



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

## Brief report

## Lessons learned from the use of COVID-19 convalescent plasma at Kaiser Permanente

Kevin Tse, MD,<sup>a</sup> Qiaoling Chen, MS,<sup>b</sup> Ariadna Padilla, MBA,<sup>b</sup> Kenneth Martinez, MS,<sup>c</sup> Alejandra Salazar, BS, CLS,<sup>c</sup> Jennifer Aidikoff, CLS,<sup>d</sup> Stephanie Soliven, CLS, MBA,<sup>e</sup> Ann Sintef, MT(ASCP), SBB, CQA (ASQ),<sup>f</sup> Darryl Palmer-Toy, MD-PhD,<sup>f</sup> Brian Platz, MD,<sup>g</sup> Hedyeh Shafi, MD,<sup>d</sup> and Allison Zemek, MD<sup>c</sup> *San Diego, Pasadena, Downey, Los Angeles, and North Hollywood, Calif*

**Background:** In April 2020, the Mayo Clinic helped establish the US Food and Drug Administration Expanded Access Protocol for COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) convalescent plasma (CCP). The effectiveness of CCP in the published literature is contradictory because some retrospective studies showed benefit in reducing mortality and severe illness, whereas prospective randomized controlled trials demonstrated no benefit of CCP.

**Objectives:** To discuss (1) the implementation of CCP across Kaiser Permanente Southern California between April 2020 and April 2021, (2) retrospective multivariable analysis of 2,831 patients with COVID-19 who were transfused with CCP compared with 18,475 patients with COVID-19 who did not receive CCP, (3) how to reconcile contradictory published data regarding the efficacy of CCP, and (4) guidance regarding the future use of convalescent plasma in a large community hospital setting.

**Methods:** Multivariable analysis was controlled for demographic characteristics, level of oxygen delivery, intensive care unit stay, selected laboratory findings, and other concurrent treatment-related variables. Tubing segments from 151 CCP units transfused between October 2020 and April 2021 were retrospectively tested for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) anti-spike protein

receptor-binding domain IgG. Multivariable analysis showed that CCP transfusion did not affect mortality rates at 30 days and 5 months (odds ratio, 1.04, 95% CI, 0.87-1.25, and hazard ratio, 1.05, 95% CI, 0.93-1.19).

**Conclusions:** If convalescent plasma is offered as a therapeutic in a future viral pandemic, we recommend (1) transfusing only those patients who are negative for neutralizing antibodies, (2) transfusing very early during the disease course, (3) only using convalescent plasma with known levels of neutralizing antibodies, or (4) alternatively providing fractionated hyperimmune globulin. (*J Allergy Clin Immunol Global* 2022;■■■■:■■■-■■■.)

**Key words:** COVID-19, convalescent plasma

### INTRODUCTION

The use of COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) convalescent plasma (CCP) for the treatment of patients with COVID-19 resulted in numerous publications with conflicting outcomes. In 2021, Joyner et al<sup>1</sup> published positive retrospective analyses using data gathered through the US Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) Expanded Access Protocol. The study suggested a reduction in 30-day mortality in patients who received "very high titer" CCP (>80th percentile, >1:2560) versus "low titer" CCP (<20th percentile, <1:160).<sup>1</sup> However, several large prospective randomized controlled trials, including the investigation by Ortigoza et al,<sup>2</sup> the National Institutes of Health SIREN-C3PO trial,<sup>3</sup> and the UK RECOVERY trial,<sup>4</sup> did not show benefit in reducing overall mortality. On the basis of our experience at a large integrated health care system, we suspect the following factors contributed to these conflicting results and were also challenges to overcome in community hospitals: (1) insufficient neutralizing antibodies present in donor CCP; (2) minimum thresholds set for "high titer" varied widely between studies; and (3) emergent data, which suggests that CCP should be reserved only for patients with COVID-19 with undetectable neutralizing antibodies before transfusion.<sup>5</sup>

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Kaiser Permanente serves 12.4 million members in 8 states and Washington DC. Kaiser Permanente Southern California (KPSC) includes 15 hospitals in urban, suburban, and semirural areas serving 4.7 million members. KPSC provided CCP to eligible, consenting patients hospitalized for COVID-19 under the FDA Expanded Access Protocol (EAP) and Emergency Use

From <sup>a</sup>the Department of Allergy and Immunology, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, San Diego, <sup>b</sup>the Department of Research and Evaluation, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Pasadena, <sup>c</sup>the Department of Pathology, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Downey Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, Downey, <sup>d</sup>the Department of Pathology, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Los Angeles Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, Los Angeles, <sup>e</sup>the Department of Pathology, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, San Diego, <sup>f</sup>SCPMG Regional Reference Core Laboratories, Kaiser Permanente - Southern California Permanente Medical Group, North Hollywood, and <sup>g</sup>the Department of Pathology, Southern California Permanente Medical Group, West Los Angeles Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, Los Angeles.

This research was supported by a grant from the Regional Research Committee of Kaiser Permanente Southern California (RRC grant no. KP-RRC-20201002).

Disclosure of potential conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no relevant conflicts of interest.

Received for publication April 29, 2022; revised June 29, 2022; accepted for publication July 18, 2022.

Available online xxx.

Corresponding author: Allison Zemek, MD, Kaiser Permanente Downey Medical Center, Department of Pathology, 9333 Imperial Highway, Downey, CA 90242. E-mail: [allison.j.zemek@kp.org](mailto:allison.j.zemek@kp.org).

2772-8293

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaciig.2022.07.003>

**TABLE I.** Retrospective testing of donor plasma for SARS-COV-2 anti-spike protein receptor-binding domain IgG on Beckman Dxl 800 instrument

S/Co ratio	Interpretation	N = 151
<0.8 S/Co	Nonreactive	24 (15.9%)
≥0.8 to <1.0 S/Co	Equivocal	6 (4%)
≥1.0 S/Co	Reactive	121 (80.1%)
>3.3 S/Co	Acceptable threshold for high titer CCP per FDA EUA Letter of Authorization in June 2021	67 (44.3%)
>6.6 S/Co	~80th percentile	30 (20%)

EUA, Emergency Use Authorization; S/Co, Signal to Cut-off.

**TABLE II.** Multivariable odds ratio and Cox-proportional hazard ratio for patients with COVID-19, 30-d and 5-mo mortality

Patient characteristic	Overall cohort 30-d mortality (N = 21,195)			Overall cohort 5-mo mortality (N = 21,306)		
	Odds ratio	95% CI		Hazard ratio	95% CI	
CCP (n = 2,831) vs no CCP (n = 18,475)	1.04	0.87	1.25	1.05	0.93	1.19
Male (n = 12,237) vs female (n = 9,069)	1.28	1.15	1.42	1.13	1.05	1.21
Race/ethnicity (ref White n = 4,094)						
Asian/Pacific Islander (n = 2,347)	0.69	0.55	0.87	0.80	0.69	0.93
Black (n = 1,802)	0.72	0.60	0.86	0.82	0.70	0.97
Hispanic (n = 12,840)	0.85	0.73	0.98	0.87	0.77	0.99
Other/unknown (n = 223)	1.17	0.67	2.07	1.17	0.78	1.74
Age (y) (ref 18-49, n = 5,172)						
50-65 (n = 6,911)	2.13	1.82	2.49	1.87	1.67	2.09
66-79 (n = 6,248)	4.75	3.86	5.85	3.16	2.75	3.64
≥80 (n = 2,975)	19.34	15.35	24.37	7.96	6.86	9.23
BMI (ref 18.5-24.9) (n = 4,272)						
Overweight (25-29.9) (n = 6,315)	0.71	0.61	0.82	0.78	0.70	0.87
Obese (30-39.9) (n = 8,034)	0.65	0.57	0.73	0.74	0.67	0.82
Morbidly obese (>40) (n = 2,685)	0.83	0.69	1.01	0.87	0.78	0.97
ICU (n = 3,565) vs no ICU (n = 17,741)	3.73	3.00	4.63	2.46	2.16	2.79
Dexamethasone (yes n = 15,573 vs no n = 5,733)	1.51	1.13	2.01	1.28	1.10	1.50
Remdesivir (yes n = 14,384 vs no n = 6,922)	0.63	0.47	0.83	0.74	0.63	0.87
Tocilizumab (yes n = 390 vs no n = 20,916)	0.99	0.76	1.29	1.04	0.92	1.18
Elixhauser comorbidity index	1.16	1.14	1.18	1.12	1.11	1.13
AST (ref = normal <35 U/L)						
High (>35 U/L) (n = 14,036)	1.50	1.29	1.75	1.27	1.15	1.41
Very high (>175 U/L) (n = 1,295)	2.72	2.31	3.21	1.77	1.56	2.00
Ferritin (ref = normal range given age/sex)						
Abnormal (n = 12,871)	1.52	1.27	1.82	1.24	1.13	1.37
D-Dimer (ref = normal <0.5 FEU μg/mL)						
Abnormal (>0.5 FEU μg/mL) (n = 16,386)	2.15	1.72	2.69	1.99	1.70	2.32
O <sub>2</sub> support (ref = room air, n = 2,898)						
Intubation (n = 4,134)	10.29	7.84	13.52	5.51	4.44	6.84
Noninvasive with pressure support (BIPAP/SIPAP/CPAP) (n = 807)	13.37	8.56	20.88	6.35	4.56	8.84
Noninvasive nonpressure support (HFNC/T-PIECE/Ventimask) (n = 1,280)	4.82	3.48	6.68	3.10	2.28	4.23
Low O <sub>2</sub> -need (non-rebreather, nasal cannula) (n = 12,185)	1.42	1.05	1.90	1.29	1.06	1.57

For 30-d mortality, we used logistic regression and excluded 111 patients who lost membership within 30-d, because their mortality status was unknown. For 5-mo mortality, we used Cox-proportional hazards survival analysis, and those patients were considered censored and kept.

AST, Aspartate aminotransferase; BIPAP, bilevel positive airway pressure; BMI, body mass index; CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; FEU, fibrinogen equivalent unit; HFNC, high flow nasal cannula; ICU, intensive care unit; SIPAP, synchronized inspiratory positive airway pressure.

Authorization (EUA) guidelines (see <https://www.uscovidplasma.org>), with additional internal recommendations to reserve transfusion for nonpregnant patients within 3 days of admission or within 7 days of symptom onset, and preferably negative for anti-severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-COV-2) antibodies before transfusion. We performed retrospective multivariable analyses of 2,831 patients with COVID-19 treated with CCP compared with 18,475 patients with COVID-19 who did not receive CCP in KPSC. Only 277 (10%) patients were tested for the presence of antinucleocapsid IgG antibodies before transfusion (Abbott SARS-COV-2 IgG

Assay). Tubing segments from 151 CCP units transfused between October 2020 and April 2021 were retrospectively tested at the Southern California Permanente Medical Group (SCPMG) Regional Reference Laboratories for SARS-COV-2 anti-spike protein receptor-binding domain IgG on the Beckman Dxl 800 instrument (ACCESS, Beckman Coulter, Brea, Calif). This period of time spanned the original "wild-type" SARS-CoV-2 and the subsequent "alpha variant." Of the 151 tested segments, only 67 (44%) met the FDA criteria for "high titer" (S/Co ≥ 3.3, FDA EUA Letter, June 2021); 24 (15.9%) were nonreactive; and 6 (4%) equivocal (Table I).

When adjusted for demographic characteristics, level of oxygen delivery, intensive care unit stay, selected laboratory findings, and other concurrent treatment-related variables, CCP transfusion did not affect mortality rates at 30 days and 5 months (odds ratio, 1.04, 95% CI, 0.87-1.25, and hazard ratio, 1.05, 95% CI, 0.93-1.19) (Table II). No significant increase in adverse transfusion reactions related to CCP was identified. Multivariable analysis showed no reduction in mortality rate at 30 days and 5 months for the subset of patients who received CCP with detectable neutralizing antibodies at S/Co greater than or equal to 3.3 or equivalent (odds ratio, 0.87, 95% CI, 0.58-1.31, and hazard ratio, 0.96, 95% CI, 0.74- 1.24), respectively. Although not statistically significant when adjusted by multivariable analysis, patients who received CCP with the upper 75th percentile of antibodies had a lower 30-day mortality compared with overall (9.1% vs 27.9%).

The American Red Cross provided CCP for most community hospitals, and when SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody testing was still very limited, the American Red Cross used donor criteria such as full recovery from COVID-19 as a surrogate for antibody testing, which likely resulted in subtherapeutic and nontherapeutic convalescent plasma entering the supply inventory. Consistent with our findings, Clark et al<sup>6</sup> noted that the levels of antispikes, antinucleocapsid, and neutralizing antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 in CCP donor plasma samples provided by the American Red Cross were highly variable, with some plasma containing subtherapeutic antibody levels (ie, S/Co of 0.02 for Abbot IgG, positive is  $\geq 1.00$ ). In retrospect, government agencies' initial recommendations for antibody thresholds that constituted "high titer" CCP were much too low. If convalescent plasma is offered as a therapeutic in a future viral

pandemic, if at all, we raise consideration for (1) limiting transfusion to only those patients who are negative for neutralizing antibodies, (2) transfusing very early during the disease course, (3) only using convalescent plasma with known levels of neutralizing antibodies more than 80th percentile compared with the donor pool, and not offering convalescent plasma transfusion at all until such a verifiable quantity of antibodies can be measured, or (4) pooling convalescent plasma units to make fractionated hyperimmune globulin.

We thank the following for assistance with this study: Stephanie Tovar (Department of Research Evaluation, Southern California Permanente Medical Group), for study coordination.

#### REFERENCES

1. Joyner MJ, Carter RE, Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Mills JR, Johnson PW, et al. Convalescent plasma antibody levels and the risk of death from Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:1015-27.
2. Ortigoza MB, Yoon H, Goldfeld KS, Troxel AB, Daily JP, Wu Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 convalescent plasma in hospitalized patients: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2022;182:115-26.
3. Korley FK, Durkalski-Mauldin V, Yeatts SD, Schulman K, Davenport RD, Dumont LJ, et al. Early convalescent plasma for high-risk outpatients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385:1951-60.
4. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Convalescent plasma in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet* 2021;397:2049-59.
5. Herman JD, Wang C, Loos C, Yoon H, Rivera J, Eugenia Dieterle M, et al. Functional convalescent plasma antibodies and pre-infusion titers shape the early severe COVID-19 immune response. *Nat Commun* 2021;12:6853.
6. Clark NM, Janaka SK, Hartman W, Stramer S, Goodhue E, Weiss J, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA antibodies in COVID-19 convalescent plasma do not enhance viral infection. *PLoS One* 2022;17:e0257930.