1	Submitted to JAMA Network Open on: 25 February 2023
2	Reduced control of SARS-CoV-2 infection is associated with lower mucosal
3	antibody responses in pregnant women
4	Laura A. St Clair, PhD ^{1#} ; Raghda E. Eldesouki, PhD ^{2,3#} , Jaiprasath Sachithanandham, PhD ^{1#} ,
5	Anna Yin, MPH ^{1#} , Amary Fall, PhD ² , C. Paul Morris, MD, PhD ^{2,4} , Julie M. Norton, MS ² , Michael
6	Forman, PhD ² , Omar Abdullah, BS ² , Santosh Dhakal, DVM, PhD ¹ ; Caelan Barranta, BS ¹ , Hana
7	Golding, PhD ⁵ , Susan J. Bersoff-Matcha, MD ⁶ , Catherine Pilgrim-Grayson ⁷ , Leah Berhane, MD,
8	MHA ⁷ , Andrea L. Cox, MD, PhD ^{1,8,9} , Irina Burd, MD, PhD ¹⁰ , Andrew Pekosz, PhD ^{1,8,11} , Heba H.
9	Mostafa, MD, PhD ² , Eili Y. Klein, PhD ^{11,12*} , and Sabra L. Klein, PhD ^{1,8*}
10	¹ W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins
11	University Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA
12	² Department of Pathology, Division of Medical Microbiology, Johns Hopkins University School of
13	Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
14	³ Medical Genetics Unit, Histology Department, School of Medicine, Suez Canal University,
15	Egypt
16	⁴ National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda,
17	MD, USA
18	⁵ Division of Viral Products, Center of Biologics Evaluation and Research, U.S. Food and Drug
19	Administration, Silver Spring, MD, USA
20	⁶ Office of Women's Health, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, USA
21	⁷ Division of Urology, Obstetrics, and Gynecology; Office of Rare Diseases, Pediatrics, Urologic
22	and Reproductive Medicine; Office of New Drugs; Center for Drug Evaluation and Research;
23	U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD, USA
24	⁸ Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
25	⁹ Bloomberg Kimmel Institute for Cancer Immunotherapy, Johns Hopkins University School of
26	Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

- St Clair et al. 2
- ¹⁰Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, University of Maryland
- 28 School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
- ²⁹ ¹¹Department of Emergency Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore,
- 30 MD, USA
- ¹²Center for Disease Dynamics, Economics, and Policy, Washington DC, USA
- 32
- 33 #equal contributors
- 34 *co-senior authors
- 35 **Corresponding authors:**
- 36 <u>eklein@jhu.edu</u>
- 37 5801 Smith Ave, Davis Suite 3220, Baltimore, MD 21209
- 38 sklein2@jhu.edu (Primary)
- 39 615 North Wolfe Street, Rm W2118, Baltimore, MD 21205
- 40 **Running Title**: SARS-CoV-2 infection in pregnant women
- 41 **Key words**: COVID-19, gestation, breakthrough infection, Omicron variant, Delta variant
- 42

43 Key Points

- 44 **Question:** Is greater COVID-19 disease severity during pregnancy associated with either
- 45 reduced mucosal antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 or increased viral RNA levels?
- 46 Finding: In a retrospective cohort of pregnant and non-pregnant women with confirmed SARS-
- 47 CoV-2 infection, we observed that (1) disease severity, including ICU admission, was greater
- 48 among pregnant than non-pregnant women; (2) vaccination was associated with reduced
- 49 recovery of infectious virus in non-pregnant women but not in pregnant women; (3) increased
- 50 nasopharyngeal viral RNA levels were associated with reduced mucosal IgG antibody
- responses in pregnant women; and (4) greater maternal age was associated with reduced

- St Clair et al. 3
- 52 mucosal IgG responses and increased viral RNA levels, especially among women infected with
- 53 the Omicron variant.
- 54 **Meaning:** The findings of this study provide novel evidence that, during pregnancy, lower
- 55 mucosal antibody responses are associated with reduced control of SARS-CoV-2, including
- variants of concern, and greater disease severity, especially with increasing maternal age.
- 57 Reduced mucosal antibody responses among vaccinated pregnant women highlight the need
- 58 for bivalent booster doses during pregnancy.
- 59

60 <u>Abstract</u>

- 61 **Importance:** Pregnant women are at increased risk of severe COVID-19, but the contribution of
- viral RNA load, the presence of infectious virus, and mucosal antibody responses remain
- 63 understudied.
- 64 **Objective:** To evaluate the association of COVID-19 outcomes following confirmed infection
- 65 with vaccination status, mucosal antibody responses, infectious virus recovery and viral RNA
- 66 levels in pregnant compared with non-pregnant women.
- 67 **Design:** A retrospective observational cohort study of remnant clinical specimens from SARS-
- 68 CoV-2 infected patients between October 2020-May 2022.
- 69 Setting: Five acute care hospitals within the Johns Hopkins Health System (JHHS) in the
- 70 Baltimore, MD-Washington, DC area.
- 71 **Participants:** Participants included confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected pregnant women and
- matched non-pregnant women (matching criteria included age, race/ethnicity, and vaccination
- 73 status).
- 74 **Exposure:** SARS-CoV-2 infection, with documentation of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccination.
- 75 Main Outcome(s): The primary dependent measures were clinical COVID-19 outcomes,
- recovery, viral RNA levels, and mucosal anti-spike (S) IgG titers from upper
- respiratory tract samples. Clinical outcomes were compared using odds ratios (OR), and

St Clair et al. 4

78	measures of virus and antibody were compared using either Fisher's exact test, two-way
79	ANOVA, or regression analyses. Results were stratified according to pregnancy, vaccination
80	status, maternal age, trimester of pregnancy, and infecting SARS-CoV-2 variant.
81	Results(s): A total of 452 individuals (117 pregnant and 335 non-pregnant) were included in the
82	study, with both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals represented. Pregnant women were at
83	increased risk of hospitalization (OR = 4.2; CI = 2.0-8.6), ICU admittance, (OR = 4.5; CI = 1.2-
84	14.2), and of being placed on supplemental oxygen therapy (OR = 3.1; CI =1.3-6.9). An age-
85	associated decrease in anti-S IgG titer and corresponding increase in viral RNA levels (P<
86	0.001) was observed in vaccinated pregnant, but not non-pregnant, women. Individuals in their
87	3 rd trimester had higher anti-S IgG titers and lower viral RNA levels (<i>P</i> < 0.05) than those in their
88	1 st or 2 nd trimesters. Pregnant individuals experiencing breakthrough infections due to the
89	omicron variant had reduced anti-S IgG compared to non-pregnant women (P < 0.05).
90	Conclusions and Relevance: In this cohort study, vaccination status, maternal age, trimester
91	of pregnancy, and infecting SARS-CoV-2 variant were each identified as drivers of differences
92	in mucosal anti-S IgG responses in pregnant compared with non-pregnant women. Observed
93	increased severity of COVID-19 and reduced mucosal antibody responses particularly among
94	pregnant participants infected with the Omicron variant suggest that maintaining high levels of
95	SARS-CoV-2 immunity may be important for protection of this at-risk population.
96	

97 Introduction

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has caused more than 650 million confirmed SARS-CoV-2
cases and greater than 6.6 million deaths reported worldwide [1]. Pregnant women are
classified as an at-risk group for severe complications, but the relationship between physiologic,
immunologic, and hormonal changes that occur during pregnancy and increased disease
severity risk remain unclear [2-4]. Analyses from the US Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention (CDC), show that among people with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections from

St Clair et al. 5

104	January 2020-December 2021, pregnant women were 5 times more likely to be admitted to an
105	intensive care unit (ICU), had a 76% greater risk of requiring invasive ventilation, and had a 3.3
106	times greater risk of death compared to non-pregnant women [5]. Despite these increased risks,
107	the immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection and efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in
108	pregnant women remains understudied [6-10]. Studies that have analyzed immune responses
109	to SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination have largely focused on serological immunity, with
110	limited analysis of the mucosal antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection [11] and its
111	association with virus load, especially among pregnant women.
112	In this retrospective observational cohort study, remnant nasopharyngeal (NP) swab or
113	lateral mid-turbinate nasal swab samples from pregnant and matched non-pregnant patients
114	with confirmed positive SARS-CoV-2 infection who visited the Johns Hopkins Health System
115	between October 2020-May 2022 were analyzed for clinical outcomes, virus lineage, infectious
116	virus recovery, quantification of viral RNA level, and assessment of mucosal anti-spike (S) IgG
117	titers. Differences in each measure were compared between non-pregnant and pregnant
118	women and stratified by vaccination status, age, trimester of pregnancy, and infecting SARS-
119	CoV-2 variants.

120

121 Materials and Methods

122 Ethical considerations and data availability

123 This study was conducted under the Johns Hopkins University IRB protocols IRB00221396,

124 IRB00288258, IRB00289116 and a waiver of consent. Remnant clinical specimens from

- individuals who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 following standard of care or diagnostic
- screening were used in this study. Whole viral genome sequencing was performed for genomic
- 127 SARS-CoV-2 surveillance and sequences were made publicly available in the GISAID

128 database.

129 Subjects and sample selection

St Clair et al. 6

This was a retrospective observational cohort study that used remnant nasopharyngeal swabs 130 (from symptomatic patients) or lateral mid-turbinate nasal swabs (from asymptomatic patients) 131 132 after standard of care diagnostic screening for SARS-CoV-2 infection across JHHS. Multiple molecular assays were performed to confirm SARS-CoV-2 infection, as previously described 133 [12, 13]. Clinical information, and information about vaccination and immune status of 134 135 individuals were bulk extracted from the electronic health record that is shared across JHHS 136 and analyzed as previously described in [14]. The cohort excluded anyone who identified as 137 male, whose sex at birth was recorded as male, or who chose not to disclose their sex at birth. Propensity score matching was used to select a cohort of control patients (3:1 ratio of control to 138 pregnant patients). Psmatch2 in Stata was used to match the patients on the variables listed 139 140 above using two methods, the first used no replacement (i.e., selection of best matches for every pregnant patient in the cohort), then with a nearest neighbor of 4 with a caliper of 0.01 141 142 was used to select additional patients that might be near close matches. Initial selection identified 287 pregnant patients and 817 matched non-pregnant controls; however, of this 143 144 group, complete vaccination data, full sequencing data, and remnant clinical specimens were only available for 117 pregnant individuals (84 unvaccinated, 33 vaccinated), and 335 matched 145 non-pregnant controls (244 unvaccinated, 91 vaccinated) which defined the final cohort (Table 146 1). For the purposes of this study, vaccinated individuals were defined as those who either 147 148 received two primary doses (Pfizer/BioNTech or Moderna mRNA-1273 vaccines) or received the primary doses and third booster dose prior to confirmed infection. Unvaccinated individuals 149 were defined as individuals who had received no COVID-19 vaccine prior to infection. 150 Individuals who were partially vaccinated were excluded from this study. 151

152 Amplicon-based Sequencing

153 Specimen preparation, extractions, and sequencing were performed as described previously

154 [15, 16]. NEBNext® ARTIC SARS-CoV-2 Companion Kit (VarSkip Short SARS-CoV-2 # E7660-

L) was used for library preparation and sequencing using the Nanopore GridION. Base-calling

- St Clair et al. 7
- of reads was conducted using the MinKNOW, followed by demultiplexing with guppybarcoder
- that requires barcodes at both ends. Artic-ncov2019 medaka protocol was used for alignment
- and variant calling [17, 18]. Clades were determined using Nextclade beta v 1.13.2
- 159 (clades.nextstrain.org, Last accessed March 30, 2022), and lineages were determined with
- 160 Pangolin COVID-19 lineage Assigner [19]. Sequences with coverage >90% and mean depth
- 161 >100 were submitted to GISAID database.

162 SARS-CoV-2 PCR

- 163 After clinical diagnosis, samples were retested using the CDC designed primers and probes for
- the N gene to assess viral RNA levels (Cycle threshold, or Ct) [20]. Equivalent distribution of
- data between samples collected from NP swabs and lateral mid-turbinate nasal swabs was
- observed; as such, analysis of Ct values did not control for sample type.

167 Infectious SARS-CoV-2 recovery

- 168 TMPRSS2 VeroE6 cells (RRID: CVCL_YQ49) obtained from the cell repository of the National Institute
- of Infectious Diseases, Japan [18, 21], and were cultured as previously described [22]. For virus
- isolation, cells plated in 24-well dishes had the culture media replaced with 350 µL of infection media
- 171 (culture media except that the FBS was reduced to 2.5%), followed by the addition of 150 μL of swab
- 172 specimen. After incubation for 2 hours at 37°C, the inoculum was removed and replaced with 500 μL
- infection media. The cells were monitored daily for the appearance of SARS-CoV-2 cytopathic effect
- 174 (CPE) and the presence of SARS-CoV-2 genomes in CPE positive samples was confirmed by reverse
- transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) as previously described [23].

176 Indirect enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays

- 177 The protocol was adapted from published protocols [24] that were established previously in our
- 178 laboratory [6, 25-27], and was modified to assess total IgG from viral transport media (VTM).
- 179 Briefly, 96-well plates were coated with full-length vaccine-strain (ancestral) Spike (S) protein
- 180 (SeroNet) and incubated overnight at 4°C. Coating buffer was removed, plates were washed,
- and blocked for 1 hour at room temperature. All samples were heat inactivated at 56°C for 1

St Clair et al. 8

hour prior to use. Negative controls using pooled VTM from COVID-19 negative patients were 182 plated at final concentration of 1:4. Positive control samples using a monoclonal antibody 183 184 against SARS-CoV-2 S protein (Sino Biological, 40150-D001) were plated at a final concentration of 1:5000. Samples were prepared in 2-fold serial dilutions starting at 1:4 and 185 ending at 1:512. Blocking solution was removed, and diluted samples were added to the plates 186 187 and incubated at room temperature for 2 hours. Plates were washed 3 times, and 50 µL of 188 secondary antibody (1:5000 dilution of HRP-conjugated goat anti-human Fc-specific lgG: 189 Invitrogen #A18823) was added to each well, and plates were incubated in the dark at room temperature for 1 hour. Plates were washed and all residual liquid was removed. SIGMAFAST 190 OPD (o-phenylenediamine dihydrochloride) solution (Millipore Sigma) was added to each well, 191 192 and plates were incubated in the dark for 10 minutes. 3M HCI (ThermoFisher) was added to 193 each well to stop reaction, and the optical density of each plate was read at 490 nm using a 194 SpectraMax i3 ELISA Plate Reader (BioTek Instruments). Cutoff values were calculated by adding the average of all negative control OD values and 3 times the standard deviation of the 195 196 negative control values. Values were considered positive (responders) if at or above the cutoff 197 value and negative (non-responders) if below the cutoff.

198

199 Statistical analyses

200 Comparisons of clinical characteristics, infectious virus recovery, and between anti-S IgG 201 responders and non-responders were tested using a two-sided Fisher's exact test. Prior to conducting statistical analyses of anti-S IgG values, area under the curve (AUC) values were 202 calculated by plotting the normalized optical density values against the sample dilution. A two-203 204 way ANOVA using Tukey's multiple comparisons was used to assess differences in anti-S IgG AUC among groups, as well as differences in SARS-CoV-2 N Ct values among groups. 205 206 Multivariate regression models (logistic and linear) were used to investigate the association of 207 immunological measures (CPE, viral RNA level, and anti-Spike IgG) with pregnancy and

St Clair et al. 9

208	vaccination, controlling for participant age, race/ethnicity, and area deprivation index (ADI) as
209	necessary. An interaction term of the predictor variables was also included in the statistical
210	models to allow for the predicted probabilities to vary by pregnancy and vaccination status.
211	Contrasts of marginal effects were performed as post-estimation comparisons across pregnancy
212	and vaccination groups. All analyses were performed using either Prism software version 9.5
213	(Graphpad) or using Stata version 17.0 (StataCorp).
214	
215	<u>Results</u>
216	
217	Clinical Data Analysis
218	Clinical outcomes between pregnant and non-pregnant women with confirmed SARS-
219	CoV-2 infections differed. While pregnant women were less likely to report symptoms than non-
220	pregnant women (OR = 0.41; CI = 0.23-0.71; <i>P</i> = 0.003); among symptomatic individuals,
221	pregnant women were more likely to require hospitalization (OR = 4.2; CI = 2.0-8.6, P = 0.0003)
222	or be admitted to the ICU (OR = 4.5; CI = 1.2-14.2, P = 0.02) with COVID-19 as their primary
223	reason for admission (OR = 3.1; CI = 1.4-6.8; <i>P</i> = 0.009) (Table 2). In addition, pregnant women
224	were more likely to be placed on supplemental oxygen therapy than non-pregnant women (OR
225	= 3.1; CI = 1.3-6.9, <i>P</i> = 0.012) (Table 2).
226	
227	Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 variants among pregnant and non-pregnant women
228	Whole genome sequencing (WGS) results were used to classify infecting SARS-CoV-2
229	variants into one of five categories: ancestral lineages (i.e., those circulating prior to Alpha),
230	Alpha variant, Delta variant, Omicron variant (through BA.2.12.1), and other (i.e., encompassing
231	all other variants). Among unvaccinated individuals, most samples collected were from
232	infections prior to vaccine availability and were predominately caused by ancestral lineages
233	(40% in non-pregnant women and 32% in pregnant women); samples from infections by all

St Clair et al. 10

234	other variants, however, were proportionally represented (Table 3). As emergency use
235	authorization of both the Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna mRNA-1273 vaccines coincided with
236	the emergence and dominance of the Alpha variant, many samples collected from the
237	vaccinated non-pregnant and pregnant cohort were individuals experiencing breakthrough
238	infections from either the Delta variant (53% and 24%, respectively) or Omicron variants (38%
239	and 73%, respectively) (Table 3).
240	
241	SARS-CoV-2 virus RNA level and recovery of infectious virus from upper respiratory
242	samples
243	To evaluate if the differences in clinical severity between non-pregnant and pregnant
244	women were due to differences in virus load, we compared infectious virus recovery and viral
245	RNA levels (Ct values) for each group. Because there were no statistical differences in the days
246	to symptom onset between symptomatic non-pregnant (2.2 \pm 2.6 days) and pregnant (2.4 \pm 3.4
247	days) women within this cohort, these analyses were conducted regardless of the days to
248	symptom onset and whether the patient was symptomatic or asymptomatic at the time of
249	collection, consistent with previous studies [17]. The number of samples from which infectious
250	virus was recovered was significantly lower among non-pregnant vaccinated than unvaccinated
251	women (<i>P</i> <0.05; Figure 1A). While a similar trend was noted between unvaccinated and
252	vaccinated pregnant women, this did not reach statistical significance. There were no statistical
253	differences in the rates of infectious virus recovery between non-pregnant and pregnant women,
254	regardless of vaccination status. Viral RNA levels were similarly distributed between pregnant
255	and non-pregnant women, and no statistical differences were observed (Figure 1B).
256	Additionally, we assessed whether there were differences between the number of individuals
257	with high (Ct > 20; low viral RNA levels) versus low (Ct \leq 20; high viral RNA levels) viral RNA
258	levels within each group. While greater percentages of vaccinated non-pregnant and pregnant
259	women had lower viral levels (58% and 60%, respectively) than their unvaccinated counterparts

St Clair et al. 11

260 (45% and 58%, respectively), these differences were not statistically significant (**Figure 1B**, **red**

261 **text**).

262

285

263 Comparisons of mucosal anti-S IgG titers between pregnant and non-pregnant women

Although previous reports suggest that pregnant women have reduced antibody 264 265 responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection [6, 28-30], these studies focused solely on serum antibody 266 responses. As SARS-CoV-2 infection initiates in the upper respiratory tract, we sought to 267 evaluate whether differences in mucosal IgG responses between non-pregnant and pregnant women may account for differences in clinical severity. Vaccinated individuals had greater anti-268 269 S IgG titers than unvaccinated individuals, regardless of pregnancy status (P < 0.0001; Figure 270 **1C**). Proportions of individuals with undetectable anti-S IgG (i.e., non-responders) were greater 271 in unvaccinated women compared to vaccinated women (non-pregnant: P < 0.0001; pregnant: 272 P < 0.0001), but there were no statistically significant differences between pregnant and non-273 pregnant women within vaccination groups (Figure 1C, red text). The correlation between anti-274 S IgG titers and infectious virus recovery and between anti-S IgG titers and viral RNA Ct values was examined as a proxy to assess whether there were differences in the antiviral activity of 275 276 antibodies produced by non-pregnant and pregnant women. In the regression model controlling 277 for age, race/ethnicity, and ADI, there was a strong inverse correlation between anti-S IgG AUC 278 and the probability of recovering infectious virus (Figure 1D) as well as viral RNA level (Supplemental Figure 1A) among unvaccinated women, regardless of pregnancy status, and 279 280 among vaccinated non-pregnant women. While similar inverse relationships were observed for vaccinated pregnant women, they were not statistically significant. Notably, when the variable 281 282 for time post-symptom onset was included in the regression models (excluding asymptomatic individuals; non-pregnant, N=35; pregnant, N=26), the inverse correlation between anti-S IgG 283 AUC and the probability of recovering infectious virus (Supplemental Figure 1B) as well as 284

between anti-S IgG and viral RNA Ct values (not shown) remained unchanged.

St Clair et al. 12

286

Age and trimester of pregnancy influence mucosal immunity in pregnant, vaccinated women

To further interrogate possible pregnancy-associated differences in mucosal antibody 289 290 responses and viral level, we determined whether maternal age or gestational age contributed 291 to observed variability in SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike IgG AUC values (Figure 1C). Individuals in our 292 cohort were classified into one of three maternal age groups; ages 18-24, ages 25-34, and ages 293 35-44. We first compared viral RNA level, mucosal anti-S IgG AUC values, and rate of infectious virus recovery regardless of days to symptom onset or whether the patients were symptomatic 294 295 or asymptomatic. Among unvaccinated individuals, viral RNA level (Figure 2A), rates of 296 infectious virus recovery (Figure 2A, red text), and mucosal anti-IgG AUC values (Figure 2B), 297 were similar across all groups, regardless of pregnancy status. No age-related differences were 298 noted in either viral RNA level (Figure 2A) or anti-S IgG AUC values (Figure 2B) among nonpregnant, vaccinated women. Among vaccinated, pregnant women, viral RNA levels increased 299 300 (Figure 2A) and anti-S IgG AUC values decreased (Figure 2B) with maternal age, with pregnant women ages 25-34 and ages 35-44 having significantly greater viral RNA (P < 0.001) 301 and lower anti-S IgG AUC values (P < 0.001) compared to pregnant women ages 18-24 (Figure 302 303 **2A-B**). Additionally, we observed trends in which the rates of infectious virus recovery 304 decreased with age in non-pregnant, vaccinated women, but increased with age in pregnant, vaccinated women although these trends did not reach statistical significance (Figure 2A, red 305 306 text). The proportion of non-responders was greater in unvaccinated women compared to vaccinated women, regardless of age (non-pregnant: P < 0.0001; pregnant: P < 0.0001), but 307 308 there were no statistically significant age-associated differences between pregnant and nonpregnant women within vaccination groups (Figure 2B, red text). When controlled for 309 310 race/ethnicity and ADI, similar trends in the relationship between Ct values and age (Supplemental Figure 2A) and with the probability of recovery of infectious virus and age 311

```
St Clair et al. 13
```

312	(Supplemental Figure 2B) within each group were observed, however, none were statistically
313	significant. Likewise, when controlled for race/ethnicity, ADI, and time since vaccination
314	(Supplemental Figure 1C), we observed a similar age-associated trend of decreased anti-S
315	IgG AUC values among vaccinated pregnant women which was not statistically significant.
316	Importantly, the average time between completion of vaccination and infection was similar
317	among non-pregnant (176 \pm 85 days) and pregnant (187 \pm 95 days) women.
318	Next, we examined the relationships between gestational age, viral RNA level, mucosal
319	anti-S IgG AUC values, and recovery of infectious virus, regardless of days to symptom onset or
320	whether the patients were symptomatic or asymptomatic. Although no statistical differences in
321	viral RNA level (Figure 2C) or recovery of infectious virus (Figure 2C, red text) were observed
322	across trimesters of pregnancy, a trend of reduced viral level across trimester was observed,
323	with the lowest values being recorded in the third trimester for both unvaccinated and
324	vaccinated pregnant women. Among vaccinated pregnant women, anti-S IgG AUC values were
325	greater in the third trimester compared to either the first ($P < 0.05$) or second ($P < 0.05$)
326	trimester of pregnancy (Figure 2D). Proportions of non-responders (i.e., those with
327	undetectable anti-S IgG) within each trimester were greater in unvaccinated compared to
328	vaccinated pregnant women (1 st trimester: <i>P</i> =0.0002; 2 nd trimester: <i>P</i> =0.02; 3 rd trimester:
329	P=0.002); and were not statistically different between trimesters within vaccination groups
330	(Figure 2D, red text). When controlled for race/ethnicity, ADI, and days post-symptom onset for
331	symptomatic individuals (Supplemental Figure 2C), a similar trimester-associated decrease in
332	viral RNA level was observed, but this did not reach statistical significance. When controlled for
333	race/ethnicity, ADI, and time between completion of vaccination and infection (Supplemental
334	Figure 1D), a trimester-associated increase in anti-S IgG was observed, but it was not
335	statistically significant. The mean time between completion of vaccination and infection was
336	similar between women in their first trimester (216 \pm 57 days) and second trimester (214 \pm 105
337	days) but decreased in women in their third trimester (159 \pm 102 days) of pregnancy. Taken

St Clair et al. 14

together, these results suggest that mucosal antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection are

reduced with increased maternal age and earlier in pregnancy.

340

341 Pregnant women infected with Omicron variants have reduced mucosal anti-S IgG levels

This patient cohort included individuals infected with both Delta and Omicron (through 342 343 BA.2.12.1) variants. We conducted an additional analysis of pregnancy-associated differences 344 based on the infecting variant. No differences in viral RNA level were detected among either 345 pregnant or non-pregnant women (Figure 3A). Pregnant, vaccinated individuals infected with Omicron, but not Delta, variants had significantly lower anti-S IgG AUC values than non-346 pregnant, vaccinated women (P < 0.05; Figure 3B). In contrast, anti-S IgG AUC values were 347 348 comparable between unvaccinated pregnant and non-pregnant women infected with either Delta or Omicron variants. The proportion (Figure 3B, red text) of unvaccinated, non-pregnant 349 350 women with non-detectable anti-S IgG titers was lower among those infected with Omicron 351 variants compared to Delta (P = 0.01) but was higher among unvaccinated pregnant women (P352 = 0.0003). Similar observations were made among vaccinated individuals but were not 353 statistically significant.

In our previous studies, we have shown that lower Ct values (Ct≤20; i.e., high viral RNA) are associated with greater rates of infectious virus recovery [14, 17], and that individuals infected with Delta variants had greater rates of infectious virus recovery than those infected with Omicron variants [17]. Thus, we assessed whether there were differences in infectious virus recovery among individuals with high viral RNA levels, but found no statistical differences in the rates of infectious virus recovery between individuals infected with either the Delta or Omicron variants within this cohort (**Supplemental Figure 2D**).

361

362 Discussion

St Clair et al. 15

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has raised awareness about pregnant women being 363 364 at greater risk for severe complications arising from many viruses, including SARS-CoV-2 [2, 5, 365 31]. In a retrospective cohort of pregnant and non-pregnant women with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, we observed that disease severity, including ICU admission and oxygen 366 supplementation, was greater among pregnant than non-pregnant women. We further explored 367 368 the role of vaccination in mucosal immunity and recovery of live SARS-CoV-2 and viral RNA 369 from the upper respiratory tract. Vaccination reduced recovery of infectious virus in non-370 pregnant, but not pregnant, women suggesting that vaccine-induced immunity and protection might be reduced during pregnancy, as previously reported for other infectious diseases [2]. 371 Greater maternal age was associated with reduced mucosal antibody responses and greater 372 373 viral RNA levels, especially among pregnant women infected with the Omicron variant. These 374 findings provide mechanistic insights into how pregnant women are at greater risk of severe 375 COVID-19, including from breakthrough infections with variants of concern following receipt of 376 the monovalent COVID-19 vaccines.

377 Advanced maternal age (i.e., 35+ years of age) has previously been associated with severe clinical outcomes and adverse fetal outcomes following SARS-CoV-2 in pregnant 378 379 women [32, 33]. While several studies highlight that SARS-CoV-2 infected pregnant women 380 typically present with asymptomatic or mild infections [3, 34], there are data illustrating that 381 pregnant women with SARS-CoV-2 infections are at increased risk of hospitalization, ICU admittance, invasive ventilation, and death than non-pregnant women [3, 5, 31, 35]. Increased 382 risk of severe outcomes among pregnant women have persisted at least through the Delta 383 variant wave [5], and we now show that this further persists in the Omicron variant wave of the 384 385 pandemic.

Existing serological evidence in SARS-CoV-2 infection demonstrates that pregnant women have enhanced inflammatory responses and reduced humoral responses compared to non-pregnant women [6, 8, 36, 37]. The data from the current study add to the existing literature

St Clair et al. 16

389	by showing that mucosal antibody responses also are reduced in pregnant women compared
390	with non-pregnant women, with further reductions with advanced maternal age, in the first
391	trimester of pregnancy, and with some infecting variants of concern.

392 Clinical Implications

Among pregnant women with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, reduced mucosal 393 394 antibody responses were associated with greater infectious virus recovery and viral RNA levels, 395 especially among women with advanced maternal age and women infected with the Omicron 396 variant. These data highlight that monovalent vaccines were not sufficient to protect pregnant women against Omicron, which is consistent with reports in the general population [38-41], and 397 highlight the need for receipt of the bivalent booster in pregnant women. Pregnant women were 398 399 not included in phase III clinical trials for any of the vaccine candidates or the bivalent booster 400 [42]; and limited data are available from women who became pregnant while participating in 401 vaccine trials [43-46]. Because pregnancy is a unique biological state [47-51], additional studies 402 evaluating vaccine efficacy and the use of SARS-CoV-2 therapeutic agents (including use of 403 monoclonal antibodies) are necessary to ensure that the same correlates of protection apply to this high-risk population [52]. Currently, the CDC recommends that pregnant women consult 404 405 with their physician to make decisions on vaccination. However, the lack of supporting vaccine 406 safety and efficacy in pregnancy complicates the benefit-risk analysis for healthcare providers 407 and pregnant women. Greater use of animal models to assess vaccine efficacy during pregnancy and how pregnancy may alter vaccine-induced immunity and protection from 408 409 breakthrough infection is needed [42].

410 Study Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the small sample size. While these studies were powered for the primary clinical outcome, we were unable to give adequate statistical consideration for additional potential confounding variables (e.g., time since symptom onset, time between vaccination and sample collection) in the regression models. This was due both to

St Clair et al. 17

incomplete charting data (e.g. 77 symptomatic participants without a reported date of symptom 415 onset), and due to the use of convenience samples which limited our ability to control for 416 417 race/ethnicity, age, ADI, and time between vaccination and sample collection. When we applied 418 multivariate regression analysis that controlled for these variables, the trends in our data 419 remained consistent but lost statistical power. This highlights the need to verify these data in a 420 larger clinical cohort. Moreover, only upper respiratory samples were collected, and no serum 421 samples were available for additional analyses (e.g., IgA antibody levels, virus neutralization or 422 cross-reactivity with Spike proteins from variants of concern). For clinical outcomes, pregnant women in our study were reportedly less symptomatic than non-pregnant women; this was, 423 however, based on self-reporting from a general list of questions that may not distinguish 424 425 COVID-19-related illness from pregnancy-associated symptoms (e.g., fatigue, muscles or body aches, headache, digestive issues, nausea, or vomiting). Symptomatic COVID-19 cases among 426 427 pregnant women may not be accurately represented. Because samples were collected at different points of care within the Johns Hopkins Medical System, differences in sample 428 429 collection may contribute to the variability in infectious virus recovery, viral RNA levels, and 430 antibody titers.

431 **Conclusions**

Pregnancy is associated with more severe outcomes from COVID-19 during the Omicron wave of the pandemic. Advanced maternal age, first trimester of pregnancy, and infection with Omicron were identified as factors contributing to decreased mucosal antibody responses with concomitant increases in live virus recovery and mucosal viral RNA levels. Greater consideration of pregnancy in prophylactic and therapeutic interventions for people infected with SARS-CoV-2 [53] is needed to enable pregnant women and their healthcare providers to make evidence-based decisions about care.

439

440 Author Contributions:

St Clair et al. 18

- 441 Concept and Design: LAS, REE, JS, ALC, IB, SLK, EYK, AP, HHM
- 442 Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data: LAS, REE, JS, AY, AF, CPM, JMN, MF, OA,
- 443 SD, CB, AP, HHM, EYK, SLK
- 444 Drafting of Manuscript. LAS, AY, SLK
- 445 Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors.
- 446 Statistical analysis: LAS, AY, REE, JS
- 447 Obtained Funding: SLK, ALC, AP, HHM
- 448 Supervision: SLK, EYK, AP, HHM
- 449 Acknowledgements: We would like to sincerely thank Barbara Wesley, MD, MPH from the
- 450 Center for Drug Evaluation and Research at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for her
- thoughtful suggestions during conceptualization and design and during preparation of this

452 manuscript.

- 453 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.
- 454 **Funding/Support:** This project was supported by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) of
- 455 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of a financial assistance
- 456 award [Center of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation grant to Johns Hopkins
- 457 University, U01FD005942, awarded to SLK] funded by Office of Women's Health/FDA/HHS,
- 458 with additional support provided by NIH/NCI U54CA260492 (SLK and ALC); NIH/NIAID
- 459 N7593021C00045 (AP); 75D30121C11061 (HHM); U01CK000589 (EYK). The contents are
- those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an
- 461 endorsement, by Office of Women's Health/FDA/HHS, or the U.S. Government.

462

463 Figure Legends

464 Figure 1 – SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA levels and antibody responses stratified by pregnancy

465 **and vaccination status**. Remnant clinical upper respiratory tract specimens were used

determine rates of infectious virus recovery (A), viral RNA level (B), and anti-spike (ancestral

St Clair et al. 19

467	spike) IgG titers (C) from mucosal swab samples. In (A), a positive cytopathic effect (CPE) in
468	tissue culture was indicative of the presence of infectious virus. The dashed line in (B)
469	represents the cutoff value (Ct ≤20) between high viral RNA and low viral levels, and the red text
470	indicates the percentage of participants with Ct values > 20 (low viral RNA levels). The dashed
471	line in (C) represents the limit of detection, and the red text indicates the percentage of non-
472	responders (results below the limit of detection). Multivariate logistic regression was used to
473	assess the correlation between anti-spike IgG titer and the probability of recovery of infectious
474	virus (D). Analysis included Fisher's exact test (A) and) and two-way ANOVAs with Tukey's
475	multiple comparisons test (B-C). * <i>P</i> < 0.05, *** <i>P</i> < 0.001, **** <i>P</i> < 0.0001. <i>anti-S IgG</i> , anti-
476	ancestral strain spike immunoglobulin G; AUC, area under the curve; Ct, cycle threshold;
477	SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.
478	
479	Figure 2 – The effects of maternal and gestational age on mucosal viral RNA levels and
480	antibody responses (A-B) Study participants were divided into three maternal age groups:
481	ages 18-24, ages 25-34, and ages 35-44, and samples were re-analyzed to assess differences
482	
	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated
483	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess
483 484	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the
483 484 485	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the percentage of individuals with recoverable infectious virus, and the red text in (B,D) indicates
483 484 485 486	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the percentage of individuals with recoverable infectious virus, and the red text in (B,D) indicates the percentage of non-responders (i.e. those with anti-S IgG below the limit of detection). (A-D):
483 484 485 486 487	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the percentage of individuals with recoverable infectious virus, and the red text in (B,D) indicates the percentage of non-responders (i.e. those with anti-S IgG below the limit of detection). (A-D): Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons test. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$,
483 484 485 486 487 488	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the percentage of individuals with recoverable infectious virus, and the red text in (B,D) indicates the percentage of non-responders (i.e. those with anti-S IgG below the limit of detection). (A-D): Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons test. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, **** $P < 0.001$.
483 484 485 486 487 488 489	in viral RNA levels (A) and anti-S IgG (B). (C-D) Results from unvaccinated and vaccinated pregnant women were stratified according to trimester of pregnancy and re-analyzed to assess differences in viral RNA levels (C) and anti-S IgG (D). The red text in (A,C) indicates the percentage of individuals with recoverable infectious virus, and the red text in (B,D) indicates the percentage of non-responders (i.e. those with anti-S IgG below the limit of detection). (A-D): Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons test. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$. Figure 3 – Analysis of mucosal viral RNA levels and antibody responses to Delta and

491 infecting strain (delta or omicron), pregnancy status, and vaccination status, and re-analyzed to

492 assess differences in viral RNA level (A) and anti-S (ancestral/vaccine strain) IgG (B). Two-way

St Clair et al. 20

ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons tests (A-B) *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001, ****P < 0.0

494 <0.0001.

495 Supplemental Figure 1 – Multivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses.

- 496 Multivariate logistic regression was used to assess the correlation between anti-spike IgG titer
- 497 and viral RNA levels (A), anti-spike IgG titer and the probability of infectious virus recovery (B),
- 498 anti-spike IgG titer and age (C), and trimester of pregnancy and anti-spike IgG titer (D). (A-C):
- 499 Variables were continuous, and p-values represent strength of correlation between variables for
- 500 each categorical group and comparisons between groups. (D): Trimester of pregnancy was
- 501 utilized as a categorical variable, p-values represent comparisons between stated groups.

502 Supplemental Figure 2 – Multivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA levels and

503 recovery of infectious virus.

- 504 Multivariate logistic regression was used to assess the correlation between age and viral RNA
- 505 levels (A), age and the probability of infectious virus recovery (B), viral RNA levels and trimester
- of pregnancy (C). Recovery of infectious virus from samples with high viral RNA levels (Ct \leq 20)
- 507 is reported in (D). (A-B) Variables were continuous, and p-values represent strength of
- 508 correlation between variables for each categorical group and comparisons between groups. (C):
- 509 Trimester of pregnancy was utilized as a categorical variable, p-values represent comparisons
- 510 between stated groups. (D): A Fisher's exact test was utilized.

511

St Clair et al. 21

512 **Tables**

513 Table 1 – Patients and samples used in this study

	Pregnant		Second Trimester	Third Trimester	Not Pregnant
Variables, N	117	28	36	53	335
Patient Age					
mean age	29.7	29.3	30.3 29.		30.7
18-24, n (%)	26 (22.2%)	8 (28.6%)	7 (19.4%)	11 (20.8%)	72 (21.5%)
25-34, n (%)	64 (54.7%)	14 (50.0%)	18 (50.0%)	32 (60.4%)	157 (46.9%)
35-44, n (%)	27 (23.1%)	6 (21.4%)	11 (30.6%)	10 (18.9%)	106 (31.6%)
Race/Ethnicity					
Black, n (%)	48 (41.0%)	14 (50.0%)	13 (36.1%)	21 (39.6%)	138 (41.2%)
Hispanic, n (%)	22 (18.8%)	2 (7.1%)	6 (16.7%)	14 (26.4%)	53 (15.8%)
Other, n (%)	13 (11.1%)	4 (14.3%)	3 (8.3%)	6 (11.3%)	30 (9.0%)
White, n (%)	34 (29.1%)	8 (28.6%)	14 (38.9%)	12 (22.6%)	114 (34.0%)
9th Month, n (%)	26 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	26 (49.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Area Deprivation Index	6.3	6.6	5.9	6.4	6.4
Charlson Score	0	0	0	0	0
Vaccination Status					
Unvaccinated, n (%)	84 (71.8%)	20 (71.4%)	27 (75.0%)	37 (69.8%)	244 (72.8%)
Vaccinated, n (%)	33 (28.2%)	8 (28.6%)	9 (25.0%)	16 (30.2%)	91 (27.2%)
Moderna mRNA-1273, n (%)	12 (10.2%)	2 (7.2%)	3 (8.3%)	7 (13.2%)	24 (7.2%)
Pfizer/BioNtech, n (%)	21 (18.0%)	6 (21.4%)	6 (16.7%)	9 (17.0%)	67 (20.0%)
Homologous Booster, n (%)	7 (6.0%)	2 (7.1%)	2 (5.6%)	3 (5.7%)	46 (13.7%)
Heterologous Booster, n (%)	1 (0.85%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (0.90%)

"Vaccinated" includes individuals that received full two-dose mRNA vaccine regimen and/or received a booster dose prior to infection.

"Unvaccinated" includes individuals that had not received any vaccine dose prior to infection. Partially vaccinated individuals were excluded from this study.

St Clair et al. 22

	Pregnant	First Trimester	Second Trimester	Third Trimester	Non- Pregnant	Odds Pregnant vs. Non-Pregnant Total [Cl]	P- value
Variables, N	117	28	36	53	335		
Symptomatic	91	25	32	34	300	0.41 [0.23-	
Total, n (%)	(77.7%)	(89.3%)	(88.9%)	(64.1%)	(89.6%)	0.71]	0.003
Unvaccinated,	63	18	24	21	220	0.33 [0.17-	
n (%)	(69.2%)	(72.0%)	(75.0%)	(61.8%)	(73.3%)	0.61]	0.0014
Vaccinated, n	28	7	8	13	80		
(%)	(30.8%)	(28.0%)	(25.0%)	(38.2%)	(26.7%)	0.77 [0.26-2.1]	0.76
Hospitalization	17			14			
Total, n (%)	(14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (8.3%)	(26.4%)	13 (3.9%)	4.2 [2.0-8.6]	0.0003
COVID reason							
for admission	13			11			
Total, n (%)	(11.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.6%)	(20.7%)	13 (3.9%)	3.1 [1.4-6.8]	0.009
ICU Admittance							
Total, n (%)	6 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.8%)	5 (9.4%)	4 (1.2%)	4.5 [1.2-14.2]	0.02
Supplemental				9			
O2, n (%)	11 (9.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.6%)	(17.0%)	11 (3.3%)	3.1 [1.3-6.9]	0.012

Table 2 - Differences in clinical severity between non-pregnant and pregnant females

522 Table 3 – SARS-CoV-2 Lineage Distribution

	Ancestral	Alpha	Delta	Omicron	Other	Total
Unvaccinated						
Non-pregnant, n (%)	97 (40%)	58 (24%)	32 (13%)	23 (9%)	34 (14%)	244
Pregnant, n (%)	27 (32%)	12 (14%)	14 (17%)	23 (27%)	8 (10%	84
Vaccinated						
Non-pregnant, n (%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)	48 (53%)	35 (38%)	2 (2%)	91
Pregnant, n (%)	0 (%)	0 (0%)	8 (24%)	24 (73%)	1 (3%)	33

<u>References</u>:

World Health Organization. *WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard*. 2022; Available from:
 <u>https://covid19.who.int/</u>.

St Clair	et al	. 23
----------	-------	------

530	2.	Vermillion, M.S. and S.L. Klein, <i>Pregnancy and infection: using disease pathogenesis to inform</i>
221	2	Vuccine Strutegy. NPJ Vaccines, 2010. 3 . p. b.
552	5.	Anotey, J., et al., chinical manifestations, fisk jactors, and material and permutal outcomes of
555		coronaviras aisease 2019 in pregnancy. Inving systematic review and meta-analysis. Binj, 2020.
534	4	370 : p. 113320.
535	4.	Yang, Z., et al., Coronavirus alsease 2019 (COVID-19) and pregnancy: a systematic review. J
530	-	Matern Fetal Neonatal Med, 2022. 35 (8): p. 1619-1622.
537	5.	Strid, P., et al., Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Severity Among Women of Reproductive
538 539		(SARS-CoV-2) Infection by Pregnancy Status-United States, 1 January 2020-25 December 2021.
540		Clin Infect Dis, 2022. 75 (Supplement_2): p. S317-s325.
541	6.	Sherer, M.L., et al., Pregnancy alters interleukin-1 beta expression and antiviral antibody
542		responses during severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection. Am J Obstet
543		Gynecol, 2021. 225 (3): p. 301.e1-301.e14.
544	7.	Collier, AR.Y., et al., Immunogenicity of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines in Pregnant and Lactating
545		<i>Women.</i> JAMA, 2021. 325 (23): p. 2370.
546	8.	Collier, A.Y., et al., Immunogenicity of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines in Pregnant and Lactating
547		<i>Women.</i> Jama, 2021. 325 (23): p. 2370-2380.
548	9.	Gray, K.J., et al., Coronavirus disease 2019 vaccine response in pregnant and lactating women: a
549		<i>cohort study.</i> Am J Obstet Gynecol, 2021. 225 (3): p. 303.e1-303.e17.
550	10.	Edlow, A.G., et al., Assessment of Maternal and Neonatal SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load, Transplacental
551		Antibody Transfer, and Placental Pathology in Pregnancies During the COVID-19 Pandemic.
552		JAMA Netw Open, 2020. 3 (12): p. e2030455.
553	11.	Russell, M.W. and J. Mestecky, Mucosal immunity: The missing link in comprehending SARS-CoV-
554		2 infection and transmission. Front Immunol, 2022. 13: p. 957107.
555	12.	Mostafa, H.H., et al., Comparison of the analytical sensitivity of seven commonly used
556		commercial SARS-CoV-2 automated molecular assays. J Clin Virol, 2020. 130 : p. 104578.
557	13.	Jarrett, J., et al., Clinical performance of the GenMark Dx ePlex respiratory pathogen panels for
558		upper and lower respiratory tract infections. J Clin Virol, 2021. 135 : p. 104737.
559	14.	Huai Luo, C., et al., Infection With the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
560		CoV-2) Delta Variant Is Associated With Higher Recovery of Infectious Virus Compared to the
561		Alpha Variant in Both Unvaccinated and Vaccinated Individuals. Clin Infect Dis, 2022. 75 (1): p.
562		e715-e725.
563	15.	Thielen, P.M., et al., Genomic diversity of SARS-CoV-2 during early introduction into the
564		Baltimore-Washinaton metropolitan area. JCI Insight. 2021. 6 (6).
565	16.	Morris, C.P., et al., An Update on SARS-CoV-2 Diversity in the United States National Capital
566		Region: Evolution of Novel and Variants of Concern. Clin Infect Dis. 2021.
567	17.	Fall, A., et al., The displacement of the SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta with Omicron: An investigation
568	<u>-</u> /.	of hospital admissions and upper respiratory viral loads. EBioMedicine, 2022, 79 : p. 104008.
569	18.	Morris C.P., et al., Omicron Subvariants: Clinical Laboratory, and Cell Culture Characterization
570		Clin Infect Dis 2022
571	19	O'Toole A., et al., Assignment of epidemiological lineages in an emerging pandemic using the
572	10.	nangolin tool. Virus Evol. 2021. 7(2): n. veab064
573	20	Uhteg K et al Comparing the anglytical performance of three SARS-CoV-2 molecular
574	20.	diagnostic assays Clin Virol 2020 127 n 104384
575	21	Matsuvama S et al Enhanced isolation of SARS-CoV-2 by TMPRSS2-expressing cells Proc Nat
576	<u>-</u>	Acad Sci II S A 2020 117 (13): n 7001-7003
570		//////////////////////////////////////

St Clair et al. 24

	~~	
5//	22.	Gniazdowski, V., et al., Repeat COVID-19 Molecular Testing: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 Culture
578		with Molecular Assays and Cycle Thresholds. Clin Intect Dis, 2020.
579	23.	Lu, X., et al., US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute
580		Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. Emerg Infect Dis, 2020. 26(8): p. 1654-65.
581	24.	Stadlbauer, D., et al., SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed Protocol for a
582		Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. Curr Protoc Microbiol, 2020. 57(1): p.
583		e100.
584	25.	Klein, S.L., et al., Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses in a COVID-19
585		convalescent plasma donor population. J Clin Invest, 2020. 130 (11): p. 6141-6150.
586	26.	Park, H.S., et al., Adaptive immune responses in vaccinated patients with symptomatic SARS-
587		CoV-2 Alpha infection, JCI Insight, 2022, 7 (5).
588	27	Shapiro, J.R., et al., Association of Frailty, Age, and Biological Sex With Severe Acute Respiratory
589	27.	Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Messenger RNA Vaccine-Induced Immunity in Older Adults. Clin Infect
505		Dis 2022 75(Supplement 1): n S61-s71
500	20	Atvon C ot al. COVID 10 mPNA vaccines drive differential antibody Ec functional profiles in
291	20.	Atyeo, C., et al., COVID-19 MKNA vaccines anve algerential antibody FC-Junctional progress in
592	20	pregnant, nactating, and nonpregnant women. Sci Transi Med, 2021. 15 (017). p. edbio051.
593	29.	wei, L., et al., <i>Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of Childbearing-Age women with COVID-19</i>
594	20	in Wunan: Retrospective, Single-Center Study. J Med Internet Res, 2020. 22(8): p. e19642.
595	30.	Mohr-Sasson, A., et al., Laboratory characteristics of pregnant compared to non-pregnant
596		women infected with SARS-CoV-2. Arch Gynecol Obstet, 2020. 302 (3): p. 629-634.
597	31.	US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 Underlying Medical Conditions.
598		2022; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-
599		care/underlyingconditions.html.
600	32.	Guarga Montori, M., et al., Advanced maternal age and adverse pregnancy outcomes: A cohort
601		<i>study.</i> Taiwan J Obstet Gynecol, 2021. 60 (1): p. 119-124.
602	33.	Kortekaas, J.C., et al., Risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes of late- and postterm pregnancies in
603		advanced maternal age: A national cohort study. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand, 2020. 99(8): p.
604		1022-1030.
605	34.	Vousden, N., et al., The incidence, characteristics and outcomes of pregnant women hospitalized
606		with symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in the UK from March to September
607		2020: A national cohort study using the UK Obstetric Surveillance System (UKOSS). PLoS One,
608		2021. 16 (5): p. e0251123.
609	35.	Bellos, L. A. Pandita, and R. Panza. <i>Maternal and perinatal outcomes in pregnant women</i>
610		infected by SARS-CoV-2: A meta-analysis. Fur I Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2021. 256 : p. 194-
611		204
612	36	Lokken F.M. et al. Disease severity pregnancy outcomes and maternal deaths among
613	50.	nregnant nations with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection in Washington
614		State Am Obstat Gynacol 2021 225 (1): p. 77 o1 77 o14
014 61E	27	State. All J Obstet Gyllecol, 2021. 223 (1), p. 77.e1-77.e14.
615	57.	Xu, S., et al., Clinical Manifestation and Neonatal Outcomes of Preynant Patients With
010		<i>Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pheumonia în Wunan, China.</i> Open Forum Infect Dis, 2020. 7 (7): p.
617		
618	38.	Surie, D., et al., Effectiveness of Monovalent mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19-Associated
619		Hospitalization Among Immunocompetent Adults During BA.1/BA.2 and BA.4/BA.5 Predominant
620		Periods of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant in the United States - IVY Network, 18 States, December
621		<i>26, 2021-August 31, 2022</i> . MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2022. 71 (42): p. 1327-1334.
622	39.	Andrews, N., et al., Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. N
623		Engl J Med, 2022. 386 (16): p. 1532-1546.

St Clair et al. 25

624 625 626	40.	Link-Gelles, R., et al., <i>Effectiveness of Bivalent mRNA Vaccines in Preventing Symptomatic SARS-</i> <i>CoV-2 Infection - Increasing Community Access to Testing Program, United States, September-</i> <i>November 2022</i> , MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2022, 71 (48): p. 1526-1530.
627 628	41.	Planas, D., et al., <i>Considerable escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron to antibody neutralization</i> . Nature, 2022. 602 (7898): p. 671-675.
629 630	42.	Klein, S.L., P.S. Creisher, and I. Burd, <i>COVID-19 vaccine testing in pregnant females is necessary</i> . J Clin Invest, 2021. 131 (5).
631 632	43.	Food and Drug Administration, <i>Vaccines and Related Products Advisory Committee Meeting</i> June 7, 2022.
633 634	44.	Food and Drug Administration, <i>Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee</i> <i>Meeting</i> . December 10, 2020.
635 636	45.	Food and Drug Administration, Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee Meeting. February 26, 2021.
637 638	46.	Food and Drug Administration, Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Commitee Meeting. October 14-15, 2021.
639 640 641	47.	Bohn, M.K. and K. Adeli, <i>Physiological and metabolic adaptations in pregnancy: importance of trimester-specific reference intervals to investigate maternal health and complications.</i> Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci, 2022. 59 (2): p. 76-92.
642 643	48.	Mor, G. and I. Cardenas, <i>The immune system in pregnancy: a unique complexity</i> . Am J Reprod Immunol, 2010. 63 (6): p. 425-33.
644	49.	Soma-Pillay, P., et al., <i>Physiological changes in pregnancy</i> . Cardiovasc J Afr, 2016. 27 (2): p. 89-94.
645 646	50.	Robinson, D.P. and S.L. Klein, <i>Pregnancy and pregnancy-associated hormones alter immune responses and disease pathogenesis</i> . Horm Behav, 2012. 62 (3): p. 263-71.
647 648	51.	Mauvais-Jarvis, F., S.L. Klein, and E.R. Levin, <i>Estradiol, Progesterone, Immunomodulation, and COVID-19 Outcomes.</i> Endocrinology, 2020. 161 (9).
649 650	52.	Food and Drug Administration, <i>Pregnant Women: Scientific and Ethical Considerations for</i> Inclusion in Clinical Trials Guidance for Industry. 2018: Rockville, MD. p. 14.
651 652 653	53.	Garneau, W.M., et al., Analysis of Clinical Outcomes of Pregnant Patients Treated With Nirmatrelvir and Ritonavir for Acute SARS-CoV-2 Infection. JAMA Netw Open, 2022. 5 (11): p. e2244141.
654		



- Vaccinated, Non-Pregnant
- Vaccinated, Pregnant

St Clair et al., Fig 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.19.23287456; this version posted March 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.



Α







