## Final Study Report J2X-MC-B003

## A Cohort Study to Evaluate the Real-World Utilization and Effectiveness of Bebtelovimab Compared to Paxlovid among Patients with Mild-to-Moderate COVID-19 Who Are at High Risk for Progressing to Severe Illness

### **Confidential Information**

Note to Regulatory Authorities: This document may contain protected personal data and/or commercially confidential information exempt from public disclosure. Eli Lilly and Company requests consultation regarding release/redaction prior to any public release. In the United States, this document is subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Exemption 4 and may not be reproduced or otherwise disseminated without the written approval of Eli Lilly and Company or its subsidiaries.

VV-CLIN-122403

# **PASS** Information

Title	A Cohort Study to Evaluate the Real-World Utilization and Effectiveness of Bebtelovimab Compared to Paxlovid among Patients with Mild-to-Moderate COVID-19 Who Are at High Risk
	for Progressing to Severe Illness
Version identifier of the final study report	V1
Date of last version of the final study report	N/A
EU PAS register number	EUPAS50700
Active substance	No ATC code available
Medicinal product(s)	N/A
Product reference	N/A
Procedure number	N/A
Marketing authorisation holder(s)	Eli Lilly and Company
Joint PASS	No
Research question and objectives	The primary objective is to estimate the 30-day risk difference of the composite outcome of all-cause hospitalization or all cause death for patients who receive bebtelovimab versus Paxlovid. Secondary outcomes include all-cause hospitalizations, all-cause deaths, and all-cause emergency department visits.
Country(-ies) of study	United States
Author	PPD
Signature of principal investigator	Signature on file/see approval date below

# **Marketing Authorisation Holder**

Marketing authorisation holder (MAH)	Eli Lilly and Company	
	Lilly Corporate Center	
	Indianapolis, IN 46285	
MAH contact person	PPD	
	Eli Lilly and Company	
	Lilly Corporate Center	
	Indianapolis, IN 46285	
	United States	
	PPD	
	PPD	

# **Table of Contents**

Section		Page
Table of C	Contents	4
1 Abst	ract	
2 List	of Abbreviations	
3 Inves	stigators	
4 Othe	r Responsible Parties	
5 Mile	stones	
6 Ratio	onale and Background	
7 Rese	arch Ouestion and Objectives	
7.1 S	tudy Objectives	
8 Ame	ndments and Updates	
9 Rese	arch Methods	
9.1 S	tudy Design	
9.2 S	etting	
9.2.1	Study Cohort Development	
9.2.2	Follow-Up and Censoring (Primary and Sensitivity Analysis	
	Methodology)	
9.3 S	ubjects	
9.4 V	ariables	
9.4.1	Study Variable Identification	
9.4.2	Variables to Classify the Study Cohorts	
9.4.3	Variables to Classify the Study Outcomes	
9.4.4	Variables to Classify the Study Outcomes – Supplementary	
	Analyses Using EHR Data linked to Health Insurance	31
9.4.5	Variables to Classify Baseline Covariates	32
9.5 D	ata Sources	
9.5.1	TriNetX Dataworks USA Network	
9.5.2	TriNetX Linked Network (Supplemental Data Source)	41
9.6 B	ias	41
9.6.1	Confounding	
9.6.2	Selection Bias	
9.6.3	Information Bias	
9.6.3	3.1 Misclassification of the Exposure	
9.6.3	3.2 Misclassification of the Outcome	

9.7	Stud	y Size	45
9.7	.1	Feasibility Assessment	45
9.7	.2	Noninferiority Margin	45
9.7	.3	Sample Size and Power	46
9.8	Data	Transformation	47
9.9	Stati	stical Methods	47
9.9	.1	Main Summary Measures	47
9.9	.2	Main Statistical Methods	48
9.	9.2.1	Analysis Overview	48
9.	9.2.2	Method to Control for Confounding	48
9.	9.2.3	Describe Baseline Characteristics	49
9.	9.2.4	Primary and Secondary Analyses	50
9.9	.3	Missing Values	51
9.9	.4	Subgroup Analyses	51
9.9	.5	Sensitivity Analyses	52
9.9	.6	Amendments to the Statistical Analysis Plan	53
9.10	Qual	lity Control	55
10 R	esults		
10.1	Parti	cipants	
10.2	Desc	criptive Data	
10.2	2.1	CEM Matching Rate and Propensity Score Distribution	
10.2	2.2	Baseline Characteristics	62
10.3	Outc	come Data	103
10.	3.1	COVID-19 Treatments During Follow-up	103
10.	3.2	Number of Events and Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes	106
10.4	Mair	and Secondary Outcomes	107
10.4	Othe	r Analyses	108
10.5	5 1	Subgroup Analyses	108
10.1	5.2	Sensitivity Analyses	
10	0.5.2.1	Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential	
		Channeling Bias	117
10	0.5.2.2	<ol> <li>Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding</li> </ol>	119
10	0.5.2.3	3. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data	121
10	53	Supplemental Analyses in TriNetY I inked Network	121
10	э.э А Ам	erse Events/Adverse Reactions	124
10.0	Auvo		124
II D	1scuss	101	125

11.1 Key Results		
11.2 Limitations		
11.3 Interpretation		128
11.4 Generalisability		128
12 Other Information		129
13 Conclusions		
14 References		131
15 Annex 1. List of Standa	alone Documents	134
16 Annex 2. Report on Su	pplemental Analyses in TriNetX Linked	
Network		135
16.1 A2.1. Rationale and	Background	135
16.2 A2.2. Research Que	stions and Objectives	
16.3 A2.3. Research Met	hods	135
16.3.1 A2.3.1. Study	Design	135
16.3.2 A2.3.2. Study	Cohort	136
16.3.3 A2.3.3. Outcor	mes	
16.3.4 A2.3.4. Baselin	ne Covariates	137
16.3.5 A2.3.5. Follow	v-Up and Censoring	138
16.3.6 A2.3.6. Data S	ources	
16.3.7 A2.3.7. Statisti	ical Analysis Plan	
16.3.8 A2.3.8. Analys	sis	
16.4 A2.4. Results		
16.4.1 A2.4.1. Partici	pants	
16.4.2 A2.4.2. Descri	ptive Data	141
16.4.2.1 A2.4.2.1. C	CEM Matching Rate and Propensity Score	
Distribution	n	141
16.4.2.2 A2.4.2.2. B	Baseline Characteristics	145
16.4.3 A2.4.3. Outcor	ne Data	
16.4.3.1 A2.4.3.1. C	OVID-19 Treatments and Insurance	
Disenrollm	ent During Follow-up	
16.4.3.2 A2.4.3.2 N	umber of Events and Cumulative Incidence	100
ICAA ADA N	and Secondary Outcomes	
10.4.4 A2.4.4. Main F		
16.4.5 A2.4.5. Other A	Analyses	
16.4.5.1 A2.4.5.1. S	ubgroup Analyses	
16.4.5.2 A2.4.5.2. S	ensitivity Analyses	
16.4.5.2.1 A2.4.5.	2.1. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to	107
Mitigat	e Potential Unanneling Blas	

10	5.4.5.2.2	A2.4.5.2.2. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding	199
10	5.4.5.2.3	A2.4.5.2.3. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data	201
16.5 A	A2.5. Discu	ssion	201
16.5.	1 A2.5.1	. Key Results	201
16.5.2	2 A2.5.2	2. Limitations	202
16.5.3	3 A2.5.3	. Interpretation	203
16.5.4	4 A2.5.4	. Generalisability	203
16.6 A	A2.6. Concl	lusions	204
16.7 A	A2.7. Refer	ences	205

Table		Page
Table 9.1.	Treatments indicated or used for COVID-19	30
Table 9.2.	Baseline Comorbidities	34
Table 9.3.	Baseline Comorbidities to Classify Immunocompromised Status	35
Table 9.4.	Baseline Symptoms	
Table 9.5.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy	
Table 9.6.	Feasibility assessment	45
Table 9.7.	Baseline Immunocompromised Classification	52
Table 10.1.	Patient Disposition	57
Table 10.2.	Distribution of Patients within CEM Categories for Unmatched and Matched Cohorts	59
Table 10.3.	Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts	63
Table 10.4.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts	65
Table 10.5.	Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts	67
Table 10.6.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts	74
Table 10.7.	Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts	81
Table 10.8.	Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables in the Matched Cohorts	84
Table 10.9.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables in the Matched Cohorts	86
Table 10.10.	Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables in the Matched Cohorts	88
Table 10.11.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables in the Matched Cohorts	94
Table 10.12.	Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables in the Matched Cohorts .	101
Table 10.13.	COVID-19 Treatment Administration during Follow-up in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts	

### J2X-MC-B003 Non-interventional PASS Final Study Report

Table 10.14.	Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts1	06
Table 10.15.	Risk Differences for Primary and Secondary Outcomes in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts1	07
Table 10.16.	Results from Subgroup Analyses1	09
Table 10.17.	Results from Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias1	18
Table 10.18.	Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding1	20
Table 10.19.	Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data	22
Table.A2.1.	Patient Disposition for Supplemental Analyses1	40
Table.A2.2.	Distribution of Patients within CEM Categories for Supplemental Analyses in Unmatched and Matched Cohorts1	42
Table.A2.3.	Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts1	46
Table.A2.4.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts14	48
Table.A2.5.	Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts1	50
Table.A2.6.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts1	57
Table.A2.7.	Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts1	65
Table.A2.8.	Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts1	68
Table.A2.9.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts1	70
Table A2.10.	Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts1	72
Table.A2.11.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts1	78
Table.A2.12.	Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts1	85

Table.A2.13.	COVID-19 Treatment Administration and Insurance Disenrollment during Follow-up for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts
Table.A2.14.	Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts
Table.A2.15.	Risk differences for primary and secondary outcomes for supplemental analyses in the unmatched and matched cohorts190
Table.A2.16.	Results from Subgroup Analyses in the Matched Cohorts for Supplemental Analyses
Table.A2.17.	Results from Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias for Supplemental Analyses
Table.A2.18.	Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding for Supplemental Analyses200

### **List of Figures**

Figure	Pa	age
Figure 9.1.	Schematic representation of the study cohort development and study time-period.	26
Figure 9.2.	Noninferiority assessment	46
Figure 10.1.	Propensity score distribution in the A) unmatched and B) matched cohorts.	61
Figure 10.2.	BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): age $\geq 65$ and age $< 65$	114
Figure 10.3.	BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): immunocompromised (lmnX) Yes and No.	.114
Figure 10.4.	BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): COVID-19 vaccination Yes and No.	.115
Figure 10.5.	BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): emergency department visit Yes and No.	.116
Figure.A2.1.	Propensity score distribution for supplemental analyses in the A) unmatched and B) matched cohorts	.144

## 1 Abstract

### Title

A Cohort Study to Evaluate the Real-World Utilization and Effectiveness of Bebtelovimab Compared to Paxlovid among Patients with Mild-to-Moderate COVID-19 Who Are at High Risk for Progressing to Severe Illness

### Keywords

COVID-19, bebtelovimab, effectiveness, noninferiority, cohort study

### **Rationale and background**

On 11 February 2022, the United States (US) Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued an emergency use authorization (EUA) for bebtelovimab (BEB), an antibody used for the treatment of mild-to-moderate coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in adults and pediatric patients (12 years of age and older weighing at least 40 kg) with positive results of direct acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) viral testing, who were at high risk for progression to severe COVID-19, including hospitalization or death, and for whom other COVID-19 treatment options approved or authorized by the FDA were not available or clinically appropriate.

Recognizing the limitations of the available clinical data, conditions of the letter of authorization required Eli Lilly and Company (Lilly) to submit a protocol for a clinical trial to collect additional information on BEB effectiveness outcomes. Although the US FDA de-authorized BEB 30 November 2022 due to the high level of circulating BEB-resistant Omicron subvariants BQ.1 and BQ.1.1, this study was conducted to address research questions regarding the effectiveness of BEB prior to de-authorization.

### **Research question and objectives**

The primary objective was to estimate the 30-day risk difference (RD) of the composite outcome of all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death for patients who received BEB compared to patients who received Paxlovid<sup>TM</sup> (nirmatrelvir / ritonavir; PAX). The primary analysis used noninferiority (NI) hypothesis testing with an *a priori* specified NI margin. The secondary objective was to estimate the 30-day RD of all-cause hospitalizations, all-cause deaths, and all-cause emergency department (ED) visits.

### Study design

An observational, cohort study design was used to compare the effectiveness of BEB to PAX in adults and adolescents with mild-to-moderate COVID-19. Confounding control was achieved using coarsened exact matching (CEM) on *a priori* defined baseline variables in conjunction with variables selected for high-dimensional propensity score (HDPS) methods. For the primary analysis only, the NI null hypothesis was tested using the 1-sided Type I error of 0.025 by setting the upper confidence level of the risk difference (RD<sub>UCL</sub>) 95% confidence interval (CI) for BEB versus PAX to be less than the prespecified NI margin of 1.795%.

### Setting

The study cohorts included patients who received BEB or PAX between 16 February 2022 and 31 August 2022. Follow-up began on the day after index date and continued until 30-days post-index using an intention-to-treat (ITT) approach.

### Subjects and study size, including dropouts

After applying patient identification criteria, 12,920 BEB-exposed and 70,741 PAX-exposed patients remained in the unmatched cohorts. After conducting HDPS matching, 5,827 BEB-exposed and 5,827 PAX-exposed patients remained in the matched cohorts.

### Variables and data sources

Study variables were ascertained from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, an electronic health record (EHR) network that includes de-identified, longitudinal outpatient and inpatient data from health care organizations (HCOs) across the US. BEB exposure data were obtained from facility-based infusion centers and outpatient administrations. Oral PAX exposure data were ascertained from facility-based and outpatient medication records. Outcomes data were classified using facility-based and outpatient records. Baseline characteristics, including demographics, clinical parameters, comorbidities, pharmacotherapy exposure, and healthcare resource utilization (HRU), were ascertained from all available inpatient and outpatient records prior to and including the index date.

### Results

In the matched cohorts, the median age was 65 (interquartile range [IQR] 50 – 74) and 65 (IQR 50 – 74) years in BEB and PAX, respectively. Patients were primarily female (60.24% in BEB and 60.53% in PAX), White (84.07% in BEB and 84.06% in PAX), and non-Hispanic (77.43% in BEB and 78.05% in PAX). Adequate balance was achieved in all but 3 pre-specified covariates (eGFR, blood pressure, and oxygen saturation). Due to missingness >5%, these variables were not included in the PS generating model. Before matching, baseline differences between BEB and PAX treated patients were observed for demographics (e.g., median age: BEB 66 years; PAX 61years); comorbidities (e.g., immunocompromised status: BEB 50%; PAX 33%); pharmacotherapy utilization (e.g., COVID-19 vaccination status: BEB 18%; PAX 11%); and healthcare utilization (e.g., ED visit within 7 days before treatment: BEB 19%; PAX 8%).

The cumulative incidence of the composite outcome all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death in the matched cohorts was 2.03% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.68%, 2.42%) among patients treated with BEB and 1.84% (95% CI: 1.51%, 2.21%) among patients treated with PAX. BEB was noninferior to PAX for composite all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death; the RD was 0.19% (95% CI: -0.31%, 0.69%), with its UCL (0.69%) well within the noninferiority margin of 1.795%.

The cumulative incidence of hospitalization, ED visit, and death, respectively in matched cohorts, was 1.94% (95% CI: 1.60%, 2.33%), 5.08% (95% CI: 4.53%, 5.68%), and 0.10% (95% CI: 0.04%, 0.22%) for patients treated with BEB, and 1.82% (95% CI: 1.49%, 2.20%), 4.58%

(95% CI: 4.06%, 5.15%), and 0.02% (95% CI: 0.00%, 0.10%) for patients treated with PAX. BEB (compared to PAX) was not associated with increased risks of hospitalization (RD 0.12%; 95% CI: -0.37%, 0.61%), ED visit (RD 0.50%; 95% CI: -0.28%, 1.28%), or death (RD 0.086%; 95% CI: -0.003%, 0.175%). There was no evidence of effect modification by subgroups for age  $\geq 65$  years, immunocompromised status, COVID-19 vaccine, or ED visit within 7 days pre-index. Sensitivity analyses suggest that channeling bias and unmeasured confounding do not pose major threats to the validity of findings.

### Discussion

BEB was noninferior for the primary outcome (composite all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death) and had no statistically significant differences in the risk of hospitalization, ED visit, or death compared to PAX based the point estimates and confidence intervals. The treatment effect was consistent among subgroups of interest and results from sensitivity analyses were generally consistent with the primary findings. Overall, findings from this study were consistent with those of prior studies investigating the real-world effectiveness of BEB for COVID-19.

#### Conclusion

This study of the real-world utilization and effectiveness of BEB compared to PAX found BEBtreated patients (before matching) were older and a higher percentage had comorbidities associated with experiencing severe COVID-19 illness. After matching, to account for channeling bias, BEB- and PAX-treated patients were well balanced on baseline demographics, comorbidities, pharmacotherapy, and healthcare utilization. We observed BEB was not inferior to PAX with respect to 30-day all-cause hospitalization or death based on the *a priori* specified non-inferiority margin (primary composite outcome). Similarly, the risk of hospitalization, ED visit, and death (secondary outcomes) was not different for patients treated with BEB compared to those treated with PAX. Given evidence supporting the effectiveness of BEB, research on newer antibody therapies for emerging COVID-19 variants is warranted. As observed in the present study, real-world data permit the description of potentially important utilization disparities and, after accounting for baseline differences, estimating a valid treatment effect.

### **Marketing Authorisation Holder**

Eli Lilly and Company

Names and affiliations of principal investigators

**PPD** Eli Lilly and Company

**PPD** COHRDATA, INC

# 2 List of Abbreviations

Term	Definition
ACH	anticholinergic
ADL	activities of daily living
ASD	absolute standardized difference
BEB	bebtelovimab
BMI	body mass index
BP	blood pressure
CCSR	Clinical Classifications Software Refined
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CEM	coarsened exact matching
CI	confidence interval
CKD	chronic kidney disease
COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
СРТ	Current Procedural Terminology
CSV	comma-separated values
ED	emergency department
eGFR	estimated glomerular filtration rate
EHR	electronic health record
ESRD	end-stage renal disease
EUA	emergency use authorization
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
НСО	health care organization
HCPCS	Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System
HCUP	Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project
HDPS	high-dimensional propensity score
HRU	healthcare resource utilization
ICD-9/10-CM	International Classification of Diseases, Ninth/Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification
ICD-10-PCS	International Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Procedure Coding System
ICU	intensive care unit
IDN	integrated delivery network
IQR	interquartile range
ІТТ	intention-to-treat
LABA	long-acting beta agonist

LCL	lower confidence limit
LOINC	Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes
M1	margin
M2	noninferiority margin
MCQ	Mayo Clinic Quadratic
MICE	multivariate imputation using chained equations
NDC	National Drug Code
NI	noninferiority
OR	odds ratio
ΡΑΧ	Paxlovid <sup>TM</sup>
PDL	programmed death-ligand
PS	propensity score
RD	risk difference
RR	risk ratio
SABA	short-acting beta agonist
SARS-CoV-2	Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
sCr	serum creatinine
TNFX	tumor necrosis factor inhibitors
UCL	upper confidence limit
UPMC	University of Pittsburgh Medical Center
US	United States
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs

# 3 Investigators

### **Eli Lilly Investigators:**

### PPD

Lilly Corporate Center Indianapolis, IN 46285 United States PPD

### PPD

Lilly Corporate Center Indianapolis, IN 46285 United States PPD

### **TriNetX Investigators:**

PPD

COHRDATA, INC San Clemente, CA 92672 United States **PPD** 

# 4 Other Responsible Parties

Not applicable.

Milestone	Planned date	Actual date	Comments
Start of Data Collection	15 February 2023	23 March 2023	
(Primary Analysis)			
End of Data Collection	15 February 2023	23 March 2023	
(Primary Analysis)			
Final report of study results	31 July 2023	See Page 1	
(Primary Analysis)			
Start of Data Collection	5 September 2023	5 September 2023	
(Supplemental Analysis)			
End of Data Collection	5 September 2023	5 September 2023	
(Supplemental Analysis)			
Final report of study results	11 December 2023	11 December 2023	
(Supplemental Analysis)			

## **5** Milestones

## 6 Rationale and Background

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and its resulting illness coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is associated with over 90 million cases of COVID-19 and over 1 million deaths in the United States (US) (CDC 2022b). Common symptoms of mild COVID-19 disease include fever, myalgia, headache, difficulty breathing, weakness, gastrointestinal symptoms, and loss of smell or taste (Parasher 2021). Progression to more severe disease may lead to hospitalization, non-invasive and invasive ventilation, and death (WHO 2020; Parasher 2021). Patients with COVID-19 who also have multiple comorbidities or chronic diseases are more likely to experience severe disease and progress rapidly (Emami et al. 2020; Hodge et al. 2020; Choi et al. 2021; CDC 2022a).

In December 2020, COVID-19 vaccinations became available in the US. The successful distribution and utilization of COVID-19 vaccines resulted in less severe clinical disease, lower hospitalization rates, and reduced mortality (Bernal et al. 2021; Monto 2021; Nguyen et al. 2021; Wagner et al. 2021; Andrews et al. 2022; Khairat et al. 2022). Nonetheless, important questions remain regarding waning immunity, re-infection rates, outcomes among immunocompromised persons and the clinical impact of new variants (Pei et al. 2021).

In December 2021, two oral antiviral treatments, Paxlovid<sup>TM</sup> (nirmatrelvir / ritonavir) and Lagevrio<sup>TM</sup> (molnupiravir), received emergency use authorizations (EUAs) for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in certain high-risk patients. PAX was subsequently recommended as first-line therapy for the treatment of patients at high risk of severe disease, and it was made available free of charge. Remdesivir was also listed as first-line therapy but required an infusion 3 consecutive days and was only available for purchase through commercial channels (NIH 2022). Limitations for these antiviral treatments include numerous drug-drug interactions for Paxlovid<sup>TM</sup> (PAX) (FDA 2021b) and age and pregnancy restrictions and possibly decreased efficacy for molnupiravir (FDA 2021a).

A randomized controlled trial conducted between 16 July 2021 and 9 December 2021, consisting of 2,246 patients with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis from 343 worldwide sites, found that patients treated with PAX had a lower rate of hospitalization at the 28-day benchmark compared with the placebo group. In the modified intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis, which had a population of 774 patients, 0.77% of patients in the PAX group (N=389) compared with 7.01% of patients in the placebo group (N=385) had a COVID-19 related hospitalization (Hammond et al. 2022). On 25 May 2023 the US Food and Drug Administration approved the oral antiviral Paxlovid<sup>TM</sup> for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in adults at high risk of severe disease progression (FDA 2023).

Several monoclonal antibody therapies were made available for the treatment of COVID-19. In November 2020, bamlanivimab and REGEN-COV<sup>TM</sup> (casirivimab/imdevimab) received EUAs for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in adults and certain pediatric patients who were at high risk for progressing to severe COVID-19 and/or hospitalization (ASPR 2023a; ASPR 2023b). Subsequently in February 2021, bamlanivimab in combination with etesevimab received an EUA for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in adults and certain pediatric

patients as well as post-exposure prophylaxis. By January 2022 however, bamlanivimab alone, bamlanivimab/etsevimab, and casirivimab/imdevimab were no longer available in the US due to the increased frequency of viral variants with resistance to these treatments, such as the Omicron variant (ASPR 2022; ASPR 2023a; ASPR 2023b). Sotrovimab, another monoclonal antibody, was issued an EUA in May 2021 for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19; this EUA was revoked in April 2022 due to increased frequency of the Omicron BA.2 subvariant (FDA 2022c).

On 11 February 2022, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued an EUA for BEB, an antibody that demonstrated neutralization against the Omicron variant of COVID-19 (FDA 2022b). By April 2022, bebtelovimab (BEB) remained the only monoclonal antibody available for treatment due to the high Omicron subvariant BA.2 prevalence in the US and the de-authorization of sotrovimab. BEB was used for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients (12 years of age and older weighing at least 88 pounds [40 kg]) with positive results of direct SARS-CoV-2 viral testing, and who were at high risk for progression to severe COVID-19 illness, including hospitalization or death, and for whom other COVID-19 treatment options approved or authorized by the FDA were not available or clinically appropriate. BEB, administered as a single intravenous injection over at least 30 seconds in an appropriate clinical setting, required administration as soon as possible after positive results of direct SARS-CoV-2 viral testing on severe COV-2 viral testing of a symptom onset.

Data that supported the EUA for treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 were primarily based on analyses from the Phase 2 portion of the BLAZE-4 trial (NCT04634409), which was conducted before the emergence of the Omicron variant. Based on the totality of scientific evidence available, including the available Phase 2 and pharmacokinetic data, along with the nonclinical viral neutralization data for Omicron and other variants of concern, it was reasonable to believe that BEB may reduce the risk of progression to hospitalization or death (Iketani et al. 2022). Recognizing limitations of the available clinical data, however, the letter of authorization required Lilly to submit a proposed clinical trial protocol to further evaluate the effectiveness of BEB.

In the time since the BEB EUA, studies evaluating the effectiveness of BEB and PAX have been conducted externally. Cohort studies using electronic health records (EHRs) in the US and a double-blind, Phase 2 to 3 randomized controlled trial found that BEB and PAX, respectively, were associated with decreased rates of hospitalizations for high-risk patients within 28 or 30 days after drug initiation. A 2022 study, which included high-risk patients who had a positive SARS-CoV-2 test from 30 March 2022 through 28 May 2022, found the 28-day incidence of hospitalization or death was 3.1% versus 5.5% (conditional odds ratio [OR]=0.53; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.32 to 0.86) in 930 BEB treated versus 930 propensity score (PS) matched non-treated patients, respectively (McCreary et al. 2022).

Similarly, a study using the Mayo Clinic's integrated healthcare delivery network (IDN) comprising of patients in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida, and Arizona who were treated with BEB or PAX from 20 March 2022 through 14 June 2022 found that 1.4% of BEB treated patients (N=2833), and 1.2% of PAX treated patients (N=774) progressed to a severe disease

outcome (Razonable et al. 2022). These rates were found not to be significantly different from each other. The study also found that 0.5% of patients treated with BEB (N=14) and 0.3% of patients treated with PAX (N=2) were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU).

On 30 November 2022, during protocol development of the current study, the US FDA de-authorized BEB due to the high level of circulating Omicron subvariants (BQ.1 and BQ.1.1) that were not expected to be effectively neutralized (FDA 2022a). To address research questions regarding the effectiveness of BEB prior to the suspension of the EUA, this noninferiority (NI) study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of BEB relative to PAX to address research questions regarding the effectiveness of BEB prior to the de-authorization.

# 7 Research Question and Objectives

### 7.1 Study Objectives

### **Primary objective**

The primary objective was to estimate the 30-day risk difference (RD) and 95% CI of a composite outcome of all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death, for patients who received BEB compared with patients who received PAX. The cumulative incidence and RD and corresponding 95% CIs were reported.

This analysis used NI hypothesis testing with an *a priori* specified NI margin. The NI null hypothesis was tested using the one-sided Type I error of 0.025 by setting the upper confidence level of the risk difference (RD<sub>UCL</sub>) 95% CI for BEB versus PAX to be less than the *a priori* specified NI margin of 1.795%. The null hypothesis was defined as a higher risk of 30-day all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death for patients treated with BEB compared with patients treated with PAX by at least 1.795%. We rejected the null hypothesis and established NI if the RD<sub>UCL</sub> excluded 1.795%. More detail can be found in Sections 9.7.2 and 9.7.3.

The NI null (H<sub>0</sub>) and alternative (H<sub>1</sub>) hypotheses were:

- NI H<sub>0</sub>:  $RD_{UCL} \ge 1.795\%$ , and
- NI H<sub>1</sub>:  $RD_{UCL} < 1.795\%$ .

### Secondary objectives

The secondary objective was to estimate the 30-day RD of all-cause hospitalization, all-cause death, and all-cause emergency department (ED) visits for patients who received BEB compared with patients who received PAX.

The cumulative incidence, RD, and 95% CI were reported; however, hypothesis testing was not conducted for the secondary objectives.

# 8 Amendments and Updates

Not applicable.

## **9** Research Methods

### 9.1 Study Design

An observational, cohort study design was used to describe and compare the effectiveness of BEB to PAX in adults and adolescents with mild-to-moderate COVID-19. A balanced and well confounding controlled cohort study design is appropriate to complement clinical trials to 1) evaluate multiple study outcomes, 2) determine the cumulative incidence (risk) and RD of each outcome, and 3) increase the precision of outcome estimation. The study cohorts were identified from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network and included patients who received BEB or PAX during the index period (16 February 2022 to 31 August 2022). The index date was the date of the first BEB or first PAX record during the index period. An ITT approach was used to derive the cumulative incidence and RD and 95% CI of 30-day all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death (primary analysis composite outcome), and of all-cause hospitalization, all-cause death, and all-cause ED visit (secondary analysis outcomes). For comparing the outcomes between the 2 cohorts, confounding control was achieved using coarsened exact matching (CEM) on a priori defined baseline variables in conjunction with PS matching on a broader set of baseline variables selected with HDPS methodology. For the primary analysis only, the NI null hypothesis for this objective was tested using the 1-sided Type I error of 0.025 by setting the RD<sub>UCL</sub> 95% CI for BEB versus PAX to be less than the prespecified NI margin of 1.795%. A schematic representation of the study design is displayed in Figure 9.1.



† The Baseline Date is the date corresponding to 6-months prior to the Index Date

#### Figure 9.1. Schematic representation of the study cohort development and study time-period.

## 9.2 Setting

### 9.2.1 Study Cohort Development

The study cohorts were identified from the TriNetX Dataworks USA EHR network, which includes over 92 million patients from 56 health care organizations (HCOs). More detail on TriNetX Dataworks USA can be found in Section 9.5.1. The study cohorts included patients who received BEB or PAX during the index period (16 February 2022 to 31 August 2022). The index date was the date of the first BEB or first PAX record during the index period. If a patient was exposed to both BEB and PAX during the index period, they were included in the cohort (BEB or PAX) based on the first date of BEB or PAX exposure. However, patients who were exposed to both BEB and PAX on the same date were excluded. Therefore, patients were included in only 1 cohort for this study.

## 9.2.2 Follow-Up and Censoring (Primary and Sensitivity Analysis Methodology)

Follow-up began on the day after index date (that is, index date plus 1 day) and continued until 30-days post-index. Using an ITT approach, the exposure status (BEB or PAX) classified on the index date was carried forward for the entire 30-day follow-up period. With this approach, all patients in the study cohorts were included in the analysis set, regardless of post-index use of convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibody, or antiviral therapy.

We described the proportion of patients who received post-index convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibody, or antiviral treatment indicated, authorized, or used to treat or prevent COVID-19 (excluding BEB/PAX on the index date). Table 9.1 lists the specific treatments.

## 9.3 Subjects

Both cohorts were restricted to include patients who met all the following inclusion/exclusion criteria:

- 1. BEB or PAX exposure during index period;
- 2. age 12 years and older as of the index date;
- 3. at least 1 healthcare encounter within 6 to 36 months pre-index:
  - a. Qualifying healthcare encounters included any of the following: office visit, inpatient admission, ED visit, diagnosis or procedure code, clinical measurement (e.g., blood pressure [BP] measurement), laboratory or diagnostic test, or medication prescribing record;
- 4. no inpatient admission within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date);
- 5. no hospice care within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date);
- 6. no treatment indicated or used for COVID-19 within 90 days pre-index (inclusive of index date):
  - a. excluding BEB/PAX on the index date; and
- 7. no supplemental or chronic oxygen therapy within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date).

### 9.4 Variables

### 9.4.1 Study Variable Identification

The codes used to classify each study variable were ascertained from the EHR data within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. For the supplemental analysis, the EHR data was augmented with health insurance claims codes (for example, National Drug Code [NDC]) from the TriNetX Linked Network. Unless otherwise specified, each study variable was classified by the presence of 1 code recorded in any setting (for example, inpatient or outpatient). The specific codes to classify each variable are included in a separate code list document. For each variable type, the code systems included the following:

- Medical diagnoses were classified using:
  - International Classification of Disease, Ninth Revision/International Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9/10-CM);
- COVID-19 symptoms were classified using:
  - ICD-10-CM;
  - Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes (LOINC);
- Pharmacotherapy was classified using:
  - RxNorm;
  - Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS);
  - Current Procedural Terminology (CPT);
  - o NDC;
- Healthcare procedures were classified using:
  - ICD-10-CM;
  - o CPT;
  - HCPCS;
  - International Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Procedure Coding System (ICD-10-PCS);
- Laboratory data was classified using:
- LOINC; Healthcare encounters were classified using:
  - CPT;
  - HCPCS; and
  - ICD-10-CM

## 9.4.2 Variables to Classify the Study Cohorts

### **BEB and PAX classification**

BEB exposure data was ascertained from facility-based infusion centers and outpatient administrations. BEB exposure was classified as a binary indicator variable (yes/no) during the index period by at least 1 HCPCS or RxNorm code. The first BEB administration date was used to classify the BEB index date.

Oral PAX (combination of nirmatrelvir and ritonavir) was ascertained from facility-based and outpatient medication records. PAX exposure was classified as a binary indicator variable

(yes/no) during the index period by at least 1 RxNorm code. The first PAX date was assigned as the PAX index date.

### Age

Patient age was classified as of the index date. Age was classified as a continuous variable (in years), a binary variable (age  $\geq$ 65 years), and a categorical variable (12-29 years, 30-44 years, 45-54 years, 55-64 years, 65-74 years, 75-84 years, and  $\geq$ 85 years).

#### Baseline activity in the EHR network

Patients in the study cohorts were required to have at least 1 healthcare encounter in the EHR database between 6 and 36 months prior to the index date. This requirement was intended to increase the likelihood of ascertaining important study variables by ensuring all patients had a history of receiving care with the contributing HCO network.

#### **Inpatient admission**

To restrict the study cohorts to patients with mild-to-moderate COVID-19 disease, patients who had an inpatient admission within 30 days prior to index date were excluded from the study cohorts (inclusive of the index date). Inpatient admissions were classified using facility-based EHR data.

### Hospice care

Patients with evidence of hospice care within 30 days prior to index date were excluded from the study cohorts (inclusive of the index date). Hospice care was classified using facility-based and outpatient EHR data.

#### Treatments indicated or used for COVID-19

Patients who were exposed to inpatient or outpatient therapy indicated or used for the treatment of COVID-19 within 90 days prior to the index date (inclusive of the index date) were excluded from both study cohorts. Table 9.1 provides the specific exclusionary treatments.

Convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibody, or antiviral therapy was classified using outpatient prescribing records and/or facility-based administrations. Of note, this did not include exposure to BEB or PAX on the index date.

Convalescent plasma		
COVID-19 convalescent plasma		
Monoclonal Antibody Therapy		
Bamlanivimab		
Bamlanivimab/etesevimab		
Bebtelovimab		
Casirivimab/imdevimab		
Sotrovimab		
Antiviral Therapy		
Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine <sup>a</sup>		
Ivermectin <sup>a</sup>		
Molnupiravir		
Nirmatrelvir/ritonavir		
Remdesivir		

 Table 9.1.
 Treatments indicated or used for COVID-19

Abbreviation: COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019.

<sup>a</sup> Not approved or authorized for use by the FDA but known to be used for the treatment of COVID-19.

### **Oxygen support**

Patients who utilized oxygen support (that is, invasive/non-invasive ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation/extracorporeal life support) within 30 days prior to the index date (inclusive of index date) were excluded. Oxygen support was classified using outpatient and facility-based EHR data.

### 9.4.3 Variables to Classify the Study Outcomes

Outcomes were ascertained within 30 days following the index date (that is, the follow-up period). The index date (Day 0) was not included in the follow-up period. All study outcomes were classified using outpatient and facility-based EHR data within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. Outpatient records were used to augment facility-based records to ascertain deaths which occurred outside of the hospital.

The primary outcome was the composite of all-cause hospitalization or all-cause mortality. The primary outcome was classified by the first evidence of an inpatient confinement or death during follow-up. The secondary outcomes were all-cause hospitalization, all-cause mortality, and all-cause ED visit.

#### All-cause hospitalization

All-cause hospitalization was classified by the first inpatient confinement, including ICU admissions but not 24-hour observations or ED visits. The outcome date was the date of the first inpatient confinement recorded in the EHR. Subsequent hospitalizations were not ascertained or analyzed.

All-cause hospitalization included all inpatient admissions regardless of the admitting or discharge diagnosis. The rationale for studying all-cause hospitalization, as opposed to COVID-

19 related hospitalization, was to include events that may have otherwise been excluded due to symptom-based coding practices. That is, patients who were hospitalized due to COVID-19 illness but where the primary diagnosis was recorded as something other than COVID-19 (for example, shortness of breath, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or pneumonia) would have required the study investigators to impose subjective criteria to classify a COVID-19-related hospitalization. Using the broader outcome definition of all-cause hospitalization captures worsening COVID-19 illness without excluding events based on healthcare provider coding practices.

### All-cause mortality

All-cause mortality was classified from in-hospital death, physician-recorded death, or a change in the patients' vital status (death) during follow-up. To protect patient privacy, the month and year of death, for the month following the true death date, were included in TriNetX Dataworks USA EHR data. For example, if the true date of death was 30 April 2022, the month and year of death, as observed in the EHR data, would have been May 2022.

To account for this death date characteristic, the ascertainment of all-cause mortality extended into the month after the follow-up period end date. For example, if the index date for a hypothetical patient was 18 April 2022, the first and last date of the follow-up period would have been 19 April 2022 and 18 May 2022, respectively. In this scenario, we ascertained deaths recorded in May and June 2022. However, the date of death was assigned to the date of the last post-index EHR record during the follow-up period, that is, 19 April 2022 to 18 May 2022 in this example. If the last post-index EHR record occurred after the end of the follow-up period, for example, after 18 May 2022, the death was not counted as an outcome event. If there were zero post-index EHR records prior to a recorded death, the death date was assigned to the first day of follow-up, that is, index date plus 1 day or 19 April 2022 in this example.

### ED visit

ED visits (including observation encounters or less than 24-hour stays) not resulting in an inpatient confinement on the same day were classified by 1 encounter code from facility-based EHRs during follow-up. The first date an ED visit was recorded defined the outcome date. Only the first ED visit during follow-up was ascertained and analyzed.

## 9.4.4 Variables to Classify the Study Outcomes – Supplementary Analyses Using EHR Data linked to Health Insurance Claims and Mortality Data

For supplementary analyses using data from the TriNetX Linked Network, the study outcomes are the same as described in the primary analysis. The TriNetX Linked Network includes longitudinal, de-identified, patient-level data for a subset of patients whose EHRs are linked to closed medical and pharmacy health insurance claims and to external mortality data. The concept of closed claims means that all healthcare interactions that are paid by the health insurance provider are available, regardless of the site of care. Participating HCOs within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network permit the linkage of EHR data to closed health insurance claims data and to external mortality data using de-identified Datavant tokens. Datavant's death index is comprised of mortality data obtained from the Social Security Death Index and from obituary feed data.

The linked population includes a subset of patients from the primary analysis cohorts who have health records in both the TriNetX EHR database and the closed health insurance claims or mortality databases. The linked population is used to ascertain events that occur outside the HCO network.

All de-identified patient data in the TriNetX Linked Network are harmonized to standard terminologies. Clinical facts from the EHR and claims data are defined by:

- ICD-10-CM diagnosis codes,
- CPT, HCPCS, and ICD-10-PCS procedure codes,
- NDC, RxNorm Drug, RxNorm Ingredient, CPT, HCPCS, and ICD-10-PCS medication codes, and
- LOINCs for laboratory test results.

The outcomes for the supplementary analyses, using the linked population, are those listed and described in Section 9.4.3. The outcomes are classified using the same methodology as described for the primary analysis; however, the coding systems are augmented with codes from health insurance claims data (for example, place of service codes to classify inpatient confinements, ED visits and discharge status to classify in-hospital death).

## 9.4.5 Variables to Classify Baseline Covariates

Baseline covariates were ascertained from ambulatory and inpatient EHRs within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. Unless otherwise specified, each baseline covariate was classified by 1 code using all available data prior to and including the index date. If more than 1 baseline value was available (for example, body mass index [BMI] and BP), the value recorded on the index date or closest to the index date was ascertained.

### Demographics

- Age was classified as a continuous variable (in years), a binary variable (≥65 years [yes/no]), and a categorical variable (12-29 years, 30-44 years, 45-54 years, 55-64 years, 65-74 years, 75-84 years, and ≥85 years).
- Sex was classified as a binary variable (male/female) as reported in the EHR.
- Race was classified as a categorical variable (White, Black, Other, Unknown).

### **Clinical parameters**

Clinical parameters were classified from EHR data during *a priori* specified ascertainment windows in close temporality prior to BEB and PAX initiation. This approach provided baseline data with greater clinical relevance regarding patient health status immediately prior to or at the time of BEB and PAX initiation.

However, with this approach, it was expected that a large percentage (for example, more than 50%) of patients would not have recorded clinical data during the ascertainment window as listed here, and longer ascertainment windows would likely have yielded lower levels of missingness. The rationale for ascertaining and including these variables, given the high degree of missingness, was to better describe the study cohorts despite the inherent limitations of absent data.

- BP was ascertained within 7 days prior to the index date using the last available pre-index value and classified as a categorical variable (for example, normotensive [systolic BP  $\leq$ 120 mm Hg and diastolic BP  $\leq$ 80 mm Hg], Stage 1[systolic BP 130 to 139 mm Hg or diastolic BP 80 to 89 mm Hg], Stage 2 [systolic BP ≥140 mm Hg or diastolic BP ≥90 mm Hg], missing)
- Oxygen saturation was ascertained within 7 days prior to the index date using the last available pre-index value and classified as a continuous and categorical variable (for example, <85%, 85 to <95%,  $\ge95\%$ , missing)
- BMI was ascertained using the last available value prior to the index date as reported in the EHR or calculated using the formula:
  - $BMI = Weight in Kg/Height in m^2$ •
    - Classified as a categorical variable
      - Underweight: BMI < 18.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>
      - Normal:  $18.5 \le BMI < 25.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$
      - Overweight:  $25.0 \le BMI \le 30.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$ •
      - Obese: BMI  $\geq$  30.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup>
      - Missing

### **Smoking status**

Smoking status was classified as reported in the EHR as current, past, or unknown. The last available value prior to the index date and as reported in the EHR was used.

### Laboratory data

Serum creatinine (sCr), used to calculate the estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), was ascertained using all available pre-index data. However, it was expected that serum creatinine would be absent for a large percentage (for example, more than 50%) of cohort members.

The rationale for ascertaining and including eGFR, given the high degree of absent data, was to better describe the study cohorts and to augment the classification of chronic kidney disease (CKD). eGFR was calculated using the Mayo Clinic Quadratic (MCQ) formula and classified as a continuous and categorical variable (for example, eGFR  $\geq$ 90, 60 to 89, 30 to 59, 15 to 29, <15 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, missing).

### **Comorbidities**

Baseline comorbidities included conditions associated with high risk of severe COVID-19 illness and hospitalization as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (Kompaniyets et al. 2021; CDC 2022c). Additionally, guided by the recent COVID-19 publication by McCreary et al. (2022), we included comorbidities to classify immunocompromised status.

Each baseline comorbidity was classified using all available pre-index data as a binary variable (yes/no) by at least 1 inpatient or outpatient diagnosis code. In addition to diagnosis codes, the classification of CKD and obesity was augmented by eGFR (that is, eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) and BMI (that is, BMI >30 kg/ m<sup>2</sup>). Patients who did not have a code or laboratory/clinical value for a given comorbidity were classified as not having the comorbidity.

Diagnosis codes to classify each comorbidity were ascertained from the Agency for Healthcare

Research and Quality Clinical Classifications Index using the lowest level clinical classifications index grouping for each comorbidity.

Table 9.2 presents baseline comorbidities. Table 9.3 presents additional baseline comorbidities to classify immunocompromised status.

Baseline comorbidities					
Pulmonary	Disabilities				
Alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency	Attention disorder (ADHD)				
Asthma	Cerebral palsy				
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia	Congenital malformations (birth defects)				
COPD and bronchiectasis	Intellectual and developmental disabilities				
Cystic fibrosis	Learning disabilities				
Interstitial lung disease	Limitations with self-care				
Pulmonary embolism	Spinal cord injuries				
Pulmonary hypertension					
Endocrine	Infectious disease				
Diabetes Type 1	Hepatitis B				
Diabetes Type 2	Hepatitis C				
Diabetes Type 1 or 2 w/complications	Tuberculosis				
Obesity					
Renal	Neurocognitive				
Chronic kidney disease	Dementia				
End-stage renal disease					
Hepatic	Mental health				
Alcoholic liver disease	Anxiety and fear-related disorders				
Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease	Mood disorders, including depression				
Autoimmune hepatitis	Schizophrenia spectrum disorders				
Cirrhosis	Substance use disorders				
Circulatory	Blood disorder				
Cardiomyopathy or myocarditis	Aplastic anemia				
Cerebrovascular disease	Sickle cell disease				
Coronary artery disease	Thalassemia				
Heart failure					
Hypertension	Pregnancy				

Table 9.2.Baseline Comorbidities

Abbreviations: ADHD = attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Baseline comorbidities to classify immunocompromised status				
Mast cell activation disorder				
Mast cell activation syndrome & related disorders				
Microscopic polyangiitis				
Multifocal fibrosclerosis				
Multisystem inflammatory syndrome				
Necrotizing vasculopathies				
Overlap syndromes				
Personal history of antineoplastic chemotherapy				
Personal history of immunosuppression therapy				
Personal history of irradiation				
Personal history of monoclonal drug therapy				
Personal history of systemic steroid therapy				
Polyarteritis nodosa & related conditions				
Polyclonal hypergammaglobulinemia				
Polymyalgia rheumatica				
Polymyositis				
Relapsing panniculitis [Weber-Christian]				
Rheumatoid arthritis				
Sarcoidosis				
Sjogren syndrome				
Systemic involvement of connective tissue				
Systemic lupus erythematosus				
Systemic sclerosis				
Transplant – solid organ or hematopoietic				
Thrombotic microangiopathy				
Wegener's granulomatosis				

 Table 9.3.
 Baseline Comorbidities to Classify Immunocompromised Status

Abbreviations: HSCT-TMA = Hematopoietic stem cell transplant thrombotic microangiopathy.

#### **COVID-19 diagnosis (past and present)**

A present COVID-19 diagnosis was ascertained within 7 days pre-index and classified as a binary variable. A past COVID-19 diagnosis was ascertained anytime in the baseline period, except within 7 days pre-index.

### **COVID-19 symptoms**

The COVID-19 related symptoms listed in Table 9.4 were ascertained within 7 days pre-index and classified as binary variables.

Baseline symptoms
Anosmia and parosmia
Cough
Diarrhea
Fatigue
Fever or chills
Headache
Muscle or body aches/myalgia
Nausea or vomiting
Shortness of breath or difficulty breathing/dyspnea
Sore throat/pharyngitis

#### Table 9.4.Baseline Symptoms

#### Pharmacotherapy

Baseline pharmacotherapy was used to describe the study cohorts and evaluated for inclusion in the PS generating model.

Pharmacotherapy utilization, described as binary variables, was classified as present and past. Unless otherwise specified, present use was classified within 6-months pre-index (that is, index date to 6-months pre-index, inclusive of both dates). Past use was classified any time prior to 6months pre-index.

Table 9.5 presents the specific baseline pharmacotherapies.

Notes regarding specific medications:

- COVID-19 vaccines:
  - Classified as:
    - present use: within 9 months pre-index,
    - past use: greater than 9 months pre-index;
  - Based on feasibility from the EHR data ascertained in September 2022, at least 1 past COVID-19 vaccination was documented for approximately 25% of patients exposed to BEB/PAX. Approximately 12% of patients have documentation of a present COVID-19 vaccination.
- Antiemetics (used to augment the classification of nausea and vomiting):
  - Classified as:
    - present use: within 7 days pre-index,
    - past use: greater than 7 days pre-index;
- Corticosteroids (inhaled, oral, or systemic):
  - Classified as:
    - present use: within 7 days pre-index,
    - past use: greater than 7 days pre-index;
- Antivirals:
  - Classified as:
    - present use: within 6 months pre-index:
- Note: Patients were excluded who received antivirals listed in Table 9.1 within 90 days pre-index;
- past use: greater than 6 months pre-index;
- SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing monoclonal antibodies:
  - Classified as:
    - present use: within 6 months pre-index:
      - Note: Patients were excluded who received SARS-CoV-2– neutralizing monoclonal antibodies listed in Table 9.1 within 90 days pre-index; and
    - past use: greater than 6 months pre-index.

Table 9.5.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy
	=

Medication class	Medication Sub-class	Medication
COVID-19		See code list for details
vaccine		
Anticoagulant	Novel anticoagulant	Rivaroxaban, dabigatran, apixaban, edoxaban
	Anticoagulant	Warfarin
Antihypertensive		Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor, angiotensin II receptor blocker, MRA, loop diuretic, thiazide diuretic, beta blocker
Lipid-lowering	Statin	Atorvastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, rosuvastatin calcium, simvastatin
agent	Cholesterol absorption inhibitor	Ezetimibe
	Bile Acid Sequestrant	Cholestyramine, colestipol, colesevelam
	PCSK9 inhibitor	Alirocumab and evolocumab
	Adenosine triphosphate-citrate lyase inhibitor	Bempedoic acid
	Fibrate	Gemfibrozil, fenofibrate, clofibrate
Bronchodilator	Short-acting beta2-agonist	Albuterol, levalbuterol, albuterol and ipratropium bromide
	Long-acting beta2-agonist	Salmeterol, arformoterol, formoterol, olodaterol, vilanterol
	Anticholinergic	Ipratropium bromide, tiotropium bromide
	Theophylline	Theophylline
Leukotriene modifier		Montelukast, zafirlukast, and zileuton
Antiemetic		Metoclopramide, ondansetron, prochlorperazine, promethazine
Antidiabetic agent	Alpha-glucosidase inhibitor	Acarbose, miglitol
_	Amylin analog	Pramlintide
	Dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor	Alogliptan, linagliptin, saxagliptin, sitagliptin
	Incretin mimetic	Albiglutide, dulaglutide, exenatide, liraglutide, lixisenatide
	Insulin	
	Meglitinide	Nateglinide, repaglinide
	Non-sulfonylurea	Metformin

Medication class	Medication Sub-class	Medication				
	SGLT-2 inhibitor	Canagliflozin, dapagliflozin, empagliflozin				
	Sulfonylurea	Chlorpropamide, glimepiride, glipizide, glyburide, tolazamide, tolbutamide				
	Thiazolidinedione	Rosiglitazone, pioglitazone				
Immune	B-cell depleting therapy	Belimumab, ocrelizumab, rituximab, ofatumumab				
modulatory						
agent	CAR-T therapy	Axicabtagene ciloleucel, brexucabtagene autoleucel, ciltacabtegene autoleucel, idecabtagene vicleucel, tisagenlecleucel				
	Cell death protein 1 therapy (PD-1 and PDL-1)	Cemiplimab, dostarlimab, nivolumab, pembrolizumab, atezolizumab, avelumab, durvalumab				
	Corticosteroid	Beclomethasone, budesonide, deflazacort, dexamethasone, hydrocortisone,				
	(inhaled, oral, or systemic)	methylprednisolone, prednisolone, prednisone, triamcinolone, fluticasone,				
		mometasone				
	Immunosuppressant	Cyclosporine, everolimus, sirolimus, tacrolimus				
	TNF inhibitor	Adalimumab, etanercept, golimumab, infliximab				
	Other immune modulatory agent	Abatacept, anakinra, tocilizumab, azathioprine, leflunomide, methotrexate, mycophenolate, mycophenolate mofetil, sulfasalazine, cyclophosphamide				
Antiviral		Chloroquine, hydroxychloroquine sulfate, ivermectin, molnupiravir, nirmatrelvir and ritonavir, ritonavir, remdesivir				
SARS-CoV-2– neutralizing monoclonal antibodies		Tixagevimab and cilgavimab, bamlanivimab and etesevimab, casirivimab and imdevimab, sotrovimab				

Abbreviations: CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; MRA = mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist; PCSK9 = proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin Type 9; PD-1 = programmed cell death 1; PDL-1 = programmed cell death ligand 1; SARS-CoV-2 = severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SGLT-2 = sodium-glucose co-transporter-2; TNF = tumor necrosis factor.

#### Healthcare resource utilization

Baseline healthcare resource utilization (HRU) variables were classified by 1 code from facility and ambulatory encounter records within 7 days pre-index and within 1 year pre-index. HRU was described as continuous (for example, number of office visits), binary (for example, inpatient admission [yes/no]), and categorical variables. The categories were empirically derived from the observed distribution of the continuous variables.

The HRU variables included the following:

- outpatient office encounter (including telehealth and virtual encounters);
- inpatient admission (including ICU admissions):
  - Classified within 1 year pre-index excluding the 30 days before the index date. Note: Patients were excluded who had an inpatient admission within 30 days preindex (inclusive of the index date);
- ED visit; and
- observation encounter (that is, less than 24-hour stay).

## 9.5 Data Sources

### 9.5.1 TriNetX Dataworks USA Network

This observational cohort study used the EHR data from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network as the primary data source. This de-identified, longitudinal data source includes outpatient and inpatient EHRs from participating HCOs across the US. These patient-level data are sourced from a global federated health research network with real-time updates, typically every 2 to 4 weeks. Currently, the standardized EHR fields are available for approximately 92 million patients from 56 US-based HCOs. Network members include academic medical centers, IDNs, specialty hospitals, and large specialty physician practices.

EHR data from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network are generated from routine healthcare encounters within an open network. Patients may receive all or a proportion of their care through this network. Healthcare encounters which occurred outside the contributing HCO network were not observed. To mitigate the potential for missing data, eligibility requirements were incorporated to restrict the study population to only patients who previously received care within the contributing HCO network.

All patient data in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network are harmonized to standard terminologies. Clinical facts from the EHR are defined by:

- ICD-9/10-CM diagnosis codes,
- CPT, HCPCS, and ICD-10-PCS procedure codes,
- RxNorm medication codes,
- Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) drug classification system, ICD-10-PCS medication codes, and
- LOINCs for laboratory test results.

This EHR data source is rich in longitudinal data and includes:

- laboratory test results (including serum creatinine to classify eGFR),
- pharmacotherapy data (to classify BEB and PAX exposure),
- inpatient admission, in-hospital and physician-recorded death, and ED encounter data (to classify the study outcomes), and
- detailed data on patient demographics, medical history, pharmacotherapy, and healthcare utilization (to classify baseline patient characteristics).

# 9.5.2 TriNetX Linked Network (Supplemental Data Source)

For supplemental analyses, the source population and study cohorts were developed from the TriNetX Linked Network. The TriNetX Linked Network includes patients from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network EHR database who also have linked closed health insurance claims data and linked mortality data.

The linked study population includes a subset of patients in the primary study cohorts who have health records in both the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network EHR database and in the linked claims or mortality databases. Patients included in the linked study population were used to ascertain study outcomes and covariate data that were documented outside the EHR database. For example, the linked study population enables the ascertainment of hospitalizations and deaths that occur outside the site-specific care setting of the HCOs contributing EHR data to the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network.

Participating HCOs within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network permit the linkage of EHR data to closed health insurance claims data, including medical and pharmacy claims, and mortality data using de-identified tokens from Datavant. Datavant's death index is comprised of data from the Social Security Death Index and obituary feed data. The HCOs that contribute data to the TriNetX Linked Network are de-identified as are the individual patient records. Approximately 10% of all patients in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network are included in the TriNetX Linked Network.

All patient-level, longitudinal data in the TriNetX Linked Network are harmonized to standard terminologies. Clinical records from the EHR and claims data are defined by:

- ICD-9/10-CM diagnosis codes,
- CPT, HCPCS, and ICD-10-PCS procedure codes,
- National Drug Codes (NDC), RxNorm, CPT, HCPCS, and ICD-10-PCS medication codes, and
- CPT and LOINCs for laboratory test results.

### 9.6 Bias

Bias is systematic error resulting from incorrect estimation of the exposure and outcome association. Potential forms of bias include confounding, selection bias and information bias.

Bias may be independent of exposure status (non-differential bias) or associated with the exposure under investigation (differential bias).

### 9.6.1 Confounding

A confounding variable is a variable that is associated with the outcome of interest and independently associated with the exposure. A confounder can create a spurious association when one does not exist, or mask one when in fact an association exists. For this study, confounding was particularly relevant, as it related to the association between COVID-19 treatment selection (that is, BEB or PAX) and independently with the study outcomes (hospitalization, death, and ED visit) with:

- COVID-19 disease severity,
- the presence of high-risk comorbidities (for example, immunocompromised status),
- advanced age, and
- COVID-19 vaccine exposure status.

Methods were incorporated in the study design (for example, active comparator, nonhospitalized patients) and analysis (for example, CEM and PS matching, lagged index date sensitivity analysis) to mitigate confounding and to estimate a valid treatment effect. Additionally, a sensitivity analysis using multiple imputation of missing baseline covariate data was conducted to further mitigate potential confounding bias. Finally, a quantitative bias sensitivity analysis was conducted to estimate the minimum strength of association that an unmeasured confounder would need to have to explain the observed treatment effect.

Other sources of potential confounding bias that may have impacted this study were COVID-19 vaccine exposure status and time-dependent confounding from post-index exposure to monoclonal antibody or antiviral therapy (other than BEB or PAX). The initial feasibility assessment showed only 25% of BEB-treated patients had a COVID-19 vaccination record in the EHR, whereas the CDC data showed approximately 89% of patients aged 12 years and older received at least 1 COVID-19 vaccination. These disparate findings indicated a high degree of missingness. Given this, patients classified as 'unvaccinated' were more likely 'undetermined' than truly unvaccinated. Therefore, we executed the primary analyses on all patients meeting inclusion/exclusion criteria, agnostic of EHR-defined vaccination status. Under the assumption that the high vaccination rate reported by the CDC applied equally to patients included in the BEB and PAX cohorts, it was unlikely that the results were confounded by vaccine status; however, misclassification of vaccine status limited a data-driven assessment of imbalances. Therefore, subgroup analyses within vaccinated patients were conducted, as evidence of COVID-19 vaccination in the EHR was not likely to be misclassified. Characteristics of the vaccine distribution were examined in efforts to ensure that the treatment groups were as comparable as possible. To assess potential time-dependent confounding, we described the proportion of patients who received post-index treatment with monoclonal antibody or antiviral therapy (other than BEB or PAX).

## 9.6.2 Selection Bias

Selection bias occurs when study inclusion (or exclusion) is associated with an extraneous factor (for example, severe COVID-19 illness leading to hospitalization or death) that is not the exposure under investigation. Importantly, this selection factor is associated with the study exposure and independently with the study outcome. In circumstances where a selection factor excludes patients from cohort entry, the resulting bias cannot be controlled for in the analysis and must be accounted for in the study design or potentially illuminated through sensitivity analyses or descriptive analyses.

To mitigate the potential for selection bias, the study cohorts systematically included nonhospitalized patients in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network who were treated with BEB or PAX during the study period.

## 9.6.3 Information Bias

Information bias arises from systematic errors in the way study variables are ascertained, classified, and/or attributed to patients. Information bias is common to all retrospective studies and may include data entry errors, coding specificity challenges, and missing data. Regarding missing data, healthcare encounters that occurred outside the HCO network were not captured. This may have resulted in incomplete healthcare profiles and potentially missing exposure or outcome data. Strategies to mitigate missing data and other sources of information bias were incorporated into the study design and study methodology. These included the following:

- including only patients who regularly received care with the contributing HCOs,
- using outpatient and facility-based records to classify the study cohorts and outcomes, and
- conducting subgroup analyses for patients with evidence of COVID-19 vaccination.

### 9.6.3.1 Misclassification of the Exposure

Misclassification of the exposure can occur when patients are erroneously categorized with regard to exposure status. To minimize the potential for exposure misclassification, we utilized precise medication coding criteria to classify BEB and PAX as the first exposure during the index period. Using health insurance claims in the TriNetX Linked Network further mitigates this type of misclassification.

Despite this, the likelihood of exposure misclassification may have been greater for patients exposed to PAX (dispensed as an oral medication) than for patients exposed to BEB (administered via infusion). This may have occurred if patients did not fill the PAX prescription or adhere to the prescribing guidelines (for example, they did not take the full dosing regimen). The potential impact of this differential misclassification may have resulted in:

- 1. a greater risk of the study outcomes for patients classified with PAX exposure,
- 2. a larger RD (in favor of BEB) with a narrower CI, and
- 3. an increased likelihood of rejecting the null hypothesis and establishing the NI of BEB.

While this type of exposure misclassification was both unavoidable and unmeasurable in EHR data, the likelihood of this occurring was mitigated, to some degree, by:

- the very nature of the indication (that is, COVID-19),
- the severity of the outcome (that is, hospitalization or death),
- the availability of treatment (the costs of the medications were paid by the US government),
- the relatively short course of PAX treatment (5 days), and
- the context of disease acquisition (that is, COVID-19 acquired during a global pandemic with heightened awareness of potential harm).

Another form of measurable exposure misclassification may have occurred if the exposure status, as classified on the index date, was "contaminated" by post-index antibody or antiviral therapy. To address this form of exposure misclassification, we described the use of non-index monoclonal antibody and antiviral treatment during follow-up for patients in both cohorts.

### 9.6.3.2 Misclassification of the Outcome

Misclassification of the outcome is present when patients are erroneously categorized with regard to outcome status. This can be a problem in observational studies when outcome data are missing, equivocal, or uninterruptible.

In the present study, hospitalization and ED visits that occurred outside the TriNetX HCO Network were not ascertained. To mitigate this type of outcome misclassification, eligibility requirements were incorporated, which restricted the study cohorts to include only patients who regularly received care within the TriNetX HCO Network. Additionally, the supplemental analyses, using data from the TriNetX Linked Network, included complete (or near complete) ascertainment of outcome data from closed insurance claims with linked mortality data.

To protect patient privacy, the date of death in the EHR includes the year and month only. Therefore, a true date of death was not available. As a proxy for the death date, among patients with death recorded in the EHR during follow-up, we classified the last post-index record in the EHR database as the death date.

While this approach has been used in other TriNetX studies, the date of death may be misclassified. This misclassification would have likely over-counted the number of deaths, as the actual date of death may have occurred after the 30-day follow-up window. To some degree, the supplemental analyses using data from the TriNetX Linked Network assessed the robustness of the treatment effect and elucidate outcome misclassification; however, the reduced sample size in the TriNetX Linked Network limited the number of events and precision substantially.

## 9.7 Study Size

### 9.7.1 Feasibility Assessment

From 16 February 2022 to 31 August 2022, a total of 14,347 and 40,369 patients received BEB and PAX, respectively. After enforcing the proposed inclusion/exclusion criteria, it was estimated that 8,794 patients receiving BEB and 24,744 patients receiving PAX would be available for matching (Table 9.6).

	Feasibility Assessment - Estimated (Data From 16 Feb 2022 to 31 Aug 2022)									
0	Included in source population		86,489,7	783						
		BEB	PAX	Retained <sup>a</sup>						
1	Exposure to BEB or PAX during index period	14,347	40,369	n/a						
2	Age $\geq$ 12 years at index date	14,275	40,167	0.995						
3	$\geq$ 1 healthcare encounter within 6-36 months pre-index	9,993	28,117	0.700						
4	No inpatient admission within 30 days pre-index	9,693	27,273	0.970						
5	No hospice care within 30 days pre-index	9,644	27,137	0.995						
6	No treatment for COVID-19	9,066	25,509	0.940						
7	No supplemental or chronic oxygen therapy	8,794	24,744	0.970						

#### Table 9.6.Feasibility assessment

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; PAX = Paxlovid

<sup>a</sup> "Retained" refers to the estimated proportion of patients to be retained after enforcing each inclusion or exclusion criterion

# 9.7.2 Noninferiority Margin

For the NI study design of BEB versus PAX, the fixed margin method, also referred to as the 95% to 95% method, was used to define the NI margin for the RD (FDA 2016):

- the first 95% refers to the CI of the estimated effect of the control based on the historical studies demonstrating the effect; and
- the second 95% refers to the CI used to test the null hypothesis in the NI study with the first 95% lower CI defined as the margin (M1).

In this study, a fraction (50%) of M1 was used to provide reasonable assurance that BEB preserved a clinically sufficient fraction of the PAX treatment effect.

Based on this consideration, the NI margin was calculated using the available historical data from the PAX Phase 2 to 3 double-blind, randomized, controlled trial (Hammond et al. 2022). In this trial, symptomatic, unvaccinated, non-hospitalized adults at high risk of progression for COVID-19 were assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive either PAX or placebo every 12 hours for 5 days to assess COVID-19–related hospitalization or death from any cause through Day 28. The study showed a reduction in COVID-19–related hospitalization or death of 6.32% (95% CI: - 9.04% to -3.59%) for PAX compared to placebo.

The lower 95% CI (3.59%) was used in our NI study as the M1 and 50% of M1 (1.795%) was used as the NI margin (M2) for this BEB versus PAX NI study. This M2 of absolute 1.795% increase in hospitalization or death must be excluded by the one-sided 95% CI for the hospitalization/mortality RDs between BEB and PAX in the NI study to establish the NI of BEB compared with PAX.

Figure 9.2 shows the 5 potential results (A, B, C, D, and E) that were used to test the null hypothesis (Mauri and D'Agostino 2017). If potential results A, B, or C were observed, it would be established that BEB treatment is not inferior to PAX treatment. If potential results D or E were observed, NI would not be established.



Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; CI = confidence interval;  $H_0$  = null hypothesis,  $H_1$  = alternative hypothesis; PAX = Paxlovid; NI = noninferiority; RD = risk difference; UCL = upper confidence limit.

Note: The hypothetical BEB versus PAX RD are presented as percentages with two-sided 95% CIs to facilitate interpretation (RD null value = 0.0%).

### Figure 9.2. Noninferiority assessment.

## 9.7.3 Sample Size and Power

The primary objective was to estimate the 30-day RD and 95% CI of the composite outcome of all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death for patients who received BEB compared with patients who received PAX.

For the NI test of the primary objective, N=1,065 for each arm would provide 80% power and N=1,390 for each arm would provide 90% power, assuming a hospitalization rate of 1.4% for BEB and 1.2% for PAX (Razonable et al. 2022) with the NI margin of 1.795%.

## 9.8 Data Transformation

The TriNetX Dataworks USA Network platform natively supports the ingestion of EHR data, such as:

- demographics,
- diagnosis history,
- medications administered and prescribed,
- procedures,
- laboratory results, and
- vital signs from a variety of external sources (for example, i2b2, Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics, Epic).

A combination of purpose-built products and toolkits have been developed by the TriNetX Engineering and Technical Services teams for reuse across the federated network.

Before being accessible through the network platform, the data are first staged within the TriNetX clinical data warehouse. Once the data reside within the clinical data warehouse, the EHR data are mapped to a common data model, direct patient identifiers are removed, and data quality measures are run to assess the cleanliness, consistency, correctness, and completeness of the data. After this evaluation process is completed, the data are ingested into optimized data marts designed to support the capabilities and performance of the network platform. As TriNetX Dataworks USA is a federated network, all the technology and data reside either on a TriNetX appliance, at the HCO, or within a cloud-based hosting infrastructure.

The source population and study cohorts required for this study was defined using terminologies in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network platform. A download of de-identified, patient-level data was extracted through a secure process and saved as set of comma-separated values (CSV) files. The CSV files were combined into an analytic dataset based on synthetic patient identifiers and transformed in the Stata data files. The files were stored on a shared drive to be accessed by the lead scientist and analyst. All analyses were performed using Stata Version 16.1 (StataCorp LLC; College Station, Texas USA).

# 9.9 Statistical Methods

## 9.9.1 Main Summary Measures

For baseline characteristics, binary and categorial variables were described and summarized using frequencies and percentages, while continuous variables were described and summarized using mean, standard deviation, median, interquartile range (IQR), and minimum and maximum. For primary and secondary outcomes, cumulative incidences with 95% confidence intervals and risk differences with 95% confidence intervals were estimated. More detail can be found in Sections 9.9.2.3 and 9.9.2.4.

### 9.9.2 Main Statistical Methods

### 9.9.2.1 Analysis Overview

The following steps were followed sequentially:

- 1. Construct BEB and PAX study cohorts (unmatched):
  - a. describe patients included and excluded, and
  - b. describe baseline characteristics and absolute standardized differences (ASD) for unmatched cohorts.
- 2. Construct matched cohorts using CEM in conjunction with PS matching:
  - a. evaluate PS distributions before and after matching, and
  - b. describe baseline characteristics and ASD for matched cohorts.
- 3. Describe proportion of patients in the matched cohorts who initiated post-index convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibody, or antiviral therapy for the treatment of COVID-19.
- 4. Execute analysis for the primary objective:
  - a. unmatched and matched cohorts.
- 5. Execute analyses for the secondary objectives:
  - a. unmatched and matched cohorts.
- 6. Execute subgroup analyses:
  - a. matched cohorts.
- 7. Execute sensitivity analyses:
  - a. matched cohorts.
- 8. Repeat Steps 1 and 2 using data from the TriNetX Linked Network (supplemental analyses).
- 9. Execute supplemental analyses for the primary and secondary objectives using data from the TriNetX Linked Network (Steps 3-7).

### 9.9.2.2 Method to Control for Confounding

Confounding control was achieved using CEM on highly selected and *a priori* defined baseline variables in conjunction with PS matching on a broader set of baseline variables.

The rationale for using CEM in conjunction with PS matching was 2-fold. Firstly, it ensured tight control of critical baseline confounders (for example, age 65 years or older, immunocompromised, COVID-19 vaccine exposure, and pre-index ED visit). Secondly, it permitted sensitivity or restricted analyses on the CEM variables without breaking the matched pairs used for the primary analyses. For example, if age 65 years or older (yes/no) and immunocompromised status (yes/no) were included as CEM variables, these covariates would be consistent for patients in each matched pair. Sensitivity analyses could then be restricted to patients aged 65 years or older or immunocompromised patients without re-matching.

The 4 binary CEM variables included:

- age  $\geq 65$ ,
- immunocompromised,

- ED visit within 7 days pre-index (inclusive of the index date), and
- COVID-19 vaccination within 9 months pre-index.

In summary, the predicted probability of exposure (that is, BEB versus PAX) was generated from a multi-variable logistic regression model conditioned on baseline covariates. The CEM procedure was then implemented to create unique groupings or risk-sets based on the observed combination of CEM variables. Each CEM risk-set included at least 1 BEB exposed patient and potentially many PAX exposed patients. Within each CEM risk-set, the match selected for each BEB exposed patient was the PAX exposed patient with the nearest PS value. Nearest neighbor matching without replacement with a caliper of 0.01 on the PS was used to ensure the estimated probability of exposure did not differ by more than 1.0% between each patient in each matched pair. Each BEB exposed patient was matched to 1 PAX exposed patient (1:1 matching).

Using methodology to generate a high-dimensional PS, all baseline covariates presented in the baseline covariate section (Section 9.4.5 and Table 9.2, Table 9.3, Table 9.4, and Table 9.5) and 2-way interaction terms were evaluated for inclusion in the PS generating model, as permitted given model degrees of freedom. High-dimensional PS methodology uses a data-driven approach to covariate selection that prioritizes covariates according to the amount of confounding each covariate accounts for after adjusting for demographic covariates (Schneeweiss et al. 2009). To avoid model assumption violations, continuous baseline variables were categorized into quintiles or dichotomized, if a clinically relevant threshold existed.

The following PS generating model was used to predict exposure status given baseline covariates:

• logistic regression model to generate the PS:

 $logit{Pr(A_i = 1)} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Z_i$ 

where, A = exposure status; Z = baseline covariates.

Based on this model, the predicted probability of BEB exposure (versus PAX exposure) given baseline covariates (that is, the PS) was generated. Matching on the PS, in conjunction with CEM matching, was then used to account for baseline confounding.

### 9.9.2.3 Describe Baseline Characteristics

Analysis: Describe baseline characteristics

Analysis type: Descriptive

Analysis sets:

- BEB and PAX unmatched cohorts, and
- BEB and PAX matched cohorts.

### Methodology:

Baseline variables were ascertained using all available EHR data on or before the index date, unless otherwise specified. If data was available on the index date, the last pre-index value was

used. For continuous variables (e.g., eGFR), if data was not available during the baseline period, the variable value was set to missing. Binary and categorical variables were described as the frequency and percentage of patients. Continuous variables were described by the:

- mean,
- standard deviation,
- median,
- 25th and 75th percentiles (IQR), and
- minimum and maximum.

ASDs (BEB versus PAX) were calculated before matching and after matching. This measure describes the balance of a given variable between 2 groups (cohorts). ASD  $\geq 0.1$  and < 0.1 depict poor balance and acceptable balance, respectively.

Additionally, PS distributions were described before and after matching.

### 9.9.2.4 Primary and Secondary Analyses

### Outcomes

- Primary (composite outcome):
  - All-cause hospitalization or all-cause mortality;
- Secondary:
  - All-cause hospitalization,
  - All-cause death, and
  - All-cause ED visit.

Analysis type: Descriptive and comparative

### Analysis sets:

- BEB and PAX unmatched cohorts, and
- BEB and PAX matched cohorts.

**Exposure contrast:** BEB versus PAX (reference category)

### **Measures of effect**

- Cumulative incidence and 95% CI:
  - Clopper-Pearson 95% CI (exact binomial); and
- RD and 95% CI.

### Hypothesis testing (primary analysis only)

Hypothesis testing was conducted for the primary outcome for patients included in the matched cohorts. The null hypothesis was *the risk of 30-day all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death was higher for patients treated with BEB compared to patients treated with PAX – by at least 1.795%*. We rejected the null hypothesis, and established NI, if the RD<sub>UCL</sub> excluded 1.795%. More detail on hypothesis testing can be found in Sections 9.7.2 and 9.7.3.

## 9.9.3 Missing Values

Baseline covariates were not included in the PS generating model if any cell count of the 2x2 table was less than 10 or if the variable had missing values for more than 5% of cohort members. When a given baseline variable (for example, BMI, age, sex) had missingness more than 0% and less than or equal to 5%, the variable value was imputed to the most prevalent value of the observed variable distribution. The rationale for imputing missing baseline covariate values, where missingness was more than 0% and less than or equal to 5%, was to retain the analytic set sample size while introducing only a minor degree of misclassification bias, which was likely to be non-differential. A sensitivity analysis was conducted using multiple imputation of baseline covariates where the missingness pattern was more than 0% and less than or equal to 30% (Granger et al. 2019).

# 9.9.4 Subgroup Analyses

Among patients included in the matched pairs, the same primary and secondary analyses were conducted for the subgroups presented here. The subgroup analyses were conducted for:

- 1) all matched pairs,
- 2) matched pairs with the condition present (for example, age 65 years or older), and
- 3) matched pairs with the condition absent (for example, age less than 65 years).

The following subgroup analyses were conducted:

- Age 65 years or older (yes/no):
  - Analyses were conducted for matched pairs stratified by age at least 65 years and age less than 65 years. The rationale for this analysis was to evaluate the consistency of the treatment effect for older and younger patients who were exposed to BEB or PAX for the treatment of COVID-19.
- COVID-19 vaccine status (yes/undetermined):
  - Analyses were conducted for matched pairs stratified by COVID-19 vaccine status. That is where COVID-19 vaccination status was documented in the prior 9 months and where vaccine status was undetermined. The rationale for this analysis was to evaluate the treatment effect within the subgroup of patients where there is the lowest likelihood of vaccine status misclassification.
- Pre-index ED visit (yes/no):
  - Analyses were conducted for matched pairs who had and did not have an ED visit within 7 days before initiating BEB or PAX. As we matched on baseline ED visit status (that is, within 7 days pre-index), we eliminated potential channeling bias by ED visit status, which may be a marker of COVID-19 disease severity. The rationale for this sensitivity analysis was to evaluate the consistency of the treatment effect for patients who had more severe disease (that is, patients who had a pre-index ED visit) and for patients who had less severe disease (that is, patients who did not have a pre-index ED visit).
- Immunocompromised (yes/no):
  - Analyses were conducted for matched pairs stratified by baseline immunocompromised status (McCreary et al. 2022). This analysis evaluated the

consistency of the treatment effect for patients who were moderately to severely immunocompromised and for patients who were not immunocompromised.

• Table 9.7 includes the algorithm defined by McCreary et al. to classify immunocompromised status.

#### Table 9.7. Baseline Immunocompromised Classification

Baseline immunocompromised classification - by at least one condition listed below
Procedures
Radiation oncology procedure
Organ or stem cell transplant
Comorbidities
Cancer diagnosis
for example, heme malignancies, leukemia, lymphoma, myeloma, breast cancer, bone cancer, solid organ cancers, Myelodysplastic syndromes, myeloproliferative disorders, chronic lymphocytic leukemia, acute myeloid leukemia, diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, follicular lymphoma
Diagnosis of graft versus host disease
Systemic lupus erythematosus
Rheumatoid arthritis
Inflammatory bowel disease
HIV
Other conditions indicative of immune compromised (see Table 9.4)
Pharmacotherapy
Any CAR-T therapy
Actively being on biologics
Cell death protein 1 (PD-1) therapy
B-cell depleting therapy medications

Abbreviations: CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus.

Citation: from Appendix B of McCreary et al. 2022

## 9.9.5 Sensitivity Analyses

Among patients included in the matched cohorts, the same primary and secondary analyses were conducted for the sensitivity analyses described here.

#### Sensitivity analysis to mitigate potential channeling bias

In this analysis, the index date was imputed or "lagged" to the primary index date plus 1 day. The rationale for this sensitivity analysis was to mitigate potential channeling bias that may occur if the observed treatment with 1 agent (BEB or PAX) was differentially utilized based on the likelihood of experiencing an early outcome event (for example, hospitalization). By systematically lagging the index date 1 day forward in time for all study cohort members, we

thereby excluded patients who had an event very early during follow-up and mitigated bias related to disease severity at the time of BEB or PAX treatment.

#### Sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of unmeasured confounding

Using E-value methodology proposed by VanderWeele and Ding (VanderWeele and Ding 2017; VanderWeele et al. 2019), we performed sensitivity analyses to assess the potential impact of unmeasured confounding on the observed treatment effect (that is, the RD) for the primary and secondary analyses. The E-value was defined as the minimum strength of association an unmeasured confounder would need to have with both the exposure (that is, BEB or PAX) and the outcome, conditional on the measured baseline covariates, to explain the exposure-outcome association. With this approach, the investigator does not select a baseline confounder or specify the confounding association a priori. Rather, the E-value depicts the strength of association between a hypothetical confounder and the exposure and outcome required to expunge or explain the observed treatment effect. The investigator (and readers) may then assess if a confounder association of that magnitude is plausible. The E-value was originally developed on the risk ratio (RR) scale; however, modifications of this approach have been developed to estimate the E-value on the RD scale (Linden et al. 2020).

#### Sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of missing baseline covariate data

To assess the potential impact of missing baseline covariate data, we used multiple imputation for select baseline covariates (for example, BMI, age, sex) in which the missingness pattern was more than 0% and less than or equal to 30% (Granger et al. 2019). The rationale for this sensitivity analysis was to further mitigate potential confounding for important baseline covariates which may be omitted from the PS generating model using the primary approach (that is, because they have missingness more than 5%). Note: The primary approach was to systematically impute to the most prevalent value of the observed variable distribution when a given baseline variable (for example, BMI, age, sex) has missingness more than 0% and less than or equal to 5%.

## 9.9.6 Amendments to the Statistical Analysis Plan

### Variables to classify baseline covariates

HCO Type: HCO type, classified as a categorical variable based on the facility of which the index BEB or PAX record occurred, was stated as a variable to be obtained in the original protocol. However, information on HCO type is not available in TriNetX Dataworks USA. Thus, the variable was not included in the present study.

### Methods to control for confounding

Matching Rate Threshold for CEM Variables: An *a priori* threshold for dropping a CEM variable based on the matching rate (less than 85% matching rate within any CEM category) was specified in the original protocol to account for a situation in which there was insufficient sample available in each exact matching category. Though this threshold was met in the present study, CEM variables were not dropped due to the adequate overall sample size and covariate balance in the matched cohorts.

#### Accounting for calendar time

After protocol approval, additional consideration was given to calendar date of SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis as changes in the composition of the circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants may influence study results. Monitoring of COVID-19 variants over time showed bebtelovimab-resistant variant prevalence was low over the study period; however, the potential for differences in disease severity and subsequently study outcomes between variants warranted inclusion of time in the analysis.

Two approaches considered for accounting for calendar time in the propensity score were: 1) including month of the index date in the propensity score model, or 2) including the index date as a CEM variable using time-period bins. Evaluation of circulating variants identified three relevant time-period bins:

- BA.1/BA.1.1: 01 February 2022 through 26 March 2022,
- BA.2/BA.2.12.1: 27 March 2022 through 26 June 2022, and
- BA.4/BA.5: 27 June 2022 through the end of August 2022.

Approach 1, including a categorical variable for month of index date in the propensity score calculations, was selected because it resulted in a higher matching rate than including timeperiod of the index date as a CEM variable. In the CEM variable approach, the number of CEM categories would have been increased from 16 to 48, limiting the matched cohort sizes.

Consideration of calendar time also promoted consideration of data source. Prior to considering calendar time, the study cohort was developed using the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network (Cohort extracted 30 January 2023). Some healthcare organizations in this network provide data that are "date-shifted" to help protect patient privacy, in which dates associated with encounters in the health record are shifted a specified amount of time. The amount of time that records are shifted is unknown and may differ from patient to patient. During protocol development, the TriNetX study team considered the rate of misclassification due to date-shifting as a minor risk and, therefore, did not initially exclude date shifted patient data. However, upon creating month-specific categorical variables, the TriNetX team investigated the impact that data-shifted data could have on the study population and determined the extent of potential of misclassification required correction. As a result, the final study cohorts were created excluding date-shifted data, resulting in the final unmatched cohort size of 73,479 patients, extracted on 23 March 2023.

#### Immunocompromised CEM variable

In addition to medication and procedure codes, the immunocompromised status CEM variable was pre-specified to include ICD-10 diagnosis codes used by McCreary et al. (2022). However, a discrepancy was identified after analyses were completed. In addition to codes used by McCreary et al., the immunocompromised status CEM variable included ICD-10 diagnosis codes derived from categories in the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Clinical Classifications Software Refined (CCSR), i.e., codes not used by McCreary et al. The HCUP CCSR-derived codes were pre-specified for a separate immunocompromised status variable included in the propensity score but not for the CEM variable. The inclusion of these codes in the CEM variable was accidental. This discrepancy resulted in a minimal difference in the

prevalence of immunocompromised status based on the CEM variable (0.14% difference in the overall cohort when comparing the McCreary et al. and HCUP CCSR-derived codes to McCreary et al. codes only). Thus, the codes used for the immunocompromised status CEM variable were not changed.

# 9.10 Quality Control

In addition to quality control of the protocol and statistical analysis plan via study team review, all data gathering and analyses that were conducted after protocol and statistical analysis plan approval were overseen by 2 analysts experienced in the field of observational research using EHR data. Programming for this project was conducted by a primary analyst and code review by a separate validation analyst. For all data processing steps, the validation analyst reviewed the program code for protocol consistency, along with input/output datasets and results tables/figures. For each analysis step, code review was employed to reduce the potential risk of programming errors.

# 10 Results

## 10.1 Participants

Before applying patient qualification criteria, 12,920 BEB-exposed and 70,741 PAX-exposed patients were identified. After applying patient qualification criteria, 10,431 BEB-exposed and 63,048 PAX-exposed patients remained in the unmatched cohorts (Table 10.1). After conducting high-dimensional propensity score (HDPS) matching, 55.9% of BEB-exposed patients were retained, resulting in 5,827 BEB-exposed and 5,827 PAX-exposed patients in the matched cohorts.

Table 10.1.Patient Disposition

Patien Inclusi	t Identification Criteria – ion/Exclusion		]	BEB			P.	AX	
		Ν	N Excluded	% Excluded	% Retained	Ν	N Excluded	% Excluded	% Retained
1	Exposure to BEB or PAX during index period	12,920				70,741			
2	Age $\geq$ 12 years at index date	12,919	1	0.0%	100.0%	70,739	2	0.0%	100.0%
3	$\geq$ 1 healthcare encounter within 6-36 months pre-index	11,522	1,397	10.8%	89.2%	64,926	5,813	8.2%	91.8%
4	No inpatient admission within 30 days pre-index	11,062	460	4.0%	96.0%	64,025	901	1.4%	98.6%
5	No hospice care within 30 days pre-index	11,053	9	0.1%	99.9%	64,006	19	0.0%	100.0%
6	No exposure to monoclonal antibody or antiviral within 90 days pre-index	10,609	444	4.0%	96.0%	63,315	691	1.1%	98.9%
7	No supplemental or chronic oxygen therapy within 30 days pre-index	10,431	178	1.7%	98.3%	63,048	267	0.4%	99.6%
	Total in unmatched cohorts	10,431				63,048			
8	HDPS Matching (1:1) using a caliper of 0.01 & common support	5,827	4,604	44.1%	55.9%	5,827	57,221	90.8%	9.2%
	Total in matched cohorts	5,827				5,827			

\* "Retained" refers to the estimated proportion of patients to be retained after enforcing each inclusion or exclusion criterion or matching Abbreviations: BEB = Bebtelovimab; PAX = Paxlovid; HDPS = high dimensional propensity score

# **10.2 Descriptive Data**

## 10.2.1 CEM Matching Rate and Propensity Score Distribution

Table 10.2 presents patient distribution within CEM categories. The variables included in the CEM process resulted in 16 categories. The proportion of patients in each category within the BEB and PAX cohorts is more similar after matching. Figure 10.1 displays the PS distribution in the unmatched and matched cohorts. The propensity score represents the predicted probability of receiving BEB (vs. PAX) based on baseline covariate information. The different shapes of the distributions presented in part A of Figure 10.1 indicate that the BEB and PAX were prescribed to different patient populations. PAX treated patients represented a more clearly defined but skewed distributed patient population and were less likely to receive BEB as indicated by the right-skewed distribution. BEB patients were not as clearly defined, as indicated by the relatively uniform distribution. Only a small proportion of BEB patients were unlikely to receive PAX. The overlap of the PS distribution between BEB- and PAX-exposed patients notably improved after HDPS matching.

	CEM Categories			PAX		BEB		Total		
CEM Category	Immunocompromised Status	Age > 65	COVID-19 Vaccination within 9 Months Pre-index	ED Visit within 7 Days Pre- index	Frequency	0/0	Frequency	%	Frequency	0/0
Unmatcheo	l cohorts	- 00	TTC much	muta	Trequency	70	Trequency	/0	Trequency	70
1	No	No	No	No	22,135	35.11%	1,739	16.67%	23,874	32.49%
2	No	No	No	Yes	2,429	3.85%	377	3.61%	2,806	3.82%
3	No	No	Yes	No	2,432	3.86%	333	3.19%	2,765	3.76%
4	No	No	Yes	Yes	115	0.18%	38	0.36%	153	0.21%
5	No	Yes	No	No	12,241	19.42%	1,798	17.24%	14,039	19.11%
6	No	Yes	No	Yes	1,165	1.85%	484	4.64%	1,649	2.24%
7	No	Yes	Yes	No	1,749	2.77%	407	3.90%	2,156	2.93%
8	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	125	0.20%	68	0.65%	193	0.26%
9	Yes	No	No	No	8,364	13.27%	1,532	14.69%	9,896	13.47%
10	Yes	No	No	Yes	573	0.91%	407	3.90%	980	1.33%
11	Yes	No	Yes	No	1,071	1.70%	416	3.99%	1,487	2.02%
12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	62	0.10%	60	0.58%	122	0.17%
13	Yes	Yes	No	No	8,609	13.65%	1,785	17.11%	10,394	14.15%
14	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	558	0.89%	397	3.81%	955	1.30%
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1,317	2.09%	483	4.63%	1,800	2.45%
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	103	0.16%	107	1.03%	210	0.29%
Total					63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%
Matched co	ohorts									
1	No	No	No	No	1,112	19.08%	1,112	19.08%	2,224	19.08%
2	No	No	No	Yes	247	4.24%	247	4.24%	494	4.24%
3	No	No	Yes	No	200	3.43%	200	3.43%	400	3.43%
4	No	No	Yes	Yes	14	0.24%	14	0.24%	28	0.24%
5	No	Yes	No	No	933	16.01%	933	16.01%	1,866	16.01%
6	No	Yes	No	Yes	273	4.69%	273	4.69%	546	4.69%

 Table 10.2.
 Distribution of Patients within CEM Categories for Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

		CEM (	Categories		PAX		BEB		Total	
CEM Category	Immunocompromised Status	Age ≥ 65	COVID-19 Vaccination within 9 Months Pre-index	ED Visit within 7 Days Pre- index	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
7	No	Yes	Yes	No	230	3.95%	230	3.95%	460	3.95%
8	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	27	0.46%	27	0.46%	54	0.46%
9	Yes	No	No	No	847	14.54%	847	14.54%	1,694	14.54%
10	Yes	No	No	Yes	191	3.28%	191	3.28%	382	3.28%
11	Yes	No	Yes	No	218	3.74%	218	3.74%	436	3.74%
12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	19	0.33%	19	0.33%	38	0.33%
13	Yes	Yes	No	No	1,000	17.16%	1,000	17.16%	2,000	17.16%
14	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	211	3.62%	211	3.62%	422	3.62%
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	265	4.55%	265	4.55%	530	4.55%
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	40	0.69%	40	0.69%	80	0.69%
Total					5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened exact matching; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid.







## 10.2.2 Baseline Characteristics

Table 10.3, Table 10.4, Table 10.5, Table 10.6, and Table 10.7 display baseline variables for BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients in the unmatched cohort. The median age was higher in BEB-exposed patients (66 years; IQR 51 - 75) compared to PAX-exposed patients (61 years; IOR 47 - 71). Patients were primarily female (58.31% in BEB and 60.39% in PAX), White (82.92% in BEB and 80.63% in PAX), and non-Hispanic (73.92% in BEB and 62.84% in PAX). Common COVID-19 related characteristics included presence of a COVID-19 diagnosis anytime pre-index (80.25% in BEB and 54.18% in PAX), a COVID-19 positive test within 7 days preindex (21.65% in BEB and 13.64% in PAX), and documentation of a COVID-19 vaccine (29.80% in BEB and 18.99% in PAX). Proportions of baseline comorbidities were generally larger in BEB-exposed compared to PAX-exposed patients. Common baseline comorbidities included aplastic anemia (24.79% in BEB and 12.16% in PAX), immunodeficiency (22.93% in BEB and 9.09% in PAX), hypertension (58.93% in BEB and 47.01% in PAX), other heart conditions (48.05% in BEB and 30.74% in PAX), obesity (31.53% in BEB and 29.49% in PAX), type 2 diabetes (27.18% in BEB and 18.26% in PAX), hematologic or solid malignancy except benign skin cancer (32.64% in BEB and 22.60% in PAX), anxiety and fear (33.81% in BEB and 31.88% in PAX), depression (29.19% in BEB and 24.17% in PAX), and CKD (24.33% in BEB and 10.32% in PAX).

Common baseline medications included past dexamethasone use (41.27% in BEB and 31.61% in PAX), past methylprednisolone use (36.67% in BEB and 32.78% in PAX), past prednisone use (36.14% in BEB and 29.43% in PAX), past triamcinolone use (28.75% in BEB and 24.04% in PAX), past fluticasone use (29.84% in BEB and 30.73% in PAX), past (60.44% in BEB and 44.84% in PAX) and present antihypertensive use (32.81% in BEB and 25.00% in PAX), past short-acting beta agonist (SABA) use (36.62% in BEB and 28.08% in PAX), and past lipid lowering agent use (45.69% in BEB and 31.25% in PAX).

Distributions between two groups for all four CEM variables were imbalanced with BEB patients more likely to be immunocompromised, older, have a documented COVID-19 vaccine, and have an ED encounter within 7 days: immunocompromised status (ASD= 0.350), age  $\geq$  65 years (ASD = 0.242), documented COVID-19 vaccination within 9 months pre-index (ASD = 0.206), and an ED encounter within 7 days pre-index (ASD = 0.311). Other notably imbalanced covariates included COVID-19 diagnosis anytime pre-index (ASD = 0.578; higher proportion of BEB patients), blood pressure category (ASD = 0.676; higher percentage of missing data for PAX patients), present methylprednisolone use (ASD = 0.763; higher proportion of BEB use), present hydrocortisone use (ASD = 0.443; higher proportion of BEB patients), past anticoagulant use (ASD = 0.440; higher proportion of BEB patients), and number of outpatient encounters within 7 days pre-index (ASD = 0.559; higher number of encounters for BEB patients).

							ASD
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Index date month							0.274
February	95	0.15%	0	0.00%	95	0.13%	
March	582	0.92%	38	0.36%	620	0.84%	
April	3,902	6.19%	1,253	12.01%	5,155	7.02%	
May	12,585	19.96%	2,521	24.17%	15,106	20.56%	
June	12,652	20.07%	2,025	19.41%	14,677	19.97%	
July	18,812	29.84%	2,828	27.11%	21,640	29.45%	
August	14,420	22.87%	1,766	16.93%	16,186	22.03%	
Demographics							ASD
Patient age							0.239
Mean (SD), years	58.49 (	16.04)	62.39	(16.59)			
Median (IQR), years	61 (47	′ <b>-</b> 71)	66 (5)	1 - 75)			
Min, Max, years	12,	90	14, 92				
Age category							0.285
12-29 years	3,029	4.80%	385	3.69%	3,414	4.65%	
30-44 years	10,438	16.56%	1,443	13.83%	11,881	16.17%	
45-54 years	10,091	16.01%	1,217	11.67%	11,308	15.39%	
55-64 years	13,623	21.61%	1,857	17.80%	15,480	21.07%	
65-74 years	16,000	25.38%	2,873	27.54%	18,873	25.68%	
75-84 years	7,809	12.39%	1,970	18.89%	9,779	13.31%	
≥85 years	2,058	3.26%	686	6.58%	2,744	3.73%	
Female sex							0.042
Yes	38,074	60.39%	6,082	58.31%	44,156	60.09%	
Race							0.103
White	50,833	80.63%	8,649	82.92%	59,482	80.95%	
Black	5,491	8.71%	761	7.30%	6,252	8.51%	

 Table 10.3.
 Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts

							ASD
	PA	X	BF	B	Total		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Other	1,775	2.82%	162	1.55%	1,937	2.64%	
Unknown	4,949	7.85%	859	8.24%	5,808	7.90%	
Ethnicity							0.257
Hispanic	3,560	5.65%	585	5.61%	4,145	5.64%	
Not Hispanic	39,618	62.84%	7,711	73.92%	47,329	64.41%	
Unknown	19,870	31.52%	2,135	20.47%	22,005	29.95%	
Lifestyle variables							ASD
Smoking status 6 months p	ore-index						0.014
Yes	881	1.40%	163	1.56%	1,044	1.42%	
Smoking status >6 months	pre-index						0.047
Yes	2,522	4.00%	519	4.98%	3,041	4.14%	
Smoking ever pre-index							0.019
Yes	4,086	6.48%	725	6.95%	4,811	6.55%	
Inactivity							0.048
Yes	81	0.13%	38	0.36%	119	0.16%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened exact matching; IQR = interquartile range; max = maximum; min = minimum; PAX = Paxlovid; SD = standard deviation.

#### Table 10.4. Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts

<b>CEM variables</b>							ASD
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Immunocompromised stat	us (University of I	Pittsburgh Medi	cal Center [UPMC	C])			0.350
Yes	20,657	32.76%	5,187	49.73%	25,844	35.17%	
Age ≥ 65							0.242
Yes	25,867	41.03%	5,529	53.01%	31,396	42.73%	
COVID-19 vaccination wit	hin 9 months pre	-index			1		0.206
Yes	6,974	11.06%	1,912	18.33%	8,886	12.09%	
ED encounter within 7 day	s pre-index	1			1		0.311
Yes	5,130	8.14%	1,938	18.58%	7,068	9.62%	
COVID-19 related variable	es						ASD
COVID-19 diagnosis anyti	me pre-index						0.578
Yes	34,157	54.18%	8,371	80.25%	42,528	57.88%	
COVID-19 positive test: wi	ithin 7 days pre-in	ndex					0.213
Yes	8,600	13.64%	2,258	21.65%	10,858	14.78%	
COVID-19 positive test: >7	7 days pre-index						0.015
Yes	2,432	3.86%	434	4.16%	2,866	3.90%	
COVID-19 vaccine: past (>	>9 months pre-ind	lex)					0.252
Yes	11,974	18.99%	3,108	29.80%	15,082	20.53%	
COVID-19 antibody thera	py: present (withi	in 3-6 months pr	e-index)				0.127
Yes	325	0.52%	200	1.92%	525	0.71%	
COVID-19 antibody thera	py: past (>6 mont	hs pre-index)					0.042
Yes	386	0.61%	103	0.99%	489	0.67%	
COVID-19 related symptom	ms						ASD
Anosmia and parosmia							0.013
Yes	117	0.19%	14	0.13%	131	0.18%	
Cough							0.010
Yes	2,976	4.72%	516	4.95%	3,492	4.75%	
Fatigue							0.097

CEM variables							ASD
	PA	X	BEB		Total		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes	2,241	3.55%	583	5.59%	2,824	3.84%	
Fever or chills							0.075
Yes	2,535	4.02%	588	5.64%	3,123	4.25%	
Headache							0.042
Yes	522	0.83%	131	1.26%	653	0.89%	
Myalgia or joint pain							0.023
Yes	1,770	2.81%	335	3.21%	2,105	2.86%	
Nausea or vomiting							0.084
Yes	2,356	3.74%	574	5.50%	2,930	3.99%	
Dyspnea							0.102
Yes	1,630	2.59%	466	4.47%	2,096	2.85%	
Sore throat/pharyngitis							0.077
Yes	2,058	3.26%	500	4.79%	2,558	3.48%	
Diarrhea							0.029
Yes	609	0.97%	133	1.28%	742	1.01%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened exact matching; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019;

ED = early discontinuation; PAX = Paxlovid; SD = standard deviation.

Clinical & laboratory variables							
	PA	PAX BEB		Total			
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )			-				0.083
Mean (SD), years	30.14	30.14 (7.11)		29.58 (6.77)			
Median (IQR), years	(IQR), years 28.98 (25.11 – 33.90)			81 – 33.26)			
Min, Max, years	11.65,	76.45	12.40, 71.94				
<b>BMI category</b>							0.347
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Underweight: <18.5	547	0.87%	143	1.37%	690	0.94%	
Normal: 18.5-24	10,968	17.40%	2,278	21.84%	13,246	18.03%	
Overweight: 25-29	15,606	24.75%	3,055	29.29%	18,661	25.40%	
Obese: ≥30.0	21,265	33.73%	3,845	36.86%	25,110	34.17%	
Missing	14,662	23.26%	1,110	10.64%	15,772	21.46%	
MCQ eGFR: using last sCr pre-index							
Mean (SD), years	95.75 (	17.79)	87.59	(23.66)			
Median (IQR), years	95.52 (86.04 - 106.90)		90.23 (77.40 - 103.35)				
Min, Max, years	16.08,	161.87	14.37, 157.49				
MCQ eGFR: using last s	Cr pre-index						0.364
eGFR ≥90	33,499	53.13%	4,306	41.28%	37,805	51.45%	
eGFR 60-89	16,570	26.28%	3,188	30.56%	19,758	26.89%	
eGFR 30-59	1,704	2.70%	807	7.74%	2,511	3.42%	
eGFR <30	93	0.15%	271	2.60%	364	0.50%	
Missing	11,182	17.74%	1,859	17.82%	13,041	17.75%	
<b>Blood pressure: category</b>							0.676
Normotensive	2,148	3.41%	1,026	9.84%	3,174	4.32%	
Elevated	1,411	2.24%	704	6.75%	2,115	2.88%	
Stage 1	3,051	4.84%	1,138	10.91%	4,189	5.70%	
Stage 2	3,576	5.67%	1,891	18.13%	5,467	7.44%	
Missing	52,862	83.84%	5,672	54.38%	58,534	79.66%	
Oxygen saturation: categ	ory						0.413

 Table 10.5.
 Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts

Clinical & laboratory variables								
	PA	X	BEB		Total			
≥95%	1,822	2.89%	1,430	13.71%	3,252	4.43%		
85-95%	196	0.31%	102	0.98%	298	0.41%		
<85%	26	0.04%	15	0.14%	41	0.06%		
Missing	61,004	96.76%	8,884	85.17%	69,888	95.11%		
Comorbidities							ASD	
Autoimmune								
Crohn's disease							0.066	
Yes	739	1.17%	208	1.99%	947	1.29%		
Juvenile arthritis							0.000	
Yes	78	0.12%	13	0.12%	91	0.12%		
Rheumatoid arthri	itis						0.142	
Yes	2,488	3.95%	750	7.19%	3,238	4.41%		
Systemic lupus ery	thematosus						0.164	
Yes	2,924	4.64%	911	8.73%	3,835	5.22%		
Ulcerative colitis							0.065	
Yes	643	1.02%	187	1.79%	830	1.13%		
Blood Disorders								
Aplastic anemia					•	-	0.333	
Yes	7,665	12.16%	2,586	24.79%	10,251	13.95%		
Immunodeficiency					<b>1</b>	-	0.364	
Yes	2,656	4.21%	1,529	14.66%	4,185	5.70%		
Immunodeficiency	(UPMC)				<b>1</b>	-	0.385	
Yes	5,732	9.09%	2,392	22.93%	8,124	11.06%		
Sickle cell	1	1			1	-	0.006	
Yes	159	0.25%	30	0.29%	189	0.26%		
Thalassemia	1	1			1	-	0.012	
Yes	206	0.33%	42	0.40%	248	0.34%		
Circulatory								
Acute hemorrhagic cerebrovascular disease								

Clinical & laboratory variables								
		PAX		BEB		Total		
Yes		1,699	2.69%	508	4.87%	2,207	3.00%	
Cerebral infarction								0.180
Yes		2,331	3.70%	822	7.88%	3,153	4.29%	
	Other cerebrovasc	ular disease						0.182
Yes		3,320	5.27%	1,053	10.09%	4,373	5.95%	
	Acute myocardial i	infarction						0.208
Yes		1,754	2.78%	762	7.31%	2,516	3.42%	
	Coronary artery di	isease						0.292
Yes		4,082	6.47%	1,610	15.43%	5,692	7.75%	
	Heart failure							0.346
Yes		2,725	4.32%	1,476	14.15%	4,201	5.72%	
	Hypertension							0.241
Yes		29,636	47.01%	6,147	58.93%	35,783	48.70%	
	Myocarditis or car	diomyopathy						0.235
Yes		1,768	2.80%	846	8.11%	2,614	3.56%	
	Other heart condit	ion						0.362
Yes		19,378	30.74%	5,012	48.05%	24,390	33.19%	
	Peripheral vascula	r disease						0.238
Yes		5,193	8.24%	1,658	15.89%	6,851	9.32%	
Disab	oility							
	Cerebral palsy	1				1	-	0.040
Yes		100	0.16%	38	0.36%	138	0.19%	
	Congenital malform	mation						0.241
Yes		6,191	9.82%	1,892	18.14%	8,083	11.00%	
	Limitation of activi	ities of daily livin	g (ADL)					0.193
Yes		1,157	1.84%	563	5.40%	1,720	2.34%	
	Neurodevelopment	al disorders				1	1	0.009
Yes		2,986	4.74%	516	4.95%	3,502	4.77%	
	Spinal cord injury							0.017

Clinical & laboratory variables								
		PAX		BEB		Total		
Yes		92	0.15%	23	0.22%	115	0.16%	
Endo	Endocrine							
	Obesity							0.044
Yes		18,592	29.49%	3,289	31.53%	21,881	29.78%	
	Diabetes Type 1							0.098
Yes		1,051	1.67%	330	3.16%	1,381	1.88%	
	Diabetes Type 2							0.214
Yes		11,511	18.26%	2,835	27.18%	14,346	19.52%	
	Diabetes Type 1 or	2 (complicated)			-		-	0.224
Yes		6,484	10.28%	1,882	18.04%	8,366	11.39%	
Нера	tic							
	Alcoholic liver dise	ease			-		-	0.039
Yes		1,529	2.43%	316	3.03%	1,845	2.51%	
	Autoimmune hepa	titis					1	0.054
Yes		99	0.16%	48	0.46%	147	0.20%	
	Cirrhosis	P					1	0.174
Yes		567	0.90%	356	3.41%	923	1.26%	
	Non-alcoholic fatty	liver disease					1	0.070
Yes		4,092	6.49%	865	8.29%	4,957	6.75%	
Infec	tious							
	Hepatitis B	1			1	1	1	0.083
Yes		206	0.33%	104	1.00%	310	0.42%	
	Hepatitis C	1			1	1	1	0.077
Yes		956	1.52%	272	2.61%	1,228	1.67%	
	HIV	1			1	1		0.059
Yes		1,193	1.89%	288	2.76%	1,481	2.02%	
	Tuberculosis	1	· · · · ·		1	T	-	0.045
Yes		161	0.26%	55	0.53%	216	0.29%	
Malig	gnancy							

# J2X-MC-B003 Non-interventional PASS Final Study Report

Clinical & laboratory variables									
		PAX		BEB		Total			
	Hematological onc	ology (except ski	n)					0.226	
Yes		14,252	22.60%	3,405	32.64%	17,657	24.03%		
	Metastatic								
Yes		1,175	1.86%	461	4.42%	1,636	2.23%		
	Radiation complication								
Yes		597	0.95%	231	2.21%	828	1.13%		
Ment	al Health								
	Anxiety and fear	-					<b>.</b>	0.040	
Yes		20,102	31.88%	3,527	33.81%	23,629	32.16%		
	Bipolar	-					<b>.</b>	0.092	
Yes		1,181	1.87%	348	3.34%	1,529	2.08%		
	Depression						<b>.</b>	0.114	
Yes		15,240	24.17%	3,045	29.19%	18,285	24.88%		
	Other mood disord	ler						0.082	
Yes		1,105	1.75%	313	3.00%	1,418	1.93%		
	Schizophrenia						<b>.</b>	0.088	
Yes		628	1.00%	216	2.07%	844	1.15%		
	Substance abuse	1						0.220	
Yes		3,357	5.32%	1,187	11.38%	4,544	6.18%		
	Suicidal ideation	1				1	-	0.109	
Yes		1,459	2.31%	444	4.26%	1,903	2.59%		
Neur	cognitive disorders							0.126	
Yes		1,323	2.10%	449	4.30%	1,772	2.41%		
Pulm	onary								
	Alpha-1 antitrypsi	n deficiency						0.039	
Yes		41	0.07%	22	0.21%	63	0.09%		
	Asthma	1					1	0.060	
Yes		11,380	18.05%	2,127	20.39%	13,507	18.38%		
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia									

Clinical & laboratory variables								
	PAX		BEB		Total			
Yes	1	0.00%	1	0.01%	2	0.00%		
COPD and bronchiectasis								
Yes	6,851	10.87%	1,473	14.12%	8,324	11.33%		
Cystic fibrosis								
Yes	117	0.19%	45	0.43%	162	0.22%		
Embolism							0.192	
Yes	1,059	1.68%	536	5.14%	1,595	2.17%		
Hypertension							0.263	
Yes	1,212	1.92%	772	7.40%	1,984	2.70%		
Interstitial disease							0.157	
Yes	1,088	1.73%	459	4.40%	1,547	2.11%		
Renal								
CKD							0.378	
Yes	6,506	10.32%	2,538	24.33%	9,044	12.31%		
End-stage renal dis	ease (ESRD)						0.240	
Yes	3,022	4.79%	1,173	11.25%	4,195	5.71%		
Transplant								
Organ stem cell							0.317	
Yes	1,906	3.02%	1,147	11.00%	3,053	4.15%		
Graft versus host d	isease		1		1	-	0.048	
Yes	58	0.09%	32	0.31%	90	0.12%		
Pregnancy variables							ASD	
Pregnancy within 3 months	s pre-index						0.137	
Yes	1,216	1.93%	449	4.30%	1,665	2.27%		
Pregnancy within 9 months	s pre-index						0.105	
Yes	2,238	3.55%	600	5.75%	2,838	3.86%		
Pregnancy ever pre-index							0.088	
Yes	10,703	16.98%	2,128	20.40%	12,831	17.46%		
Clinical & laboratory variables								
---------------------------------	-----	-----	-------	--	--	--	--	--
	PAX	BEB	Total					

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; BMI = body mass index; CKD = chronic kidney disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; ED = early discontinuation; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus; IQR = interquartile range; max = maximum; MCQ = Mayo Clinic quadratic; min = minimum; PAX = Paxlovid; sCr = serum creatinine; SD = standard deviation; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Table 10.6.	Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts
-------------	---

Pharmac	otherapy variable	S						ASD
		PA	X	BF	EB	Tot	al	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Antiemeti	ics							
P	resent within 7 da	ys pre-index						0.070
Yes		381	0.60%	134	1.28%	515	0.70%	
Pa	ast >7 days pre-in	dex						0.004
Yes		9,322	14.79%	1,527	14.64%	10,849	14.76%	
Corticoste	eroids							
B	eclomethasone: p	resent (within 7 d	ays pre-index)					0.005
Yes		35	0.06%	7	0.07%	42	0.06%	
B	eclomethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-i	ndex)			-		0.031
Yes		1,103	1.75%	228	2.19%	1,331	1.81%	
Betamethasone: present (within 7 days pre-index)								
Yes		96	0.15%	10	0.10%	106	0.14%	
B	etamethasone: pa	st (>7 days pre-in	idex)			-		0.036
Yes		8,316	13.19%	1,250	11.98%	9,566	13.02%	
B	udesonide: presen	nt (within 7 days	pre-index)	r -		<b>-</b>		0.002
Yes		244	0.39%	39	0.37%	283	0.39%	
B	udesonide: past (>	>7 days pre-index	x)	r -		<b>-</b>		0.092
Yes		4,379	6.95%	988	9.47%	5,367	7.30%	
D	eflazacort: presen	nt (within 7 days j	pre-index)			-		0.006
Yes		1	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	
D	eflazacort: past (>	>7 days pre-index	()	r -		F		0.008
Yes		2	0.00%	1	0.01%	3	0.00%	
D	examethasone: pr	esent (within 7 d	ays pre-index)			-		0.356
Yes		706	1.12%	907	8.70%	1,613	2.20%	
D	examethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-i	ndex)			_		0.202
Yes		19,929	31.61%	4,305	41.27%	24,234	32.98%	
Н	lydrocortisone: pr	esent (within 7 da	ays pre-index)					0.443

Pharr	nacotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA	X	Bl	EB	Tot	al	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes		140	0.22%	994	9.53%	1,134	1.54%	
	Hydrocortisone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ii	ndex)					0.098
Yes		8,590	13.62%	1,790	17.16%	10,380	14.13%	
	Methylprednisolon	e: present (within	7 days pre-inde	ex)				0.763
Yes		1,351	2.14%	2,862	27.44%	4,213	5.73%	
	Methylprednisolon	e: past (>7 days p	ore-index)					0.082
Yes		20,664	32.78%	3,825	36.67%	24,489	33.33%	
	Prednisolone: pres	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)			1		0.265
Yes		41	0.07%	373	3.58%	414	0.56%	
	Prednisolone: past	<u>(&gt;7 days pre-ind</u>	ex)			1	1	0.166
Yes		2,115	3.35%	733	7.03%	2,848	3.88%	
	Prednisone: presen	it (within 7 days p	ore-index)			1	1	0.029
Yes		1,193	1.89%	240	2.30%	1,433	1.95%	
	Prednisone: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)			1	1	0.143
Yes		18,555	29.43%	3,770	36.14%	22,325	30.38%	
	Triamcinolone: pro	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)			1		0.006
Yes		267	0.42%	40	0.38%	307	0.42%	
	Triamcinolone: pas	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)			1		0.107
Yes		15,156	24.04%	2,999	28.75%	18,155	24.71%	
	Mometasone: prese	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)			Γ	ſ	0.008
Yes		64	0.10%	8	0.08%	72	0.10%	
	Mometasone: past	<u>(&gt;7 days pre-inde</u>	ex)			T	ſ	0.019
Yes		3,633	5.76%	555	5.32%	4,188	5.70%	
	Fluticasone: preser	nt (within 7 days j	pre-index)			1		0.002
Yes		1,314	2.08%	220	2.11%	1,534	2.09%	
	Fluticasone: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)			- 1	1	0.019
Yes		19,377	30.73%	3,113	29.84%	22,490	30.61%	
Antice	pagulants							

Phar	nacotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.310
Yes		1,176	1.87%	911	8.73%	2,087	2.84%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.440
Yes		3,455	5.48%	2,059	19.74%	5,514	7.50%	
Antid	iabetic							
	Insulin: present (w	<mark>ithin 6 months pr</mark>	e-index)					0.192
Yes		2,252	3.57%	839	8.04%	3,091	4.21%	
	Insulin: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)				_		0.364
Yes		6,210	9.85%	2,415	23.15%	8,625	11.74%	
	Other: present (wit	<u>thin 6 months pre</u>	e-index)			_		0.037
Yes		5,276	8.37%	984	9.43%	6,260	8.52%	
Other: past (>6 months pre-index)								
Yes		8,640	13.70%	1,952	18.71%	10,592	14.42%	
Antih	ypertensives							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)				-		0.173
Yes		15,762	25.00%	3,422	32.81%	19,184	26.11%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)			1	-		0.316
Yes		28,271	44.84%	6,305	60.44%	34,576	47.06%	
Antiv	iral							
	Chloroquine: prese	ent (within 3-6 mo	onths pre-index)					0.006
Yes		3	0.00%	1	0.01%	4	0.01%	
-	Chloroquine: past	<u>(&gt;6 months pre-in</u>	ndex)					0.025
Yes		77	0.12%	5	0.05%	82	0.11%	
	Hydroxychloroqui	ne sulfate: presen	t (within 3-6 mo	nths pre-index)	1	-		0.038
Yes		137	0.22%	45	0.43%	182	0.25%	
	Hydroxychloroqui	ne sulfate: past (>	6 months pre-in	dex)		-		0.102
Yes		973	1.54%	320	3.07%	1,293	1.76%	
	Ivermectin: presen	t (within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.005

Phari	nacotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes		24	0.04%	5	0.05%	29	0.04%	
	Ivermectin: past (>	-6 months pre-ind	lex)					0.015
Yes		233	0.37%	49	0.47%	282	0.38%	
	Molnupiravir: pres	sent (within 3-6 m	onths pre-index	)				0.011
Yes		4	0.01%	0	0.00%	4	0.01%	
	Molnupiravir: past	t (>6 months pre-	index)					0.011
Yes		4	0.01%	0	0.00%	4	0.01%	
	Paxlovid: present (	within 3-6 month	s pre-index)					0.006
Yes		18	0.03%	2	0.02%	20	0.03%	
	Paxlovid: past (>6	months pre-index	x)					0.020
Yes		13	0.02%	0	0.00%	13	0.02%	
Remdesivir: present (within 3-6 months pre-index)								
Yes		17	0.03%	4	0.04%	21	0.03%	
	Remdesivir: past (>	>6 months pre-ind	dex)					0.036
Yes		247	0.39%	68	0.65%	315	0.43%	
Ritux	imab B-Cell							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.054
Yes		342	0.54%	106	1.02%	448	0.61%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.105
Yes		692	1.10%	260	2.49%	952	1.30%	
Brond	chodilator							
	Short-acting beta a	ngonist (SABA): p	resent (within 6	<u>months pre-index)</u>				0.393
Yes		7,015	11.13%	2,729	26.16%	9,744	13.26%	
	SABA: past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.183
Yes		17,701	28.08%	3,820	36.62%	21,521	29.29%	
	Long-acting beta a	gonist (LABA): p	resent (within 6	months pre-index)				0.037
Yes		2,249	3.57%	447	4.29%	2,696	3.67%	
	LABA: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)						0.085

Phari	nacotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA	X	BI	EB	Tot	al	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes		6,048	9.59%	1,277	12.24%	7,325	9.97%	
	Anticholinergic (A	ACH): present (w	ithin 6 months p	re-index)				0.028
Yes		351	0.56%	82	0.79%	433	0.59%	
	ACH: past (>6 mor	nths pre-index)						0.075
Yes		1,457	2.31%	373	3.58%	1,830	2.49%	
	Theophylline: pres	ent (within 6 mor	ths pre-index)					0.007
Yes		16	0.03%	4	0.04%	20	0.03%	
	Theophylline: past	(>6 months pre-i	ndex)					0.059
Yes		86	0.14%	48	0.46%	134	0.18%	
CAR	T-cell therapy							
	Present (within 6 n	<u>nonths pre-index)</u>	) 	1 1		1		0.004
Yes		9	0.01%	2	0.02%	11	0.01%	
Past (>6 months pre-index)								
Yes		12	0.02%	3	0.03%	15	0.02%	
Conve	alescent Plasma							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)				1		0.000
Yes		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)		1		T		0.002
Yes		22	0.03%	4	0.04%	26	0.04%	
Abata	cept							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	) T	ГГ				0.023
Yes		39	0.06%	14	0.13%	53	0.07%	
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)				Γ		0.037
Yes		105	0.17%	37	0.35%	142	0.19%	
Anak	inra							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)		· · · · ·		Γ		0.000
Yes		6	0.01%	1	0.01%	7	0.01%	
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.018

Pharmacotherapy variable	es						ASD	
	PA	X	В	EB	To	tal		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Yes	10	0.02%	5	0.05%	15	0.02%		
Tocilizumab								
Present (within 6 r	nonths pre-index)						0.024	
Yes	30	0.05%	12	0.12%	42	0.06%		
Past (>6 months p	re-index)						0.051	
Yes	103	0.16%	46	0.44%	149	0.20%		
Immunosuppressive therap	<i>y</i>							
Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus,	tacrolimus: pres	sent				0.360	
Yes	320	0.51%	773	7.41%	1,093	1.49%		
Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus,	tacrolimus: pas	t				0.371	
Yes	1,387	2.20%	1,186	11.37%	2,573	3.50%		
Cyclophosphamide, azathioprine, leflunomide, methotrexate, mycophenolate, mycophenolate mofetil, sulfasalazine:								
present	T		Γ	Γ	Т	Т	0.217	
Yes	737	1.17%	511	4.90%	1,248	1.70%		
Cyclophosphamid	e, azathioprine, le	flunomide, meth	otrexate, mycophe	nolate, mycopheno	late mofetil, sulfa	salazine: past	0.352	
Yes	2,045	3.24%	1,317	12.63%	3,362	4.58%		
Leukotrienes								
Present (within 6 r	nonths pre-index)			1	1		0.013	
Yes	1,780	2.82%	318	3.05%	2,098	2.86%		
Past (>6 months p	re-index)			1	1		0.037	
Yes	5,249	8.33%	978	9.38%	6,227	8.47%		
Lipid-lowering								
Present (within 6 r	nonths pre-index)		1	1			0.154	
Yes	10,798	17.13%	2,431	23.31%	13,229	18.00%		
Past (>6 months p	re-index)						0.300	
Yes	19,702	31.25%	4,766	45.69%	24,468	33.30%		
Programmed death ligands	(PDLs)							

Pharmacotherapy variable	es						ASD
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	tal	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.053
Yes	83	0.13%	42	0.40%	125	0.17%	
Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.051
Yes	112	0.18%	49	0.47%	161	0.22%	
Tumor necrosis factor inhib	bitor (TNFXs)						
Present (within 6 months pre-index)							0.050
Yes	449	0.71%	125	1.20%	574	0.78%	
Past (>6 months pr	<u>re-index)</u>						0.079
Yes	936	1.48%	271	2.60%	1,207	1.64%	
Other Biologics							
Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	1					0.066
Yes	287	0.46%	106	1.02%	393	0.53%	
Past (>6 months pr	<u>re-index)</u>						0.147
Yes	704	1.12%	341	3.27%	1,045	1.42%	
Procedure related variable	es						ASD
<b>Radiation therapy</b>							0.093
Yes	1,228	1.95%	361	3.46%	1,589	2.16%	
Transplant							
Organ							0.264
Yes	20	0.03%	362	3.47%	382	0.52%	
Hematopoietic							0.057
Yes	72	0.11%	42	0.40%	114	0.16%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell; PAX = paxlovid.

Healthcare utilization vari	ables						ASD
	PA	X	BI	EB	Tot	tal	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Inpatient encounter: 31-36	5 days pre-index						0.198
Yes	4,258	6.75%	1,313	12.59%	5,571	7.58%	
Number inpatient encount	ers: 31-365 days	ore-index					0.202
0	58,790	93.25%	9,118	87.41%	67,908	92.42%	
1-2	3,228	5.12%	966	9.26%	4,194	5.71%	
3-5	755	1.20%	211	2.02%	966	1.31%	
6+	275	0.44%	136	1.30%	411	0.56%	
ED encounter: 8-365 days pre-index						0.194	
Yes	10,579	16.78%	2,565	24.59%	13,144	17.89%	
Number ED encounters: 8-	-365 days pre-ind	ex					0.197
0	52,469	83.22%	7,866	75.41%	60,335	82.11%	
1-2	9,187	14.57%	2,159	20.70%	11,346	15.44%	
3-5	1,166	1.85%	338	3.24%	1,504	2.05%	
6+	226	0.36%	68	0.65%	294	0.40%	
Outpatient encounter: 8-36	65 days pre-index						0.149
Yes	57,594	91.35%	9,045	86.71%	66,639	90.69%	
Number outpatient encoun	ters: 8-365 days	ore-index					0.333
0	5,454	8.65%	1,386	13.29%	6,840	9.31%	
1-5	19,313	30.63%	2,320	22.24%	21,633	29.44%	
6-11	12,421	19.70%	1,552	14.88%	13,973	19.02%	
12-23	12,927	20.50%	1,897	18.19%	14,824	20.17%	
24+	12,933	20.51%	3,276	31.41%	16,209	22.06%	
Outpatient encounter: 7 da	ays pre-index						0.349
Yes	46,314	73.46%	9,090	87.14%	55,404	75.40%	
Number outpatient encoun	ters: 7 days pre-i	ndex					0.559
0	16,734	26.54%	1,341	12.86%	18,075	24.60%	
1-2	41,164	65.29%	6,355	60.92%	47,519	64.67%	

 Table 10.7.
 Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables in the Unmatched Cohorts

Healthcare utilization variables										
	PAX BEB Total									
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
3-5	4,995	7.92%	2,551	24.46%	7,546	10.27%				
6+	155	0.25%	184	1.76%	339	0.46%				

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid.

Table 10.8, Table 10.9, Table 10.10, Table 10.11, and Table 10.12 display baseline variables for BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients in the matched cohort. The median age was 65 (IOR 50 -74) and 65 (IQR 50 -74) years in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively. Similar to the unmatched cohort, patients were primarily female (60.24% in BEB and 60.53% in PAX), White (84.07% in BEB and 84.06% in PAX), and non-Hispanic (77.43% in BEB and 78.05% in PAX). Common COVID-19 related characteristics included presence of a COVID-19 diagnosis anytime pre-index (79.20% in BEB and 79.89% in PAX), a COVID-19 positive test within 7 days pre-index (21.49% in BEB and 23.08% in PAX), and documentation of a COVID-19 vaccine (27.65% in BEB and 27.89% in PAX). Common baseline comorbidities included aplastic anemia (19.86% in BEB and 20.41% in PAX), hypertension (54.76% in BEB and 55.02% in PAX), other heart conditions (43.93% in BEB and 44.57% in PAX), obesity (30.87% in BEB and 32.01% in PAX), type 2 diabetes (25.07% in BEB and 25.52% in PAX), hematologic or solid malignancy except benign skin cancer (33.22% in BEB and 32.68% in PAX), anxiety and fear (35.85% in BEB and 36.49% in PAX), depression (30.63% in BEB and 30.53% in PAX), and CKD (19.79% in BEB and 20.25% in PAX). Common baseline medications included past dexamethasone use (39.66% in BEB and 40.79% in PAX), past methylprednisolone use (33.12% in BEB and 32.86% in PAX), past prednisone use (34.36% in BEB and 34.29% in PAX), past triamcinolone use (29.17% in BEB and 29.21% in PAX), past fluticasone use (31.41% in BEB and 31.10% in PAX), past (57.59% in BEB and 57.99% in PAX) and present (30.26% in BEB and 30.48% in PAX) antihypertensive use, past (36.45% in BEB and 36.71% in PAX) and present (19.87% in BEB and 20.22% in PAX) SABA use, and past (42.73% in BEB and 42.71% in PAX) and present (21.57% in BEB and 21.16% in PAX) lipid lowering agent use. Almost perfect balance was achieved for all four CEM variables: immunocompromised status, age  $\geq$  65 years, COVID-19 vaccine within 9 months pre-index, and an ED encounter within 7 days pre-index. Adequate balance was achieved for all pre-specified covariates except for eGFR category (ASD = 0.202), blood pressure category (ASD = 0.347), and oxygen saturation category (ASD = 0.311).

							ASD
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	tal	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Index date month							0.054
February	8	0.14%	0	0.00%	8	0.07%	
March	28	0.48%	30	0.51%	58	0.50%	
April	691	11.86%	687	11.79%	1,378	11.82%	
May	1,387	23.80%	1,360	23.34%	2,747	23.57%	
June	1,138	19.53%	1,156	19.84%	2,294	19.68%	
July	1,568	26.91%	1,577	27.06%	3,145	26.99%	
August	1,007	17.28%	1,017	17.45%	2,024	17.37%	
Demographics							
Patient age							0.009
Mean (SD), years	61.7 (	(16.6)	61.6	(16.7)			
Median (IQR), years	65 (50 - 74)		65 (5)	0 - 74)			
Min, Max, years	14,	90	14	, 92			
Age category						_	0.025
12-29 years	225	3.86%	247	4.24%	472	4.05%	
30-44 years	855	14.67%	840	14.42%	1,695	14.54%	
45-54 years	701	12.03%	719	12.34%	1,420	12.18%	
45-64 years	1,067	18.31%	1,042	17.88%	2,109	18.10%	
65-74 years	1,597	27.41%	1,586	27.22%	3,183	27.31%	
75-84 years	1,045	17.93%	1,058	18.16%	2,103	18.05%	
≥85 years	337	5.78%	335	5.75%	672	5.77%	
Female sex	<b>1</b>	•			1		0.006
Yes	3,527	60.53%	3,510	60.24%	7,037	60.38%	
Race					T		0.011
White	4,898	84.06%	4,899	84.07%	9,797	84.07%	
Black	342	5.87%	347	5.96%	689	5.91%	

 Table 10.8.
 Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables in the Matched Cohorts

Other	86	1.48%	79	1.36%	165	1.42%	
Unknown	501	8.60%	502	8.62%	1,003	8.61%	
Ethnicity							0.026
Hispanic	340	5.83%	323	5.54%	663	5.69%	
Not Hispanic	4,548	78.05%	4,512	77.43%	9,060	77.74%	
Unknown	939	16.11%	992	17.02%	1,931	16.57%	
Lifestyle variables							ASD
Smoking status 6 months p	ore-index						0.013
Yes	111	1.90%	101	1.73%	212	1.82%	
Smoking status >6 months	pre-index						0.033
Yes	352	6.04%	308	5.29%	660	5.66%	
Smoking ever pre-index							0.003
Yes	473	8.12%	425	7.29%	898	7.71%	
Inactivity							0.031
Yes	20	0.34%	19	0.33%	39	0.33%	

 $Abbreviations: \ ASD = absolute \ standardized \ difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; IQR = interquartile \ range; \ max = maximum; \ min = minimum; \ PAX = paxlovid;$ 

SD = standard deviation

#### Table 10.9. Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables in the Matched Cohorts

CEM variables									
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Immunocompromised state	us (UPMC)						0.000		
Yes	2,791	47.90%	2,791	47.90%	5,582	47.90%			
Age ≥ 65							0.000		
Yes	2,979	51.12%	2,979	51.12%	5,958	51.12%			
COVID-19 vaccination wit	hin 9 months pre	-index					0.000		
Yes	1,013	17.38%	1,013	17.38%	2,026	17.38%			
ED encounter within 7 day	s pre-index						0.000		
Yes	1,022	17.54%	1,022	17.54%	2,044	17.54%			
COVID-19 related variable	es						ASD		
COVID-19 diagnosis anyti	me pre-index						0.017		
Yes	4,655	79.89%	4,615	79.20%	9,270	79.54%			
COVID-19 positive test: wi	ithin 7 days pre-i	ndex					0.038		
Yes	1,345	23.08%	1,252	21.49%	2,597	22.28%			
COVID-19 positive test: >7	7 days pre-index						0.018		
Yes	265	4.55%	244	4.19%	509	4.37%			
COVID-19 vaccine: past (>	-9 months pre-ind	dex)					0.005		
Yes	1,625	27.89%	1,611	27.65%	3,236	27.77%			
COVID-19 antibody thera	py: present (with	in 3-6 months pr	e-index)				0.003		
Yes	77	1.32%	79	1.36%	156	1.34%			
COVID-19 antibody thera	py: past (>6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.010		
Yes	49	0.84%	44	0.76%	93	0.80%			
<b>COVID-19 related symptom</b>	ms						ASD		
Anosmia and parosmia							0.000		
Yes	10	0.17%	10	0.17%	20	0.17%			
Cough							0.001		
Yes	297	5.10%	298	5.11%	595	5.11%			
Fatigue							0.026		

Yes	418	7.17%	380	6.52%	798	6.85%	
Fever or chills							0.014
Yes	401	6.88%	381	6.54%	782	6.71%	
Headache							0.016
Yes	107	1.84%	95	1.63%	202	1.73%	
Myalgia or joint pain							0.012
Yes	258	4.43%	244	4.19%	502	4.31%	
Nausea or vomiting							0.006
Yes	364	6.25%	356	6.11%	720	6.18%	
Dyspnea							0.010
Yes	290	4.98%	278	4.77%	568	4.87%	
Sore throat/pharyngitis							0.008
Yes	317	5.44%	307	5.27%	624	5.35%	
Diarrhea							0.021
Yes	107	1.84%	91	1.56%	198	1.70%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened extract matching; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019;

PAX = paxlovid; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Clinical and laboratory variables										
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al				
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )							0.002			
Mean (SD), years	29.71	(7.01)	29.59	(6.80)						
Median (IQR), years	28.50 (24.8	30 - 33.35)	28.50 (24	70 - 33.28)						
Min, Max, years	12.48,	68.01	12.40	, 71.94						
BMI category							0.057			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
Underweight: <18.5	69	1.18%	79	1.36%	148	1.27%				
Normal: 18.5-24	1,249	21.43%	1,276	21.90%	2,525	21.67%				
Overweight: 25-29	1,634	28.04%	1,642	28.18%	3,276	28.11%				
Obese: ≥30.0	2,079	35.68%	2,141	36.74%	4,220	36.21%				
Missing	796	13.66%	689	11.82%	1,485	12.74%				
MCQ eGFR: using last sC	Cr pre-index				-		0.054			
Mean (SD), years	92.24 (	19.20)	90.43	(21.72)						
Median (IQR), years	92.63 (82.3	1 - 104.87)	91.98 (80.	95 - 104.44)						
Min, Max, years	18.51,	159.67	14.78,	157.49						
MCQ eGFR: using last sC	Cr pre-index				-		0.202			
eGFR ≥90	2,847	48.86%	2,612	44.83%	5,459	46.84%				
eGFR 60-89	1,895	32.52%	1,725	29.60%	3,620	31.06%				
eGFR 30-59	285	4.89%	339	5.82%	624	5.35%				
eGFR <30	18	0.31%	98	1.68%	116	1.00%				
Missing	782	13.42%	1,053	18.07%	1,835	15.75%				
<b>Blood pressure: category</b>							0.347			
Normotensive	297	5.10%	433	7.43%	730	6.26%				
Elevated	199	3.42%	305	5.23%	504	4.32%				
Stage 1	343	5.89%	552	9.47%	895	7.68%				
Stage 2	523	8.98%	983	16.87%	1,506	12.92%				
Missing	4,465	76.63%	3,554	60.99%	8,019	68.81%				
Oxygen saturation: catego	ory						0.311			

 Table 10.10.
 Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables in the Matched Cohorts

≥95%	264	4.53%	772	13.25%	1,036	8.89%				
85-95%	48	0.82%	50	0.86%	98	0.84%				
<85%	10	0.17%	6	0.10%	16	0.14%				
Missing	5,505	94.47%	4,999	85.79%	10,504	90.13%				
Comorbidities							ASD			
Autoimmune										
Crohn's disease										
Yes	111	1.90%	106	1.82%	217	1.86%				
Juvenile arthritis							0.000			
Yes	11	0.19%	11	0.19%	22	0.19%				
Rheumatoid arthr	itis						0.010			
Yes	446	7.65%	431	7.40%	877	7.53%				
Systemic lupus ery	thematosus						0.012			
Yes	525	9.01%	505	8.67%	1,030	8.84%				
Ulcerative colitis							0.012			
Yes	98	1.68%	89	1.53%	187	1.60%				
Blood Disorder										
Aplastic anemia							0.014			
Yes	1,189	20.41%	1,157	19.86%	2,346	20.13%				
Immunodeficiency	r						0.013			
Yes	537	9.22%	559	9.59%	1,096	9.40%				
Immunodeficiency	(UPMC)			-		_	0.001			
Yes	1,052	18.05%	1,054	18.09%	2,106	18.07%				
Sickle cell				1		-	0.012			
Yes	20	0.34%	16	0.27%	36	0.31%				
Thalassemia	1			1	1	-	0.005			
Yes	24	0.41%	22	0.38%	46	0.39%				
Circulatory										
Acute hemorrhagi	c cerebrovascula	r disease			T	-1	0.020			
Yes	240	4.12%	264	4.53%	504	4.32%				
Cerebral infarction	n						0.003			

Yes		430	7.38%	435	7.47%	865	7.42%	
	Other cerebrovasc	ular disease						0.026
Yes		463	7.95%	505	8.67%	968	8.31%	
	Acute myocardial	infarction						0.014
Yes		378	6.49%	358	6.14%	736	6.32%	
	Coronary artery d	isease						0.005
Yes		768	13.18%	758	13.01%	1,526	13.09%	
	Heart failure							0.013
Yes		653	11.21%	629	10.79%	1,282	11.00%	
	Hypertension							0.005
Yes		3,206	55.02%	3,191	54.76%	6,397	54.89%	
	Myocarditis cardio	omyopathy						0.004
Yes		335	5.75%	341	5.85%	676	5.80%	
	Other heart condit	ion						0.013
Yes		2,597	44.57%	2,560	43.93%	5,157	44.25%	
	Peripheral vascula	r disease						0.017
Yes		797	13.68%	832	14.28%	1,629	13.98%	
Disab	ility							
	Cerebral palsy							0.009
Yes		19	0.33%	22	0.38%	41	0.35%	
	Congenital malfor	mation						0.012
Yes		1,057	18.14%	1,031	17.69%	2,088	17.92%	
	Limitation of ADL	1						0.012
Yes		305	5.23%	290	4.98%	595	5.11%	
	Neurodevelopment	tal disorders						0.009
Yes		297	5.10%	309	5.30%	606	5.20%	
	Spinal cord injury							0.016
Yes		9	0.15%	13	0.22%	22	0.19%	
Endo	crine							
	Obesity							0.024
Yes		1,865	32.01%	1,799	30.87%	3,664	31.44%	

	Diabetes Type 1							0.014
Yes		167	2.87%	154	2.64%	321	2.75%	
	Diabetes Type 2							0.010
Yes		1,487	25.52%	1,461	25.07%	2,948	25.30%	
	Diabetes Type 1 or	· 2 (complicated)						0.016
Yes		886	15.21%	853	14.64%	1,739	14.92%	
Нера	tic							
	Alcoholic liver dise	ease						0.011
Yes		153	2.63%	143	2.45%	296	2.54%	
	Autoimmune hepa	titis						0.005
Yes		28	0.48%	26	0.45%	54	0.46%	
	Cirrhosis							0.006
Yes		131	2.25%	126	2.16%	257	2.21%	
	Non-alcoholic fatty	liver disease						0.001
Yes		454	7.79%	453	7.77%	907	7.78%	
Infect	tious							
	Hepatitis B							0.008
Yes		40	0.69%	44	0.76%	84	0.72%	
	Hepatitis C	•						0.022
Yes		134	2.30%	154	2.64%	288	2.47%	
	HIV	•						0.011
Yes		197	3.38%	186	3.19%	383	3.29%	
	Tuberculosis	•						0.018
Yes		39	0.67%	31	0.53%	70	0.60%	
Malig	nancy							
	Hematological onc	ology (except ski	<u>n)</u>					0.012
Yes		1,904	32.68%	1,936	33.22%	3,840	32.95%	
	Metastatic	1				1		0.001
Yes		246	4.22%	247	4.24%	493	4.23%	
	Radiation complication	ation			1	1		0.001
Yes		114	1.96%	113	1.94%	227	1.95%	

Menta	ıl Health							
	Anxiety and fear							0.013
Yes		2,126	36.49%	2,089	35.85%	4,215	36.17%	
	Bipolar							0.012
Yes		195	3.35%	183	3.14%	378	3.24%	
	Depression							0.002
Yes		1,779	30.53%	1,785	30.63%	3,564	30.58%	
	Other mood disord	ler						0.019
Yes		147	2.52%	165	2.83%	312	2.68%	
	Schizophrenia							0.016
Yes		129	2.21%	116	1.99%	245	2.10%	
	Substance abuse							0.016
Yes		658	11.29%	628	10.78%	1,286	11.03%	
	Suicidal ideation							0.019
Yes		286	4.91%	263	4.51%	549	4.71%	
Neuro	cognitive disorders							0.007
Yes		237	4.07%	245	4.20%	482	4.14%	
Pulme	onary							
	Alpha-1 antitrypsi	n deficiency						0.008
Yes		11	0.19%	9	0.15%	20	0.17%	
	Asthma	•						0.009
Yes		1,297	22.26%	1,275	21.88%	2,572	22.07%	
	Bronchopulmonar	y dysplasia					1	0.000
Yes		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
	COPD and bronch	iectasis					1	0.002
Yes		815	13.99%	810	13.90%	1,625	13.94%	
	Cystic fibrosis	•						0.003
Yes		20	0.34%	19	0.33%	39	0.33%	
	Embolism	-						0.004
Yes		270	4.63%	265	4.55%	535	4.59%	
	Hypertension							0.005

Yes	318	5.46%	311	5.34%	629	5.40%				
Interstitial disease							0.012			
Yes	178	3.05%	190	3.26%	368	3.16%				
Renal										
СКД							0.012			
Yes	1,180	20.25%	1,153	19.79%	2,333	20.02%				
ESRD							0.017			
Yes	571	9.80%	542	9.30%	1,113	9.55%				
Transplant										
Organ stem cell							0.030			
Yes	269	4.62%	307	5.27%	576	4.94%				
Graft versus host d	lisease						0.007			
Yes	13	0.22%	15	0.26%	28	0.24%				
Pregnancy variables							ASD			
Pregnancy within 3 month	s pre-index						0.017			
Yes	258	4.43%	238	4.08%	496	4.26%				
Pregnancy within 9 month	s pre-index						0.014			
Yes	350	6.01%	331	5.68%	681	5.84%				
Pregnancy ever pre-index										
Yes	1,249	21.43%	1,243	21.33%	2,492	21.38%				

Abbreviations: ADL = activities of daily living; ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; BMI = body mass index; CKD = chronic kidney disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESRD = end-stage renal disease; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus; IQR = interquartile range; max = maximum; MCQ = Mayo Clinic quadratic; min = minimum; PAX = paxlovid; sCr = serum creatinine; SD = standard deviation; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Pharmacotherapy variables									
		PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al		
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Antie	metics								
	Present (within 7 da	ays pre-index)						0.011	
Yes		67	1.15%	74	1.27%	141	1.21%		
	Past (>7 days pre-ii	ndex)						0.007	
Yes		745	12.79%	758	13.01%	1,503	12.90%		
Corti	costeroids								
	Beclomethasone: p	resent (within 7 da	ays pre-index)	1	1	1		0.015	
Yes		4	0.07%	2	0.03%	6	0.05%		
	Beclomethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ir	ndex)	Γ	•	Γ		0.005	
Yes		129	2.21%	133	2.28%	262	2.25%		
	Betamethasone: pro	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)	Γ	•	Γ		0.005	
Yes		7	0.12%	8	0.14%	15	0.13%		
	Betamethasone: pa	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)		1	T		0.008	
Yes		691	11.86%	707	12.13%	1,398	12.00%		
	Budesonide: presen	nt (within 7 days p	re-index)	Γ	1	T		0.003	
Yes		20	0.34%	21	0.36%	41	0.35%		
	Budesonide: past (>	>7 days pre-index)		Γ	1	T		0.021	
Yes		589	10.11%	552	9.47%	1,141	9.79%		
	Deflazacort: presen	t (within 7 days p	re-index)	Γ	T	T		0.000	
Yes		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Deflazacort: past (>	>7 days pre-index)		1	1	1		0.019	
Yes		0	0.00%	1	0.02%	1	0.01%		
	Dexamethasone: pr	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)	Γ	T	Т	Γ	0.006	
Yes		210	3.60%	204	3.50%	414	3.55%		
	Dexamethasone: pa	ust (>7 days pre-in	dex)	I	1	Т		0.023	
Yes		2,377	40.79%	2,311	39.66%	4,688	40.23%		
	Hydrocortisone: pr	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)					0.013	

 Table 10.11.
 Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables in the Matched Cohorts

Pharmacotherapy variables										
		PA	Х	В	EB	Tot	al			
		Frequency	0⁄0	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Yes		95	1.63%	105	1.80%	200	1.72%			
	Hydrocortisone: pa	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)					0.020		
Yes		911	15.63%	954	16.37%	1,865	16.00%			
	Methylprednisolon	e: present (within	7 days pre-index	<u>()</u>				0.017		
Yes		758	13.01%	725	12.44%	1,483	12.73%			
	Methylprednisolon	e: past (>7 days p	re-index)					0.005		
Yes		1,915	32.86%	1,930	33.12%	3,845	32.99%			
	Prednisolone: prese	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)		1			0.032		
Yes		40	0.69%	57	0.98%	97	0.83%			
	Prednisolone: past	<u>(&gt;7 days pre-inde</u>	x)		1			0.012		
Yes		334	5.73%	350	6.01%	684	5.87%			
	Prednisone: presen	t (within 7 days p	re-index)		1			0.018		
Yes		114	1.96%	129	2.21%	243	2.09%			
	Prednisone: past (>	7 days pre-index)			-			0.001		
Yes		1,998	34.29%	2,002	34.36%	4,000	34.32%			
	Triamcinolone: pre	esent (within 7 day	ys pre-index)	1	1			0.009		
Yes		29	0.50%	33	0.57%	62	0.53%			
	Triamcinolone: pas	t (>7 days pre-inc	lex)	1	1	_		0.001		
Yes		1,702	29.21%	1,700	29.17%	3,402	29.19%			
	Mometasone: prese	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)		1	-		0.026		
Yes		9	0.15%	4	0.07%	13	0.11%			
	Mometasone: past (	(>7 days pre-inde	x)		1	-		0.023		
Yes		302	5.18%	333	5.71%	635	5.45%			
	Fluticasone: presen	t (within 7 days p	re-index)	1	1			0.004		
Yes		117	2.01%	114	1.96%	231	1.98%			
	Fluticasone: past (>	•7 days pre-index)	)	1	1			0.007		
Yes		1,812	31.10%	1,830	31.41%	3,642	31.25%			
Antice	oagulants									

Pharmacotherapy variables									
		PA	X	B	EB	Tot	al		
		Frequency	0⁄0	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)						0.002	
Yes		348	5.97%	345	5.92%	693	5.95%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.000	
Yes		893	15.33%	892	15.31%	1,785	15.32%		
Antid	iabetic								
	Insulin: present (wi	ithin 6 months pro	e-index)					0.018	
Yes		399	6.85%	373	6.40%	772	6.62%		
	Insulin: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)						0.023	
Yes		1,139	19.55%	1,086	18.64%	2,225	19.09%		
	Other: present (wit	hin 6 months pre	-index)			-		0.018	
Yes		576	9.89%	545	9.35%	1,121	9.62%		
	Other: past (>6 mo	nths pre-index)				-		0.014	
Yes		1,032	17.71%	1,001	17.18%	2,033	17.44%		
Antih	ypertensives								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)			-	-		0.005	
Yes		1,776	30.48%	1,763	30.26%	3,539	30.37%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)	1	P				0.008	
Yes		3,379	57.99%	3,356	57.59%	6,735	57.79%		
Antiv	irals								
	Chloroquine: prese	nt (within 3-6 mo	nths pre-index)		1			0.000	
Yes		1	0.02%	1	0.02%	2	0.02%		
	Chloroquine: past (	>6 months pre-in	dex)		1			0.057	
Yes		12	0.21%	1	0.02%	13	0.11%		
	Hydroxychloroquin	ne sulfate: present	(within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)	1			0.019	
Yes		28	0.48%	21	0.36%	49	0.42%		
	Hydroxychloroquin	ne sulfate: past (>	6 months pre-ind	lex)	1			0.002	
Yes		169	2.90%	171	2.93%	340	2.92%		
	Ivermectin: present	t (within 3-6 mont	ths pre-index)					0.026	

Pharmacotherapy variables									
		PA	X	В	EB	Tot	al		
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Yes		0	0.00%	2	0.03%	2	0.02%		
	Ivermectin: past (>	6 months pre-ind	ex)					0.006	
Yes		20	0.34%	22	0.38%	42	0.36%		
	Molnupiravir: pres	ent (within 3-6 m	onths pre-index)					0.019	
Yes		1	0.02%	0	0.00%	1	0.01%		
	Molnupiravir: past	(>6 months pre-i	ndex)					0.000	
Yes		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Paxlovid: present (v	within 3-6 months	<u>s pre-index)</u>		-			0.008	
Yes		3	0.05%	2	0.03%	5	0.04%		
	Paxlovid: past (>6 i	months pre-index	)		-			0.019	
Yes		1	0.02%	0	0.00%	1	0.01%		
	Remdesivir: presen	t (within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.035	
Yes		8	0.14%	2	0.03%	10	0.09%		
	Remdesivir: past (>	-6 months pre-ind	lex)					0.002	
Yes		34	0.58%	35	0.60%	69	0.59%		
Ritux	imab B-cell								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)			-			0.004	
Yes		56	0.96%	54	0.93%	110	0.94%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)	<b>1</b>	P	1			0.004	
Yes		128	2.20%	125	2.15%	253	2.17%		
Brone	chodilator								
	SABA: present (wit	<u>thin 6 months pre</u>	-index)	P	1			0.009	
Yes		1,178	20.22%	1,158	19.87%	2,336	20.04%		
	SABA: past (>6 mo	nths pre-index)	<b>1</b>	P	1			0.005	
Yes		2,139	36.71%	2,124	36.45%	4,263	36.58%		
	LABA: present (wi	thin 6 months pre	-index)		1			0.002	
Yes		270	4.63%	268	4.60%	538	4.62%		
	LABA: past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.019	

Pharmacotherapy variables									
		PA	X	B	EB	Tota	al		
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Yes		783	13.44%	746	12.80%	1,529	13.12%		
	ACH: present (with	nin 6 months pre-i	ndex)					0.002	
Yes		51	0.88%	50	0.86%	101	0.87%		
	ACH: past (>6 mor	ths pre-index)						0.015	
Yes		221	3.79%	205	3.52%	426	3.66%		
	Theophylline: pres	ent (within 6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.037	
Yes		4	0.07%	0	0.00%	4	0.03%		
	Theophylline: past	(>6 months pre-in	idex)		1			0.006	
Yes		19	0.33%	17	0.29%	36	0.31%		
CAR	T-cell therapy								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)			1			0.026	
Yes		2	0.03%	0	0.00%	2	0.02%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)			1			0.030	
Yes		5	0.09%	1	0.02%	6	0.05%		
Conv	alescent plasma								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)			1			0.000	
Yes		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)			1			0.008	
Yes		3	0.05%	2	0.03%	5	0.04%		
Abata	cept								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)		1	1			0.024	
Yes		10	0.17%	5	0.09%	15	0.13%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)			1			0.000	
Yes		19	0.33%	19	0.33%	38	0.33%		
Anakinra									
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)			1			0.026	
Yes		2	0.03%	0	0.00%	2	0.02%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.011	

Pharmacotherapy variables									
		PA	X	В	BEB	Tot	tal		
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Yes		2	0.03%	1	0.02%	3	0.03%		
Tociliz	zumab								
	Present (within 6 m	nonths pre-index)						0.012	
Yes		6	0.10%	4	0.07%	10	0.09%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.011	
Yes		27	0.46%	23	0.39%	50	0.43%		
Immu	nosuppressive therapy	V							
	Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus,	tacrolimus: pres	ent	r			0.020	
Yes		114	1.96%	131	2.25%	245	2.10%		
	Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus,	tacrolimus: past	1	r			0.025	
Yes		301	5.17%	334	5.73%	635	5.45%		
	Cyclophosphamide	, azathioprine, lef	lunomide, metho	trexate, mycopher	iolate, mycophenola	te mofetil, sulfasa	lazine: present	0.007	
Yes		159	2.73%	166	2.85%	325	2.79%		
	Cyclophosphamide	, azathioprine, lef	lunomide, metho	trexate, mycopher	iolate, mycophenola	te mofetil, sulfasa	lazine: past	0.010	
Yes		443	7.60%	459	7.88%	902	7.74%		
Leuko	trienes								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)	Γ	Γ	1	1	1	0.010	
Yes		180	3.09%	190	3.26%	370	3.17%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)	Γ	Γ	T	I	I	0.018	
Yes		542	9.30%	572	9.82%	1,114	9.56%		
Lipid-	lowering								
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)	Γ	Γ	T	I	I	0.010	
Yes		1,233	21.16%	1,257	21.57%	2,490	21.37%		
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)	ſ	ſ	T	I	I	0.000	
Yes		2,489	42.71%	2,490	42.73%	4,979	42.72%		
<b>PDLs</b>								<u> </u>	
	Present (within 6 m	onths pre-index)	Γ	Γ	T		T	0.000	
Yes		20	0.34%	20	0.34%	40	0.34%		

Pharmacotherapy variables									
	PA	X	В	EB	Tota	al			
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.017		
Yes	19	0.33%	25	0.43%	44	0.38%			
TNFXs									
Present (within 6 m	nonths pre-index)						0.008		
Yes	77	1.32%	72	1.24%	149	1.28%			
Past (>6 months pre-index)									
Yes	167	2.87%	164	2.81%	331	2.84%			
Other biologics									
Present (within 6 m	nonths pre-index)						0.011		
Yes	47	0.81%	53	0.91%	100	0.86%			
Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.013		
Yes	122	2.09%	133	2.28%	255	2.19%			
Procedure related variable	28						ASD		
<b>Radiation therapy</b>							0.009		
Yes	200	3.43%	210	3.60%	410	3.52%			
Transplant									
Organ							0.003		
Yes	18	0.31%	19	0.33%	37	0.32%			
Hematopoietic									
Yes	18	0.31%	18	0.31%	36	0.31%			

Abbreviations: ACH = anticholinergic; ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell; LABA = long-acting beta-agonist; PAX = Paxlovid; PDL = programmed death ligand; SABA = short-acting beta-agonist; TNFX = tumor necrosis factor inhibitor.

Healthcare utilization variables								
	PA	X	B	EB	To	tal		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Inpatient encounter: 31-36	5 days pre-index						0.007	
Yes	611	10.49%	599	10.28%	1,210	10.38%		
Number inpatient encount	ers: 31-365 days	pre-index					0.022	
0	5,216	89.51%	5,228	89.72%	10,444	89.62%		
1-2	479	8.22%	461	7.91%	940	8.07%		
3-5	95	1.63%	92	1.58%	187	1.60%		
6+	37	0.63%	46	0.79%	83	0.71%		
ED encounter: 8-365 days	pre-index						0.018	
Yes	1,375	23.60%	1,330	22.82%	2,705	23.21%		
Number ED encounters: 8-	-365 days pre-ind	ex					0.022	
0	4,452	76.40%	4,497	77.18%	8,949	76.79%		
1-2	1,160	19.91%	1,116	19.15%	2,276	19.53%		
3-5	173	2.97%	177	3.04%	350	3.00%		
6+	42	0.72%	37	0.63%	79	0.68%		
Outpatient encounter: 8-30	65 days pre-index			-	-		0.001	
Yes	5,264	90.34%	5,263	90.32%	10,527	90.33%		
Number outpatient encour	ters: 8-365 days	pre-index					0.003	
0	563	9.66%	564	9.68%	1,127	9.67%		
1-5	1,296	22.24%	1,294	22.21%	2,590	22.22%		
6-11	938	16.10%	945	16.22%	1,883	16.16%		
12-23	1,215	20.85%	1,212	20.80%	2,427	20.83%		
24+	1,815	31.15%	1,812	31.10%	3,627	31.12%		
Outpatient encounter: 7 days pre-index								
Yes	4,947	84.90%	5,006	85.91%	9,953	85.40%		
Number outpatient encoun	iters: 7 days pre-i	index					0.032	
0	880	15.10%	821	14.09%	1,701	14.60%		
1-2	3,622	62.16%	3,696	63.43%	7,318	62.79%		

#### Table 10.12. Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables in the Matched Cohorts

Healthcare utilization variables							
	PA	X	B	EB	Tot		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
3-5	1,263	21.67%	1,245	21.37%	2,508	21.52%	
6+	62	1.06%	65	1.12%	127	1.09%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid.

# 10.3 Outcome Data

## 10.3.1 COVID-19 Treatments During Follow-up

Administration of COVID-19 treatments within 30 days after the index date was uncommon in both the unmatched and matched cohorts (Table 10.13). A subsequent BEB dose was administered in 3.47% and 4.46% of BEB-exposed patients in the unmatched and matched cohorts, respectively. A subsequent PAX dose was administered in 1.81% and 2.09% of PAX-exposed patients in the unmatched and matched cohorts, respectively.

			Unm	atched			Matched					
	PA	X	BE	B	То	tal	PA	X	BE	В	Tot	al
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
COVII	<b>D-19 convales</b>	cent plasma	1						-			-
No	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Yes	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Bamlar	nivimab/etese	vimab										
No	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Yes	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Bebtelo	ovimab											
No	62,817	99.63%	10,069	96.53%	72,886	99.19%	5,759	98.83%	5,567	95.54%	11,326	97.19%
Yes	231	0.37%	362	3.47%	593	0.81%	68	1.17%	260	4.46%	328	2.81%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Casiriv	<mark>imab/imdevi</mark>	mab		1	1		1					
No	63,047	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,478	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Yes	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Sotrovi	imab			1	1		1					
No	63,042	99.99%	10,430	99.99%	73,472	99.99%	5,825	99.97%	5,827	100.00%	11,652	99.98%
Yes	6	0.01%	1	0.01%	7	0.01%	2	0.03%	0	0.00%	2	0.02%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Tixage	vimab/cilgavi	mab							I			
No	63,015	99.95%	10,419	99.88%	73,434	99.94%	5,818	99.85%	5,819	99.86%	11,637	99.85%
Yes	33	0.05%	12	0.12%	45	0.06%	9	0.15%	8	0.14%	17	0.15%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Tociliz	umab			[	[		1		1			
No	63,039	99.99%	10,426	99.95%	73,465	99.98%	5,826	99.98%	5,824	99.95%	11,650	99.97%
Yes	9	0.01%	5	0.05%	14	0.02%	1	0.02%	3	0.05%	4	0.03%

 Table 10.13.
 COVID-19 Treatment Administration during Follow-up in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

			Unm	atched			Matched					
	PA	X	BF	В	То	tal	PA	Х	BE	B	Tot	al
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Hydro	Hydroxychloroquine											
No	62,991	99.91%	10,410	99.80%	73,401	99.89%	5,814	99.78%	5,820	99.88%	11,634	99.83%
Yes	57	0.09%	21	0.20%	78	0.11%	13	0.22%	7	0.12%	20	0.17%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Iverme	ectin											
No	63,038	99.98%	10,430	99.99%	73,468	99.99%	5,826	99.98%	5,826	99.98%	11,652	99.98%
Yes	10	0.02%	1	0.01%	11	0.01%	1	0.02%	1	0.02%	2	0.02%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Molnu	piravir											
No	62,964	99.87%	10,426	99.95%	73,390	99.88%	5,815	99.79%	5,822	99.91%	11,637	99.85%
Yes	84	0.13%	5	0.05%	89	0.12%	12	0.21%	5	0.09%	17	0.15%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Nirmat	trelvir/ritonav	vir										
No	61,904	98.19%	10,401	99.71%	72,305	98.40%	5,705	97.91%	5,800	99.54%	11,505	98.72%
Yes	1,144	1.81%	30	0.29%	1,174	1.60%	122	2.09%	27	0.46%	149	1.28%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10,431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	11,654	100.00%
Remde	sivir											
No	62,917	99.79%	10,386	99.57%	73,303	99.76%	5,785	99.28%	5,802	99.57%	11,587	99.43%
Yes	131	0.21%	45	0.43%	176	0.24%	42	0.72%	25	0.43%	67	0.57%
Total	63,048	100.00%	10.431	100.00%	73,479	100.00%	5,827	100.00%	5.827	100.00%	11.654	100.00%

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; PAX = paxlovid.

# 10.3.2 Number of Events and Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes

In the unmatched cohort, there was a cumulative incidence of 2.30% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 2.02%, 2.61%) and a cumulative incidence of 1.09% (95% CI: 1.01%, 1.17%) for primary outcome events in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively (Table 10.14). Among secondary outcomes, there was a cumulative incidence of 2.24% (95% CI: 1.97%, 2.55%) and 1.07% (95% CI: 0.99%, 1.16%) for hospitalizations, a cumulative incidence of 5.31% (95% CI: 4.89%, 5.76%) and 3.18% (95% CI: 3.04%, 3.32%) for ED visits, and a cumulative incidence of 0.09% (95% CI: 0.04%, 0.16%) and 0.03% (95% CI: 0.01%, 0.04%) for death in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively.

In the matched cohort, there was a cumulative incidence of 2.03% (95% CI: 1.68%, 2.42%) and 1.84% (95% CI: 1.51%, 2.21%) for primary outcome events in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively. Among secondary outcomes, there was a cumulative incidence of 1.94% (95% CI: 1.60%, 2.33%) and 1.82% (95% CI: 1.49%, 2.20%) for hospitalizations, 5.08% (95% CI: 4.53%, 5.68%) and 4.58% (95% CI: 4.06%, 5.15%) for ED visits, and a cumulative incidence of 0.10% (95% CI: 0.04%, 0.22%) and 0.02% (95% CI: 0.00%, 0.10%) for death in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively.

		Number of	Number of	Cumulativa	050/	050/	
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	
Unmatched cohorts	· •	· · · · ·					
Primary analysis							
Hospitalization OR	BEB	10,431	240	2.30%	2.02%	2.61%	
Death	PAX	63,048	686	1.09%	1.01%	1.17%	
Secondary analyses							
Hagnitalization	BEB	10,431	234	2.24%	1.97%	2.55%	
Hospitalization	PAX	63,048	677	1.07%	0.99%	1.16%	
ED visit	BEB	10,431	554	5.31%	4.89%	5.76%	
ED VISI	PAX	63,048	2,003	3.18%	3.04%	3.32%	
Death	BEB	10,431	9	0.09%	0.04%	0.16%	
Deatin	PAX	63,048	16	0.03%	0.01%	0.04%	
Matched cohorts							
Primary analysis							
Hospitalization OR	BEB	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	
Death	PAX	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%	
Secondary analyses	Secondary analyses						
Hagnitalization	BEB	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	
nospitalization	PAX	5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%	
ED visit	BEB	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	

Table 10.14.	Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes in the
	Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

Outcome	Exposure	Number of Patients Analyzed	Number of Patients with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL
	PAX	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%
Death	BEB	5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%
Death	PAX	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%

Abbreviations: 95% LCL = 95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL = 95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB = bebtelovimab; PAX = Paxlovid;.

Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

## 10.4 Main Results

RDs for primary and secondary outcomes in the unmatched and matched cohorts are presented in Table 10.15. In the matched cohorts, BEB was noninferior to PAX for the primary outcome based on the *a priori* specified NI margin of 1.795% for the UCL. The RD was 0.19% with a UCL that was within the *a priori* specified margin (95% LCL -0.31%, 95% UCL 0.69%). In the matched cohorts BEB (compared to PAX) was not associated with increased risks of hospitalization (RD 0.12%; 95% LCL -0.37%, 95% UCL 0.61%), an ED visit (RD 0.50%; 95% LCL -0.28%, 95% UCL 1.28%), or death (RD 0.086%; 95% LCL -0.003%, 95% UCL 0.175%).

Table 10.15.	Risk Differences for Primary and Secondary Outcomes in the
	Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

		Risk Difference					
		(RD, PAX = reference)					
Outcome	Exposure	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL			
Unmatched cohorts							
Primary analysis							
Hospitalization OR Death	BEB	1.21%	0.91%	1.51%			
	PAX						
Secondary analyses							
Hospitalization	BEB	1.17%	0.87%	1.46%			
	PAX						
ED visit	BEB	2.13%	1.68%	2.59%			
	PAX						
Death	BEB	0.061%	0.003%	0.119%			
	PAX						
Matched cohorts							
Primary analysis							
Hospitalization OR Death	BEB	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%			
	PAX						
Secondary analyses							
Hospitalization	BEB	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%			
	PAX						
ED visit	BEB	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%			

		Risk Difference (RD, PAX = reference)			
Outcome	Exposure	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL	
	PAX				
Death	BEB	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%	
	PAX				

Abbreviations: 95% LCL = 95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL = 95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB = bebtelovimab; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid. Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

## 10.5 Other Analyses

### 10.5.1 Subgroup Analyses

Results from subgroup analyses are displayed in Table 10.16. There was no evidence of effect modification by subgroups for age  $\geq$  65 years, immunocompromised status, COVID-19 vaccine, or ED visit within 7 days pre-index.
								R	isk Differen	ice
			Number of	Number of				(RD, 1	PAX = refe	rence)
	-	Matched Pairs	Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%		95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
Subgroup: Age $\geq 6$	5 years (yes/n	10)								
Primary analysis	1	ſ	1	I			1	1		
	BEB	A11	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%
	PAX	7 111	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%		1	1
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	2,979	61	2.05%	1.57%	2.62%	-0.03%	-0.76%	0.69%
OR Death	PAX	Present	2,979	62	2.08%	1.60%	2.66%			
	BEB	Condition	2,848	57	2.00%	1.52%	2.59%	0.42%	-0.27%	1.11%
	PAX	Absent	2,848	45	1.58%	1.15%	2.11%			
Secondary analyses	5									
	BEB	A 11	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%
	PAX	All	5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%			
TT:4-1:4:	BEB	Condition	2,979	59	1.98%	1.51%	2.55%	-0.07%	-0.78%	0.65%
Hospitalization	PAX	Present	2,979	61	2.05%	1.57%	2.62%			
	BEB	Condition	2,848	54	1.90%	1.43%	2.47%	0.32%	-0.36%	0.99%
	PAX	Absent	2,848	45	1.58%	1.15%	2.11%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%
	PAX	All	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%			
	BEB	Condition	2,979	164	5.51%	4.71%	6.39%	0.70%	-0.42%	1.83%
ED visit	PAX	Present	2,979	143	4.80%	4.06%	5.63%			
	BEB	Condition	2,848	132	4.63%	3.89%	5.47%	0.28%	-0.80%	1.36%
	PAX	Absent	2,848	124	4.35%	3.63%	5.17%			•
	BEB		5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%
	PAX	All	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%		•	
Death	BEB	Condition	2,979	2	0.07%	0.01%	0.24%	0.034%	-0.080%	0.147%
	PAX	Present	2,979	1	0.03%	0.00%	0.19%			•
	BEB		2,848	4	0.14%	0.04%	0.36%	0.140%	0.003%	0.278%

#### Table 10.16.Results from Subgroup Analyses

								Ri	isk Differen	ce
			Number of	Number of				(RD, 1	PAX = refe	rence)
	Б	Matched Pairs	Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%	DD	95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
	PAX	Absent	2,848	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%			
Subgroup: Immune	ocompromise	d (yes/no)								
Primary analysis										
	BEB	A 11	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%
	PAX	All	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	2,791	71	2.54%	1.99%	3.20%	0.18%	-0.63%	0.99%
OR Death	PAX	Present	2,791	66	2.36%	1.83%	3.00%			
	BEB	Condition	3,036	47	1.55%	1.14%	2.05%	0.20%	-0.40%	0.80%
	PAX	Absent	3,036	41	1.35%	0.97%	1.83%			
Secondary analyses	5									
	BEB	All	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%
	PAX		5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	2,791	66	2.36%	1.83%	3.00%	0.04%	-0.76%	0.83%
Hospitalization	PAX	Present	2,791	65	2.33%	1.80%	2.96%			
	BEB	Condition	3,036	47	1.55%	1.14%	2.05%	0.20%	-0.40%	0.80%
	PAX	Absent	3,036	41	1.35%	0.97%	1.83%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%
	PAX	All	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%			-
ED visit	BEB	Condition	2,791	146	5.23%	4.43%	6.12%	0.39%	-0.75%	1.54%
LD VISI	PAX	Present	2,791	135	4.84%	4.07%	5.70%			-
	BEB	Condition	3,036	150	4.94%	4.20%	5.77%	0.59%	-0.47%	1.65%
	PAX	Absent	3,036	132	4.35%	3.65%	5.13%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%
	PAX	All	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%			
Death	BEB	Condition	2,791	6	0.21%	0.08%	0.47%	0.179%	-0.006%	0.365%
	PAX	Present	2,791	1	0.04%	0.00%	0.20%			
-	BEB		3,036	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%

								R	isk Differen	ce
			Number of	Number of				(RD, 1	PAX = refe	rence)
	F	Matched Pairs	Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	<b>95%</b>	DD	95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
	PAX	Absent	3,036	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%			
Subgroup: COVID	-19 vaccine (y	ves/undetermined)								
Primary analysis										
	BEB	A 11	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%
	PAX	All	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	1,013	19	1.88%	1.13%	2.91%	0.30%	-0.84%	1.43%
OR Death	PAX	Present	1,013	16	1.58%	0.91%	2.55%			
	BEB	Condition	4,814	99	2.06%	1.67%	2.50%	0.17%	-0.39%	0.72%
	PAX	Absent	4,814	91	1.89%	1.52%	2.32%			
Secondary analyses	5									
	BEB	All	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%
	PAX		5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%			
Uconitalization	BEB	Condition	1,013	19	1.88%	1.13%	2.91%	0.30%	-0.84%	1.43%
Hospitalization	PAX	Present	1,013	16	1.58%	0.91%	2.55%			
	BEB	Condition	4,814	94	1.95%	1.58%	2.38%	0.08%	-0.46%	0.63%
	PAX	Absent	4,814	90	1.87%	1.51%	2.29%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%
	PAX	All	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%			
ED visit	BEB	Condition	1,013	64	6.32%	4.90%	8.00%	2.86%	0.99%	4.74%
ED VISI	PAX	Present	1,013	35	3.46%	2.42%	4.77%			
	BEB	Condition	4,814	232	4.82%	4.23%	5.46%	0.00%	-0.86%	0.86%
	PAX	Absent	4,814	232	4.82%	4.23%	5.46%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%
	PAX	All	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%			
Death	BEB	Condition	1,013	1	0.10%	0.00%	0.55%	0.099%	-0.095%	0.292%
	PAX	Present	1,013	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%			
	BEB		4,814	5	0.10%	0.03%	0.24%	0.083%	-0.017%	0.183%

								Ri	sk Differen	ce
			Number of	Number of				(RD, 1	PAX = refe	rence)
	T.	Matched Pairs	Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%	DD	95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
	PAX	Absent	4,814	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.12%			
Subgroup: Emerge	ncy departm	ent visit within 7 days	pre-index (yes/no	))						
Primary analysis										
	BEB	A 11	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%
	PAX	All	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	1,022	39	3.82%	2.73%	5.18%	0.98%	-0.58%	2.53%
OR Death	PAX	Present	1,022	29	2.84%	1.91%	4.05%			
	BEB	Condition	4,805	79	1.64%	1.30%	2.04%	0.02%	-0.49%	0.53%
	PAX	Absent	4,805	78	1.62%	1.29%	2.02%			
Secondary analyses	5									
	BEB	All	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%
	PAX		5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	1,022	38	3.72%	2.64%	5.07%	0.88%	-0.66%	2.42%
Hospitalization	PAX	Present	1,022	29	2.84%	1.91%	4.05%			
	BEB	Condition	4,805	75	1.56%	1.23%	1.95%	-0.04%	-0.54%	0.46%
	PAX	Absent	4,805	77	1.60%	1.27%	2.00%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%
	PAX	All	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%			
ED visit	BEB	Condition	1,022	131	12.82%	10.83%	15.02%	0.68%	-2.18%	3.55%
LD VISIC	PAX	Present	1,022	124	12.13%	10.19%	14.29%			
	BEB	Condition	4,805	165	3.43%	2.94%	3.99%	0.46%	-0.25%	1.16%
	PAX	Absent	4,805	143	2.98%	2.51%	3.50%			
	BEB	A 11	5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%
	PAX	All	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%			
Death	BEB	Condition	1,022	1	0.10%	0.00%	0.54%	0.098%	-0.094%	0.290%
2	PAX	Present	1,022	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%			
	BEB		4,805	5	0.10%	0.03%	0.24%	0.083%	-0.017%	0.183%

								<b>Risk Difference</b>		ce
			Number of	Number of				(RD, ]	PAX = refe	rence)
		<b>Matched Pairs</b>	Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%		95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
	PAX	Condition Absent	4,805	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.12%			

Abbreviations: 95% LCL = 95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL = 95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB = bebtelovimab; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid.



Figure 10.2. BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): age  $\geq$  65 and age < 65.



#### Figure 10.3.

## BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): immunocompromised (ImnX) Yes and No.



Figure 10.4. BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): COVID-19 vaccination Yes and No.



Figure 10.5. BEB vs. PAX risk difference (%): emergency department visit Yes and No.

### 10.5.2 Sensitivity Analyses

Among patients included in the matched cohorts, the same primary and secondary analyses were conducted for the sensitivity analyses described below.

#### 10.5.2.1 Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias

In this analysis, the index date was imputed or "lagged" to the primary index date plus 1 day. By

systematically lagging the index date 1 day forward in time for all study cohort members, we

thereby excluded patients who had an event very early during follow-up and mitigated bias related to disease severity at the time of BEB or PAX treatment. The results are presented in Table 10.17 below. For convenience, the results table includes results using the primary analytic methodology and results pertaining to this sensitivity analysis.

For the primary outcome (hospitalization or death within 30 days post-index), 14 events occurred on the first day of follow-up (i.e., Day 1) for patients treated with BEB (number of Day 1 events=7) and PAX (number of Day 1 events =7). These events were excluded from the sensitivity analysis. While this resulted in a reduction in the cumulative incidence (i.e., the risk) of the composite outcome in both groups, the RD (and 95% CI) was essentially unchanged compared to the RD (95% CI) using the primary methodology.

The results for the hospitalization and death outcomes followed the same pattern as the primary composite outcome. That is, the cumulative incidence was reduced by excluding Day 1 events; however, the RD was consistent with RD from the primary methodology. For the ED outcome, we observed differential exclusion of treatment events on Day 1. Approximately 14% and 8% of events were excluded on Day 1 for BEB and PAX treated patients, respectively. While the observed RD was attenuated, the 95% CIs were mostly overlapping with the 95% CI using the primary methodology.

								<b>Risk Difference</b>		e
			Number of	Number of				(RD, 1	PAX = refer	ence)
			Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%		95%	95%
Outcome	Methodology	Exposure	Analyzed	with Events	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
Primary analysis	1	1		1	1				1	
Hospitalization	Primary	BEB	5,827	118	2.03%	1.68%	2.42%	0.19%	-0.31%	0.69%
OR Death	1 mary	PAX	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%			
Hospitalization	Excluding	BEB	5,827	111	1.90%	1.57%	2.29%	0.19%	-0.30%	0.67%
OR Death	Day 1	PAX	5,827	100	1.72%	1.40%	2.08%			
Secondary analyses										
Hospitalization	Drimory	BEB	5,827	113	1.94%	1.60%	2.33%	0.12%	-0.37%	0.61%
Hospitalization	rimary	PAX	5,827	106	1.82%	1.49%	2.20%			
Hereitekartien	Excluding	BEB	5,827	107	1.84%	1.51%	2.21%	0.14%	-0.34%	0.62%
Hospitalization	Events on Day 1	PAX	5,827	99	1.70%	1.38%	2.06%			
ED visit	Drimory	BEB	5,827	296	5.08%	4.53%	5.68%	0.50%	-0.28%	1.28%
ED VISIC	rimary	PAX	5,827	267	4.58%	4.06%	5.15%			
ED -:::::	Excluding	BEB	5,827	255	4.38%	3.87%	4.93%	0.15%	-0.58%	0.89%
ED VISIT	Events on Day 1	PAX	5,827	246	4.22%	3.72%	4.77%			
Deeth	D	BEB	5,827	6	0.10%	0.04%	0.22%	0.086%	-0.003%	0.175%
Death	Primary	PAX	5,827	1	0.02%	0.00%	0.10%			
	Excluding	BEB	5,827	5	0.09%	0.03%	0.20%	0.069%	-0.014%	0.151%
Death	Events on Day 1	PAX	5,827	1	0.02%	0.0004%	0.10%			

Table 10.17.Results from Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias

Abbreviations: BEB=bebtelovimab; PAX=Paxlovid; 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit.

Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

# 10.5.2.2. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding

The E-value results are presented in Table 10.18 below. The results table includes E-value results pertaining to both the RD (i.e., the primary effect estimate) and the RR. E-value results on the RR scale are intended to augment interpretation regarding the magnitude of unmeasured confounding needed to modify the observed RR to a different value – which is not currently available on the RD scale.

For the primary outcome (hospitalization or death within 30 days post-index), considering the confounders included in the propensity score generating model, an unmeasured confounder with an association of at least 1.44 (i.e., E-value=1.44) with the exposure and outcome would be required to fully attenuate (i.e., RD=0.0) the observed RD=0.19% (95% CI -0.31%, 0.69%).

On the RR scale, the strength of association an unmeasured confounder would need to have with the exposure and outcome to shift the observed RR (RR=1.10; 95% CI=0.85-1.43) to a RR=0.5 is at least 3.84. Unmeasured confounding with a magnitude > 2.0 and >3.0 would be required to shift the observed RR to RRs of 1.5 and 2.0, respectively.

The minimum magnitude of unmeasured confounding required to nullify the observed treatment effect for the hospitalization and ED outcomes is similar with the primary outcome (E-value for hospitalization=1.33; E-Value for ED visit=1.46). For the death outcome, given the small number of observed deaths (BEB [n=6]; PAX [n=1]), the observed treatment effect (RD=0.086%) has limited precision to estimate a valid standard error using traditional asymptotic statistical methods. This occurs because the standard error calculation assumes sample sizes are large enough for the normal approximation to be valid. Therefore, the estimation of the magnitude of unmeasured confounding needed to nullify or expunge the observed treatment effect for the death outcome is limited.

	Unmeasured Required t Observed E1 Risk Diffe	d Confounding to Nullify the I Treatment ffect: erence Scale	Unmeasure	Unmeasured Confounding Required to Change the Observed Treatment Effect Risk Ratio Scale								
Outcome	E-Value RD=0.0	E-Value RD 95% CI Includes 0	Observed RRE-ValueE-ValueE-Value(95% CI)True RR=0.5True RR=1.0True RR=1.5True RR=									
Primary analysis												
Hospitalization OR Death	1.44	1.00	1.10 (0.85-1.43)	3.84	1.44	2.06	3.03					
Secondary analyses												
Hospitalization	1.33	1.00	1.06 (0.82-1.39)	3.69	1.33	2.16	3.16					
ED visit	1.46	1.00	1.11 (0.94-1.30)	3.86	1.46	2.04	3.01					
Death	11.48	1.00	6.00 (0.72-49.82)	23.49	11.48	7.46	5.45					

Table TV. TO. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the impact of Onneasured Comound	Table 10.18.	Results of Sensitivity	Analyses to A	ssess the Impact o	f Unmeasured	Confounding
--	--------------	------------------------	---------------	--------------------	--------------	-------------

Abbreviations: 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval; RD = Risk Difference; RR = Risk Ratio.

# 10.5.2.3. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data

The results are presented in Table 10.19 below.

BMI and eGFR were the only two variables that met the pre-specified missing value criteria for imputation in the primary analysis cohort before matching (BEB [N=10,431]; PAX [N=63,048]). The missingness for BMI and eGFR was 21% and 18%, respectively. Given a non-monotonic missingness pattern was observed for these two variables, imputation was performed by multivariate imputation using chained equations (MICE).

The imputation model included the missing variables (i.e., BMI and eGFR) and other variables used to predict the imputed values for BMI and eGFR. The predictor variables included the exposure variable (BEB vs. PAX), the primary composite outcome variable, pre-specified baseline covariates, and empirically identified baseline covariates (identified using HDPS methodology). Since cubic splines were ultimately desired for inclusion in the propensity score generating model, BMI and eGFR were included in the imputation model as cubic splines. Linear regression-based MICE was used to generate twenty imputation datasets (m=20) with imputed values for BMI and eGFR. Except for the outcome variable, he prediction variables included in the imputation model were the same as those included in the PS generating model.

Multiple imputation was conducted using the "Across" approach and the "Within" approach. In the "Across" approach, the PSs are averaged over *m* imputed datasets to obtain an average PS. The average PS is then used in one of the imputed datasets to obtain one estimate of the treatment effect (i.e., the risk difference). Alternatively, the "Within" approach uses the PS form each imputed dataset to obtain *m* treatment effect estimates. These estimates are then combined using Rubin's rules.

For the "Across" approach, after estimating of the average PS, the matched cohorts included 5,755 matched pairs compared to 5,872 matched pairs when using the primary analytic methodology. For the "Within" approach, PS matching was conducted within each imputed data set (m=20). Sample sizes pertaining to each m matched cohort are not presented.

The "Across" multiple imputation approach resulted in a reduced risk of the primary outcome (hospitalization or death within 30 days post-index) for BEB and PAX treated patients. The RD was slightly magnified (away from the "null") from 0.19% to 0.31%; however, the 95% CIs for both approaches showed considerable overlap. The "Within" multiple imputation approach resulted in an attenuated RD (from 0.19% to 0.06%); however, the 95% CIs for both approaches showed considerable overlap. The multiple imputation findings for the secondary outcomes were similar with those observed for the primary composite outcome in that there were overlapping confidence intervals with the primary methodology.

							Risk Difference			
			Number of	Number of				(RD,	PAX = refe	rence)
Outcome	Analysis	Exposure	Patients Analyzed	Patients with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL
Primary analysis								-		
	Multiple	BEB	5,755	114	1.98%	1.64%	2.37%	0.31%	-0.18%	0.80%
Hospitalization OR	Imputation "Across"	PAX	5,755	96	1.67%	1.35%	2.03%			
Death	Multiple	BEB						0.06%	-0.49%	0.62%
	Imputation "Within"	PAX								
Secondary analyses										
	Multiple	BEB	5,755	110	1.91%	1.57%	2.30%	0.26%	-0.22%	0.74%
	Imputation "Across"	PAX	5,755	95	1.65%	1.34%	2.01%			
nospitalization	Multiple	BEB						0.02%	-0.53%	0.57%
	Imputation "Within"	PAX								
	Multiple	BEB	5,755	296	5.14%	4.59%	5.75%	-0.14%	-0.95%	0.67%
FD visit	Imputation "Across"	PAX	5,755	304	5.28%	4.72%	5.89%			
ED VISIC	Multiple	BEB						0.28%	-0.60%	1.17%
	Imputation "Within"	PAX								
	Multiple	BEB	5,755	4	0.07%	0.02%	0.18%	0.000%	-0.096%	0.096%
Death	Imputation "Across"	PAX	5,755	4	0.07%	0.02%	0.18%			
Deatii	Multiple	BEB						0.023%	-0.076%	0.121%
	Imputation "Within"	PAX								

 Table 10.19.
 Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data

#### J2X-MC-B003 Non-interventional PASS Final Study Report

								R	isk Differen	ce
			Number of	Number of				(RD,	PAX = refe	ence)
			Patients	Patients	Cumulative	95%	95%		95%	95%
Outcome	Analysis	Exposure	Analyzed	with Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL

Abbreviations: 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; AM=analysis model (i.e., PS generating model); BEB=bebtelovimab; BMI=Body Mass Index; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate; HR=heart rate; IM=imputation model; PAX=Paxlovid; Y=hospitalization or death outcome variable.

Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

LY3853113 bebtelovimab

### **10.5.3** Supplemental Analyses in TriNetX Linked Network

Results from the supplemental analyses using the TriNetX Linked Network are described in the Report on Supplemental Analyses in TriNetX Linked Network, which can be found in Annex 2.

### 10.6 Adverse Events/Adverse Reactions

This is a non-interventional study based on secondary data; therefore, no Individual Case Safety Report reporting is required. This study has no protocol-defined adverse events, so a summary of adverse events was not included in this study report.

### **11 Discussion**

### 11.1 Key Results

We evaluated the effectiveness of BEB compared to PAX for patients with COVID-19. The treatment effect (i.e., the RD) was estimated for 30-day all-cause hospitalization OR death (primary outcome). The null hypothesis was that BEB was inferior to PAX given the *a priori* specified non-inferiority margin. Secondary analyses were conducted to estimate the treatment effect for all-cause hospitalization, all-cause death, and all-cause ED encounter. Hypothesis testing was not conducted for the secondary outcomes. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess potential effect modification and bias.

For the primary analysis, we observed the 95% UCL of BEB vs. PAX risk difference excluded the non-inferiority margin (1.795%) and therefore concluded BEB was not inferior to PAX. The risk of hospitalization or death was approximately 2% in both groups. Hospitalizations comprised ~97% of events compared to deaths (~3%). For the secondary analyses, we observed no statistical difference in the risk of hospitalization, ED encounter, or death for patients exposed to BEB compared to PAX. The risk of each outcome in BEB was approximately 2%, 5%, and <1%, respectively. Overall, the results for specific sub-groups of interest (i.e., stratified analyses by age  $\geq$  65 years, immunocompromised status, COVID-19 vaccination status, and ED visit) were consistent with the observed results for the primary (matched) cohort. With respect to the assessment of bias, both channeling bias related to COVID-19 severity and unmeasured confounding related to missing BMI and eGFR values do not appear to pose major threats to validity. Additionally, an assessment of the potential impact of unmeasured confounding showed that moderate/strong unmeasured confounding would be needed to change the conclusion of the study (i.e., to make BEB inferior to PAX).

To contextualize these findings, results of the present study were compared to those from a cohort study that compared the effectiveness of BEB to PAX within the Mayo Clinic health system (Razonable et al. 2022). Importantly, the present study and the Mayo Clinic study were conducted during the Omicron variant era. The main (composite) outcome in the Mayo Clinic study was hospitalization, oxygen utilization, or death within 30-days following treatment with BEB or PAX. Unlike the present study, differences in baseline patient characteristics, to mitigate channeling bias, were not accounted for in the Mayo Clinic study. The risk of the primary outcome in the present study (BEB 0.02 or 2.0%; PAX 0.018 or 1.8%) was higher than the risk reported in the Mayo Clinic study (BEB 0.014 or 1.4%; PAX 0.012 or 1.2%). However, the observed RD for the present study (0.19% [-0.31%,0.69%]) was consistent with that reported in the Mayo Clinic study (0.28% [-0.59%,1.15%]). In both the Mayo Clinic study and the present study (prior to matching), patients who were treated with BEB (vs PAX) were older and a higher percentage of patients had comorbidities associated with experiencing severe COVID-19 illness.

The observed risk of hospitalization or death in the present study may be further contextualized by two additional studies that utilized an untreated comparator group (McCreary et al. 2022; Hammond et al. 2022). McCreary et al. reported the 28-day risk of hospitalization or death was 3.1% for patients treated with BEB. Hammond et al., reported the risk of COVID-19 related

hospitalization, for patients included in a randomized trial, was 0.77% for patients treated with PAX. Despite differences in the outcome definition in these studies, both findings closely paralleled the observed risk for BEB treated patients (2.3% unmatched cohort; 2.0% matched cohort) and PAX treated patients (i.e., 1.1% unmatched cohort; 1.8% matched cohort) in the present study.

Results from the channeling bias sensitivity analysis were consistent with the results observed with the primary methodology. Channeling bias, related to COVID-19 severity, did not appear to pose a major threat to the validity of the effect estimates for the primary and secondary outcomes. The observed differential exclusion of events and attenuated risk difference for the ED outcome are noted; however, given the overlapping CIs, the overall interpretation of the treatment effect remains unchanged compared to the results with the primary methodology.

The E-value analyses showed that weak to moderate unmeasured confounding with a magnitude of at least 1.44 could nullify the observed treatment effect for hospitalization or death (produce a risk difference equal to 0), given the relatively rare incidence of the primary composite outcome (<2.0%) and small observed treatment effect (RD=0.19%). Although methods to determine the magnitude of unmeasured confounding needed to move the upper confidence limit (0.69) to the pre-specified non-inferiority margin (1.795) are not available on the risk-difference scale, the amount of unmeasured confounding needed to move the association in favor of PAX on the relative risk scale was evaluated. Those results suggested an unmeasured confounding needed to produce a relative risk of 1.5 or greater. The magnitude of unmeasured confounding needed to nullify the observed treatment effect for the hospitalization and ED outcomes is similar. This considered together with results of sensitivity analyses assessing the influence of unmeasured disease severity or other variables that may lead to channeling bias and unmeasured vaccine status suggest that study findings are robust to unmeasured confounding.

The results from the multiple imputation sensitivity analysis were consistent with the results observed with the primary methodology. The impact of missing BMI and eGFR is evident on the cumulative incidence and RD estimates; however, the overall interpretation of the findings remains unchanged. The multiple imputation results were similar when using the "Across" approach and the 'Within" approach.

### 11.2 Limitations

This study has several limitations. Regarding missing data, healthcare encounters, including COVID-19 vaccinations, that occurred outside the HCO network were not captured. This may have resulted in incomplete healthcare utilization profiles and potentially missing exposure, confounder, and outcome data. Strategies to mitigate missing data and other sources of information bias were incorporated into the study design and study methodology. These comprised the following: inclusion of only patients who regularly received care at the contributing HCOs, using medication records to classify the study cohorts, conducting subgroup analyses for patients with documented evidence of COVID-19 vaccination, and conducting sensitivity analyses, using multiple imputation, to account for missing baseline covariate data.

The impact of potentially missing outcome data will be assessed in future analyses using EHR data linked to health insurance claims data.

To mitigate confounding bias (e.g., by COVID-19 illness severity), the study cohorts were restricted to patients who were not hospitalized within 30 days prior to receiving BEB or PAX. Additional confounding control was achieved using CEM on highly selected and *a priori* defined baseline variables in conjunction with PS matching on a broader set of baseline covariates. Sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the potential impact of unmeasured confounding. These analyses showed the observed study results were robust to unmeasured confounding related to disease severity and missing BMI and eGFR data. They also showed strong unmeasured confounding would be required to substantially change the study conclusion.

With respect to exposure misclassification, the ability to identify monoclonal antibody and antiviral administrations in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network is an advantage of this data source. That is, the ability to classify BEB and PAX exposure in EHR data provides a substantial advantage compared to using health insurance claims data only, where insurance claims for BEB and other products made available under EUA are likely missing. Despite this, the likelihood of exposure misclassification may be greater for patients exposed to PAX (dispensed as an oral medication) than for patients exposed to BEB (administered via infusion). This may occur if patients did not fill the PAX prescription or adhere to the prescribing guidelines (e.g., they do not take the full dosing regimen). The potential impact of this differential misclassification may result in: 1) a greater risk of the study outcomes for patients classified with PAX exposure, 2) a larger risk difference (in favor of BEB) with a narrower CI, and 3) an increased likelihood of rejecting the null hypothesis and establishing noninferiority of BEB. While this type of exposure misclassification is both unavoidable and unmeasurable in EHR data, the likelihood of this occurring is mitigated, to some degree, by the very nature of the indication (i.e., COVID-19) the severity of the outcome (i.e., hospitalization or death), and the context of disease occurrence (i.e., COVID-19 acquired during a global pandemic with heightened awareness of potential harm). Another form of measurable exposure misclassification may occur if the exposure, as classified on the index date, is followed by post-index antibody or antiviral therapy. To address this form of exposure misclassification, we described the use of non-index monoclonal antibody and antiviral treatment during follow-up for patients in both cohorts. The results show that 1.2% and 0.5% of patients treated with PAX and BEB on the index data received the other therapy (PAX or BEB), respectively, during the 30-day follow-up period. Less than 1% of patients in both groups received remdesivir or any other antiviral/antibody therapy post-index.

To mitigate outcome misclassification, eligibility requirements were incorporated to restrict the study cohorts to include only patients who regularly received care within the TriNetX HCO network. Additionally, future analyses will be conducted among patients with linked EHR and health insurance claims data.

To evaluate the consistency of the treatment effect for specific subgroups of patients compared to the treatment effect for the overall study population (i.e., effect modification), the primary and secondary analyses were stratified by matched pairs who were age  $\geq 65$  years, immunocompromised, and who had a pre-index ED visit or documentation of receiving a

COVID-19 vaccine in the last 9 months. Overall, the results from the sub-group analyses were consistent with the observed results for the primary matched cohort.

Noninferiority testing for the primary composite outcome was conducted. The *a priori* defined noninferiority margin of 1.795% was based on a sample size of 1,390 patients in each treatment arm which provided 90% power to reject the null hypothesis. This further assumed the incidence of hospitalization or death was 1.4% for BEB and 1.2% for PAX (Razonable et al. 2022), whereas the observed sample size in each group and the risk of the primary outcome were 5,827 and ~2%, respectively. We also observed the primary outcome risk was 2.03% and 1.84% for patients treated with BEB and PAX, respectively. Thus, given the observed outcome risk and sample size, the present study had adequate power to establish noninferiority, using the *a priori* established noninferiority margin (i.e., 1.795%).

### 11.3 Interpretation

The results showed that BEB was not inferior to PAX with respect to 30-day hospitalization or death. Likewise, there was no statistical difference between BEB and PAX for the primary and secondary outcomes. The primary findings were not substantially different in the subgroups analyzed and the primary treatment effect was robust when different methods to assess bias were applied. For example, channeling bias related to COVID-19 severity did not appear to pose a major threat to validity. Similarly, the primary study findings were consistent with analyses that included imputed BMI and eGFR data. Finally, strong unmeasured confounding would be required to appreciably change the conclusion.

#### 11.4 Generalisability

Generalizability is the ability to apply the results of a study to other populations. Patients included in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network have been shown to be broadly representative of patients who receive medical care in the US. Therefore, findings from the primary and secondary analyses should be broadly generalizable to high-risk non-hospitalized patients in the US with a COVID-19 infection who were treated with monoclonal antibody or antiviral therapy. The results may also be generalizable to patients in other countries that have similar healthcare structures, healthcare utilization patterns, and patient populations with similar age and racial distributions.

## **12 Other Information**

Not applicable.

### **13 Conclusions**

In this study of patients with COVID-19 during the period of high prevalence for the Omicron BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants in the US, we found the risk of hospitalization or death was not greater for patients treated with BEB compared to patients treated with PAX. Similarly, the risk of the secondary outcomes (i.e., hospitalization, ED visit, and death) was not different for patients treated with BEB and PAX. Furthermore, the study findings were (i) consistent for important patient subgroups (e.g., immunocompromised and COVID-19 vaccinated) and (ii) robust to a variety of bias assessments. When administered to patients who were at high risk for progression to severe COVID-19 illness, the incidence of hospitalization or death was not greater for patients treated with BEB compared to patients treated with PAX.

### 14 References

- Andrews N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 booster vaccines against COVID-19-related symptoms, hospitalization and death in England. *Nat Med.* 2022;28(4):831-837.
- [ASPR] Administration for Strategic Preparedness and Response. 2022. Allocation of Bamlanivimab/Etesevimab and REGEN-COV Therapeutics Paused 2022 [Available from: https://aspr.hhs.gov/COVID-19/Therapeutics/updates/Pages/important-update-24January2022.aspx.
- [ASPR] Administration for Strategic Preparedness and Response. 2023a. Important information about bamlanivimab (updated April 7, 2023). Available from: https://aspr.hhs.gov/COVID-19/Therapeutics/Products/Bamlanivimab/Pages/default.aspx.
- [ASPR] Administration for Strategic Preparedness and Response. 2023b. Important information about REGEN-COV (updated April 7, 2023). Available from: https://aspr.hhs.gov/COVID-19/Therapeutics/Products/REGEN-COV/Pages/default.aspx.
- [CDC] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022a. Estimated COVID-19 burden 2022 (updated August 12, 2022). Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/burden.html.
- [CDC] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022b. COVID data tracker 2022. Available from: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker.
- [CDC] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022c. Underlying medical conditions associated with higher risk for severe COVID-19: information for healthcare professionals 2022. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html.
- Choi YJ, Park JY, Lee HS, et al. Variable effects of underlying diseases on the prognosis of patients with COVID-19. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(7):e0254258.
- Emami A, Javanmardi F, Pirbonyeh N, Akbari A. Prevalence of underlying diseases in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Acad Emerg Med.* 2020;8(1):e35.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2016. Non-inferiority clinical trials to establish effectiveness: Guidance for Industry 2016 Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/78504/download.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2021a. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes additional oral antiviral for treatment of COVID-19 in certain adults. 2021 Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-additional-oral-antiviral-treatment-covid-19-certain.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2021b. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes first oral antiviral for treatment of COVID-19 2021. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-first-oral-antiviral-treatment-covid-19.

- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2022a. FDA announces bebtelovimab is not currently authorized in any US region 2022. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-announces-bebtelovimab-not-currently-authorized-any-us-region.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2022b. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes new monoclonal antibody for treatment of COVID-19 that retains activity against omicron variant 2022. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-new-monoclonal-antibody-treatment-covid-19-retains.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2022c. FDA updates sotrovimab emergency use authorization 2022. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-updates-sotrovimab-emergency-use-authorization.
- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. 2023. FDA approves first oral antiviral for treatment of COVID-19 in adults 2023. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-oral-antiviral-treatment-covid-19-adults#:~:text=Today%2C%20the%20U.S.%20Food%20and,19%2C%20including%20hospita lization%20or%20death.
- Granger E, Sergeant JC, Lunt M. Avoiding pitfalls when combining multiple imputation and propensity scores. *Stat Med.* 2019;38(26):5120-5132.
- Hammond J, Leister-Tebbe H, Gardner A, et al. Oral nirmatrelvir for high-risk, nonhospitalized adults with COVID-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2022;386(15):1397-1408.
- Hodge D, Marra F, Marzolini C, et al. Drug interactions: a review of the unseen danger of experimental COVID-19 therapies. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2020;75(12):3417-3424.
- Iketani S, Liu L, Guo Y, et al. Antibody evasion properties of SARS-CoV-2 omicron sublineages. *Nature*. 2022;604(7906):553-556.
- Khairat S, Zou B, Adler-Milstein J. Factors and reasons associated with low COVID-19 vaccine uptake among highly hesitant communities in the US. *Am J Infect Control*. 2022;50(3):262-267.
- Kompaniyets L, Pennington AF, Goodman AB, et al. Underlying medical conditions and severe illness among 540,667 adults hospitalized with COVID-19, March 2020-March 2021. *Prev Chronic Dis.* 2021;18:E66.
- Linden A, Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ. Conducting sensitivity analysis for unmeasured confounding in observational studies using E-values: the evalue package. *The Stata Journal*. 2020;20:162-175.
- Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, et al. Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(7):585-594.
- Mauri L, D'Agostino RB, Sr. Challenges in the design and interpretation of noninferiority trials. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;377(14):1357-1367.
- McCreary EK, Kip KE, Collins K, et al. Evaluation of bebtelovimab for treatment of COVID-19 during the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant era. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2022;9(10):ofac517.

- Monto AS. The future of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination lessons from influenza. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;385(20):1825-1827.
- Nguyen KH, Nguyen K, Corlin L, et al. Changes in COVID-19 vaccination receipt and intention to vaccinate by socioeconomic characteristics and geographic area, United States, January 6 March 29, 2021. *Ann Med.* 2021;53(1):1419-1428.
- [NIH] National Institutes of Health. Therapeutic management of nonhospitalized adults with COVID-19. 2022 Available from: https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/management/clinical-management-of-adults/nonhospitalized-adults--therapeutic-management/.
- Parasher A. COVID-19: current understanding of its pathophysiology, clinical presentation and treatment. *Postgrad Med J.* 2021;97(1147):312-320.
- Pei S, Yamana TK, Kandula S, et al. Burden and characteristics of COVID-19 in the United States during 2020. *Nature*. 2021;598(7880):338-341.
- Razonable RR, O'Horo JC, Hanson SN, et al. Comparable outcomes for bebtelovimab and ritonavir-boosted nirmatrelvir treatment in high-risk patients with coronavirus disease-2019 during severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 BA.2 omicron epoch. *J Infect Dis*. 2022;226(10):1683-1687.
- Schneeweiss S, Rassen JA, Glynn RJ, et al. High-dimensional propensity score adjustment in studies of treatment effects using health care claims data. *Epidemiology*. 2009;20(4):512-22.
- VanderWeele TJ, Ding P. sensitivity analysis in observational research: introducing the E-Value. *Ann Intern Med.* 2017;167(4):268-274.
- VanderWeele TJ, Ding P, Mathur M. Technical Considerations in the Use of the E-Value. Journal of Causal Inference. 2019.
- Wagner CE, Saad-Roy CM, Morris SE, et al. Vaccine nationalism and the dynamics and control of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. 2021;373(6562):eabj7364.
- [WHO] World Health Organization Working Group. A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical research. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(8):e192-e197.

## **15 Annex 1.** List of Standalone Documents

No.	Document Reference No.	Date	Title
1.	v1	17 February 2023	LY3853113 RWE Final Report Code List

### 16 Annex 2. Report on Supplemental Analyses in TriNetX Linked Network

### 16.1 A2.1. Rationale and Background

On 11 February 2022, the FDA issued an EUA for BEB, an antibody used for the treatment of mild-to-moderate COVID-19 in adults and pediatric patients (12 years of age and older weighing at least 40 kg) with positive results of direct SARS-CoV-2 viral testing, who were at high risk for progression to severe COVID-19, including hospitalization or death, and for whom other COVID-19 treatment options approved or authorized by the FDA were not available or clinically appropriate (FDA 2022).

Recognizing the limitations of the available clinical data, conditions of the letter of authorization required Eli Lilly and Company to submit a protocol for a clinical trial to collect additional information on BEB effectiveness outcomes. A cohort study using data from the TriNetX Dataworks USA EHR Network, as described in Sections 1 through 14 of this final study report, was conducted to address research questions regarding the effectiveness of BEB prior to its de-authorization on 30 November 2022.

To further assess the robustness of findings from the study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, supplemental analyses were conducted in the TriNetX Linked Network. The TriNetX Linked Network includes a subset of patients from the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network EHR database who also have linked closed health insurance claims data and linked mortality data, allowing the ascertainment of hospitalizations, deaths, and other healthcare services that occurred outside of the site-specific care setting of the HCOs contributing EHR data to the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network.

### 16.2A2.2. Research Questions and Objectives

The primary and secondary objective of the supplemental analyses were the same as in the study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. The primary objective was to estimate the 30-day RD and 95% CI of a composite outcome of all-cause hospitalization or all-cause death, for patients who received BEB compared with patients who received PAX. The secondary objective was to estimate the 30-day RD of all-cause hospitalization, all-cause death, and all-cause ED visits for patients who received BEB compared with patients who received PAX. The cumulative incidence and RD and corresponding 95% CIs were reported for all outcomes. Hypothesis testing was not conducted for the supplemental analyses (i.e., an a priori NI margin was not specified).

### 16.3 A2.3. Research Methods

### 16.3.1 A2.3.1. Study Design

The study objectives for the supplemental analyses in the TriNetX Linked Network were assessed using a cohort study design among patients with EHR data linked to health insurance claims (claims) data within the TriNetX Linked Network. Major aspects of the study design remained the same as in the cohort study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network; minor modifications that were made in the supplemental analyses are described below in Sections 16.3.2 (A2.3.2) through 16.3.7 (A2.3.7).

#### 16.3.2 A2.3.2. Study Cohort

The study cohort for the supplemental analyses was constructed using similar methodology as described in Section 9.2.1. However, the variables used to classify each inclusion/exclusion criterion were ascertained from either EHR data, claims data, or both. The specific data source for each variable is provided below.

The study cohorts included patients who received BEB or PAX during the index period (i.e., 16 February 2022 to 31 August 2022). The index date was the date of the first BEB or first PAX record during the index period. If a patient was exposed to both BEB and PAX during the index period, they were included in the cohort (BEB or PAX) based on the first date of BEB or PAX exposure. However, patients who were exposed to both BEB and PAX on the index date were excluded. Therefore, a patient was allowed to be included in only one cohort. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were as follows:

- 1. BEB or PAX exposure during index period (index date):
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.
- 2. At least 12 years old (i.e., age  $\geq$  12 years) as of the index date: a. Ascertained from EHR data only.
- 3. 12 months of continuous insurance enrollment pre-index (with no gaps >45 days) with medical and pharmacy coverage AND "EHR activity" 6-36 months pre-index:
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.
- 4. No inpatient admission within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date):
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.
- 5. No hospice care within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date):
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.
- 6. No treatment indicated or used for COVID-19 within 90 days pre-index (inclusive of index date) - excluding BEB/PAX on the index date:
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.
- 7. No supplemental or chronic oxygen therapy within 30 days pre-index (inclusive of index date):
  - a. Ascertained from EHR and claims data.

#### 16.3.3 A2.3.3. Outcomes

Each outcome was ascertained and classified using the same methodology as in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study, as described in Section 9.4.3.

All outcomes were classified using both EHR and claims data. Evidence of the outcome in either data source (i.e., EHR or claims) classified the outcome status as present (yes). If there was no evidence of the outcome in either data source, the outcome status was classified as absent (no).

#### All-cause hospitalization

All-cause hospitalization was classified using both EHR and claims data using the methodology described in Section 9.4.3.

#### All-cause mortality

All-cause mortality was classified using both EHR and claims data using the methodology described in Section 9.4.3. In addition to EHR recorded deaths, the TriNetX Linked Network uses de-identified tokenization to connect and source additional mortality data from private obituary information, closed or private claims, and the Social Security Administration Death Master File.

#### **Emergency Department (ED) visit**

The ED outcome was classified using both EHR and claims data using the methodology described in Section 9.4.3.

### 16.3.4 A2.3.4. Baseline Covariates

The classification of baseline covariates followed similar methodology as in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study, as described in Section 9.4.5. The specific data source for each variable is listed below (i.e., EHR data only, claims data only, EHR and claims data).

For binary covariates classified using both EHR and claims data (e.g., COVID-19 diagnosis), evidence in either data source (i.e., EHR or claims) classified the covariate status as present (yes). If there was no evidence of the covariate in either data source, the covariate status was classified as absent (no).

#### Demographics

- Age EHR data only
- Sex EHR data only
- Race EHR data only

#### **Clinical parameters**

- Blood pressure (BP) EHR data only
- Oxygen saturation EHR data only
- Body mass index (BMI) EHR data only

#### **Smoking status**

• Smoking status – EHR and claims data

#### Laboratory data

• Serum creatinine – EHR data only

#### Comorbidities

• Baseline comorbidities – EHR and claims data

#### **COVID-19 diagnosis**

• COVID-19 diagnosis – EHR and claims data

#### **COVID-19 symptoms**

• COVID-19 related symptoms - EHR and claims data

#### Pharmacotherapy

• Baseline pharmacotherapy – EHR and claims data

#### Healthcare resource utilization

• Baseline healthcare resource utilization – EHR and claims data

### 16.3.5 A2.3.5. Follow-Up and Censoring

Follow-up and censoring followed similar methodology as in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study, as described in Section 9.2.2. Follow-up began on the day after index date (i.e., index date plus one day) and continued until 30-days post-index.

Using an ITT approach, the exposure status (i.e., BEB or PAX) classified on the index date was carried forward for the entire 30-day follow-up period. With this approach, all patients in the study cohorts were included in the analysis set, regardless of post-index use of convalescent plasma, monoclonal antibody therapy, antiviral therapy, or insurance disenrollment.

Using both EHR and claims data, we described the frequency and proportion of patients who received any of the following: post-index convalescent plasma; monoclonal antibody therapy; and antiviral treatment indicated, authorized, or used to treat or prevent COVID-19 (excluding BEB/PAX on the index date). We also described the frequency and proportion of patients with insurance disenrollment during follow-up.

### 16.3.6 A2.3.6. Data Sources

The TriNetX Linked Network is described in detail in Section 9.5.2. The TriNetX Linked Network includes patients from TriNetX Dataworks USA Network who also have linked closed health insurance claims data and linked mortality data. Participating HCOs within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network permit the linkage of EHR data to closed health insurance claims data, including medical and pharmacy claims, and mortality data using de-identified tokens from Datavant. Datavant's death index is comprised of data from the Social Security Death Index and obituary feed data. The HCOs that contribute data to the TriNetX Linked Network are de-identified as are the individual patient records. Approximately 10% of all patients in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network are included in the TriNetX Linked Network. Among patients in the TriNetX Linked Network, approximately 48% have commercial insurance, 31% have Managed Medicaid, 6% have Medicare Advantage, and 15% have multiple types of insurances.

### 16.3.7 A2.3.7. Statistical Analysis Plan

#### Method to Control for Confounding

The method to control for confounding followed the same methodology as in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study, as described in Section 9.9.2.2. However, baseline covariates

were ascertained from both EHR and claims data. For the empirically identified baseline covariates used to generate the HDPS, we first deleted duplicate baseline records (i.e., codes) from EHR and claims data that occurred on the same (pre-index) date. This was done to prevent "double counting" codes that existed in both the EHR data and claims data.

### 16.3.8 A2.3.8. Analysis

#### **Baseline Characteristics**

The methodology described for the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study in Section 9.9.2.3 was used to describe and analyze baseline characteristics.

#### **Primary and Secondary Analyses**

The methodology described for the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study in Section 9.9.2.4 was used to describe and analyze the primary and secondary outcomes. However, hypotheses testing was not applicable to the supplemental analyses using the TriNetX Linked Network.

#### **Subgroup Analyses**

The methodology described for the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study in Section 9.9.4 was used for the subgroup analyses.

#### Sensitivity Analyses

The methodology described for the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study in Section 9.9.5 was used for the sensitivity analyses.

### 16.4A2.4. Results

### 16.4.1 A2.4.1. Participants

Before applying patient qualification criteria, 5,462 BEB-exposed and 14,501 PAX-exposed patients were identified. After applying patient qualification criteria, 1,998 BEB-exposed and 3,301 PAX-exposed patients remained in the unmatched cohorts (Table.A2.1). After conducting HDPS matching, 37.5% of BEB-exposed patients were retained, resulting in 750 BEB-exposed and 750 PAX-exposed patients in the matched cohorts.

Patient Id	lentification Criteria – Inclusion/Exclusion		BEB			PAX	
		Ν	% Excluded	% Retained	Ν	% Excluded	% Retained
1	Exposure to BEB or PAX during index period	5,462			14,501		
2	Age $\geq 12$ years at index date	5,461	0.02%	99.98%	14,230	1.87%	98.13%
3	12 months of continuous insurance enrollment pre-index and "EHR activity" 6-36 months pre- index	2,517	53.9%	46.1%	3,694	74.0%	26.0%
4	No inpatient admission within 30 days pre-index	2,260	10.2%	89.8%	3,551	3.9%	96.1%
5	No hospice care within 30 days pre-index	2,251	0.4%	99.6%	3,542	0.3%	99.7%
6	No exposure to monoclonal antibody or antiviral within 90 days pre-index	2,070	8.0%	92.0%	3,344	5.6%	94.4%
7	No supplemental or chronic oxygen therapy within 30 days pre-index	1,998	3.5%	96.5%	3,301	1.3%	98.7%
	Total in unmatched cohorts	1,998			3,301		
8	HDPS Matching (1:1) using a caliper of 0.01 & common support	750	62.5%	37.5%	750	77.3%	22.7%
	Total in matched cohorts	750			750		

Table.A2.1.Patient Disposition for Supplemental Analyses

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; EHR = electronic health record; HDPS = high dimensional propensity score; PAX = paxlovid.

\* "Retained" refers to the estimated proportion of patients to be retained after enforcing each inclusion or exclusion criterion or matching.

### 16.4.2 A2.4.2. Descriptive Data

#### 16.4.2.1 A2.4.2.1. CEM Matching Rate and Propensity Score Distribution

Table.A2.2 presents patient distribution within CEM categories. The proportion of patients in each category within the BEB and PAX cohorts is the same after matching. Similar to the PS distribution in the unmatched cohorts in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, the different shapes of the distributions presented in part A of Figure.A2.1 indicate that BEB and PAX were prescribed to different patient populations. PAX treated patients represented a more clearly defined but skewed distributed patient population and were less likely to receive BEB as indicated by the right-skewed distribution. BEB patients were not as clearly defined, as indicated by a lesser-skewed distribution. The overlap of the PS distribution between BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients notably improved after HDPS matching. PS distributions in the matched cohorts appear to be more normally distributed compared to the matched cohorts in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network.

	CEM Categories				PAX		BEB		Total	
CEM Category	Immunocompromised Status	Age ≥ 65	COVID-19 Vaccination within 9 Months Pre-index	ED Visit within 7 Days Pre- index	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unmatched cohorts										
1	No	No	No	No	655	19.8%	264	13.2%	919	17.3%
2	No	No	No	Yes	183	5.5%	193	9.7%	376	7.1%
3	No	No	Yes	No	469	14.2%	138	6.9%	607	11.5%
4	No	No	Yes	Yes	42	1.3%	77	3.9%	119	2.2%
5	No	Yes	No	No	145	4.4%	59	3.0%	204	3.8%
6	No	Yes	No	Yes	18	0.5%	39	2.0%	57	1.1%
7	No	Yes	Yes	No	153	4.6%	49	2.5%	202	3.8%
8	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	0.2%	20	1.0%	27	0.5%
9	Yes	No	No	No	444	13.5%	264	13.2%	708	13.4%
10	Yes	No	No	Yes	95	2.9%	192	9.6%	287	5.4%
11	Yes	No	Yes	No	501	15.2%	222	11.1%	723	13.6%
12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	28	0.8%	123	6.2%	151	2.8%
13	Yes	Yes	No	No	250	7.6%	145	7.3%	395	7.5%
14	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	29	0.9%	85	4.3%	114	2.2%
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	268	8.1%	90	4.5%	358	6.8%
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	14	0.4%	38	1.9%	52	1.0%
Total					3,301	62.3%	1,998	37.7%	5,299	100.0%
Matched cohorts										
1	No	No	No	No	148	19.7%	148	19.7%	296	19.7%
2	No	No	No	Yes	89	11.9%	89	11.9%	178	11.9%
3	No	No	Yes	No	68	9.1%	68	9.1%	136	9.1%
4	No	No	Yes	Yes	20	2.7%	20	2.7%	40	2.7%
5	No	Yes	No	No	18	2.4%	18	2.4%	36	2.4%
6	No	Yes	No	Yes	6	0.8%	6	0.8%	12	0.8%

Table.A2.2.Distribution of Patients within CEM Categories for Supplemental Analyses in Unmatched and<br/>Matched Cohorts

	CEM Categories				PAX		BEB		Total	
CEM Category	Immunocompromised Status	Age ≥ 65	COVID-19 Vaccination within 9 Months Pre-index	ED Visit within 7 Days Pre- index	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
7	No	Yes	Yes	No	15	2.0%	15	2.0%	30	2.0%
8	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	4	0.3%
9	Yes	No	No	No	123	16.4%	123	16.4%	246	16.4%
10	Yes	No	No	Yes	50	6.7%	50	6.7%	100	6.7%
11	Yes	No	Yes	No	103	13.7%	103	13.7%	206	13.7%
12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	15	2.0%	15	2.0%	30	2.0%
13	Yes	Yes	No	No	43	5.7%	43	5.7%	86	5.7%
14	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14	1.9%	14	1.9%	28	1.9%
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	35	4.7%	35	4.7%	70	4.7%
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%
Total					750	50.0%	750	50.0%	1,500	100.0%

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened exact matching; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = paxlovid.



## Figure.A2.1. Propensity score distribution for supplemental analyses in the A) unmatched and B) matched cohorts.
## 16.4.2.2 A2.4.2.2. Baseline Characteristics

Table.A2.3, Table.A2.4, Table.A2.5, Table.A2.6, and Table.A2.7 display baseline variables for BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients in the unmatched cohorts. The mean age was 55 (SD 16) and 54 (SD 17) years in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively. Patients were primarily female (61.7% in BEB and 61.9% in PAX) and White (71.0% in BEB and 73.8% in PAX). The addition of the linked claims data resulted in higher proportions of patients with a COVID-19 diagnosis and documentation of previous COVID-19 vaccination than observed in the main analysis (COVID diagnosis: 82.25% in BEB and 54.18% in PAX in the main analyses versus 98.2% in BEB and 62.0% in PAX in the linked supplemental analysis; COVID-19 vaccination: 29.80% in BEB and 18.99% in PAX in the main analysis versus 44.4% in BEB and 41.0% in PAX in the linked supplemental analysis). Common baseline comorbidities included aplastic anemia (32.9% in BEB and 25.3% in PAX), immunodeficiency (25.4% in BEB and 14.0% in PAX), hypertension (56.5% in BEB and 52.0% in PAX), other heart conditions (58.3% in BEB and 48.3% in PAX), obesity (60.4% in BEB and 49.1% in PAX), type 2 diabetes (36.6% in BEB and 26.3% in PAX), hematologic or solid malignancy except benign skin cancer (39.5% in BEB and 35.2% in PAX), anxiety and fear (53.6% in BEB and 47.2% in PAX), depression (45.8% in BEB and 38.9% in PAX), asthma (31.4% in BEB and 30.2% in PAX), COPD and bronchiectasis (24.7% in BEB and 20.1% in PAX), and CKD (21.5% in BEB and 14.0% in PAX), all of which had larger proportions compared to the unmatched cohorts in the main analysis.

Higher proportions of medication use were observed among cohorts created with the addition of the linked insurance claims vs. EHR data alone. Medication history in the cohorts created using the additional linked data showed higher proportions of BEB patients with a history of exposure to antiemetics (52.6% in BEB and 37.7% in PAX) and steroids (largest difference observed with dexamethasone, 54.3% in BEB and 46.0% in PAX). Patients exposed to BEB also had more past (20.6% in BEB, 13.6% in PAX) and present (9.8% in BEB and 6.5% in PAX) insulin use, past (68.7% in BEB and 58.0% in PAX) and present (52.2% in BEB and 44.6% in PAX) antihypertensive use, past SABA use (49.2% in BEB and 46.2% in PAX), past (51.2% in BEB and 44.2% in PAX), and present (41.2% in BEB and 35.5% in PAX) lipid lowering agent use.

Distributions between the treatment groups for three of the four CEM variables were imbalanced: immunocompromised status (ASD= 0.174), documented COVID-19 vaccination within 9 months pre-index (ASD = 0.143), and an ED encounter within 7 days pre-index (ASD = 0.619). Other notably imbalanced covariates included COVID-19 diagnosis anytime pre-index (ASD = 1.016), eGFR category (ASD = 0.400), immunodeficiency (ASD = 0.309), past antiemetic use (ASD = 0.302), and present cyclosporine, everolimus, sirolimus, or tacrolimus use (ASD = 0.303).

							ASD
	PA	X	BE	B	Tot	al	
	N=3,	301	N=1	,998	N=5,	299	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Index date month							0.277
February	10	0.3%	4	0.2%	14	0.3%	
March	30	0.9%	15	0.8%	45	0.8%	
April	119	3.6%	170	8.5%	289	5.5%	
May	534	16.2%	401	20.1%	935	17.6%	
June	650	19.7%	498	24.9%	1,148	21.7%	
July	1,039	31.5%	516	25.8%	1,555	29.3%	
August	919	27.8%	394	19.7%	1,313	24.8%	
Demographics							ASD
Patient age							
Mean (SD), years	54 (	17)	55 (	16)	54 (1	17)	0.002
Age category							0.011
12-29 years	297	9.0%	154	7.7%	451	8.5%	
30-44 years	618	18.7%	406	20.3%	1,024	19.3%	
45-54 years	597	18.1%	347	17.4%	944	17.8%	
55-64 years	905	27.4%	566	28.3%	1,471	27.8%	
65-74 years	496	15.0%	318	15.9%	814	15.4%	
75-84 years	264	8.0%	154	7.7%	418	7.9%	
≥85 years	124	3.8%	53	2.7%	177	3.3%	
Female sex							0.005
Yes	2,044	61.9%	1,232	61.7%	3,276	61.8%	
Race							0.078
White	2,435	73.8%	1,419	71.0%	3,854	72.7%	
Black	409	12.4%	241	12.1%	650	12.3%	
Unknown	457	13.8%	338	16.9%	795	15.0%	

# Table.A2.3.Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the<br/>Unmatched Cohorts

							ASD		
	PA	X	В	EB	Total				
	N=3.	,301	N=1,998		N=5,299				
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Lifestyle variables							ASD		
Smoking status 6 months pre-index									
Yes	215	6.5%	144	7.2%	359	6.8%			
Smoking status >6 months	pre-index						0.023		
Yes	615	18.6%	390	19.5%	1,005	19.0%			
Smoking ever pre-index							0.027		
Yes	635	19.2%	406	20.3%	1,041	19.6%			
Inactivity							0.035		
Yes	8	0.2%	9	0.5%	17	0.30%			

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized differences; BEB = bebtelovimab; PAX = Paxlovid; SD = standard deviation.

Table.A2.4.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts
-------------	--

CEM variables							ASD
	PA N-2	X 201	BE	CB	Tot	al	
	IN-3	,501	Encarron ex	,998 0/	Encauchan	0/	
	rrequency	70 D'44-hh Masi	Frequency	70	rrequency	70	0.174
Immunocompromised stat	us (University of	AO 20/	1 150	59.00/	2 799	52 (0/	0.1/4
Yes	1,629	49.3%	1,159	58.0%	2,788	52.6%	0.011
$Age \ge 65$							0.011
Yes	884	26.8%	525	26.3%	1,409	26.6%	
COVID-19 vaccination wit	thin 9 months pre	-index	1 1				0.143
Yes	1,482	44.9%	757	37.9%	2,239	42.3%	
ED encounter within 7 day	ys pre-index						0.619
Yes	416	12.6%	767	38.4%	1,183	22.3%	
COVID-19 related variabl	es						ASD
COVID-19 diagnosis anyti	ime pre-index						1.016
Yes	2,048	62.0%	1,962	98.2%	4,010	75.7%	
COVID-19 positive test: w	ithin 7 days pre-i	ndex	· · ·				0.115
Yes	345	10.5%	284	14.2%	629	11.9%	
COVID-19 positive test: >'	7 days pre-index	·					0.070
Yes	89	2.7%	79	4.0%	168	3.2%	
COVID-19 vaccine: past (>	>9 months pre-in	dex)					0.070
Yes	1,352	41.0%	887	44.4%	2,239	42.3%	
COVID-19 MABs: present	t (within 6 month	s pre-index)			•		0.136
Yes	20	0.6%	44	2.2%	64	1.2%	
COVID-19 MABs: past (>	6 months pre-ind	ex)			I		0.167
Yes	36	1.1%	72	3.6%	108	2.0%	
COVID-19 related sympto	ms	1			1		ASD
Anosmia and parosmia							0.043
Yes	9	0.3%	11	0.6%	20	0.4%	
Cough	-						0.155
Yes	17	0.5%	47	2.4%	64	1.2%	

CEM variables							ASD
	PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1,	BEB N=1,998		Total N=5,299	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Fatigue							0.226
Yes	165	5.0%	222	11.1%	387	7.3%	
Fever or chills							0.259
Yes	233	7.1%	302	15.1%	535	10.1%	
Headache							0.078
Yes	8	0.2%	16	0.8%	24	0.5%	
Myalgia or joint pain							0.150
Yes	133	4.0%	150	7.5%	283	5.3%	
Nausea or vomiting							0.159
Yes	179	5.4%	192	9.6%	371	7.0%	
Dyspnea							0.236
Yes	138	4.2%	205	10.3%	343	6.5%	
Sore throat/pharyngitis							0.207
Yes	170	5.1%	214	10.7%	384	7.2%	
Diarrhea							0.075
Yes	42	1.3%	45	2.3%	87	1.6%	

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; CEM = coarsened exact matching; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019; PAX = paxlovid.

Clinical & laboratory varia	ables						ASD
	PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1	EB ,998	Tota N=5,2	al 299	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
BMI category							0.051
Underweight: <18.5	28	0.8%	19	1.0%	47	0.9%	
Normal: 18.5-24	320	9.7%	161	8.1%	481	9.1%	
Overweight: 25-29	417	12.6%	254	12.7%	671	12.7%	
Obese: ≥30.0	769	23.3%	448	22.4%	1,217	23.0%	
Missing	1,767	53.5%	1,116	55.9%	2,883	54.4%	
MCQ eGFR: using last sC	r pre-index						0.400
eGFR ≥90	1,707	51.7%	755	37.8%	2,462	46.5%	
eGFR 60-89	625	18.9%	274	13.7%	899	17.0%	
eGFR 30-59	118	3.6%	67	3.4%	185	3.5%	
eGFR <30	9	0.3%	35	1.8%	44	0.8%	
Missing	842	25.5%	867	43.4%	1,709	32.3%	
Blood pressure: category							0.003
Normotensive	112	3.4%	54	2.7%	166	3.1%	
Elevated	60	1.8%	36	1.8%	96	1.8%	
Stage1	114	3.5%	70	3.5%	184	3.5%	
Stage2	140	4.2%	90	4.5%	230	4.3%	
Missing	2,875	87.1%	1,748	87.5%	4,623	87.2%	
Oxygen saturation: catego	ry						0.038
≥95%	203	6.1%	126	6.3%	329	6.2%	
85-95%	18	0.5%	19	1.0%	37	0.7%	
<85%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	3	0.1%	
Missing	3,078	93.2%	1,852	92.7%	4,930	93.0%	
Comorbidities							ASD
Autoimmune							

# Table.A2.5.Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the<br/>Unmatched Cohorts

Clini	cal & laboratory varia	ables						ASD
		PA	X	BI	СВ	Tot	al	
		N=3,	301	N=1	,998	N=5,2	299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Crohn's disease							0.069
Yes		56	1.7%	54	2.7%	110	2.1%	
	Juvenile arthritis							0.005
Yes		9	0.3%	6	0.3%	15	0.3%	
	Rheumatoid arthri	tis						0.106
Yes		192	5.8%	171	8.6%	363	6.9%	
	Systemic lupus ery	thematosus						0.103
Yes		185	5.6%	164	8.2%	349	6.6%	
	<b>Ulcerative colitis</b>							0.062
Yes		52	1.6%	49	2.5%	101	1.9%	
Blood	Disorders							
	Aplastic anemia							0.168
Yes		835	25.3%	657	32.9%	1,492	28.2%	
	Immunodeficiency							0.309
Yes		186	5.6%	298	14.9%	484	9.1%	
	Immunodeficiency	(UPMC)						0.289
Yes		463	14.0%	508	25.4%	971	18.3%	
	Sickle cell							0.016
Yes		25	0.8%	18	0.9%	43	0.8%	
	Thalassemia							0.013
Yes		16	0.5%	8	0.4%	24	0.5%	
Circu	latory							
	Acute hemorrhagic	c cerebrovascular	disease					0.042
Yes		144	4.4%	105	5.3%	249	4.7%	
	Cerebral infarction	1						0.064
Yes		177	5.4%	138	6.9%	315	5.9%	
	Other cerebrovasce	ular disease						0.117

Clinic	al & laboratory vari	ables						ASD
		PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1,	B 998	Tot: N=5,2	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes		363	11.0%	298	14.9%	661	12.5%	
	Acute myocardial	infarction						0.199
Yes		124	3.8%	170	8.5%	294	5.5%	
	Coronary artery di	isease						0.240
Yes		393	11.9%	414	20.7%	807	15.2%	
	Heart failure							0.275
Yes		316	9.6%	382	19.1%	698	13.2%	
	Hypertension							0.091
Yes		1,716	52.0%	1,129	56.5%	2,845	53.7%	
	Myocarditis or car	diomyopathy						0.189
Yes		192	5.8%	221	11.1%	413	7.8%	
	Other heart condit	ion						0.201
Yes		1,596	48.3%	1,165	58.3%	2,761	52.1%	
	Peripheral vascula	r disease						0.130
Yes		533	16.1%	424	21.2%	957	18.1%	
Disab	ility							
	Cerebral palsy							0.022
Yes		29	0.9%	22	1.1%	51	1.0%	
	Congenital malfor	mation						0.167
Yes		491	14.9%	425	21.3%	916	17.3%	
	Limitation of activ	ities of daily living	g (ADL)					0.150
Yes		101	3.1%	124	6.2%	225	4.2%	
	Neurodevelopment	tal disorders						0.030
Yes		311	9.4%	206	10.3%	517	9.8%	
	Spinal cord injury							0.008
Yes		22	0.7%	12	0.6%	34	0.6%	
Endoc	crine							

Clinical & laboratory variables								
		PA N=3,	X 301	Bl N=1	EB ,998	Tot N=5,2	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Obesity							0.228
Yes		1,622	49.1%	1,207	60.4%	2,829	53.4%	
	Diabetes Type 1							0.079
Yes		165	5.0%	137	6.9%	302	5.7%	
	Diabetes Type 2							0.223
Yes		869	26.3%	732	36.6%	1,601	30.2%	
	Diabetes Type 1 or	· 2 (complicated)						0.200
Yes		656	19.9%	567	28.4%	1,223	23.1%	
Hepa	tic							
	Alcoholic liver dise	ease						0.100
Yes		127	3.8%	120	6.0%	247	4.7%	
	Autoimmune hepa	titis						0.034
Yes		7	0.2%	8	0.4%	15	0.3%	
	Cirrhosis							0.099
Yes		58	1.8%	66	3.3%	124	2.3%	
	Non-alcoholic fatty	y liver disease		1				0.196
Yes		438	13.3%	411	20.6%	849	16.0%	
Infect	tious							
	Hepatitis B	1		1				0.093
Yes		25	0.8%	36	1.8%	61	1.2%	
	Hepatitis C							0.030
Yes		71	2.2%	52	2.6%	123	2.3%	
	HIV							0.006
Yes		47	1.4%	27	1.4%	74	1.4%	
	Tuberculosis							0.012
Yes		20	0.6%	14	0.7%	34	0.6%	
Malig	nancy							

Clinical & laboratory variables								
		PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1,	CB ,998	Tot: N=5,2	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Hematological onc	ology (except skin	)					0.089
Yes		1,162	35.2%	789	39.5%	1,951	36.8%	
	Metastatic							0.068
Yes		82	2.5%	73	3.7%	155	2.9%	
	<b>Radiation complica</b>	ation						0.066
Yes		111	3.4%	93	4.7%	204	3.8%	
Ment	al Health							
	Anxiety and fear							0.127
Yes		1,559	47.2%	1,070	53.6%	2,629	49.6%	
	Bipolar							0.080
Yes		201	6.1%	163	8.2%	364	6.9%	
	Depression							0.141
Yes		1,283	38.9%	915	45.8%	2,198	41.5%	
	Other mood disord	ler						0.000
Yes		114	3.5%	69	3.5%	183	3.5%	
	Schizophrenia							0.072
Yes		73	2.2%	68	3.4%	141	2.7%	
	Substance abuse							0.070
Yes		434	13.1%	312	15.6%	746	14.1%	
	Suicidal ideation							0.046
Yes		119	3.6%	90	4.5%	209	3.9%	
Neur	ocognitive disorders							0.056
Yes		155	4.7%	119	6.0%	274	5.2%	
Pulm	onary							
	Alpha-1 antitrypsi	n deficiency						0.063
Yes		0	0.0%	4	0.2%	4	0.1%	
	Asthma							0.027

Clinical & laboratory variables								
	PA N=3.	X 301	BE N=1.	EB .998	Tot N=5.7	al 299		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Yes	997	30.2%	628	31.4%	1,625	30.7%		
Bronchopulmona	ary dysplasia						0.045	
Yes	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	2	0.0%		
COPD and brone	chiectasis						0.110	
Yes	665	20.1%	494	24.7%	1,159	21.9%		
Cystic fibrosis							0.056	
Yes	10	0.3%	14	0.7%	24	0.5%		
Embolism							0.127	
Yes	94	2.8%	107	5.4%	201	3.8%		
Hypertension							0.213	
Yes	124	3.8%	178	8.9%	302	5.7%		
Interstitial diseas	e						0.091	
Yes	126	3.8%	115	5.8%	241	4.5%		
Renal								
СКД							0.197	
Yes	463	14.0%	430	21.5%	893	16.9%		
ESRD							0.283	
Yes	44	1.3%	138	6.9%	182	3.4%		
Transplant								
Organ stem cell							0.259	
Yes	171	5.2%	249	12.5%	420	7.9%		
Graft versus host	disease						0.008	
Yes	6	0.2%	3	0.2%	9	0.2%		
Pregnancy variables							ASD	
Pregnancy within 3 mont	ths pre-index						0.130	
Yes	85	2.6%	101	5.1%	186	3.5%		
Pregnancy within 9 mont	ths pre-index						0.173	

Clinical & laboratory variables									
	PA	X	B	EB	Total				
	N=3,301 N=1,998 N=5,299								
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Yes	105	3.2%	139	7.0%	244	4.6%			
Pregnancy ever pre-index	Pregnancy ever pre-index								
Yes	814	24.7%	570	28.5%	1,384	26.1%			

Abbreviations: ADL = activities of daily living; ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; BMI = body mass index; CKD = chronic kidney disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESRD = end-stage renal disease; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus; MCQ = Mayo Clinic quadratic; PAX = paxlovid; sCr = serum creatinine; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

# Table.A2.6.Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the<br/>Unmatched Cohorts

Phar	macotherapy variable	S						ASD
		PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1,	CB ,998	Tota N=5,2	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Antie	metics							
	Present (within 7 d	ays pre-index)						0.209
Yes		60	1.8%	116	5.8%	176	3.3%	
	Past (>7 days pre-in	ndex)						0.302
Yes		1,246	37.7%	1,051	52.6%	2,297	43.4%	
Corti	costeroids							
	Beclomethasone: p	resent (within 7 d	ays pre-index)					0.025
Yes		1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	
	Beclomethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ii	ndex)					0.028
Yes		101	3.1%	71	3.6%	172	3.2%	
	Betamethasone: present (within 7 days pre-index)							0.037
Yes		9	0.3%	10	0.5%	19	0.4%	
	Betamethasone: pa	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)					0.036
Yes		701	21.2%	395	19.8%	1,096	20.7%	
	Budesonide: preser	nt (within 7 days p	ore-index)					0.052
Yes		23	0.7%	24	1.2%	47	0.9%	
	Budesonide: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)					0.013
Yes		404	12.2%	236	11.8%	640	12.1%	
	Deflazacort: presen	nt (within 7 days p	ore-index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Deflazacort: past (>	>7 days pre-index						0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Dexamethasone: pr	resent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)					0.148
Yes		52	1.6%	80	4.0%	132	2.5%	
	Dexamethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ir	ıdex)					0.165

Phar	macotherapy variable	28						ASD
		PA N=3	X 301	BI N=1	EB ,998	Tot N=5,	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Yes		1,520	46.0%	1,084	54.3%	2,604	49.1%	
	Hydrocortisone: pi	resent (within 7 d	ays pre-index)					0.191
Yes		12	0.4%	54	2.7%	66	1.2%	
	Hydrocortisone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-i	ndex)					0.001
Yes		887	26.9%	538	26.9%	1,425	26.9%	
	Methylprednisolon	e: present (within	n 7 days pre-inde	ex)				0.189
Yes		59	1.8%	105	5.3%	164	3.1%	
	Methylprednisolon	e: past (>7 days p	ore-index)					0.130
Yes		1,669	50.6%	1,139	57.0%	2,808	53.3%	
	Prednisolone: pres	ent (within 7 days	s pre-index)					0.112
Yes		45	1.4%	60	3.0%	105	2.0%	
	Prednisolone: past	(>7 days pre-inde	ex)					0.076
Yes		1,346	40.8%	890	44.5%	2,236	42.2%	
	Prednisone: presen	nt (within 7 days p	ore-index)					0.074
Yes		147	4.5%	122	6.1%	269	5.1%	
	Prednisone: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)					0.079
Yes		1,755	53.2%	1,141	57.1%	2,896	54.7%	
	Triamcinolone: pro	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)					0.067
Yes		20	0.6%	25	1.3%	45	0.8%	
	Triamcinolone: pas	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)					0.058
Yes		1,375	41.7%	890	44.5%	2,265	42.7%	
	Mometasone: pres	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)					0.003
Yes		7	0.2%	4	0.2%	11	0.2%	
	Mometasone: past	(>7 days pre-inde	ex)					0.072
Yes		416	12.6%	206	10.3%	622	11.7%	
	Fluticasone: preser	nt (within 7 days	ore-index)	·				0.050
Yes		115	3.5%	89	4.5%	204	3.8%	

Phar	macotherapy variable	es						ASD
		РА	X	BI	EB	Tot	al	
		N=3,	301	N=1	,998	N=5,2	299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Fluticasone: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)					0.015
Yes		1,617	49.0%	964	48.2%	2,581	48.7%	
Antic	oagulants							
	Present (within 6 m	nonths pre-index)						0.259
Yes		131	4.0%	213	10.7%	344	6.5%	
	Past (>6 months pr	·e-index)						0.252
Yes		257	7.8%	317	15.9%	574	10.8%	
Antid	iabetic							
	Insulin: present (w	ithin 6 months pr	e-index)					0.121
Yes		215	6.5%	196	9.8%	411	7.8%	
	Insulin: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)						0.188
Yes		448	13.6%	412	20.6%	860	16.2%	
	Other: present (wit	thin 6 months pre	-index)					0.100
Yes		522	15.8%	392	19.6%	914	17.2%	
	Other: past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.157
Yes		677	20.5%	543	27.2%	1,220	23.0%	
Antih	ypertensives							
	Present (within 6 m	nonths pre-index)						0.152
Yes		1,471	44.6%	1,042	52.2%	2,513	47.4%	
	Past (>6 months pr	·e-index)						0.222
Yes		1,916	58.0%	1,372	68.7%	3,288	62.0%	
Antiv	iral							
	Chloroquine: prese	ent (within 3-6 mo	onths pre-index)					0.025
Yes		1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	
	Chloroquine: past	(>6 months pre-in	idex)					0.021
Yes		8	0.2%	3	0.2%	11	0.2%	
	Hydroxychloroqui	ne sulfate: present	t (within 3-6 mo	nths pre-index)				0.072

Pharmacotherapy variables										
		PA N=3.	X 301	B N=1	EB 1,998	Tot N=5,	al 299			
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Yes		8	0.2%	15	0.8%	23	0.4%			
	Hydroxychloroqui	ne sulfate: past (>	6 months pre-in	dex)				0.073		
Yes		78	2.4%	72	3.6%	150	2.8%			
	Ivermectin: presen	t (within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.010		
Yes		1	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.0%			
	Ivermectin: past (>	-6 months pre-ind	lex)					0.065		
Yes		43	1.3%	43	2.2%	86	1.6%			
	Molnupiravir: pres	sent (within 3-6 m	onths pre-index	)				0.025		
Yes		1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%			
	Molnupiravir: past	t (>6 months pre-	index)					0.040		
Yes		1	0.0%	3	0.2%	4	0.1%			
	Paxlovid: present (	within 3-6 month	s pre-index)					0.065		
Yes		7	0.2%	0	0.0%	7	0.1%			
	Paxlovid: past (>6	months pre-index	x)					0.049		
Yes		4	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.1%			
	Remdesivir: preser	nt (within 3-6 mor	ths pre-index)					0.010		
Yes		1	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.0%			
	Remdesivir: past (>	<u>&gt;6 months pre-inc</u>	dex)					0.062		
Yes		24	0.7%	27	1.4%	51	1.0%			
Ritux	imab B-Cell									
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.024		
Yes		39	1.2%	29	1.5%	68	1.3%			
	Past (>6 months pr	e-index)						0.044		
Yes		63	1.9%	51	2.6%	114	2.2%			
Bron	chodilator									
	SABA: present (wi	thin 6 months pro	e-index)					0.120		
Yes		691	20.9%	520	26.0%	1,211	22.9%			

Pharm	acotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA N=3	X 301	BE N=1	CB ,998	Tot N=5,	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	SABA: past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.060
Yes		1,526	46.2%	984	49.2%	2,510	47.4%	
	LABA: present (wi	ithin 6 months pr	e-index)					0.044
Yes		268	8.1%	187	9.4%	455	8.6%	
	LABA: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)						0.010
Yes		569	17.2%	352	17.6%	921	17.4%	
	ACH: present (wit	hin 6 months pre-	index)					0.003
Yes		55	1.7%	34	1.7%	89	1.7%	
	ACH: past (>6 mor	nths pre-index)						0.062
Yes		155	4.7%	122	6.1%	277	5.2%	
	Theophylline: pres	ent (within 6 mor	ths pre-index)					0.049
Yes		4	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.1%	
	Theophylline: past	: (>6 months pre-i	ndex)					0.035
Yes		8	0.2%	9	0.5%	17	0.3%	
CAR T	-cell therapy							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.035
Yes		2	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.024
Yes		4	0.1%	1	0.10%	5	0.10%	
Conval	lescent Plasma							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.071
Yes		0	0.0%	5	0.3%	5	0.1%	
Abatac	ept							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.006
Yes		4	0.1%	2	0.1%	6	0.1%	

Phar	macotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA N=3	X ,301	B N=1	EB 1,998	Tot N=5,	al 299	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.004
Yes		6	0.2%	4	0.2%	10	0.2%	
Anak	inra							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)		1		1	0.055
Yes		0	0.0%	3	0.2%	3	0.1%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)	-				•	0.071
Yes		0	0.0%	5	0.3%	5	0.1%	
Tocil	izumab							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)		1		1	0.029
Yes		3	0.1%	4	0.2%	7	0.1%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)			1		1	0.064
Yes		2	0.1%	7	0.4%	9	0.2%	
Immi	unosuppressive therap	<i>y</i>						
	Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus	<u>, tacrolimus: pre</u>	sent (within 6 mon	ths pre-index)		1	0.303
Yes		58	1.8%	166	8.3%	224	4.2%	
	Cyclosporine, ever	<u>olimus, sirolimus</u>	<u>, tacrolimus: pas</u>	<u>t (&gt;6 months pre-in</u>	ndex)		1	0.234
Yes		150	4.5%	214	10.7%	364	6.9%	
	Cyclophosphamide present (within 6 n	e, azathioprine, le nonths pre-index)	flunomide, meth	otrexate, mycophe	nolate, mycopheno	late mofetil, sulfa	salazine:	0.230
Yes		74	2.2%	141	7.1%	215	4.1%	
(>6 n	Cyclophosphamide 10nths pre-index)	e, azathioprine, le	flunomide, meth	otrexate, mycophe	nolate, mycopheno	olate mofetil, sulfa	salazine: past	0.234
Yes		174	5.3%	235	11.8%	409	7.7%	
Leuk	otrienes							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)					0.113
Yes		214	6.5%	191	9.6%	405	7.6%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)					-	0.087
Yes		547	16.6%	398	19.9%	945	17.8%	

Pharmacotherapy v	variables						ASD
	PA N=3,	X 301	BE N=1	CB ,998	Tot N=5,	al 299	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Lipid-lowering							
Present (wit	thin 6 months pre-index)						0.117
Yes	1,172	35.5%	832	41.2%	1,995	37.6%	
Past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)					1	0.141
Yes	1,459	44.2%	1,023	51.2%	2,482	46.8%	
PDLs							
Present (wit	thin 6 months pre-index)					1	0.004
Yes	6	0.2%	4	0.2%	10	0.2%	
Past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.039
Yes	11	0.3%	12	0.6%	23	0.4%	
TNFXs							
Present (wit	thin 6 months pre-index)						0.027
Yes	54	1.6%	40	2.0%	94	1.8%	
Past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.068
Yes	71	2.2%	65	3.3%	136	2.6%	
<b>Other Biologics</b>							
Present (wit	thin 6 months pre-index)						0.047
Yes	39	1.2%	35	1.8%	74	1.4%	
Past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.119
Yes	49	1.5%	66	3.3%	115	2.2%	
Procedure related v	variables						ASD
Radiation therapy							0.066
Yes	131	4.0%	107	5.4%	238	4.5%	
Transplant							
Organ							0.300
Yes	3	0.1%	91	4.6%	94	1.8%	

Pharmacotherapy variables										
	PA	X	В	EB	Tot	al				
	N=3.	,301	<b>N=</b>	N=1,998		N=5,299				
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
Hematopoietic	natopoietic						0.015			
Yes	6	0.2%	5	0.3%	11	0.2%				

Abbreviations: ACH = anticholinergic; ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell;

LABA = long-acting beta-agonist; PAX = Paxlovid; PDL = programmed death ligand; SABA = short-acting beta-agonist; TNFX = tumor necrosis factor inhibitor.

Healthcare utilization v	ariables						ASD
	PA N-3	X 201	BE	CB	Tot	al 200	
	Frequency	<u> </u>	Frequency	998 %	Frequency	299 %	
Inpatient encounter: 31	-365 days pre-ind	ex	Trequency	/0	irequency	70	0.268
Yes	552	16.7%	555	27.8%	1,107	20.9%	
Number inpatient enco	unters: 31-365 day	s pre-index				1	0.258
0	2,749	83.3%	1,443	72.2%	4,192	79.1%	
1-2	229	6.9%	213	10.7%	442	8.3%	
3-5	153	4.6%	146	7.3%	299	5.6%	
6+	170	5.1%	196	9.8%	366	6.9%	
ED encounter: 8-365 da	ys pre-index		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				0.252
Yes	1,164	35.3%	951	47.6%	2,115	39.9%	
Number ED encounters	s: 8-365 days pre-i	ndex					0.289
0	2,137	64.7%	1,047	52.4%	3,184	60.1%	
1-2	829	25.1%	579	29.0%	1,408	26.6%	
3-5	243	7.4%	254	12.7%	497	9.4%	
6+	92	2.8%	118	5.9%	210	4.0%	
Outpatient encounter: 8	8-365 days pre-ind	lex					0.008
Yes	3,240	98.2%	1,959	98.0%	5,199	98.1%	
Number outpatient enc	ounters: 8-365 day	vs pre-index					0.126
0	61	1.8%	39	2.0%	100	1.9%	
1-5	414	12.5%	273	13.7%	687	13.0%	
6-11	560	17.0%	450	22.5%	1,010	19.1%	
12-23	980	29.7%	575	28.8%	1,555	29.3%	
24+	1,286	39.0%	661	33.1%	1,947	36.7%	
Outpatient encounter: 7	7 days pre-index						0.288
Yes	2,737	82.9%	1,417	70.9%	4,154	78.4%	
Number outpatient enco	ounters: 7 days pr	e-index					0.196
0	564	17.1%	581	29.1%	1,145	21.6%	

Table.A2.7.	Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched Cohorts
-------------	--

Healthcare utilization variables										
	PA N=3,	X 301	B N=1	BEB N=1,998		Total N=5,299				
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
1-2	2,302	69.7%	1,159	58.0%	3,461	65.3%				
3-5	415	12.6%	240	12.0%	655	12.4%				
6+	20	0.6%	18	0.9%	38	0.7%				

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = Paxlovid.

Table.A2.8, Table.A2.9, Table.A2.10, Table.A2.11, and Table.A2.12 display baseline variables for BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients in the matched cohorts. The mean age was 51 (SD 16) and 52 (SD 16) years in BEB-exposed and PAX-exposed patients, respectively. Similar to the unmatched cohorts, patients were primarily female (62.5% in both BEB and PAX) and White (71.5% in BEB and 73.1% in PAX). Common COVID-19 related characteristics included presence of a COVID-19 diagnosis anytime pre-index (95.5% in BEB and 96.9% in PAX) and documentation of a COVID-19 vaccine (43.2% in BEB and 40.3% in PAX). Common baseline comorbidities included aplastic anemia (26.0% in BEB and 26.3% in PAX), hypertension (50.3% in BEB and 50.0% in PAX), other heart conditions (48.9% in BEB and 47.3% in PAX), obesity (56.9% in both BEB and PAX), type 2 diabetes (29.1% in BEB and 28.8% in PAX), hematologic or solid malignancy except benign skin cancer (35.1% in BEB and 34.5% in PAX), anxiety and fear (50.7% in BEB and 52.4% in PAX), depression (44.9% in BEB and 46.5% in PAX), asthma (30.9% in BEB and 30.4% in PAX), and COPD and bronchiectasis (22.4% in BEB and 20.5% in PAX). Common baseline medications included past antiemetic use (45.7% in BEB and 45.5% in PAX), past dexamethasone use (52.0% in BEB and 51.9% in PAX), past methylprednisolone use (50.0% in BEB and 54.1% in PAX), past prednisolone use (38.8% in BEB and 41.6% in PAX), past prednisone use (54.5% in BEB and 55.6% in PAX), past triamcinolone use (39.5% in BEB and 41.1% in PAX), past fluticasone use (46.8% in BEB and 44.1% in PAX), past (60.9% in BEB and 58.8% in PAX) and present (46.1% in BEB and 44.4% in PAX) antihypertensive use, past SABA use (46.8% in BEB and 47.2% in PAX), and past (42.0% in BEB and 40.1% in PAX) and present (31.7% in BEB and 31.5% in PAX) lipid lowering agent use. Perfect balance was achieved for all four CEM variables: immunocompromised status, age  $\geq 65$  years, COVID-19 vaccine within 9 months pre-index, and an ED encounter within 7 days pre-index. Adequate balance was achieved for all pre-specified covariates except for eGFR category (ASD = 0.323) and organ transplant (ASD = 0.131), with the BEB cohort having more patients with missing eGFR data and more patients with a history of organ transplant.

	PA N=7	X /50	BF N=7	CB 750	Tot N=1,	al 500	ASD
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Index date month	· _ ·				<u> </u>		0.030
February	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	
March	6	0.8%	7	0.9%	13	0.9%	
April	42	5.6%	34	4.5%	76	5.1%	
May	138	18.4%	137	18.3%	275	18.3%	
June	176	23.5%	170	22.7%	346	23.1%	
July	199	26.5%	213	28.4%	412	27.5%	
August	188	25.1%	188	25.1%	376	25.1%	
Demographics							ASD
Patient Age							0.023
Mean (SD)	52 (	16)	51 (	16)	51 (1	16)	
Age Category							0.025
12-29 years	77	10.3%	84	11.2%	161	10.7%	
30-44 years	167	22.3%	166	22.1%	333	22.2%	
45-54 years	147	19.6%	147	19.6%	294	19.6%	
55-64 years	225	30.0%	219	29.2%	444	29.6%	
65-74 years	72	9.6%	85	11.3%	157	10.5%	
75-84 years	52	6.9%	34	4.5%	86	5.7%	
≥85 years	10	1.3%	15	2.0%	25	1.7%	
Female sex							0.000
Yes	469	62.5%	469	62.5%	938	62.5%	
Race							0.034
White	548	73.1%	536	71.5%	1,084	72.3%	
Black	90	12.0%	95	12.7%	185	12.3%	
Unknown	112	14.9%	119	15.9%	231	15.4%	
Lifestyle variables							ASD

Table.A2.8.Baseline Demographic Characteristics and Lifestyle Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the<br/>Matched Cohorts

	PA N=7	X 750	BF N='	EB 750	Total N=1,500		ASD		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Smoking status 6 months pre-index									
Yes	61	8.1%	70	9.3%	131	8.7%			
Smoking status >6 months	Smoking status >6 months pre-index								
Yes	159	21.2%	168	22.4%	327	21.8%			
Smoking ever pre-index							0.025		
Yes	167	22.3%	175	23.3%	342	22.8%			
Inactivity	Inactivity								
Yes	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%			

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; PAX = Paxlovid; SD = standard deviation.

Table.A2.9.	Baseline CEM and COVID-19 Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts
-------------	--

CEM variables							ASD
	PA N='	X 750	BE N=7	CB 750	Tot N=1,-	al 500	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Immunocompromised stat	us (UPMC)	•	· · ·				0.000
Yes	384	51.2%	384	51.2%	768	51.2%	
Age ≥65							0.000
Yes	134	17.9%	134	17.9%	268	17.9%	
COVID-19 vaccination with	thin 9 months pre	-index					0.000
Yes	259	34.5%	259	34.5%	518	34.5%	
ED encounter within 7 day	ED encounter within 7 days pre-index						0.000
Yes	197	26.3%	197	26.3%	394	26.3%	
COVID-19 related variables							
COVID-19 diagnosis anyti	me pre-index						0.077
Yes	727	96.9%	716	95.5%	1,443	96.2%	
COVID-19 positive test: w	ithin 7 days pre-i	ndex					0.032
Yes	91	12.1%	99	13.2%	190	12.7%	
COVID-19 positive test: >'	7 days pre-index						0.035
Yes	25	3.3%	30	4.0%	55	3.7%	
COVID-19 vaccine past (>	9 months pre-ind	ex)					0.059
Yes	302	40.3%	324	43.2%	626	41.7%	
<b>COVID-19 MABs present</b>	(within 6 months	pre-index)					0.043
Yes	8	1.1%	5	0.7%	13	0.9%	
COVID-19 MABs past (>6	months pre-inde	x)					0.033
Yes	18	2.4%	22	2.9%	40	2.7%	
COVID-19 related sympto	ms						ASD
Anosmia and parosmia							0.020
Yes	4	0.5%	3	0.4%	7	0.5%	
Cough							0.030
Yes	7	0.9%	5	0.7%	12	0.8%	

CEM variables									
	PA N=7	X 750	B N=	EB 750	Total N=1,500				
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%			
Fatigue							0.020		
Yes	56	7.5%	60	8.0%	116	7.7%			
Fever or chills	Fever or chills								
Yes	95	12.7%	97	12.9%	192	12.8%			
Headache	Headache								
Yes	2	0.3%	6	0.8%	8	0.5%			
Myalgia or joint pain							0.027		
Yes	47	6.3%	52	6.9%	99	6.6%			
Nausea or vomiting							0.046		
Yes	75	10.0%	65	8.7%	140	9.3%			
Dyspnea							0.032		
Yes	48	6.4%	54	7.2%	102	6.8%			
Sore throat/pharyngitis							0.000		
Yes	65	8.7%	65	8.7%	130	8.7%			
Diarrhea							0.054		
Yes	14	1.9%	9	1.2%	23	1.5%			

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease-2019; CEM = coarsened exact matching; ED = early discontinuation; MAB = monocolonal antibodies; PAX = paxlovid; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Table A2.10.	Baseline Clinical, Laboratory, and Comorbidity Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched
	Cohorts

Clinical and laboratory	variables						ASD
	PA N=7	X /50	BE N=7	CB 750	Tot N=1,4	al 500	
BMI category	·						0.098
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Underweight: <18.5	7	0.9%	6	0.8%	13	0.9%	
Normal: 18.5-24	80	10.7%	67	8.9%	147	9.8%	
Overweight: 25-29	92	12.3%	90	12.0%	182	12.1%	
Obese: ≥30.0	206	27.5%	177	23.6%	383	25.5%	
Missing	365	48.7%	410	54.7%	775	51.7%	
MCQ eGFR: using last s	sCr pre-index						0.323
eGFR ≥90	375	50.0%	292	38.9%	667	44.5%	
eGFR 60-89	108	14.4%	69	9.2%	177	11.8%	
eGFR 30-59	18	2.4%	16	2.1%	34	2.3%	
eGFR <30	4	0.5%	9	1.2%	13	0.9%	
Missing	245	32.7%	364	48.5%	609	40.6%	
Blood pressure: categor	у						0.076
Normotensive	41	5.5%	24	3.2%	65	4.3%	
Elevated	22	2.9%	15	2.0%	37	2.5%	
Stage1	33	4.4%	31	4.1%	64	4.3%	
Stage2	49	6.5%	38	5.1%	87	5.8%	
Missing	605	80.7%	642	85.6%	1,247	83.1%	
Oxygen saturation: cate	gory						0.000
≥95%	53	7.1%	47	6.3%	100	6.7%	
85-95%	5	0.7%	7	0.9%	12	0.8%	
<85%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Missing	692	92.3%	696	92.8%	1,388	92.5%	
Comorbidities							ASD
Autoimmune							

#### LY3853113 bebtelovimab

Clinic	al and laboratory va	riables						ASD
		P. N=	AX =750	B N=	SEB =750	To N=1	otal 1,500	
	Crohn's disease							0.033
Yes		22	2.9%	18	2.4%	40	2.7%	
	Juvenile arthritis							0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Rheumatoid arthri	tis						0.026
Yes		57	7.6%	52	6.9%	109	7.3%	
	Systemic lupus ery	thematosus						0.016
Yes		55	7.3%	52	6.9%	107	7.1%	
	Ulcerative colitis							0.027
Yes		15	2.0%	18	2.4%	33	2.2%	
Blood disorder								
	Aplastic anemia							0.006
Yes		197	26.3%	195	26.0%	392	26.1%	
	Immunodeficiency							0.014
Yes		63	8.4%	66	8.8%	129	8.6%	
	Immunodeficiency	(UPMC)						0.000
Yes		136	18.1%	136	18.1%	272	18.1%	
	Sickle cell		· · ·					0.030
Yes		7	0.9%	5	0.7%	12	0.8%	
	Thalassemia		· · ·					0.000
Yes		4	0.5%	4	0.5%	8	0.5%	
Circu	latory							
	Acute hemorrhagic	c cerebrovascula	r disease					0.028
Yes		27	3.6%	31	4.1%	58	3.9%	
	Cerebral infarction	1					÷	0.030
Yes		42	5.6%	37	4.9%	79	5.3%	
	Other cerebrovasce	ular disease					·	0.065
Yes		87	11.6%	72	9.6%	159	10.6%	
	Acute myocardial i	nfarction						0.017

Clinic	al and laboratory va	riables						ASD
		PA N=	AX 750	l N	BEB 1=750	T N=	otal 1,500	
Yes		44	5.9%	47	6.3%	91	6.1%	
	Coronary artery di	isease						0.015
Yes		112	14.9%	116	15.5%	228	15.2%	
	Heart failure							0.054
Yes		81	10.8%	94	12.5%	175	11.7%	
	Hypertension							0.005
Yes		375	50.0%	377	50.3%	752	50.1%	
	Myocarditis cardio	myopathy	-			·		0.000
Yes		53	7.1%	53	7.1%	106	7.1%	
	Other heart condit	ion	·			÷		0.032
Yes		355	47.3%	367	48.9%	722	48.1%	
	Peripheral vascula	r disease			•	·	·	0.041
Yes	-	120	16.0%	109	14.5%	229	15.3%	
Disab	ility	•			·	·	·	
	Cerebral palsy							0.047
Yes		7	0.9%	4	0.5%	11	0.7%	
	Congenital malfor	mation			•	·	÷	0.074
Yes		142	18.9%	121	16.1%	263	17.5%	
	Limitation of activ	ities of daily livir	ng (ADL)					0.015
Yes		26	3.5%	24	3.2%	50	3.3%	
	Neurodevelopment	al disorders						0.017
Yes	2	84	11.2%	80	10.7%	164	10.9%	
	Spinal cord injury							0.016
Yes		6	0.8%	5	0.7%	11	0.7%	
Endo	crine	•		-	•	•	•	
	Obesity							0.000
Yes	v	427	56.9%	427	56.9%	854	56.9%	
	Diabetes Type 1				1	•		0.046
Yes	• •	38	5.1%	46	6.1%	84	5.6%	

Clinie	cal and laboratory va	riables						ASD
		PA N='	AX 750	E N:	BEB =750		otal 1,500	
	Diabetes Type 2							0.006
Yes		216	28.8%	218	29.1%	434	28.9%	
	Diabetes Type 1 or	2 (complicated)						0.019
Yes		159	21.2%	165	22.0%	324	21.6%	
Hepa	tic							
	Alcoholic liver dise	ease						0.037
Yes		28	3.7%	23	3.1%	51	3.4%	
	Autoimmune hepa	titis						0.023
Yes		3	0.4%	2	0.3%	5	0.3%	
	Cirrhosis							0.019
Yes		16	2.1%	14	1.9%	30	2.0%	
	Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease							0.000
Yes		124	16.5%	124	16.5%	248	16.5%	
Infect	tious							
	Hepatitis B							0.024
Yes		10	1.3%	8	1.1%	18	1.2%	
	Hepatitis C							0.000
Yes		18	2.4%	18	2.4%	36	2.4%	
	HIV							0.024
Yes		10	1.3%	8	1.1%	18	1.2%	
	Tuberculosis							0.037
Yes		5	0.7%	3	0.4%	8	0.5%	
Malig	nancy							
	Hematological onc	ology (except skir	n)					0.011
Yes		259	34.5%	263	35.1%	522	34.8%	
	Metastatic							0.043
Yes		16	2.1%	21	2.8%	37	2.5%	
	<b>Radiation complica</b>	ation						0.013
Yes		32	4.3%	30	4.0%	62	4.1%	

PAX N=750         BEB N=750         Total N=1,50           Mental health         N=750         Total N=1,500           Mental health         N=750         N=1,500           Anxiety and fear         0.035           Yes         393         52.4%         380         50.7%         773         51.5%           Bipolar         0.035         0.035         0.035         0.035         0.032           Yes         69         9.2%         56         7.5%         125         8.3%         0           Depression         Use         0.032         337         44.9%         686         45.7%         0.032           Yes         25         3.3%         20         2.7%         45         3.0%         0.031           Yes         23         3.1%         18         2.4%         41         2.7%         0.041           Yes         31         14.8%         111         14.8%         2.2         14.8%         0           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0           Yes         31         5.5%         32         5.5%         33         5.5%         2      <	Clini	cal and laboratory va	riables						ASD
N=/S0         N=/S0         N=/S0         N=/S00           Mental health         N=/S00         N=/S00         N=/S00           Anxiety and fear         0.035         N=/S00         N			P	AX	l	BEB		otal	
Mathia data         0.035           Anxiety and fear         0.035           Yes         393         52.4%         380         50.7%         773         51.5%         0.063           Bipolar         0.063         9.2%         56         7.5%         125         8.3%         0.063           Yes         69         9.2%         56         7.5%         125         8.3%         0.032           Yes         349         46.5%         337         44.9%         686         45.7%         0.039           Yes         349         46.5%         337         2.7%         45         3.0%         0.039           Yes         25         3.3%         20         2.7%         45         3.0%         0.039           Yes         23         3.1%         18         2.4%         41         2.7%         0.011           Yes         111         14.8%         111         14.8%         222         14.8%         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.007           Yes         41         5.5%         42         5.6%         83	Maria	-1 1 141.	N=	=/50	N	=/50	N=	1,500	
0.035         0.035         Yes       393       52.4%       380       50.7%       773       51.5%         Bipolar       0.063         Yes       69       9.2%       56       7.5%       125       8.3%       0.032         Depression       0.033         Ves       349       46.5%       337       44.9%       686       45.7%       0.039         Yes       25       3.3%       20       2.7%       45       3.0%       0.041         Yes       23       3.1%       18       2.4%       41       2.7%       0.001         Yes       111       14.8%       111       14.8%       222       14.8%       0.000         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.000         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.000         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.006         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%       9.000	Ment	al health							0.025
Yes         393         52.4%         380         50.7%         7/3         51.5%           Bipolar	37	Anxiety and fear	202	50.40/	200	50.70/	772	51.50/	0.035
Bipolar         0.063           Yes         69         9.2%         56         7.5%         125         8.3%         0           Depression         0.039         Yes         349         46.5%         337         44.9%         686         45.7%         0.039           Yes         25         3.3%         20         2.7%         45         3.0%         0.039           Yes         25         3.3%         20         2.7%         41         2.7%         0.031           Yes         23         3.1%         18         2.4%         41         2.7%         0.011           Yes         23         3.1%         18         2.4%         41         2.7%         0.001           Yes         111         14.8%         111         14.8%         222         14.8%         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.007           Yes         0         0.00%         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.0%	Yes		393	52.4%	380	50.7%	//3	51.5%	0.0(2
Yes         69         9.2%         56         7.5%         125         8.3%		Bipolar	(0)	0.00/		7.50/	105	0.00/	0.063
Depression         0.032           Yes         349         46.5%         337         44.9%         686         45.7%           Other mood disorder         0.039         9	Yes		69	9.2%	56	7.5%	125	8.3%	
Yes       349       46.5%       337       44.9%       686       45.7%         Other mood disorder       0.039         Yes       25       3.3%       20       2.7%       45       3.0%         Schizophrenia       0.041         Yes       23       3.1%       18       2.4%       41       2.7%       0.041         Substance abuse       0.000         Yes       111       14.8%       111       14.8%       2.2       14.8%         Suicidal ideation       Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.007         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%       9.000         Yes       0       0.00%       0       0.00%		Depression	<b>a</b> 40			44.007			0.032
Other mood disorder         0.039           Yes         25         3.3%         20         2.7%         45         3.0%           Schizophrenia         0.041         2.7%         45         3.0%         0.011           Yes         23         3.1%         18         2.4%         41         2.7%         0.041           Substance abuse         0.000         41         2.7%         0.000         0.000           Yes         111         14.8%         111         14.8%         222         14.8%         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.006           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%         0.006           Yes         41         5.5%         42         5.6%         83         5.5%         0.000           Yes         0         0.00%         0         0.00%         0         0.00%         0         0.012           Yes         0         0.00%         2         0.3%         2 </td <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td>349</td> <td>46.5%</td> <td>337</td> <td>44.9%</td> <td>686</td> <td>45.7%</td> <td></td>	Yes		349	46.5%	337	44.9%	686	45.7%	
Yes       25 $3.3\%$ 20 $2.7\%$ 45 $3.0\%$ Schizophrenia       0.041         Yes       23 $3.1\%$ 18 $2.4\%$ 41 $2.7\%$ Substance abuse       0.000         Yes       111       14.8%       111       14.8%       222       14.8%         Suicidal ideation       0.007       Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.007         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.007         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.007         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%       9.0000         Yes       0       0.00%       0       0.00%       0       0.000       9.0000         Yes       0       0.00%       0       0.00%       0       0.0012       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000       9.0000		Other mood disord	ler			1	T		0.039
Schizophrenia         0.041           Yes         23 $3.1\%$ 18 $2.4\%$ 41 $2.7\%$ Substance abuse         0.000           Yes         111         14.8%         111         14.8%         222         14.8%           Suicidal ideation         9         0.007           Yes         32 $4.3\%$ 33 $4.4\%$ 65 $4.3\%$ 0.007           Yes         41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ 83 $5.5\%$ 0.000           Yes         0 $0.0\%$ $0$ $0.00\%$ $0$ $0.00\%$ Yes         0 $0.0\%$ $0$ $0.0\%$ $0$ $0.045$ Yes         0.2 $0.3\%$ </td <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>20</td> <td>2.7%</td> <td>45</td> <td>3.0%</td> <td></td>	Yes		25	3.3%	20	2.7%	45	3.0%	
Yes       23 $3.1\%$ 18 $2.4\%$ 41 $2.7\%$ Substance abuse       0.000         Yes       111 $14.8\%$ 111 $14.8\%$ $222$ $14.8\%$ Suicidal ideation       0.007         Yes       32 $4.3\%$ $33$ $4.4\%$ $65$ $4.3\%$ Neurocognitive disorders       0.006         Yes       41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ $83$ $5.5\%$ Pulmonary       41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ $83$ $5.5\%$ Ves       0 $0.00\%$ 0 $0.00\%$ 0 $0.00\%$ Yes       0 $0.00\%$ 0 $0.00\%$ 0 $0.00\%$ Yes       228 $30.4\%$ $232$ $30.9\%$ $460$ $30.7\%$ Yes       228 $30.4\%$ $232$ $30.9\%$ $460$ $30.7\%$ $0.012$ Yes       0 $0.0\%$ $2$ $0.3\%$ $2$ $0.1\%$ $0.073$ Yes       0 $0.0\%$ $2$ $0.3\%$ $2$ $0.$		Schizophrenia				-	1	- 1	0.041
Substance abuse       0.000         Yes       111       14.8%       111       14.8%       222       14.8%         Suicidal ideation       0.007         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.006         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%       0.006         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%       0.006         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%       0.006         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.0%       0       0.006       0       0.006         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.0%       0       0.006       0       0.000       0       0.000       0       0.000       0       0.000       0       0.001       0       0.012       0       0       0.012       0       0.073       0       0       0.073       0       0.073       0       0       0.045       0       0.045       0       0.023       0       0.023       0       0.023       0       0.023       0	Yes		23	3.1%	18	2.4%	41	2.7%	
Yes       111       14.8%       111       14.8%       222       14.8%         Suicidal ideation       0.007         Yes       32       4.3%       33       4.4%       65       4.3%         Neurocognitive disorders       0.006         Yes       41       5.5%       42       5.6%       83       5.5%         Pulmonary       0.000         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.00%         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.00%       0       0.000         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.0%       0       0.00%       0       0.000         Yes       0       0.0%       0       0.0%       0       0.00%       0       0.000         Yes       228       30.4%       232       30.9%       460       30.7%       0.012         Yes       228       30.4%       232       30.9%       460       30.7%       0.073         Yes       0       0.0%       2       0.3%       2       0.1%       0.045         Yes       154       20.5%       168       22.4%       322       21.5%       0.023		Substance abuse	Substance abuse						0.000
Suicidal ideation         0.007           Yes         32         4.3%         33         4.4%         65         4.3%           Neurocognitive disorders         0.006           Yes         41         5.5%         42         5.6%         83         5.5%           Pulmonary          0         0         0.006         0           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.00%         0         0.000           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.006           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.000           Yes         228         30.4%         232         30.9%         460         30.7%           Bronchopulmonary dysplasia         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%         0           GOPD and bronchicetasis          0.045         322         21.5%         0         0.023           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%         0.023	Yes		111	14.8%	111	14.8%	222	14.8%	
Yes       32 $4.3\%$ 33 $4.4\%$ 65 $4.3\%$ Neurocognitive disorders       0.006         Yes       41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ 83 $5.5\%$ Pulmonary       0.000         Yes       41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ 83 $5.5\%$ Pulmonary       0.000         Yes       0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.0\%$ 0         Yes       0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.00$ Yes       228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ $460$ $30.7\%$ 0.012         Yes       228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ $460$ $30.7\%$ 0.073         Yes       0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.1\%$ Yes       0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.045$ Yes       154 $20.5\%$ 168 $22.4\%$ $322$ $21.5\%$ $0.023$ Yes       2 $0.3\%$ 3 $0.4\%$ 5 $0.3\%$ <td></td> <td>Suicidal ideation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.007</td>		Suicidal ideation							0.007
Neurocognitive disorders         0.006           Yes         41         5.5%         42         5.6%         83         5.5%         6           Pulmonary           On 00         0.0%         0         0.00%         0         0.000           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.000         0           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.00%         0         0.000           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.012         0.012           Yes         228         30.4%         232         30.9%         460         30.7%         0.012           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.073         0.073           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%         0.045           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%         0.023           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%         0.023 <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td>32</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>33</td> <td>4.4%</td> <td>65</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td></td>	Yes		32	4.3%	33	4.4%	65	4.3%	
Yes41 $5.5\%$ 42 $5.6\%$ $83$ $5.5\%$ $Pulmonary$ Alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency0.000Yes0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.00\%$ Yes0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.0\%$ 0 $0.012$ Yes228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ 460 $30.7\%$ Bronchopulmonary dysplasia0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.1\%$ Yes0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.1\%$ Yes154 $20.5\%$ 168 $22.4\%$ $322$ $21.5\%$ Yes2 $0.3\%$ 3 $0.4\%$ 5 $0.3\%$	Neuro	ocognitive disorders							0.006
Pulmonary         0         0.000           Alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency         0.000           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.000           Yes         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         0         0.000         0           Yes         228         30.4%         232         30.9%         460         30.7%         0.012           Yes         228         30.4%         232         30.9%         460         30.7%         0.073           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%         0.045           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%         0.045           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%         0.023           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%	Yes		41	5.5%	42	5.6%	83	5.5%	
Alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency0.000Yes00.0%00.0%0Asthma0.012Yes228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ 460 $30.7\%$ 0Bronchopulmonary dysplasia0.073Yes00.0%20.3%20.1%COPD and bronchiectasis0.045Yes15420.5%16822.4%32221.5%0.023Yes20.3%30.4%50.3%0.1%	Pulm	onary	•				·	·	
Yes00.0%00.0%00.0%0AsthmaYes228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ 460 $30.7\%$ Bronchopulmonary dysplasiaYes0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.1\%$ COPD and bronchiectasisYes154 $20.5\%$ 168 $22.4\%$ $322$ $21.5\%$ Yes2 $0.3\%$ 3 $0.4\%$ 5 $0.3\%$		Alpha-1 antitrypsi	n deficiency						0.000
Asthma       0.012         Yes       228 $30.4\%$ 232 $30.9\%$ $460$ $30.7\%$ $0.073$ Bronchopulmonary dysplasia       0.073         Yes       0 $0.0\%$ 2 $0.3\%$ 2 $0.1\%$ COPD and bronchiectasis       0.073         Yes       154 $20.5\%$ 168 $22.4\%$ $322$ $21.5\%$ Cystic fibrosis         Yes       2 $0.3\%$ 3 $0.4\%$ 5 $0.3\%$	Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Yes       228       30.4%       232       30.9%       460       30.7%         Bronchopulmonary dysplasia       0.073         Yes       0       0.0%       2       0.3%       2       0.1%         Yes       0       0.0%       2       0.3%       2       0.1%         COPD and bronchiectasis       0.045       0.045         Yes       154       20.5%       168       22.4%       322       21.5%         Yes       2       0.3%       3       0.4%       5       0.3%		Asthma					•		0.012
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia         0.073           Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%           COPD and bronchiectasis         0.045           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%         0.023           Cystic fibrosis           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%	Yes		228	30.4%	232	30.9%	460	30.7%	
Yes         0         0.0%         2         0.3%         2         0.1%           COPD and bronchiectasis           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%           Cystic fibrosis         0.023           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%		Bronchopulmonar	y dysplasia				•		0.073
COPD and bronchiectasis         0.045           Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%         0.023           Cystic fibrosis         0.023           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%	Yes		0	0.0%	2	0.3%	2	0.1%	
Yes         154         20.5%         168         22.4%         322         21.5%           Cystic fibrosis           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%		<b>COPD</b> and bronch	iectasis	- I			1	1	0.045
Cystic fibrosis         0.023           Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%	Yes		154	20.5%	168	22.4%	322	21.5%	
Yes         2         0.3%         3         0.4%         5         0.3%		Cystic fibrosis	1			-	1	1	0.023
	Yes		2	0.3%	3	0.4%	5	0.3%	
Embolism 0.035		Embolism	1			1	1	I	0.035

Clinical and laboratory var	riables						ASD
	P N:	AX =750	E N=	BEB =750	Total N=1,500		
Yes	31	4.1%	26	3.5%	57	3.8%	
Hypertension							0.024
Yes	37	4.9%	41	5.5%	78	5.2%	
Interstitial disease							0.013
Yes	31	4.1%	33	4.4%	64	4.3%	
Renal							
CKD							0.022
Yes	124	16.5%	118	15.7%	242	16.1%	
ESRD							0.056
Yes	18	2.4%	25	3.3%	43	2.9%	
Transplant							
Organ stem cell							0.079
Yes	38	5.1%	52	6.9%	90	6.0%	
Graft versus host d	lisease						0.052
Yes	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	
Pregnancy variables							ASD
Pregnancy within 3 month	s pre-index						0.047
Yes	27	3.6%	34	4.5%	61	4.1%	
Pregnancy within 9 month	s pre-index			•			0.072
Yes	33	4.4%	45	6.0%	78	5.2%	
Pregnancy ever pre-index							0.064
Yes	186	24.8%	207	27.6%	393	26.2%	

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; BMI = body mass index; CKD = chronic kidney disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESRD = end-stage renal disease; MCQ = Mayo Clinic quadratic; PAX = paxlovid; sCr = serum creatinine; SD = standard deviation; UPMC = University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

# Table.A2.11.Baseline Pharmacotherapy and Procedure-related Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the<br/>Matched Cohorts

Phar	macotherapy variables	<b>S</b>						ASD
		PA N=7	X 50	BE N=7	B 750	Tota N=1,5	al 500	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Antie	metics							
	Present (within 7 da	ays pre-index)						0.033
Yes		30	4.0%	35	4.7%	65	4.3%	
	Past (>7 days pre-ir	ndex)						0.005
Yes		341	45.5%	343	45.7%	684	45.6%	
Corti	costeroids							
	Beclomethasone: pr	resent (within 7 d	ays pre-index)					0.000
Yes	_	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Beclomethasone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ii	ndex)					0.061
Yes	_	20	2.7%	28	3.7%	48	3.2%	
	Betamethasone: pro	esent (within 7 da	ys pre-index)					0.042
Yes		4	0.5%	2	0.3%	6	0.4%	
	Betamethasone: pas	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)					0.023
Yes		154	20.5%	161	21.5%	315	21.0%	
	Budesonide: presen	t (within 7 days p	ore-index)					0.028
Yes	_	6	0.8%	8	1.1%	14	0.9%	
	Budesonide: past (>	-7 days pre-index	)					0.037
Yes		83	11.1%	92	12.3%	175	11.7%	
	Deflazacort: presen	t (within 7 days p	ore-index)					0.000
Yes	_	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Deflazacort: past (>	-7 days pre-index	)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Dexamethasone: pr	esent (within 7 da	ays pre-index)			•		0.031
Yes	<b>*</b>	21	2.8%	25	3.3%	46	3.1%	
	Dexamethasone: pa	st (>7 days pre-ir	ndex)			•		0.003
Yes		389	51.9%	390	52.0%	779	51.9%	

Phar	macotherapy variable	es						ASD	
		PAX N=750		BEB N=750		Total N=1,500			
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
	Hydrocortisone: p	resent (within 7 da	ays pre-index)					0.013	
Yes		9	1.2%	8	1.1%	17	1.1%		
	Hydrocortisone: pa	ast (>7 days pre-ir	ndex)					0.009	
Yes		175	23.3%	178	23.7%	353	23.5%		
	Methylprednisolor	e: present (within	7 days pre-inde	ex)				0.009	
Yes		18	2.4%	19	2.5%	37	2.5%		
	Methylprednisolor	ne: past (>7 days p	ore-index)					0.083	
Yes		406	54.1%	375	50.0%	781	52.1%		
	Prednisolone: pres	ent (within 7 days	pre-index)		·		•	0.022	
Yes		10	1.3%	12	1.6%	22	1.5%		
	Prednisolone: past	(>7 days pre-inde	ex)		•		•	0.057	
Yes		312	41.6%	291	38.8%	603	40.2%		
	Prednisone: preser	nt (within 7 days p	re-index)					0.039	
Yes		42	5.6%	49	6.5%	91	6.1%		
	Prednisone: past (>	>7 days pre-index	)		•		•	0.021	
Yes		417	55.6%	409	54.5%	826	55.1%		
	Triamcinolone: present (within 7 days pre-index)								
Yes		8	1.1%	7	0.9%	15	1.0%		
	Triamcinolone: pa	st (>7 days pre-in	dex)		•		•	0.033	
Yes		308	41.1%	296	39.5%	604	40.3%		
	Mometasone: present (within 7 days pre-index)							0.030	
Yes		1	0.1%	2	0.3%	3	0.2%		
	Mometasone: past (>7 days pre-index)							0.027	
Yes		76	10.1%	70	9.3%	146	9.7%		
	Fluticasone: present (within 7 days pre-index)								
Yes		41	5.5%	26	3.5%	67	4.5%		
	Fluticasone: past (>7 days pre-index)								
Yes	<u>_</u>	331	44.1%	351	46.8%	682	45.5%		

Phar	macotherapy variables							ASD
		PAX N=750		BEB N=750		Total N=1,500		
	F	requency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Antic	roagulants							
	Present (within 6 month	ıs pre-index)						0.023
Yes		45	6.0%	41	5.5%	86	5.7%	
	Past (>6 months pre-ind	lex)						0.014
Yes		71	9.5%	68	9.1%	139	9.3%	
Antia	liabetic							
	Insulin: present (within	6 months pr	e-index)					0.015
Yes		54	7.2%	57	7.6%	111	7.4%	
	Insulin: past (>6 month	s pre-index)						0.000
Yes		108	14.4%	108	14.4%	216	14.4%	
	Other: present (within 6	6 months pre	-index)					0.004
Yes		115	15.3%	116	15.5%	231	15.4%	
	Other: past (>6 months	pre-index)						0.000
Yes		163	21.7%	163	21.7%	326	21.7%	
Antik	ypertensives							
	Present (within 6 month	ıs pre-index)						0.035
Yes		333	44.4%	346	46.1%	679	45.3%	
	Past (>6 months pre-index)							0.044
Yes		441	58.8%	457	60.9%	898	59.9%	
Antiv	virals							
	Chloroquine: present (v	vithin 3-6 ma	onths pre-index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Chloroquine: past (>6 months pre-index)							
Yes		0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	
	Hydroxychloroquine su	lfate: presen	t (within 3-6 mo	nths pre-index)				0.023
Yes		2	0.3%	3	0.4%	5	0.3%	
	Hydroxychloroquine su	lfate: past (>	6 months pre-in	dex)				0.024
Yes		23	3.1%	20	2.7%	43	2.9%	
Phar	macotherapy variable	25						ASD
-------	----------------------	--------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	---------------	-----------	-------
		PA N=7	X 750	BE N=7	B 750	Tot: N=1,5	al 500	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Ivermectin: presen	t (within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Ivermectin: past (>	-6 months pre-ind	ex)					0.041
Yes		11	1.5%	15	2.0%	26	1.7%	
	Molnupiravir: pres	sent (within 3-6 m	onths pre-index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Molnupiravir: past	t (>6 months pre-i	index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Paxlovid: present (	within 3-6 months	s pre-index)					0.090
Yes		3	0.4%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	
	Paxlovid: past (>6	months pre-index						0.052
Yes		1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	
	Remdesivir: preser	nt (within 3-6 mon	ths pre-index)					0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Remdesivir: past (>	>6 months pre-ind	lex)					0.036
Yes		8	1.1%	11	1.5%	19	1.3%	
Ritux	imab B-cell							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.034
Yes		12	1.6%	9	1.2%	21	1.4%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.029
Yes		16	2.1%	13	1.7%	29	1.9%	
Bron	chodilator							
	SABA: present (wi	thin 6 months pre	e-index)					0.050
Yes		189	25.2%	173	23.1%	362	24.1%	
	SABA: past (>6 mo	onths pre-index)						0.008
Yes		354	47.2%	351	46.8%	705	47.0%	
	LABA: present (wi	ithin 6 months pre	e-index)	·				0.025
Yes	- ``	61	8.1%	56	7.5%	117	7.8%	

Phar	macotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA N='	X 750	B N=	EB =750	To N=1	tal ,500	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	LABA: past (>6 m	onths pre-index)						0.029
Yes		113	15.1%	121	16.1%	234	15.6%	
	ACH: present (wit	hin 6 months pre	-index)					0.010
Yes		13	1.7%	14	1.9%	27	1.8%	
	ACH: past (>6 mo	nths pre-index)						0.006
Yes		36	4.8%	35	4.7%	71	4.7%	
	Theophylline: pres	ent (within 6 mor	ths pre-index)		·			0.052
Yes		1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	
	Theophylline: past	(>6 months pre-	ndex)			·		0.000
Yes		2	0.3%	2	0.3%	4	0.3%	
CAR	T-cell therapy					·		
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.052
Yes		1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)			·			0.073
Yes		2	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	
Conv	alescent plasma					·		
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)			·			0.052
Yes		0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	
Abata	ıcept				·			
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.090
Yes		3	0.4%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.069
Yes	·	4	0.5%	1	0.1%	5	0.3%	
Anak	inra						-	
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)						0.000
Yes		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Pharm	nacotherapy variable	es						ASD
		PA N='	AX 750	B N=	EB 750	To N=1	tal ,500	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.052
Yes		0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	
Tocili	zumab							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)					0.000
Yes		1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.052
Yes		0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	
Immu	nosuppressive therap	y						
	Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus	<u>, tacrolimus: pre</u>	esent (within 6 mon	ths pre-index)			0.038
Yes		21	2.8%	26	3.5%	47	3.1%	
	Cyclosporine, ever	olimus, sirolimus	<u>, tacrolimus: pas</u>	st (>6 months pre-i	ndex)			0.011
Yes		48	6.4%	46	6.1%	94	6.3%	
	Cyclophosphamide present (within 6 n	e, azathioprine, le nonths pre-index)	flunomide, meth	otrexate, mycophe	nolate, mycophen	olate mofetil, sulfa	salazine:	0.029
Yes		28	3.7%	24	3.2%	52	3.5%	
	Cyclophosphamide (>6 months pre-inc	e, azathioprine, le lex)	flunomide, meth	otrexate, mycophe	nolate, mycophen	olate mofetil, sulfa	salazine: past	0.011
Yes		52	6.9%	50	6.7%	102	6.8%	
Leuko	otrienes							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)					0.010
Yes		60	8.0%	62	8.3%	122	8.1%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.028
Yes		134	17.9%	142	18.9%	276	18.4%	
Lipid-	lowering							
	Present (within 6 n	nonths pre-index)	)					0.006
Yes		236	31.5%	238	31.7%	474	31.6%	
	Past (>6 months pr	re-index)						0.038
Yes		301	40.1%	315	42.0%	616	41.1%	

Pharmacotherapy variable	es						ASD
	PAX N=7	X 50	BE N=7	B 750	Tota N=1,5	al 500	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
PDLs							
Present (within 6 r	months pre-index)						0.052
Yes	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	
Past (>6 months p	re-index)						0.030
Yes	1	0.1%	2	0.3%	3	0.2%	
TNFXs							
Present (within 6 r	months pre-index)						0.084
Yes	20	2.7%	11	1.5%	31	2.1%	
Past (>6 months pre-index)							0.023
Yes	24	3.2%	21	2.8%	45	3.0%	
Other Biologics							
Present (within 6 r	months pre-index)						0.038
Yes	7	0.9%	10	1.3%	17	1.1%	
Past (>6 months p	re-index)						0.011
Yes	11	1.5%	12	1.6%	23	1.5%	
Procedure related variable	es						ASD
Radiation therapy							0.014
Yes	31	4.1%	29	3.9%	60	4.0%	
Transplant							
Organ							0.131
Yes	1	0.1%	9	1.2%	10	0.7%	
Hematopoietic							0.052
Yes	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	

Abbreviations: ACH = anticholinergic; ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; CAR-T = chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cell; LABA = long-acting beta-agonist; PAX = paxlovid; SABA = short-acting beta-agonist; TNFX = tumor necrosis factor inhibitor.

Healthcare utilization vari	ables						ASD
	PA N.	X	BI	EB 750	Tot	tal 500	
	N=	/50	N=	0/	N=1,	500	
	Frequency	<b>%</b>	Frequency	%	Frequency	<b>%</b> 0	0.024
Inpatient encounter: 31-36	5 days pre-index	10.10/	1.50	20.00/	202	10.50/	0.024
Yes	143	19.1%	150	20.0%	293	19.5%	
Number inpatient encount	ters: 31-365 days	pre-index	1			1	0.002
0	607	80.9%	600	80.0%	1,207	80.5%	
1-2	59	7.9%	69	9.2%	128	8.5%	
3-5	33	4.4%	35	4.7%	68	4.5%	
6+	51	6.8%	46	6.1%	97	6.5%	
ED encounter: 8-365 days	pre-index		· · · · ·		-		0.024
Yes	314	41.9%	323	43.1%	637	42.5%	
Number ED encounters: 8	-365 days pre-ind	lex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				0.011
0	436	58.1%	427	56.9%	863	57.5%	
1-2	208	27.7%	220	29.3%	428	28.5%	
3-5	74	9.9%	70	9.3%	144	9.6%	
6+	32	4.3%	33	4.4%	65	4.3%	
Outpatient encounter: 8-3	65 days pre-index	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C					0.025
Yes	732	97.6%	729	97.2%	1,461	97.4%	
Number outpatient encour	nters: 8-365 days	pre-index					0.006
0	18	2.4%	21	2.8%	39	2.6%	
1-5	121	16.1%	124	16.5%	245	16.3%	
6-11	170	22.7%	161	21.5%	331	22.1%	
12-23	218	29.1%	210	28.0%	428	28.5%	
24+	223	29.7%	234	31.2%	457	30.5%	
Outpatient encounter: 7 da	ays pre-index						0.048
Yes	589	78.5%	574	76.5%	1,163	77.5%	
Number outpatient encour	nters: 7 days pre-	index					0.011
0	161	21.5%	176	23.5%	337	22.5%	

#### Table.A2.12. Baseline Healthcare Utilization Variables for Supplemental Analyses in the Matched Cohorts

Healthcare utilization variables										
	PA N=7	X 750	B N=	EB =750	Tot N=1,					
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%				
1-2	511	68.1%	488	65.1%	999	66.6%				
3-5	74	9.9%	80	10.7%	154	10.3%				
6+	4	0.5%	6	0.8%	10	0.7%				

Abbreviations: ASD = absolute standardized difference; BEB = bebtelovimab; ED = early discontinuation; PAX = Paxlovid.

### 16.4.3 A2.4.3. Outcome Data

# 16.4.3.1 A2.4.3.1. COVID-19 Treatments and Insurance Disenrollment During Follow-up

Administration of COVID-19 treatments within 30 days after the index date was uncommon in both the unmatched and matched cohorts (Table.A2.13). A subsequent BEB dose was administered in 12.4% and 10.4% of BEB-exposed patients in the unmatched and matched cohorts, respectively. A subsequent PAX dose was dispensed in 6.7% and 8.3% of PAX-exposed patients in the unmatched and matched cohorts, respectively. These frequencies are higher than observed in the cohorts formed using EHR data alone, in which 4.46% of matched BEB-exposed patients had an additional BEB administration documented and 2.09% of PAX-exposed patients filled an additional PAX prescription. Insurance disenrollment during follow-up was uncommon in both the unmatched and matched cohorts.

		Unmatched Cohorts						Matched Cohorts					
	PA N = 3	X 3,301	BE N = 1	CB ,998	To N = 5	Total N = 5,299		PAX N = 750		CB 750	To N = 1	tal 1,500	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
COVID-19 treatment													
Convalescent plasma	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Bamlanivimab/ etesevimab	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Bebtelovimab	9	0.3%	248	12.4%	257	4.8%	2	0.3%	78	10.4%	80	5.3%	
Casirivimab/ imdevimab	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sotrovimab	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Tixagevimab/ cilgavimab	3	0.1%	2	0.1%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	
Tocilizumab	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hydroxychloro- quine	3	0.1%	6	0.3%	9	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	
Ivermectin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Molnupiravir	4	0.1%	4	0.2%	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Nirmatrelvir/ ritonavir	63	1.9%	0	0.0%	63	1.2%	14	1.9%	0	0.0%	14	0.9%	
Nirmatrelvir	220	6.7%	21	1.1%	241	4.5%	62	8.3%	5	0.7%	67	4.5%	
Ritonavir	64	1.9%	0	0.0%	64	1.2%	14	1.9%	0	0.0%	14	0.9%	
Remdesivir	14	0.4%	9	0.5%	23	0.4%	4	0.5%	1	0.1%	5	0.3%	
Insurance disenrollment	36	1.1%	11	0.6%	47	0.9%	9	1.2%	4	0.5%	12	0.9%	

## Table.A2.13.COVID-19 Treatment Administration and Insurance Disenrollment during Follow-up for Supplemental<br/>Analyses in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

Abbreviations: BEB = bebtelovimab; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease-2019; PAX = paxlovid.

# 16.4.3.2 A2.4.3.2 Number of Events and Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes

In the unmatched cohorts, the cumulative incidence of hospitalization or death was 5.91% (95% CI: 4.91%, 7.03%) among BEB-treated patients and 3.06% (95% CI: 2.50%, 3.71%) among PAX-treated patients (Table.A2.14). For secondary outcomes, the cumulative incidence of hospitalizations was 5.91% (95% CI: 4.91%, 7.03%) and 3.03% (95% CI: 2.47%, 3.67%) for BEB and PAX, respectively. The cumulative incidence of ED visits was 11.56% (95% CI: 10.19%, 13.05%) and 6.60% (95% CI: 5.78%, 7.51%) for BEB and PAX, respectively. The cumulative incidence of death was 0.100% (95% CI: 0.012%, 0.361%) and 0.061% (95% CI: 0.007%, 0.219%) in BEB and PAX, respectively.

In the matched cohorts, the cumulative incidence of hospitalization or death was 2.80% (95% CI: 1.74%, 4.25%) and 3.60% (95% CI: 2.39%, 5.19%) in BEB and PAX, respectively. Among secondary outcomes, the cumulative incidence of hospitalizations was 2.80% (95% CI: 1.74%, 4.25%) and 3.60% (95% CI: 2.39%, 5.19%) for BEB and PAX, respectively. The cumulative incidence of ED visits among BEB and PAX-treated patients was 8.40% (95% CI: 6.51%, 10.62%) and 8.27% (95% CI: 6.40%, 10.47%), respectively. The cumulative incidence of death was 0.133% (95% CI: 0.003%, 0.741%) and 0.000% (95% CI: 0.000%, 0.491%) for BEB and PAX, respectively. Compared to the matched cohorts in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network (without linked claims), the cumulative incidence of all outcomes increased except for death.

Outcome	Exposure	Number of Patients Analyzed	Number of Patients with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL
Unmatched cohor	·ts					
Primary analysis				1		
Hospitalization	BEB	1,998	118	5.91%	4.91%	7.03%
OR Death	PAX	3,301	101	3.06%	2.50%	3.71%
Secondary analys	es					
Hamitalization	BEB	1,998	118	5.91%	4.91%	7.03%
Hospitalization	PAX	3,301	100	3.03%	2.47%	3.67%
ED visit	BEB	1,998	231	11.56%	10.19%	13.05%
ED VISI	PAX	3,301	218	6.60%	5.78%	7.51%
Death	BEB	1,998	2	0.100%	0.012%	0.361%
Death	PAX	3,301	2	0.061%	0.007%	0.219%
Matched cohorts						
Primary analysis						
Hospitalization	BEB	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%
OR Death	PAX	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%
Secondary analys	es					
Hearitelization	BEB	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%
riospitalization	PAX	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%

Table.A2.14.Cumulative Incidence for Primary and Secondary Outcomes for<br/>Supplemental Analyses in the Unmatched and Matched Cohorts

ED visit	BEB	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%
ED VISIT	PAX	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%
Death	BEB	750	1	0.133%	0.003%	0.741%
Death	PAX	750	0	0.000%	0.000%	0.491%

Abbreviations: 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB=bebtelovimab; PAX=Paxlovid.

## 16.4.4 A2.4.4. Main Results

RDs for primary and secondary outcomes in the unmatched and matched cohorts are presented in Table.A2.15. In the matched cohorts, BEB (compared to PAX) was not associated with an increased risk of hospitalization or death; the RD was -0.80% (95% LCL -2.58%, 95% UCL 0.98%). Additionally, BEB (compared to PAX) was not associated with increased risks of hospitalization (RD -0.80%; 95% LCL -2.58%, 95% UCL 0.98%), an ED visit (RD 0.13%; 95% LCL -2.66%, 95% UCL 2.93%), or death (RD 0.133%; 95% LCL -0.128%, 95% UCL 0.394%).

Table.A2.15.Risk differences for primary and secondary outcomes for<br/>supplemental analyses in the unmatched and matched cohorts

			<b>Risk Difference</b>	
			(RD, PAX = reference	ce)
Outcome	Exposure	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL
Unmatched cohorts				
Primary analysis				
Hospitalization OR	BEB	2.85%	1.66%	4.04%
Death	PAX			
Secondary analyses				
Homitolization	BEB	2.88%	1.69%	4.06%
nospitalization	PAX			
ED visit	BEB	4.96%	3.32%	6.60%
ED visit	PAX			
Deeth	BEB	0.040%	-0.123%	0.202%
Death	PAX			
Matched cohorts				
Primary analysis				
Hospitalization OR	BEB	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
Death	PAX			
Secondary analyses				
Hospitalization	BEB	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
Hospitalization	PAX			
ED visit	BEB	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%
LD VISIC	PAX			
Death	BEB	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%
Dealli	PAX			

			Risk Differenc	e						
			(RD, PAX = refere	ence)						
Outcome	Exposure	RD 95% LCL 95% UCL								

Abbreviations: 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB=bebtelovimab; PAX=Paxlovid.

Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

## 16.4.5 A2.4.5. Other Analyses

#### 16.4.5.1 A2.4.5.1. Subgroup Analyses

Results from subgroup analyses for the matched cohorts are displayed in Table.A2.16. There was no evidence of effect modification by subgroups for age  $\geq 65$  years, immunocompromised status, COVID-19 vaccine, or ED visit within 7 days pre-index. There was an increased risk of an ED visit with BEB compared to PAX in the age  $\geq 65$  years subgroup, however the low number of events (10 in BEB and one in PAX) and wide 95% confidence interval of the effect estimate (RD 6.72%; 95% LCL 2.03%, 95% UCL 11.40%) indicate limited precision.

				Number				R	isk Differenc	e
		Matched	Number	0f Patients				(RD,	PAX = refer	ence)
Outcome	Exposure	Pairs Analyzed	Patients Analyzed	with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL
Subgroup: Age ≥ 65 years (yes/no)										
Primary analysis										
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
	PAX	All	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%			
Hospitalization OP Death	BEB	Condition	134	4	2.99%	0.82%	7.47%	-5.22%	-10.69%	0.24%
Hospitalization OK Death	PAX	Present	134	11	8.21%	4.17%	14.21%			
	BEB	Condition	616	17	2.76%	1.62%	4.38%	0.16%	-1.64%	1.97%
	PAX	Absent	616	16	2.60%	1.49%	4.18%			
Secondary analyses										
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
	PAX	АП	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%			
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	134	4	2.99%	0.82%	7.47%	-5.22%	-10.69%	0.24%
nospitalization	PAX	Present	134	11	8.21%	4.17%	14.21%			
	BEB	Condition	616	17	2.76%	1.62%	4.38%	0.16%	-1.64%	1.97%
	PAX	Absent	616	16	2.60%	1.49%	4.18%			
	BEB	A 11	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%
	PAX	All	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%			
ED visit	BEB	Condition	134	10	7.46%	3.64%	13.30%	6.72%	2.03%	11.40%
	PAX	Present	134	1	0.75%	0.02%	4.09%			
	BEB	Condition	616	53	8.60%	6.51%	11.10%	-1.30%	-4.53%	1.94%
	PAX	Absent	616	61	9.90%	7.66%	12.54%			
	BEB	A 11	750	1	0.13%	0.00%	0.74%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%
	PAX	All	750	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%			
Death	BEB	Condition	134	0	0.00%	0.00%	2.72%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	PAX	Present	134	0	0.00%	0.00%	2.72%			
	BEB		616	1	0.16%	0.00%	0.90%	0.162%	-0.156%	0.480%

Table A2 16	Poculte from Subaroup A	nalyses in the Matched C	oharte for Supplemental Analyse
1 abie.Az. 10.	Results from Subgroup A	Analyses in the matched C	onorts for Supplemental Analyse

				Number				Risk Difference			
		Matahad	Number	0f Dationts				(RD,	PAX = refer	ence)	
Outcome	Exposure	Pairs Analyzed	Patients Analyzed	with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL	
	PAX	Condition Absent	616	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.60%				
Subgroup: Immunocompromised (yes/1	10)										
Primary analysis											
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX	All	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hognitalization OP Doath	BEB	Condition	384	18	4.69%	2.80%	7.31%	0.52%	-2.39%	3.43%	
Hospitalization OK Death	PAX	Present	384	16	4.17%	2.40%	6.68%				
	BEB	Condition	366	3	0.82%	0.17%	2.38%	-2.19%	-4.16%	-0.21%	
	PAX	Absent	366	11	3.01%	1.51%	5.31%				
Secondary analyses											
	BEB	All	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX		750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition Present	384	18	4.69%	2.80%	7.31%	0.52%	-2.39%	3.43%	
Hospitalization	PAX		384	16	4.17%	2.40%	6.68%				
	BEB	Condition	366	3	0.82%	0.17%	2.38%	-2.19%	-4.16%	-0.21%	
	PAX	Absent	366	11	3.01%	1.51%	5.31%				
	BEB	A 11	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%	
	PAX	All	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%				
FD visit	BEB	Condition	384	28	7.29%	4.90%	10.37%	-0.26%	-3.97%	3.45%	
ED VISIC	PAX	Present	384	29	7.55%	5.12%	10.67%				
	BEB	Condition	366	35	9.56%	6.75%	13.05%	0.55%	-3.66%	4.75%	
	PAX	Absent	366	33	9.02%	6.29%	12.43%				
	BEB	A 11	750	1	0.13%	0.00%	0.74%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%	
Death	PAX	All	750	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%				
Deatti	BEB	Condition	384	1	0.26%	0.01%	1.44%	0.260%	-0.249%	0.770%	
	PAX	Present	384	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.96%				

				Number				Risk Difference			
		Matahad	Number	0f Detients				(RD,	PAX = refer	rence)	
Outcome	Exposure	Pairs Analyzed	Patients Analyzed	with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL	
	BEB	Condition	366	0	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	
	PAX	Absent	366	0	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%				
Subgroup: COVID-19 vaccine (yes/und	etermined)										
Primary analysis											
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX	All	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hagnitalization OP Dooth	BEB	Condition	259	9	3.47%	1.60%	6.49%	0.77%	-2.21%	3.75%	
Hospitalization OK Death	PAX	Present	259	7	2.70%	1.09%	5.49%				
	BEB	Condition	491	12	2.44%	1.27%	4.23%	-1.63%	-3.85%	0.59%	
	PAX	Absent	491	20	4.07%	2.51%	6.22%				
Secondary analyses											
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX	АП	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hospitalization	BEB	Condition	259	9	3.47%	1.60%	6.49%	0.77%	-2.21%	3.75%	
Hospitalization	PAX	Present	259	7	2.70%	1.09%	5.49%				
	BEB	Condition	491	12	2.44%	1.27%	4.23%	-1.63%	-3.85%	0.59%	
	PAX	Absent	491	20	4.07%	2.51%	6.22%				
	BEB	A 11	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%	
	PAX	All	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%				
FD visit	BEB	Condition	259	10	3.86%	1.87%	6.99%	-0.77%	-4.24%	2.70%	
ED VISIC	PAX	Present	259	12	4.63%	2.42%	7.95%				
	BEB	Condition	491	53	10.79%	8.19%	13.88%	0.61%	-3.22%	4.44%	
	PAX	Absent	491	50	10.18%	7.65%	13.20%				
	BEB	Δ11	750	1	0.13%	0.00%	0.74%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%	
Death	PAX	All	750	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%				
Death	BEB	Condition	259	1	0.39%	0.01%	2.13%	0.386%	-0.369%	1.141%	
	PAX	Present	259	0	0.00%	0.00%	1.41%				

				Number				Risk Difference			
		Matahad	Number	0f Potionts				(RD,	PAX = refer	ence)	
Outcome	Exposure	Pairs Analyzed	Patients Analyzed	with Event	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL	
	BEB	Condition	491	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	
	PAX	Absent	491	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.75%				
Subgroup: Emergency department visit within 7 days pre-index (yes/no)											
Primary analysis											
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX	All	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hagnitalization OP Dooth	BEB	Condition	197	5	2.54%	0.83%	5.82%	-2.03%	-5.68%	1.62%	
Hospitalization OK Death	PAX	Present	197	9	4.57%	2.11%	8.50%				
	BEB	Condition	553	16	2.89%	1.66%	4.66%	-0.36%	-2.40%	1.67%	
	PAX	Absent	553	18	3.25%	1.94%	5.10%				
Secondary analyses											
	BEB	A 11	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%	
	PAX	All	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%				
Hemitelization	BEB	Condition	197	5	2.54%	0.83%	5.82%	-2.03%	-5.68%	1.62%	
nospitalization	PAX	Present	197	9	4.57%	2.11%	8.50%				
	BEB	Condition	553	16	2.89%	1.66%	4.66%	-0.36%	-2.40%	1.67%	
	PAX	Absent	553	18	3.25%	1.94%	5.10%				
	BEB	A 11	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%	
	PAX	All	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%				
ED vigit	BEB	Condition	197	41	20.81%	15.37%	27.16%	4.06%	-3.64%	11.76%	
ED VISIC	PAX	Present	197	33	16.75%	11.82%	22.71%				
	BEB	Condition	553	22	3.98%	2.51%	5.96%	-1.27%	-3.74%	1.21%	
	PAX	Absent	553	29	5.24%	3.54%	7.44%				
	BEB	A 11	750	1	0.13%	0.00%	0.74%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%	
Death	PAX	All	750	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%				
Deam	BEB	Condition	197	0	0.00%	0.00%	1.86%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	
	PAX	Present	197	0	0.00%	0.00%	1.86%				

				Number				Risk Difference		
			Number	of				(RD, PAX = reference)		ence)
		Matched	of	Patients						,
		Pairs	Patients	with	Cumulative	95%	95%		95%	95%
Outcome	Exposure	Analyzed	Analyzed	Event	Incidence	LCL	UCL	RD	LCL	UCL
	BEB	Condition	553	1	0.18%	0.00%	1.00%	0.181%	-0.173%	0.535%
	PAX	Absent	553	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.66%			

Abbreviations: 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB=bebtelovimab; PAX=Paxlovid.

#### 16.4.5.2 A2.4.5.2. Sensitivity Analyses

#### *16.4.5.2.1* A2.4.5.2.1. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias

In these sensitivity analyses, outcomes that occurred on the first day of follow-up were excluded. Results for the matched cohorts are presented in Table.A2.17. For convenience, the table includes results using the primary analytic approach and results pertaining to this sensitivity analysis.

For the primary outcome (hospitalization or death within 30 days post-index), two events occurred on the first day of follow-up (i.e., Day 1) for patients treated with BEB (number of Day 1 events=1) and PAX (number of Day 1 events =1). While this resulted in a small reduction in the cumulative incidence of the primary outcome in both groups, the RD (and 95% CI) was essentially unchanged compared to the RD (95% CI) using the primary methodology.

The results for the hospitalization outcome followed the same pattern as the primary composite outcome. This occurred because there was only one death in the TriNetX Linked Network cohorts; the patient who died was hospitalized prior to death. For the ED outcome, we did not observe differential exclusion of events on Day 1. For BEB- and PAX-exposed patients, seven and six ED events occurred on the first day of follow-up, respectively. These events were excluded. This resulted in a small reduction in the cumulative incidence in both groups; however, the RD (and 95% CI) was essentially unchanged compared to the RD (95% CI) using the primary methodology. Zero death events occurred on the first day of follow-up. Therefore, the death outcome results did not change.

				Number				Ri	isk Differei	nce
			Number	0f Patients				(RD, 1	PAX = refe	rence)
Outcome	Methodology	Exposure	of Patients Analyzed	with Events	Cumulative Incidence	95% LCL	95% UCL	RD	95% LCL	95% UCL
Primary analysis	·	-	·							
Hospitalization	D	BEB	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
OR Death	Frinary	PAX	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%			
Hospitalization	Excluding	BEB	750	20	2.67%	1.64%	4.09%	-0.80%	-2.54%	0.94%
OR Death	Events on Day 1	PAX	750	26	3.47%	2.28%	5.04%			
Secondary analyses			-							
Hospitalization	Primary	BEB	750	21	2.80%	1.74%	4.25%	-0.80%	-2.58%	0.98%
Hospitalization		PAX	750	27	3.60%	2.39%	5.19%			
Hospitalization	Excluding	BEB	750	20	2.67%	1.64%	4.09%	-0.80%	-2.54%	0.94%
Hospitalization	Events on Day 1	PAX	750	26	3.47%	2.28%	5.04%			
ED visit	Drimory	BEB	750	63	8.40%	6.51%	10.62%	0.13%	-2.66%	2.93%
	I I IIIai y	PAX	750	62	8.27%	6.40%	10.47%			
ED visit	Excluding	BEB	750	56	7.47%	5.69%	9.59%	0.00%	-2.66%	2.66%
ED VISIC	Events on Day 1	PAX	750	56	7.47%	5.69%	9.59%			
Deeth	Dutana	BEB	750	1	0.133%	0.003%	0.741%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%
Death	Primary	PAX	750	0	0.000%	0.000%	0.491%			
Death	Excluding	BEB	750	1	0.133%	0.003%	0.741%	0.133%	-0.128%	0.394%
Death	Events on Day 1	PAX	750	0	0.000%	0.000%	0.491%			

 Table.A2.17.
 Results from Sensitivity Analyses to Mitigate Potential Channeling Bias for Supplemental Analyses

Abbreviations: 95% LCL=95% confidence interval lower confidence limit; 95% UCL=95% confidence interval upper confidence limit; BEB=bebtelovimab; PAX=Paxlovid.

Note: For the Risk Difference analyses, PAX is the reference category.

#### 16.4.5.2.2 A2.4.5.2.2. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding

The E-value results for the assessment of unmeasured confounding are presented in Table.A2.18. The table includes E-value results pertaining to both the RD (i.e., the primary effect estimate) and the RR. E-value results on the RR scale are intended to augment interpretation regarding the magnitude of unmeasured confounding that would be needed to modify the observed RR to a different RR value.

For the primary outcome of hospitalization or death within 30 days post-index, considering the confounders included in the propensity score generating model, unmeasured confounding with a magnitude of at least 1.89 (i.e., E-value=1.89) would be required to fully attenuate (i.e., RD=0.0) the observed RD (-0.08% [95% CI -2.58%, 0.98%]). On the RR scale, unmeasured confounding with a magnitude of at least 2.49 would be required to change the observed RR (0.78 [95% CI 0.44, 1.36]) to a RR of 0.5. Unmeasured confounding with a magnitude of >3.0 and >4.0 would be required to change the observed RR to RRs of 1.5 and 2.0, respectively. Note that an RR >1.0 signifies a greater risk of the outcome for BEB versus PAX.

The minimum magnitude of unmeasured confounding required to nullify (RD=0.0%) the observed treatment effect for hospitalization is the same as the primary composite outcome (i.e., E-value=1.89). For the ED outcome, unmeasured confounding of at least 1.14 (i.e., E-Value=1.14) would be required to nullify (RD=0.0%) the observed RD (i.e., RD=0.13% [-2.66%, 2.93%]). For the death outcome, given the small number of observed deaths, the observed treatment effect (RD=0.13% [-0.13%, 0.39%]) had an insufficient number of events to assess unmeasured confounding.

## Table.A2.18.Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Unmeasured Confounding for Supplemental<br/>Analyses

	Unmeasured Co Required to N Observed Treatn Risk Differen	Unmeasured Confounding Required to Change the Observed Treatment Effect: Risk Ratio Scale									
Outcome	Observed RD 95% CI	E-Value RD=0.0	Observed RR 95% CI	E-Value True RR=0.5	E-Value True RR=1.0	E-Value True RR=Observed RR	E-Value True RR=1.5	E-Value True RR=2.0			
Primary analysis											
Hospitalization OR Death	-0.008 (0.026-0.009)	1.89	0.78 (0.44-1.36)	2.49	1.89	1.00	3.27	4.58			
Secondary analyses											
Hospitalization	-0.008 (0.026-0.009)	1.89	0.78 (0.44-1.36)	2.49	1.89	1.00	3.27	4.58			
ED visit	0.001 (-0.027-0.029)	1.14	1.02 (0.73-1.42)	3.48	1.14	1.00	2.32	3.35			
Death		Insufficient number of events to assess unmeasured confounding									

Abbreviations: 95% CI=95% Confidence Interval; RD=Risk Difference; RR=Risk Ratio

#### 16.4.5.2.3 A2.4.5.2.3. Results of Sensitivity Analyses to Assess the Impact of Missing Baseline Covariate Data

No baseline covariates met the pre-specified criteria of missingness >0% and <30% to assess the potential bias of missing baseline data using multiple imputation before matching—the missingness for BMI, eGFR, and blood pressure was 54%, 32%, and 87%, respectively. Therefore, sensitivity analyses to assess the potential impact of missing baseline covariate data were not conducted.

## 16.5A2.5. Discussion

## 16.5.1 A2.5.1. Key Results

These supplemental analyses in the TriNetX Linked Network were conducted to assess the robustness of findings from the cohort study in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network which evaluated the effectiveness of BEB compared to PAX in patients with COVID-19. The same primary (30-day all-cause hospitalization OR death) and secondary (all-cause hospitalization, all-cause death, and all-cause ED encounter) outcomes assessed in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network study were assessed in the supplemental analyses. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses were conducted as well to assess potential effect modification and bias.

While the overall risk of the primary outcome in the matched cohorts was higher compared to that of the matched cohorts in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network (without linked claims), the risk difference (-0.80% [-2.58%, 0.98%]) suggested that BEB was not associated with an increased risk of 30-day all-cause hospitalization or death compared to PAX. Similarly, secondary outcome risks (except for death) were higher compared to the matched cohorts in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. However, BEB was not associated with increased risks of hospitalization, ED encounter, or death compared to PAX. Subgroup analyses were overall consistent with the primary and secondary analyses, suggesting no evidence of effect modification by age, immunocompromised status, COVID-19 vaccination status, or baseline ED visit. While there was an increased risk of an ED visit with BEB compared to PAX in the age ≥ 65 years subgroup, the low number of events and limited precision of the effect estimate may indicate a chance finding rather than effect modification. The results from sensitivity analyses to assess the potential impact of channeling bias were consistent with those from the primary and secondary analyses, suggesting the observed findings were not substantially impacted by channeling bias. Likewise, sensitivity analyses pertaining to unmeasured confounding showed a considerable magnitude of unmeasured confounding (1.9 on RD scale and 1.9 - 4.5 on the RR scale) would be needed to substantially change the observed results. These subgroup and sensitivity analysis results depict robustness of the study findings in the TriNetX Linked Network and corroborate findings from the study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, providing further evidence of BEB's effectiveness for patients with COVID-19 during the period of high prevalence of Omicron BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants in the US.

Findings from these supplemental, linked analyses were consistent with the main analyses using the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network (i.e., EHR data without linked claims) despite potential

differences in data completeness and underlying populations between the two data sources. Use of the TriNetX Linked Network allowed augmentation of EHR data with insurance claims data, providing additional information on healthcare services given by HCOs outside of those contributing to the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. These may include diagnoses, procedures, treatments, and other acute and non-acute medical services that were not captured in the EHR database alone. Further, mortality information was derived from additional data sources (Social Security Death Index, obituary feed data) for patients in the TriNetX Linked Network, allowing for more complete ascertainment of death outcomes compared to the EHR data alone. There were also notable differences in baseline characteristics between data sources. Patients in the TriNetX Linked Network were younger but generally had higher proportions of comorbidities, pharmacotherapy use, and healthcare resource utilization compared to patients in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. This may be due to the additional capture of insurance claims which identified comorbidities, pharmacotherapy use, and other healthcare services that were not identified in the EHR data. This could also reflect a different underlying population in the supplemental, linked analyses compared to the main analyses, as patients in the TriNetX Linked Network are the subset of those in TriNetX Dataworks USA Network who had health insurance claims data available for linkage to the EHR data. Patients in this subset may differ with regards to demographics and other characteristics. For example, patients in the TriNetX Linked Network primarily represent patients with commercial, Managed Medicaid, and Medicare Advantage insurance plans rather than traditional Medicare.

A few recent studies related to BEB or PAX real-world effectiveness have been published since the time of initiating the supplemental analyses. One study described adverse events, including hospitalization and death, in 849 patients treated with BEB in a suburban medical center. The study found a low proportion of hospitalizations (0.1%) and no deaths among BEB-treated patients (Knopp et al. 2023). Two studies reported a lack of real-world effectiveness in BEBtreated patients in a large healthcare system, however neither study utilized an active comparator group (i.e., they compared BEB-treated to untreated patients) (Sridhara et al. 2023 and Wang et al. 2023). Although propensity score techniques can reduce bias due to baseline differences between treated and untreated groups, an active comparator is generally more preferred over an untreated comparator to better address residual confounding. Furthermore, the Wang et al. study included time during which BQ.1/BQ.1.1 subvariants were growing. These variants are known to be resistant to BEB and do not reflect the circulating variants at the time of this analysis. Both studies found a low risk of hospitalization or death in BEB-treated patients (0.1 - 2.2%). Last, a study conducted in a large healthcare system, including periods in which the BQ.1, BQ.1.1, XBB, and XBB.1.5 subvariants were present, reported a decreased hazard of hospitalization or death among nirmatrelvir-treated vs. untreated patients (Lin et al. 2023).

## 16.5.2 A2.5.2. Limitations

While confounding bias is a potential limitation of this and all observational studies, confounding control was achieved in this study by using an active comparator rather than an untreated comparison group, CEM on highly selected and *a priori* defined baseline covariates, and PS matching on a broader set of pre-specified and HDPS-identified baseline covariates.

Moreover, use of the TriNetX Linked Network allowed for the ascertainment of baseline diagnoses recorded, procedures given, and medications dispensed from HCOs outside of the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, further mitigating potential confounding bias.

Similar to the study conducted in TriNetX Dataworks USA, exposure misclassification may occur. For PAX-treated patients, prescriptions and dispensings do not confirm adherence to the prescribed dosing regimen. However, given the potential severity and global awareness of SARS-CoV-2 infection, adherence may have improved and therefore mitigated exposure misclassification to some degree. Furthermore, we observed that the utilization of the opposite treatment during follow-up (i.e., PAX in BEB-treated or BEB in PAX-treated patients) was rare.

Leveraging the closed insurance claims data from the TriNetX Linked Network improved mitigation of outcome misclassification, as it allowed for the capture of hospitalizations and ED visits that occurred outside of the EHR network but were recorded in the insurance claims. Further, the additional linked mortality data from the Social Security Death Index and obituary feeds potentially reduced misclassification of death outcomes.

It is unclear if differences in baseline characteristics between patients in the TriNetX Linked Network (i.e., patients with EHR data and linked insurance claims) and patients in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network (i.e., patients with EHR data alone) were due to the additional capture of diagnoses, pharmacotherapy, and other healthcare services via the linked claims or due to true underlying differences between patients with EHR data and linked claims and patients with EHR data alone.

Given that the TriNetX Linked Network represents a subset of patients within the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network, the study sample size was reduced compared to the study conducted in the latter database. This reduced treatment effect precision—especially among subgroup analyses, in which the ability to detect effect modification was limited compared to the study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network. This also impacts generalizability, as patients in the TriNetX Linked Network are primarily commercially insured rather than federally insured (e.g., traditional Medicare), as mentioned below in Section 16.5.4 (A2.5.4).

## 16.5.3 A2.5.3. Interpretation

Results of these supplemental analyses in the TriNetX Linked Network suggest that BEB was not associated with an increased risk of the 30-day hospitalization or death, nor was it associated with an increased risk of the secondary outcomes compared to PAX. These findings corroborate those of the study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network.

## 16.5.4 A2.5.4. Generalisability

While patients in the larger TriNetX Dataworks USA Network have been shown to be broadly representative of patients who receive medical care in the US, patients within the TriNetX Linked Network may be more representative of patients with health insurance, particularly those who are commercially-insured. Thus, results of this study may be more generalizable to a commercially-insured population compared to a federally-insured population (e.g., Medicare or Medicaid).

## 16.6A2.6. Conclusions

These supplemental analyses in the TriNetX Linked Network suggest that BEB was not associated with an increased risk of hospitalization or death, nor was it associated with an increased risk of secondary outcomes (hospitalization, ED visit, death) compared to PAX in patients with COVID-19 during the period of high prevalence of the Omicron BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants. These findings support those of the initial study conducted in the TriNetX Dataworks USA Network that concluded BEB was non-inferior to PAX, strengthening the evidence base on the real-world effectiveness of BEB. Though BEB was de-authorized in November 2022, these studies demonstrate an example of how real-world evidence can inform regulatory decision-making when a public health crisis, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, demands a robust assessment of the real-world use and effectiveness of new, emerging therapeutics.

## 16.7 A2.7. References

- [FDA] Food and Drug Administration. Coronavirus (COVID-19) update: FDA authorizes new monoclonal antibody for treatment of COVID-19 that retains activity against omicron variant 2022. 2022. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/pressannouncements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-new-monoclonal-antibodytreatment-covid-19-retains.
- Knopp BW, Weiss HZ, Fahmy S, et al. A comparison of the adverse effects and utility of different monoclonal antibodies for SARS-CoV-2: a retrospective cohort study. *Cureus*. 2023;15(8):e43094.
- Lin D, Abi Fadel F, Huang S, et al. Nirmatrelvir or molnupiravir use and severe outcomes from omicron infections. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(9):e2335077.
- Sridhara S, Gungor AB, Erol HK, et al. Lack of effectiveness of bebtelovimab monoclonal antibody among high-risk patients with SARS-CoV-2 omicron during BA.2, BA2.12.1 and BA.5 subvariants dominated era. *PLoS ONE*. 2023;18(4):e0279326.
- Wang X, Abi Fadel F, Huang S, et al. Effectiveness of bebtelovimab against hospitalization and death from the omicron Ba.4/BA.5 and BQ.1/BQ.1.1 subvariants. *Chest.* 2023;164(4):872-74.