Impact of monoclonal antibody treatment on hospitalization and mortality among non-hospitalized adults with SARS-CoV-2 infection

Authors: J. Ryan Bariola MD¹, Erin K. McCreary PharmD¹, Richard J. Wadas MD², Kevin E. Kip PhD³, Oscar C. Marroquin MD³, Tami Minnier MSN, RN⁴, Stephen Koscumb BS³, Kevin Collins BS³, Mark Schmidhofer MD⁵, Judith A. Shovel BSN RN⁴, Mary Kay Wisniewski, MT MA COM⁴, Colleen Sullivan MHA⁶, Donald M. Yealy MD², David A Nace MD MPH⁷, David T. Huang MD MPH^{2,8,9}, Ghady Haidar MD¹, Tina Khadem PharmD¹, Kelsey Linstrum MS^{6,9}, Christopher W. Seymour MD MSc^{6,9}, Stephanie K. Montgomery MS^{6,9}, Derek C. Angus MD MPH FRCP^{6,8,9}, Graham M. Snyder MD SM¹

1. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
2. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
3. Clinical Analytics, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
4. Wolff Center, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
5. Division of Cardiology, Dept of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
6. UPMC Health System Office of Healthcare Innovation, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
7. Division of Geriatric Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
8. Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

9. Clinical Research Investigation and Systems Modeling of Acute Illness (CRISMA) Center,
Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine,
Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Corresponding Author:

Graham M. Snyder, MD SM

Address: 3601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 150, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Phone/Fax: 412-647-6718/412-692-2768

Email: snydergm3@upmc.edu

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, monoclonal antibodies, bamlanivimab, etesevimab,
casirivimab, imdevimab

ABSTRACT

Background: Monoclonal antibody (mAb) treatment may prevent complications of COVID-19.

We sought to quantify the impact of bamlanivimab monotherapy on hospitalizations and mortality, as well as Emergency Department (ED) visits without hospitalization, among outpatients at high risk of COVID-19 complications.

Methods: We compared patients receiving mAb to patients who met criteria but did not receive mAb from December 2020 through March 2021. The study population selection used propensity scores to match 1:1 by likelihood to receive mAb. The primary outcome was hospitalization or all-cause mortality within 28 days; the secondary outcome was hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization within 28 days. Odds ratios (OR) calculation used logistic regression modeling including propensity score and mAb receipt predictors.

Results: The study population included 234 patients receiving mAb and 234 matched comparator patients not receiving mAb. Patients receiving mAb were less likely to experience hospitalization or mortality (OR 0.31, 95% confidence interval [95%CI] 0.17-0.56, $p=0.00001$) and hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization (OR 0.50, 95%CI 0.43-0.83, $p=0.007$). The impact of mAb was more pronounced in prevention of hospitalization (among all age groups, OR 0.35, 95%CI 0.19-0.66, $p=0.001$) than mortality or ED visit without hospitalization, and most strongly associated with patients age 65 years and older (primary outcome OR 0.28, 95%CI 0.14-0.56, $p=0.0003$).

Conclusions: Bamlanivimab monotherapy was associated with reduction in the composite outcome of hospitalizations and mortality in patients with mild-moderate COVID-19. The benefit may be strongest in preventing hospitalization in patients ages 65 years or older.

INTRODUCTION

Monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) bind to the SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein and block viral entry into host cells, neutralizing the virus.¹⁻⁵ Between November 2020 and February 2021 four mAbs provided as three treatments received Food and Drug Administration Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for treatment of patients with mild to moderate COVID-19 within 10 days of symptom onset: bamlanivimab 700mg (LY-coV555; Eli Lilly), etesevimab 1,400mg (LY-CoV016; Eli Lilly), casirivimab 1,200mg (REGN10933; Regeneron), imdevimab 1,200mg (REGN10987). Several clinical trials currently evaluate mAbs for prevention or treatment of COVID-19; however, real-world data are limited, and the role of mAbs for patients with COVID-19 remains controversial.^{3, 5}

Use of mAb therapy is low in the United States despite widespread drug availability due to lack of robust efficacy data, operational challenges with outpatient infusions, and patient access issues.⁶ Our health system established a mAb program in November 2020 to decrease COVID-19-related complications for patients with mild-moderate illness and expand access to care for underserved patients with COVID-19. Initially, only bamlanivimab monotherapy was available; our evaluation and distribution process has been described elsewhere.⁷ This study quantifies the impact of bamlanivimab monotherapy on hospitalizations, mortality, and Emergency Department (ED) visits among outpatients at high risk of progressing to severe COVID-19. We also explored whether patient age, body mass index, and timing of infusions relative to initial diagnosis had any association with response to therapy.

METHODS

Study Setting

UPMC is a 40-hospital integrated academic healthcare system providing care principally within central and western Pennsylvania (USA). After the November 2020 EUA was granted for bamlanivimab, UPMC rapidly established 16 outpatient infusion centers across all served geographical areas. We also infused mAb at our UPMC Senior Communities (i.e., long-term care facilities), patient homes (via collaboration with a home infusion company), and behavioral health units. Physicians referred patients via outpatient and oncology electronic medical records (EMR) or paper order including non-UPMC providers. A centralized team with pharmacists and physicians reviewed orders daily to confirm EUA criteria; decentralized nursing teams then contacted and scheduled eligible patients for infusions. This study was approved by the UPMC Quality Improvement Review Committee (Project ID 2882 and Project ID 3116).

We used the EMR to access all key clinical data, including detailed sociodemographic and medical history data, diagnostic and clinical tests conducted, surgical and other treatment procedures performed, prescriptions ordered, and billing charges on all outpatient and in-hospital encounters, with diagnoses and procedures coded based on the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth and Tenth revisions (ICD-9 and ICD-10, respectively).

We linked the deidentified primary data sources using common variables within the UPMC data systems aggregated in its Clinical Data Warehouse that include: (i) *Medipac*, the admit, discharge and transfer registration and hospital-based billing system; (ii) *Cerner*, the inpatient EMR for relevant clinical information for bedded patients at a UPMC inpatient hospital; (iii) *Epic*, the UPMC EMR for ambulatory office visits owned by UPMC; and (iv) *Aria*, the EMR utilized in most ambulatory Cancer Centers at UPMC for both radiation oncology and medical oncology.⁸

Study Population

The study population was derived from patients who received bamlanivimab from December 9, 2020 to March 3, 2021. Patients were candidates for therapy based on criteria consistent with EUA criteria including: recently diagnosed mild to moderate COVID-19 (with a positive polymerase chain reaction or antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 virus within 10 days of the date the test was obtained); body mass at least 40 kg; age ≥ 65 years or age ≥ 12 years with a medical condition conferring high risk of COVID-19 progression to severe disease and/or hospitalization.⁹ Patients were included in the study population if they completed the mAb infusion and had attainment of one of the study outcomes of interest within 28 days of infusion, or had 28 days of follow-up without an outcome.

We also derived a comparator group from the same at-risk population by identifying non-hospitalized patients with a positive polymerase chain reaction or antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 during the same time period who were eligible for mAb infusion based on our modified EUA criteria but not infused. Similar to the group receiving mAb, comparator patients were included in the study population if they had attainment of one of the study outcomes of interest within 28 days or had 28 days of follow-up without an outcome. For infused patients, the 28-day follow-up period commenced on the date of their infusion. For comparator patients, the follow-up period commenced two days after their SARS-CoV-2 test result date, which corresponded to the earliest time from test positivity to initiation of treatment for infused patients.

Study Outcomes

The primary outcome was hospitalization or all-cause mortality within 28 days of meeting study eligibility (day of infusion for the group receiving mAb, 30 days after test positivity for the non-infused group). We assessed in-hospital mortality using the discharge disposition of “Ceased to Breathe” sourced from the inpatient EMR and out-of-hospital deaths

from the Social Security Death Index. The secondary outcome was hospitalization or 28-day Emergency Department (ED) visit without hospitalization. To understand the contribution of individual elements of the primary and secondary composite outcomes, we also analyzed the frequency of individual events: ED visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, and mortality within 28 days.

Statistical Methods

After identifying patients in the study population receiving mAb, we selected from the at-risk comparator population individuals matched by propensity score.^{10, 11} Age is a strong predictor for complications of COVID-19 and the prevalence of high-risk medical conditions vary substantially by patient age.^{12, 13} We anticipated that differences in patient profiles between infused and non-infused patients would vary by age because of the age-specific criteria for bamlanivimab contained in the EUA. Moreover, immunosenescence occurs with aging, so we anticipated age to be a potential effect modifier in the relationship between mAb receipt and study outcomes.¹⁴ Therefore, we planned *a priori* to select non-infused patients using propensity scores within age strata consistent with the EUA criteria: less than 55 years, 55 years to less than 65 years, and 65 years of age and older.⁹ Patients receiving mAb infusion and the selected comparator patients across all age strata were then combined to constitute the study population. We used this approach, rather than initially running a single model from the full dataset, to optimize selection of appropriate controls. To illustrate, in the full dataset, the prevalence of history of morbid obesity was 27.4% versus 24.9% ($p=0.37$) in infused vs. non-infused patients, respectively, whereas in the subset of patients age 55 to < 65 years, the respective prevalence was 66.7% vs. 22.4% ($p<0.00001$). Thus, we believe that more robust matching of infused to

non-infused patients was achieved by capturing and adjusting for the important differences in presenting profiles within each age-specific cohort.

Propensity scores were derived using logistic regression models fit from a multitude of variables in separate age-stratified groups with treatment with mAb as the response variable and forward stepwise selection of measured pre-treatment explanatory variables at $p < 0.15$ (see **Supplemental Table 1** for listing of variables used in the propensity score models). We included variables deemed biologically relevant (e.g. age, gender, Charlson Comorbidity Index score) into all models prior to stepwise selection. We used 1:1 propensity score matching with a maximum propensity score probability difference of 0.01 to construct equal size matched infused and non-infused groups within age strata. We did not impute missing values for variables used in deriving the propensity scores but did assess whether patients with propensity scores (i.e., full covariate data) versus those with missing propensity scores were similar in terms of age, gender, and race distributions (to assess randomness of missing data).

We compared characteristics of infused versus non-infused patients using student *t*-tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. Because in this observational study we must infer the time at risk for non-infused patients (starting at the time they *would have* received mAb had they been referred for care, conservatively using two days after SARS-CoV-2 testing), we compared the distribution of time from beginning of follow-up to study outcome among patients receiving mAb infusion and those who did not, both in the at-risk and matched populations (**Supplemental Table 2**). Crude 28-day rates of the study outcomes were described by infusion status. For the propensity matched patient analysis of primary and secondary outcomes, as well as individual elements of the composite outcomes (ED visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, mortality) we fit logistic regression models with the derived

propensity scores (i.e., predicted probability of being treated with mAb) as a continuous variable to control for confounding, with mAb receipt as the predictor of interest in the model.

We also performed one sensitivity and three exploratory analyses. As a sensitivity analysis, we used the propensity score (i.e., predicted probability of being treated with mAb) as a continuous variable to control for confounding and evaluate study outcomes in a larger unmatched cohort of patients who did and did not receive mAb. We did not employ the use of inverse probability weighting given the very large imbalance of eligible bamlanivimab treated versus not infused patients. We postulated that mAb may be more efficacious in the potentially immunosenescent older population. Thus, we evaluated the study outcomes within the pre-defined age strata. In the second exploratory analysis among the larger unmatched cohort, an interaction term of mAb x BMI was created to examine potential effect modification of treatment with mAb by BMI.¹⁵ To identify a potential benefit of prompt (versus delayed) administration of mAb, as a third exploratory analysis we compared the rates of three outcomes – ED visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, and mortality – within the analysis group stratified by time from diagnosis to infusion: 0 to 2 days, 3 to 4 days, 5 to 7 days, and 8 to 10 days.

Study outcomes are described with effect estimate (odds ratio [OR]) and 95% confidence interval (95%CI). We set the alpha error at 0.05 for univariate comparisons of baseline characteristics by infusion status as well as for adjusted odds ratios. All analyses were performed using the SAS System (Cary, NC), version 9.4. Methods and results are reported in accordance with The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) statement (see **Supplemental Table 3**).¹⁶

RESULTS

Study Population

During the study period (December 9, 2020 through March 3, 2021), 636 patients received mAb. Four hundred and sixty-three (72.8%) patients achieved a study outcome or completed 28-day follow-up time and are in the analysis group, with the last infused patient who did not die treated on February 3, 2021. The non-infused at-risk population included 17,599 COVID-19 non-hospitalized patients potentially eligible for mAb according to modified EUA criteria, of which 16,565 (94.1%) achieved study outcome or had sufficient follow-up time.

Table 1 shows a comparison of baseline characteristics of the infused versus non-infused patients both in the unmatched at-risk population and matched study population. The unmatched populations are significantly different on most characteristics with patients receiving mAb infusion demonstrating higher frequencies of these medical conditions. After propensity score matching within age strata, 234 patients receiving mAb infusion and 234 patients not receiving mAb were included in the study population. After propensity matching, all matched and selected unmatched variables did not differ statistically between patients who received versus did not receive mAb infusion.

Primary and Secondary Outcomes

Among the 234 propensity-matched patients receiving mAb infusion, 15 (6.4%) were hospitalized, 4 (1.7%) died, and 16 (6.8%) had an ED visit without hospitalization (**Table 2**). Among the 234 propensity-matched patients not receiving mAb infusion, 38 (16.2%) were hospitalized, 12 (5.1%) died, and 15 (6.4%) had an ED visit without hospitalization. **Figure 1a** shows the frequency of the primary outcome (28-day hospitalization or mortality) and the secondary outcome (hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization) among the matched patients receiving mAb versus those not receiving mAb infusion. In the propensity adjusted

analyses (**Table 2**), patients receiving mAb had an estimated 69% lower odds of hospitalization or mortality (OR 0.31, 95% CI 0.17-0.56) and estimated 50% lower odds of hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization (OR 0.50, 95% CI 0.43-0.83). **Figure 1b** shows the frequency of the individual elements of the composite primary and secondary outcomes (ED visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, mortality) among the matched patients receiving mAb versus those not receiving mAb infusion, and **Table 2** lists the corresponding ORs and 95% confidence intervals.

Sensitivity and Exploratory Analyses

Supplemental Table 4 provides risk estimates for the composite primary and secondary outcomes, and outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, in an unmatched cohort of patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion and an at-risk population of patients not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion, adjusted for propensity to receive mAb. The 236 patients with non-missing covariate data who received mAb had an estimated 59% lower odds of hospitalization or mortality than the 16,565 patients who did not receive mAb (propensity-score adjusted OR 0.41, 95% CI 0.24-0.70). Thus, study results were consistent between the matched and unmatched group analyses.

Table 2 provides adjusted ORs for the primary and secondary outcomes, plus individual outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, stratified by age. In propensity score adjusted analyses for the 28-day rate of hospitalization or mortality, there was no differential treatment effect by BMI. P-values for the interaction term of mAb x BMI were 0.55, 0.81, 0.38, and 0.84 for all patients and in the age groups less than 55 years, 55 to less than 65 years, and 65 years and older, respectively. **Supplemental Figure 1** indicates among patients aged 65 years and older lower composite hospitalization or mortality event rates comparing mAb infused to non-

infused patients across all BMI categories. **Figure 2** indicates that among patients in the study population receiving mAb infusion, those who received their infusion within 4 days of their positive SARS-CoV-2 test result had lower 28-day rates of ED visit without hospitalization and hospitalization than patients who received their infusion 5 days or more after their positive SARS-CoV-2 test result. Rates of mortality were low and similar by timing of infusion.

Finally, age, gender, and race distributions between patients with full covariate data and those with missing data were similar (data not shown).

DISCUSSION

Our observational study suggests a benefit of mAb treatment in reducing the risk of COVID-19 complications for patients at higher risk of severe disease. Initial reports of bamlanivimab 700 mg in outpatients showed improvement of symptoms at day 11 for the entire study population³ and numerically fewer hospitalizations and ED visits at day 29 (1.6% vs 6.3%).¹⁷ A post hoc analysis in BLAZE-1 of those 65 or older or with BMI of 35 kg/m² or greater demonstrated a larger numerical benefit, 2.7% vs 13.5%.³ In this report of our experience, we identified a similar association between bamlanivimab monotherapy and hospitalization or mortality in a propensity matched analysis with an OR of 0.31, or a 69% lower odds of hospitalization or mortality.

In our health system, rates of hospitalizations and ED visits in patients aged 65 years or older were higher than the clinical trial, yet a benefit to mAb treatment was nonetheless observed. This benefit occurred through decreased hospitalizations and mortality (OR 0.28) as well as for hospitalizations alone (OR 0.32) and for hospitalizations or ED visits without

hospitalization (OR 0.43). We also identified a tendency of mortality benefit in this age group (OR 0.35), although our sample size and event limit declaring an association.

Cumulatively our report shows benefit for patients across several possible outcomes, and we consider this highly relevant from a clinical standpoint. While we did not observe statistically significant differences in the primary or secondary outcomes in younger age groups, the odds ratios in the group aged 55 to less than 65 years, and few outcomes in those age less than 55 years suggest an effect may exist though potentially smaller in magnitude.

We identified greater benefits with administration within 4 days of symptom onset, particularly regarding rates of hospitalization. While the EUA allows for use within 10 days of symptom onset, the median duration of symptoms prior to receiving bamlanivimab 700 mg was 5 days in BLAZE-1³. As with other passive antibody therapies, this is consistent with the supposition that earlier treatment is better, and health systems may reasonably evaluate a shorter window of eligibility for mAb therapy. Our analysis shows that benefits in the elderly are independent of BMI. The potential differential benefit of mAb therapy for COVID-19 in patients with this and other co-morbidities warrants more focused analysis.

There are several limitations of our study. Given our design, it is not surprising that there were several baseline differences between those infused and not infused in other age groups. We mitigated confounding with propensity score modeling of closely matched groups of patients, and a sensitivity analysis using propensity-score adjusted unmatched patients not receiving mAb infusion affirmed the findings. Furthermore, the group receiving mAb had more comorbid conditions predisposing to the primary and secondary outcomes, which may underestimate the magnitude of the treatment effect if there was residual confounding. We cannot reliably distinguish the presence, extent, or severity of symptoms in our data set, all of which may impact

effectiveness. Additionally, viral loads in blood or any site were not measured in our data set, limiting any insights based on this variable. The time to event in both treated and untreated groups were similar, suggesting that ED visit or hospitalization did not account for why the untreated population did not receive mAb. Viral loads in blood or any site were not measured in our data set, limiting any insights based on this variable.

We did not have information regarding variant strains of SARS-CoV-2 prior to or after bamlanivimab monotherapy. While reported rates of clinically concerning variants were low in Pennsylvania during much of this time frame, there is concern that use of bamlanivimab monotherapy will lead to escape variants and/or that variants are underreported.¹⁸ We were unable to evaluate any such existing prevalence or emergence in our patients. Finally, during the time of this study, we utilized bamlanivimab monotherapy exclusively, so we are unable to comment on any comparison to the other available monoclonal antibodies for treatment of mild-moderate COVID-19 infection. On March 24th, the United States Department of Health and Human Services announced they would no longer supply sites with bamlanivimab alone due to concern about increased rates of resistant variants.¹⁹ Many of our patients received bamlanivimab when the rates of resistant variants in this country was low, thus explaining why we still saw benefit with bamlanivimab monotherapy. Going forward it will be critical to better define the roles of the various available therapies and where each may be best utilized, including possibly a continued role for bamlanivimab monotherapy.

In our non-experimental design, we observed that bamlanivimab monotherapy is associated with decreased hospitalization rates and mortality in patients with mild-moderate COVID-19 infection, particularly among those 65 years or older, and may likely extend to younger patients as well. This benefit appears more likely when administered early after

309 diagnosis. Further study can confirm our observations and investigate the role of mAb treatment
310 in other high-risk subgroups and the use of various mAb regimens.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the clinical staff of the UPMC monoclonal antibody infusion centers as well as the support and administrative staff behind this effort, including but not limited to: Debbie Albin, Jennifer Dueweke, Robert Shulik, Amy Lukanski, Rozalyn Russell, Debra Rogers, Jesse Duff, Kevin Pruznak, Jennifer Zabala, Trudy Bloomquist, Daniel Gessel, LuAnn King, Jonya Brooks, Libby Shumaker, Betsy Tedesco, Sarah Sakaluk, Kathleen Flinn, Susan Spencer, Le Ann Kaltenbaugh, Michelle Adam, Meredith Axe, Melanie Pierce, Debra Masser, Theresa Murillo, Sherry Casali, Jim Krosse, Jeana Colella, Rebecca Medva, Jessica Fesz, Ashley Beyerl, Jodi Ayers, Hilary Maskiewicz, Mikaela Bortot, Amy Helmuth, Heather Schaeffer, Janice Dunsavage, Erik Hernandez, Ken Trimmer, Sheila Kruman, Teressa Polcha, and their entire teams. We also thank the U.S. federal government and Pennsylvania Department of Health for the provision of monoclonal antibody treatment.

Funding Statement: This work received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: None of the authors received any payments or influence from a third-party source for the work presented, and none report any potential conflicts of interest.

References

1. Jones BE, Brown-Augsburger PL, Corbett KS, et al. LY-CoV555, a rapidly isolated potent neutralizing antibody, provides protection in a non-human primate model of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *bioRxiv*. Oct 1 2020;doi:10.1101/2020.09.30.318972
2. Myron S. Cohen¹, Ajay Nirula², Mark Mulligan³, Richard Novak⁴, Mary Marovich⁵, Alexander Stermer⁶, Andrew C. Adams², Andrew E. Schade², Jack Knorr², Jay L. Tuttle², Janelle Sabo², Paul Klekotka², Lei Shen², Daniel M. Skovronsky², for BLAZE-2 study team (Lilly/NIAID/CoVPN). Bamlanivimab prevents COVID-19 morbidity and mortality in nursing-home setting. Oral abstract #121. Presented at Virtual CROI 2021. .
3. Gottlieb RL, Nirula A, Chen P, et al. Effect of Bamlanivimab as Monotherapy or in Combination With Etesevimab on Viral Load in Patients With Mild to Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*. Feb 16 2021;325(7):632-644. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.0202
4. Weinreich DM, Sivapalasingam S, Norton T, et al. REGN-COV2, a Neutralizing Antibody Cocktail, in Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 17 2020;doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2035002
5. Webb BJ, Buckel W, Vento T, et al. Real-World Effectiveness and Tolerability of Monoclonal Antibodies for Ambulatory Patients with Early COVID-19. 3/17/2021 2021;doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253646>
6. Ault A. Rollout of COVID Monoclonal Antibodies Lacked Unified Plan: Expert Panel. Accessed 23 Mar 2021. Available at: <https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/945223>.
7. Bariola JR, McCreary EK, Khadem T, Snyder GM, Wadas RJ, Nace DA, White DB, Yealy DM, Schmidhofer M. Establishing a Distribution Network for COVID-19 Monoclonal

348 Antibody Therapy Across a Large Health System During a Global Pandemic. *Open Forum Infect*
349 *Dis.* 2021. In press.

350 8. Reitz KM, Marroquin OC, Zenati MS, et al. Association Between Preoperative
351 Metformin Exposure and Postoperative Outcomes in Adults With Type 2 Diabetes. *JAMA Surg.*
352 Jun 1 2020;155(6):e200416. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2020.0416

353 9. FDA News Release. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes monoclonal
354 antibody for treatment of COVID-19. Published November 9, 2020. Accessed November 13,
355 2020. <https://bit.ly/2HesBBs>.

356 10. Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of
357 Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivariate Behav Res.* May 2011;46(3):399-424.
358 doi:10.1080/00273171.2011.568786

359 11. Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The central role of the propensity score in observational
360 studies for causal effects. *Biometrika.* 1983; 70: 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/70.1.41>.

361 12. Lim ZJ, Subramaniam A, Ponnappa Reddy M, et al. Case Fatality Rates for Patients with
362 COVID-19 Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation. A Meta-analysis. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
363 *Med.* Jan 1 2021;203(1):54-66. doi:10.1164/rccm.202006-2405OC

364 13. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities,
365 and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area.
366 *JAMA.* May 26 2020;323(20):2052-2059. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775

367 14. Bajaj V, Gadi N, Spihlman AP, Wu SC, Choi CH, Moulton VR. Aging, Immunity, and
368 COVID-19: How Age Influences the Host Immune Response to Coronavirus Infections? *Front*
369 *Physiol.* 2020;11:571416. doi:10.3389/fphys.2020.571416

- 370 15. Tartof SY, Qian L, Hong V, et al. Obesity and Mortality Among Patients Diagnosed With
371 COVID-19: Results From an Integrated Health Care Organization. *Ann Intern Med.* Nov 17
372 2020;173(10):773-781. doi:10.7326/m20-3742
- 373 16. Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttman A, et al. The REporting of studies Conducted using
374 Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) statement. *PLoS Med.* Oct
375 2015;12(10):e1001885. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001885
- 376 17. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody LY-CoV555 in
377 Outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* Jan 21 2021;384(3):229-237.
378 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2029849
- 379 18. Liu H, Wei P, Zhang Q, et al. 501Y.V2 and 501Y.V3 variants of SARS-CoV-2 lose
380 binding to Bamlanivimab in vitro. *bioRxiv.* Feb 16 2021;doi:10.1101/2021.02.16.431305
- 381 19. US Department of Health and Human Services. Update on COVID-19 variants and
382 impact on bamlanivimab distribution. Available from:
383 [https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-](https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx)
384 [MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.phe.gov/emergency/events/COVID19/investigation-MCM/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx). Accessed March 24th, 2021.
- 385

387 Table 1. Comparison of Characteristics of Unmatched and Propensity Matched Patients

Characteristic	Age Group Matching*	Unmatched			Propensity Matched		
		Infused (N=463)	Not infused (N=16565)	p-value	Infused (N=234)	Not infused (N=234)	p-value
Age, mean, SD	A,B,C	66.3, 14.4	55.3, 19.2	<.0001	67.2, 13.0	66.1, 15.0	0.4079
Female gender, %	A,B,C	53.3	59.6	0.0065	53.4	50.9	0.5788
Black race, %	B,C	5.7	9.3	0.0099	5.1	8.5	0.1429
Charlson Comorbidity Index Score, mean, SD	A,B,C	1.7, 1.8	0.9, 1.3	<.0001	1.6, 1.7	1.5, 1.7	0.5540
Allegheny as county of residence, %	A,B,C	49.7	34.8	<.0001	51.3	46.6	0.3091
History of cirrhosis, %	B	3.0	0.9	<.0001	3.0	1.3	0.2010
History of adrenal insufficiency, %	A	7.6	3.6	0.0012	7.7	5.1	0.2575
History of end stage renal disease, %	A,B,C	3.0	0.9	0.0008	3.0	3.8	0.6109
History of morbid obesity, %	A,B,C	27.4	24.9	0.3701	26.9	22.2	0.2376
History of hypertension, %	C	68.2	49.8	<.0001	73.5	75.2	0.6720
DOACS, %	B	11.8	5.6	<.0001	11.1	14.1	0.3296
Hydroxychloroquine, %	B	3.8	1.5	0.0051	3.8	3.0	0.6109
Immunomodulators, %	B	3.8	1.5	0.0043	3.4	2.1	0.3988
Statins, %	B	59.1	36.9	<.0001	58.5	61.1	0.5716
Current tobacco use, %	Not matched	7.2	9.0	0.3302	6.8	4.3	0.2303
Alcohol use, %	Not matched	53.8	51.7	0.5193	54.1	46.5	0.1025
Illicit drug use, %	Not matched	1.5	2.8	0.0952	2.6	2.6	1.0000
History of diabetes, %	Not matched	30.3	22.1	<.0001	32.9	31.6	0.7667
History of hyperlipidemia, %	Not matched	75.5	51.2	<.0001	75.6	71.4	0.2949
History of atrial fibrillation, %	Not matched	15.0	6.0	<.0001	14.5	12.8	0.5905
History of coronary artery disease, %	Not matched	19.5	11.8	<.0001	19.7	26.1	0.0987
History of congestive heart failure, %	Not matched	13.5	6.5	<.0001	14.5	15.8	0.6991
History of COPD, %	Not matched	24.9	17.4	<.0001	25.6	22.2	0.3861
History of obstructive sleep apnea, %	Not matched	30.5	18.7	<.0001	30.3	29.9	0.9197

388

History of pulmonary hypertension, %	Not matched	4.9	1.7	<.0001	6.4	5.1	0.5520
ACE Inhibitors, %	Not matched	21.9	18.0	0.1133	21.4	20.1	0.7323
Antidepressants, %	Not matched	32.5	32.6	0.9794	32.5	35.0	0.5575
Beta blockers, %	Not matched	38.0	23.9	<.0001	37.2	41.9	0.2983
Corticosteroids, %	Not matched	38.4	45.4	0.0052	36.8	40.2	0.4472

*A: Age < 55 years; B: Age 55 to < 65 years; C: Age 65 years and older.

389 **Table 2. Propensity Matched Event Rates and Odds Ratios of Study Outcomes Overall and Stratified by Age Group**

Outcome	Number of Events		28-Day Event Rate (%)		Odds Ratio Estimates		
	Infused (n=234)	Not Infused (n=234)	Infused	Not Infused	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p-value
All Patients							
Hospitalization or mortality	16	45	6.8	19.2	0.31	0.17, 0.56	0.00001
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	28	50	12.0	21.4	0.50	0.43, 0.83	0.007
ED visit without hospitalization	16	15	6.4	6.4	1.07	0.52, 2.22	0.85
Hospitalization	15	38	6.4	16.2	0.35	0.19, 0.66	0.001
Mortality	4	12	1.7	5.1	0.32	0.10, 1.01	0.05
Age < 55 years	(n=42)	(n=42)					
Hospitalization or mortality	2	3	4.8	7.1	0.65	0.10, 4.10	0.65
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	7	5	16.7	11.9	1.48	0.43, 5.10	0.53
ED visit without hospitalization	6	4	14.3	9.5	1.58	0.41, 6.08	0.50
Hospitalization	2	3	4.8	7.1	0.65	0.10, 4.10	0.65
Mortality	0	0	0.0	0.0	-----	-----	-----
Age 55 to < 65 years	(n=34)	(n=34)					
Hospitalization or mortality	2	6	5.9	17.6	0.29	0.05, 1.56	0.15
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	2	7	5.9	20.6	0.24	0.05, 1.26	0.09
ED visit without hospitalization	1	2	2.9	5.9	0.49	0.04, 5.61	0.56
Hospitalization	2	5	5.9	14.7	0.36	0.06, 2.01	0.25
Mortality	0	1	0.0	2.9	0.0	-----	-----
Age 65 years and older	(n=158)	(n=158)					
Hospitalization or mortality	12	36	7.6	22.8	0.28	0.14, 0.56	0.0003
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	19	38	12.0	24.0	0.43	0.24, 0.79	0.006
ED visit without hospitalization	9	9	5.7	5.7	1.00	0.39, 2.59	1.0
Hospitalization	11	30	7.0	19.0	0.32	0.15, 0.66	0.002
Mortality	4	11	2.5	7.0	0.35	0.11, 1.11	0.08

390

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1a. Frequency of 28-day hospitalization or mortality (primary outcome), and hospitalization or Emergency Department visit without hospitalization (secondary outcome) among the matched patients receiving monoclonal antibody (orange bars) versus those not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion (blue bars). P-values are from the logistic regression models.

Figure 1b. Frequency of the individual elements of the composite primary and secondary outcomes including Emergency Department visit without hospitalization, hospitalization, and mortality among the matched patients receiving monoclonal antibody (orange bars) versus those not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion (blue bars). P-values are from the logistic regression models.

Figure 2. Among all study patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion, comparison of crude 28-day outcome rates by timing of infusion. Blue bars (0 to 2 days), orange bars (3 to 4 days), grey bars (5 to 7 days), yellow bars (8 days or more).

409 FIGURES

Figure 1a.

Figure 1b.

Figure 2.

413

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Supplemental Table 1. Variables selected for propensity score adjustment

Analysis Group	Variables
Age < 55 years	Age Gender Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of renal insufficiency History of end stage renal disease History of irritable bowel syndrome Charlson Comorbidity Index score Model c-statistic: 0.826
Age 55 to < 65 years	Age Gender Race Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of cirrhosis History of end stage renal disease Charlson Comorbidity Index score Medications: direct oral anticoagulants, hydroxychloroquine, immunomodulators, statins Model c-statistic: 0.852
Age ≥ 65 years	Age Gender Race Residence in Allegheny county Morbid obesity History of hypertension Charlson Comorbidity Index score Model c-statistic: 0.670

Supplemental Table 2. Comparison of days to individual outcomes between patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion and patients not receiving monoclonal antibody infusion, in both the at-risk population and matched study population.

	Outcome	Infused			Not Infused			p-value
		N	Median	IQR	N	Median	IQR	
At-risk population	ED visit without hospitalization	30	7	4, 15	1040	4	2, 10	0.04
	Hospitalization	31	8	2, 15	1379	5	2, 11	0.40
	Mortality	7	13	5, 23	301	11	7, 16	0.38
Matched study population	ED visit without hospitalization	16	7	2.5, 14	15	4	2, 8	0.20
	Hospitalization	15	5	1, 21	38	8.5	3, 16	0.66
	Mortality	4	18	8.5, 24	12	9.5	9, 11	0.16

Note: ED, Emergency Department; IQR, interquartile range

422 **Supplemental Table 3.** RECORD statement

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items	Location in manuscript where items are reported
Title and abstract					
	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 3; Lines 41-46	<p>RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be included.</p> <p>RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract.</p> <p>RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.</p>	Page 3; Lines 41-46
Introduction					
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4; Lines 65-67, 73-77		
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4; Lines 70-72 (hypothesis), Lines 73-77 (objectives)		
Methods					
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 6; Lines 110-121		
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	<p>Page 5; Lines 81-84 (Setting/locations)</p> <p>Page 6; Lines 104-105 (relevant dates of exposure), Lines 110-112</p>		

			Page 10; 196-199 (follow up)		
Participants	6	<p>(a) <i>Cohort study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants</p> <p>(b) <i>Cohort study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case</p>	<p>Page 6; Lines 104-110 (eligibility), Lines 113-121 (comparator group and period of follow up)</p> <p>Page 8; Lines 151-161 (PS matching process)</p>	<p>RECORD 6.1: The methods of study population selection (such as codes or algorithms used to identify subjects) should be listed in detail. If this is not possible, an explanation should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.2: Any validation studies of the codes or algorithms used to select the population should be referenced. If validation was conducted for this study and not published elsewhere, detailed methods and results should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.3: If the study involved linkage of databases, consider use of a flow diagram or other graphical display to demonstrate the data linkage process, including the number of individuals with linked data at each stage.</p>	Page 5; Lines 96-102 (database)
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.	<p>Page 6-7; Lines 123-131 (outcomes)</p> <p>Page 7-8; Lines 142-150, 151-161 (addressing confounders)</p>	RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.	<p>Page 6-7; Lines 123-131 (Codes for primary outcomes)</p> <p>Supplemental Table 1 (PS variables for confounding)</p>
Data sources/ measurement	8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	<p>Page 5; Lines 91-102 (sources of data)</p> <p>Page 7-9; Lines 133-134, 140-192 (method of assessment and data analysis)</p>		

Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 7-9; Lines 132-192		
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 10; Lines 196-209		
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why	Page 8; Lines 162-163		
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) <i>Cohort study</i> - If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> - If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 7-9; Lines 132-192		
Data access and cleaning methods		..		<p>RECORD 12.1: Authors should describe the extent to which the investigators had access to the database population used to create the study population.</p> <p>RECORD 12.2: Authors should provide information on the data cleaning methods used in the study.</p>	Page 5; Lines 91-102
Linkage		..		RECORD 12.3: State whether the study included person-level, institutional-level, or other data linkage across two or more databases. The methods of linkage and	Page 5; Lines 91-102

				methods of linkage quality evaluation should be provided.	
Results					
Participants	13	(a) Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (<i>e.g.</i> , numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Page 10; Lines 196-209	RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study (<i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and linkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/or by means of the study flow diagram.	Page 10; Lines 196-209
Descriptive data	14	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (<i>e.g.</i> , demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) <i>Cohort study</i> - summarise follow-up time (<i>e.g.</i> , average and total amount)	(a) Page 10, Lines 202-209 Pages 20-21, Lines 287-288, Table 2 (b) Page 8, Lines 158-161 Page 12, Lines 246-247 (c) Page 6, Lines 110-112 and 116-121. Time to event data not analyzed by study design.		
Outcome data	15	<i>Cohort study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <i>Case-control study</i> - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure <i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Page 10, Lines 213-214 Page 22, Lines 389-390, Table 2 Page 24, Lines 409-412 Page 27, Lines 418-412, Supplemental Table 2 Page 34, Lines 424-427, Supplemental Table 4		

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g., 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	(a) Page 10, Lines 202-209 (unadjusted) Pages 10-11, Lines 210-224 (adjusted) Page 22, Lines 389-390, Table 2 (both) (b) N/A, all variables are continuous or binary. Subgroup age categories are defined. (Page 7, Lines 140-142) (c) N/A		
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—e.g., analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Pages 11-12, Lines 225-247		
Discussion					
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 12, Lines 250-258 Pages 14-15, Lines 305-309		
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Page 13, Lines 278-290	RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	Page 8, Lines 151-161 Pages 13-14, Lines 278-290
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Pages 14-15, Lines 305-310		

Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Page 14, Lines 291-298		
Other Information					
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 16, Line 322 (no external funding source)		
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code		..		RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how to access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	Not available/provided

423 *Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution ([CC BY](#)) license.

424 **Supplemental Table 4.** Composite primary and secondary outcomes, and outcomes comprising the composite outcomes, in an
425 unmatched cohort of patients receiving monoclonal antibody infusion and an at-risk population of patients not receiving monoclonal
426 antibody infusion

	All Patients				Patients with Propensity Score				Odds Ratio Estimates		
	Number of Events		Event Rate (%)		Number of Events		Event Rate (%)				
	Infused (n=463)	Not Infused (n=16,565)	Infused	Not Infused	Infused (n=236)	Not Infused (n=16,515)	Infused	Not Infused	Adj. OR	95%CI	P-value
Hospitalization or mortality	33	1516	7.1	9.1	17	1507	7.2	9.1	0.41	0.24, 0.70	0.001
Hospitalization or ED visit without hospitalization	56	2254	12.1	13.6	29	2244	12.3	13.6	0.60	0.40, 0.91	0.02
ED visit without hospitalization	30	1040	6.5	6.3	16	1037	6.8	6.3	1.05	0.63, 1.77	0.85
Hospitalization	31	1379	6.7	8.3	16	1371	6.8	8.3	0.44	0.25, 0.77	0.004
Mortality	7	301	1.5	1.8	5	300	2.1	1.8	0.37	0.12, 1.16	0.29

427 Note: ED, Emergency Department; OR, odds ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval

428 **Supplemental Figure 1.** Frequency of composite hospitalization or mortality outcome among
429 study population aged 65 years and older, by treatment received and BMI category

430 **Supplemental Figure 1.**

431 Note: BMI, body mass index in units of kilograms per meter squared.