# THE LANCET Respiratory Medicine

## Supplementary appendix 1

This appendix formed part of the original submission and has been peer reviewed. We post it as supplied by the authors.

Supplement to: Ehrmann S, Li J, Ibarra-Estrada M, et al. Awake prone positioning for COVID-19 acute hypoxaemic respiratory failure: a randomised, controlled, multinational, open-label meta-trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; published online August 20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00356-8.

## Awake prone positioning for COVID-19 acute hypoxaemic respiratory failure: A randomized, controlled, multinational, open-label meta-trial

### Supplementary appendix

<ul> <li>1.1. Authors' contribution</li> <li>1.2. Investigators from each participating center</li> <li>2. Methods</li> <li>2.1. Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in individual trials</li> <li>2.2. Table S2. Standard management in individual trials</li> <li>3. Results</li> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.5. Table S8. Mexican trial</li> <li>p</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>p</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation art day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation art day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation art day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation art day</li> <li>3.6.1. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> &lt;190 vs≥190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup</li></ul>	1.	Awake Prone Positioning Meta-Trial Group	
<ul> <li>1.2. Investigators from each participating center</li> <li>2. Methods</li> <li>2.1. Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in individual trials</li> <li>2.2. Table S2. Standard management in individual trials</li> <li>3. Results</li> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. Americantrial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		1.1. Authors' contribution	p 2
<ul> <li>2. Methods <ol> <li>Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in individual trials</li> <li>Table S2. Standard management in individual trials</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Results <ol> <li>Results</li> <li>Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.5. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>Pa.3.6. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>Pa.3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>Pa.3.4. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> </ol> </li> </ul>		1.2. Investigators from each participating center	р3
<ul> <li>2.1. Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in individual trials</li> <li>2.2. Table S2. Standard management in individual trials</li> <li>3. Results</li> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F;O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>	2.	Methods	
<ul> <li>2.2. Table S2. Standard management in individual trials</li> <li><b>3. Results</b></li> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.3.6. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		2.1. Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in individual trials	р5
<ul> <li>3. Results</li> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. Americantrial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.5. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.6. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning in individual trials</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on each at day 28</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on each at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub>&lt;190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		2.2. Table S2. Standard management in individual trials	р7
<ul> <li>3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results</li> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. Americantrial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.5. Table S8. Mexican trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4. Table S1. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on group at a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>	3.	Results	-
<ul> <li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li> <li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.3.5. Table S8. Mexican trial</li> <li>3.4. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning in individual trials</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		3.1. Figure S1. Three interim analyses results	p 8
<ul> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.3.5. Table S8. Mexican trial</li> <li>3.3.6. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning in individual trials</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>p. 3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		<ul><li>3.2. Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome</li><li>3.3. Baseline demographic and disease characteristics in the awake prone positioning group and standard care group in individual trials</li></ul>	p 9
<ul> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day</li> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs ≥ 190)</li> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>3.3.1. Table S4. American trial</li> <li>3.3.2. Table S5. Canadian trial</li> <li>3.3.3. Table S6. French trial</li> <li>3.3.4. Table S7. Irish trial</li> <li>3.3.5. Table S8. Mexican trial</li> <li>3.3.6. Table S9. Spanish trial</li> <li>3.4. Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning in individual trials</li> <li>3.4.1. Figure S2 Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups</li> <li>3.4.2. Table S10. Description of the duration of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in individual trials</li> <li>3.5. Investigation of heterogeneity between trials</li> </ul>	p10 p11 p12 p13 p14 p15 p16
3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28       p         3.6. Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO <sub>2</sub> /F <sub>1</sub> O <sub>2</sub> < 190 vs ≥ 190)		<ul> <li>3.5.1. Figure S3. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at day 28</li> <li>3.5.2. Figure S4. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at day.</li> </ul>	p 17 p 18
<ul> <li>3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment</li> <li>3.7. Per-protocol analysis</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>3.5.3. Figure S5. Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at day 28</li> <li>3.6 Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/FrO<sub>2</sub> &lt; 190 vs &gt; 190)</li> </ul>	p 18
enrollment P 3.7. Per-protocol analysis n		3.6.1. Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at	p 19
P		enrollment 3.7. Per-protocol a nalysis	p 20

#### 1.1 Authors' contribution

SE, JL and ET designed the meta-trial project.

MIE, YP, SE, JL, DV, SM, BM, JGL, DC, IP and OR designed and conducted the individual trials. All authors significantly contributed to the conduct of the meta-trial, attending monthly web meetings. ET conducted data analysis.

IP, BM, JL, YP, SE, ET, MIE, and OR drafted the manuscript.

All authors reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content, and approved the final manuscript. SE, JL, MIE, YP, IP, BM and OR equally contributed to the overall project described in this article.

The authors sincerely thank Richard Kallet (University of California, San Francisco at San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center, San Francisco, California, United States), Paolo Biselli (University Hospital, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil) for acting as independent advisory board of the meta-trial steering committee.

We also thank the member of data safety monitoring board, Andrew Smyth (National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland) for his oversight in the Irish trial.

### 1.2 Investigators from each participating center

Center	PI(s)	Investigators
Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, USA.	Jie Li, Sara Mirza, David Vines	Ahmad A Elshafei, Brady J. Scott, Tyler Weiss, Ramandeep Kaur, Lauren J Harnois, Amanda Miller, Flor Cerda, Andrew Klein Jacob R Burd Kathleen Posa-Kearney
Unity Point Health-Des Moines, Des Moines, IA, USA	Matthew Trump	Julie Jackson, Trevor Oetting, Mark Greenwood, Lindsay Hazel, Lisa Kingery
Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA	Idrees Mogri	Lindsey Morris, Joon Yong Moon, Julianne Garnett
University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI, USA	Shijing Jia	Kristine Nelson
Galway University Hospitals, Ireland	Bairbre McNicholas	David Cosgrave, Camilla Giacomini, John Laffey, Aoife Brennan, Conor Judge, Maeve Keman, Claire Kelly, Ritika Ranjan, Siobhan Casey, Kevin O'Connell, Evelyn Newell, David Gallagher
University College Dublin, Ireland		Alistair Nichol
Beaumont Hospital, Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin, Ireland		Ger Curley
Hospital Civil Fray Antonio Alcalde. Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.	Miguel Ibarra Estrada	Roxana García-Salcido, Alexandra Vargas-Obieta, Guadalupe Aguirre-Avalos, Sara A Aguirre-Díaz, Luz Alcántar-Vallín, Montserrat Alvarado-Padilla, Quetzalcóatl Chávez-Peña, José A. López-Pulgarín, Julio C Mijangos-Méndez.
Hospital General de Occidente. Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.	Miguel Marín- Rosales	Jorge E García-Alvarado, Oscar G Baltazar-González, Maura C González-Guerrero, Paola G Gutiérrez Ramírez
Hôpital de Verdun, Montréal, Québec, Canada	Ivan Pavlov	Sean Gilman, Patrice Plamondon, Rachel Roy
Royal Victoria Hospital and Montreal General Hospital, both part of the McGill University Healthcare, Montréal, Québec, Canada	Dev Jayaraman, Jason Shahin	Raham Ragoshai, Aasmine Kaur, Josie Campisi
Hôpital de la Cité-de-la-Santé, Laval, Québec, Canada	Joseph Dahine	Stefanie Perron, Slimane Achouri, Ronald Racette
Hôpital de Gaspé, Gaspé, Québec, Canada	Anne Kulenkamp	
Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron, Spain	Oriol Roca	Andrés Pacheco, Marina García-de-Acilu
Hospital Universitari del Mar, Spain	Joan R. Masclans	Irene Dot
CHRU Tours, Hôpital Bretonneau, Tours France	Yonatan Perez	Laetitia Bodet-Contentin, Denis Garot, Stephan Ehrmann, Emmanuelle Mercier, Charlotte Salmon Gandonnière, Marlène Morisseau, Youenn Jouan, Walid Darwiche, Annick Legras, Antoine Guillon, Elsa Tavernier, Pierre-François Dequin
CHRU Tours, Hôpital Trousseau, Tours, France	Anne-Charlotte Tellier	
CHU de Nantes, Nantes, France	Jean Reignier	Jean-Baptiste Lascarrou, Amélie Seguin, Luc Desmedt, Emmanuel Canet
CH Le Mans, Le Mans, France	Christophe Guitton	Rémy Marnai, Jean-Christophe Callahan, Mickaël Landais, Nicolas Chudeau, Cédric Darreau, Patrice Tirot, Marjorie Saint Martin, Charlene Le Moal.
CHR Orléans, Orléans, France	Mai-Anh Nay	Grégoire Muller, Sophie Jacquier
CHU Cavale Blanche, Brest, France	Gwenaël Prat	Pierre Bailly, Nicolas Ferrière
CHU Poitiers, Poitiers, France	Arnaud W Thille	Jean-Pierre Frat
CHU de Nice, Nice, France	Jean Dellamonica	Clément Saccheri, Matthieu Buscot
CH Victor Dupouy, Argenteuil, France	Gaëtan Plantefève	Damien Contou
Assistance publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Louis Mourier, Colombes, France	Damien Roux	Jean-Damien Ricard, Laura Federici, Noémie Zucman, Santiago Freita, Ramos, Marc Amouretti, Sébastien Besset, Coralie Gernez
CHBA Vannes, Vannes, France	Agathe Delbove	
Assistance publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Tenon, Paris, France	Guillaume Voiriot	Alexandre Elabbadi, Muriel Fartoukh
CHU de Lille, Lille France	Saad Nseir	Sébastien Préau, Raphaël Favory Alexandre Pierre
CH Mont-de-Marsan, Mont-de-Marsan, France	Arnaud Sement	
CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France	Nicolas Terzi	Florian Sigaud, Clara Candille, Emanuele Turbil

Amiens university hospital, Amiens, France	Julien Maizel	Clément Brault, Yoan Zerbib
CHU de Caen, Caen, France	Aurélie Joret	Cédric Daubin
Centre hospitalier intercommunal Aix-Pertuis	Laurent Lefebvre	Alais Giraud
CH de Dax, Dax, France	Adrien Auvet	
CH Béthune, Béthune, France	Christophe Vinsonneau	Mehdi Marzouk
CHU Dijon-Bourgogne, Dijon, France	Jean-Pierre Quenot	Pascal Andreu, Marie Labruyère, Jean-Baptiste Roudaut François Aptel
CHU Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France	Alexandre Boyer	Philippe Boyer
CHD Vendée, La Roche sur Yon, France	Jean-Claude Lacherade	Hugo Hille
CH Valence, Valence, France	Marie Bouteloup	Matthieu Jeannot
CH Blois, Blois, France	Marc Feller	
CH Lorient, Lorient, France	Guillaume Grillet	
Hôpital Brabois, CHUNancy, Vandoeuvre les Nancy, France	Bruno Levy	Antoine Kimmoun

#### Table S1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria in each trial

	Mexico	USA and Canada	Ireland	France and Spain
Inclusion criteria	<ol> <li>Adult patients (18 y) with RT-PCR- confirmed Covid-19 and respiratory distress (regardless of Berlin criteria for ARDS).</li> <li>Requirement of a F<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ≥30% through high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) to maintain a capillary S<sub>p</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ≥90%.</li> <li>Written informed consent</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Covid-19 pneumonia based on the center for disease control guidelines</li> <li>Presence of acute hypoxemic respiratory failure;</li> <li>Acute onset within 7 days of insult, or new (within 7 days) or worsening respiratory symptoms;</li> <li>Bilateral opacities on chest x-ray or computer tomographic scanner not fully explained by effusions, lobar or lung collapse, or nodules;</li> <li>Cardiac failure not the primary cause of acute respiratory failure</li> <li>Written informed consent</li> <li>P<sub>a</sub>O<sub>2</sub> / F<sub>i</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ratio &lt;200 mmHg or S<sub>p</sub>O<sub>2</sub> / F<sub>i</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt; 240 with HFNC at 50 L/min and SpO<sub>2</sub> maintained at 92-95%</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Suspected or confirmed Covid-19 infection</li> <li>Bilateral Infiltrates on chest X-ray</li> <li>S<sub>p</sub>O<sub>2</sub> &lt;94% on F<sub>i</sub>O<sub>2</sub> 40% by either venturi facemask or high flow nasal cannula</li> <li>Respiratory rate&lt;40 breath/min</li> <li>Written informed consent</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Adult patient suffering from Covid-19 pneumonia according to the diagnostic criteria in effect at the time of inclusion or very strongly suspected.</li> <li>Patient treated by nasal high flow therapy</li> <li>Moderate or severe ARDS: bilateral radiological opacities not explained entirely by effusions, atelectasis or nodules; acute hypoxemia with worsening within the 7 previous days, not entirely explained by left ventricular failure; P<sub>a</sub>O<sub>2</sub> / F<sub>i</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ratio &lt;300 mmHg (or equivalent S<sub>p</sub>O<sub>2</sub> / F<sub>i</sub>O<sub>2</sub>).</li> <li>Written informed consent in France, oral consent in Spain</li> </ol>

Exclusion criteria	<ol> <li>Age &lt;18 y</li> <li>Pregnancy</li> <li>Patients with immediate need of mechanical ventilation (altered mental status, signs of respiratory fatigue)</li> <li>Any vasopressor requirement to maintain a median arterial pressure ≥65 mmHg</li> <li>Contraindications for APP: recent abdominal or thoracic surgery/trauma, facial/pelvic/spine fractures, untreated pneumothorax)</li> <li>Do not resuscitate or do not intubate order</li> <li>Refusal or disability (uncooperative) of the patient to enroll in the study</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Patients with a consistent SpO<sub>2</sub>&lt;80% when evaluated with a FiO<sub>2</sub> of 0·6, or signs of respiratory fatigue (respiratory rate &gt; 40/min, PaCO<sub>2</sub>&gt; 50mmHg / pH&lt;7·30, and obvious accessory respiratory muscle use);</li> <li>Immediate need for intubation (PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub>&lt; 50 mmHg or SpO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub>&lt;90, unable to protect airway or mental status change);</li> <li>Hemodynamic instability (sustained systolic blood pressure &lt;90mmHg, sustained mean blood pressure below 65 mmHg or requirement for vasopressor);</li> <li>Unable to collaborate with HFNC/APP with agitation or refusal of HFNC/APP.</li> <li>Chest trauma or any contraindication for APP</li> <li>Pneumothorax</li> <li>Age &lt; 18 years</li> <li>Pregnant</li> <li>Body mass index &gt; 40 kg/m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Unable to communicate</li> <li>Patient with moderate or severe ILD</li> <li>Patient with stage IV lung cancer</li> <li>Patient requiring long term oxygen therapy</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Age &lt;18</li> <li>2)Uncooperative or likely to be unable to lie on abdomen for 16 hours</li> <li>3) Vomiting or bowel obstruction</li> <li>4) Palliative care</li> <li>5) Multiorgan failure</li> <li>6)Standard contraindications to APP including the presence of an open abdominal wound, unstable pelvic fracture, spinal lesions and instability, pregnancy &gt; 20/40 gestation and brain injury without monitoring of intracranial pressure.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Indication for immediate tracheal intubation</li> <li>Significant acute progressive circulatory insufficiency</li> <li>Impaired consciousness, confusion, restlessness</li> <li>Body mass index&gt; 40 kg / m2</li> <li>Chest trauma or other contraindication to APP</li> <li>Pneumothorax</li> <li>Vulnerable person: safeguard of justice, curatorship or tutorship known at inclusion</li> <li>Pregnant or lactating woman</li> </ol>
-----------------------	--	---	---	--

 $HFNC \ denotes \ high-flow \ nasal \ cannula, APP \ a wake \ prone \ positioning, \\ SpO_2 \ denotes \ peripheral \ blood \ oxygen \ saturation, \\ PaO_2, \ partial \ pressure \ of \ oxygen, \\ FiO_2 \ Fraction \ of \ inspired \ oxygen.$ 

#### Table S2. Standard management in each trial

Mexico	USA and Canada	Ireland	France and Spain
HFNC will be initiated at 40 L/min at 37°C according to patient comfort and tolerance (Vapotherm, Precision Flow. Exeter, New Hampshire), with $F_iO_2$ titrated to a capillary $S_pO_2$ of 92% to 95%. HFNC will be withdrawn when $F_iO_2$ is $\leq$ 40%. Staff intensivists will continuously monitor vital signs and adherence to protocol on a 24/7 basis.	HFNC will be initiated at 50 L/min (AIRVO2 or Optiflow, Fisher & Paykel Health care Limited., Auckland, New Zealand) with temperature set at $37^{\circ}$ C. Nasal cannula size will be determined by the patient's nostril size ( $\leq$ 50%). FiO <sub>2</sub> will be adjusted to maintain SpO <sub>2</sub> at 92% to 95%. Flow and temperature will be adjusted based on patient's comfort and clinical response	Control patients will receive full standard care.	HFNC adapted for an $S_pO_2$ of 90-95%. Except in case of poor tolerance by the patient a minimum gas flow rate of 50 L/min will be set initially. Weaning of the HFNC will first be performed reducing $F_iO_2$ down to 0.4 before reducing the gas flow rate. In clinically stable patients with a $F_iO_2$ less than or equal to 0.4 and a gas flow rate less than or equal to 30 L/min, an attempt will be made to switch to standard oxygen therapy at 4-6 L/min.

 $SpO_2 \, denotes \, peripheral \, blood \, ox \, ygen \, saturation, FiO_2 \, Fraction \, of \, inspired \, ox y \, gen.$ 



Figure S1.Z statistic for the three interim analyses

The changing pace of the pandemic dynamics made planning and executions of interim analysis very challenging. The meta-trial experienced a sudden surge of inclusions in the last months of 2020 while preparing the second interim analysis (planned at 400 patients). By the time the results were a vailable in December (which recommended to continue recruitment), 800 patients had a lready been included, thus the steering committee decided not to perform the third interim analysis (planned at 600 patients) and move directly to the fourth interim analysis (800 patients). In the short time required to make this decision, 928 patients had been included in the interim analysis which ended up with the decision to stop recruitment. At the time of recruitment interruption, 1126 patients had been included.

Analysis	Awake prone positioning	Standard care	Difference of proportions	Confidence interval
1	35% (46/131)	40% (51/127)	-5.0%	[-19·3%;9·4%]
2	35% (84/238)	42 % (101/239)	-7.0%	[-17.8%;4.0%]
3	40% (184/463)	47% (220/465)	-7.6%	[-14.9%;-0.2%]
4	39.5% (223/564)	46.1% (257/557)	-6.6%	[-13·2%;0%]

#### Table S3. Repeated confidence intervals of the primary outcome

As multiple looks at the data affects the construction of confidence intervals just as it affects significance levels of hypothesis tests the sequence of confidence intervals, using the Miettinen and Nurminen method <u>https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4023479/</u> on the nominal alpha-level of the upper bound, corresponding to the interim and final analyses. Using this method assures a confidence level of 95% for the 4 confidence intervals simultaneously.

#### Table S4. American trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 110)	MD	APP (n = 112)
Age, mean ± sd	0	$62.5 \pm 13.3$	0	$62 \cdot 2 \pm 12 \cdot 5$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	42 (38%)	0	40 (36%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	0	$30.5 \pm 5.3$	0	$30.0 \pm 5.1$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1; Q3]		0.8 [0.3;1.8]		0.8 [0.3;1.8]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$26.1 \pm 7.4$	0	$25.3 \pm 6.1$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean ± sd	4	91·7 ± 11·1	7	$91.2 \pm 13.0$
$SpO_2$ : $F_iO_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$156{\cdot}0\pm40{\cdot}6$	0	$152.0 \pm 37.8$
Coexisting illness— no. (%) ‡				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	41 (37%)	0	25 (22%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	21 (19%)	0	11 (10%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	8 (7%)	0	11 (10%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	2 (2%)	0	1 (1%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	51 (46%)	0	49 (44%)
Obesity — no. (%)	0	61 (56%)	0	59 (53%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	6 (6%)	0	8 (7%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	88 (80%)	0	80 (71%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	15 (14%)	0	7 (6%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	14 (13%)	0	20 (18%)
Intermediate care unit	0	0 (0%)	0	1 (1%)
Intensive care unit	0	96 (87%)	0	91 (81%)

SpO<sub>2</sub> denotes peripheral blood oxygen saturation, FiO<sub>2</sub> Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data.

<sup>†</sup> The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

 $\ddagger$  Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disease; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate < 60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> prior to hospital a dmission; severe liver disea se — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disea se with Child-Pugh score  $\ge$  10; obesity — body-mass index  $\ge$  30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

#### Table S5. Canadian trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 6)	MD	APP (n = 7)
Age, mean ± sd	0	$68.3 \pm 20.5$	0	$65.1 \pm 15.6$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	2 (33%)	0	4 (57%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	2	$30.7 \pm 6.5$	1	$27.4 \pm 3.6$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1; Q3]		0.2 [0; 0.4]		0.0 [0; 0.2]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$28 \cdot 2 \pm 2 \cdot 2$	0	$29.0 \pm 1.9$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$88.2 \pm 10.0$	0	$89.9 \pm 8.0$
$SpO_2$ : $F_1O_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$166.8 \pm 86.5$	0	$169{\cdot}3 \pm 68{\cdot}1$
Coexisting illness— no. (%) ‡				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	3 (50%)	0	3 (43%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	1 (17%)	0	2 (29%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	2 (33%)	0	0 (0%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	2 (33%)	0	5 (71%)
Obesity — no. (%)	2	2 (50%)	1	1 (17%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	4 (67%)	0	6 (86%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	3 (50%)	0	3 (43%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	3 (50%)	0	2 (29%)
Intermediate care unit	0	0 (0%)	0	3 (43%)
Intensive care unit	0	3 (50%)	0	2 (29%)

 $SpO_2$  denotes peripheral blood ox ygen saturation,  $FiO_2$  Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data. † The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

 $\ddagger$  Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disease; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate < 60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> prior to hospital admission; severe liver disease — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disease with Child -Pugh score  $\geq 10$ ; obesity — body-mass index  $\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ .

#### Table S6. French trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 202)	MD	APP (n = 200)
Age, mean ± sd	1	$62.9 \pm 11.5$	0	$64.2 \pm 10.2$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	51 (25%)	0	49 (25%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	0	$28.9 \pm 4.4$	1	$28.7 \pm 4.1$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1 ; Q3]		1.0 [1.0; 3.0]		2.0 [1.0; 3.0]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$23.8 \pm 5.5$	1	$24.2 \pm 5.2$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean ± sd	2	$90.2 \pm 13.0$	0	$91.6 \pm 13.4$
$SpO_2$ : $F_iO_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$155.8 \pm 44.6$	0	$155.2 \pm 48.3$
Coexisting illness— no. (%‡				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	11 (5%)	0	22 (11%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	28 (14%)	0	28 (14%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	5 (3%)	0	7 (4%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	1 (1%)	0	3 (2%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	50 (25%)	0	50 (25%)
Obesity — no. (%)	0	74 (37%)	1	61 (31%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	22 (11%)	0	33 (17%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	193 (96%)	0	199 (100%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	6 (3%)	0	9 (5%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intermediate care unit	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intensive care unit	0	202 (100%)	0	200 (100%)

SpO<sub>2</sub> denotes peripheral blood ox ygen saturation, FiO<sub>2</sub> Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data. † The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters. ‡ Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disease; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate  $< 60 \text{ mL/min}/1.73 \text{ m}^2$  prior to hospital admission; severe liver disease — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disease with Child-Pugh score  $\geq 10$ ; obesity — body-mass index  $\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ .

#### Table S7. Irish trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 12)	MD	APP (n = 12)
Age, mean ± sd	0	$59.3 \pm 16.0$	0	$62.8 \pm 11.0$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	5 (42%)	0	3 (25%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	0	$34.2 \pm 7.9$	0	$32.2 \pm 7.1$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1; Q3]		1.0 [1.0; 1.8]		1.0 [1.0; 2.5]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$25.8 \pm 6.3$	0	$23.8 \pm 4.6$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$90.2 \pm 11.7$	0	$94.9 \pm 9.3$
$SpO_2$ : $F_iO_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$178.3 \pm 52.7$	0	$193.9 \pm 45.5$
Coexisting illness—no. (%)‡				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	4 (33%)	0	7 (58%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	4 (33%)	0	2 (17%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	3 (25%)
Obesity — no. (%)	0	8 (67%)	0	6 (50%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (8%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	11 (92%)	0	12 (100%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	2 (17%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intermediate care unit	0	4 (33%)	0	8 (67%)
Intensive care unit	0	8 (67%)	0	4 (33%)

SpO<sub>2</sub> denotes peripheral blood oxygen saturation, FiO<sub>2</sub> Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data.

† The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.
‡ Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disease; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate < 60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> prior to hospital admission; severe liver disease — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disease with Child-Pugh score  $\geq 10$ ; obesity — body-mass index  $\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ .

#### Table S8. Mexican trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 214)	MD	APP (n = 216)
Age, mean ± sd	0	$58.2 \pm 15.8$	0	$58.6 \pm 15.8$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	88 (41%)	0	84 (39%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	0	$30.0 \pm 3.8$	0	$30.3 \pm 4.6$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1 ; Q3]		0.6 [0.4; 1.0]		0.7 [0.4; 1.0]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$25.3 \pm 4.2$	0	$25.0 \pm 4.3$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$82.6 \pm 7.4$	0	$82.7 \pm 7.3$
$SpO_2$ : $F_iO_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$135.5 \pm 37.9$	0	$134.7 \pm 38.7$
Coexisting illness— no. (%)‡				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	67 (31%)	0	62 (29%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	10 (5%)	0	18 (8%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	19 (9%)	0	24 (11%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	3 (1%)	0	4 (2%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	68 (32%)	0	64 (30%)
Obesity — no. (%)	0	81 (38%)	0	86 (40%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	2 (1%)	0	3 (1%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	184 (86%)	0	182 (84%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	20 (9%)	0	23 (11%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intermediate care unit	0	162 (76%)	0	172 (80%)
Intensive care unit	0	52 (24%)	0	44 (20%)

 $SpO_2 denotes peripheral blood oxygen saturation, FiO_2 Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data.$ 

<sup>†</sup> The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.

 $\ddagger$  Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disease ; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate < 60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> prior to hospital a dmission; severe liver disease — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disease with Child-Pugh score  $\ge$  10; obesity — body-mass index  $\ge$  30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

#### Table S9. Spanish trial

Variable	MD	Standard care (n = 13)	MD	APP (n = 17)
Age, mean ± sd	0	$52.4 \pm 11.5$	0	$58.1 \pm 9.9$
Female sex — no. (%)	0	3 (23%)	0	4 (24%)
Body mass index, mean $\pm$ sd $\dagger$	0	$28.9 \pm 4.9$	0	$30.1 \pm 3.2$
Number of days from admission in hospital to enrolment in study, med [Q1; Q3]		1.0 [0; 4.0]		2.0 [1.0;4.0]
Respiratory rate at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$20.8 \pm 3.8$	0	$21.4 \pm 4.9$
Mean arterial pressure at enrolment, mean ± sd	0	$85.4 \pm 14.2$	0	$93.2 \pm 17.9$
$SpO_2$ : $F_iO_2$ ratio at enrolment, mean $\pm$ sd	0	$155.8 \pm 30.7$	0	$162.9 \pm 22.8$
Coexisting illness—no. (%) <sup>+</sup>				
Chronic heart disease — no. (%)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (6%)
Chronic lung disease — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	2 (12%)
Chronic kidney disease — no. (%)	0	1 (8%)	0	3 (18%)
Severe liver disease — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Diabetes mellitus (type I and II) — no. (%)	0	2 (15%)	0	5 (29%)
Obesity — no. (%)	0	5 (39%)	0	8 (47%)
Active malignancy — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Use of glucocorticoids for treatment of Covid-19 — no. (%)	0	12 (92%)	0	15 (88%)
Do-not-intubate — no. (%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Highest treating location — no. (%)				
General ward	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intermediate care unit	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Intensive care unit	0	13 (100%)	0	17 (100%)

SpO<sub>2</sub> denotes peripheral blood oxygen saturation, FiO<sub>2</sub> Fraction of inspired oxygen, MD missing data.

† The body-mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters.
‡ Coexisting illnesses were defined as follows: chronic heart disease — heart failure or coronary artery disease or hypertension; chronic lung disease — obstructive or restrictive lung disea se; chronic kidney disease — estimated glomerular filtration rate <  $60 \text{ mL/min}/1.73 \text{ m}^2$  prior to hospital admission; severe liver disea se — cirrhosis and/or portal hypertension with history of variceal bleeding, or liver disease with Child -Pugh score>10; obesity — body-mass index >  $30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ .



3.4 Daily duration of time spent in prone positioning in individual trials

Figure S2: Boxplots durations of prone positioning (in hours per day from Day 0 to Day 14) in both groups

Group	Country	min	max	Mean ± sd	Median[Q1;Q3]
APP	Canada	0.0	7.0	$2.7 \pm 2.2$	2.4 [1.7; 3.0]
APP	France	0.0	15.8	$2.9 \pm 2.9$	2.0 [1.0; 3.7]
APP	Ireland	0.0	9.5	$3.3 \pm 2.7$	3.1 [2.1; 3.9]
APP	Mexico	3.7	15.5	$9.0 \pm 3.2$	8.6 [6.1; 11.4]
APP	Spain	0.0	5.1	$1.7 \pm 1.2$	1.6 [1.1; 2.3]
APP	USA	0.0	19.2	$4.4 \pm 4.7$	2.5 [0.7; 6.9]
APP	Meta-trial	0.0	19.2	$5.6 \pm 4.4$	5.0 [1.6; 8.8]
Standard care	Canada	0.0	0.0	$0 \pm 0$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	France	0.0	3.3	$0 \pm 0.3$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	Ireland	0.0	7.6	$1.0 \pm 2.5$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	Mexico	0.0	4.8	$0.3 \pm 1.0$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	Spain	0.0	0.0	$0 \pm 0$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	USA	0.0	10.0	$0.7 \pm 2.0$	0 [0;0]
Standard care	Meta-trial	0.0	10.0	$0.3 \pm 1.2$	0 [0;0]

APP, awake prone positioning

 $Table \, S10: \, Description \, of \, the \, durations \, of \, prone \, positioning (in \, hours \, per \, day \, from \, Day \, 0 \, to \, Day \, 14) \, in \, individual \, trials$ 

#### 3.5 Investigation of heterogeneity between trials

		APP 🕄	Standard	d care						
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk	Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Median	Mean
Canada	3	7	3	6			→ 0.86	[0.27; 2.77]	2.4	2.7
France	82	200	85	202		·	0.97	[0.77; 1.23]	2.0	2.9
Ireland	0	12	2	12	·		→ 0.20	[0.01; 3.76]	3.1	3.3
Mexico	88	216	112	214			0.78	[0.63; 0.96]	8.6	9.0
Spain	5	17	7	13 ·	- <b>-</b>		0.55	[0.22; 1.33]	1.6	1.7
USA	45	112	48	110		+	0.92	[0.68; 1.26]	2.5	4.4
Fixed effect model		564		557	$\sim$	-	0.86	[0.75; 0.98]		
Random effects model					$\sim$	-	0.86	[0.75; 0.98]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ [0%	69%] (; 69%				_		-			
				0.	5	1	2			

Figure S3: Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation or death (primary outcome) at Day 28. Median and mean durations of prone positioning sessions in hours

Study I	ntubations	APP Total	Standard Intubations	l care Total	Hazard Ratio	HR	95%-CI	Median	Mean
Canada	1	7	1	6	<	→ 0.93	[0.07; 12.07]	2.4	2.7
France	76	200	82	202		— 0.91	[0.67; 1.23]	2.0	2.9
Ireland	0	12	2	12				3.1	3.3
Mexico	65	216	92	214		0.62	[0.45; 0.84]	8.6	9.0
Spain	5	17	7	13	<	0.53	[0.19; 1.48]	1.6	1.7
USA	38	112	39	110		0.85	[0.55; 1.33]	2.5	4.4
Fixed effect model		564		557		0.76	[0.63; 0.92]		
<b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\% [0\%]$	79%1					0.76	[0.63; 0.92]		
	10,0]			0	.4 0.75 1	1.5			

Figure S4: Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on intubation at Day 28. Median and mean durations of prone positioning sessions in hours

		APP	Standard	l care						
Study	Deaths	Total	Deaths	Total	Risk R	atio	RR	95%-CI	Median	Mean
Canada	2	7	2	6	<del>د ا</del>		→ 0.86	[0.17; 4.37]	2.4	2.7
France	21	200	20	202			→ 1.06	[0.59; 1.89]	2.0	2.9
Ireland	0	12	0	12					3.1	3.3
Mexico	71	216	79	214	<b>,</b>	+	0.89	[0.69; 1.15]	8.6	9.0
Spain	2	17	1	13	<		→ 1.53	[0.15; 15.09]	1.6	1.7
USA	21	112	30	110	< I	+	0.69	[0.42; 1.12]	2.5	4.4
Fixed effect model		564		557		-	0.87	[0.71; 1.08]		
Random effects model						-	0.87	[0.71; 1.08]		
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ [0%	; 48%]			0	5	1				
	-			0	0.75	1	1.5			

Figure S5: Forest plot with mixed effects linear model with group as a fixed effect and country as a random effect on death at Day 28. Median and mean durations of prone positioning sessions in hours

#### 3.6 Interaction between subgroups according to severity (SpO<sub>2</sub>/ $F_1O_2 < 190 vs \ge 190$ )

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol							
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk	Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Median	Mean	
Less severe patients											
Canada	0	2	0	2					2.2	2.2	
France	13	51	7	49	_		1.78	[0.78; 4.10]	1.7	2.1	
Ireland	0	6	1	7	< <u>+</u> +		→ 0.38	[0.02; 7.91]	4	3.9	
Mexico	6	38	11	32	< I	+	0.46	[0.19; 1.10]	10.1	9.9	
Spain	0	5	0	2					1.7	1.6	
USA	7	18	7	23			- 1.28	[0.55; 2.98]	5.5	6.2	
Random effects model		120		115			0.98	[0.48; 2.00]			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 46\%$ , $\tau^2$	<sup>2</sup> = 0.233	0, <i>p</i> = 0	).13								
Severe patients											
Canada	3	5	3	4			0.80	[0.32; 1.99]	2.4	2.9	
France	69	149	78	153		•	0.91	[0.72; 1.15]	2.2	3.2	
Ireland	0	6	1	5	<	_	→ 0.28	[0.01; 5.62]	2.9	2.6	
Mexico	82	178	101	182	- •	H	0.83	[0.68; 1.02]	8	8.8	
Spain	5	12	7	11		+	0.65	[0.29; 1.46]	1.4	1.7	
USA	38	94	41	87		+-	0.86	[0.62; 1.19]	2.1	4.1	
Random effects model		444		442	$\langle$	>	0.85	[0.74; 0.98]			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$ , $\tau^2$	= 0, p = 0	0.93									
				0	2 0.5	1 2	5				
				0	.2 0.5	1 Z	5				

Figure S6: Subgroup analysis of the primary outcome according to the severity at enrollment. Interaction test p=0.62. Median and mean durations of prone positioning sessions in hours

#### 3.7 Per-protocol analysis

Patients in the standard care group who remained in APP for more than 1 hour during any one of the first 14 days whilst on HFNC, and patients in the APP group who stayed in APP less than 1 hour daily on a verage while on HFNC during the first 14 days, were excluded from the per-protocol population as defined a priori.

#### **Results:**

The per-protocol analysis was carried out, after excluding 64 patients of the standard care group who underwent off-protocol APP and 83 patients from the APP group who didn't stay in APP for a minimum of 1 hour daily when eligible as defined prospectively. In the per-protocol population, the primary outcome occurred in 195 of 481 (41%) patients in the APP group and in 221 out of 493 (45%) patients in the standard care group (relative risk 0.90, 95% CI 0.77 to 1.04).

#### Interpretation:

Beyond lack of power, as the adherence to the protocol may have been influenced by the course of the disease (rescue APP among the most severe patients), the APP and standard care groups of the pre-defined per-protocol population were probably no longer comparable, which precludes meaningful interpretation of this analysis.