

# **ASCOT Statistical Analysis Report**

James Totterdell

Rob Mahar

2022-12-15

# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>18</b>
1.1	Purpose . . . . .	18
1.2	Interventions . . . . .	18
1.3	Outcomes . . . . .	19
1.4	Modelling . . . . .	19
1.4.1	General Considerations . . . . .	19
1.4.2	Further Details . . . . .	21
1.5	Trial Decision Criteria . . . . .	23
<b>2</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>24</b>
2.1	Study Population . . . . .	24
2.1.1	Summary . . . . .	24
2.1.2	Analysis Sets . . . . .	24
2.1.2.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	25
2.1.2.2	ACS-ITT . . . . .	26
2.1.2.3	AVS-ITT . . . . .	26
2.1.2.4	FAS-PP . . . . .	27
2.1.2.5	ACS-PP . . . . .	27
2.1.2.6	AVS-PP . . . . .	28
2.1.3	Disposition . . . . .	29
2.1.4	Intervention Allocations . . . . .	29
2.1.5	Compliance . . . . .	36
2.1.6	Baseline Characteristics . . . . .	39
2.1.6.1	Demographics . . . . .	39
2.1.6.2	Co-morbidities . . . . .	43
2.1.6.3	Prognostics . . . . .	45
2.1.6.4	Overall Summary . . . . .	50
2.1.7	Discharge Summaries . . . . .	51
2.1.7.1	Drugs Received During Hospital Stay . . . . .	51
2.2	Primary Outcome . . . . .	53
2.2.1	Descriptive . . . . .	53
2.2.2	Primary Analysis . . . . .	57
2.2.2.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	57
2.2.2.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	60
2.2.2.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	62

2.2.2.4	FAS-PP . . . . .	65
2.2.2.5	AVS-PP . . . . .	67
2.2.2.6	ACS-PP . . . . .	69
2.2.3	Sensitivity Analyses . . . . .	70
2.2.3.1	AVS-ITT Treatment Only (Post-hoc) . . . . .	70
2.2.3.2	FAS-ITT “Best-case” scenario . . . . .	71
2.2.3.3	FAS-ITT “Worst-case” scenario . . . . .	73
2.2.3.4	Temporal Variation . . . . .	75
2.2.4	Subgroups . . . . .	76
2.2.4.1	Region . . . . .	77
2.2.4.2	Age group . . . . .	79
2.2.4.3	Days since symptom onset . . . . .	82
2.2.4.4	Oxygen requirement . . . . .	85
2.2.4.5	Receipt of Corticosteroids . . . . .	88
2.2.4.6	Receipt of Remdesivir . . . . .	90
2.2.4.7	Receipt of other antiviral agent . . . . .	91
2.2.4.8	Vaccination Status . . . . .	93
2.2.4.9	Iatrogenic immunosuppression . . . . .	96
2.2.4.10	D-Dimer . . . . .	97
2.3	Secondary Outcomes . . . . .	98
2.3.1	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 . . . . .	98
2.3.1.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	99
2.3.1.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	105
2.3.1.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	107
2.3.2	WHO 8-point ordinal outcome scale at day 28 . . . . .	112
2.3.2.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	113
2.3.2.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	117
2.3.2.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	119
2.3.3	All-cause mortality to day 28 . . . . .	122
2.3.3.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	123
2.3.3.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	125
2.3.3.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	126
2.3.4	Days alive and free of hospital to day 28 . . . . .	128
2.3.4.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	130
2.3.4.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	134
2.3.4.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	136
2.3.5	Days alive and free of invasive or non-invasive ventilation to day 28 . . . . .	138
2.3.5.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	140
2.3.5.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	144
2.3.5.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	146
2.3.6	Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 . . . . .	148
2.3.6.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	149
2.3.6.2	AVS-ITT . . . . .	151

2.3.6.3	ACS-ITT . . . . .	152
2.3.7	Modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) breathlessness scale at day 28 . . . . .	154
2.3.7.1	FAS-ITT . . . . .	155
2.3.8	Quality of life as measured by EQ-5D-5L questionnaire at day 28 . . . .	158
2.4	Domain Specific Outcomes . . . . .	161
2.4.1	Antiviral Domain . . . . .	161
2.4.1.1	Viral Clearance . . . . .	162
2.4.1.2	Viral Load . . . . .	163
2.4.1.3	Elevation of Alanine Transaminase (ALT) or Aspartate Transaminase (AST) . . . . .	165
2.4.1.4	Serum Potassium . . . . .	168
2.4.1.5	Serum Sodium . . . . .	171
2.4.1.6	Bleeding Events . . . . .	173
2.4.1.7	Thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site . . . . .	176
2.5	Safety Listings . . . . .	177
2.5.1	SAEs . . . . .	177
2.5.2	SARs . . . . .	177
<b>3</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>178</b>
3.1	Outcomes by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	178
3.1.1	Primary Outcome by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	178
3.1.2	Time to recovery to day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	182
3.1.3	WHO outcome scale at day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	186
3.1.4	Mortality to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	189
3.1.5	Days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)	192
3.1.6	Days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)	195
3.1.7	Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	198
3.1.8	Modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) breathlessness scale at day 28 (FAS-ITT) . . . . .	201
3.2	Primary Model Posterior Predictive Summaries . . . . .	205
3.2.1	Primary Outcome . . . . .	205
3.2.2	WHO outcome scale at day 28 . . . . .	206
3.2.3	Mortality to day 28 . . . . .	207
3.2.4	Days alive and free of hospital to day 28 . . . . .	208
3.2.5	Days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 . . . . .	210
3.2.6	Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 . . . . .	212
3.2.7	mMRC Breathlessness Scale . . . . .	213

## List of Figures

2.1	Combined domain flowchart for anticoagulation. . . . .	30
2.2	Combined domain flowchart for antiviral. . . . .	31
2.3	Overall enrolment to the study by domain with intervention availability. Vertical dashed lines indicate timing of interim analyses. . . . .	32
2.4	Intervention allocations by calendar time (month) for anticoagulation domain. . . . .	33
2.5	Intervention allocations by calendar time (month) for antiviral domain (excludes India as antiviral domain not available). . . . .	33
2.6	Intervention allocations by study site for anticoagulation domain. . . . .	34
2.7	Intervention allocations by study site for antiviral domain. . . . .	35
2.8	Distribution of Nafamostat infusion duration by study day (1 to 8) amongst participants assigned to Nafamostat. . . . .	36
2.9	Distribution of age amongst participants randomised in the trial. . . . .	39
2.10	Distribution of age amongst participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain. . . . .	40
2.11	Distribution of age amongst participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	40
2.12	Days between events for hospitalisation, randomisation, symptom onset, and first positive test. . . . .	49
2.13	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	58
2.14	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	59
2.15	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	61
2.16	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	63
2.17	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	64
2.18	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-PP . . . . .	66
2.19	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-PP . . . . .	68
2.20	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-PP . . . . .	69
2.21	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	70
2.22	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome. . . . .	71
2.23	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome. . . . .	72

2.24	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome. . . . .	73
2.25	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome. . . . .	74
2.26	Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by age subgroup using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	80
2.27	Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by age subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions. . . . .	81
2.28	Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by days since first symptoms subgroup using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	83
2.29	Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by days since first symptoms subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions. . . . .	84
2.30	Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by supplemental oxygen subgroup using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	86
2.31	Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by supplemental oxygen subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions, black points posterior-predictive medians. . . . .	87
2.32	Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by receipt of steroids subgroup using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	89
2.33	Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by receipt of other antiviral subgroup using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	92
2.34	Posterior densities of odds ratio for anticoagulation interventions relative to standard dose by patient vaccination status at baseline using FAS-ITT set. . . . .	95
2.35	Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT. . . . .	100
2.36	Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT. . . . .	100
2.37	Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, FAS-ITT. . . . .	102
2.38	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on recovery to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	103
2.39	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on death to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	104
2.40	Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, anticoagulation domain, AVS-ITT. . . . .	105
2.41	Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, AVS-ITT. . . . .	106
2.42	Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, antiviral domain, ACS-ITT. . . . .	107
2.43	Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, ACS-ITT. . . . .	109

2.44	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on recovery to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	110
2.45	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on death to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	111
2.46	Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	113
2.47	Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	114
2.48	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	115
2.49	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on WHO outcome scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	116
2.50	Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	117
2.51	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	118
2.52	Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	119
2.53	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	120
2.54	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on WHO outcome scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	121
2.55	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	123
2.56	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 mortality for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	124
2.57	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	125
2.58	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	126
2.59	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 mortality for the primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	127
2.60	Observed overall distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28, FAS-ITT.	128
2.61	Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	130
2.62	Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	131
2.63	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	132
2.64	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on days alive and free of hospital to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	133
2.65	Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	134

2.66	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	135
2.67	Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	136
2.68	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	137
2.69	Observed overall distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28, FAS-ITT.	138
2.70	Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	140
2.71	Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	141
2.72	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	142
2.73	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	143
2.74	Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	144
2.75	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	145
2.76	Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	146
2.77	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	147
2.78	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	149
2.79	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 shortness of breath for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	150
2.80	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT. . . . .	151
2.81	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT. . . . .	152
2.82	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 shortness of breath for the primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	153
2.83	Observed distribution of mMRC breathlessness scale (mMRCbs) at day 28 by treatment group, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT. . . . .	155
2.84	Observed distribution of mMRC breathlessness scale (mMRCbs) at day 28 by treatment group, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT. . . . .	156
2.85	Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT. . . . .	156
2.86	Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on mMRC breathlessness scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	157
2.87	Cycle threshold values days 1 to 7. Line segments join values measured on the same individual. . . . .	164
3.1	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age. . . . .	178
3.2	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by sex, FAS-ITT.	178



3.3	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by supplemental oxygen requirement, FAS-ITT. . . . .	179
3.4	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	179
3.5	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	180
3.6	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	180
3.7	Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by days since first symptoms at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 7 days. . . . .	181
3.8	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by age group at randomisation, FAS-ITT. . .	182
3.9	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT. . . . .	182
3.10	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	183
3.11	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . .	183
3.12	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.	184
3.13	Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	185
3.14	Distribution of WHO outcome scale day 28 by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age. . . .	186
3.15	Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT. . . . .	186
3.16	Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	187
3.17	Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . .	187
3.18	Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	188
3.19	Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	188
3.20	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age.	189
3.21	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT. . . . .	189
3.22	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at baseline, FAS-ITT. . . . .	190
3.23	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	190
3.24	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	191
3.25	Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	191
3.26	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by age groups, FAS-ITT.	192
3.27	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT. . . . .	192

3.28	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at baseline, FAS-ITT. . . . .	193
3.29	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	193
3.30	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	194
3.31	Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	194
3.32	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by age groups, FAS-ITT.	195
3.33	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT. . . .	195
3.34	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	196
3.35	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	196
3.36	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	197
3.37	Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT. . . . .	197
3.38	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by age groups. .	198
3.39	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by sex. . . . .	198
3.40	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation. . . . .	199
3.41	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by country of randomisation. . . . .	199
3.42	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by country and site of randomisation. . . . .	200
3.43	Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation. . . . .	200
3.44	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by age groups. . . . .	201
3.45	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by sex. . . . .	202
3.46	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by oxygen requirement. . . . .	202
3.47	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by country of randomisation. . . . .	203
3.48	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by country and site of randomisation. . . . .	203
3.49	Distribution of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mM-RCbs) at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation. . . . .	204
3.50	Posterior predictive distribution for primary outcome by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. .	205

3.51	Posterior predictive distribution for WHO scale by model covariates for primary model using ACS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . .	206
3.52	Posterior predictive distribution for mortality to day 28 by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. .	207
3.53	Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by model covariates (intervention, country, and epoch) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . . .	208
3.54	Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by model covariates (site) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . . .	209
3.55	Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by model covariates (intervention, country, and epoch) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . . .	210
3.56	Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by model covariates (site) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . . .	211
3.57	Posterior predictive distribution for shortness of breath at day 28 by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . . .	212
3.58	Posterior predictive distribution for mMRC scale by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions. . . .	213

## List of Tables

2.1	Overview of the analysis sets used in this report. . . . .	24
2.2	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the FAS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	25
2.3	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the ACS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	26
2.4	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the AVS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	26
2.5	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the FAS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	27
2.6	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the ACS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	27
2.7	Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the AVS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data. . . . .	28
2.8	Compliance to Nafamostat. . . . .	37
2.9	Per-protocol status for antiviral domain . . . . .	38
2.10	Baseline demographics for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain. . . . .	41
2.11	Baseline demographics for participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	42
2.12	Baseline comorbidities for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain. . . . .	43
2.13	Baseline comorbidities for participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	44
2.14	Baseline prognostics for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain. . . . .	46
2.15	Baseline prognostics for participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	48
2.16	Baseline summary for participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	50
2.17	Drugs received during hospital stay for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain. . . . .	51
2.18	Drugs received during hospital stay for participants randomised to the antiviral domain. . . . .	52

2.19	Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group.	53
2.20	Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group. . . . .	54
2.21	Breakdown of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	55
2.22	Breakdown of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	56
2.23	Summary of domain decision qauntities for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	57
2.24	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	58
2.25	Summary of domain decision qauntities for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	60
2.26	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	61
2.27	Summary of domain decision qauntities (relative to standard dose) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	62
2.28	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	62
2.29	Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-PP. . . . .	65
2.30	Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, FAS-PP.	65
2.31	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-PP set. . . . .	66
2.32	Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-PP. . . . .	67
2.33	Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, AVS-PP.	67
2.34	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-PP set. . . . .	67
2.35	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-PP set. . . . .	69
2.36	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for treatment-only model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	70
2.37	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome. .	71
2.38	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome. . . . .	73
2.39	Summary of participant outcomes by region of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	77
2.40	Summary of participant outcomes by region of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	78
2.41	Summary of participant outcomes by age group at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	79

2.42	Summary of participant outcomes by age group at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	79
2.43	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by age of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	80
2.44	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by age of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	80
2.45	Summary of participant outcomes by days since symptom onset in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	82
2.46	Summary of participant outcomes by days since symptom onset in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	82
2.47	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by DSFS of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	83
2.48	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by DSFS of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	83
2.49	Summary of participant outcomes by room air and oxygen saturation in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	85
2.50	Summary of participant outcomes by room air and oxygen saturation in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	85
2.51	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by room air and oxygen saturation at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	86
2.52	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by room air and oxygen saturation at enrolment the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	86
2.53	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of corticosteroids during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	88
2.54	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of corticosteroids during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	88
2.55	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by receipt of corticosteroids in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	89
2.56	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by receipt of corticosteroids in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	89
2.57	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of remdesivir during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	90
2.58	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of remdesivir during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	90
2.59	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of other antiviral during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	91
2.60	Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of other antiviral during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	91
2.61	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by receipt of other antiviral in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	92
2.62	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by receipt of other antiviral in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	92

2.63	Summary of participant outcomes by whether patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain. . . . .	93
2.64	Summary of participant outcomes by whether patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain. . . . .	94
2.65	Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	94
2.66	Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	94
2.67	Summary for time to recovery (TTR) or death to day 28, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT . . . . .	99
2.68	Summary for time to recovery (TTR) or death to day 28, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT . . . . .	99
2.69	Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, FAS-ITT. . . . .	101
2.70	Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, AVS-ITT. . . . .	106
2.71	Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, ACS-ITT. . . . .	108
2.72	Summary of WHO scale at 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	112
2.73	Summary of WHO scale at 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	112
2.74	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	114
2.75	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	117
2.76	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	120
2.77	Summary of mortality by day 28 by treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	122
2.78	Summary of mortality by day 28 by treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	122
2.79	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	123
2.80	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	125
2.81	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	126
2.82	Summary of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	128
2.83	Summary of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	129
2.84	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	131
2.85	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	134

2.86	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	136
2.87	Summary of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	138
2.88	Summary of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT. . . . .	139
2.89	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	141
2.90	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	144
2.91	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	146
2.92	Summary of WHO scale at 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, ACS-ITT. . . . .	148
2.93	Summary of WHO scale at 28 by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT. . . . .	148
2.94	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	149
2.95	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set. . . . .	151
2.96	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set. . . . .	152
2.97	Summary of mMRC scale at day 28 by treatment group, anticoagulation domain, ACS-ITT. . . . .	154
2.98	Summary of mMRC scale at day 28 by treatment group, antiviral domain, AVS-ITT. . . . .	154
2.99	Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mMRC breathlessness scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set. . . . .	155
2.100	Prevalence of 10 most frequent, and worst, reported EQ-5D-5L profiles by treatment (day 28), AVS-ITT. . . . .	158
2.101	Distribution of responses on the EQ-5D-5L (day 28), AVS-ITT. . . . .	159
2.102	Descriptive summary of EQ-5D VAS (day 28), AVS-ITT. . . . .	160
2.103	Descriptive summary of participant PCR testing. . . . .	162
2.104	Descriptive summary of daily PCR testing, study days 1 to 7. . . . .	162
2.105	Descriptive summary of participant cycle threshold values. . . . .	163
2.106	Descriptive summary of daily Ct values, study days 1 to 7. . . . .	163
2.107	Descriptive summary of participant cycle threshold values. . . . .	165
2.108	Descriptive summary of daily ALT levels (IU/L) and testing. . . . .	166
2.109	Descriptive summary of daily AST levels (IU/L) and testing. . . . .	167
2.110	Descriptive summary of participant serum potassium levels (mmol/L) and testing. . . . .	168
2.111	Descriptive summary of daily serum potassium levels (mmol/L) and testing. . . . .	169
2.112	Elevated serum potassium SAE notes. . . . .	170
2.113	Descriptive summary of participant serum sodium levels (mmol/L) and testing. . . . .	171



2.114	Descriptive summary of daily serum sodium levels (mmol/L) and testing. . .	172
2.115	Descriptive summary of major bleeding (ISTH) events. . . . .	173
2.116	Major bleeding SAEs/SARs notes. . . . .	173
2.117	Descriptive summary of clinically relevant non-major bleeding (ISTH) events reported at day 28. . . . .	174
2.118	Non-major bleeding SAEs/SARs notes. . . . .	174
2.119	Descriptive summary of bleeding events reported. . . . .	175
2.120	Line listing of patients who experienced bleeding events. . . . .	175
2.121	Descriptive summary of thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site events. . . .	176
2.122	SAE listing. . . . .	177
2.123	SAR listing. . . . .	177

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose

The trial steering committee (TSC) closed randomisation to the anticoagulation domain on 2022-04-08. The blinded statistical analysis working group prepared a statistical analysis plan (SAP) for reporting the results of the anticoagulation domain. The unblinded team of statisticians undertook the analyses using the relevant records as extracted from the database on 2022-06-06.

Subsequently, the TSC closed randomisation to the antiviral domain on 2022-08-11. The blinded statistical analysis group prepared a SAP for reporting the results of the antiviral domain. Given all study domains have closed, the unblinded team of statisticians undertook final analyses using the relevant records as extracted from the database on 2022-10-26.

This report summarises the data and results of the analyses for the ASCOT trial. The report focuses on the antiviral domain but also reports on the anticoagulation domain for completeness sake.

## 1.2 Interventions

There were two mutually exclusive interventions in the antiviral domain. They were:

- no specific antiviral (standard of care, control)
- Nafamostat

There were four mutually exclusive interventions in the anticoagulation domain. They were:

- low-dose thromboprophylaxis (control)
- intermediate-dose thromboprophylaxis

- low-dose thromboprophylaxis with aspirin
- therapeutic-dose thromboprophylaxis

For full details of the interventions, refer to the domain specific appendices to the protocol.

## 1.3 Outcomes

For details on the primary and secondary outcomes, refer to the core protocol. For details on the domain specific outcomes refer to the anticoagulation domain-specific appendix.

## 1.4 Modelling

### 1.4.1 General Considerations

All binary outcomes were analysed using a logistic regression model, ordinal outcomes by a cumulative logistic model with proportional odds, and the time to recovery outcome by a discrete-time competing-risk (death) time-to-event model (multinomial logistic regression). Weakly informative priors were specified for all models.

The (pre-specified) primary model for all outcomes included fixed terms for:

- anticoagulation intervention
- antiviral intervention
- intervention ineligibility (eligible for aspirin, ineligible for aspirin)
- age group ( $< 60$ ,  $\geq 60$  years of age)
- sex (male, female)
- oxygen requirement (did not require supplemental oxygen, did require supplemental oxygen)
- region of enrolment (India, Australia/New Zealand, Nepal)

Hierarchical terms were also included for:

- site of enrolment (nested within region)
- epoch of enrolment (4-week groupings)

Outcomes are coded such that an odds ratio less than 1 implies a decrease in the outcome, for example, lower odds of 28 day mortality, fewer days alive and free of hospital, etc. Therefore, depending on the outcome, an odds ratio less than 1 may imply benefit or harm, but this will be made clear for each outcome.

In general, the reference group (to which the model intercept(s) or baseline hazard applies) was taken to be a patient who was:

- randomised to the anticoagulation domain (equal weighting across all interventions)
- *not* randomised to the antiviral domain
- eligible for aspirin intervention
- less than 60 years of age
- was male
- did not require supplemental oxygen
- enrolled in India during the most recent epoch

based on the most prevalent level of each covariate.

Bayesian models were computed using Stan via `cmdstanr` (0.5.2 and `cmdstan` version 2.30.1) in R (4.2.2). For each model, 8 chains were used with a warm-up of 1000 iterations and sampling for 2500 iterations per chain resulting in 20,000 posterior draws per model. Standard diagnostics were assessed for each model (divergent transitions, trace plots, R-hat). If an issue was identified (e.g. divergent transitions) then the default sampling parameters may have been adjusted (e.g. increasing target acceptance rate or increasing maximum tree depth). If any convergence issues resulted for the pre-specified models, then they are reported along with the model results. If the model was amended in any way to satisfy convergence criteria (e.g. aggregation of groups, removal of model terms) then this is reported in the relevant section. Sampling was run using a different (randomly selected) random seed for each model, and these were recorded for replication.

Due to the small number of enrolments at New Zealand sites, in models where country of enrolment were included as a term, Australia and New Zealand were combined into one region. The hierarchical site effects for centres in Australia and New Zealand were nested within this joint region rather than each country individually. For models where site was included as a random effect, sites with less than 5 participants were aggregated within region into an “other sites” grouping. Similarly, for models where epoch was included, epochs with less than 10 participants were aggregated with the adjacent epoch.

Missing outcome data were not imputed for any of the models (with the exception of the deterministic imputation used in the best-case/worst-case sensitivity analyses). The only baseline covariate of interest which had missing values was oxygen requirement. For the primary analyses, participants with missing information for oxygen requirement (25 participants in full analysis set) were assumed to have *not* required supplemental oxygen.

#### 1.4.2 Further Details

For all models, the primary linear predictor was the same. For a participant  $i$  with outcome  $y_i$ , their region of enrolment is denoted by  $r(i) \in \{1, \dots, R\}$ , their site by  $s(i) \in \{1, \dots, S_{r(i)}\}$ , and their epoch by  $t(i) \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . Their anticoagulation design vector is denoted by  $x_{Ci}$  and their antiviral design vector by  $x_{Ai}$ , their aspirin ineligibility by  $e_i$ , their age group by  $a_i$ , and oxygen requirement  $o_i$ , so that

$$\eta_i = x_{Ci}^T \beta_C + x_{Ai}^T \beta_A + \rho_{r(i)} + \xi_{r(i),s(i)} + \tau_{t(i)} + \omega_1 e_i + \omega_2 a_i + \omega_3 o_i,$$

was the linear predictor for the outcome for participant  $i$ .

For all models, the prior distribution on the linear components were

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_C &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Normal}(0, 1) \\ \beta_A &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Normal}(0, 1) \\ \rho_1 = 0, \rho_r &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 1), \quad r = 2, \dots, R \\ \tau_1 = 0, \tau_t &\sim \text{Normal}(\tau_{t-1}, \sigma_\tau^2), \quad t = 2, \dots, T \\ \sigma_\tau &\sim \text{Student-}t(3, 0, 1) \\ \xi_{r,s} &\sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{\xi_r}^2), \quad s = 1, \dots, S_r, \quad r = 1, \dots, R \\ \sigma_{\xi_r} &\sim \text{Student-}t(3, 0, 1), \quad r = 1, \dots, R \\ \omega_1 &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 10^2) \\ \omega_2 &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5^2) \\ \omega_3 &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5^2). \end{aligned}$$

For **binary outcomes**,  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , the model was

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\eta) &= \text{logit}^{-1}(\beta_0 + \eta) \\ y_i &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi(\eta_i))\end{aligned}$$

with  $\beta_0 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5^2)$ .

For **ordinal outcomes** with  $K$  levels,  $y_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , the model was

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_k(\eta) &= \begin{cases} 1 - \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta - \alpha_1) & k = 1 \\ \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta - \alpha_{k-1}) - \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta - \alpha_k) & k = 2, \dots, K-1 \\ \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta - \alpha_{K-1}) & k = K \end{cases} \\ y_i &\sim \text{Categorical}(\pi_k(\eta_i))\end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_k < \alpha_{k+1}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K-2\}$  and  $\pi(0) \sim \text{Dirichlet}(2/K, \dots, 2/K)$ .

For the **time-to-clinical-recovery outcome**, where  $d_i \in \{1, \dots, 28\}$  denotes the day of first event (or censoring at day 28) and  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  indicates event types (unrecovered, recovered, died), and  $y_{id} = (y_{id0}, y_{id1}, y_{id2})$  with  $y_{itm} \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates the status of patient  $i$  at day  $d \leq d_i$ , then the model was

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_m(d, \eta) &= \frac{\exp(\alpha_{dm} + \eta_m)}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^M \exp(\alpha_{dl} + \eta_l)}, \quad m = 1, 2 \\ y_{id} &\sim \text{Multinomial}\left(1, \left(1 - \sum_{l=1}^2 \lambda_l(d, \eta_i), \lambda_1(d, \eta_i), \lambda_2(d, \eta_i)\right)\right), \quad d \leq d_i,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2)$  contains the event-specific linear predictors with event-specific parameters in the same structure as previously introduced, and with priors

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{1m} &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 10^2) \\ \alpha_{dm} &\sim \text{Normal}(\alpha_{d-1,m}, \sigma_\alpha^2), \quad m = 1, 2,\end{aligned}$$

on the event-specific baseline-hazard terms.

## 1.5 Trial Decision Criteria

As per the statistical appendix to the core protocol, the following decision quantities were of interest in the anticoagulation domain for the primary outcome model:

- **Superiority:** superiority was assessed using the posterior probability that the intervention has the lowest odds of the outcome amongst all interventions in the domain. If a single intervention had probability exceeding 0.99 superiority would be triggered for that intervention.
- **Effectiveness:** effectiveness was assessed relative to the low-dose arm as the posterior probability that the intervention reduces the odds of the outcome. If any intervention had probability exceeding 0.99 then effectiveness would be triggered for that intervention.
- **Futility:** futility was assessed relative to the low-dose arm as the posterior probability that the intervention reduces the odds of the outcome by no more than a factor of 1/1.1. If any intervention had probability exceeding 0.95 then futility would be triggered for that intervention.
- **Equivalence:** equivalence was assessed relative to the low-dose arm as the posterior probability that the intervention alters the odds of the outcome by a factor bounded by (1/1.1, 1.1).

## 2 Results

### 2.1 Study Population

#### 2.1.1 Summary

At the time of database lock for the antiviral domain, 1,606 participants had been enrolled onto the study platform. Of these enrolees, 1,574 were randomised to the anticoagulation domain and 159 were randomised to the antiviral domain (127 to both domains, 32 to antiviral only, and 1,447 to anticoagulation only). The first participant was randomised on 2021-02-08, the last participant enrolled into the anticoagulation domain was randomised on 2022-03-29, and the last participant enrolled into the antiviral domain was randomised on 2022-08-04.

From the 1,606 enrolled participants, 18 withdrew consent for follow-up, leaving 1,588 participants with expected follow-up.

#### 2.1.2 Analysis Sets

Table 2.1: Overview of the analysis sets used in this report.

Name	Definition
FAS-ITT	All participants who were randomised to at least one study domain. Participants will be analysed as randomised, irrespective of withdrawal from treatment, treatment compliance, or other protocol deviations.
ACS-ITT	Subset of FAS-ITT who were randomised to the anticoagulation domain.
AVS-ITT	Subset of FAS-ITT who were randomised to the antiviral domain.



Name	Definition
FAS-PP	All participants who were randomised to at least one study domain and satisfied platform, domain, and intervention protocol requirements.
ACS-PP	All participants who were randomised to the anticoagulation domain and satisfied platform, domain, and intervention protocol requirements.
AVS-PP	All participants who were randomised to the antiviral domain and satisfied platform, domain, and intervention protocol requirements.

The following sections summarise the distribution of treatment allocations for participants included in each of the above sets.

#### 2.1.2.1 FAS-ITT

Table 2.2: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the FAS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral			Total
	Not randomised A	SoC	Nafamostat	
Not randomised C	0 (0)	18 (3)	14 (1)	32 (4)
Low	569 (19)	26 (1)	24 (3)	619 (23)
Intermediate	566 (13)	19 (0)	35 (6)	620 (19)
Low with aspirin	278 (6)	6 (0)	1 (0)	285 (6)
Therapeutic	35 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	50 (0)
Total	1448 (38)	73 (4)	85 (10)	1606 (52)

### 2.1.2.2 ACS-ITT

Table 2.3: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the ACS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral			Total
	Not randomised A	SoC	Nafamostat	
Low	569 (19)	26 (1)	24 (3)	619 (23)
Intermediate	566 (13)	19 (0)	35 (6)	620 (19)
Low with aspirin	278 (6)	6 (0)	1 (0)	285 (6)
Therapeutic	35 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	50 (0)
Total	1448 (38)	55 (1)	71 (9)	1574 (48)

### 2.1.2.3 AVS-ITT

Table 2.4: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the AVS-ITT set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral		Total
	SoC	Nafamostat	
Not randomised C	18 (3)	14 (1)	32 (4)
Low	26 (1)	24 (3)	50 (4)
Intermediate	19 (0)	35 (6)	54 (6)
Low with aspirin	6 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)
Therapeutic	4 (0)	11 (0)	15 (0)
Total	73 (4)	85 (10)	158 (14)

#### 2.1.2.4 FAS-PP

Table 2.5: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the FAS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral			Total
	Not randomised A	SoC	Nafamostat	
Not randomised C	0 (0)	16 (3)	11 (0)	27 (3)
Low	554 (12)	24 (0)	16 (0)	594 (12)
Intermediate	553 (7)	18 (0)	29 (4)	600 (11)
Low with aspirin	267 (3)	6 (0)	1 (0)	274 (3)
Therapeutic	34 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	44 (0)
Total	1408 (22)	66 (3)	65 (4)	1539 (29)

#### 2.1.2.5 ACS-PP

Table 2.6: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the ACS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral			Total
	Not randomised A	SoC	Nafamostat	
Low	554 (12)	24 (0)	16 (0)	594 (12)
Intermediate	553 (7)	18 (0)	29 (4)	600 (11)
Low with aspirin	267 (3)	6 (0)	1 (0)	274 (3)
Therapeutic	34 (0)	2 (0)	8 (0)	44 (0)
Total	1408 (22)	50 (0)	54 (4)	1512 (26)

### 2.1.2.6 AVS-PP

Table 2.7: Distribution of intervention assignments for participants in the AVS-PP set. Brackets indicate the number of participants in that cell with missing primary outcome due to withdrawal from the study, loss-to-follow-up, or missing data.

Anticoagulation	Antiviral		Total
	SoC	Nafamostat	
Not randomised C	16 (3)	11 (0)	27 (3)
Low	24 (0)	16 (0)	40 (0)
Intermediate	18 (0)	29 (4)	47 (4)
Low with aspirin	6 (0)	1 (0)	7 (0)
Therapeutic	2 (0)	8 (0)	10 (0)
Total	66 (3)	65 (4)	131 (7)

### **2.1.3 Disposition**

Of the 1,606 participants randomised to the trial, 18 withdrew consent for follow-up (16 on study day 1 and 2 on study day 2) leaving 1,588 participants continuing to study day 28. The analyses and summaries included in this report exclude data on participants who withdrew consent for follow-up.

Platform and domain specific flow diagrams is shown in in [Figure 2.1](#) and [Figure 2.2](#).

[Figure 2.3](#) presents overall platform enrolments by calendar time with timing of intervention availabilities and interim analyses. Due to an insufficient number of participants on the therapeutic anticoagulation arm, the initial allocation ratios were not changed during recruitment to the anticoagulation domain. Therefore, the only trial adaptations which occurred were the cessation of the standard dose plus aspirin intervention in the anticoagulation domain, the opening of the antiviral domain, and the introduction of the therapeutic dose intervention into the anticoagulation domain. Despite this, the timing of interim analyses are indicated on the Figures.

### **2.1.4 Intervention Allocations**

Response adaptive randomisation (RAR) was never activated in the anticoagulation domain. This was due to the therapeutic intervention never exceeding the minimum sample size of 50, and the fixed allocation to control. Therefore, target allocations to the interventions were uniform across all available interventions from trial start to trial closure. However, the available interventions did change over time and availability varied by region and site. Similarly, RAR was never activated in the antiviral domain due to insufficient sample size.

The following figures summarise treatment allocations by country, site, and calendar time.




Figure 2.1: Combined domain flowchart for anticoagulation.




Figure 2.2: Combined domain flowchart for antiviral.




Figure 2.3: Overall enrolment to the study by domain with intervention availability. Vertical dashed lines indicate timing of interim analyses.






Figure 2.4: Intervention allocations by calendar time (month) for anticoagulation domain.




Figure 2.5: Intervention allocations by calendar time (month) for antiviral domain (excludes India as antiviral domain not available).




Figure 2.6: Intervention allocations by study site for anticoagulation domain.




Figure 2.7: Intervention allocations by study site for antiviral domain.

### 2.1.5 Compliance

There were two participants who received the wrong dosage (according to the antiviral domain specific appendix) on at least one day given their baseline weight:

- One participant reportedly had 3 days of 500 mg/day instead of 350 mg/day (baseline weight of 65 kg). This participant was determined to not be per-protocol.
- Another participant reportedly had 2 days of 350 mg/day instead of 250 mg/day (baseline weight of 60 kg). This participant was determined to be per-protocol.

Figure 2.8 presents the distribution of Nafamostat infusion duration for each study day amongst participants assigned to receive Nafamostat. Table 2.8 presents summaries of treatment compliance for participants assigned to Nafamostat. Table 2.9 outlines the number of participants who were not per-protocol and the associated reason by their assigned antiviral intervention.




Figure 2.8: Distribution of Nafamostat infusion duration by study day (1 to 8) amongst participants assigned to Nafamostat.

Table 2.8: Compliance to Nafamostat.

Summary	Value
<b>Days on study treatment</b>	
Median (IQR)	5 (3 - 7)
Min, Max	0, 8
Missing	0
<b>Days off study treatment</b>	
Median (IQR)	0 (0 - 1)
Min, Max	0, 7
Missing	0
<b>Total hours receiving infusion</b>	
Median (IQR)	89.7 (57.8 - 138.8)
Min, Max	0.0, 176.6
Missing	0
<b>Hours per day on infusion</b>	
Median (IQR)	17.6 (14.3 - 19.7)
Min, Max	0.0, 22.1
Missing	0
<b>Proportion of days admitted to hospital with infusion <math>\geq 21/24</math> hours<sup>1</sup></b>	
Median (IQR)	0.55 (0.50 - 0.71)
Min, Max	0.00, 0.88
Missing	0
<b>Days with 21/24 hours infusion</b>	
Median (IQR)	3 (2 - 5)
Min, Max	0, 7
Missing	0
<b>Days without 21/24 hours infusion</b>	
Median (IQR)	0 (0 - 1)
Min, Max	0, 7
Missing	0

Days on study treatment is any part day on drug.

Days off treatment is any day when no Nafamostat was administered.

Days without 21/24 excludes day 1 and day of discharge.

<sup>1</sup> up to 7 days while hospitalised

Table 2.9: Per-protocol status for antiviral domain

Antiviral	Per Protocol?	Reason	Count
Standard of care	Not Per Protocol	withdrawn from antiviral & anticoagulation treatment (by patient)	1
Standard of care	Per Protocol	NA	72
Nafamostat	Not Per Protocol	>3 hr disruption	9
Nafamostat	Not Per Protocol	withdrawn from antiviral treatment (by patient)	7
Nafamostat	Not Per Protocol	>3 hr disruption. Dose was charted incorrectly for patient's weight on days 1 to 4.	1
Nafamostat	Not Per Protocol	Patient received more than allocated dose (up to day 9) with a disruption on day 7 of >3hrs	1
Nafamostat	Not Per Protocol	withdrawn from antiviral treatment (by treating clinician due to nausea and vomiting)	1
Nafamostat	Per Protocol	NA	62
Nafamostat	Per Protocol	withdrawn from antiviral & anticoagulation treatment (by treating clinician due to concerns about haemoptysis)	1

## 2.1.6 Baseline Characteristics

The following baseline summaries exclude participants who withdrew consent for follow-up.

### 2.1.6.1 Demographics

The age distribution of participants are presented in Figure 2.9, Figure 2.10, and Figure 2.11.




Figure 2.9: Distribution of age amongst participants randomised in the trial.

Baseline demographics stratified by anticoagulation interventions are reported in Table 2.10 and by antiviral interventions in Table 2.11.




Figure 2.10: Distribution of age amongst participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain.




Figure 2.11: Distribution of age amongst participants randomised to the antiviral domain.



Table 2.10: Baseline demographics for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain.

Variable	Anticoagulation				Overall (n = 1556)
	Low dose (n = 610)	Intermediate dose (n = 613)	Low dose with aspirin (n = 283)	Therapeutic dose (n = 50)	
Age (years), Median (IQR)	48 (37, 60)	48 (37, 61)	50 (38, 62)	58 (46, 69)	49 (37, 61)
<b>Country</b>					
India, n (%)	493 (81)	516 (84)	275 (97)	4 (8)	1288 (83)
Australia, n (%)	49 (8)	59 (10)	7 (2)	11 (22)	126 (8)
Nepal, n (%)	56 (9)	31 (5)	0 (0)	31 (62)	118 (8)
New Zealand, n (%)	12 (2)	7 (1)	1 (0)	4 (8)	24 (2)
<b>Sex</b>					
Male, n (%)	354 (58)	387 (63)	157 (55)	25 (50)	923 (59)
Female, n (%)	256 (42)	226 (37)	126 (45)	25 (50)	633 (41)
<b>Weight (kg)</b>					
Median, (IQR)	68 (62, 76)	70 (62, 77)	68 (62, 76)	66 (57, 80)	69 (62, 76)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Vaccinated<sup>1</sup></b>					
Yes, n (%)	191 (31)	220 (36)	42 (15)	27 (54)	480 (31)
Missing, n (%)	32 (5)	22 (4)	29 (10)	0 (0)	83 (5)
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Indian, n (%)	494 (81)	518 (85)	275 (97)	4 (8)	1291 (83)
European, n (%)	21 (3)	18 (3)	4 (1)	4 (8)	47 (3)
Asian, n (%)	20 (3)	12 (2)	1 (0)	10 (20)	43 (3)
Pacific Islander, n (%)	13 (2)	12 (2)	2 (1)	3 (6)	30 (2)
Middle Eastern, n (%)	11 (2)	11 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (1)
Maori, n (%)	3 (0)	4 (1)	0 (0)	3 (6)	10 (1)
African, n (%)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Aboriginal, n (%)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (0)
Latin American, n (%)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Other, n (%)	45 (7)	28 (5)	0 (0)	23 (46)	96 (6)
Unknown, n (%)	8 (1)	9 (1)	0 (0)	3 (6)	20 (1)
<b>Smoking</b>					
Current, n (%)	17 (3)	21 (3)	3 (1)	5 (10)	46 (3)
Former, n (%)	74 (12)	53 (9)	15 (5)	14 (28)	156 (10)
Never, n (%)	519 (85)	539 (88)	265 (94)	31 (62)	1354 (87)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

<sup>1</sup> Site LUD did not have ethics approval for collection of vaccination status.

Table 2.11: Baseline demographics for participants randomised to the antiviral domain.

Variable	Antiviral		Overall (n = 155)
	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	
Age (years), Median (IQR)	46 (37, 60)	44 (34, 60)	45 (35, 60)
<b>Country</b>			
India, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Australia, n (%)	65 (89)	67 (82)	132 (85)
Nepal, n (%)	2 (3)	3 (4)	5 (3)
New Zealand, n (%)	6 (8)	12 (15)	18 (12)
<b>Sex</b>			
Male, n (%)	39 (53)	56 (68)	95 (61)
Female, n (%)	34 (47)	26 (32)	60 (39)
<b>Weight (kg)</b>			
Median, (IQR)	90 (70, 106)	90 (79, 110)	90 (78, 108)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Vaccinated<sup>1</sup></b>			
Yes, n (%)	27 (37)	31 (38)	58 (37)
Missing, n (%)	7 (10)	1 (1)	8 (5)
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Indian, n (%)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (1)
European, n (%)	18 (25)	27 (33)	45 (29)
Asian, n (%)	6 (8)	6 (7)	12 (8)
Pacific Islander, n (%)	12 (16)	12 (15)	24 (15)
Middle Eastern, n (%)	9 (12)	11 (13)	20 (13)
Maori, n (%)	1 (1)	7 (9)	8 (5)
African, n (%)	2 (3)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Aboriginal, n (%)	3 (4)	1 (1)	4 (3)
Latin American, n (%)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Other, n (%)	6 (8)	9 (11)	15 (10)
Unknown, n (%)	17 (23)	11 (13)	28 (18)
<b>Smoking</b>			
Current, n (%)	8 (11)	12 (15)	20 (13)
Former, n (%)	22 (30)	16 (20)	38 (25)
Never, n (%)	43 (59)	54 (66)	97 (63)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

<sup>1</sup> Site LUD did not have ethics approval for collection of vaccination status.

### 2.1.6.2 Co-morbidities

Baseline co-morbidities stratified by anticoagulation interventions are reported in Table 2.12 and to by antiviral interventions in Table 2.13.

Table 2.12: Baseline comorbidities for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain.

Comorbidity	Anticoagulation				Overall (n = 1556)
	Low dose (n = 610)	Intermediate dose (n = 613)	Low dose with aspirin (n = 283)	Therapeutic dose (n = 50)	
None, n (%)	364 ( 60)	378 ( 62)	166 ( 59)	19 ( 38)	927 ( 60)
Hypertension, n (%)	147 ( 24)	140 ( 23)	68 ( 24)	14 ( 28)	369 ( 24)
Diabetes, n (%)	140 ( 23)	139 ( 23)	78 ( 28)	11 ( 22)	368 ( 24)
Obesity, n (%)	23 ( 4)	22 ( 4)	3 ( 1)	5 ( 10)	53 ( 3)
Asthma, n (%)	19 ( 3)	16 ( 3)	6 ( 2)	4 ( 8)	45 ( 3)
Chronic lung disease, n (%)	16 ( 3)	13 ( 2)	1 ( 0)	7 ( 14)	37 ( 2)
Chronic cardiac disease, n (%)	11 ( 2)	15 ( 2)	1 ( 0)	2 ( 4)	29 ( 2)
Obstructive sleep apnoea, n (%)	3 ( 0)	2 ( 0)	2 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	7 ( 0)
Iatrogenic immunosuppression, n (%)	1 ( 0)	6 ( 1)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	7 ( 0)
Chronic kidney disease, n (%)	0 ( 0)	5 ( 1)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	6 ( 0)
Malignant neoplasm, n (%)	1 ( 0)	2 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 2)	4 ( 0)
Moderate or severe liver disease, n (%)	2 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 ( 0)
Dialysis, n (%)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)
HIV infection, n (%)	1 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	1 ( 0)
Dementia, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Missing, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)

Table 2.13: Baseline comorbidities for participants randomised to the antiviral domain.

Comorbidity	Antiviral		Overall (n = 155)
	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	
None, n (%)	31 ( 42)	34 ( 41)	65 ( 42)
Obesity, n (%)	19 ( 26)	22 ( 27)	41 ( 26)
Hypertension, n (%)	16 ( 22)	17 ( 21)	33 ( 21)
Diabetes, n (%)	16 ( 22)	15 ( 18)	31 ( 20)
Asthma, n (%)	10 ( 14)	10 ( 12)	20 ( 13)
Chronic lung disease, n (%)	7 ( 10)	6 ( 7)	13 ( 8)
Chronic cardiac disease, n (%)	3 ( 4)	6 ( 7)	9 ( 6)
Iatrogenic immunosuppression, n (%)	2 ( 3)	4 ( 5)	6 ( 4)
Obstructive sleep apnoea, n (%)	3 ( 4)	2 ( 2)	5 ( 3)
Chronic kidney disease, n (%)	2 ( 3)	2 ( 2)	4 ( 3)
Malignant neoplasm, n (%)	1 ( 1)	2 ( 2)	3 ( 2)
Dialysis, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Moderate or severe liver disease, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Dementia, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
HIV infection, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Missing, n (%)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)

### **2.1.6.3 Prognostics**

Baseline prognostics stratified by anticoagulation interventions are reported in Table [2.14](#) and to by antiviral interventions in Table [2.15](#).

Table 2.14: Baseline prognostics for participants randomised to the anticoagulation domain.

Variable	Anticoagulation				Overall (n = 1556)
	Low dose (n = 610)	Intermediate dose (n = 613)	Low dose with aspirin (n = 283)	Therapeutic dose (n = 50)	
<b>Was the patient on room air for any of the preceding 24 hours?</b>					
Yes, n (%)	460 (75)	460 (75)	224 (79)	39 (78)	1183 (76)
Missing, n (%)	8 (1)	9 (1)	8 (3)	0 (0)	25 (2)
<b>Was the patient's GCS &lt; 15?</b>					
Yes, n (%)	63 (10)	65 (11)	6 (2)	2 (4)	136 (9)
Missing, n (%)	125 (20)	135 (22)	60 (21)	0 (0)	320 (21)
<b>Peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO2) on room air (Lowest)</b>					
Median (IQR)	95 (94, 97)	96 (94, 97)	96 (94, 97)	94 (92, 96)	96 (94, 97)
Missing, n (%)	150 (25)	153 (25)	59 (21)	11 (22)	373 (24)
<b>Highest respiratory rate (breaths/minute)</b>					
Median (IQR)	22 (21, 25)	22 (21, 26)	22 (20, 26)	22 (20, 24)	22 (21, 26)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
<b>Highest recorded Urea in the last 24 hours (mmol/L)</b>					
Median (IQR)	4 (3, 5)	5 (4, 6)	4 (3, 6)	4 (3, 6)	4 (3, 6)
Missing, n (%)	30 (5)	33 (5)	16 (6)	1 (2)	80 (5)
<b>Highest recorded CRP in the last 24 hours (mg/L)</b>					
Median (IQR)	70 (37, 190)	75 (38, 220)	77 (44, 223)	68 (33, 129)	73 (39, 200)
Missing, n (%)	74 (12)	59 (10)	18 (6)	29 (58)	180 (12)
<b>APTT<sup>1</sup></b>					
Median (IQR)	33 (29, 36)	33 (30, 36)	32 (28, 37)	33 (28, 38)	33 (29, 36)
Missing, n (%)	430 (70)	439 (72)	195 (69)	35 (70)	1099 (71)
<b>INR<sup>1</sup></b>					
Mean (SD)	1.19 (0.39)	1.23 (0.58)	1.32 (1.34)	1.12 (0.18)	1.23 (0.72)
Missing, n (%)	103 (17)	105 (17)	47 (17)	7 (14)	262 (17)
<b>Fibrinogen<sup>1</sup> (g/L)</b>					
Mean (SD)	5.19 (2.01)	5.20 (1.60)	4.75 (1.40)	6.49 (1.52)	5.14 (1.71)
Missing, n (%)	564 (92)	555 (91)	243 (86)	42 (84)	1404 (90)
<b>Prothrombin time<sup>1</sup> (sec)</b>					
Median (IQR)	14 (13, 17)	14 (13, 17)	15 (13, 16)	13 (12, 14)	14 (13, 16)
Missing, n (%)	193 (32)	204 (33)	116 (41)	10 (20)	523 (34)
<b>Taking aspirin</b>					
Yes, n (%)	20 (3)	25 (4)	2 (1)	3 (6)	50 (3)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Time from onset of symptoms to hospitalisation</b>					
Median (IQR)	5 (3, 7)	5 (3, 6)	4 (2, 6)	4 (3, 6)	4 (3, 6)
<b>Time from hospitalisation to randomisation</b>					
Median (IQR)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 1)	1 (0, 2)
<b>D-dimer</b>					
Test performed, n(%)	494 (81)	514 (84)	247 (87)	17 (34)	1272 (82)
Out of range, n(%)	182 (37)	177 (35)	63 (26)	10 (59)	432 (34)

<sup>1</sup> For APTT, INR, Fibrinogen, and Prothrombin only at least one required.



Table 2.15: Baseline prognostics for participants randomised to the antiviral domain.

Variable	Antiviral		Overall (n = 155)
	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	
Was the patient on room air for any of the preceding 24 hours?			
Yes, n (%)	48 (66)	42 (51)	90 (58)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Was the patient's GCS < 15?			
Yes, n (%)	5 (7)	4 (5)	9 (6)
Missing, n (%)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO2) on room air (Lowest)			
Median (IQR)	93 (90, 95)	93 (92, 95)	93 (91, 95)
Missing, n (%)	25 (34)	40 (49)	65 (42)
Highest respiratory rate (breaths/minute)			
Median (IQR)	24 (20, 28)	24 (21, 28)	24 (21, 28)
Missing, n (%)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Highest recorded Urea in the last 24 hours (mmol/L)			
Median (IQR)	5 (4, 7)	5 (4, 7)	5 (4, 7)
Missing, n (%)	4 (5)	4 (5)	8 (5)
Highest recorded CRP in the last 24 hours (mg/L)			
Median (IQR)	68 (32, 114)	55 (28, 84)	58 (28, 108)
Missing, n (%)	5 (7)	11 (13)	16 (10)
APTT <sup>1</sup>			
Median (IQR)	33 (31, 36)	33 (30, 36)	33 (30, 36)
Missing, n (%)	23 (32)	20 (24)	43 (28)
INR <sup>1</sup>			
Mean (SD)	1.09 (0.09)	1.07 (0.11)	1.08 (0.10)
Missing, n (%)	25 (34)	26 (32)	51 (33)
Fibrinogen <sup>1</sup> (g/L)			
Mean (SD)	5.76 (2.08)	5.62 (1.56)	5.68 (1.79)
Missing, n (%)	42 (58)	42 (51)	84 (54)
Prothrombin time <sup>1</sup> (sec)			
Median (IQR)	13 (13, 14)	13 (13, 14)	13 (13, 14)
Missing, n (%)	30 (41)	29 (35)	59 (38)
Taking aspirin			
Yes, n (%)	4 (5)	8 (10)	12 (8)
Missing, n (%)	18 (25)	14 (17)	32 (21)
Time from onset of symptoms to hospitalisation			
Median (IQR)	6 (4, 8)	6 (4, 8)	6 (4, 8)
Time from hospitalisation to randomisation			
Median (IQR)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)
D-dimer			
Test performed, n(%)	54 (74)	51 (62)	105 (68)
Out of range, n(%)	35 (65)	32 (64)	67 (64)

<sup>1</sup> For APTT, INR, Fibrinogen, and Prothrombin only at least one required.



The relative timing (in days) of hospitalisation, symptom onset, randomisation, and first positive test are presented in Figure 2.12.




Figure 2.12: Days between events for hospitalisation, randomisation, symptom onset, and first positive test.

## 2.1.6.4 Overall Summary

Table 2.16: Baseline summary for participants randomised to the antiviral domain.

Variable	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	All participants (n = 155)
Age – yr	46 (37, 60)	44 (34, 60)	45 (35, 60)
Male sex	39 (53)	56 (68)	95 (61)
<b>Country</b>			
Australia	65 (89)	67 (82)	132 (85)
New Zealand	6 (8)	12 (15)	18 (12)
Nepal	2 (3)	3 (4)	5 (3)
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
European	18 (25)	27 (33)	45 (29)
Pacific peoples or Maori	13 (18)	19 (23)	32 (21)
Middle Eastern	9 (12)	11 (13)	20 (13)
Asian	6 (8)	6 (7)	12 (8)
Aboriginal	3 (4)	1 (1)	4 (3)
Indian	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (1)
African	2 (3)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Latin American	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Other/unknown	21 (29)	19 (23)	40 (26)
Weight – kg	90 (70, 106)	90 (79, 110)	90 (78, 108)
Vaccinated – no./total no.	27/66 (41)	31/81 (38)	58/147 (39)
<b>Co-morbidities</b>			
Obesity	19 (26)	22 (27)	41 (26)
Hypertension	16 (22)	17 (21)	33 (21)
Diabetes	16 (22)	15 (18)	31 (20)
Asthma	10 (14)	10 (12)	20 (13)
Chronic lung disease	7 (10)	6 (7)	13 (8)
Chronic cardiac disease	3 (4)	6 (7)	9 (6)
<b>No. of days</b>			
Onset of symptoms to hospitalisation	8 (5, 10)	7 (5, 10)	8 (5, 10)
Hospitalisation to randomisation	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)
Any time breathing ambient air in past 24 hours	48 (66)	42 (51)	90 (58)
Lowest SpO2 while breathing ambient air	93 (90, 95)	93 (92, 95)	93 (91, 95)
Highest respiratory rate in past 24 hours	24 (20, 28)	24 (21, 28)	24 (21, 28)
Glasgow coma score < 15	5 (7)	4 (5)	9 (6)
<b>Lab values</b>			
CRP – mg/L	68 (32, 113)	53 (28, 74)	58 (28, 102)
CRP Patients evaluated	68 (93)	71 (87)	139 (90)
D-dimer > upper limit normal	35 (65)	32 (64)	67 (64)
D-dimer Patients evaluated	54 (74)	50 (61)	104 (67)
APTT – s	33 (31, 36)	33 (30, 36)	33 (30, 36)
APTT Patients evaluated	50 (68)	62 (76)	112 (72)
Internation normalised ratio (SD)	1.09 (0.09)	1.07 (0.11)	1.08 (0.10)
INR Patients evaluated	48 (66)	56 (68)	104 (67)

## 2.1.7 Discharge Summaries

### 2.1.7.1 Drugs Received During Hospital Stay

There were 18 participants without a discharge record (due to withdrawal of consent for follow-up). For the continuing participants, the other medications received during their hospital stay are reported in Table 2.17 and Table 2.18.

Table 2.17: Drugs received during hospital stay for participants randomised to the anti-coagulation domain.

Drug received	Anticoagulation				Overall (n = 1556)
	Low dose (n = 610)	Intermediate dose (n = 613)	Low dose with aspirin (n = 283)	Therapeutic dose (n = 50)	
Antibacterial drugs, n (%)	449 (74)	443 (72)	231 (82)	38 (76)	1161 (75)
<b>Antivirals</b>					
No antiviral, n (%)	125 (20)	120 (20)	44 (16)	39 (78)	328 (21)
Camostat, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Favipiravir, n (%)	97 (16)	100 (16)	34 (12)	0 (0)	231 (15)
Doxycycline, n (%)	76 (12)	81 (13)	22 (8)	2 (4)	181 (12)
Ivermectin, n (%)	201 (33)	200 (33)	91 (32)	0 (0)	492 (32)
Remdesivir, n (%)	286 (47)	289 (47)	169 (60)	10 (20)	754 (48)
Other antiviral, n (%)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
<b>Immunomodulatory</b>					
No immunomodulatory, n (%)	60 (10)	68 (11)	38 (13)	6 (12)	172 (11)
Anakinra, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Corticosteroids, n (%)	396 (65)	388 (63)	183 (65)	37 (74)	1004 (65)
Sarilumab, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Azithromycin, n (%)	105 (17)	108 (18)	38 (13)	5 (10)	256 (16)
Tocilizumab, n (%)	12 (2)	11 (2)	5 (2)	2 (4)	30 (2)
Baricitinib, n (%)	36 (6)	50 (8)	11 (4)	6 (12)	103 (7)
Ruxolitinib, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Tofacitinib, n (%)	11 (2)	13 (2)	5 (2)	0 (0)	29 (2)
Zinc, n (%)	388 (64)	394 (64)	173 (61)	13 (26)	968 (62)
Other immunomodulatory, n (%)	20 (3)	20 (3)	11 (4)	1 (2)	52 (3)

Table 2.18: Drugs received during hospital stay for participants randomised to the anti-viral domain.

Drug received	Antiviral		Overall (n = 155)
	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	
Antibacterial drugs, n (%)	33 (45)	38 (46)	71 (46)
<b>Antivirals</b>			
No antiviral, n (%)	28 (38)	36 (44)	64 (41)
Camostat, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Favipiravir, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Doxycycline, n (%)	1 (1)	7 (9)	8 (5)
Ivermectin, n (%)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (1)
Remdesivir, n (%)	39 (53)	39 (48)	78 (50)
Other antiviral, n (%)	5 (7)	3 (4)	8 (5)
<b>Immunomodulatory</b>			
No immunomodulatory, n (%)	10 (14)	9 (11)	19 (12)
Anakinra, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Corticosteroids, n (%)	55 (75)	70 (85)	125 (81)
Sarilumab, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Azithromycin, n (%)	6 (8)	9 (11)	15 (10)
Tocilizumab, n (%)	5 (7)	3 (4)	8 (5)
Baricitinib, n (%)	24 (33)	38 (46)	62 (40)
Ruxolitinib, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Tofacitinib, n (%)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Zinc, n (%)	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (2)
Other immunomodulatory, n (%)	3 (4)	3 (4)	6 (4)

## 2.2 Primary Outcome

### 2.2.1 Descriptive

The primary outcome is a composite comprised of:

- day 28 mortality
- vasopressor/inotropic support within first 28 days
- new intensive respiratory support within first 28 days.

The definition also allowed for patients who had unknown day 28 status, but were discharged against medical advice (DAMA) and designated as likely to die within 28 days. However, no participants met this criteria (all cases of DAMA and likely to die within 28 days had known day 28 status).

The proportion of participants who met the primary outcome, and rates of missingness, are reported in Table 2.19 and Table 2.20.

A breakdown of the composite, including missingness by component is reported for ACS-ITT and AVS-ITT in Table 2.21 and Table 2.22 respectively. Missingness was predominantly due to unknown patient status at study day 28.

A summary of the primary outcome by each of the baseline covariates pre-specified to be included in the primary model (or as pre-specified subgroup analyses) are presented in the appendix (Section 3.1.1).

Table 2.19: Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group.

n (%)	Low dose	Intermediate dose	Low dose with aspirin	Therapeutic dose	Overall
Randomised	610	613	283	50	1556
Outcome missing	14 (2.3)	12 (2.0)	4 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	30 (1.9)
Outcome observed	596 (97.7)	601 (98.0)	279 (98.6)	50 (100.0)	1526 (98.1)
Met primary outcome	35 (5.9)	25 (4.2)	20 (7.2)	7 (14.0)	87 (5.7)

Table 2.20: Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group.

n (%)	Standard of care	Nafamostat	Overall
Randomised	73	82	155
Outcome missing	4 (5.5)	7 (8.5)	11 (7.1)
Outcome observed	69 (94.5)	75 (91.5)	144 (92.9)
Met primary outcome	8 (11.6)	4 (5.3)	12 (8.3)

Table 2.21: Breakdown of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, ACS-ITT.

Outcome	Breakdown	Anticoaguation					Overall (n = 1588)
		Not randomised (n = 32)	Low dose (n = 610)	Intermediate dose (n = 613)	Low dose with aspirin (n = 283)	Therapeutic dose (n = 50)	
Primary outcome							
No		24 (75.0)	561 (92.0)	576 (94.0)	259 (91.5)	43 (86.0)	1463 (92.1)
Yes		4 (12.5)	35 (5.7)	25 (4.1)	20 (7.1)	7 (14.0)	91 (5.7)
Unknown	Total	4 (12.5)	14 (2.3)	12 (2.0)	4 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	34 (2.1)
	Day 28 status	3 (9.4)	13 (2.1)	10 (1.6)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	28 (1.8)
	Vasopressor/inotropes	1 (3.1)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.4)
Total		32 (100.0)	610 (100.0)	613 (100.0)	283 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Mortality							
Alive at day 28		29 (90.6)	577 (94.6)	588 (95.9)	271 (95.8)	44 (88.0)	1509 (95.0)
Death within 28 days	Total	0 (0.0)	19 (3.1)	15 (2.4)	10 (3.5)	6 (12.0)	50 (3.1)
	Prior to discharge	0 (0.0)	15 (2.5)	11 (1.8)	10 (3.5)	4 (8.0)	40 (2.5)
	Post-discharge	0 (0.0)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (4.0)	10 (0.6)
Unknown		3 (9.4)	14 (2.3)	10 (1.6)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	29 (1.8)
Total		32 (100.0)	610 (100.0)	613 (100.0)	283 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Vasopressor/inotropes							
Not required		27 (84.4)	591 (96.9)	595 (97.1)	273 (96.5)	48 (96.0)	1534 (96.6)
Use within 28 days	Total	1 (3.1)	6 (1.0)	6 (1.0)	6 (2.1)	2 (4.0)	21 (1.3)
	Prior to discharge	1 (3.1)	5 (0.8)	6 (1.0)	6 (2.1)	2 (4.0)	20 (1.3)
	Post-discharge	0 (0.0)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.0)	3 (0.2)
Unknown		4 (12.5)	13 (2.1)	12 (2.0)	4 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	33 (2.1)
Total		32 (100.0)	610 (100.0)	613 (100.0)	283 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Ventilation							
Not required		25 (78.1)	562 (92.1)	579 (94.5)	263 (92.9)	43 (86.0)	1472 (92.7)
Use within 28 days	Total	4 (12.5)	35 (5.7)	24 (3.9)	18 (6.4)	7 (14.0)	88 (5.5)
	Prior to discharge	4 (12.5)	29 (4.8)	19 (3.1)	13 (4.6)	5 (10.0)	70 (4.4)
	Post-discharge	0 (0.0)	6 (1.0)	5 (0.8)	5 (1.8)	2 (4.0)	18 (1.1)
Unknown		3 (9.4)	13 (2.1)	10 (1.6)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	28 (1.8)
Total		32 (100.0)	610 (100.0)	613 (100.0)	283 (100.0)	50 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)

Table 2.22: Breakdown of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT.

Outcome	Breakdown	Antiviral			Overall (n = 1588)
		Not randomised to antiviral (n = 1433)	Standard of care (n = 73)	Nafamostat (n = 82)	
Primary outcome					
No		1331 (92.9)	61 (83.6)	71 (86.6)	1463 (92.1)
Yes		79 (5.5)	8 (11.0)	4 (4.9)	91 (5.7)
Unknown	Total	23 (1.6)	4 (5.5)	7 (8.5)	34 (2.1)
	Day 28 status	18 (1.3)	3 (4.1)	7 (8.5)	28 (1.8)
	Vasopressor/inotropes	5 (0.3)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	6 (0.4)
Total		1433 (100.0)	73 (100.0)	82 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Mortality					
Alive at day 28		1364 (95.2)	70 (95.9)	75 (91.5)	1509 (95.0)
Death within 28 days	Total	50 (3.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	50 (3.1)
	Prior to discharge	40 (2.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	40 (2.5)
	Post-discharge	10 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (0.6)
Unknown		19 (1.3)	3 (4.1)	7 (8.5)	29 (1.8)
Total		1433 (100.0)	73 (100.0)	82 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Vasopressor/inotropes					
Not required		1391 (97.1)	68 (93.2)	75 (91.5)	1534 (96.6)
Use within 28 days	Total	18 (1.3)	2 (2.7)	1 (1.2)	21 (1.3)
	Prior to discharge	17 (1.2)	2 (2.7)	1 (1.2)	20 (1.3)
	Post-discharge	3 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.2)
Unknown		24 (1.7)	3 (4.1)	6 (7.3)	33 (2.1)
Total		1433 (100.0)	73 (100.0)	82 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)
Ventilation					
Not required		1339 (93.4)	62 (84.9)	71 (86.6)	1472 (92.7)
Use within 28 days	Total	76 (5.3)	8 (11.0)	4 (4.9)	88 (5.5)
	Prior to discharge	58 (4.0)	8 (11.0)	4 (4.9)	70 (4.4)
	Post-discharge	18 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (1.1)
Unknown		18 (1.3)	3 (4.1)	7 (8.5)	28 (1.8)
Total		1433 (100.0)	73 (100.0)	82 (100.0)	1588 (100.0)



## 2.2.2 Primary Analysis

The primary model was a logistic regression model adjusting for anticoagulation treatment, antiviral treatment, age ( $\geq 60$  or not), oxygen requirement (required supplemental oxygen or not), and region (India (ref), Australia/New Zealand, and Nepal), with random effects for site (nested within country) and epoch (calendar time 4 week intervals, most recent epoch as reference). The three most recent epochs were combined due to small numbers, and the two earliest epochs were combined for the same reason. Sites with fewer than 5 enrolments were combined within region into an “other sites” category. The primary analysis was based on the FAS-ITT set using the full model as specified in the statistical appendix to the core protocol. An odds ratio less than 1 implies a benefit (reduction in the odds of primary outcome).

### 2.2.2.1 FAS-ITT

The SAP specified that the analysis based on FAS-ITT as secondary. However, this analysis is presented first.

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

The trial decision quantities are reported in Table 2.23 and the model parameter posteriors are summarised in Table 2.24 and Figure 2.14.

Table 2.23: Summary of domain decision quantities for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Intervention	Posterior	Superior Pr(OR = min(OR))	Effective Pr(OR < 1)	Futile Pr(OR > 1/1.1)	Equivalent Pr(1/1.1 < OR < 1.1)
<b>Antiviral</b>					
SoC	1.00	0.05	-	-	-
Nafamostat	0.36 (0.10, 1.22)	0.95	0.95	0.07	0.03
<b>Anticoagulation</b>					
Low-dose	1.00	0.06	-	-	-
Intermediate-dose	0.71 (0.40, 1.22)	0.67	0.90	0.18	0.13
Low-dose with aspirin	0.85 (0.45, 1.60)	0.27	0.69	0.42	0.21
Therapeutic-dose	2.57 (0.87, 7.07)	0.01	0.04	0.97	0.03

Table 2.24: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.36	(0.10, 1.22)	0.43 (0.31)	0.95
Intermediate-dose	0.71	(0.40, 1.22)	0.73 (0.21)	0.90
Low-dose with aspirin	0.85	(0.45, 1.60)	0.90 (0.30)	0.69
Therapeutic-dose	2.57	(0.87, 7.07)	2.93 (1.65)	0.04
Ineligible aspirin	2.26	(0.61, 7.42)	2.71 (1.80)	0.11
Age $\geq 60$	1.75	(1.07, 2.82)	1.80 (0.45)	0.01
Female	0.64	(0.38, 1.03)	0.66 (0.17)	0.97
Oxygen requirement	3.65	(2.21, 6.11)	3.78 (1.01)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.05	(0.25, 4.06)	1.34 (1.06)	0.47
Nepal	1.59	(0.42, 5.81)	1.98 (1.49)	0.24




Figure 2.13: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.14: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.2.2.2 AVS-ITT

The SAP pre-specified that the primary model would be fit using the AVS-ITT including all the pre-specified covariates. This analysis deviated from that specified in the SAP for a number of reasons:

- almost all in AVS-ITT were enrolled in Australia/New Zealand, with no events observed in Nepal, so region was dropped from the model
- there was concurrent randomisation to antiviral domain (where available) throughout the entire study, so epoch term dropped was dropped from the model
- other covariates dropped due to small number of cases and events (ineligible for aspirin).

Therefore, the analysis restricted to the AVS-ITT set was based on a reduced model compared to that specified in the SAP. Due to the small number of events, the parameter posteriors will be sensitive to the priors.

In summary, the analysis was based on the following:

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** antiviral intervention, anticoagulation intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-ITT

Table 2.25: Summary of domain decision quantities for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Intervention	Posterior	Superior Pr(OR = min(OR))	Effective Pr(OR < 1)	Futile Pr(OR > 1/1.1)	Equivalent Pr(1/1.1 < OR < 1.1)
<b>Antiviral</b>					
SoC	1.00	0.08	-	-	-
Nafamostat	0.41 (0.12, 1.38)	0.92	0.92	0.10	0.05

Table 2.26: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.41	(0.12, 1.38)	0.50 (0.34)	0.92
Intermediate-dose	0.61	(0.14, 2.53)	0.79 (0.66)	0.75
Low-dose with aspirin	0.51	(0.07, 3.21)	0.80 (0.97)	0.75
Therapeutic-dose	0.81	(0.13, 4.38)	1.17 (1.25)	0.60
Age $\geq 60$	1.29	(0.30, 4.79)	1.61 (1.23)	0.36
Female	0.64	(0.16, 2.27)	0.79 (0.59)	0.75
Required oxygen	2.64	(0.56, 16.89)	4.14 (5.34)	0.11
CRP (2nd tertile)	3.31	(0.78, 16.48)	4.64 (4.68)	0.05
CRP (3rd tertile)	0.83	(0.14, 4.84)	1.23 (1.42)	0.59
CRP (unknown)	0.17	(0.00, 2.76)	0.46 (0.95)	0.88




Figure 2.15: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.2.2.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch
- **Set:** ACS-ITT

Table 2.27: Summary of domain decision quantities (relative to standard dose) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Intervention	Posterior	Superior Pr(OR = min(OR))	Effective Pr(OR < 1)	Futile Pr(OR > 1/1.1)	Equivalent Pr(1/1.1 < OR < 1.1)
<b>Antiviral</b>					
SoC	1.00	0.03	-	-	-
Nafamostat	0.25 (0.05, 1.06)	0.97	0.97	0.04	0.02
<b>Anticoagulation</b>					
Low-dose	1.00	0.06	-	-	-
Intermediate-dose	0.70 (0.40, 1.21)	0.68	0.90	0.18	0.12
Low-dose with aspirin	0.85 (0.45, 1.60)	0.26	0.69	0.42	0.21
Therapeutic-dose	2.54 (0.88, 7.09)	0.01	0.04	0.97	0.03

Table 2.28: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.25	(0.05, 1.06)	0.33 (0.29)	0.97
Intermediate-dose	0.70	(0.40, 1.21)	0.73 (0.21)	0.90
Low-dose with aspirin	0.85	(0.45, 1.60)	0.89 (0.29)	0.69
Therapeutic-dose	2.54	(0.88, 7.09)	2.91 (1.66)	0.04
Ineligible aspirin	2.55	(0.66, 8.57)	3.07 (2.10)	0.08
Age ≥ 60	1.75	(1.07, 2.87)	1.81 (0.46)	0.01
Female	0.64	(0.38, 1.05)	0.66 (0.17)	0.96
Oxygen requirement	3.77	(2.24, 6.45)	3.92 (1.09)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.84	(0.19, 3.46)	1.08 (0.88)	0.59
Nepal	1.72	(0.44, 6.21)	2.13 (1.57)	0.21




Figure 2.16: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.




Figure 2.17: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.



#### 2.2.2.4 FAS-PP

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch
- **Set:** FAS-PP

Table 2.29: Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-PP.

n (%)	Not randomised to anticoagulation	Low dose	Intermediate dose	Low dose with aspirin	Therapeutic dose	Overall
Randomised	27	594	600	274	44	1539
Outcome missing	3 (11.1)	12 (2.0)	11 (1.8)	3 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	29 (1.9)
Outcome observed	24 (88.9)	582 (98.0)	589 (98.2)	271 (98.9)	44 (100.0)	1510 (98.1)
Met primary outcome	3 (12.5)	35 (6.0)	25 (4.2)	19 (7.0)	6 (13.6)	88 (5.8)

Table 2.30: Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, FAS-PP.

n (%)	Not randomised to antiviral	Standard of care	Nafamostat	Overall
Randomised	1408	66	65	1539
Outcome missing	22 (1.6)	3 (4.5)	4 (6.2)	29 (1.9)
Outcome observed	1386 (98.4)	63 (95.5)	61 (93.8)	1510 (98.1)
Met primary outcome	78 (5.6)	8 (12.7)	2 (3.3)	88 (5.8)

Table 2.31: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-PP set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.18	(0.04, 0.74)	0.24 (0.19)	0.99
Intermediate-dose	0.71	(0.40, 1.26)	0.74 (0.22)	0.88
Low-dose with aspirin	0.82	(0.43, 1.53)	0.86 (0.28)	0.74
Therapeutic-dose	2.55	(0.82, 7.60)	2.97 (1.78)	0.05
Ineligible aspirin	2.24	(0.58, 7.51)	2.69 (1.84)	0.11
Age $\geq 60$	1.70	(1.03, 2.80)	1.75 (0.45)	0.02
Female	0.57	(0.33, 0.92)	0.58 (0.15)	0.99
Oxygen requirement	3.86	(2.30, 6.65)	4.02 (1.11)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.95	(0.22, 3.80)	1.23 (1.02)	0.52
Nepal	1.63	(0.42, 6.00)	2.03 (1.54)	0.23




Figure 2.18: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-PP

### 2.2.2.5 AVS-PP

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** antiviral intervention, anticoagulation intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-PP

Table 2.32: Summary of primary composite outcome by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-PP.

n (%)	Not randomised to anticoagulation	Low dose	Intermediate dose	Low dose with aspirin	Therapeutic dose	Overall
Randomised	27	40	47	7	10	131
Outcome missing	3 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (8.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (5.3)
Outcome observed	24 (88.9)	40 (100.0)	43 (91.5)	7 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	124 (94.7)
Met primary outcome	3 (12.5)	4 (10.0)	3 (7.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (8.1)

Table 2.33: Summary of primary composite outcome by antiviral treatment group, AVS-PP.

n (%)	Standard of care	Nafamostat	Overall
Randomised	66	65	131
Outcome missing	3 (4.5)	4 (6.2)	7 (5.3)
Outcome observed	63 (95.5)	61 (93.8)	124 (94.7)
Met primary outcome	8 (12.7)	2 (3.3)	10 (8.1)

Table 2.34: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the AVS-PP set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.23	(0.06, 0.83)	0.29 (0.21)	0.99
Intermediate-dose	0.84	(0.19, 3.57)	1.10 (0.96)	0.60
Low-dose with aspirin	0.50	(0.07, 3.34)	0.80 (0.99)	0.76
Therapeutic-dose	0.70	(0.08, 5.14)	1.17 (1.52)	0.63
Age ≥ 60	1.05	(0.21, 4.50)	1.38 (1.18)	0.47
Female	0.23	(0.04, 0.98)	0.30 (0.26)	0.98
Oxygen requirement	6.84	(1.15, 71.65)	14.33 (38.79)	0.02




Figure 2.19: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-PP

### 2.2.2.6 ACS-PP

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch
- **Set:** ACS-PP

Table 2.35: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the ACS-PP set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.17	(0.03, 0.79)	0.23 (0.22)	0.99
Intermediate-dose	0.70	(0.40, 1.23)	0.73 (0.21)	0.90
Low-dose with aspirin	0.82	(0.43, 1.53)	0.86 (0.28)	0.73
Therapeutic-dose	2.52	(0.82, 7.54)	2.94 (1.76)	0.05
Ineligible aspirin	2.48	(0.63, 8.45)	3.00 (2.11)	0.09
Age $\geq 60$	1.77	(1.06, 2.94)	1.84 (0.49)	0.01
Female	0.60	(0.35, 0.99)	0.62 (0.16)	0.98
Oxygen requirement	3.78	(2.25, 6.48)	3.93 (1.09)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.88	(0.20, 3.62)	1.14 (0.92)	0.57
Nepal	1.69	(0.41, 5.99)	2.07 (1.50)	0.22




Figure 2.20: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-PP

## 2.2.3 Sensitivity Analyses

The SAP outlined a number of sensitivity analyses. Any sensitivity analyses not outlined in the SAP will be indicated as post-hoc.

### 2.2.3.1 AVS-ITT Treatment Only (Post-hoc)

The SAP pre-specified a number of covariates for the analysis based on the AVS-ITT. These were included, but due to the small number of events there may be little data to inform the model parameters. Therefore, the AVS-ITT analyses was also undertaken where the model only contained a term for the antiviral intervention received. The results of this treatment-only model are reported below.

Table 2.36: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for treatment-only model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.49	(0.15, 1.43)	0.57 (0.34)	0.90




Figure 2.21: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.2.3.2 FAS-ITT “Best-case” scenario

Table 2.37: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.35	(0.10, 1.23)	0.43 (0.30)	0.95
Intermediate-dose	0.71	(0.41, 1.24)	0.74 (0.21)	0.89
Low-dose with aspirin	0.86	(0.46, 1.59)	0.90 (0.29)	0.69
Therapeutic-dose	2.68	(0.94, 7.35)	3.06 (1.71)	0.03
Ineligible aspirin	2.56	(0.70, 8.18)	3.04 (2.00)	0.08
Age ≥ 60	1.73	(1.06, 2.83)	1.78 (0.45)	0.01
Female	0.64	(0.38, 1.03)	0.66 (0.17)	0.97
Oxygen requirement	3.67	(2.21, 6.18)	3.82 (1.02)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.97	(0.24, 3.74)	1.22 (0.95)	0.52
Nepal	1.59	(0.40, 5.74)	1.96 (1.45)	0.25




Figure 2.22: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome.




Figure 2.23: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing do not meet primary outcome.



### 2.2.3.3 FAS-ITT “Worst-case” scenario

Table 2.38: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.62	(0.22, 1.71)	0.71 (0.39)	0.82
Intermediate-dose	0.72	(0.44, 1.16)	0.74 (0.18)	0.91
Low-dose with aspirin	0.78	(0.44, 1.35)	0.81 (0.24)	0.80
Therapeutic-dose	1.65	(0.62, 4.20)	1.85 (0.94)	0.15
Ineligible aspirin	1.05	(0.29, 3.30)	1.24 (0.79)	0.47
Age ≥ 60	1.59	(1.02, 2.41)	1.62 (0.36)	0.02
Female	0.77	(0.50, 1.16)	0.78 (0.17)	0.90
Oxygen requirement	2.75	(1.77, 4.28)	2.82 (0.65)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	2.10	(0.51, 8.03)	2.65 (2.06)	0.15
Nepal	1.46	(0.36, 4.97)	1.78 (1.27)	0.28




Figure 2.24: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome.




Figure 2.25: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line 0.95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects for the primary outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set assuming missing meet primary outcome.

#### **2.2.3.4 Temporal Variation**

## 2.2.4 Subgroups

The pre-specified subgroups where treatment effect heterogeneity with respect to Nafamostat was to be investigated were:

- region (India, Australia/New Zealand, Nepal)
- days since symptom onset ( $\leq 7$  or  $> 7$  days)
- age at enrolment ( $< 60$  or  $\geq 60$  years of age)
- supplemental oxygen or oxygen saturation less than 94% at randomisation (yes or no)
- receipt of corticosteroid during hospital stay (yes or no)
- receipt of remdesivir during hospital stay (yes or no)
- receipt of other agent intended to be antiviral against SARS-CoV-2 during hospital stay (yes or no)
- vaccination status

Domain-specific subgroups were additionally specified as:

- presence of iatrogenic immunosuppression at randomisation
- D-dimer above upper limit of normal at baseline (yes or no)

The analysts note that:

- The antiviral domain was almost exclusive to participants in Australia/New Zealand (5 were randomised in Nepal, 0 in India), therefore, no subgroup analysis was undertaken for region
- Given the small number of events in the antiviral domain, there is little data to inform subgroup specific effects for Nafamostat beyond what is assumed in the specified prior.
- Some of the subgroups relate to post-randomisation events, which make interpretation of the treatment effects difficult.

For each sub-group analysis, the primary model was extended to include an interaction term between the covariate of interest and the antiviral interventions (not randomised and randomised to Nafamostat).

### 2.2.4.1 Region

A summary of the primary outcome by country and intervention is reported in Table 2.39 and Table 2.40. Note that no participants enrolled in Nepal or New Zealand received standard dose plus aspirin due to the timing of its removal from the domain. Additionally, no participants enrolled in India were randomised to the antiviral domain and very few in Nepal. No subgroup analysis for Nafamostat was undertaken for region as there were no events observed in the antiviral domain outside of Australia/New Zealand.

Table 2.39: Summary of participant outcomes by region of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>India</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	0	0	- (-%)
Low dose	493	486	27 (6%)
Intermediate dose	516	511	20 (4%)
Low dose with aspirin	275	272	20 (7%)
Therapeutic dose	4	4	0 (0%)
<b>Australia/New Zealand</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	27	23	4 (17%)
Low dose	61	57	4 (7%)
Intermediate dose	66	59	4 (7%)
Low dose with aspirin	8	7	0 (0%)
Therapeutic dose	15	15	1 (7%)
<b>Nepal</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	5	5	0 (0%)
Low dose	56	53	4 (8%)
Intermediate dose	31	31	1 (3%)
Low dose with aspirin	0	0	- (-%)
Therapeutic dose	31	31	6 (19%)

Table 2.40: Summary of participant outcomes by region of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>India</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	1288	1273	67 (5%)
Standard of care	0	0	- (-%)
Nafamostat	0	0	- (-%)
<b>Australia/New Zealand</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	27	22	1 (5%)
Standard of care	71	67	8 (12%)
Nafamostat	79	72	4 (6%)
<b>Nepal</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	118	115	11 (10%)
Standard of care	2	2	0 (0%)
Nafamostat	3	3	0 (0%)

### 2.2.4.2 Age group

A subgroup analysis of age group ( $< 60$  or  $\geq 60$  years of age) was undertaken using the FAS-ITT set. A summary of the primary outcome by age group and intervention is reported in Table 2.41.

Table 2.41: Summary of participant outcomes by age group at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Age <math>&lt; 60</math> years</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	25	22	3 (14%)
Low dose	445	436	18 (4%)
Intermediate dose	436	427	15 (4%)
Low dose with aspirin	195	192	11 (6%)
Therapeutic dose	26	26	3 (12%)
<b>Age <math>\geq 60</math> years</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	7	6	1 (17%)
Low dose	165	160	17 (11%)
Intermediate dose	177	174	10 (6%)
Low dose with aspirin	88	87	9 (10%)
Therapeutic dose	24	24	4 (17%)

Table 2.42: Summary of participant outcomes by age group at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Age <math>&lt; 60</math> years</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	1013	998	42 (4%)
Standard of care	54	51	5 (10%)
Nafamostat	60	54	3 (6%)
<b>Age <math>\geq 60</math> years</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	420	412	37 (9%)
Standard of care	19	18	3 (17%)
Nafamostat	22	21	1 (5%)

Table 2.43: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by age of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set.

Age	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Age < 60	0.37	(0.09, 1.43)	0.46 (0.37)	0.93	0.09
Age ≥ 60	0.29	(0.04, 1.99)	0.46 (0.59)	0.89	0.12

Table 2.44: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by age of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set.

Age	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Age < 60	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Age ≥ 60	0.77	(0.10, 5.59)	1.28 (1.67)	0.60




Figure 2.26: Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by age subgroup using FAS-ITT set.






Figure 2.27: Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by age subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions.

### 2.2.4.3 Days since symptom onset

A subgroup analysis of days since first symptoms (DSFS) group ( $\leq 7$  or  $> 7$  days) was undertaken using the FAS-ITT set. A summary of the primary outcome by DSFS group and intervention is reported in Table 2.45.

Table 2.45: Summary of participant outcomes by days since symptom onset in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Days since first symptoms <math>\leq 7</math></b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	17	15	3 (20%)
Low dose	421	412	22 (5%)
Intermediate dose	432	426	20 (5%)
Low dose with aspirin	206	203	15 (7%)
Therapeutic dose	39	39	5 (13%)
<b>Days since first symptoms <math>&gt; 7</math></b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	15	13	1 (8%)
Low dose	189	184	13 (7%)
Intermediate dose	181	175	5 (3%)
Low dose with aspirin	77	76	5 (7%)
Therapeutic dose	11	11	2 (18%)

Table 2.46: Summary of participant outcomes by days since symptom onset in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Days since first symptoms <math>\leq 7</math></b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	1039	1026	57 (6%)
Standard of care	34	31	6 (19%)
Nafamostat	42	38	2 (5%)
<b>Days since first symptoms <math>&gt; 7</math></b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	394	384	22 (6%)
Standard of care	39	38	2 (5%)
Nafamostat	40	37	2 (5%)

Table 2.47: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by DSFS of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set.

Days since symptom onset	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Days from symptom onset $\leq 7$	0.28	(0.06, 1.16)	0.37 (0.31)	0.96	0.05
Days from symptom onset > 7	0.53	(0.08, 3.18)	0.81 (0.96)	0.75	0.29

Table 2.48: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by DSFS of enrolment in the FAS-ITT set.

Days since symptom onset	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Days from symptom onset $\leq 7$	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Days from symptom onset > 7	1.90	(0.27, 13.40)	3.09 (3.99)	0.27




Figure 2.28: Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by days since first symptoms subgroup using FAS-ITT set.




Figure 2.29: Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by days since first symptoms subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions.

#### 2.2.4.4 Oxygen requirement

A subgroup analysis for supplemental oxygen requirement at baseline was undertaken using the FAS-ITT set.

Table 2.49: Summary of participant outcomes by room air and oxygen saturation in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not required supplemental oxygen</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	9	6	1 (17%)
Low dose	358	349	11 (3%)
Intermediate dose	372	369	11 (3%)
Low dose with aspirin	179	177	7 (4%)
Therapeutic dose	24	24	1 (4%)
<b>Required supplemental oxygen</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	23	22	3 (14%)
Low dose	252	247	24 (10%)
Intermediate dose	241	232	14 (6%)
Low dose with aspirin	104	102	13 (13%)
Therapeutic dose	26	26	6 (23%)

Table 2.50: Summary of participant outcomes by room air and oxygen saturation in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not required supplemental oxygen</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	900	886	30 (3%)
Standard of care	23	21	0 (0%)
Nafamostat	19	18	1 (6%)
<b>Required supplemental oxygen</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	533	524	49 (9%)
Standard of care	50	48	8 (17%)
Nafamostat	63	57	3 (5%)

Table 2.51: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by room air and oxygen saturation at enrolment in the FAS-ITT set.

Supplemental oxygen	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Did not require supplemental oxygen	0.76	(0.12, 4.72)	1.18 (1.38)	0.61	0.42
Required supplemental oxygen	0.25	(0.05, 0.98)	0.32 (0.25)	0.98	0.03

Table 2.52: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by room air and oxygen saturation at enrolment the FAS-ITT set.

Supplemental oxygen	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Did not require supplemental oxygen	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Required supplemental oxygen	0.32	(0.05, 2.24)	0.52 (0.72)	0.88




Figure 2.30: Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by supplemental oxygen subgroup using FAS-ITT set.




Figure 2.31: Posterior predictive distribution of primary outcome proportion for antiviral interventions by supplemental oxygen subgroup using FAS-ITT set. Red diamonds indicate sample proportions, black points posterior-predictive medians.

### 2.2.4.5 Receipt of Corticosteroids

A summary of the primary outcome by receipt of corticosteroids and intervention is reported in Table 2.53 and Table 2.54.

It is noted that this subgroup analysis was pre-specified, however receipt of corticosteroids is reported on the discharge summary and is a post-randomisation event (any receipt during their index hospital admission). Therefore, interpretation of this subgroup is challenging (more severe patients may have been more likely to receive corticosteroids, availability may be site specific, etc.).

Table 2.53: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of corticosteroids during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive corticosteroids</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	12	11	0 (0%)
Low dose	214	210	8 (4%)
Intermediate dose	225	223	6 (3%)
Low dose with aspirin	100	98	4 (4%)
Therapeutic dose	13	13	1 (8%)
<b>Received corticosteroids</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	20	17	4 (24%)
Low dose	396	386	27 (7%)
Intermediate dose	388	378	19 (5%)
Low dose with aspirin	183	181	16 (9%)
Therapeutic dose	37	37	6 (16%)

Table 2.54: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of corticosteroids during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive corticosteroids</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	534	526	18 (3%)
Standard of care	18	18	0 (0%)
Nafamostat	12	11	1 (9%)
<b>Received corticosteroids</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	899	884	61 (7%)
Standard of care	55	51	8 (16%)
Nafamostat	70	64	3 (5%)



Table 2.55: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by receipt of corticosteroids in the FAS-ITT set.

Received corticosteroids	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Did not receive corticosteroids	0.95	(0.15, 6.22)	1.50 (1.79)	0.52	0.52
Received corticosteroids	0.21	(0.04, 0.85)	0.27 (0.22)	0.99	0.02

Table 2.56: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by receipt of corticosteroids in the FAS-ITT set.

Received corticosteroids	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Did not receive corticosteroids	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Received corticosteroids	0.21	(0.03, 1.49)	0.35 (0.47)	0.94




Figure 2.32: Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by receipt of steroids subgroup using FAS-ITT set.

#### 2.2.4.6 Receipt of Remdesivir

A summary of the primary outcome by receipt of remdesivir and intervention is reported in Table 2.57 and Table 2.58.

Table 2.57: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of remdesivir during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive remdesivir</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	24	20	3 (15%)
Low dose	324	315	7 (2%)
Intermediate dose	324	316	6 (2%)
Low dose with aspirin	114	112	2 (2%)
Therapeutic dose	40	40	5 (12%)
<b>Received remdesivir</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	8	8	1 (12%)
Low dose	286	281	28 (10%)
Intermediate dose	289	285	19 (7%)
Low dose with aspirin	169	167	18 (11%)
Therapeutic dose	10	10	2 (20%)

Table 2.58: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of remdesivir during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive remdesivir</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	749	733	16 (2%)
Standard of care	34	31	5 (16%)
Nafamostat	43	39	2 (5%)
<b>Received remdesivir</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	684	677	63 (9%)
Standard of care	39	38	3 (8%)
Nafamostat	39	36	2 (6%)

### 2.2.4.7 Receipt of other antiviral agent

A summary of the primary outcome by receipt of other antiviral and intervention is reported in Table 2.59 and Table 2.60.

This subgroup analysis was pre-specified, however receipt of an antiviral is reported on the discharge summary and is a post-randomisation event.

Table 2.59: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of other antiviral during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive other antiviral</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	24	21	2 (10%)
Low dose	337	324	27 (8%)
Intermediate dose	340	331	23 (7%)
Low dose with aspirin	169	165	13 (8%)
Therapeutic dose	48	48	7 (15%)
<b>Received other antiviral</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	8	7	2 (29%)
Low dose	273	272	8 (3%)
Intermediate dose	273	270	2 (1%)
Low dose with aspirin	114	114	7 (6%)
Therapeutic dose	2	2	0 (0%)

Table 2.60: Summary of participant outcomes by receipt of other antiviral during index hospital stay in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Did not receive other antiviral</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	780	760	63 (8%)
Standard of care	66	63	6 (10%)
Nafamostat	72	66	3 (5%)
<b>Received other antiviral</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	653	650	16 (2%)
Standard of care	7	6	2 (33%)
Nafamostat	10	9	1 (11%)

Table 2.61: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by receipt of other antiviral in the FAS-ITT set.

Received other antiviral	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Did not receive other antivirals	0.40	(0.10, 1.52)	0.50 (0.39)	0.91	0.11
Received other antivirals	0.12	(0.00, 3.89)	0.57 (2.22)	0.88	0.13

Table 2.62: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by receipt of other antiviral in the FAS-ITT set.

Received other antiviral	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Did not receive other antivirals	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Received other antivirals	0.29	(0.00, 13.03)	1.85 (8.99)	0.73




Figure 2.33: Posterior densities of odds ratio for antiviral interventions relative to standard dose by receipt of other antiviral subgroup using FAS-ITT set.

#### 2.2.4.8 Vaccination Status

There were 8 participants randomised to the antiviral domain who had unknown vaccination status none of whom met the primary outcome conditions. Due to small numbers, the effect of Nafamostat amongst those with unknown vaccination status was assumed to be the same as those who were not vaccinated.

Table 2.63: Summary of participant outcomes by whether patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set, anticoagulation domain.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Not vaccinated</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	9	7	3 (43%)
Low dose	387	378	24 (6%)
Intermediate dose	371	362	15 (4%)
Low dose with aspirin	212	208	14 (7%)
Therapeutic dose	23	23	4 (17%)
<b>Vaccinated</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	15	13	1 (8%)
Low dose	191	186	3 (2%)
Intermediate dose	220	217	5 (2%)
Low dose with aspirin	42	42	1 (2%)
Therapeutic dose	27	27	3 (11%)
<b>Unknown</b>			
Not randomised to anticoagulation	8	8	0 (0%)
Low dose	32	32	8 (25%)
Intermediate dose	22	22	5 (23%)
Low dose with aspirin	29	29	5 (17%)
Therapeutic dose	0	0	- (-%)

Table 2.64: Summary of participant outcomes by whether patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set, antiviral domain.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Primary outcome
<b>Not vaccinated</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	913	897	51 (6%)
Standard of care	39	37	7 (19%)
Nafamostat	50	44	2 (5%)
<b>Vaccinated</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	437	430	10 (2%)
Standard of care	27	25	1 (4%)
Nafamostat	31	30	2 (7%)
<b>Unknown</b>			
Not randomised to antiviral	83	83	18 (22%)
Standard of care	7	7	0 (0%)
Nafamostat	1	1	0 (0%)

Table 2.65: Summary of odds ratios for treatment effects by patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set.

Vaccination status	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)	Pr(OR > 1/1.1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>					
Not vaccinated	0.27	(0.07, 1.03)	0.34 (0.26)	0.97	0.04
Vaccinated	0.85	(0.10, 6.46)	1.45 (2.04)	0.56	0.47
Unknown	0.27	(0.07, 1.03)	0.34 (0.26)	0.97	0.04

Table 2.66: Summary of odds ratio comparisons of treatment effects by patient vaccination status at baseline in the FAS-ITT set.

Vaccination status	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
Not vaccinated	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00
Vaccinated	3.14	(0.40, 24.82)	5.46 (7.55)	0.14
Unknown	1.00	(1.00, 1.00)	1.00 (0.00)	0.00




Figure 2.34: Posterior densities of odds ratio for anticoagulation interventions relative to standard dose by patient vaccination status at baseline using FAS-ITT set.

#### **2.2.4.9 Iatrogenic immunosuppression**

No analysis was undertaken as only 6 participants assigned to the antiviral domain had presence of iatrogenic immunosuppression at baseline.



#### **2.2.4.10 D-Dimer**

## 2.3 Secondary Outcomes

For all secondary outcomes, the primary model (the model adjusting for interventions, age group, country, site, and epoch using the relevant outcome model) was fit to the ACS-ITT set. The only sensitivity analysis conducted was to repeat the analyses restricted to contemporaneous controls using a reduced model.

### 2.3.1 Time to clinical recovery to day 28

This section reports on the analysis for time to clinical recovery. Time to clinical recovery was taken as the first day from the index admission at which the patient had a WHO outcome score of 3 or less. For participants whose WHO outcome score was greater than 3 on the day of discharge, their day of recovery was counted as the first day after discharge, e.g. if discharged on day 7 with a daily WHO score of 4, then time to recovery was quantified as 8. Death was treated as a competing-risk to recovery. If recovery and death reportedly occurred on the same day (e.g. daily status WHO scale  $< 4$  but discharge outcome of death on same day), then the patient was considered to have died on that day without recovery. No adjustment was made for participants who recovered but then subsequently died (i.e. only the first event was considered; any such patients were just counted as recovered on the relevant day). No allowance was made for participants who discharged against medical advice (treated as recovered following discharge).

The analysis of the time to clinical recovery to day 28 outcome used a discrete-time competing risk time-to-event model (multinomial logistic regression). The events of interest were death or recovery. Baseline cause-specific hazards were modelled separately for death and recovery with some smoothing enforced across adjacent time points via a first order random walk prior on the logit intercept terms.

This modelling approach deviated from that specified in the SAP which did not account for the competing risk of death.

### 2.3.1.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** multinomial logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, epoch
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

Table 2.67: Summary for time to recovery (TTR) or death to day 28, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT

Intervention	Randomised	Known	Died	Recovered	Unrecovered	TTR, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised	32	32	0 (0.0)	30 (93.8)	2 (6.2)	6 (5.00, 8.75)
Low	610	610	15 (2.5)	592 (97.0)	3 (0.5)	6 (4.00, 7.00)
Intermediate	613	613	10 (1.6)	598 (97.6)	5 (0.8)	6 (4.00, 7.00)
Low with aspirin	283	283	9 (3.2)	271 (95.8)	3 (1.1)	6 (4.00, 8.00)
Therapeutic	50	50	4 (8.0)	46 (92.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (4.25, 9.00)

Table 2.68: Summary for time to recovery (TTR) or death to day 28, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT

Intervention	Randomised	Known	Died	Recovered	Unrecovered	TTR, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised	1433	1433	38 (2.7)	1386 (96.7)	9 (0.6)	6 (4.00, 7.00)
Standard of care	73	73	0 (0.0)	71 (97.3)	2 (2.7)	6 (5.00, 9.00)
Nafamostat	82	82	0 (0.0)	80 (97.6)	2 (2.4)	6 (5.00, 9.00)




Figure 2.35: Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.36: Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.69: Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, FAS-ITT.

Factor	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
<b>Recovery</b>				
Nafamostat	1.05	(0.70, 1.51)	1.06 (0.21)	0.58
Intermediate	1.12	(0.98, 1.29)	1.12 (0.08)	0.96
Low with aspirin	1.04	(0.86, 1.24)	1.04 (0.10)	0.66
Therapeutic	0.84	(0.57, 1.22)	0.86 (0.17)	0.19
Ineligible aspirin	0.78	(0.51, 1.16)	0.79 (0.16)	0.11
Age $\geq 60$	0.67	(0.58, 0.76)	0.67 (0.05)	0.00
Oxygen requirement	0.61	(0.53, 0.70)	0.61 (0.04)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.84	(0.48, 1.50)	0.88 (0.26)	0.27
Nepal	0.78	(0.27, 2.58)	0.93 (0.62)	0.31
<b>Death</b>				
Nafamostat	1.02	(0.10, 10.67)	1.99 (3.04)	0.50
Intermediate	0.67	(0.27, 1.65)	0.74 (0.36)	0.18
Low with aspirin	0.86	(0.35, 2.16)	0.97 (0.51)	0.37
Therapeutic	2.97	(0.82, 10.90)	3.72 (2.84)	0.95
Ineligible aspirin	4.53	(1.16, 16.65)	5.62 (4.13)	0.99
Age $\geq 60$	0.83	(0.39, 1.72)	0.89 (0.35)	0.32
Oxygen requirement	1.42	(0.66, 3.49)	1.59 (0.76)	0.81
Australia/New Zealand	0.55	(0.11, 2.37)	0.72 (0.62)	0.22
Nepal	1.81	(0.39, 8.68)	2.53 (2.45)	0.79




Figure 2.37: Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, FAS-ITT.

## Recovery




Figure 2.38: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on recovery to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

## Death




Figure 2.39: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on death to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.



### 2.3.1.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** multinomial logistic regression
- **Terms:** antiviral intervention, anticoagulation intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-ITT




Figure 2.40: Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, anticoagulation domain, AVS-ITT.

Table 2.70: Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, AVS-ITT.

Factor	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
<b>Recovery</b>				
Nafamostat	1.04	(0.72, 1.50)	1.05 (0.20)	0.57
Intermediate	0.75	(0.32, 1.68)	0.81 (0.35)	0.24
Low with aspirin	1.59	(0.55, 4.29)	1.80 (0.98)	0.81
Therapeutic	1.06	(0.43, 2.52)	1.17 (0.54)	0.56
Age $\geq 60$	0.32	(0.20, 0.50)	0.33 (0.08)	0.00
Oxygen requirement	0.77	(0.50, 1.18)	0.79 (0.18)	0.12
<b>Death</b>				
Nafamostat	1.00	(0.06, 15.61)	2.60 (6.31)	0.50
Intermediate	1.00	(0.06, 16.32)	2.76 (6.70)	0.50
Low with aspirin	1.07	(0.07, 16.34)	2.80 (5.92)	0.52
Therapeutic	0.98	(0.06, 15.85)	2.65 (5.77)	0.49
Age $\geq 60$	0.71	(0.01, 70.20)	11.26 (113.06)	0.44
Oxygen requirement	0.58	(0.01, 61.08)	10.84 (136.99)	0.41




Figure 2.41: Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.1.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** multinomial logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, epoch
- **Set:** ACS-ITT




Figure 2.42: Observed progression of patients with respect to death and recovery, antiviral domain, ACS-ITT.

Table 2.71: Posterior summary of cause-specific odds ratios for recovery or death to day 28, ACS-ITT.

Factor	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
<b>Recovery</b>				
Nafamostat	1.27	(0.84, 1.90)	1.31 (0.28)	0.87
Intermediate	1.12	(0.97, 1.27)	1.12 (0.08)	0.94
Low with aspirin	1.04	(0.85, 1.23)	1.04 (0.10)	0.64
Therapeutic	0.80	(0.54, 1.18)	0.82 (0.16)	0.14
Ineligible aspirin	0.77	(0.48, 1.18)	0.80 (0.19)	0.15
Age $\geq 60$	0.68	(0.59, 0.78)	0.68 (0.05)	0.00
Oxygen requirement	0.58	(0.51, 0.67)	0.58 (0.04)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.92	(0.51, 1.68)	0.96 (0.30)	0.38
Nepal	0.80	(0.25, 2.47)	0.92 (0.62)	0.30
<b>Death</b>				
Nafamostat	1.07	(0.11, 11.16)	2.16 (3.58)	0.52
Intermediate	0.62	(0.25, 1.50)	0.69 (0.32)	0.14
Low with aspirin	0.91	(0.39, 2.18)	1.00 (0.45)	0.42
Therapeutic	3.00	(0.72, 11.61)	3.79 (2.94)	0.94
Ineligible aspirin	4.17	(1.08, 14.91)	5.23 (3.65)	0.98
Age $\geq 60$	0.87	(0.41, 1.87)	0.95 (0.39)	0.38
Oxygen requirement	1.24	(0.56, 2.95)	1.36 (0.62)	0.69
Australia/New Zealand	0.57	(0.11, 2.49)	0.75 (0.65)	0.24
Nepal	1.79	(0.34, 8.89)	2.45 (2.43)	0.77




Figure 2.43: Cause-specific baseline hazard posterior summaries, ACS-ITT.

## Recovery




Figure 2.44: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on recovery to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

## Death




Figure 2.45: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on death to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

### 2.3.2 WHO 8-point ordinal outcome scale at day 28

This section reports on the analysis of the secondary outcome: WHO outcome scale at day 28. The model is coded so that an odds ratio less than 1 implies a benefit (reduction in odds of having a higher WHO score at day 28).

Table 2.72 presents the number of participants where the outcome was observed by the allocated anticoagulation arm. Similarly for the antiviral arms in Table 2.73.

Table 2.72: Summary of WHO scale at 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	Hospitalised	WHO, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to anticoagulation	32	29	0 (0%)	4 (14%)	2 (1, 2)
Low-dose	610	596	19 (3%)	7 (1%)	1 (1, 2)
Intermediate-dose	613	603	15 (2%)	5 (1%)	1 (1, 2)
Low-dose with aspirin	283	281	10 (4%)	5 (2%)	1 (1, 2)
Therapeutic-dose	50	50	6 (12%)	1 (2%)	1 (1, 2)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1559</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>22 (1%)</b>	<b>1 (1, 2)</b>

Table 2.73: Summary of WHO scale at 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	Hospitalised	WHO, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to antiviral	1433	1414	50 (4%)	13 (1%)	1 (1, 2)
Standard of care	73	70	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	2 (1, 2)
Nafamostat	82	75	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	1 (1, 2)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1559</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>22 (1%)</b>	<b>1 (1, 2)</b>



### 2.3.2.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

Figure 2.46 and Figure 2.47 report on the distribution of day 28 WHO score.




Figure 2.46: Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT.

The model parameters (odds ratios) are summarised in Table 2.74 for the fixed-effect terms and in Figure 2.49 for the site and epoch specific terms.




Figure 2.47: Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.74: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.68	(0.35, 1.32)	0.72 (0.25)	0.88
Intermediate-dose	0.81	(0.61, 1.07)	0.81 (0.12)	0.93
Low-dose with aspirin	0.73	(0.51, 1.05)	0.75 (0.14)	0.95
Therapeutic-dose	1.69	(0.84, 3.37)	1.80 (0.66)	0.07
Ineligible aspirin	1.63	(0.74, 3.51)	1.76 (0.72)	0.11
Age $\geq 60$	2.50	(1.91, 3.27)	2.52 (0.35)	0.00
Female	0.94	(0.73, 1.20)	0.95 (0.12)	0.70
Oxygen requirement	2.13	(1.59, 2.86)	2.15 (0.32)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.32	(0.42, 4.00)	1.55 (0.95)	0.32
Nepal	0.55	(0.18, 1.95)	0.68 (0.53)	0.83




Figure 2.48: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.49: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on WHO outcome scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.2.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** antiviral intervention, anticoagulation intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-ITT

Figure 2.50 presents the distribution of day 28 WHO score by anticoagulation intervention for AVS-ITT.




Figure 2.50: Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT.

Table 2.75: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.72	(0.36, 1.42)	0.77 (0.27)	0.82
Intermediate-dose	1.35	(0.61, 3.03)	1.47 (0.63)	0.24
Low-dose with aspirin	0.79	(0.19, 3.14)	1.01 (0.81)	0.63
Therapeutic-dose	1.82	(0.60, 5.45)	2.12 (1.29)	0.14
Age $\geq 60$	3.88	(1.83, 8.47)	4.21 (1.74)	0.00
Female	1.20	(0.60, 2.40)	1.28 (0.47)	0.30
Oxygen requirement	1.18	(0.56, 2.54)	1.28 (0.51)	0.33




Figure 2.51: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.2.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** ACS-ITT

Figure 2.52 presents the distribution of day 28 WHO score by antiviral intervention for ACS-ITT.




Figure 2.52: Observed distribution of WHO outcome scale at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT.

Table 2.76: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for WHO outcome scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.73	(0.34, 1.56)	0.79 (0.31)	0.79
Intermediate-dose	0.81	(0.61, 1.08)	0.82 (0.12)	0.93
Low-dose with aspirin	0.73	(0.51, 1.06)	0.75 (0.14)	0.95
Therapeutic-dose	1.70	(0.84, 3.40)	1.80 (0.66)	0.07
Ineligible aspirin	1.68	(0.76, 3.59)	1.80 (0.74)	0.10
Age $\geq 60$	2.37	(1.80, 3.11)	2.39 (0.33)	0.00
Female	0.94	(0.72, 1.21)	0.95 (0.13)	0.69
Oxygen requirement	2.22	(1.65, 2.98)	2.25 (0.34)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.13	(0.35, 3.49)	1.34 (0.84)	0.41
Nepal	0.59	(0.18, 2.07)	0.73 (0.54)	0.81




Figure 2.53: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.






Figure 2.54: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on WHO outcome scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

### 2.3.3 All-cause mortality to day 28

This section reports on the analysis of the secondary outcome: all-cause mortality to day 28. For this outcome, participants who died within 28 days were coded to have a value of 1, and those who did not, to have a value of 0. The model is coded so that an odds ratio less than 1 implies a benefit (reduction in odds of death by day 28).

Table 2.77 and Table 2.78 presents the number of participants where the outcome was observed by the allocated anticoagulation (for ACS-ITT) arm and antiviral arm (for AVS-ITT) respectively.

Table 2.77: Summary of mortality by day 28 by treatment group, ACS-ITT.

n (%)	Low dose	Intermediate dose	Low dose with aspirin	Therapeutic dose	Overall
Randomised	610	613	283	50	1556
Outcome missing	14 (2.3)	10 (1.6)	2 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	26 (1.7)
Outcome observed	596 (97.7)	603 (98.4)	281 (99.3)	50 (100.0)	1530 (98.3)
Died within 28 days	19 (3.2)	15 (2.5)	10 (3.6)	6 (12.0)	50 (3.3)

Table 2.78: Summary of mortality by day 28 by treatment group, AVS-ITT.

n (%)	Standard of care	Nafamostat	Overall
Randomised	73	82	155
Outcome missing	3 (4.1)	7 (8.5)	10 (6.5)
Outcome observed	70 (95.9)	75 (91.5)	145 (93.5)
Died within 28 days	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

### 2.3.3.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

The model parameters (odds ratios) are summarised in Table 2.81 for the fixed-effect terms and in Figure 2.59 for the site and epoch specific terms.

Table 2.79: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.87	(0.09, 8.45)	1.69 (2.69)	0.55
Intermediate-dose	0.80	(0.39, 1.61)	0.85 (0.31)	0.74
Low-dose with aspirin	0.80	(0.34, 1.79)	0.87 (0.37)	0.70
Therapeutic-dose	3.91	(1.16, 13.13)	4.73 (3.26)	0.01
Ineligible aspirin	4.67	(1.18, 17.25)	5.84 (4.42)	0.02
Age $\geq 60$	1.99	(1.06, 3.69)	2.09 (0.68)	0.02
Female	0.35	(0.16, 0.69)	0.37 (0.14)	1.00
Oxygen requirement	3.23	(1.71, 6.32)	3.43 (1.19)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.53	(0.11, 2.35)	0.71 (0.62)	0.80
Nepal	2.45	(0.56, 9.50)	3.10 (2.47)	0.10




Figure 2.55: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.56: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 mortality for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.3.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region.
- **Set:** AVS-ITT

Table 2.80: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	1.00	(0.09, 10.80)	2.11 (4.25)	0.50
Intermediate-dose	1.01	(0.08, 13.15)	2.33 (4.76)	0.50
Low-dose with aspirin	0.82	(0.06, 11.58)	2.02 (4.32)	0.56
Therapeutic-dose	0.87	(0.07, 11.24)	2.08 (4.37)	0.54
Age $\geq 60$	2.67	(0.07, 201.24)	40.19 (1462.79)	0.31
Female	3.34	(0.11, 223.37)	44.76 (829.81)	0.25
Oxygen requirement	6.44	(0.24, 324.90)	45.63 (250.72)	0.14




Figure 2.57: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.3.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** ACS-ITT

Table 2.81: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mortality by day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.83	(0.08, 8.65)	1.70 (3.24)	0.56
Intermediate-dose	0.80	(0.39, 1.61)	0.85 (0.32)	0.74
Low-dose with aspirin	0.82	(0.36, 1.82)	0.89 (0.38)	0.69
Therapeutic-dose	4.03	(1.22, 13.35)	4.85 (3.32)	0.01
Ineligible aspirin	4.51	(1.09, 16.52)	5.59 (4.16)	0.02
Age $\geq 60$	2.05	(1.08, 3.86)	2.15 (0.71)	0.01
Female	0.34	(0.16, 0.68)	0.36 (0.14)	1.00
Oxygen requirement	3.24	(1.67, 6.48)	3.45 (1.24)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.54	(0.11, 2.42)	0.72 (0.64)	0.79
Nepal	2.56	(0.56, 9.98)	3.24 (2.61)	0.10




Figure 2.58: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.




Figure 2.59: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 mortality for the primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

### 2.3.4 Days alive and free of hospital to day 28

This section reports on the analysis of the secondary outcome: days alive and free of hospital (DAFH) to day 28. For this outcome, participants who died within 28 days were coded to have 0 DAFH. The model is coded so that an odds ratio greater than 1 implies a benefit (increased odds of more days alive and free of hospital).

Table 2.82 presents the number of participants where the outcome was observed by the allocated anticoagulation arm. Similarly, Table 2.83 for the antiviral domain.




Figure 2.60: Observed overall distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.82: Summary of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	DAFH, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to anticoagulation	32	29	0 (0%)	22 (18, 23)
Low-dose	610	595	19 (3%)	23 (21, 24)
Intermediate-dose	613	603	15 (2%)	23 (21, 24)
Low-dose with aspirin	283	280	10 (4%)	22 (20, 24)
Therapeutic-dose	50	50	6 (12%)	22 (19, 24)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1557</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>23 (21, 24)</b>



Table 2.83: Summary of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	DAFH, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to antiviral	1433	1412	50 (4%)	23 (21, 24)
Standard of care	73	70	0 (0%)	22 (20, 24)
Nafamostat	82	75	0 (0%)	22 (19, 24)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1557</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>23 (21, 24)</b>

### 2.3.4.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

The observed distribution of DAFH by domain treatment arm is shown in Figure 2.61 and Figure 2.62.




Figure 2.61: Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.62: Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT.

Table 2.84: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	1.02	(0.56, 1.85)	1.07 (0.33)	0.52
Intermediate-dose	1.15	(0.94, 1.41)	1.16 (0.12)	0.92
Low-dose with aspirin	1.06	(0.81, 1.40)	1.08 (0.15)	0.67
Therapeutic-dose	0.65	(0.36, 1.18)	0.68 (0.21)	0.08
Ineligible aspirin	1.09	(0.58, 2.02)	1.14 (0.38)	0.60
Age $\geq 60$	0.62	(0.50, 0.76)	0.62 (0.07)	0.00
Female	1.13	(0.95, 1.36)	1.14 (0.11)	0.91
Oxygen requirement	0.47	(0.38, 0.58)	0.47 (0.05)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	0.96	(0.44, 2.16)	1.05 (0.45)	0.46
Nepal	0.85	(0.26, 3.01)	1.04 (0.79)	0.39




Figure 2.63: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.64: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on days alive and free of hospital to day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.4.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-ITT




Figure 2.65: Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT.

Table 2.85: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	0.90	(0.49, 1.62)	0.94 (0.29)	0.36
Intermediate-dose	2.57	(1.24, 5.28)	2.75 (1.05)	0.99
Low-dose with aspirin	1.97	(0.57, 6.68)	2.39 (1.67)	0.86
Therapeutic-dose	1.52	(0.59, 3.91)	1.71 (0.88)	0.81
Age $\geq 60$	0.20	(0.10, 0.41)	0.21 (0.08)	0.00
Female	0.97	(0.53, 1.79)	1.02 (0.32)	0.47
Oxygen requirement	0.73	(0.38, 1.43)	0.78 (0.27)	0.18




Figure 2.66: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.4.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** ACS-ITT




Figure 2.67: Observed distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT.

Table 2.86: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	0.97	(0.48, 1.92)	1.03 (0.37)	0.46
Intermediate-dose	1.15	(0.94, 1.41)	1.16 (0.12)	0.92
Low-dose with aspirin	1.07	(0.81, 1.41)	1.08 (0.15)	0.67
Therapeutic-dose	0.65	(0.36, 1.17)	0.68 (0.21)	0.08
Ineligible aspirin	1.12	(0.59, 2.14)	1.18 (0.40)	0.63
Age $\geq 60$	0.62	(0.50, 0.76)	0.62 (0.07)	0.00
Female	1.15	(0.96, 1.38)	1.15 (0.11)	0.93
Oxygen requirement	0.47	(0.37, 0.58)	0.47 (0.05)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.12	(0.48, 2.62)	1.24 (0.58)	0.61
Nepal	0.83	(0.25, 3.06)	1.03 (0.81)	0.37






Figure 2.68: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.

### 2.3.5 Days alive and free of invasive or non-invasive ventilation to day 28

This section reports on the analysis of the secondary outcome: days alive and free invasive or non-invasive ventilation (DAFV) to day 28. For this outcome, participants who died within 28 days were coded to have 0 DAFV.

Table 2.87 presents the number of participants where the outcome was observed by the allocated anticoagulation arm. Similarly, Table 2.88 for the antiviral domain.




Figure 2.69: Observed overall distribution of days alive and free of hospital at day 28, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.87: Summary of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	Any ventilation	DAFV, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to anticoagulation	32	25	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	28 (28, 28)
Low-dose	610	596	19 (3%)	34 (6%)	28 (28, 28)
Intermediate-dose	613	603	15 (2%)	23 (4%)	28 (28, 28)
Low-dose with aspirin	283	281	10 (4%)	18 (6%)	28 (28, 28)
Therapeutic-dose	50	50	6 (12%)	7 (14%)	28 (28, 28)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1555</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>86 (6%)</b>	<b>28 (28, 28)</b>

Table 2.88: Summary of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	Deaths	Any ventilation	DAFV, Median (Q1, Q3)
Not randomised to antiviral	1433	1414	50 (4%)	74 (5%)	28 (28, 28)
Standard of care	73	67	0 (0%)	8 (12%)	28 (28, 28)
Nafamostat	82	74	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	28 (28, 28)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1588</b>	<b>1555</b>	<b>50 (3%)</b>	<b>86 (6%)</b>	<b>28 (28, 28)</b>

### 2.3.5.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

The observed distribution of DAFV by domain treatment arm is shown in Figure 2.70 and Figure 2.71.




Figure 2.70: Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.71: Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.89: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	2.51	(0.77, 8.85)	3.08 (2.17)	0.94
Intermediate-dose	1.48	(0.85, 2.63)	1.55 (0.46)	0.91
Low-dose with aspirin	1.20	(0.63, 2.29)	1.26 (0.43)	0.71
Therapeutic-dose	0.35	(0.13, 1.00)	0.40 (0.23)	0.02
Ineligible aspirin	0.31	(0.10, 1.18)	0.40 (0.37)	0.04
Age $\geq$ 60	0.53	(0.33, 0.87)	0.55 (0.14)	0.01
Female	1.81	(1.11, 3.04)	1.88 (0.50)	0.99
Oxygen requirement	0.27	(0.15, 0.45)	0.27 (0.07)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.10	(0.29, 4.47)	1.42 (1.14)	0.56
Nepal	0.74	(0.21, 2.85)	0.94 (0.74)	0.33




Figure 2.72: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.73: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.5.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement
- **Set:** AVS-ITT




Figure 2.74: Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, AVS-ITT.

Table 2.90: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	2.52	(0.77, 8.58)	3.08 (2.19)	0.93
Intermediate-dose	1.49	(0.85, 2.65)	1.56 (0.46)	0.92
Low-dose with aspirin	1.29	(0.70, 2.51)	1.37 (0.47)	0.79
Therapeutic-dose	0.34	(0.12, 0.96)	0.39 (0.22)	0.02
Age $\geq 60$	0.51	(0.31, 0.83)	0.52 (0.13)	0.00
Female	1.84	(1.11, 3.07)	1.90 (0.51)	0.99
Oxygen requirement	0.27	(0.16, 0.45)	0.28 (0.07)	0.00






Figure 2.75: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.5.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** ACS-ITT




Figure 2.76: Observed distribution of days alive and free of ventilation at day 28 by antiviral treatment group, ACS-ITT.

Table 2.91: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR > 1)
Nafamostat	3.80	(0.89, 17.19)	5.09 (4.81)	0.97
Intermediate-dose	1.49	(0.85, 2.63)	1.55 (0.46)	0.92
Low-dose with aspirin	1.20	(0.64, 2.32)	1.27 (0.43)	0.71
Therapeutic-dose	0.35	(0.12, 1.02)	0.40 (0.24)	0.03
Ineligible aspirin	0.28	(0.08, 1.07)	0.35 (0.28)	0.03
Age $\geq 60$	0.53	(0.32, 0.88)	0.55 (0.14)	0.01
Female	1.83	(1.11, 3.09)	1.90 (0.51)	0.99
Oxygen requirement	0.26	(0.15, 0.44)	0.27 (0.07)	0.00
Australia/New Zealand	1.40	(0.34, 6.32)	1.88 (1.70)	0.68
Nepal	0.68	(0.18, 2.76)	0.87 (0.72)	0.28




Figure 2.77: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.

### 2.3.6 Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28

This section reports on the analysis of the secondary outcome: patient reported shortness of breath at day 28. For this outcome, participants who died within 28 days were coded to have a missing value, so this outcome reflects shortness of breath at day 28 amongst patients who survived to at least day 28. The model is coded so that an odds ratio less than 1 implies a benefit (reduction in odds of shortness of breath at day 28).

Table 2.92 presents the number of participants where the outcome was observed by the allocated anticoagulation arm. Similarly for the antiviral arms in Table 2.93.

Table 2.92: Summary of WHO scale at 28 by anticoagulation treatment group, ACS-ITT.

n (%)	Patients	Known	Missing	Shortness of breath day 28
Low dose	610	577 (94.6)	33 (5.4)	115 (19.9)
Intermediate dose	613	584 (95.3)	29 (4.7)	110 (18.8)
Low dose with aspirin	283	271 (95.8)	12 (4.2)	59 (21.8)
Therapeutic dose	50	44 (88.0)	6 (12.0)	11 (25.0)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1556</b>	<b>1476 (94.9)</b>	<b>80 (5.1)</b>	<b>295 (20.0)</b>

Table 2.93: Summary of WHO scale at 28 by antiviral treatment group, AVS-ITT.

n (%)	Patients	Known	Missing	Shortness of breath day 28
Standard of care	73	67 (91.8)	6 (8.2)	35 (52.2)
Nafamostat	82	73 (89.0)	9 (11.0)	36 (49.3)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>140 (90.3)</b>	<b>15 (9.7)</b>	<b>71 (50.7)</b>

### 2.3.6.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT

Table 2.94: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.85	(0.35, 2.07)	0.94 (0.45)	0.64
Intermediate-dose	0.77	(0.54, 1.09)	0.78 (0.14)	0.93
Low-dose with aspirin	1.17	(0.75, 1.83)	1.20 (0.27)	0.24
Therapeutic-dose	0.95	(0.37, 2.39)	1.05 (0.53)	0.55
Ineligible aspirin	1.23	(0.42, 3.42)	1.40 (0.79)	0.35
Age $\geq 60$	2.04	(1.45, 2.86)	2.07 (0.36)	0.00
Female	1.02	(0.75, 1.40)	1.04 (0.17)	0.44
Oxygen requirement	1.28	(0.88, 1.86)	1.30 (0.25)	0.10
Australia/New Zealand	2.29	(0.59, 8.51)	2.87 (2.18)	0.11
Nepal	0.50	(0.12, 2.50)	0.70 (0.69)	0.81




Figure 2.78: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.79: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 shortness of breath for the primary model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.6.2 AVS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, age group, sex, oxygen requirement.
- **Set:** AVS-ITT

Table 2.95: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the AVS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.81	(0.39, 1.67)	0.87 (0.33)	0.71
Intermediate-dose	0.79	(0.33, 1.86)	0.87 (0.40)	0.70
Low-dose with aspirin	0.58	(0.13, 2.45)	0.76 (0.65)	0.77
Therapeutic-dose	1.53	(0.48, 4.93)	1.83 (1.24)	0.24
Age $\geq 60$	2.95	(1.29, 7.11)	3.27 (1.52)	0.00
Female	1.17	(0.56, 2.50)	1.26 (0.51)	0.34
Oxygen requirement	2.34	(1.03, 5.56)	2.58 (1.18)	0.02




Figure 2.80: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, AVS-ITT.

### 2.3.6.3 ACS-ITT

- **Model:** logistic regression
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** ACS-ITT

Table 2.96: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for shortness of breath at day 28 primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.85	(0.35, 2.07)	0.94 (0.45)	0.64
Intermediate-dose	0.77	(0.54, 1.09)	0.78 (0.14)	0.93
Low-dose with aspirin	1.17	(0.75, 1.83)	1.20 (0.27)	0.24
Therapeutic-dose	0.95	(0.37, 2.39)	1.05 (0.53)	0.55
Ineligible aspirin	1.23	(0.42, 3.42)	1.40 (0.79)	0.35
Age $\geq 60$	2.04	(1.45, 2.86)	2.07 (0.36)	0.00
Female	1.02	(0.75, 1.40)	1.04 (0.17)	0.44
Oxygen requirement	1.28	(0.88, 1.86)	1.30 (0.25)	0.10
Australia/New Zealand	2.29	(0.59, 8.51)	2.87 (2.18)	0.11
Nepal	0.50	(0.12, 2.50)	0.70 (0.69)	0.81




Figure 2.81: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, ACS-ITT.






Figure 2.82: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on day 28 shortness of breath for the primary model fit to the ACS-ITT set.

### 2.3.7 Modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) breathlessness scale at day 28

The mMRC scale was only asked of participants who responded “yes” to the question of new or worsening breathlessness since COVID. Therefore, the distribution of this outcome scale is conditional on the patient responding that they were experiencing new or worse breathlessness since having COVID. In the following tables “Not asked” refers to participants who responded “no” to the question of breathlessness.

Table 2.97: Summary of mMRC scale at day 28 by treatment group, anticoagulation domain, ACS-ITT.

Anticoagulation intervention	Patients	Known	With exercise	Up a slight hill	Slow for age	After 100 metres	Can't leave house
Low-dose	610	577	40 (7%)	47 (8%)	12 (2%)	14 (2%)	
Intermediate-dose	613	584	50 (9%)	39 (7%)	11 (2%)	8 (1%)	
Low-dose with aspirin	283	271	26 (10%)	16 (6%)	15 (6%)	1 (0%)	
Therapeutic-dose	50	44	2 (5%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)	
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1556</b>	<b>1476</b>	<b>118 (8%)</b>	<b>106 (7%)</b>	<b>41 (3%)</b>	<b>25 (2%)</b>	

Table 2.98: Summary of mMRC scale at day 28 by treatment group, antiviral domain, AVS-ITT.

Antiviral intervention	Patients	Known	With exercise	Up a slight hill	Slow for age	After 100 metres	Can't leave house
Standard of care	73	67	5 (7%)	15 (22%)	5 (7%)	9 (13%)	1 (1%)
Nafamostat	82	73	9 (12%)	12 (16%)	5 (7%)	8 (11%)	2 (3%)
<b>Overall</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>14 (10%)</b>	<b>27 (19%)</b>	<b>10 (7%)</b>	<b>17 (12%)</b>	<b>3 (2%)</b>

### 2.3.7.1 FAS-ITT

- **Model:** cumulative logistic (ordinal) regression assuming proportional odds
- **Terms:** anticoagulation intervention, antiviral intervention, aspirin eligibility, age group, sex, oxygen requirement, region, site nested within region, and epoch.
- **Set:** FAS-ITT




Figure 2.83: Observed distribution of mMRC breathlessness scale (mMRCbs) at day 28 by treatment group, anticoagulation domain, FAS-ITT.

Table 2.99: Summary of model parameters (fixed-effects odds-ratios) for mMRC breathlessness scale at day 28 outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

Parameter	Median	95% CrI	Mean (SD)	Pr(OR < 1)
Nafamostat	0.68	(0.33, 1.39)	0.73 (0.27)	0.86
Intermediate-dose	0.74	(0.53, 1.03)	0.75 (0.13)	0.96
Low-dose with aspirin	1.11	(0.74, 1.68)	1.14 (0.24)	0.31
Therapeutic-dose	0.85	(0.35, 2.01)	0.93 (0.43)	0.64
Ineligible aspirin	1.44	(0.55, 3.51)	1.59 (0.78)	0.23
Age ≥ 60	1.98	(1.45, 2.70)	2.01 (0.32)	0.00
Sex	1.03	(0.77, 1.37)	1.04 (0.15)	0.42
Oxygen requirement	1.17	(0.83, 1.63)	1.19 (0.21)	0.18
Australia/New Zealand	2.60	(0.68, 9.38)	3.23 (2.42)	0.08
Nepal	0.44	(0.10, 2.32)	0.63 (0.81)	0.85




Figure 2.84: Observed distribution of mMRC breathlessness scale (mMRCbs) at day 28 by treatment group, antiviral domain, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.85: Posterior densities for the treatment effect odds ratios, FAS-ITT.




Figure 2.86: Posterior Summaries (point - median, block - 75% CrI, line - 95% CrI) of odds ratio for epoch and site effects on mMRC breathlessness scale at day 28 for the outcome model fit to the FAS-ITT set.

### 2.3.8 Quality of life as measured by EQ-5D-5L questionnaire at day 28

The EQ-5D-5L responses are described.

Table 2.100: Prevalence of 10 most frequent, and worst, reported EQ-5D-5L profiles by treatment (day 28), AVS-ITT.

Health state	Frequency		Cumulative	
	n	%	n	%
<b>No nafamostat</b>				
11111	25	37.9	25	37.9
11121	2	3	27	40.9
11211	2	3	29	43.9
11221	2	3	31	47
21111	2	3	33	50
21121	2	3	35	53
21222	2	3	37	56.1
21321	2	3	39	59.1
31332	2	3	41	62.1
11112	1	1.5	42	63.6
...				
45514	1	1.5	66	100
<b>Nafamostat</b>				
11111	27	36.5	27	36.5
11112	4	5.4	31	41.9
11211	3	4.1	34	45.9
21221	3	4.1	37	50
11121	2	2.7	39	52.7
11114	1	1.4	40	54.1
11133	1	1.4	41	55.4
11212	1	1.4	42	56.8
11213	1	1.4	43	58.1
11231	1	1.4	44	59.5
...				
54554	1	1.4	74	100

Table 2.101: Distribution of responses on the EQ-5D-5L (day 28), AVS-ITT.

EQ-5D-5L	No namafostat	Namafostat	Overall
<b>Mobility</b>			
1	40 (43)	43 (41)	83 (42)
2	13 (14)	18 (17)	31 (16)
3	11 (12)	8 (8)	19 (10)
4	2 (2)	4 (4)	6 (3)
5	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Any mobility problem	26 (28)	31 (30)	57 (29)
<b>Self care</b>			
1	58 (78)	61 (70)	119 (74)
2	6 (8)	5 (6)	11 (7)
3	0 (0)	5 (6)	5 (3)
4	0 (0)	3 (3)	3 (2)
5	2 (3)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Any self care problem	8 (11)	13 (15)	21 (13)
<b>Usual activities</b>			
1	34 (35)	40 (37)	74 (36)
2	15 (15)	19 (18)	34 (17)
3	15 (15)	8 (7)	23 (11)
4	1 (1)	5 (5)	6 (3)
5	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (1)
Any usual activities problem	32 (33)	34 (31)	66 (32)
<b>Pain/discomfort</b>			
1	40 (43)	47 (47)	87 (45)
2	19 (21)	14 (14)	33 (17)
3	6 (7)	8 (8)	14 (7)
4	1 (1)	4 (4)	5 (3)
5	0 (0)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Any pain/discomfort problem	26 (28)	27 (27)	53 (27)
<b>Anxiety/depression</b>			
1	47 (55)	41 (39)	88 (46)
2	9 (11)	15 (14)	24 (13)
3	7 (8)	10 (10)	17 (9)
4	2 (2)	7 (7)	9 (5)
5	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Any anxiety/depression problem	19 (22)	32 (30)	51 (27)

Table 2.102: Descriptive summary of EQ-5D VAS (day 28), AVS-ITT.

	No namafoſtat	Namafoſtat
n	73	82
Mean	78.8	78.5
SD	16.6	17.9
Median	85.0	82.5
Mode	90	90
Min	10	20
Max	100	100
Missing, n (%)	11 (15.07)	10 (12.2)



## 2.4 Domain Specific Outcomes

### 2.4.1 Antiviral Domain

The antiviral domain-specific outcomes were:

- viral clearance at days 3 and 7
- viral load at days 3 and 7
- safety:
  - elevation of Alanine Transaminase (ALT) or Aspartate Transaminase (AST)
  - elevated of serum potassium ( $> 5.5$  mmol/L)
  - decrease of serum sodium ( $< 125$  mmol/L)
  - major bleeding as defined by the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH)
  - clinically relevant non-major bleeding (as defined by the ISTH)
  - thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site

The SAP specifies that descriptive summaries are to be reported for the antiviral specific outcomes.

### 2.4.1.1 Viral Clearance

The SAP specified that viral clearance was to be summarised at days 3 and 7. However, most participants did not have any PCR tests recorded during their hospital stay (Table 2.103), and those that did had inconsistent timing of the tests (Table 2.104).

Table 2.103: Descriptive summary of participant PCR testing.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Any tests	33	39
Proportion	0.45	0.48
Total tests	55	67
Mean number of tests	0.75	0.82
Max number of tests	5	8

Table 2.104: Descriptive summary of daily PCR testing, study days 1 to 7.

Day	Standard of care					Nafamostat				
	Patients	Tests	Positive	Negative	Indeterminate	Patients	Tests	Positive	Negative	Indeterminate
1	73	12 (16)	9 (75)	2 (17)	1 (8)	82	9 (11)	8 (89)	1 (11)	0 (0)
2	73	5 (7)	4 (80)	1 (20)	0 (0)	82	5 (6)	4 (80)	0 (0)	1 (20)
3	67	11 (16)	9 (82)	2 (18)	0 (0)	79	12 (15)	11 (92)	1 (8)	0 (0)
4	63	3 (5)	3 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	72	8 (11)	7 (88)	1 (12)	0 (0)
5	51	4 (8)	4 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	55	4 (7)	2 (50)	2 (50)	0 (0)
6	41	6 (15)	5 (83)	1 (17)	0 (0)	43	6 (14)	5 (83)	1 (17)	0 (0)
7	33	5 (15)	5 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35	10 (29)	10 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)

### 2.4.1.2 Viral Load

The SAP specified a descriptive summary of viral load to days 3 and 7, and change in viral load from baseline. Very few participants (24 of 156) had baseline cycle threshold values recorded so there was little data for looking at change in viral load from baseline. Additionally, most participants had no cycle threshold values reported their hospital stay.

Table 2.105: Descriptive summary of participant cycle threshold values.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Any Ct values	19 (26)	24 (29)
Total Ct values	27	43
Max number of Ct values	2	6

Table 2.106: Descriptive summary of daily Ct values, study days 1 to 7.

Day	Standard of care					Nafamostat				
	Patients	Tests	Positive	Ct value	Median Ct value	Patients	Tests	Positive	Ct value	Median Ct value
1	73	12 (16)	9 (75)	6 (67)	26	82	9 (11)	8 (89)	5 (62)	25
2	73	5 (7)	4 (80)	2 (50)	28	82	5 (6)	4 (80)	3 (75)	29
3	67	11 (16)	9 (82)	5 (56)	32	79	12 (15)	11 (92)	9 (82)	22
4	63	3 (5)	3 (100)	3 (100)	28	72	8 (11)	7 (88)	6 (86)	24
5	51	4 (8)	4 (100)	4 (100)	26	55	4 (7)	2 (50)	2 (100)	20
6	41	6 (15)	5 (83)	3 (60)	28	43	6 (14)	5 (83)	4 (80)	22
7	33	5 (15)	5 (100)	3 (60)	26	35	10 (29)	10 (100)	7 (70)	29
8	27	2 (7)	1 (50)	0 (0)	NA	29	2 (7)	2 (100)	2 (100)	28




Figure 2.87: Cycle threshold values days 1 to 7. Line segments join values measured on the same individual.

### 2.4.1.3 Elevation of Alanine Transaminase (ALT) or Aspartate Transaminase (AST)

The SAP specified that elevation of Alanine Transaminase (ALT) or Aspartate Transaminase (AST) to more than 5 times the upper limit of normal will be summarised. The collected values were reported on IU/L, therefore a threshold of 150 IU/L was used rather than 5 times the upper limit of normal. The number of participants with any ALT/AST tests reported, and the number with values exceeding 150 IU/L are reported in Table 2.107.

Daily summaries are reported in Table 2.108 and Table 2.109.

Table 2.107: Descriptive summary of participant cycle threshold values.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Any ALT tests, n (% of assigned)	63 (86)	71 (87)
Any ALT > 150, n (% of tested)	11 (17)	12 (17)
Any AST tests, n (% of assigned)	52 (71)	60 (73)
Any AST > 150, n (% of tested)	2 (4)	6 (10)
Total days	553	586
Total days ALT tested, n (% of days)	275 (50)	316 (54)
Total days ALT > 150, n (% of tests)	33 (12)	35 (11)
Total days AST tested, n (% of days)	185 (33)	254 (43)
Total days AST > 150, n (% of tests)	2 (1)	10 (4)

Table 2.108: Descriptive summary of daily ALT levels (IU/L) and testing.

Study Day	Standard of care				Nafamostat			
	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Median	> 150 IU/L (% of tests)	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Median	> 150 IU/L (% of tests)
1	73	43 (59)	40	1 (2)	82	51 (62)	38	1 (2)
2	73	36 (49)	52	2 (6)	82	46 (56)	50	3 (7)
3	67	32 (48)	42	3 (9)	79	42 (53)	50	5 (12)
4	63	29 (46)	57	6 (21)	72	34 (47)	53	4 (12)
5	51	18 (35)	64	3 (17)	55	26 (47)	66	5 (19)
6	41	18 (44)	56	4 (22)	43	22 (51)	52	4 (18)
7	33	17 (52)	81	4 (24)	35	20 (57)	64	6 (30)
8	27	12 (44)	83	3 (25)	29	18 (62)	60	4 (22)
9	17	8 (47)	38	3 (38)	21	6 (29)	36	1 (17)
10	13	6 (46)	36	2 (33)	15	4 (27)	44	0 (0)
11	11	5 (45)	46	1 (20)	11	6 (55)	31	0 (0)
12	9	3 (33)	23	1 (33)	8	6 (75)	40	0 (0)
13	7	4 (57)	30	0 (0)	6	3 (50)	59	0 (0)
14	6	3 (50)	31	0 (0)	5	3 (60)	32	0 (0)
15	5	3 (60)	19	0 (0)	5	2 (40)	25	0 (0)
16	5	3 (60)	45	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	28	0 (0)
17	5	4 (80)	36	0 (0)	4	1 (25)	26	0 (0)
18	5	3 (60)	56	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	36	0 (0)
19	5	4 (80)	40	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	22	0 (0)
20	5	3 (60)	39	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	34	0 (0)
21	4	4 (100)	50	0 (0)	3	2 (67)	40	0 (0)
22	4	4 (100)	68	0 (0)	3	3 (100)	17	0 (0)
23	4	3 (75)	31	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	62	0 (0)
24	4	4 (100)	49	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	88	1 (50)
25	4	1 (25)	43	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	88	0 (0)
26	4	2 (50)	88	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	83	0 (0)
27	4	2 (50)	68	0 (0)	2	1 (50)	160	1 (100)
28	4	1 (25)	39	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	90	0 (0)

Table 2.109: Descriptive summary of daily AST levels (IU/L) and testing.

Study Day	Standard of care				Nafamostat			
	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Median	> 150 IU/L (% of tests)	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Median	> 150 IU/L (% of tests)
1	73	35 (48)	42	1 (3)	82	43 (52)	48	2 (5)
2	73	28 (38)	50	1 (4)	82	36 (44)	46	2 (6)
3	67	21 (31)	56	0 (0)	79	35 (44)	41	2 (6)
4	63	22 (35)	50	0 (0)	72	27 (38)	38	1 (4)
5	51	11 (22)	37	0 (0)	55	22 (40)	37	1 (5)
6	41	15 (37)	38	0 (0)	43	17 (40)	37	2 (12)
7	33	12 (36)	38	0 (0)	35	16 (46)	39	0 (0)
8	27	8 (30)	32	0 (0)	29	14 (48)	33	0 (0)
9	17	4 (24)	25	0 (0)	21	5 (24)	25	0 (0)
10	13	3 (23)	23	0 (0)	15	2 (13)	28	0 (0)
11	11	3 (27)	29	0 (0)	11	4 (36)	35	0 (0)
12	9	1 (11)	25	0 (0)	8	5 (62)	48	0 (0)
13	7	2 (29)	25	0 (0)	6	2 (33)	56	0 (0)
14	6	1 (17)	26	0 (0)	5	1 (20)	66	0 (0)
15	5	1 (20)	22	0 (0)	5	1 (20)	51	0 (0)
16	5	1 (20)	20	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	47	0 (0)
17	5	1 (20)	16	0 (0)	4	1 (25)	51	0 (0)
18	5	1 (20)	15	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	38	0 (0)
19	5	2 (40)	18	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	34	0 (0)
20	5	1 (20)	19	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	32	0 (0)
21	4	2 (50)	22	0 (0)	3	2 (67)	38	0 (0)
22	4	2 (50)	22	0 (0)	3	2 (67)	44	0 (0)
23	4	2 (50)	23	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	42	0 (0)
24	4	2 (50)	34	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	60	0 (0)
25	4	1 (25)	44	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	58	0 (0)
26	4	1 (25)	80	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	48	0 (0)
27	4	1 (25)	42	0 (0)	2	1 (50)	78	0 (0)
28	4	1 (25)	56	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	50	0 (0)

#### 2.4.1.4 Serum Potassium

Eight participants had at least one day on which they were tested and had a serum potassium level greater than 5.5 mmol/L, 7 assigned to Nafamostat, and 1 assigned to standard of care (Table 2.110). Six of the participants only had the one day exceeding 5.5 mmol/L, two had 2 days, and one had 3 days. For participants assigned to Nafamostat, all days where serum potassium exceeded 5.5 mmol/L occurred during the first 8 study days. For the participant assigned to standard of care, the elevated potassium occurred on day 10 (Table 2.111).

Of the seven participants assigned to Nafamostat, one had no reported SAE/SAR which was for hyperkalaemia. For the other six participants details are provided in Table 2.112, Table 2.122, and Table 2.123.

Table 2.110: Descriptive summary of participant serum potassium levels (mmol/L) and testing.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Any tests	67	78
Any > 5.5 mmol/L	1	7
Total days	553	586
Total tests	321	361
Total > 5.5 mmol/L	1	11



Table 2.111: Descriptive summary of daily serum potassium levels (mmol/L) and testing.

Study Day	Standard of care				Nafamostat			
	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Mean	> 5.5 (% of tests)	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Mean	> 5.5 (% of tests)
1	73	49 (67)	4.05	0 (0)	82	60 (73)	4.07	0 (0)
2	73	44 (60)	3.99	0 (0)	82	48 (59)	4.38	0 (0)
3	67	38 (57)	4.14	0 (0)	79	49 (62)	4.41	1 (2)
4	63	34 (54)	4.05	0 (0)	72	37 (51)	4.50	2 (5)
5	51	24 (47)	4.27	0 (0)	55	29 (53)	4.48	3 (10)
6	41	21 (51)	4.19	0 (0)	43	28 (65)	4.48	1 (4)
7	33	18 (55)	4.14	0 (0)	35	21 (60)	4.40	1 (5)
8	27	12 (44)	4.26	0 (0)	29	20 (69)	4.58	2 (10)
9	17	10 (59)	4.39	0 (0)	21	10 (48)	4.63	0 (0)
10	13	6 (46)	4.60	1 (17)	15	7 (47)	4.07	0 (0)
11	11	8 (73)	4.28	0 (0)	11	7 (64)	4.29	0 (0)
12	9	4 (44)	4.30	0 (0)	8	6 (75)	4.10	0 (0)
13	7	5 (71)	4.18	0 (0)	6	4 (67)	4.12	0 (0)
14	6	4 (67)	4.05	0 (0)	5	2 (40)	4.45	0 (0)
15	5	3 (60)	4.47	0 (0)	5	2 (40)	4.30	0 (0)
16	5	3 (60)	4.53	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	4.57	0 (0)
17	5	4 (80)	4.15	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	3.50	0 (0)
18	5	3 (60)	4.07	0 (0)	4	4 (100)	4.65	1 (25)
19	5	4 (80)	4.25	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	4.47	0 (0)
20	5	3 (60)	4.33	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	4.30	0 (0)
21	4	4 (100)	3.98	0 (0)	3	2 (67)	4.50	0 (0)
22	4	4 (100)	4.00	0 (0)	3	3 (100)	4.53	0 (0)
23	4	3 (75)	4.20	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.55	0 (0)
24	4	4 (100)	4.22	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.45	0 (0)
25	4	2 (50)	3.75	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.65	0 (0)
26	4	3 (75)	4.37	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.20	0 (0)
27	4	2 (50)	4.25	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.25	0 (0)
28	4	2 (50)	4.45	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	4.35	0 (0)

Table 2.112: Elevated serum potassium SAE notes.

ID	Antiviral	Onset date	SAE Term	Type	Notes from Site
ALF00014	Nafamostat	NA			
CAM00002	Nafamostat	2021-09-20	Hyperkalaemia	SAE	The patient was randomised to nafamostat and standard dose thromboprophylaxis. On Day 5 the patient had hyperkalaemia so nafamostat treatment was ceased. A separate email was sent to clarify whether or not nafamostat should continue after this patient's potassium levels normalised. In this email, I think they may have incorrectly stated it was hypokalaemia not hyperkalaemia. Unable to modify outcome of SAE, as it is locked. I have checked the pathology values following the SAE, and Potassium was restored to within normal range the following day (21/9/21), following cessation of IMP. SAE paper CRF was marked as resolved/recovered. Measured again on 23/9/21 and was within normal range. Measured again on 24/9/21 at 5.5 (higher than normal), and participant was discharged home the following day (25/9/21). No further blood test values available.
CAM00012	Nafamostat	2021-12-30	Hyperkalaemia	SAE	Nafamostat course finished on 30/12. K+ levels were noted to be at 5.9 on 30/12 and again on 31/12. Repeat K+ test on 31/12 showed K+ level of 5.2. PI has reported the hyperkalaemia is likely secondary to nafamostat as no other clinical reason for hyperkalaemia. not reported as an SAE as did not require any interventions or prolonged hospitalisation or complications and K+ levels returned naturally
MID00010	Standard of care	NA			
MMC00078	Nafamostat	2021-11-17	Hyperkalaemia	SAR	Patient had been experiencing elevated potassium levels- 6.2 mmol/L. Nafamostat ceased and patient successfully treated with resonium. A protocol breach was also submitted regarding this patient receiving the drug incorrectly (charted and administered 500mg per day from 12th to 15h Nov). The error was then discovered and the dose reduced to 375mg until the 17th November when the SAE occurred and nafamostat was ceased.
MMC00079	Nafamostat	2021-11-23	Hyperkalaemia	SAE	This patient was randomised to nafamostat and intermediate dose thromboprophylaxis. They experienced hyperkalaemia (6.0) on day 6 (23-Nov-2021) of their treatment. Their baseline potassium was 5.1. They have a number of comorbidities (obesity, diabetes, chronic kidney disease, iatrogenic immunosuppression). They were treated with Sodium Polystyrene (15mg x2 daily) on 23-Nov-21 and have since recovered. Treatment continued however the patient only received 12 hours of the infusion on day 7 due to poor IV access.
RNS00002	Nafamostat	2021-08-05	Hyperkalaemia	SAE	Serum potassium levels were 6.1 mmol/L on the 05Aug2021 - Day 4 post randomisation 05 Aug 2021, K 6.1 - ECG was normal with normal P and T waves. Pt was given Resonium A 30g po 06 Aug 2021, K 5.7, given a further Resonium A 30g po 07 Aug 2021 K 4.8 The patient was on Nafamostat 350mg IV continuously from the 02Aug2021 to 09Aug2021 The pt was discharged on no medications.
SVH00002	Nafamostat	2021-09-02	Hyperkalaemia	SAE	Clinical Synopsis / Significant Events 21/8/21 - PCR Covid +ive 25/8/21 - hospital admission 27/8/21 - ICU admission -> HFNP. 28/8/21 - . Ongoing HFNP requirement 30/8/21 - self-proning overnight 31/8/21 - Remains on HFNP, supine throughout day, self-proning encouraged overnight 2/9/21- Dex changed to Hydrocort as ? contributing to HypoNa/HyperK 3/9/21 -Urine cultures UTI 1/9 E Coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, started Tazocin from Augmentin to cover Pseudomonas aeruginosa 6/9/21 - Remains on HFNP 50L 50% 8/9/21 - Ongoing slow wean of HFNP 9/9/21 - Transitioned to NP, cleared for ward Dose was finished prior to high K+

#### 2.4.1.5 Serum Sodium

One participant had any days on which they were tested and had a serum sodium level less than 125 mmol/L. This participant had serum sodium less than 125 mmol/L on two consecutive days (study days 26 and 27). They were assigned to standard of care in the antiviral domain.

Most participants had at least one test during their hospital admission (Table 2.113). A summary of serum sodium testing by study day is presented in Table 2.114.

Table 2.113: Descriptive summary of participant serum sodium levels (mmol/L) and testing.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Any tests	67	78
Any < 125 mmol/L	1	0
Total days	553	586
Total tests	325	367
Total < 125 mmol/L	2	0

Table 2.114: Descriptive summary of daily serum sodium levels (mmol/L) and testing.

Study Day	Standard of care				Nafamostat			
	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Mean	< 125 (% of tests)	Patients	Tested (% of patients)	Mean	< 125 (% of tests)
1	73	49 (67)	136.14	0 (0)	82	60 (73)	137.13	0 (0)
2	73	44 (60)	137.41	0 (0)	82	50 (61)	137.50	0 (0)
3	67	39 (58)	137.23	0 (0)	79	49 (62)	136.43	0 (0)
4	63	34 (54)	137.38	0 (0)	72	39 (54)	135.62	0 (0)
5	51	25 (49)	137.20	0 (0)	55	29 (53)	134.66	0 (0)
6	41	22 (54)	137.45	0 (0)	43	28 (65)	135.25	0 (0)
7	33	18 (55)	136.33	0 (0)	35	22 (63)	136.32	0 (0)
8	27	12 (44)	136.08	0 (0)	29	20 (69)	133.95	0 (0)
9	17	10 (59)	136.40	0 (0)	21	10 (48)	134.60	0 (0)
10	13	6 (46)	134.67	0 (0)	15	7 (47)	134.00	0 (0)
11	11	8 (73)	136.12	0 (0)	11	7 (64)	135.14	0 (0)
12	9	4 (44)	134.25	0 (0)	8	6 (75)	134.50	0 (0)
13	7	5 (71)	135.80	0 (0)	6	4 (67)	136.50	0 (0)
14	6	4 (67)	136.00	0 (0)	5	3 (60)	136.00	0 (0)
15	5	3 (60)	134.00	0 (0)	5	2 (40)	139.00	0 (0)
16	5	3 (60)	136.33	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	136.67	0 (0)
17	5	4 (80)	137.50	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	133.50	0 (0)
18	5	4 (80)	136.50	0 (0)	4	4 (100)	136.50	0 (0)
19	5	4 (80)	134.75	0 (0)	4	3 (75)	137.33	0 (0)
20	5	3 (60)	134.33	0 (0)	4	2 (50)	136.50	0 (0)
21	4	4 (100)	135.75	0 (0)	3	2 (67)	137.00	0 (0)
22	4	4 (100)	136.00	0 (0)	3	3 (100)	137.33	0 (0)
23	4	3 (75)	136.33	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	136.50	0 (0)
24	4	4 (100)	136.00	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	137.00	0 (0)
25	4	2 (50)	137.50	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	136.00	0 (0)
26	4	3 (75)	133.67	1 (33)	2	2 (100)	138.00	0 (0)
27	4	2 (50)	132.50	1 (50)	2	2 (100)	140.50	0 (0)
28	4	2 (50)	133.50	0 (0)	2	2 (100)	141.00	0 (0)

### 2.4.1.6 Bleeding Events

#### 2.4.1.6.1 Major bleeding as defined by the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH)

One participant randomised to the antiviral domain experienced a major bleeding event (Table 2.115). Two events were recorded for this participant on study days 5 and 6. This participant was also assigned to the *intermediate-dose* intervention in the anticoagulation domain.

An SAR was recorded for this event (onset date 2021-08-30), details are provided in Table 2.116 and Table 2.123.

Table 2.115: Descriptive summary of major bleeding (ISTH) events.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Total days in hospital	553	586
Any major bleeding (patient)	0	1
Total major bleeding (days)	0	2

Table 2.116: Major bleeding SAEs/SARs notes.

Patient ID	Date of SAE onset	Concurrent Disorder / Medication?	Notes from Site
WES00039	2021-08-30	Medication - Augmentin Duo Forte, Desvenlafaxine, dexamethosone, seretide, coloxyl with senna, meloxicam	Bleed was diagnosed on CT scan performed 30/8 at 13:49. The last dose of enoxaparin was given at 08:53 on 30/8. Nafamostat was ceased at 14:18 on 30/8. The Hb was 149 on 26/8 at 00:01 (prior to randomization on 26/8), 135 on 27/8 at 02:00, 125 on 29/8 at 04:07 and 123 on 30/9 at 09:28. The onset of abdominal pain was the morning of 30/8. The Nadir Hb was 106 on 31/8 at 00:09, and has risen to 118 on 31/8 at 07:40 post transfusion. 4 units of FFP and 2 units of PRBCs given in the early hours of 31/8. Additionally 20mg protamine given 30/8 at 20:16. antiXa levels: 0.3 U/ml on 30/8 at 16:46, 0.15 U/ml on 30/8 at 21:02 and 0.12 U/ml on 31/8 at 07:40 At 09:28 on 30/8, PT was 14s, APTT 40s, INR 1.2, PLT 193, Creatinine 63 umol/l, eGR>90 and urea 6.8 mmol/l.

#### 2.4.1.6.2 Clinically relevant non-major bleeding (as defined by the ISTH)

Two participants randomised to the antiviral domain had clinically relevant non-major bleeding reported on their day 28 form (Table 2.117). One participant was assigned to Nafamostat and intermediate-dose anticoagulation. The other was assigned to standard of care in the antiviral domain and therapeutic-dose anticoagulation.

An SAR was recorded for two of these events, details are provided in Table 2.118 and Table 2.123.

Table 2.117: Descriptive summary of clinically relevant non-major bleeding (ISTH) events reported at day 28.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Missing	11	13
Any non-major bleeding	1	6

Table 2.118: Non-major bleeding SAEs/SARs notes.

Patient ID	Date of SAE onset	Concurrent Disorder / Medication?	Notes from Site
MID00009	2021-09-23	Disorder: Lymphangioleiomyomatosis (LAM) Medication: allopurinol, ceftriaxone, dexamethasone, frusemide, metformin, novorapid, sirolimus, umecidinium,	Patient was randomised to nafamostat and intermediate dose anticoagulation and they developed a minor bleed. The clinical team made the decision to reduce the heparin dose (60mg to 40mg), and there were no further issues after this. Even though it is was a minor bleed and the patient outcome not serious, it warranted a clinical response. It was felt that the bleeding was mild but persistent and increasing over a couple of days and was a potential warning sign of a life threatening event as she would not have tolerated a major pulmonary haemorrhage – she was for ward based ceiling of care despite young age because of her co-morbidities. Happily the bleeding resolved with a reduction in enoxaparin dose – I don't know whether it was going to resolve anyway.
RPH00005	2022-03-25	Medications: amoxicillin/clavulanate, fluticasone/salmeterol, morphine sulphate, pantoprazole, piperacillin/tazobactam	The patient was randomised, and began treatment, on the 16 March 2022. They were randomised to antiviral SoC, and therapeutic anticoagulation * The patient developed haemoptysis on 25 March 2022, which persisted up to 27 March 2022. * Anticoagulation treatment was ceased on the 25 March 2022. * The PI and respiratory team decided to stop anticoagulation treatment and have withdrawn the patient from the study, as they are scheduled for discharge

#### 2.4.1.6.3 Any Bleeding

For reference, all patients with any reported bleeding events are summarised in Table 2.119 and Table 2.120.

Table 2.119: Descriptive summary of bleeding events reported.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Major bleeding	0	1
Non-major bleeding	1	6
Any bleeding	1	7

Table 2.120: Line listing of patients who experienced bleeding events.

ID	Antiviral	Anticoagulation	Bleeding
ALF00014	Nafamostat	Intermediate-dose	Non-major
ALF00015	Nafamostat	Intermediate-dose	Non-major
MID00009	Nafamostat	Intermediate-dose	Non-major
MID00015	Nafamostat	Therapeutic-dose	Non-major
MID00019	Nafamostat	Therapeutic-dose	Non-major
RPH00005	Standard of care	Therapeutic-dose	Non-major
WES00039	Nafamostat	Intermediate-dose	Major
WWB00004	Nafamostat	Therapeutic-dose	Non-major

#### 2.4.1.7 Thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site

Six participants assigned to Nafamostat had reported thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site (Table 2.121).

Table 2.121: Descriptive summary of thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site events.

Variable	Standard of care	Nafamostat
Assigned	73	82
Thrombophlebitis/vasculitis at IV line site (%)	0 (0)	6 (7)



## 2.5 Safety Listings

Listings of serious adverse events (SAEs) and serious adverse reactions (SARs) for participants randomised to the antiviral domain are included in Table 2.122 and Table 2.123.

### 2.5.1 SAEs

Table 2.122: SAE listing.

Patient ID	Onset date	SAE Term	Grade	Association with Study Drug	Protocol Treatment Start Date	Protocol Treatment End Date	Action Taken	Outcome	Resolution date
RNS00002	2021-08-05	Hyperkalaemia	1	Unlikely	2021-08-02	2021-08-04	None	Recovered/resolved	2021-08-06
SVH00002	2021-09-02	Hyperkalaemia	1	Possible	2022-08-26	2022-09-01	None	Recovered/Resolved	2022-09-03
CAM00002	2021-09-20	Hyperkalaemia	1	Possible	2021-09-16	2021-09-21	Intervention interrupted	Recovered/Resolved	2021-09-21
ALF00013	2021-10-16	Nausea/Vomitting	NA	Possible	NA	NA	intervention withdrawn	NA	NA
CAM00008	2021-10-28	Hospital acquired pneumonia and empyema	3	Unlikely	2021-10-05	2021-10-12	None	Recovered/resolved	NA
ALF00014	2021-10-28	Small volume haemoptysis	NA	Possible	NA	NA	intervention withdrawn	NA	NA
MMC00079	2021-11-23	Hyperkalaemia	2	Probable	2021-11-15	2021-11-21	None	Recovered/resolved	2021-11-24
CAM00011	2021-11-28	elevated transaminases	2	Possible	2021-11-25	2021-11-28	intervention withdrawn	Recovered/Resolved	2021-11-30
CAM00012	2021-12-30	Hyperkalaemia	NA	Possible	2021-12-23	2021-12-30	None	Recovered/resolved	2021-12-31

### 2.5.2 SARs

Table 2.123: SAR listing.

Patient ID	Onset date	SAE Term	Grade	Association with Study Drug	SUSAR	Protocol Treatment Start Date	Protocol Treatment End Date	Action Taken	Outcome	Resolution date
WES00039	2021-08-30	Left retroperitoneal haemotoma	4	Probable	No	2021-08-26	2021-08-30	Intervention interrupted	Recovered/resolved	2021-09-04
MID00009	2021-09-23	Haemoptysis	1	Possible	No	2021-09-20	2021-09-23	Dose reduced	Recovered/Resolved	2021-09-24
MMC00078	2021-11-17	Hyperkalaemia	3	Probable	No	2021-11-12	2021-11-17	intervention withdrawn	Recovered/resolved	2021-11-18
RPH00005	2022-03-25	Haemoptysis	2	Definite	No	2022-03-16	2022-03-25	intervention withdrawn	Recovered/resolved	2022-03-28

## 3 Appendix

### 3.1 Outcomes by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)

#### 3.1.1 Primary Outcome by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.1: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age.




Figure 3.2: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by sex, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.3: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by supplemental oxygen requirement, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.4: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.5: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.6: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.7: Proportion of participants satisfying primary outcome criteria by days since first symptoms at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 7 days.

### 3.1.2 Time to recovery to day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.8: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by age group at randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.9: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.10: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.11: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.12: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.






Figure 3.13: Time to clinical recovery to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.

### 3.1.3 WHO outcome scale at day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.14: Distribution of WHO outcome scale day 28 by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age.




Figure 3.15: Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.16: Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.17: Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.18: Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.19: Distribution of WHO scale at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.

### 3.1.4 Mortality to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.20: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by age at randomisation, FAS-ITT. Vertical dashed line indicates the pre-specified cut-point of 60 years of age.




Figure 3.21: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.22: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at baseline, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.23: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.24: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.25: Proportion of participants who died by day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.

### 3.1.5 Days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.26: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by age groups, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.27: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT.






Figure 3.28: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at baseline, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.29: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.30: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.31: Distribution of days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.

### 3.1.6 Days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by Model Covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.32: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by age groups, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.33: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by sex, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.34: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.35: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by country of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.36: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by country and site of randomisation, FAS-ITT.




Figure 3.37: Distribution of days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation, FAS-ITT.

### 3.1.7 Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by model covariates (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.38: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by age groups.




Figure 3.39: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by sex.




Figure 3.40: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by supplemental oxygen requirement at randomisation.




Figure 3.41: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by country of randomisation.




Figure 3.42: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by country and site of randomisation.




Figure 3.43: Proportion with patient reported shortness of breath at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation.



### 3.1.8 Modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) breathlessness scale at day 28 (FAS-ITT)




Figure 3.44: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by age groups.




Figure 3.45: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by sex.




Figure 3.46: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by oxygen requirement.




Figure 3.47: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by country of randomisation.




Figure 3.48: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by country and site of randomisation.




Figure 3.49: Distrubtion of Modified Medical Research Council breathlessness scale (mMR-Cbs) at day 28 by calendar time (month) of randomisation.

## 3.2 Primary Model Posterior Predictive Summaries

### 3.2.1 Primary Outcome




Figure 3.50: Posterior predictive distribution for primary outcome by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.2 WHO outcome scale at day 28




Figure 3.51: Posterior predictive distribution for WHO scale by model covariates for primary model using ACS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.3 Mortality to day 28




Figure 3.52: Posterior predictive distribution for mortality to day 28 by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.4 Days alive and free of hospital to day 28




Figure 3.53: Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by model covariates (intervention, country, and epoch) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.






Figure 3.54: Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of hospital to day 28 by model covariates (site) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.5 Days alive and free of ventilation to day 28




Figure 3.55: Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by model covariates (intervention, country, and epoch) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.




Figure 3.56: Posterior predictive distribution for days alive and free of ventilation to day 28 by model covariates (site) for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.6 Presence of patient reported shortness of breath at day 28




Figure 3.57: Posterior predictive distribution for shortness of breath at day 28 by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.

### 3.2.7 mMRC Breathlessness Scale




Figure 3.58: Posterior predictive distribution for mMRC scale by model covariates for primary model using FAS-ITT. Red diamond indicates observed proportions.