Remdesivir Reduces Mortality in Immunocompromised Patients Hospitalised for COVID-19 **During Omicron**

Essy Mozaffari¹, Aastha Chandak², Robert L Gottlieb^{3,4,5,6}, Chidinma Chima-Melton⁷, Mark Berry¹, Alpesh N Amin⁸, Tobias Welte⁹, Paul E Sax¹⁰, Andre C Kalil¹¹

¹Gilead Sciences, Foster City, CA; ²Certara, New York, NY; ³Baylor Scott & White Heart and Vascular Hospital, Dallas, TX, USA; ⁵Baylor Scott & White The Heart Hospital, Plano, TX, USA; ⁴Baylor Scott & White The Heart Hospital, Plano, TX, USA; ⁴Baylor Scott & White The Heart Hospital, Plano, TX, USA; ⁴Baylor Scott & White Heart Hospital, Plano, TX, USA; ⁴Baylor Scott & White The Heart Hospital, Plano, TX, W ⁶Baylor Scott & White Research Institute, Dallas, TX, USA; ⁹Medizinische Hochschule Hannover, Hannover, Germany; ¹⁰Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA; ¹¹University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA

Conclusions

- > RDV demonstrating significant mortality continues immunocompromised reduction among patients hospitalized with a primary diagnosis of COVID-19 in the recent Omicron period, irrespective of the more supplemental oxygen requirements
- \succ These consistent findings through the Omicron period provides additional evidence to prior research showing benefit for RDV across all pre-dominant variants from December 2020 to April 2022¹³
- \succ In this study cohort of vulnerable patients with immunocompromised conditions, RDV remains an optimal therapy of choice

Background

- Remdesivir (RDV) reduced time to recovery and improved clinical outcomes for COVID-19 patients in several randomized controlled trials;¹⁻² with additional evidence on effectiveness through real-world studies³⁻⁵
- NIH, IDSA and WHO guidelines recommend RDV to be initiated within seven days of symptom onset in patients with high-risk for progression to severe disease, including immunocompromised patients⁶⁻⁸
- Immunocompromised patients remain at high risk of hospitalizations, complications, and mortality due to COVID-19⁹⁻¹²
- Prior research has documented the effectiveness of RDV in reducing mortality among immunocompromised patients hospitalized for COVID-**19**¹³
- Building upon prior research with more recent data, the objective of this study was to compare inpatient all-cause mortality in patients who were administered RDV in the first two days of hospitalization vs. those not administered RDV during the hospitalization during Omicron predominant era (Dec 2021 – Apr 2023)

References

1. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(19):1813-1826. 2. Spinner CD, Gottlieb RL, Criner GJ, et al. JAMA. 2020;324(11):1048-1057. 3. Mozaffari E, et al. Clinical Infectious Diseases, Volume 75, Issue 1, 1 July 2022, Pages e450–e458, 4. Chokkalingam AP, Hayden J, Goldman JD, et al. JAMA Netw Open. 2022;5(12):e2244505. 5. Garibaldi BT, Wang K, Robinson ML, et al. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(3):e213071. 6. Bhimraj A, Morgan RL, Shumaker AH, Baden L, Cheng VC, Edwards KM, Gallagher JC, Gandhi RT, Muller WJ, Nakamura MM, O'Horo JC, Shafer RW, Shoham S, Murad MH, Mustafa RA, Sultan S, Falck-Ytter Y. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19. Infectious Diseases Society of America 2023; Version 11.0.0. Available at https://www.idsociety.org/practiceguideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/. Accessed 9 February 2024. 7. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/. Accessed 9 February 2024. 8. Therapeutics and COVID-19: living guideline, 13 January 2023. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023 (WHO /2019nCoV/therapeutics/2023.1). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. 9. Ao G, et al. Transplant Rev (Orlando). 2021 Jul;35(3):100628. 10. MacKenna B, Kennedy NA, Mehrkar A, et al. Lancet Rheumatol. 2022;4(7):e490-e506. 11. Song Q, Bates B, Shao YR, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2022;40(13):1414-1427. 12. Abi Vijenthira et al. Blood 2020; 136 (25): 2881–2892 **13.** Mozaffari E, Chandak A, Gottlieb RL, et al. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2023;77(12):1626-1634.

Disclosures: **EM**, **MB**: employee and shareholder (Gilead Sciences, Inc.); **AC**: employee of Certara (contracted by Gilead Sciences, Inc. to conduct the study); **RLG**: advisor (AbbVie, Gilead Sciences, Inc., Eli Lilly, Roche, Johnson & Johnson), consultant (Eli Lilly, Gilead Sciences, Inc., Johnson & Johnson , Kinevant Sciences, Roche), de minimis investment (AbCellera), research contracts (Eli Lilly, Gilead Sciences, Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer), speaker's bureau (Pfizer); **CCM**: advisor (AstraZeneca, Gilead Sciences, Inc.), speaker's bureau (AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim), consultant (Gilead Sciences, Inc.); ANA: principal investigator or coinvestigator (clinical trials sponsored by NIH/NIAID, NeuroRx Pharma, Pulmotect, Blade Therapeutics, Novartis, Takeda, Humanigen, Eli Lilly, PTC Therapeutics, OctaPharma, Fulcrum Therapeutics, Alexion), speaker and/or consultant (Pfizer, Salix, Alexion, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Ferring, Seres, Spero, Eli Lilly, Nova Nordisk, Gilead, Renibus, GSK, Dexcom, Reprieve, HeartRite, Aseptiscope)- these relationships are unrelated to the current work; **TW**: received grants (DFG, BMBF, EU, WHO), fees for lectures (AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biontech, Boehringer, Berlin Chemie GSK, MSD, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi Aventis), served on Advisory Boards (AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer, GSK, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi Aventis); PES: study investigator (Gilead Sciences, ViiV), advisor or review panel member (Gilead Sciences, ViiV, Janssen, Merck)-all of these relationships are unrelated to COVID-19; ACK: investigator (National Institutes of Health Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial).

Data source Healthcare D — US hospi Medicaid — Covers ~	Effectiveness Retrospective cohort study (Table 1) PINC AI Healthcare Database (formerly Premier Database) tal-based, service-level, all-payer (Commercial, Medicare, , others) database 25% of all US hospitalizations from 48 states information on billed services for each day of
Table 1. S	tudy design
Inclusion criteria	 ✓ First admission to the hospital Dec 1, 2021-Apr 30, 2023 ✓ Age ≥18 years old ✓ <i>Primary</i> discharge diagnosis of COVID-19 (ICD-10 CM: U07.1) flagged for being "present-on-admission" ✓ Diagnosed with an immunocompromised condition: cancer, transplant, hematologic malignancies, immunosuppressive medications, toxic effects of antineoplastics, primary immunodeficiencies, severe combined immunodeficiencies, asplenia, bone marrow failure/aplastic anaemia, or HIV
Exclusion criteria	 Pregnant Had incomplete/erroneous data fields Transferred from another hospital or hospice Transferred to another hospital Admitted for elective procedures Discharged or died during the baseline period (first two days of hospitalization)
Treatment	RDVNon-RDVRDV treatment within 2Patients not receiving RDVdays of admissionduring the hospitalization

(defined as a discharge status of "expired" or "hospice")

Statistical analysis

- Analyses were stratified by no supplemental oxygen charges (NSOc) and any supplemental oxygen requirements upon admission
- Propensity scores (PS) were estimated using separate logistic regression models for NSOc / any supplemental oxygenation at baseline
- Covariates used in PS calculation: baseline demographics (age, gender, race, ethnicity, primary payor), comorbidities (obesity, COPD, diabetes mellitus, renal disease, cardiovascular disease, cancer, immunocompromised condition), hospital characteristics (bed size, urban/rural, teaching, region of the hospital), admission month, admission from skilled nursing facility (SNF), intensive care unit (ICU)/General ward at baseline, other indicators of severity based on admit diagnoses (respiratory failure, hypoxemia, sepsis, pneumonia), concomitant medications at baseline (corticosteroids, convalescent plasma, anticoagulants, tocilizumab, baricitinib)
- Cox Proportional Hazards Model (adjusting for hospital-level random effects and key clinical covariates) was used to examine time to 14- and 28-day mortality overall
- Patients who did not have the outcome of interest or were discharged alive were censored at 14 and 28 days in the analyses

The 31st Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI), March 3-6, 2024, Denver, CO, USA

esults

udy population

After applying inclusion/exclusion criteria, 26,770 patients were included in the analysis:

- 15,257 patients were treated with RDV in the first two days of hospitalization and
- 11,513 patients were not treated with RDV
- After 1:1 matching with replacement:

- 10,687 RDV-treated patients were matched to 4,989 unique non-RDV patients (equivalent to 10,687 non-RDV patients based on matching with replacement)

Post-matching balance was achieved across groups with different baseline supplemental oxygen and VOC periods with all covariates with a standardized difference absolute value of <0.15

In the matched cohort: 74% were 65 years or older, 49% with NSOc, and 51% with any supplemental oxygen charges at baseline (Table 2)

nadjusted analysis (PS-matched cohort)

During Dec 2021 – Apr2023, a lower mortality rate was consistently observed overall and by supplemental oxygen requirements in the overall study period:

	28-day mortality		14-day mortality		
	RDV	Non-RDV	RDV	Non-RDV	
Omicron period	10.3%	13.7%	15.0%	19.2%	
NSOc	7.0%	9.9%	10.7%	17.3%	
Any Supp. O2	13.5%	17.3%	19.7%	24.5%	

Note: RDV, remdesivir, NSOc, no supplementary oxygen charges

After adjusting for baseline and clinical covariates, RDV was associated with a significantly lower mortality risk compared to non-RDV overall (adjusted hazard ratio [95% CI]: 0.75 [0.68-0.83]) in patients with NSOc (0.72 [0.61-0.85]) and in patients with any supplemental oxygen requirement (0.77[0.68-0.87]) at 28 days

A similar benefit for RDV vs. non-RDV was observed for 14-day mortality overall (0.73 [0.65-0.82]) in patients with NSOc (0.69 [0.57-0.83]) and in patients with any supplemental oxygen requirement (0.75 [0.65-0.86]) (Figure 1)

igure 1. 14- and 28- day mortality for RDV vs. Non-RDV immunocompromised patients with COVID-19 during **Omicron period (adjusted Cox Proportional Hazards model)**

	Ν		aHR [95% CI]	P value
14-day mortality				
Omicron	21,374	⊢−−−− −	0.73 [0.65 - 0.82]	<.0001
NSOc	10,442	·i	0.69 [0.57 - 0.83]	<.0001
Any Supp. O2	10,932	ب ا	0.75 [0.65 - 0.86]	<.0001
28-day mortality				
Omicron	21,374	⊢−−−− I	0.75 [0.68 - 0.83]	<.0001
NSOc	10,442	⊢−−−−− 1	0.72 [0.61 - 0.85]	<.0001
Any Supp. O2	10,932	⊢−−−− 1	0.77 [0.68 - 0.87]	<.0001
	0.4	0.6 0.8	1 1.2	
	1	Favors RDV	Favors Non-RDV	

Immunocompromised conditions: cancer, transplant, hematologic malignancies, immunosuppressive medications, toxic effects of antineoplastics, primary immunodeficiencies, severe combined immunodeficiencies, asplenia, bone marrow failure/aplastic anemia, or HIV

aHR=adjusted hazard ratio; Any Supp. O2= low-flow oxygen, high-flow oxygen/non-invasive ventilation and invasive mechanical ventilation/extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; CI=confidence interval; NSOc=no supplemental oxygen charges; RDV=remdesivir

12	b	le	2

Age group

Gender

Race

Ethnicity

Primary pa

Bed size

Comorbidi

Hospital w upon adm

Other trea at baseline

Baseline oxygenatio

Note: Baseline was assessed as the worst status in the first two days of the hospitalization ICU: Intermediate Care Unit; COPD: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disorder; NSOc: No supplementary oxygen charges; LFO: Low-Flow Oxygen; HFO/NIV: High-Flow Oxygen/Non-invasive ventilation; IMV/ECMO: Invasive Mechanical Ventilation/ Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation; RDV, remdesivir1



		Unmatch	ed cohort	Matchee	d cohort
		No RDV	RDV	No RDV	RDV
		n= 11,513	n= 15,257	n= 10,687	n= 10,687
	18-49	7.4%	7.8%	5.4%	5.4%
	50-64	21.3%	22.7%	20.8%	20.8%
	65+	71.2%	69.5%	73.9%	73.9%
	Female	49.9%	51.1%	52.0%	50.9%
	White	74.8%	75.8%	78.0%	76.6%
	Black	17.0%	14.4%	13.7%	14.6%
	Asian	1.5%	2.2%	1.7%	1.9%
	Other	6.7%	7.6%	6.6%	6.9%
	Hispanic	8.5%	11.4%	9.7%	9.7%
	Non-Hispanic	83.7%	82.7%	83.9%	84.0%
	Unknown	7.8%	5.9%	6.4%	6.4%
	Commercial	13.1%	15.3%	13.8%	76.1%
	Medicare	75.3%	73.0%	75.7%	7.0%
yor	Medicaid	7.8%	8.4%	7.2%	3.2%
	Other	3.8%	3.4%	3.4%	76.1%
	<100	6.6%	6.4%	6.1%	6.0%
	100-199	14.8%	15.5%	14.8%	14.9%
	200-299	20.4%	18.6%	18.6%	19.4%
	300-399	19.7%	16.2%	18.4%	17.6%
	400-499	11.6%	10.4%	10.5%	10.4%
	500+	26.8%	32.9%	31.7%	31.7%
	Obesity	24.1%	26.0%	26.7%	26.4%
	COPD	36.2%	41.2%	41.3%	41.0%
	Cardiovascular disease	89.6%	87.8%	88.4%	89.6%
ies	Diabetes mellitus	39.1%	37.4%	38.0%	38.1%
	Renal disease	40.7%	30.8%	32.4%	32.8%
	Cancer	42.0%	42.2%	42.0%	43.2%
ard	General Ward	83.4%	81.1%	82.7%	82.1%
ssion	ICU	16.6%	18.9%	17.3%	17.9%
	Anticoagulants	66.7%	74.7%	74.3%	75.0%
tments e	Corticosteroids	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
	Convalescent plasma	69.2%	86.8%	88.1%	88.1%
	Tocilizumab	4.2%	4.3%	6.2%	5.1%
	Baricitinib	2.4%	3.8%	3.8%	3.9%
on	NSOc	56.8%	49.1%	48.9%	48.9%
	LFO	26.4%	30.6%	31.0%	31.0%
	HFO/NIV	13.7%	18.0%	18.5%	18.5%
••	IMV/ECMO	3.2%	2.2%	1.6%	1.6%