

2025 Clinical Practice Guideline Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America on the Treatment and Management of COVID-19: Abatacept

Nandita Nadig,^{1,a} Adarsh Bhimraj,^{2,a} Kelly Cawcutt,³ Kathleen Chiotos,⁴ Amy L. Dzierba,⁵ Arthur Y. Kim,^{6,7} Greg S. Martin,⁸ Jeffrey C. Pearson,⁹ Amy Hirsch Shumaker,^{10,11} Lindsey R. Baden,^{6,12} Roger Bedimo,¹³ Vincent Chi-Chung Cheng,¹⁴ Kara W. Chew,¹⁵ Eric S. Daar,¹⁶ David V. Glidden,¹⁷ Erica J. Hardy,¹⁸ Steven Johnson,¹⁹ Jonathan Z. Li,^{6,12} Christine MacBrayne,²⁰ Mari M. Nakamura,^{21,22} Laura Riley,^{23,24} Robert W. Shafer,²⁵ Shmuel Shoham,²⁶ Pablo Tebas,²⁷ Phyllis C. Tien,²⁸ Jennifer Loveless,²⁹ Yngve Falck-Ytter,^{10,11} Rebecca L. Morgan,^{10,30,b} and Rajesh T. Gandhi^{6,7,b}

¹Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, USA; ²Division of Infectious Diseases, Houston Methodist Hospital, Houston, Texas, USA; ³Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, Nebraska, USA; ⁴Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia/University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA; ⁵Department of Medicine, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York City, New York, USA; ⁶Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ⁷Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ⁸Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA; ⁹Department of Pharmacy, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ¹⁰Department of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio, USA; ¹¹Department of Medicine, VA Northeast Ohio Healthcare System, Cleveland, Ohio, USA; ¹²Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ¹³Department of Medicine, UT Southwestern/VA North Texas Health Care System, Dallas, Texas, USA; ¹⁴Department of Microbiology, Queen Mary Hospital, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China; ¹⁵Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, USA; ¹⁶Department of Medicine, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Torrance, California, USA; ¹⁷Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA; ¹⁸Departments of Medicine and Obstetrics and Gynecology, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, USA; ¹⁹Department of Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado, USA; ²⁰Department of Pharmacy, Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, Colorado, USA; ²¹Antimicrobial Stewardship Program and Division of Infectious Diseases, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ²²Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ²³New York-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medical Center, New York City, New York, USA; ²⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York City, New York, USA; ²⁵Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, USA; ²⁶Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; ²⁷Department of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA; ²⁸Department of Medicine, UCSF/VA San Francisco Health Care System, San Francisco, California, USA; ²⁹Clinical Affairs and Practice Guidelines, Infectious Diseases Society of America, Arlington, Virginia, USA; and ³⁰Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

This article provides a focused update to the clinical practice guideline on the treatment and management of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), developed by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. The guideline panel presents a recommendation on the use of abatacept in hospitalized adults with severe or critical COVID-19. The recommendation is based on evidence derived from a systematic literature review and adheres to a standardized methodology for rating the certainty of evidence and strength of recommendation according to the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) approach.

Keywords. COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; abatacept; guideline.

Posted online at <https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/> on May 30, 2025. As COVID-19 treatment and management guidelines may change rapidly with evolving virus variants and ongoing research, please check the website for the most current version of this guideline.

In patients hospitalized with severe or critical COVID-19 receiving systemic glucocorticoids, should abatacept compared to no abatacept be added to standard care?

Recommendation: In hospitalized adults receiving systemic glucocorticoids who are experiencing severe, rapidly progressing COVID-19* or critical COVID-19**, when baricitinib and tocilizumab are not available, the IDSA guideline panel suggests abatacept rather than no abatacept (*conditional recommendation, low certainty of evidence*).

*Severe, rapidly progressing illness is defined as patients with SpO₂ ≤94% on room air, including patients on supplemental oxygen who are worsening despite treatment with systemic glucocorticoids.

**Critical illness is defined as patients requiring high-flow nasal cannula oxygen/non-invasive ventilation or invasive mechanical ventilation or ECMO.

Received 18 June 2025; editorial decision 23 June 2025; published online 9 September 2025

^aN. N. and A. B. contributed equally to this work.

^bR. L. M. and R. T. G. contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence: Adarsh Bhimraj, Division of Infectious Diseases, Houston Methodist Hospital, 6560 Fannin St, Ste 1512, Houston, TX 77030 (practiceguidelines@idsociety.org).

Clinical Infectious Diseases® 2025;81(9):i17–21

© The Author(s) 2025. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Infectious Diseases Society of America. All rights reserved. For commercial re-use, please contact reprints@oup.com for reprints and translation rights for reprints. All other permissions can be obtained through our RightsLink service via the Permissions link on the article page on our site—for further information please contact journals.permissions@oup.com. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaf354>

BACKGROUND

Abatacept is a recombinant fusion protein (cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated antigen 4 [CTLA-4] linked to human immunoglobulin) that is used to block T cell activation [1]. CTLA-4 is a protein receptor that is expressed by activated T cells. By mediating inhibitory signals, this receptor can decrease T cell proliferation and cytokine production [2]. This mechanism helps suppress immune responses, making it valuable for treating autoimmune conditions. Abatacept is U.S. Food and Drug Administration–approved for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis, and psoriatic arthritis, as well as the prevention of acute graft versus host disease [3, 4]. Excessive T cell stimulation and proliferation were thought to contribute to the pathogenesis of COVID-19; consequently, abatacept was considered as a potential option for treating COVID-19 by modulating the T cell response [5]. Although abatacept is not approved for the treatment of COVID-19, it has been evaluated in clinical trials for the treatment of hospitalized patients with moderate to severe COVID-19 [6].

In this focused update to the 2023 guideline [7], a recommendation is provided for abatacept. The primary audience for this recommendation is clinicians who treat hospitalized adults with severe or critical COVID-19.

METHODS

The panel's recommendation is based on a systematic review of available evidence and adheres to a standardized methodology for rating the certainty of evidence and strength of recommendation according to the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) approach (Supplementary Figure 1) [8]. The recommendation has been endorsed by the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society, Society for Healthcare Epidemiology, and Society of Critical Care Medicine.

Strong recommendations are made when the recommended course of action would apply to most people with few exceptions. Conditional recommendations are made when the suggested course of action would apply to the majority of people with many exceptions and shared decision making is important.

A literature search was conducted in August 2024 as part of a systematic review. Key eligibility criteria at both the topic and clinical question levels guided the selection of studies for inclusion. For this clinical question, only hospitalized adults were included. The primary comparison of interest was abatacept versus no abatacept.

A critical appraisal of the evidence according to the GRADE approach, along with an assessment of the benefits and harms of care options, informed the recommendation [8, 9]. Details of the systematic review and guideline development processes are available in the [Supplementary Material](#).

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

The search identified 1 randomized, controlled trial (N = 1049), ACTIV-1 IM, that reported on adults aged ≥ 18 years with severe COVID-19 who were randomized to treatment with abatacept (10 mg/kg, maximum dose 1000 mg) plus standard of care or standard of care alone (Supplementary Table 1) [6]. Standard of care across the treatment and control arms included remdesivir (93–94%), corticosteroids (89–93%), tocilizumab (3%), and baricitinib (1–3%). Though the primary endpoint of the study was time to recovery, this trial also reported on the outcomes of mortality at 28 days, recovery at 28 days (assessed by the first day a hospitalized participant did not require oxygen or ongoing care, or the patient was not hospitalized with or without limitations on activities, ie, categories 6, 7, or 8 on an 8-point ordinal scale), and serious adverse events (Table 1).

Benefits

Among hospitalized patients, abatacept showed a trend toward reduced mortality at 28 days compared to no abatacept treatment (risk ratio [RR], 0.73; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.53–1.01; low certainty of evidence). In addition, patients receiving abatacept trended toward improved recovery as measured by improvement to hospitalization without oxygen requirements or release from the hospital (hazard ratio, 1.12; 95% CI: 0.98–1.28; moderate certainty of evidence).

Harms

Serious adverse events among patients receiving abatacept did not differ from those receiving usual care (RR, 0.94; 95% CI: 0.77–1.16; low certainty of evidence). The low certainty of evidence was due to very serious concerns with imprecision, reflecting both the wide CI, which includes appreciable benefits and possible harms, and few reported events.

Other Considerations

The panel agreed that the overall certainty of evidence was low (Table 1, Supplementary Table 2), given the sparseness in mortality data and because the 95% CIs cannot exclude the potential for no meaningful difference in mortality, recovery, and serious adverse events. Regarding the definition of severe, rapidly progressing COVID-19, the panel recognizes that SpO₂ alone may not always correlate with disease severity, and the recommendation should be interpreted in the clinical context of the patient.

There are limited human data on the use of abatacept in pregnancy, and its use in pregnancy has generally been avoided. However, in the small number of pregnancy exposures reported (n = 161), there is no indication that it increases the risk of miscarriage or birth defects [10]. The large size of the molecule and poor absorption in the gut suggest that there is minimal infant exposure via breastmilk ingestion [11]. Use of abatacept in

Table 1. GRADE Evidence Profile: In patients hospitalized with severe or critical COVID-19 receiving systemic glucocorticoids, should abatacept be added to standard care?

Certainty Assessment			No. of Patients				Effect					
No. of Studies	Study Design	Risk of Bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other Considerations	Abatacept	No Abatacept	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Mortality (follow-up, 28 d)												
1 [6]	Randomized trial	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious ^a	Very serious ^{b,c}	None	56/509 (11%)	77/510 (15.1%)	RR 0.73 (0.53–1.01) ^d	41 fewer per 1000 (from 71 fewer to 2 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low	Critical
Recovery (follow-up, 28 d; assessed with first day a hospitalized participant did not require oxygen or ongoing care or patient was not hospitalized with or without limitations on activities) ^e												
1 [6]	Randomized trial	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious ^a	Serious ^f	none	414/524 (79.0%)	397/525 (75.6%)	HR 1.12 (0.98–1.28) ^g	38 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 80 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate	Critical
SAEs (assessed with death, life-threatening adverse event, new/prolonged hospitalization, persistent/significant incapacity/substantial disruption of normal life functions, congenital anomaly/birth defect)												
1 [6]	Randomized trial	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious ^a	Very serious ^a	None	128/509 (25.1%)	136/510 (26.7%)	RR 0.94 (0.77–1.16) ^h	16 fewer per 1000 (from 61 fewer to 43 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low ^{h,i}	Critical

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; RR, risk ratio; SAE, serious adverse event.

^aO'Halloran et al [6] included patients aged ≥18 years.

^b95% CI cannot exclude the potential for no mortality benefit.

^cEvents do not meet optimal information size and suggest fragility in the estimate.

^dOdds ratio in O'Halloran et al [6] was 0.62 (95% CI: 0.41–0.94). Analyzed as binary end points using a logistic regression model with an indicator variable for treatment group, geographic region, baseline disease severity on the 8-point ordinal scale, age, and sex.

^eEquivalent to categories 6, 7, or 8 on the study's 8-point ordinal scale.

^f95% CI cannot exclude no meaningful difference in recovery.

^gRecovery rate ratio, similar to a hazard ratio.

^hAll SAEs reported. SAEs reported by site principal investigators as related to the study drug: abatacept = 9/509, placebo = 7/510 (RR = 1.29; 95% CI: .48–3.43).

ⁱAll SAEs reported. SAEs reported by site principal investigators as related to the study drug: abatacept = 9/509, placebo = 7/510 (RR = 1.29; 95% CI: 0.48–3.43).

the setting of COVID-19 for pregnant patients is reasonable if benefits clearly outweigh potential risks.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

Head-to-head comparisons of baricitinib, tocilizumab, abatacept, and infliximab in patients with severe, rapidly progressing COVID-19 and critical COVID-19 would be informative. It is also uncertain whether a combination of 2 or more immunomodulatory agents (ie, baricitinib, tocilizumab, abatacept, infliximab) offers additional mortality or recovery benefits. Additionally, the efficacy of abatacept has not been evaluated in children or adolescents with severe or critical COVID-19. Future studies evaluating abatacept for COVID-19 should consider enrolling children and adolescents, particularly given the pediatric experience with abatacept and available pediatric dosing recommendations for non-COVID-19 indications.

The guideline panel suggests the use of abatacept in hospitalized adults receiving systemic glucocorticoids who are experiencing severe, rapidly progressing COVID-19 or critical COVID-19, when baricitinib and tocilizumab are not available.

Supplementary Data

[Supplementary materials](#) are available at *Clinical Infectious Diseases* online. Consisting of data provided by the authors to benefit the reader, the posted materials are not copyedited and are the sole responsibility of the authors, so questions or comments should be addressed to the corresponding author.

Notes

Acknowledgments. The expert panel acknowledges former panelists for their work on the primary guideline. The panel also acknowledges the following organizations and selected reviewers for their review of the draft manuscript: Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society, Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists, Society for Healthcare Epidemiology, and Society of Critical Care Medicine; Drs Judith Aberg and John O'Horo; and Drs Robin Colgrove and Nicolás Cortés-Penfield on behalf of the IDSA Standards & Practice Guidelines Subcommittee.

Drs Adarsh Bhimraj and Rajesh T. Gandhi are chair and vice chair of the panel, respectively. The Hospitalized Patients subgroup, under the leadership of Dr Nandita Nadig, led the development of the recommendation. Remaining panelists assisted with interpretation of data, as well as drafting, revising, and approving the recommendation and manuscript. Drs Rebecca Morgan, lead methodologist, and Yngve Falck-Ytter, methodologist, were responsible for designing and performing the data analyses and leading the panel according to the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation process. Jennifer Loveless, methodologist, was responsible for project planning and management, including revisions to and final approval of the recommendation and manuscript.

Disclaimer. It is important to recognize that guidelines cannot always account for individual variation among patients. They are assessments of current scientific and clinical information provided as an educational service; are not continually updated and may not reflect the most recent evidence (new evidence may emerge between the time information is drafted and when it is published or read); should not be considered inclusive of all proper methods of care or as a statement of the standard of care; do not mandate any course of medical care; and are not intended to supplant clinician judgment with respect to particular patients or situations. Whether to follow guidelines and to what extent is voluntary, with the ultimate determination regarding their application to be made by the clinician in light of each patient's individual circumstances. While IDSA makes every effort

to present accurate, complete, and reliable information, these guidelines are presented "as is" without any warranty, either express or implied. IDSA (and its officers, directors, members, employees, and agents) assume no responsibility for any loss, damage, or claim with respect to any liabilities, including direct, special, indirect, or consequential damages, incurred in connection with these guidelines or reliance on the information presented.

The guidelines represent the proprietary and copyrighted property of IDSA. All rights reserved. No part of these guidelines may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of IDSA. Permission is granted to physicians and healthcare providers solely to copy and use the guidelines in their professional practices and clinical decision-making. No license or permission is granted to any person or entity, and prior written authorization by IDSA is required to sell, distribute, or modify the guidelines or to make derivative works of or incorporate the guidelines into any product, including, but not limited to, clinical decision support software or any other software product. Except for the permission granted above, any person or entity who would like to use the guidelines in any way must contact IDSA for approval in accordance with the terms and conditions of third-party use, in particular, any use of the guidelines in any software product.

Financial support. This work was supported by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. This project has been funded in whole or in part with federal funds from the National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, under Contract No. 75N91019D00024. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human Services, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the US government.

Potential conflicts of interest. Evaluation of relationships as potential conflicts of interest (COI) is determined by a review process. The assessment of disclosed relationships for possible COIs is based on the relative weight of the financial relationship (ie, monetary amount) and the relevance of the relationship (ie, the degree to which an association might reasonably be interpreted by an independent observer as related to the topic or recommendation of consideration). No panelists had COIs directly related to abatacept. The following panelists have scientific advisory/consultant roles not related to the topic of COVID-19 with indicated companies: R. B. with Merck and Gilead, E. S. D. with Gilead, D. V. G. with Merck and Gilead, S. S. with Pfizer (concluded), P. T. with Merck, and R. G. with Merck. The following panelists have scientific advisory/consultant roles related to COVID-19 but not severe/critical COVID-19 with indicated companies: R. B. with Shionogi, K. C. with Pardes Biosciences (concluded), A. Y. K. with Shionogi, S. S. with Adamis and Immunome (concluded), and P. T. with Shionogi. J. C. P. had a scientific advisory/consultant role (concluded) with InflaRx related to vilobelimab for critical COVID-19. No disclosures were reported for all other authors (the majority of panelists), including chair and vice chair.

All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

Additional information. More detailed information on the analysis and development of the recommendation is available in the [Supplementary Material](#).

References

1. Alegre ML, Frauwirth KA, Thompson CB. T-cell regulation by CD28 and CTLA-4. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2001; 1:220–8.
2. Oyewole-Said D, Konduri V, Vazquez-Perez J, Weldon SA, Levitt JM, Decker WK. Beyond T-cells: functional characterization of CTLA-4 expression in immune and non-immune cell types. *Front Immunol* 2020; 11:608024.
3. Mohamed Ahamada M, Wu X. Analysis of efficacy and safety of abatacept for rheumatoid arthritis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2023; 41:1882–900.
4. Abatacept (Orencia) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2021. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2021/125118s240lbl.pdf. Accessed 12 February 2025.
5. Julià A, Bonafonte-Pardàs I, Gómez A, et al. Targeting of the CD80/86 proinflammatory axis as a therapeutic strategy to prevent severe COVID-19. *Sci Rep* 2021; 11:11462.

6. O'Halloran JA, Ko ER, Anstrom KJ, et al. Abatacept, cenicriviroc, or infliximab for treatment of adults hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia. *JAMA* **2023**; 330:328–39.
7. Bhimraj A, Morgan RL, Shumaker AH, et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines on the treatment and management of patients with COVID-19 (September 2022). *Clin Infect Dis* **2024**; 78:e250–349.
8. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* **2008**; 336: 924–6.
9. Infectious Diseases Society of America. IDSA handbook on clinical practice guideline development. Available at: <https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/clinical-practice-guidelines-development-training-and-resources/>. Accessed 10 February 2025.
10. Kumar M, Ray L, Vemuri S, Simon TA. Pregnancy outcomes following exposure to abatacept during pregnancy. *Semin Arthritis Rheum* **2015**; 45:351–6.
11. Sammaritano LR, Bermas BL, Chakravarty EE, et al. 2020 American College of Rheumatology guideline for the management of reproductive health in rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases. *Arthritis Rheumatol* **2020**; 72:529–56.