T and NK Cells: A Case Report. International journal of molecular sciences 2021;22(20) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/ijms222010934.
82. Jiang J, Miao Y, Zhao Y, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy: Helpful treatment of COVID-19 in a kidney transplant recipient presenting with severe clinical manifestations and complex complications. Clinical transplantation 2020;34(9):e14025. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/ctr.14025.
83. Jin H, Reed JC, Liu STH, et al. Three patients with X-linked agammaglobulinemia hospitalized for COVID-19 improved with convalescent plasma. The journal of allergy and clinical immunology In practice 2020;8(10):3594-3596.e3. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.jaip.2020.08.059.

84. Karaolidou F, Loutsidi NE, Mellios Z, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy in an immunocompromised patient with multiple COVID-19 flares: a case report. Respirol Case Rep 2021;9(12):e0858. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/rcr2.858.
85. Karataş A, İnkaya A, Demiroğlu H, et al. Prolonged viral shedding in a lymphoma patient with COVID-19 infection receiving convalescent plasma. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2020;59(5):102871. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2020.102871.
86. Katz-Greenberg G, Yadav A, Gupta M, et al. Outcomes of COVID-19-positive kidney transplant recipients: A single-center experience. Clinical nephrology 2020;94(6):318-321. (In eng). DOI: 10.5414/cn110311.
87. Keitel V, Bode JG, Feldt T, et al. Case Report: Convalescent Plasma Achieves SARS-CoV-2 Viral Clearance in a Patient With Persistently High Viral Replication Over 8 Weeks Due to Severe Combined Immunodeficiency (SCID) and Graft Failure. Frontiers in immunology 2021;12:645989. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.645989.
88. Kemp SA, Collier DA, Datir RP, et al. SARS-CoV-2 evolution during treatment of chronic infection. Nature 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-03291-y.
89. Kenig A, Ishay Y, Kharouf F, Rubin L. Treatment of B-cell depleted COVID-19 patients with convalescent plasma and plasma-based products. Clinical immunology (Orlando, Fla) 2021:108723. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.clim.2021.108723.
90. Ketels T, Gisolf J, Claassen M, et al. Short Communication: Prolonged COVID-19 Infection in a Patient with Newly Diagnosed HIV/AIDS. AIDS research and human retroviruses 2022;38(5):399-400. (In eng). DOI: 10.1089/aid.2021.0145.
91. Khan AM, Ajmal Z, Raval M, Tobin E. Concurrent Diagnosis of Acute Myeloid Leukemia and COVID-19: A Management Challenge. Cureus 2020;12(8):e9629. (In eng). DOI: 10.7759/cureus.9629.
92. Khatamzas E, Rehn A, Muenchhoff M, et al. Emergence of multiple SARS-CoV-2 mutations in an immunocompromised host. 2021:2021.01.10.20248871. DOI: 10.1101/2021.01.10.20248871 %J medRxiv.
93. Khatri A, Chang KM, Berlinrut I, Wallach F. Mucormycosis after Coronavirus disease 2019 infection in a heart transplant recipient - Case report and review of literature. Journal de mycologie medicale 2021;31(2):101125. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.mycmed.2021.101125.
94. Kluger MA, Czogalla J, Schmidt-Lauber C, et al. Convalescent plasma treatment for early post-kidney transplant acquired COVID-19. Transplant infectious disease : an official journal of the Transplantation Society 2021;23(4):e13685. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/tid.13685.
95. Kremer AE, Kremer AN, Willam C, et al. Successful treatment of COVID-19 infection with convalescent plasma in B-cell-depleted patients may promote cellular immunity. European journal of immunology 2021;51(10):2478-2484. (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/eji.202149277.
96. Lancman G, Mascarenhas J, Bar-Natan M. Severe COVID-19 virus reactivation following treatment for B cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Journal of hematology & oncology 2020;13(1):131. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s13045-020-00968-1.
97. Lang-Meli J, Fuchs J, Mathé P, et al. Case Series: Convalescent Plasma Therapy for Patients with COVID-19 and Primary Antibody Deficiency. Journal of clinical immunology 2022;42(2):253-265. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s10875-021-01193-2.
98. Lazzari L, Oltolini C, Ciceri F, Giglio F. Complicated and persistent severe COVID-19 pneumonia in a recipient of allogeneic haematopoietic stem cell transplant. BMJ case reports 2021;14(10) (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bcr-2021-245992.
99. Lemus HN, Alkayyali M, Kim E, Cunnigham-Rundles C, Pyburn D, Abrams R. Acute Cerebellitis and Myeloradiculitis Associated With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Common Variable Immunodeficiency-A Case Report. The Neurohospitalist 2022;12(2):361-365. (In eng). DOI: 10.1177/19418744211050215.
100. Lima B, Gibson GT, Vullaganti S, et al. COVID-19 in recent heart transplant recipients: Clinicopathologic features and early outcomes. Transplant infectious disease : an official journal of the Transplantation Society 2020;22(5):e13382. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/tid.13382.

101. Lindemann M, Krawczyk A, Dolff S, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in renal transplant and haemodialysis patients treated with convalescent plasma. 2020:2020.12.09.20239673. DOI: 10.1101/2020.12.09.20239673 %J medRxiv.
102. London J, Boutboul D, Lacombe K, et al. Severe COVID-19 in Patients with B Cell Alymphocytosis and Response to Convalescent Plasma Therapy. Journal of clinical immunology 2020:1-6. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s10875-020-00904-5.
103. Lubnow M, Schmidt B, Fleck M, et al. Secondary hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis and severe liver injury induced by hepatic SARS-CoV-2 infection unmasking Wilson's disease: Balancing immunosuppression. International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases 2021;103:624-627. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.12.047.
104. Luetkens T, Metcalf R, Planelles V, et al. Successful transfer of anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunity using convalescent plasma in an MM patient with hypogammaglobulinemia and COVID-19. Blood advances 2020;4(19):4864-4868. (In eng). DOI: 10.1182/bloodadvances.2020002595.
105. Madariaga MLL, Guthmiller JJ, Schrantz S, et al. Clinical predictors of donor antibody titre and correlation with recipient antibody response in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma clinical trial. (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/joim.13185).
106. Martens T, Hens L, De Pauw M, Van Belleghem Y. Heart Transplantation Complicated by COVID-19 Infection. The Annals of thoracic surgery 2022;113(4):e267-e269. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2021.07.003.
107. Martínez-Barranco P, García-Roa M, Trelles-Martínez R, et al. Management of Persistent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Patients with Follicular Lymphoma. Acta haematologica 2021 (In eng). DOI: 10.1159/000521121.
108. Martínez-Chinchilla C, Vazquez-Montero L, Palazón-Carrión N, et al. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Severely Immunocompromised Patients With Complete Remission B-Cell Lymphoma and Anti-CD20 Monoclonal Antibody Therapy: A Case Report of Two Cases. Frontiers in immunology 2022;13:860891. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.860891.
109. Martinot M, Jary A, Fafi-Kremer S, et al. Emerging RNA-Dependent RNA Polymerase Mutation in a Remdesivir-Treated B-cell Immunodeficient Patient With Protracted Coronavirus Disease 2019. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America 2021;73(7):e1762-e1765. (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1474.
110. Mehta SA, Rana MM, Motter JD, et al. Incidence and Outcomes of COVID-19 in Kidney and Liver Transplant Recipients With HIV: Report From the National HOPE in Action Consortium. Transplantation 2021;105(1):216-224. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/tp.0000000000003527.
111. Mendes-Correa MC, Vilas-Boas LSS, Bierrenbach AL, et al. Individuals who were mildly symptomatic following infection with SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.28 have neutralizing antibodies to the P.1 variant. 2021:2021.05.11.21256908. DOI: 10.1101/2021.05.11.21256908 %J medRxiv.
112. Milošević I, Jovanović J, Stevanovic O. Atypical course of COVID-19 in patient with Bruton agammaglobulinemia. Journal of infection in developing countries 2020;14(11):1248-1251. (In eng). DOI: 10.3855/jidc.13840.
113. Mira E, Yarce OA, Ortega C, et al. Rapid recovery of a SARS-CoV-2-infected X-linked agammaglobulinemia patient after infusion of COVID-19 convalescent plasma. The journal of allergy and clinical immunology In practice 2020;8(8):2793-2795. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.jaip.2020.06.046.
114. Mohseni M, Albus M, Kaminski A, Harrison MF. A Case of COVID-19 Re-Infection in a Liver Transplant Patient. Cureus 2021;13(5):e14916. (In eng). DOI: 10.7759/cureus.14916.
115. Monrad I, Sahlertz SR, Nielsen SSF, et al. Persistent Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection in Immunocompromised Host Displaying Treatment Induced Viral Evolution. Open forum infectious diseases 2021;8(7):ofab295. (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofab295.
116. Moore JL, Ganapathiraju PV, Kurtz CP, Wainscoat B. A 63-Year-Old Woman with a History of Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma with Persistent SARS-CoV-2 Infection Who Was Seronegative and Treated with

Convalescent Plasma. The American journal of case reports 2020;21:e927812. (In eng). DOI: 10.12659/ajcr.927812.
117. Moutinho-Pereira S, Calisto R, Sabio F, Guerreiro L. High-titre convalescent plasma therapy for an immunocompromised patient with systemic lupus erythematosus with protracted SARS-CoV-2 infection. BMJ case reports 2021;14(8) (In eng). DOI: 10.1136/bcr-2021-244853.
118. Naeem S, Gohh R, Bayliss G, et al. Successful recovery from COVID-19 in three kidney transplant recipients who received convalescent plasma therapy. Transplant infectious disease : an official journal of the Transplantation Society 2020:e13451. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/tid.13451.
119. Nguyen MC, Lee EJ, Avery RK, et al. Transplant of SARS-CoV-2-infected Living Donor Liver: Case Report. Transplantation direct 2021;7(8):e721. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/txd.0000000000001178.
120. Niu A, McDougal A, Ning B, et al. COVID-19 in allogeneic stem cell transplant: high false-negative probability and role of CRISPR and convalescent plasma. Bone marrow transplantation 2020:1-3. (In eng). DOI: 10.1038/s41409-020-0972-8.
121. Nussenblatt V, Roder A, Das S, et al. Year-long COVID-19 infection reveals within-host evolution of SARS-CoV-2 in a patient with B cell depletion. 2021:2021.10.02.21264267. DOI: 10.1101/2021.10.02.21264267 %J medRxiv.
122. Nyström K, Hjorth M, Fust R, et al. Specific T-cell responses for guiding treatment with convalescent plasma in severe COVID-19 and humoral immunodeficiency: a case report. BMC Infect Dis 2022;22(1):362. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s12879-022-07323-4.
123. Oliva A, Cancelli F, Brogi A, et al. Convalescent plasma for haematological patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia and severe depletion of B-cell lymphocytes following anti-CD20 therapy: a single-centre experience and review of the literature. The new microbiologica 2022;45(1):62-72. (In eng).
124. Ordaya EE, Abu Saleh OM, Stubbs JR, Joyner MJ. Vax-Plasma in Patients With Refractory COVID-19. Mayo Clin Proc 2022;97(1):186-189. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2021.11.001.
125. Ormazabal Vélez I, Induráin Bermejo J, Espinoza Pérez J, Imaz Aguayo L, Delgado Ruiz M, García-Erce JA. Two patients with rituximab associated low gammaglobulin levels and relapsed covid-19 infections treated with convalescent plasma. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2021;60(3):103104. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2021.103104.
126. Pommeret F, Colomba J, Bigenwald C, et al. Bamlanivimab+ etesevimab therapy induces SARS-CoV-2 immune escape mutations and secondary clinical deterioration in COVID-19 patients with B-cell malignancies. Annals of Oncology 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.annonc.2021.07.015.
127. Prasad RM, Srivastava S, Wang E, et al. Effect of Immunosuppressive Diseases and Rituximab Infusions on Allowing COVID-19 Infection to Relapse. The Permanente journal 2021;26(1):123-131. (In eng). DOI: 10.7812/tpp/21.035.
128. Rüfenacht S, Gantenbein P, Boggian K, et al. Remdesivir in Coronavirus Disease 2019 patients treated with anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies: a case series. Infection 2022;50(3):783-790. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s15010-022-01821-y.
129. Ribeiro LC, Benites BD, Ulaf RG, et al. Rapid clinical recovery of a SARS-CoV-2 infected common variable immunodeficiency patient following the infusion of COVID-19 convalescent plasma. Allergy, asthma, and clinical immunology : official journal of the Canadian Society of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 2021;17(1):14. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s13223-021-00518-5.
130. Rnjak D, Ravlić S, Šola AM, et al. COVID-19 convalescent plasma as long-term therapy in immunodeficient patients? Transfusion clinique et biologique : journal de la Societe francaise de transfusion sanguine 2021;28(3):264-270. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.tracli.2021.04.004.
131. Rodriguez JA, Bonnano C, Khatiwada P, Roa AA, Mayer D, Eckardt PA. COVID-19 Coinfection with Mycobacterium abscessus in a Patient with Multiple Myeloma. Case reports in infectious diseases 2021;2021:8840536. (In eng). DOI: 10.1155/2021/8840536.
132. Rodriguez-Pla A, Vikram HR, Khalid V, Wesselius LJ. COVID-19 pneumonia in a patient with granulomatosis with polyangiitis on rituximab: case-based review. Rheumatology international 2021;41(8):1509-1514. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s00296-021-04905-4.

133. Schenker C, Hirzel C, Walti LN, et al. Convalescent plasma and remdesivir for protracted COVID-19 in a patient with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia: a case report of late relapse after rapid initial response. British journal of haematology 2022;196(3):e27-e29. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/bjh.17806.
134. Schreiber A, Elango K, Hong K, Ahsan C. Cardiac transplant recipient with COVID-19 induced acute hypoxic respiratory failure: a case report. European heart journal Case reports 2021;5(6):ytab217. (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/ehjcr/ytab217.
135. Sepulcri C, Dentone C, Mikulska M, et al. The longest persistence of viable SARS-CoV-2 with recurrence of viremia and relapsing symptomatic COVID-19 in an immunocompromised patient – a case study. Open forum infectious diseases 2021;ofab217:2021.01.23.21249554. DOI: 10.1101/2021.01.23.21249554 %J medRxiv.
136. Shankar R, Radhakrishnan N, Dua S, et al. Convalescent plasma to aid in recovery of COVID-19 pneumonia in a child with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Transfusion and apheresis science : official journal of the World Apheresis Association : official journal of the European Society for Haemapheresis 2021;60(1):102956. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transci.2020.102956.
137. Spinicci M, Mazzoni A, Borchi B, et al. AIDS patient with severe T cell depletion achieved control but not clearance of SARS-CoV-2 infection.n/a(n/a). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.202149574.
138. Steiner S, Schwarz T, Corman VM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 T Cell Response in Severe and Fatal COVID-19 in Primary Antibody Deficiency Patients Without Specific Humoral Immunity. Frontiers in immunology 2022;13:840126. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.840126.
139. Szwebel TA, Veyer D, Robillard N, et al. Usefulness of Plasma SARS-CoV-2 RNA Quantification by Droplet-based Digital PCR to Monitor Treatment Against COVID-19 in a B-cell Lymphoma Patient. Stem Cell Rev Rep 2021;17(1):296-299. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s12015-020-10107-5.
140. Taha Y, Wardle H, Evans AB, et al. Persistent SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with secondary antibody deficiency: successful clearance following combination casirivimab and imdevimab (REGN-COV2) monoclonal antibody therapy. Annals of clinical microbiology and antimicrobials 2021;20(1):85. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s12941-021-00491-2.
141. Trimarchi H, Gianserra R, Lampo M, Monkowski M, Lodolo J. Eculizumab, SARS-CoV-2 and atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. Clinical kidney journal 2020;13(5):739-741. (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/ckj/sfaa166.
142. Van Damme KFA, Tavernier S, Van Roy N, et al. Case Report: Convalescent Plasma, a Targeted Therapy for Patients with CVID and Severe COVID-19. Frontiers in immunology 2020;11:596761. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.596761.
143. van Oers NSC, Hanners NW, Sue PK, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with hepatitis in an infant with X-linked severe combined immunodeficiency. Clinical immunology (Orlando, Fla) 2021;224:108662. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.clim.2020.108662.
144. Wright Z, Bersabe A, Eden R, Cap A. Successful Use of COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma in a Patient Recently Treated for Follicular Lymphoma. Clinical lymphoma, myeloma & leukemia 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.clml.2020.06.012.
145. Ye M, Fu D, Ren Y, et al. Treatment with convalescent plasma for COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China. Journal of medical virology 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.1002/jmv.25882.
146. Zhang LB, Pang RR, Qiao QH, et al. Successful recovery of COVID-19-associated recurrent diarrhea and gastrointestinal hemorrhage using convalescent plasma. Military Medical Research 2020;7(1):45. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s40779-020-00273-5.
147. Zhang LL, Liu Y, Guo YG, et al. Convalescent Plasma Rescued a Severe COVID-19 Patient with Chronic Myeloid Leukemia Blast Crisis and Myelofibrosis. Turkish journal of haematology : official journal of Turkish Society of Haematology 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.4274/tjh.galenos.2020.2020.0400.
148. Zimmerli A, Monti M, Fenwick C, et al. Case Report: Stepwise Anti-Inflammatory and Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Effects Following Convalescent Plasma Therapy With Full Clinical Recovery. Frontiers in immunology 2021;12:613502. (In eng). DOI: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.613502.
149. Zimmermann J, Glueck OM, Fertmann JM, et al. COVID-19 in Recent Lung Transplant Recipients: Clinical Outcomes and Management Strategies. Transplantation proceedings 2022 (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2021.12.014.

150. Franchini M, Focosi D, Percivalle E, et al. Variant of Concern-Matched COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Usage in Seronegative Hospitalized Patients. Viruses 2022;14(7) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/v14071443.
151. Belcari G, Conti A, Mazzoni A, Lanza M, Mazzetti P, Focosi D. Clinical and Virological Response to Convalescent Plasma in a Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia Patient with COVID-19 Pneumonia. Life (Basel, Switzerland) 2022;12(7) (In eng). DOI: 10.3390/life12071098.
152. Baang JH, Smith C, Mirabelli C, et al. Prolonged SARS-CoV-2 replication in an immunocompromised patient. J Infect Dis 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa666.
153. McKemey E, Shields AM, Faustini SE, et al. Resolution of Persistent COVID-19 After Convalescent Plasma in a Patient with B Cell Aplasia. Journal of clinical immunology 2021;41(5):926-929. (In eng). DOI: 10.1007/s10875-021-00996-7.
154. Pal P, Ibrahim M, Niu A, et al. Safety and efficacy of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in severe pulmonary disease: A report of 17 patients. Transfusion medicine (Oxford, England) 2021;31(3):217-220. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/tme.12729.
155. Meyts I, Bucciol G, Quinti I, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 in patients with inborn errors of immunity: An international study. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology 2021;147(2):520-531. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.jaci.2020.09.010.
156. Buckland MS, Galloway JB, Fhogartaigh CN, et al. Treatment of COVID-19 with remdesivir in the absence of humoral immunity: a case report. Nat Commun 2020;11(1):6385. (In eng). DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-19761-2.
157. Hatzl S, Eisner F, Schilcher G, et al. Response to "COVID-19 in persons with haematological cancers". Leukemia 2020;34(8):2265-2270. (In eng). DOI: 10.1038/s41375-020-0914-x.
158. Reuken PA, Stallmach A, Pletz MW, et al. Severe clinical relapse in an immunocompromised host with persistent SARS-CoV-2 infection. Leukemia 2021;35(3):920-923. (In eng). DOI: 10.1038/s41375-021-01175-8.
159. Truong TT, Ryutov A, Pandey U, et al. Increased viral variants in children and young adults with impaired humoral immunity and persistent SARS-CoV-2 infection: A consecutive case series. EBioMedicine 2021;67:103355. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103355.
160. Wang B, Van Oekelen O, Mouhieddine TH, et al. A tertiary center experience of multiple myeloma patients with COVID-19: lessons learned and the path forward. Journal of hematology & oncology 2020;13(1):94. (In eng). DOI: 10.1186/s13045-020-00934-x.
161. Rahman F, Liu STH, Taimur S, et al. Treatment with convalescent plasma in solid organ transplant recipients with COVID-19: Experience at large transplant center in New York City. Clinical transplantation 2020:e14089. (In eng). DOI: 10.1111/ctr.14089.
162. Kutzler HL, Poulos CM, Cheema F, et al. COVID-19 in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients: Observations From Connecticut. Transplantation 2021;105(1):e6-e8. (In eng). DOI: 10.1097/tp.0000000000003495.
163. Malsy J, Veletzky L, Heide J, et al. Sustained response after remdesivir and convalescent plasma therapy in a B-cell depleted patient with protracted COVID-19. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America 2020 (In eng). DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1637.
164. Ho HE, Mathew S, Peluso MJ, Cunningham-Rundles C. Clinical outcomes and features of COVID-19 in patients with primary immunodeficiencies in New York City. The journal of allergy and clinical immunology In practice 2021;9(1):490-493.e2. (In eng). DOI: 10.1016/j.jaip.2020.09.052.
165. Cesaro S, Ljungman P, Mikulska M, et al. Recommendations for the management of COVID-19 in patients with haematological malignancies or haematopoietic cell transplantation, from the 2021 European Conference on Infections in Leukaemia (ECIL 9). Leukemia 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41375-022-01578-1.
166. IDSA Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19. Accessed online at https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/ on February 9, 2022.

167. Clinical Practice Guidelines from the Association for the Advancement of Blood and Biotherapies (AABB): COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma. Accessed online at https://www.aabb.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/regulatory/clinical-practice-guidelines-from-aabb-ccp.pdf?sfvrsn=e24ea825_0 on August 2, 2022.
168. Casadevall A, Pirofski LA, Joyner MJ. The Principles of Antibody Therapy for Infectious Diseases with Relevance for COVID-19. mBio 2021;12(2) (In eng). DOI: 10.1128/mBio.03372-20.
169. Mukhina OA, Fomina DS, Parshin VV, et al. SARS-CoV-2 evolution in a patient with secondary B-cell immunodeficiency: A clinical case. Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics 2022:2101334. (In eng). DOI: 10.1080/21645515.2022.2101334.
170. Focosi D, Tuccori M, Antonelli G, Maggi F. What is the optimal usage of Covid-19 convalescent plasma donations? Clin Microb Infect 2020;S1198-743X(20):30589-9.
171. Sample, I. Doctors treat first UK patient in Covid 'super donor 'blood trial. The Guardian. Accessed online at https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/jun/30/doctors-treat-first-uk-patient-covid-super-donor-blood-trial-antibodies on August 3, 2022.
172. Focosi D, Franchini M, Joyner MJ, Casadevall A, Sullivan DJ. Analysis of anti-Omicron neutralizing antibody titers in different convalescent plasma sources. 2021:2021.12.24.21268317v4. DOI: 10.1101/2021.12.24.21268317v4.