



Clinical trial results:

A Multicenter, Randomized, Double-blind, Parallel Group Study to Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of Anti-COVID-19 Immune Globulin (Human) 20% (C19-IG 20%) versus Placebo in Asymptomatic Ambulatory Outpatients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection

Summary

EudraCT number	2021-000269-34
Trial protocol	ES
Global end of trial date	27 December 2021

Results information

Result version number	v1 (current)
This version publication date	29 December 2022
First version publication date	29 December 2022

Trial information

Trial identification

Sponsor protocol code	GC2010
-----------------------	--------

Additional study identifiers

ISRCTN number	-
ClinicalTrials.gov id (NCT number)	NCT04847141
WHO universal trial number (UTN)	-

Notes:

Sponsors

Sponsor organisation name	Grifols Therapeutics LLC
Sponsor organisation address	79 TW Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC, United States, 27709
Public contact	Mireia Torres, Instituto Grifols, S.A., mireia.torres@grifols.com
Scientific contact	Mireia Torres, Instituto Grifols, S.A., mireia.torres@grifols.com

Notes:

Paediatric regulatory details

Is trial part of an agreed paediatric investigation plan (PIP)	No
Does article 45 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial?	No
Does article 46 of REGULATION (EC) No 1901/2006 apply to this trial?	No

Notes:

Results analysis stage

Analysis stage	Final
Date of interim/final analysis	27 December 2021
Is this the analysis of the primary completion data?	No
Global end of trial reached?	Yes
Global end of trial date	27 December 2021
Was the trial ended prematurely?	Yes

Notes:

General information about the trial

Main objective of the trial:

The purpose of the study was to compare the efficacy of anti-COVID-19 immune globulin (human) 20% (C19-IG 20%) (2 doses) versus placebo with regard to the percentage of asymptomatic subjects who remained asymptomatic, i.e., who did not develop symptomatic coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) through Day 14 as per the protocol defined criteria.

Protection of trial subjects:

All subjects were required to read and sign an Informed Consent Form.

Background therapy: -

Evidence for comparator: -

Actual start date of recruitment	28 April 2021
Long term follow-up planned	No
Independent data monitoring committee (IDMC) involvement?	Yes

Notes:

Population of trial subjects

Subjects enrolled per country

Country: Number of subjects enrolled	Spain: 465
Worldwide total number of subjects	465
EEA total number of subjects	465

Notes:

Subjects enrolled per age group

In utero	0
Preterm newborn - gestational age < 37 wk	0
Newborns (0-27 days)	0
Infants and toddlers (28 days-23 months)	0
Children (2-11 years)	0
Adolescents (12-17 years)	0
Adults (18-64 years)	445
From 65 to 84 years	18
85 years and over	2

Subject disposition

Recruitment

Recruitment details:

Subjects took part in the study at 5 centres in Spain, from 28 April 2021 (first subject enrolled to receive the study drug) to 27 December 2021 (last subject completed).

Pre-assignment

Screening details:

Subjects with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection were randomised in a 1:1:1 ratio to receive C19-IG 20% 1 gram (g), C19-IG 20% 2 g, and placebo. A total of 555 subjects were screened and 465 subjects were randomised in the study. Among these, 461 subjects were dosed, and 430 subjects completed the study.

Period 1

Period 1 title	Overall Study (overall period)
Is this the baseline period?	Yes
Allocation method	Randomised - controlled
Blinding used	Double blind
Roles blinded	Subject, Investigator, Carer, Assessor

Arms

Are arms mutually exclusive?	Yes
Arm title	C19-IG 20% 1 g

Arm description:

Subjects received 1 g of C19-IG 20% subcutaneous (SC) infusion containing one syringe of 5 millilitres (mL) C19-IG 20% plus one syringe of 5 mL sterile 0.9% sodium chloride (NaCl) on Day 1.

Arm type	Experimental
Investigational medicinal product name	0.9% NaCl
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Solution for injection
Routes of administration	Subcutaneous use

Dosage and administration details:

0.9% NaCl 5 mL was administered via SC infusion.

Investigational medicinal product name	C19-IG 20%
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Solution for injection
Routes of administration	Subcutaneous use

Dosage and administration details:

1 g of C19-IG 20% was administered via SC infusion.

Arm title	C19-IG 20% 2 g
------------------	----------------

Arm description:

Subjects received 2 g of C19-IG 20% SC infusion containing two syringes 5 mL each of C19-IG 20% on Day 1.

Arm type	Experimental
Investigational medicinal product name	C19-IG 20%
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Solution for injection
Routes of administration	Subcutaneous use

Dosage and administration details:

2 g of C19-IG 20% was administered via SC infusion.

Arm title	Placebo
------------------	---------

Arm description:

Subjects received C19-IG 20% matching placebo as SC infusion containing two syringes of 5 mL each sterile 0.9% NaCl injection on Day 1.

Arm type	Placebo
Investigational medicinal product name	0.9% NaCl
Investigational medicinal product code	
Other name	
Pharmaceutical forms	Solution for injection
Routes of administration	Subcutaneous use

Dosage and administration details:

C19-IG 20% matching placebo administered via SC infusion.

Number of subjects in period 1^[1]	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo
Started	152	153	156
Completed	142	143	145
Not completed	10	10	11
Adverse event, non-fatal	1	-	1
Withdrawal by Subject	2	4	3
Lost to follow-up	7	5	7
Reason not Specified	-	1	-

Notes:

[1] - The number of subjects reported to be in the baseline period are not the same as the worldwide number enrolled in the trial. It is expected that these numbers will be the same.

Justification: 465 subjects were randomised of which 461 subjects were dosed.

Baseline characteristics

Reporting groups

Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 1 g
Reporting group description:	
Subjects received 1 g of C19-IG 20% subcutaneous (SC) infusion containing one syringe of 5 millilitres (mL) C19-IG 20% plus one syringe of 5 mL sterile 0.9% sodium chloride (NaCl) on Day 1.	
Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 2 g
Reporting group description:	
Subjects received 2 g of C19-IG 20% SC infusion containing two syringes 5 mL each of C19-IG 20% on Day 1.	
Reporting group title	Placebo
Reporting group description:	
Subjects received C19-IG 20% matching placebo as SC infusion containing two syringes of 5 mL each sterile 0.9% NaCl injection on Day 1.	

Reporting group values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo
Number of subjects	152	153	156
Age categorical			
Units: Subjects			

Age continuous			
Units: years			
arithmetic mean	38.8	41.1	38.8
standard deviation	± 12.76	± 12.40	± 13.33
Gender categorical			
Units: Subjects			
Female	66	62	69
Male	86	91	87
Ethnicity			
Units: Subjects			
Hispanic or Latino	40	32	45
Not Hispanic or Latino	112	121	111
Race			
Units: Subjects			
Asian	1	0	3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	1	0
Black or African American	4	6	3
White	138	140	140
More than one race	0	0	1
Unknown or Not Reported	9	6	9

Reporting group values	Total		
Number of subjects	461		
Age categorical			
Units: Subjects			

Age continuous Units: years arithmetic mean standard deviation	-		
Gender categorical Units: Subjects			
Female	197		
Male	264		
Ethnicity Units: Subjects			
Hispanic or Latino	117		
Not Hispanic or Latino	344		
Race Units: Subjects			
Asian	4		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1		
Black or African American	13		
White	418		
More than one race	1		
Unknown or Not Reported	24		

End points

End points reporting groups

Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 1 g
Reporting group description: Subjects received 1 g of C19-IG 20% subcutaneous (SC) infusion containing one syringe of 5 millilitres (mL) C19-IG 20% plus one syringe of 5 mL sterile 0.9% sodium chloride (NaCl) on Day 1.	
Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 2 g
Reporting group description: Subjects received 2 g of C19-IG 20% SC infusion containing two syringes 5 mL each of C19-IG 20% on Day 1.	
Reporting group title	Placebo
Reporting group description: Subjects received C19-IG 20% matching placebo as SC infusion containing two syringes of 5 mL each sterile 0.9% NaCl injection on Day 1.	

Primary: Percentage of Asymptomatic Subjects Who Remained Asymptomatic, i.e., Who did Not Develop Symptomatic COVID-19 Through Day 14

End point title	Percentage of Asymptomatic Subjects Who Remained Asymptomatic, i.e., Who did Not Develop Symptomatic COVID-19 Through Day 14
End point description: Subjects were described as symptomatic if they a. experienced at least two of the following systemic symptoms: fever (≥ 38 °C), chills, myalgia, headache, sore throat, cough, fatigue that interferes with activities of daily living, new olfactory/taste disorder(s), and vomiting/diarrhoea; b. experienced at least one of the following respiratory signs/symptoms: new or worsening shortness of breath or difficulty breathing; c. experienced a peripheral oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry (SpO ₂) $< 94\%$ on room air; or d. had radiographical evidence of pneumonia. The percentage of subjects who meet the primary endpoint within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% confidence interval (CI). Intent-to-treat (ITT) population included all subjects who were randomised. Modified ITT (mITT) population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.	
End point type	Primary
End point timeframe: Up to Day 14	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	59.9 (51.6 to 67.7)	64.7 (56.6 to 72.3)	63.5 (55.4 to 71.0)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[1]
P-value	= 0.5167 ^[2]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-3.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-14.6
upper limit	7.4

Notes:

[1] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[2] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects meeting the primary efficacy endpoint between C19-IG 20% 1 g and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	Placebo v C19-IG 20% 2 g
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[3]
P-value	= 0.8197 ^[4]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	1.2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9.6
upper limit	12

Notes:

[3] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[4] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects meeting the primary efficacy endpoint between C19-IG 20% 2 g and placebo.

Secondary: Change From Baseline in SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load (log10 Copies/mL)

End point title	Change From Baseline in SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load (log10 Copies/mL)
End point description:	
Mean change from baseline (CFB) in log10 SARS-CoV-2 viral load at Days 7 and 14 was assessed. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with data available for analysis at the given time point.	
End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Baseline to Day 7 and Day 14	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: log10 copies/mL				
least squares mean (confidence interval 95%)				
CFB at Day 7 (n=143, 140, 147)	-1.49 (-1.74 to -1.25)	-1.76 (-2.01 to -1.51)	-1.59 (-1.83 to -1.35)	
CFB at Day 14 (n=135, 134, 137)	-2.80 (-2.97 to -2.64)	-3.02 (-3.19 to -2.85)	-2.91 (-3.08 to -2.75)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 7	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[5]
P-value	= 0.5756
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	Least squares (LS) mean difference
Point estimate	0.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.24
upper limit	0.44

Notes:

[5] - 95% CI for the difference in the LS mean between 1 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the ANCOVA model, including change from baseline value as dependent variable; treatment group as fixed effect; and baseline viral load value, age, and gender as covariates.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 7	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[6]
P-value	= 0.3289
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.17
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.52
upper limit	0.17

Notes:

[6] - 95% CI for the difference in the LS mean between 2 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the ANCOVA model, including change from baseline value as dependent variable; treatment group as fixed effect; and baseline viral load value, age, and gender as covariates.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[7]
P-value	= 0.3418
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.12
upper limit	0.34

Notes:

[7] - 95% CI for the difference in the LS mean between 1 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the ANCOVA model, including change from baseline value as dependent variable; treatment group as fixed effect; and baseline viral load value, age, and gender as covariates.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[8]
P-value	= 0.3688
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.11
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.34
upper limit	0.13

Notes:

[8] - 95% CI for the difference in the LS mean between 2 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the ANCOVA model, including change from baseline value as dependent variable; treatment group as fixed effect; and baseline viral load value, age, and gender as covariates.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Who Remained in an Outpatient Setting and Maintained an SpO2 \geq 94% on Room Air on Day 3, Day 7, and Day 14

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Who Remained in an Outpatient Setting and Maintained an SpO2 \geq 94% on Room Air on Day 3, Day 7, and Day 14
-----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

An outpatient setting was defined as no hospitalisation or intensive care unit (ICU) admission through Days 3, 7, and 14. The percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting and maintained

SpO2 \geq 94% on room air at each timepoint within each treatment group were presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with data available for analysis at given timepoint. p-value and 95% CI were not estimable for C19-IG 20% 1 g vs placebo as all subjects had remained in an outpatient setting and maintained SpO2 \geq 94% on Room Air in C19-IG 20% 1 g and placebo arm on Day 3.

End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Day 3, Day 7, and Day 14	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Day 3 (n=151, 152, 156)	100 (97.6 to 100)	98.7 (95.3 to 99.8)	100 (97.7 to 100)	
Day 7 (n=149, 151, 156)	100 (97.6 to 100)	96.7 (92.4 to 98.9)	98.7 (95.5 to 99.8)	
Day 14 (n=148, 149, 154)	95.3 (90.5 to 98.1)	94.0 (88.8 to 97.2)	96.1 (91.7 to 98.6)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 3	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[9]
P-value	= 0.1506 ^[10]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-1.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.7
upper limit	1.2

Notes:

[9] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[10] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting & maintained SpO2 \geq 94% between C19-IG 20% 2 g & placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
----------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 7

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[11]
P-value	= 0.1655 ^[12]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	1.3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.3
upper limit	4.6

Notes:

[11] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[12] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting & maintained SpO₂≥94% between C19-IG 20% 1 g & placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 7

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[13]
P-value	= 0.2337 ^[14]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.5
upper limit	1.7

Notes:

[13] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[14] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting & maintained SpO₂≥94% between C19-IG 20% 2 g & placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 14

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
-------------------	--------------------------

Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[15]
P-value	= 0.7212 ^[16]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-0.8
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.1
upper limit	4.2

Notes:

[15] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[16] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting & maintained SpO₂ ≥ 94% between C19-IG 20% 1 g & placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 14

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[17]
P-value	= 0.3897 ^[18]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-2.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.8
upper limit	3.1

Notes:

[17] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[18] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who remained in an outpatient setting & maintained SpO₂ ≥ 94% between C19-IG 20% 2 g & placebo.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Negative for SARS-CoV-2 by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Test at Multiple Timepoints Through Day 14 and Through Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Negative for SARS-CoV-2 by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Test at Multiple Timepoints Through Day 14 and Through Day 29
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The percentage of subjects with negative SARS-CoV-2 by PCR through Day 14 and Day 29 within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with non-missing test results at the given visit.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Day 3, Day 7, Day 14, and Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)				
Day 3 (n=148, 148, 154)	29.1 (21.9 to 37.1)	30.4 (23.1 to 38.5)	26.0 (19.3 to 33.7)	
Day 7 (n=143, 141, 147)	37.8 (29.8 to 46.3)	44.0 (35.6 to 52.6)	36.1 (28.3 to 44.4)	
Day 14 (n=135, 135, 137)	65.2 (56.5 to 73.2)	74.1 (65.8 to 81.2)	67.2 (58.6 to 74.9)	
Day 29 (n=125, 127, 124)	92.0 (85.8 to 96.1)	89.0 (82.2 to 93.8)	87.1 (79.9 to 92.4)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 3	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[19]
P-value	= 0.5489 ^[20]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	3.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-7.1
upper limit	13.3

Notes:

[19] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[20] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 3	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[21]
P-value	= 0.392 ^[22]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	4.4
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.8
upper limit	14.7

Notes:

[21] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[22] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 7

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[23]
P-value	= 0.7632 ^[24]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	1.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-9.5
upper limit	12.9

Notes:

[23] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[24] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 7

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[25]
P-value	= 0.1702 ^[26]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	7.9

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.6
upper limit	19.2

Notes:

[25] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[26] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 14

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[27]
P-value	= 0.7316 ^[28]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	-2
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-13.3
upper limit	9.4

Notes:

[27] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[28] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 14

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[29]
P-value	= 0.2104 ^[30]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	6.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-4.2
upper limit	18

Notes:

[29] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[30] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 29	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[31]
P-value	= 0.2059 ^[32]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	4.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.9
upper limit	13.2

Notes:

[31] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[32] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 29	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[33]
P-value	= 0.6463 ^[34]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	1.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-6.5
upper limit	10.3

Notes:

[33] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[34] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who had a negative test result between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Time to Negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR From Baseline Through Day 29

End point title	Time to Negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR From Baseline Through Day 29
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The first negative test result was defined as the first PCR negative result after the first PCR positive

result. Kaplan-Meier (KM) method was used for analysis. Subjects who did not have any viral load data or had negative test results through the study were excluded from the KM analysis. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "Subjects analysed" is the subjects who achieved negative test results through Day 29.

End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Baseline to Day 29	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	101	95	112	
Units: days				
median (confidence interval 95%)	14 (14 to 15)	14 (14 to 15)	14 (14 to 15)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	213
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.9033
Method	Logrank

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	207
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority
P-value	= 0.5456
Method	Logrank

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Who Required Oxygen (O2) Supplementation on or Before Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Who Required Oxygen (O2) Supplementation on or Before Day 29
End point description:	
The percentage of subjects requiring oxygen supplementation through Day 29 within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.	
End point type	Secondary

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	2.0 (0.4 to 5.7)	3.9 (1.5 to 8.3)	1.3 (0.2 to 4.6)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[35]
P-value	= 0.6311 ^[36]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.9
upper limit	4.6

Notes:

[35] - 95% CI for percentage difference between each of 1 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[36] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required oxygen supplementation between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[37]
P-value	= 0.1441 ^[38]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	2.6
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.2
upper limit	7.3

Notes:

[37] - 95% CI for percentage difference between each of 2 g C19-IG 20% dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[38] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required oxygen supplementation between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Duration of Any Oxygen Use Through Day 29

End point title	Duration of Any Oxygen Use Through Day 29
End point description:	
The duration (number of days) of any oxygen use from Day 1 through Day 29 was calculated based on the start/stop date of using oxygen supplementation. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "Subjects analysed" is the number of subjects who required oxygen supplementation.	
End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Up to Day 29	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	3	5	2	
Units: days				
median (full range (min-max))	7.0 (6 to 9)	7.0 (2 to 8)	9.5 (4 to 15)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	5
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[39]
P-value	= 0.8555
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.02
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.23
upper limit	0.27

Notes:

[39] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between 1 g C19-IG 20% and placebo was calculated using an ANCOVA model, with number of days on oxygen as dependent variable and treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline characteristics (including age and gender).

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	7
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[40]
P-value	= 0.8108
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.03
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.22
upper limit	0.28

Notes:

[40] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between 2 g C19-IG 20% and placebo was calculated using an ANCOVA model, with number of days on oxygen as dependent variable and treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline characteristics (including age and gender).

Secondary: Absolute Value Score on a 7-point Ordinal Scale

End point title	Absolute Value Score on a 7-point Ordinal Scale
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The ordinal scale is a 7-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 used to measure clinical status of a subject based on the following points: 1) death; 2) hospitalised, on invasive mechanical ventilation or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO); 3) hospitalised, on non-invasive ventilation or high flow oxygen devices; 4) hospitalised, requiring supplemental oxygen; 5) hospitalised, not requiring supplemental oxygen; 6) not hospitalised, limitation on activities; and 7) not hospitalised, no limitations on activities. A higher score indicates less severity. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with data available at the given time point.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Baseline, Day 7, 14, and 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: score on a scale				
arithmetic mean (standard deviation)				
Baseline [n=152, 153, 156]	7.0 (± 0.00)	7.0 (± 0.08)	7.0 (± 0.08)	
Day 7 (n=148, 147, 154)	7.0 (± 0.08)	7.0 (± 0.16)	7.0 (± 0.19)	
Day 14 (n=146, 148, 146)	7.0 (± 0.32)	6.9 (± 0.48)	7.0 (± 0.08)	
Day 29 (n=142, 144, 145)	7.0 (± 0.20)	7.0 (± 0.14)	7.0 (± 0.08)	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Mean Change From Baseline in the 7-point Ordinal Scale

End point title	Mean Change From Baseline in the 7-point Ordinal Scale
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The ordinal scale is a 7-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 used to measure clinical status of a subject based on the following points: 1) death; 2) hospitalised, on invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO; 3) hospitalised, on non-invasive ventilation or high flow oxygen devices; 4) hospitalised, requiring supplemental oxygen; 5) hospitalised, not requiring supplemental oxygen; 6) not hospitalised, limitation on activities; and 7) not hospitalised, no limitations on activities. A higher score indicates less severity. The analysis was performed by using a linear mixed-effects model for repeated measures (MMRM). mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with data available at the given time point.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Day 7, Day 14, and Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: score on a scale				
least squares mean (confidence interval 95%)				
CFB at Day 7 (n=148, 147, 154)	-0.00 (-0.03 to 0.02)	-0.02 (-0.05 to 0.00)	-0.04 (-0.06 to -0.01)	
CFB at Day 14 (n=146, 148, 146)	-0.05 (-0.11 to 0.00)	-0.07 (-0.12 to -0.01)	-0.00 (-0.06 to 0.05)	
CFB at Day 29 (n=142, 144, 145)	-0.04 (-0.06 to -0.01)	-0.02 (-0.04 to 0.01)	-0.00 (-0.03 to 0.03)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 7

Comparison groups	Placebo v C19-IG 20% 1 g
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[41]
P-value	= 0.0692 ^[42]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.03
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	0
upper limit	0.07

Notes:

[41] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[42] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 7	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[43]
P-value	= 0.4956 ^[44]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.02
upper limit	0.05

Notes:

[43] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[44] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[45]
P-value	= 0.22 ^[46]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.05
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.13
upper limit	0.03

Notes:

[45] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[46] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[47]
P-value	= 0.0906 ^[48]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.07
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.14
upper limit	0.01

Notes:

[47] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[48] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 29

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[49]
P-value	= 0.0439 ^[50]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.04
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.07
upper limit	0

Notes:

[49] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[50] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 29

Comparison groups	Placebo v C19-IG 20% 2 g
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[51]
P-value	= 0.4128 ^[52]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.01

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.05
upper limit	0.02

Notes:

[51] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[52] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects in Each Severity Category of the 7-point Ordinal Scale

End point title	Percentage of Subjects in Each Severity Category of the 7-point Ordinal Scale
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The ordinal scale is a 7-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 used to measure clinical status of a subject based on the following points: 1) death; 2) hospitalised, on invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO; 3) hospitalised, on non-invasive ventilation or high flow oxygen devices; 4) hospitalised, requiring supplemental oxygen; 5) hospitalised, not requiring supplemental oxygen; 6) not hospitalised, limitation on activities; and 7) not hospitalised, no limitations on activities. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with data available at the given time point in each treatment group. The percentage values are rounded off to the nearest decimal point.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Days 1, 7, 14, and 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (not applicable)				
Day 1: 1 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 1: 2 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 1: 3 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 1: 4 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 1: 5 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 1: 6 (n=152, 153, 156)	0.0	0.7	0.6	
Day 1: 7 (n=152, 153, 156)	100	99.3	99.4	
Day 7: 1 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 7: 2 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 7: 3 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 7: 4 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 7: 5 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 7: 6 (n=148, 147, 154)	0.7	2.7	3.9	
Day 7: 7 (n=148, 147, 154)	99.3	97.3	96.1	
Day 14: 1 (n=146, 148, 146)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 14: 2 (n=146, 148, 146)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 14: 3 (n=146, 148, 146)	0.0	1.4	0.0	
Day 14: 4 (n=146, 148, 146)	0.7	0.0	0.0	
Day 14: 5 (n=146, 148, 146)	0.7	0.0	0.0	

Day 14: 6 (n=146, 148, 146)	1.4	2.0	0.7	
Day 14: 7 (n=146, 148, 146)	97.3	96.6	99.3	
Day 29: 1 (n=142, 144, 145)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 29: 2 (n=142, 144, 145)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 29: 3 (n=142, 144, 145)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 29: 4 (n=142, 144, 145)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 29: 5 (n=142, 144, 145)	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Day 29: 6 (n=142, 144, 145)	4.2	2.1	0.7	
Day 29: 7 (n=142, 144, 145)	95.8	97.9	99.3	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Change From Baseline in National Early Warning Score (NEWS)

End point title	Change From Baseline in National Early Warning Score (NEWS)
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The NEWS has demonstrated an ability to classify subjects at risk of poor outcomes. This score is based on 7 clinical parameters (respiration rate, oxygen saturation, any supplemental oxygen, temperature, systolic blood pressure (BP), heart rate, level of consciousness [Alert, Voice, Pain, Unresponsive]). A score of 0 to 3 was allocated to each parameter except supplemental oxygen use (score of 0 or 2) and level of consciousness (score of 0 [alert, normal health condition] or 3 [altered mental state/confusion, worst health condition]). All parameter scores were summed to get an aggregate NEWS assessment. Scoring for NEWS ranges from 0 to 20, with higher scores meaning more severity/higher clinical risk: low risk (score 1 to 4); medium risk (score 5 to 6); high risk (score 7 to 20). The analysis is performed by using a linear MMRM. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "n" is the number of subjects with a non-missing NEWS total score at the

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Baseline to Day 7, Day 14, and Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: score on a scale				
least squares mean (confidence interval 95%)				
CFB at Day 7 (n=137, 138, 146)	0.70 (0.50 to 0.90)	0.78 (0.58 to 0.98)	0.70 (0.51 to 0.90)	
CFB at Day 14 (n=132, 134, 138)	0.68 (0.49 to 0.87)	0.65 (0.46 to 0.84)	0.67 (0.48 to 0.86)	
CFB at Day 29 (n=121, 123, 121)	0.61 (0.43 to 0.79)	0.59 (0.40 to 0.77)	0.46 (0.27 to 0.64)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 7	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[53]
P-value	= 0.9713 ^[54]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.28
upper limit	0.27

Notes:

[53] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[54] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 7	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[55]
P-value	= 0.5985 ^[56]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.07
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.2
upper limit	0.35

Notes:

[55] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[56] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[57]
P-value	= 0.9209 ^[58]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.25
upper limit	0.28

Notes:

[57] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[58] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 14	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[59]
P-value	= 0.9181 ^[60]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	-0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.28
upper limit	0.25

Notes:

[59] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[60] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Statistical analysis description:	
Day 29	
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[61]
P-value	= 0.2443 ^[62]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.15

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.11
upper limit	0.41

Notes:

[61] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[62] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
-----------------------------------	----------------------------

Statistical analysis description:

Day 29

Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[63]
P-value	= 0.3233 ^[64]
Method	Kenward-Roger
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.13
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.13
upper limit	0.39

Notes:

[63] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method for calculating the denominator degrees of freedom.

[64] - p-value was calculated using restricted maximum likelihood with the Kenward-Roger method.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Who Required At Least One COVID-19 Related Medically Attended Visit (MAV) for Management/Treatment of COVID-19 Which May Have Occurred in Any Setting Through Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Who Required At Least One COVID-19 Related Medically Attended Visit (MAV) for Management/Treatment of COVID-19 Which May Have Occurred in Any Setting Through Day 29
-----------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

MAV for management/treatment of COVID-19 may have occurred in any setting e.g., emergency department, urgent care, outpatient clinic, or professional setting wherein direct in-person/telemedicine medical assessment and escalation of care for COVID-19 was provided by licensed healthcare personnel. The percentage of subjects requiring at least one COVID-19-related MAV for management/treatment of COVID-19 (apart from routinely scheduled study-directed visits) within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	17.1 (11.5 to 24.0)	19.0 (13.1 to 26.1)	14.1 (9.1 to 20.6)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[65]
P-value	= 0.4676 ^[66]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	3
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-5.3
upper limit	11.5

Notes:

[65] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[66] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required at least 1 COVID-19 related MAV between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[67]
P-value	= 0.2507 ^[68]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	4.9
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.6
upper limit	13.4

Notes:

[67] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[68] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required at least 1 COVID-19 related MAV between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Who Required Hospital Admission for Medical Care (Non-Quarantine Purposes) Through Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Who Required Hospital Admission for Medical Care (Non-Quarantine Purposes) Through Day 29
-----------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The percentage of subjects requiring hospital admission through Day 29 within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	2.0 (0.4 to 5.7)	4.6 (1.9 to 9.2)	1.9 (0.4 to 5.5)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[69]
P-value	= 0.9744 ^[70]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.1
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.8
upper limit	4

Notes:

[69] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[70] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required hospital admission between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo

Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[71]
P-value	= 0.1878 ^[72]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	2.7
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-1.6
upper limit	7.5

Notes:

[71] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[72] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required hospital admission between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Duration of Hospital Stay Through Day 29

End point title	Duration of Hospital Stay Through Day 29
End point description:	The duration (number of days) of hospitalisation from post-randomisation through Day 29 was calculated based on hospital admission and discharge dates recorded. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "Subjects analysed" is the number of subjects who were hospitalised.
End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	3	7	3	
Units: days				
median (full range (min-max))	9.0 (6 to 18)	10.0 (3 to 15)	9.0 (8 to 15)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	6
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[73]
P-value	= 0.9485
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.01

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.38
upper limit	0.4

Notes:

[73] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using ANCOVA model, including length of hospital stay as dependent variable & treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	10
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[74]
P-value	= 0.4734
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.14
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.25
upper limit	0.54

Notes:

[74] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using ANCOVA model, including length of hospital stay as dependent variable & treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Who Required Intensive Care Unit (ICU) Admission or Initiation of ICU Level Care Through Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Who Required Intensive Care Unit (ICU) Admission or Initiation of ICU Level Care Through Day 29
-----------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The percentage of subjects requiring ICU admission through Day 29 within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. ICU level care is defined as the medical need for intensive or invasive monitoring; the immediate or impending need for the support of the airway, breathing, or circulation; and/or stabilisation of acute severe, or life-threatening complications of COVID-19. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	0.66 (0.02 to 3.61)	0.65 (0.02 to 3.59)	0.64 (0.02 to 3.52)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	Placebo v C19-IG 20% 1 g
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[75]
P-value	= 0.9853 ^[76]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.02
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.05
upper limit	3.12

Notes:

[75] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[76] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required ICU admission between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	Placebo v C19-IG 20% 2 g
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[77]
P-value	= 0.989 ^[78]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.99
upper limit	3.07

Notes:

[77] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[78] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects who required ICU admission between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Duration of ICU Stay Through Day 29

End point title	Duration of ICU Stay Through Day 29
-----------------	-------------------------------------

End point description:

The duration (number of days) of ICU stay from post-randomisation through Day 29 was calculated

based on ICU admission and discharge dates recorded. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "Subjects analysed" is the number of subjects who were admitted to the ICU.

End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Up to Day 29	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	1	1	1	
Units: days				
median (full range (min-max))	7.0 (7 to 7)	5.0 (5 to 5)	3.0 (3 to 3)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	2
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[79]
P-value	= 0.578
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.03
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.07
upper limit	0.12

Notes:

[79] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using ANCOVA model, including length of hospital stay as dependent variable & treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	2
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[80]
P-value	= 0.9065
Method	ANCOVA
Parameter estimate	LS mean difference
Point estimate	0.01

Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-0.09
upper limit	0.1

Notes:

[80] - 95% CI for difference in LS mean between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using ANCOVA model, including length of hospital stay as dependent variable & treatment group as fixed effect, adjusting for baseline.

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation Through Day 29

End point title	Percentage of Subjects Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation Through Day 29
-----------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The percentage of subjects requiring invasive mechanical ventilation through Day 29 within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (not applicable)	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Duration of Invasive Mechanical Ventilation Through Day 29

End point title	Duration of Invasive Mechanical Ventilation Through Day 29
-----------------	------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

The duration (number of days) on invasive mechanical ventilation from post randomisation through Day 29 was calculated based on the start/stop dates of invasive mechanical ventilation. No subjects required mechanical ventilation throughout the study duration.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	0 ^[81]	0 ^[82]	0 ^[83]	
Units: days				
median (confidence interval 95%)	(to)	(to)	(to)	

Notes:

[81] - "Subjects analysed" is 0 as no subjects required invasive mechanical ventilation.

[82] - "Subjects analysed" is 0 as no subjects required invasive mechanical ventilation.

[83] - "Subjects analysed" is 0 as no subjects required invasive mechanical ventilation.

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: All-Cause Mortality Through Day 29

End point title	All-Cause Mortality Through Day 29
End point description:	
All-cause mortality rate is the percentage of subjects in each treatment group who experienced mortality up to Day 29. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.	
End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Up to Day 29	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (not applicable)	0	0	0	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Percentage of Subjects With Critical COVID-19 Illness

End point title	Percentage of Subjects With Critical COVID-19 Illness
End point description:	
Critical COVID-19 illness was defined as any one of the following: (a) requiring ICU admission or ICU level of care, (b) invasive mechanical ventilation, or (c) resulting in death by Day 29. The percentage of subjects with critical COVID-19 illness defined above within each treatment group was presented along with a two-sided exact (Clopper-Pearson) 95% CI. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed.	
End point type	Secondary
End point timeframe:	
Up to Day 29	

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	152	153	156	
Units: percentage of subjects				
number (confidence interval 95%)	0.66 (0.02 to 3.61)	0.65 (0.02 to 3.59)	0.64 (0.02 to 3.52)	

Statistical analyses

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 1 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 1 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	308
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[84]
P-value	= 0.9853 ^[85]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.02
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-3.05
upper limit	3.12

Notes:

[84] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[85] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects with critical COVID-19 illness between C19-IG 20% 1 g dose group and placebo.

Statistical analysis title	C19-IG 20% 2 g vs. Placebo
Comparison groups	C19-IG 20% 2 g v Placebo
Number of subjects included in analysis	309
Analysis specification	Pre-specified
Analysis type	superiority ^[86]
P-value	= 0.989 ^[87]
Method	Chi-squared
Parameter estimate	Difference in percentage
Point estimate	0.01
Confidence interval	
level	95 %
sides	2-sided
lower limit	-2.99
upper limit	3.07

Notes:

[86] - 95% CI for percentage difference between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo was calculated using the exact unconditional method.

[87] - p-value was calculated using Chi-square test with 5% level of significance to test the null hypothesis of no difference in the percentage of subjects with critical COVID-19 illness between C19-IG 20% 2 g dose group and placebo.

Secondary: Length of Time to Clinical Progression to Critical COVID-19 Illness Through Day 29

End point title	Length of Time to Clinical Progression to Critical COVID-19 Illness Through Day 29
-----------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

End point description:

Length of time to clinical progression to critical COVID-19 illness was defined as the time to death, invasive mechanical ventilation, or ICU admission/requiring ICU level of care. ICU level care is defined as the medical need for intensive or invasive monitoring; the immediate or impending need for the support of the airway, breathing, or circulation; and/or stabilisation of acute severe, or life-threatening complications of COVID-19. The time to clinical progression was estimated using the KM method. mITT population included the subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. Here, "Subjects analysed" is the subjects who had clinical progression through Day 29. Subjects who did not meet the criteria for clinical progression were right censored as of the date of last subject's contact on or prior to Day 29. "99999" indicates that the median and 95% CI were not estimable due to insufficient number of subjects with the events.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 29

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	1	1	1	
Units: days				
median (confidence interval 95%)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Secondary: Time to COVID-19 Symptoms Through Day 14

End point title	Time to COVID-19 Symptoms Through Day 14
-----------------	------------------------------------------

End point description:

Subjects were symptomatic if they a. experienced at least two of the following systemic symptoms: fever ($\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$), chills, myalgia, headache, sore throat, cough, fatigue that interferes with activities of daily living, new olfactory/taste disorder(s), and vomiting/diarrhoea; b. experienced at least one of following respiratory signs/symptoms: new or worsening shortness of breath or difficulty breathing; c. experienced peripheral oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry (SpO_2) $< 94\%$ on room air; or d. had radiographical evidence of pneumonia. Time to COVID-19 symptoms was time from study drug administration to first time point when any of above elements was fulfilled through Day 14. Time to COVID-19 symptoms was estimated using KM method. mITT population included subset of ITT subjects who were also dosed. "Subjects analysed" is number of subjects who experienced symptoms through Day 14. "99999" indicates that median and 95% CI were not estimable due to insufficient number of subjects with the events.

End point type	Secondary
----------------	-----------

End point timeframe:

Up to Day 14

End point values	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo	
Subject group type	Reporting group	Reporting group	Reporting group	
Number of subjects analysed	61	54	57	
Units: days				
median (confidence interval 95%)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	99999 (99999 to 99999)	

Statistical analyses

No statistical analyses for this end point

Adverse events

Adverse events information

Timeframe for reporting adverse events:

From start of the study up to end of study (up to Day 60)

Adverse event reporting additional description:

Safety population included all subjects who received any amount of C19-IG 20%/Placebo.

Assessment type	Systematic
-----------------	------------

Dictionary used

Dictionary name	MedDRA
-----------------	--------

Dictionary version	23.0
--------------------	------

Reporting groups

Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 1 g
-----------------------	----------------

Reporting group description:

Subjects received 1 g of C19-IG 20% SC infusion containing one syringe of 5 mL C19-IG 20% plus one syringe of 5 mL sterile 0.9% NaCl on Day 1.

Reporting group title	C19-IG 20% 2 g
-----------------------	----------------

Reporting group description:

Subjects received 2 g of C19-IG 20% SC infusion containing two syringes 5 mL each of C19-IG 20% on Day 1.

Reporting group title	Placebo
-----------------------	---------

Reporting group description:

Subjects received C19-IG 20% matching placebo as SC infusion containing two syringes of 5 mL each sterile 0.9% NaCl injection on Day 1.

Serious adverse events	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo
Total subjects affected by serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	3 / 152 (1.97%)	7 / 153 (4.58%)	3 / 156 (1.92%)
number of deaths (all causes)	0	0	0
number of deaths resulting from adverse events	0	0	0
Infections and infestations			
COVID-19 pneumonia			
subjects affected / exposed	3 / 152 (1.97%)	7 / 153 (4.58%)	1 / 156 (0.64%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 3	0 / 7	0 / 1
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Pneumonia			
subjects affected / exposed	0 / 152 (0.00%)	0 / 153 (0.00%)	2 / 156 (1.28%)
occurrences causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 2
deaths causally related to treatment / all	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0

Frequency threshold for reporting non-serious adverse events: 5 %

Non-serious adverse events	C19-IG 20% 1 g	C19-IG 20% 2 g	Placebo
Total subjects affected by non-serious adverse events			
subjects affected / exposed	10 / 152 (6.58%)	8 / 153 (5.23%)	5 / 156 (3.21%)
Investigations			
Alanine aminotransferase increased			
subjects affected / exposed	10 / 152 (6.58%)	8 / 153 (5.23%)	5 / 156 (3.21%)
occurrences (all)	10	8	5

More information

Substantial protocol amendments (globally)

Were there any global substantial amendments to the protocol? Yes

Date	Amendment
05 March 2021	The purpose of the amendment was: 1. Radiographical studies were to be done for suspicion of pneumonia (they were previously optional). 2. The new exploratory objective added to include an overall assessment of COVID-19 symptoms severity on Day 7 and Day 29. 3. The Calculated Risk score was globally removed. It was considered better to perform subgroup analysis of known comorbidities affecting COVID-19 disease severity. 4. An independent data safety monitoring board (DSMB) review of interim safety data was added to occur when approximately 399 subjects had been randomised and treated with follow-up through Day 29 (approximately 133 subjects per randomised group). 5. New text was added delineating guidance for subsequent (post study) COVID-19 vaccine administrations and new subgroup analyses were added for comorbidities of special interest.
27 April 2021	The purpose of the amendment was to expand the recruitment age window to 30 years of age and older in order to facilitate enrollment and potentially benefit broader age range of SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals.
28 June 2021	The purpose of the amendment was to expand the recruitment age window to 18 years of age and older in order to facilitate enrollment and potentially benefit broader age range of SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals.
13 October 2021	The purpose of the amendment was: 1. To add a new secondary efficacy endpoint for time to COVID-19 symptoms based on a priori case definition. 2. Addition of an interim futility analysis which was to be conducted to provide guidance in the setting of dynamic changes within the context of an evolving epidemic.

Notes:

Interruptions (globally)

Were there any global interruptions to the trial? Yes

Date	Interruption	Restart date
27 December 2021	The study was terminated for futility.	-

Notes:

Limitations and caveats

None reported