

Integrative Systems Immunology Analysis Reveals Elevated Anti-AGTR1 Levels with Accumulating COVID-19 Symptoms

Dennyson Leandro M Fonseca¹, Maj Jäpel², Igor Salerno Filgueiras³, Gabriela Crispim Baiocchi³, Yuri Ostrinski^{4,5}, Gilad Halpert⁵, Yael Bublil Lavi⁶, Elroy Vojdani⁷, Juan Carlo Santos e Silva⁸, Júlia Nakanishi Usuda⁸, Paula P. Freire⁸, Adriel Leal Nóbile⁸, Anny Silva Adri⁸, Pedro Barcelos Marçal⁸, Yohan Lucas Gonçalves Corrêa⁸, Fernando Yuri Nery do Vale⁸, Letícia Oliveira Lopes⁸, Solveig Lea Schmidt², Xiaoqing Wang⁹, Carl Vahldieck^{10,11}, Benedikt Fels^{10,11}, Lena F. Schimke³, Mario Hiroyuki Hirata⁸, Gustavo Cabral-Miranda³, Taj Ali AKhan^{12,13}, Rusan Catar¹⁴, Guido Moll^{14,15,16}, Thayna Silva-Sousa¹⁷, Yen-Rei A Yu¹⁸, Rodrigo JS Dalmolin^{19,20}, Howard Amital⁵, Aristo Vojdani²¹, Helder Nakaya^{8,22}, Hans D. Ochs²³, Jonathan I. Silverberg²⁴, Jason Zimmerman²⁵, Israel Zyskind^{25,26}, Avi Z Rosenberg²⁷, Kai Schulze-Forster²⁸, Harald Heidecke²⁸, Alexander Hackel^{2*}, Kristina Kusche-Vihrog^{10,11*}, Yehuda Shoenfeld^{5,29*}, Gabriela Riemekasten^{2*}, Reza Akbarzadeh^{2*}, Alexandre H.C Marques^{19*}, Otavio Cabral-Marques^{1,3,8,30,31,32*}

¹Interunit Postgraduate Program on Bioinformatics, Institute of Mathematics and Statistics (IME), University of Sao Paulo (USP), Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil

²Department of Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany

³Department of Immunology, Institute of Biomedical Sciences, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

⁴Institute of Microbiology and Virology, Riga Stradins University, Riga, Latvia

⁵Zabludowicz Center for Autoimmune Diseases, Sheba Medical Center, Tel-Hashomer, Israel

⁶Scakler faculty of medicine, Tel Aviv University, Israel

⁷Regenera Medical 11860 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 301, Los Angeles, CA 90025 USA

⁸Department of Clinical and Toxicological Analyses, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil

⁹Priority Area Chronic Lung Diseases, Research Center Borstel, Borstel, Germany

¹⁰Institute of Physiology, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany

¹¹German Research Centre for Cardiovascular Research (DZHK), Partner Site Hamburg/Lübeck/Kiel, Lübeck, Germany

¹²Institute of Pathology and Diagnostic Medicine, Khyber Medical University, Peshawar, Pakistan

¹³Emerging Pathogens Institute, Department of Medicine, University of Florida, USA

¹⁴Department of Nephrology and Internal Intensive Care Medicine, Charité University Hospital, Berlin, Germany

¹⁵Julius Wolff Institute (JWI), Charité University Hospital, Berlin, Germany

¹⁶BIH Center for Regenerative Therapies (BCRT), Charité University Hospital, Berlin, Germany

¹⁷Nuclear and Energy Research Institute, IPEN-CNEN/SP, São Paulo, Brazil

¹⁸University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Denver, CO, USA

¹⁹Bioinformatics Multidisciplinary Environment, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Brazil

²⁰Department of Biochemistry, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Brazil

²¹Immunosciences Laboratory, Inc., Los Angeles, CA 90035, USA.

²²Instituto Israelita de Ensino e Pesquisa Albert Einstein, Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil.

²³Department of Pediatrics, University of Washington School of Medicine, and Seattle Children's Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA

²⁴School of Medicine and Health Sciences, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA

²⁵Maimonides Medical Center, Brooklyn, NY, USA

²⁶Department of Pediatrics, NYU Langone Medical Center, New York, NY, USA

²⁷Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

²⁸CellTrend Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung (GmbH), Luckenwalde, Germany

²⁹Reichman University Herzeliya, Israel

³⁰Department of Medicine, Division of Molecular Medicine, Laboratory of Medical Investigation 29, University of São Paulo (USP) School of Medicine

³¹Network of Immunity in Infection, Malignancy, and Autoimmunity (NIIMA), Universal Scientific Education and Research Network (USERN), Sao Paulo, Brazil

³²DO'R Institute for research, São Paulo, Brazil

*Contributed equally

Corresponding author

Dennyson Leandro M Fonseca, PhD
Interunit Postgraduate Program on Bioinformatics
University of São Paulo
Matão Street, 1010
São Paulo-SP, 05508-090, Brazil.
E-mail: dennyson@usp.br

Otavio Cabral-Marques, MSc, PhD
Department of Medicine, Division of Molecular Medicine
University of São Paulo School of Medicine
Avenida Dr. Arnaldo, 455
São Paulo, SP, 01246-903, Brazil
Email: otavio.cmarques@usp.br

Reza Akbarzadeh, PhD

r.akbarzadeh@uni-luebeck.de

ABSTRACT

1
2 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) displays a broad spectrum of symptoms, with the
3 underlying reasons for this variability still not fully elucidated. Our study investigates the
4 potential association between specific autoantibodies (AABs), notably those that targeting G
5 protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) and renin-angiotensin system (RAS) related molecules, and
6 the diverse clinical manifestations of COVID-19, commonly observed in patients with
7 autoimmune conditions, including rheumatic diseases, such as systemic sclerosis. In a cross-
8 sectional analysis, we explored the relationship between AAB levels and the presence of key
9 COVID-19 symptoms. Hierarchical clustering analysis revealed a robust correlation between
10 certain AABs and symptoms such as fever, muscle ache, anosmia, and dysgeusia, which
11 emerged as significant predictors of disease severity. Specifically, AABs against CHRM5 and
12 CXCR3 were strongly linked to fever, while AABs against CHRM5 and BDKRB1 correlated
13 with muscle ache. Anosmia was predominantly associated with AABs against F2R and AGTR1,
14 while dysgeusia was linked to AABs against BDKRB1 and AGTR1. Furthermore, we observed a
15 rise in AAB levels with the accumulation of these symptoms, with the highest levels detected in
16 patients presenting all four predictors. Multinomial regression analysis identified AABs targeting
17 AGTR1 as a key predictor for one or more of these core symptoms. Additionally, our study
18 indicated that anti-AGTR1 antibodies triggered a concentration-dependent degradation of eGC,
19 which could be mitigated by the AGTR1 antagonist Losartan. This suggests a potential
20 mechanistic connection between eGC degradation, the observed COVID-19 symptoms, and
21 rheumatic diseases. In conclusion, our research underscores a substantial correlation between
22 AABs, particularly those against GPCRs and RAS-related molecules, and the severity of
23 COVID-19 symptoms. These findings open avenues for potential therapeutic interventions in the
24 management of COVID-19.

25

26 INTRODUCTION

27 Neutralizing autoantibodies (AABs) dysregulation is associated with clinical severity of
28 severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) disease. Bastard et al.^{1,2} characterized the presence
29 of high titers of neutralizing AABs against interferons (IFNs), essential molecules for the
30 immune response against viruses³ including the severe acute respiratory syndrome virus 2
31 (SARS-CoV-2), which increase the susceptibility to COVID-19-associated pneumonia and
32 death. Further study showed diverse functional AABs were associated with severe COVID-19
33 infection, including those targeting cytokines (e.g., IL-1B and IL-6), chemokines (e.g., CCL11
34 and CXCL26), complement components (e.g., C5A and C9) and chemokine receptors (e.g.,
35 CCR2, CCRL2)⁴. These studies demonstrated the contribution of AABs to COVID-19 immunity.

36 We^{5,6} and other research groups⁷⁻⁹ reported that COVID-19 severity is also associated
37 with the dysregulation of AABs associated with autoimmune diseases (e.g., anti-phospholipid,
38 anti-platelet glycoprotein, anti-nuclear AABs, and others). In particular, AABs against G protein-
39 coupled receptors (GPCR) and renin-angiotensin system (RAS)-related molecules were
40 associated with severe COVID-19 symptoms defined as requiring supplemental oxygen
41 therapy¹⁰. These two groups of molecules are expressed by several human cells populations and
42 modulate a myriad of intracellular signaling pathways and biological processes, such as cell
43 trafficking, proliferation, survival, and differentiation, as well as neurotransmission and
44 vasoconstriction¹¹⁻¹⁵. Furthermore, several of these AABs act as functional, binding GPCRs and
45 modulating intracellular pathways¹⁶ including those against the angiotensin receptor type 1
46 (AGT1R), which cause COVID-19-related symptoms^{17,18}, such as skin and lung inflammation¹⁹.
47 Notably, anti-AGT1R AABs have been implicated in various autoimmune conditions such as
48 systemic sclerosis (SSc)⁵⁸. There is evidence highlighting the pivotal role of endothelial

49 dysfunction and injury in both SSc and COVID-19⁵⁹. This endothelial cell activation and
50 dysfunction represent a crucial and evolving step in the pathogenesis of these diseases⁵⁵.
51 However, while the mechanism of anti-AGTR1 AABs-induced pathology is better understood in
52 SSc, in the context of COVID-19, the association of these AABs with disease development is not
53 yet fully understood.

54 COVID-19 exhibits a diverse range of manifestations. Symptoms among individuals can
55 vary widely, including fever, diarrhea, headache, depression, and amnesia²⁰. The underlying
56 causes of this variability remain elusive, particularly the potential role of AABs. This study aims
57 to determine whether individuals with specific symptoms exhibit higher levels of certain AABs.
58 Uncovering these associations could provide new insights into the pathophysiology of SARS-
59 CoV-2 infections, which remains crucial. This is the case despite advancements in controlling
60 the COVID-19 pandemic through prior infections, vaccinations²¹, and the increasing availability
61 of treatments such as antivirals and immunomodulators²².

62

63 **METHODS**

64 **Study cohort**

65 We conducted a thorough investigation involving 244 unvaccinated adults residing in the
66 United States. This cohort comprised 169 individuals diagnosed with COVID-19, confirmed
67 through SARS-CoV-2 positive tests obtained via nasopharyngeal swab and polymerase chain
68 reaction (PCR). Additionally, we included 75 randomly selected age, sex, and SARS-CoV-2
69 negative through PCR testing. COVID-19 patients were stratified according to the severity
70 classification outlined by the World Health Organization (WHO). This categorization included

71 mild cases (n=74), characterized by a fever duration of ≤ 1 day and a peak temperature of
72 37.8°C ; moderate cases (n=63), exhibiting a fever duration of \geq seven days and a peak
73 temperature of $\geq 38.8^{\circ}\text{C}$; and severe cases (n=32), characterized by severe symptoms
74 necessitating supplemental oxygen therapy. Every participant, including both healthy controls
75 and patients, provided informed written consent in accordance with the principles set forth by the
76 Declaration of Helsinki. The study received approval from the IntegReview institutional review
77 board (Coronavirus Antibody Prevalence Study, CAPS-613) and adhered to the reporting
78 guidelines outlined by Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
79 (STROBE). Detailed demographic and clinical data are provided in the following sections
80 (**Supplementary Table**).

81

82 **Measurements of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and AABs linked to autoimmune diseases.**

83 We detected human IgG AABs against 14 different GPCRs (AGTR1, AGTR2, MAS1,
84 BDKRB1, ADRA1A, ADRB1, ADRB2, CHRM3, CHRM4, CHRM5, CXCR3, F2R, C5AR1), 2
85 molecules serving as entry for SARS-CoV-2 (ACE2, NRP1), and antibodies against the
86 transmembrane receptor STAB1 from frozen serum using commercial ELISA kits (CellTrend,
87 Germany) as previously described¹⁰. The assays were conducted according to the manufacturer's
88 instructions and as previously described. Briefly, duplicate samples of a 1:100 serum dilution
89 were incubated at 4°C for 2 h, and the AAB concentrations were calculated as arbitrary units
90 (U) based on a standard curve of five standards ranging from 2.5 to 40°U/ml . The ELISA kits
91 were validated following the Food and Drug Administration's Guidance for Industry:
92 Bioanalytical Method Validation.

93

94 **Enrichment of AAB targets**

95 To perform functional enrichment analysis of the targets of AABs, we utilized the
96 ClusterProfiler^{23,24} package in R²⁵. This package enables the enrichment of gene sets that
97 collectively participate in a common biological process (BP). For this purpose, we considered the
98 17 targets: ACE2, ADRA1B, ADRB1, ADRB2, AGTR1, AGTR2, BDKRB1, C5AR1, CHRM3,
99 CHRM4, CHRM5, CHRNA1, CXCR3, F2R, MAS1, NRP1, and STAB1. Based on the results
100 adjusted by false discovery rate (FDR), we only present the pathways that were deemed
101 significant ($\text{adj } p < 0.05$). For the results visualization we used ggplot2²⁶ R²⁵ package and created
102 with Biorender.com.

103

104 **Heatmap clustering and multi-study factor analyses**

105 The levels of AABs and cohort features were visualized in a heatmap with hierarchical
106 clustering (Euclidean distance) using the R²⁵ packages ComplexHeatmap²⁷ and Circlize²⁸.
107 Furthermore, we performed a multi-study factor analysis (MSFA) among AAB levels. The
108 MSFA method integrates all data simultaneously, estimating parameters through maximum-
109 likelihood analysis^{29,30}. This approach allows for the identification of unobservable factors that
110 may be specific (only in the control group and only in COVID-19 individuals and shared among
111 the groups of healthy donors (Control) and COVID-19 cases.

112

113 **Classification of symptoms, relative effectors, and mixed canonical correlation analysis**

114 We used the random forest model to rank the COVID-19 symptoms. Distinct groups were
115 designated as 0 (non-COVID-19 disease, i.e., healthy donors) and 1 (COVID-19 disease,

116 including mild, moderate, and severe cases). Furthermore, due to inherent imbalance in group
117 sizes, the weight argument from the RandomForest³¹ R²⁵ package was employed to correct this
118 disparity and ensure balanced representation between groups³¹. After identifying the most
119 relevant symptoms, subgroups were created to evaluate individuals with the presence of at least
120 one or more of these key symptoms.

121 In addition, was performed the relative effects of AABs on four COVID-19 symptoms
122 were assessed using a MANOVA analysis with bootstrap methodology, involving 1000
123 resamplings. Additionally, we computed confidence intervals (CI) for the relative effects using
124 bootstrap techniques. The statistical analysis was performed using the R²⁵ packages nrmv³² and
125 reshape2³³. Finally, to demonstrate latent Gaussian correlation between binary variables (four
126 symptoms individually) and continuous variables (AAB levels), we applied the mixed canonical
127 correlation (CCA) with Kendall correlation and used the mixedCCA³⁴ R²⁵ package.

128

129 **Principal component analysis and factorial analysis.**

130 The Principal Component analysis (PCA) with spectral decomposition was conducted
131 following previously outlined methods^{5,35}. This approach allowed us to assess the discriminatory
132 capacity of AABs in distinguishing symptom subgroups. To perform these calculations, we used
133 specific R²⁵ functions, namely get_eig and get_pca_var from the factoextra package³⁶. The PCA
134 itself was implemented using the prcomp function. Additionally, we employed latent factor
135 analysis to identify sets of AABs (observed variables) that may indirectly interfere with the latent
136 variables³⁷. For this purpose, we used the factload function from the DandEFA³⁸ R²⁵ package.

137

138 **Median plots and multinomial logistic regression**

139 We used median values to visually represent the distribution of significant levels of
140 AABs in the presence and absence of symptoms in individuals with COVID-19. Statistical
141 differences in AAB levels were assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by post hoc
142 analysis employing the Dunn test. Significance was established with a p-value < 0.05, and
143 adjusted p-values FDR served as the significance cut-off. The creation of box plots was
144 performed using the R packages *rstatix*³⁹ and *ggplot2*²⁶. In addition, the multinomial regression
145 was applied to show AAB levels that decrease and increase through CI with odds ratio (OR),
146 when compared with 0 group. For this we used the *multinom* function from *nnet*⁴⁰ R²⁵ package.
147 The significance of the AABs was evaluated using a 95% exponential CI.

148

149 **Effects of anti-AGTR1 on the glycocalyx height & stiffness**

150 To assess the height and stiffness of the endothelial glycocalyx (eGC), human umbilical
151 vein endothelial cells (HUVECs) were cultured on coverslips until reaching confluence and then
152 treated with either an anti-AGTR1 monoclonal antibody (anti-AGTR1 mAb, clone: 5.2a¹⁹) or the
153 corresponding isotype control antibody (Purified Mouse IgG2a, clone: MG2a-53; BioLegend,
154 San Diego, CA, USA) for 24 hours. In certain experiments, 1 μ M Losartan (Losartan Carboxylic
155 Acid, Cayman Chemical Company, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) was utilized to inhibit the AGTR1
156 function. Throughout the experimental procedure, cells were maintained in HEPES-buffered
157 solution (Gibco, Waltham, MA, USA) supplemented with 1% fetal bovine serum (Bio&Sell,
158 Feucht, Germany). The architecture of the eGC was evaluated utilizing Atomic Force
159 Microscopy (AFM) nanoindentation technique (NanoWizard4, Bruker, Karlsruhe, Germany).
160 This involved employing a triangular gold-coated cantilever with a spherical tip (diameter: 10

161 μm ; Novascan, Ames, IA, USA) as the primary component of the AFM. The cantilever, with a
162 spring constant of 10 pN/nm, was gently brought into contact with the cell surface with a
163 maximal loading force of 0.5 nN to induce indentation. As the cantilever bent upon contact with
164 the cell, the deflection of a laser beam focused on the surface of the gold-coated cantilever was
165 monitored using a photodiode. Subsequently, force-distance curves were generated and analyzed
166 to determine the height and stiffness of the glycocalyx. This analysis was facilitated by Protein
167 Unfolding and Nano-Indentation Analysis Software (PUNIAS3D; Version 1.0; Release 2.3;
168 Copyright 2009), followed by statistical evaluation of the obtained values. Statistical analysis
169 was performed using R²⁵ programming. Shapiro Wilk test was applied to test for normality of the
170 data distribution. To compare the means of the non-parametric groups, Kruskal Wallis test was
171 used, followed by Dunn's post-hoc test for multiple comparisons. Data are presented as mean \pm
172 standard error of the mean (SEM) and FDR < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

173

174 **RESULTS**

175 **Serum AAB signatures associated with COVID-19 symptoms.**

176 Initially, hierarchical clustering association between serum levels of AABs targeting 17
177 receptors, selected based on their functionally and hypothesized association with COVID-19
178 symptoms (**Figure 1a**). I.e., these receptors include GPCRs not previously associated with the
179 RAS (CHRM3, CHRM4, CHRM5, CHRNA1, CXCR3, C5AR1, F2R, NRP1, STAB1), as well
180 as molecules belonging to or influencing the RAS (herein referred to as RAS-related molecules).
181 The latter category comprises non-GPCRs (ACE2 and MAS1) as well as GPCRs (ADRB1,
182 ADRB2, AGTR1, AGTR2, ADRA1A, and BDKRB1). These molecules are expressed in various
183 body tissues, including those of the nervous, circulatory, and immune systems⁴¹. They are

184 associated with biological processes relevant to COVID-19 pathophysiological mechanisms,
185 including vasculopathy, cognitive dysfunction, and hyper inflammation. (**Figures 1b**).

186 The hierarchical clustering of the AABs revealed a consistent trend: as the severity of
187 COVID-19 progressed from mild to moderate to severe disease, there was a corresponding
188 increase in the levels of these antibodies, along with their association with the disease symptoms.
189 The number of patients with each symptom is described in **Supplementary Figure 1**. For
190 example, symptoms like muscle ache and fever displayed a higher propensity to cluster in line
191 with moderate and severe COVID-19 patients than other symptoms, such as diarrhea and
192 dysgeusia (**Figure 2a**). Here, the control group is formed by healthy individuals or SARS-CoV-2
193 negative controls presenting at least one symptom of gastro-intestinal or respiratory disease. Of
194 note, given that we recently characterized our COVID-19 cohort^{6,10,42,43}, finding them to have
195 comparable average age, sex distribution, and sample collection dates, we excluded these
196 variables as potential confounders in our analyses.

197 Furthermore, MSFA indicated the presence of specific latent factors when comparing
198 healthy controls to COVID-19 patients (**Figure 2b**), supporting our previous hypothesis of
199 AABs playing a role in both health and disease. In this context, the existence of common
200 (shared) latent factors suggests physiological functions that are regulated by AABs but are not
201 affected by the disease state.

202

203 **Identifying key symptoms and AABs in COVID-19 using random forest analysis and**
204 **relative effect**

205 To identify the most relevant symptoms within our cohort (**Figure 3a**) related to the
206 COVID-19 phenotype and to further explore the correlation between the concentration of AABs
207 and these symptoms, we employed random forest analysis, which is a random forest approach.
208 This method is capable of identifying the most significant predictors of a given phenotype⁴⁴. Our
209 analysis indicated that anosmia, muscle ache, fever, and dysgeusia were the most relevant
210 symptoms defining our COVID-19 cohort (**Figure 3b**). The random forest model achieved an
211 area under the curve (AUC) above 70% for both specificity and sensitivity for each symptom
212 (**Figure 3c**).

213 Next, we investigated which AABs could be associated with the development of the four
214 most relevant symptoms that predict the phenotype of our COVID-19 cohort. This determination
215 was based on our analysis of the correlation strength between these AABs and the symptoms,
216 alongside other relevant factors considered in our study methodology. We conducted a relative
217 effector analysis using the bootstrap and MANOVA test, which serves as a probabilistic measure
218 to assess the likelihood of AABs influencing COVID-19 symptoms. This approach revealed
219 distinct patterns of AABs behavior and their associations with each symptom (**Figure 3d**).
220 Specifically, AABs targeting F2R, AGTR1, and NRP1 showed the strongest association with
221 anosmia, while those against BDKRB1, CHRM5, AGTR2, and AGTR1 were most closely linked
222 to muscle ache. Additionally, anti-CHRM5, anti-CXCR3, anti-MAS1, and CHRM5 displayed
223 the highest correlation with fever, and anti-BDKRB1, anti-AGTR1, anti-AGTR2, and anti-F2R
224 were most strongly associated with dysgeusia. In agreement, CCA indicated AABs targeting
225 AGTR1, AGTR2, BDKRB1, CHRM3, CHRM5, CXCR3, F2R, and MAS1 with high positive
226 correlation with at least one symptom (**Figure 3e**).

227

228 **Exploring AAB profiles as predictors of COVID-19 symptom severity**

229 To further investigate the correlations between AABs and the four most relevant
230 symptoms predicting the phenotype of our COVID-19 cohort, we explored the stratification
231 capacity of AABs levels based on the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms. To achieve this,
232 we conducted PCA with spectral decomposition using the AABs levels of controls and COVID-
233 19 patients. We categorized these individuals into five groups based on the number of symptoms
234 present and their importance score (>50 or <50) (**Figure 3b and 3c**). Therefore, healthy controls,
235 other controls without COVID-19 but with symptoms of mild respiratory illness, and a unique
236 severe COVID-19 patient who, at the time of sample collection, neither exhibited the most
237 relevant symptoms defining our COVID-19 cohort (anosmia, muscle ache, fever, and dysgeusia)
238 nor the other symptoms considered in our analysis due to extreme illness and, were categorized
239 as *group 0*. Since we did not observe striking differences in the hierarchical clustering pattern of
240 AABs when excluding the other controls without COVID-19 but with symptoms of mild
241 respiratory illness and this unique severe COVID-19 group (**Supplementary Figure 2**), we
242 assumed that they did not impact the global pattern of the results obtained. Finally, we defined
243 COVID-19 patients exhibiting one, two, three, or four symptoms as *groups 1, 2, 3, or 4*
244 (**Supplementary Figure 3**).

245 This approach revealed that AABs progressively stratify COVID-19 patients (**Figure 4a**).
246 In essence, as the number of symptoms (anosmia, dysgeusia, muscle ache, and fever) increases,
247 there is an observable trend of higher levels of these AABs in patients. Specifically, individuals
248 presenting all four symptoms show a more distinct separation from healthy controls compared to
249 those with three, two, or one of these symptoms. Notably, the AABs identified through the
250 relative effect analysis were found to be part of two major contribution clusters that appeared to

251 play a significant role in stratifying COVID-19 symptoms (**Figure 4b**). The first cluster,
252 comprising CXCR3-AABs, CHRM5-AABs, BDKRB1-AABs, and MAS1-AABs, was shown to
253 contribute most significantly to the principal component (PC) 2. The second cluster, which had a
254 greater impact on PC1, included AGTR1-AABs, ADRA1-AABs, CHRM3-AABs, C5AR1-
255 AABs, ADRB1-AABs, ADRB2-AABs, and CHRM4-AABs. A third cluster of AABs, with less
256 contribution to both PC1 and PC2, consisted of AGTR2-AABs, CHRNA1, F2R-AABs, STAB1-
257 AABs, NRP1-AABs, and ACE2-AABs.

258 Additionally, we observed a similar clustering tendency in the AABs profile, where those
259 targeting CHRM5, CXCR3, AGTR2, BDKRB1, and F2R had the highest contribution score for
260 factor 3, while AABs against C5AR1, ADRB1, ADRB2, CHRM4, ADRA1, CHRM3, and
261 AGTR1 showed the highest contribution score for factor 1 in our EFA (**Figure 4c**). The goal of
262 EFA is to uncover underlying structures or factors that explain the correlations among a set of
263 observed variables. These factors are latent constructs that cannot be directly measured but are
264 inferred from the patterns of correlations among the observed variables⁴⁵. This result reinforces
265 the possibility that AABs are contributing synergistically to COVID-19 symptoms, possibly
266 through their dysregulation of the biological processes in which they are involved.

267

268 **Association of dysregulated AABs with COVID-19 symptom accumulation**

269 The stratification results described above suggest that levels of AABs dysregulate with
270 the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms. To address this, we conducted a multiple comparison
271 analysis between patients without symptoms and those presenting one, two, three, or all four
272 symptoms (anosmia, dysgeusia, muscle ache, and fever). This approach revealed significant

273 alterations in several AABs with COVID-19 symptoms accumulation, namely, AABs targeting
274 ACE2, AGTR1, AGTR2, BDKRB1, CHRM3, CHRM5, CXCR3, F2R, and MAS1 (**Figure 5a**).

275 Given that multiple comparisons, such as Dunn's test following Kruskal-Wallis, increase
276 the risk of Type I error (false positives), we further conducted a multinomial logistic regression
277 analysis. This analysis inherently adjusts for multiple comparisons, potentially providing a more
278 conservative estimate of significance. This approach was performed to evaluate the association
279 between AAB levels and the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms more rigorously. It revealed
280 that the anti-AGTR1 antibody was the only one strongly associated with significant OR and FDR
281 adjusted p-values with the development of one, two, three, or all four of the assessed symptoms
282 (**Figure 5b**).

283

284 **Functional effects of anti-AGTR1 on the glyocalyx height & stiffness**

285 Inflammation-induced degradation of the eGC, a critical component in preserving
286 endothelial function, has been implicated in the pathogenesis of COVID-19-related endothelial
287 dysfunction⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸. Utilizing an anti-AGTR1 monoclonal antibody (mAb) across various
288 concentrations (10, 50, and 100 µg/mL), we observed concentration-dependent reductions in
289 eGC height and increases in stiffness compared to isotype controls (**Figure 6a**). Notably, even at
290 the lowest concentration (10 µg/mL), the anti-AGTR1 mAb significantly diminished eGC height
291 by approximately 25% and heightened stiffness by over 50% ($p < 0.0001$). Incremental
292 concentrations exacerbated these effects, with a peak reduction in eGC height and increased
293 stiffness at 50 µg/mL.

294 To assess the specificity of anti-AGTR1 mAb actions and explore potential protective
295 strategies, we employed Losartan, an AGTR1 antagonist, in conjunction with the mAb.
296 Treatment with anti-AGTR1 mAb (50 µg/mL) plus Losartan restored eGC height by nearly 45%
297 and reduced stiffness by about 18% relative to anti-AGTR1 mAb treatment alone, underscoring
298 the protective effect of Losartan against eGC degradation (**Figure 6b**). Controls with Losartan
299 alone showed no significant changes, confirming the specificity of the anti-AGTR1 mAb effects.

300

301 **DISCUSSION**

302 This manuscript presents a comprehensive analysis of AABs targeting GPCRs and RAS-
303 related molecules in relation to COVID-19 symptoms. The hierarchical clustering analysis
304 revealed an increasing trend in AABs levels corresponding to the severity of COVID-19 and
305 associated symptoms. The machine learning approach identified anosmia, muscle ache, fever,
306 and dysgeusia as the most relevant symptoms defining the COVID-19 cohort, underscoring the
307 importance of these symptoms in characterizing COVID-19. The relative effect and CCA
308 analysis further elucidated the association between specific AABs and COVID-19 symptoms.
309 For instance, AABs targeting NRP1, F2R, and AGTR1 were strongly associated with anosmia,
310 while those against BDKRB1, CHRM5, AGTR2, and AGTR1 were linked to muscle ache. The
311 stratification analysis based on the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms demonstrated that
312 AABs progressively stratify COVID-19 patients, with those presenting all four relevant
313 symptoms showing a clearer separation from healthy controls. The analysis of dysregulation of
314 AABs levels with the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms further strengthens the association
315 between these AABs and COVID-19 pathophysiology. Although further studies are warranted to
316 validate these findings and explore the potential therapeutic implications of targeting these AABs

317 in COVID-19 management, our data provide valuable insights into the role of AABs targeting
318 GPCRs and RAS-related molecules in COVID-19 pathophysiology and symptomatology. This
319 study focused on COVID-19 symptomatology adds a new dimension to understanding COVID-
320 19 pathophysiology by providing a comprehensive analysis of AABs targeting GPCRs and RAS-
321 related molecules.

322 Notably, AABs targeting GPCRs is an evolving history in autoimmunity⁴⁹ and they
323 functionally have been well characterized⁴⁹. For instance, anti-AGT1R AABs, which showed the
324 strongest association with the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms, have been shown to trigger
325 *in vitro* and *in vivo* effects also developed by COVID-19 patients⁵⁰⁻⁵³, such as lung
326 hyperinflammation, infiltration of immune cells, and endothelial damage^{19,54,55}. Apart from its
327 role in the renin-angiotensin system, angiotensin II also exhibits pro-inflammatory effects by
328 stimulating ADAM metallopeptidase domain 17 (ADAM17), leading to the production of
329 inflammatory cytokines such as INF- γ , IL-8 and interleukin-6^{54,56,57}. A recent study has
330 demonstrated that anti-AT1R antibodies can act in an agonistic and synergistic manner with
331 angiotensin II¹⁹. Hence, these antibodies could potentially enhance the effects of angiotensin II,
332 contributing to the development of COVID-19 symptoms. Nevertheless, since compelling
333 emerging data suggest that anti-AGTR1 AABs may play a role in the pathophysiology of
334 COVID-19^{10,56,60,61}, we hypothesize that these AABs might contribute to the dysregulation of the
335 RAS, promote hyperinflammation, and be implicated in the endothelial dysfunction presented by
336 COVID-19 patients as they are involved in the etiopathogenesis of SSc. However, further
337 research is needed to validate these findings and understand the underlying mechanisms by
338 which anti-AGTR1 AABs contribute to COVID-19 pathophysiology and the precise mechanisms
339 and clinical implications of anti-AT1R AABs in COVID-19.

340 Moreover, decreased eGC height and elevated stiffness after treatment with anti-AGTR1
341 antibodies being reversed by Losartan, indicates a possible new specific pathological effect of
342 antiAGTR1 AABs. This result is in agreement with emerging evidence suggesting that the
343 degradation of the eGC⁶², a key regulator of vascular homeostasis⁶³, plays a critical role in the
344 constellation of COVID-19 symptoms^{48,60}. The eGC's impairment, as indicated by our findings,
345 could contribute to systemic manifestations such as anosmia and dysgeusia⁶⁴. These sensory
346 deficits may arise from compromised microvascular integrity within the olfactory and gustatory
347 systems, leading to disrupted cellular function in these regions. Additionally, the observed
348 increase in eGC stiffness and reduced height may impede muscle perfusion, potentially
349 elucidating the myalgia experienced by many COVID-19 patients⁶⁵. Fever, a hallmark of the
350 body's inflammatory response to infection⁶⁶, may also be potentiated by eGC damage⁶⁷. The
351 resultant endothelial dysfunction could amplify cytokine production and release, precipitating the
352 febrile response. Together, these associations underscore the need for further investigation into
353 the impact of eGC degradation on vascular health and its implications for the multisystemic
354 symptoms encountered in COVID-19, potentially offering novel insights into targeted
355 therapeutic interventions.

356 In conclusion, the comprehensive analysis presented in this work provides crucial
357 insights into the nuanced interactions between AABs and specific COVID-19 symptoms,
358 shedding light on the differential associations observed across varying symptomatology. For
359 instance, the hierarchical clustering analysis showed an increasing trend in AABs levels
360 corresponding to COVID-19 severity and its associated symptoms, with specific AAB strongly
361 linked to symptoms such as anosmia and muscle ache. The study also highlighted the progressive
362 stratification of COVID-19 patients based on autoantibody levels and the dysregulation of these

363 levels with the accumulation of symptoms. Importantly, this study is the first to investigate the
364 association between these AABs and specific COVID-19 symptoms, adding a new dimension to
365 our understanding of COVID-19 pathophysiology. Further research is needed to validate these
366 findings and explore the therapeutic implications of targeting these AABs in COVID-19
367 management.

368

369

370 **Data availability.**

371 All data used in this study are provided in the Supplementary Data.

372

373 **Competing Interest Statement**

374 The Authors declare no Competing Financial or Non-Financial Interests.

375

376 **Author Contributions**

377 DLMF, RA, and OCM wrote the manuscript; DLMF, ISF, OCM, RA, MJ, SLS, BF, CV, XW,
378 LFS, RJSD, HDO, GCM, RC, GCB, PPF, YRAY, HN, RFC, MHH, GM, RC, FYNV, YLGC,
379 AHCM, JNU, ALN, ASA, PBM, TSS, JCSS and LOL provided scientific insights; DLMF,
380 OCM, GCB, PPF, and AHCM performed data and bioinformatics analyses; HDO, GM, RC,
381 OCM, LFS, YRAY, GCM, RC, RA, KKV, and, AHCM revised and edited the manuscript;
382 DLMF, AHCM, HH, AV, HA, IZ, AZR, GR, RA, KKV, YS, KSF, and OCM conceived the
383 project and designed the study; JIS, AZR, and IZ diagnosed, recruited or followed-up the
384 patients; KSF, HH, AZR, GH, YO, JZ, JIS, IZ, EV, YBL and YS coordinated the serum
385 collection and databank or performed the experiments; IZ, AZR, AV, YS, AHCM, GR, RA, and
386 OCM supervised the project.

387

388 **Acknowledgments**

389 We acknowledge the patients for participating in this study. We would like to recognize
390 the contributions of Lev Rochel Bikur Cholim of Lakewood (led by Rabbi Yehuda Kasirer and
391 Mrs. Leeba Prager) and the hundreds of volunteers who collected samples for this research
392 through the MITZVA Cohort. We thank the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP grants
393 2018/18886-9, 2020/01688-0, and 2020/07069-0 to OCM, 2020/16246-2 and 2023/13356-0 to
394 DLMF, 2020/09146-1 to PPF, 2020/07972-1 to GCB, 2023/12268-0 to ASA, 2023/06086-6 to
395 PMB, and 2019/27139-5 to JCSS) for financial support. We acknowledge the National Council
396 for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) Brazil (grants: 309482/2022-4 to OCM
397 and 102430/2022-5 to LFS) and the the Coordination of Superior Level Staff Improvement
398 (CAPES) (grants: 88887.801068/2023-00 to ALN, CAPES/PROEX grant 88887.917898/2023-
399 00 to JNU and 88887.699840/2022-00 to FYNV). The contributions by G.M. and R.C. were
400 made possible by funding from the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research
401 (BMBF) and German Research Foundation (DFG; projects #394046635, subproject A03, as part
402 of CRC 1365, and EXPAND-PD; CA2816/1-1) through the Berlin Institute of Health (BIH)-
403 Center for Regenerative Therapies (BCRT) and the Berlin-Brandenburg School for Regenerative
404 Therapies (BSRT, GSC203), respectively, and in part by the European Union's Horizon 2020
405 Research and Innovation Program under grant agreements No 733006 (PACE) and 779293
406 (HIPGEN). We also acknowledge the German Research Foundation (DFG: Research Training
407 Group 'Autoimmune Pre-Disease' RTG 2633 and Excellence Cluster 'Precision Medicine in
408 Inflammation' EXC 2167) and the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF,
409 Mesinflammation consortium no. 01EC1901D).

410

411 **REFERENCE**

- 412 1. Bastard, P. *et al.* Autoantibodies against type I IFNs in patients with life-threatening
413 COVID-19. *Science* **370**, (2020).
- 414 2. Bastard, P. *et al.* Autoantibodies neutralizing type I IFNs are present in ~4% of uninfected
415 individuals over 70 years old and account for ~20% of COVID-19 deaths. *Sci. Immunol.*
416 **6**, 130 (2021).
- 417 3. McNab, F., Mayer-Barber, K., Sher, A., Wack, A. & O'Garra, A. Type I interferons in
418 infectious disease. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* 2015 152 **15**, 87–103 (2015).
- 419 4. Wang, E. Y. *et al.* Diverse functional autoantibodies in patients with COVID-19. *Nat.*
420 *2021* 5957866 **595**, 283–288 (2021).
- 421 5. Fonseca, D. L. M. *et al.* Severe COVID-19 patients exhibit elevated levels of
422 autoantibodies targeting cardiolipin and platelet glycoprotein with age: a systems biology
423 approach. *npj Aging* 2023 91 **9**, 1–14 (2023).
- 424 6. Baiocchi, G. C. *et al.* Cross-sectional analysis reveals autoantibody signatures associated
425 with COVID-19 severity. *J. Med. Virol.* **95**, (2023).


- 426 7. Lee, S. J. *et al.* Prevalence, clinical significance, and persistence of autoantibodies in
427 COVID-19. *Viol. J.* **20**, 1–8 (2023).
- 428 8. Son, K. *et al.* Circulating anti-nuclear autoantibodies in COVID-19 survivors predict long
429 COVID symptoms. *Eur. Respir. J.* **61**, (2023).
- 430 9. Chang, S. E. *et al.* New-onset IgG autoantibodies in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.
431 *Nat. Commun.* **12**, (2021).
- 432 10. Cabral-Marques, O. *et al.* Autoantibodies targeting GPCRs and RAS-related molecules
433 associate with COVID-19 severity. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-28905-5.
- 434 11. Venkatakrishnan, A. J. *et al.* Molecular signatures of G-protein-coupled receptors. *Nature*
435 **494**, 185–194 (2013).
- 436 12. Flock, T. *et al.* Selectivity determinants of GPCR-G-protein binding. *Nature* **545**, 317–322
437 (2017).
- 438 13. Nomiya, H., Osada, N. & Yoshie, O. A family tree of vertebrate chemokine receptors
439 for a unified nomenclature. *Dev. Comp. Immunol.* **35**, 705–715 (2011).
- 440 14. Bryant, V. L. & Slade, C. A. Chemokines, their receptors and human disease: the good,
441 the bad and the itchy. *Immunol. Cell Biol.* **93**, 364–371 (2015).
- 442 15. Guo, D. F., Sun, Y. L., Hamet, P. & Inagami, T. The angiotensin II type 1 receptor and
443 receptor-associated proteins. *Cell Res. 2001 113* **11**, 165–180 (2001).
- 444 16. Cabral-Marques, O. & Riemekasten, G. Functional autoantibodies targeting G protein-
445 coupled receptors in rheumatic diseases. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* **13**, 648–656 (2017).
- 446 17. Novak, N. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, skin and immunology – What do we know so
447 far? *Allergy Eur. J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **76**, 698–713 (2021).
- 448 18. Whitaker, M. *et al.* Persistent COVID-19 symptoms in a community study of 606,434
449 people in England. *Nat. Commun. 2022 131* **13**, 1–10 (2022).
- 450 19. Yue, X. *et al.* Induced antibodies directed to the angiotensin receptor type 1 provoke skin
451 and lung inflammation, dermal fibrosis and act species overarching. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* **81**,
452 1281 (2022).
- 453 20. Mehta, O. P., Bhandari, P., Raut, A., Kacimi, S. E. O. & Huy, N. T. Coronavirus Disease
454 (COVID-19): Comprehensive Review of Clinical Presentation. *Front. Public Heal.* **8**,
455 582932 (2020).
- 456 21. Ao, D., He, X., Liu, J. & Xu, L. Strategies for the development and approval of COVID-
457 19 vaccines and therapeutics in the post-pandemic period. *Signal Transduct. Target. Ther.*
458 **2023 81** **8**, 1–17 (2023).
- 459 22. Meyerowitz, E. A., Scott, J., Richterman, A., Male, V. & Cevik, M. Clinical course and
460 management of COVID-19 in the era of widespread population immunity. *Nat. Rev.*
461 *Microbiol.* **2023** 1–14 (2023) doi:10.1038/s41579-023-01001-1.
- 462 23. Wu, T. *et al.* clusterProfiler 4.0: A universal enrichment tool for interpreting omics data.
463 *Innov.* **2**, (2021).
- 464 24. Yu, G., Wang, L. G., Han, Y. & He, Q. Y. ClusterProfiler: An R package for comparing

- 465 biological themes among gene clusters. *Omi. A J. Integr. Biol.* **16**, 284–287 (2012).
- 466 25. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing. <https://www.r-project.org/>.
- 467 26. Wickham, H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. (2016).
- 468 27. Gu, Z., Eils, R. & Schlesner, M. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in
469 multidimensional genomic data. *Bioinformatics* **32**, 2847–2849 (2016).
- 470 28. Gu, Z., Gu, L., Eils, R., Schlesner, M. & Brors, B. circlize Implements and enhances
471 circular visualization in R. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2811–2812 (2014).
- 472 29. De Vito, R., Bellio, R., Trippa, L. & Parmigiani, G. Multi-study factor analysis.
473 *Biometrics* **75**, 337–346 (2019).
- 474 30. De Vito, R., Bellio, R., Trippa, L. & Parmigiani, G. *Bayesian Multi-study Factor Analysis*
475 *for High-throughput Biological Data*. (2018).
- 476 31. Liaw, A. & Wiener, M. Classification and Regression by randomForest. **2**, (2002).
- 477 32. Ellis, A. R., Burchett, W. W., Harrar, S. W. & Bathke, A. C. Nonparametric Inference for
478 Multivariate Data: The R Package nrmv. *J. Stat. Softw.* **76**, 1–18 (2017).
- 479 33. Wickham, H. Reshaping Data with the reshape Package. *J. Stat. Softw.* **21**, 1–20 (2007).
- 480 34. Yoon, G., Müller, C. L. & Gaynanova, I. Fast Computation of Latent Correlations. *J.*
481 *Comput. Graph. Stat.* **30**, 1249–1256 (2021).
- 482 35. Lever, J., Krzywinski, M. & Altman, N. Principal component analysis. *Nat. Methods* **14**,
483 641–642 (2017).
- 484 36. Alboukadel Kassambara & Fabian Mundt. factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of
485 Multivariate Data Analyses. (2020).
- 486 37. Cai, L. Latent variable modeling. *Shanghai Arch. Psychiatry* **24**, 118 (2012).
- 487 38. Manukyan, A., Çene, E., Sedef, A. & Demir, I. Dandelion plot: a method for the
488 visualization of R-mode exploratory factor analyses. *Comput. Stat.* **29**, 1769–1791 (2014).
- 489 39. A, K. rstatix: Pipe-Friendly Framework for Basic Statistical Tests. (2021).
- 490 40. Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Ripley (Springer,
491 2002).
- 492 41. Cooray, S. N., Chan, L., Webb, T. R., Metherell, L. & Clark, A. J. L. Accessory proteins
493 are vital for the functional expression of certain G protein-coupled receptors. *Mol. Cell.*
494 *Endocrinol.* **300**, 17–24 (2009).
- 495 42. Silverberg, J. I. *et al.* Association of Varying Clinical Manifestations and Positive Anti-
496 SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies: A Cross-Sectional Observational Study. *J. allergy Clin.*
497 *Immunol. Pract.* **9**, 3331-3338.e2 (2021).
- 498 43. Zyskind, I. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Symptom Onset in Culturally Linked
499 Orthodox Jewish Communities Across Multiple Regions in the United States. *JAMA*
500 *Netw. Open* **4**, e212816–e212816 (2021).
- 501 44. Li, J. *et al.* A multicenter random forest model for effective prognosis prediction in
502 collaborative clinical research network. *Artif. Intell. Med.* **103**, (2020).


- 503 45. factload: R-mode Exploratory Factor Analysis in DandEFA: Dandelion Plot for R-Mode
504 Exploratory Factor Analysis. <https://rdrr.io/cran/DandEFA/man/factload.html>.
- 505 46. K, S. *et al.* Injury to the Endothelial Glycocalyx in Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19.
506 *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* **202**, 1178–1181 (2020).
- 507 47. Fraser, D. D. *et al.* Endothelial Injury and Glycocalyx Degradation in Critically Ill
508 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients: Implications for Microvascular Platelet Aggregation.
509 *Crit. Care Explor.* **2**, E0194 (2020).
- 510 48. Fels, B. *et al.* Mineralocorticoid receptor-antagonism prevents COVID-19-dependent
511 glycocalyx damage. *Pflugers Arch.* **474**, 1069–1076 (2022).
- 512 49. Cabral-Marques, O. *et al.* Autoantibodies targeting G protein-coupled receptors: An
513 evolving history in autoimmunity. Report of the 4th international symposium. *Autoimmun.*
514 *Rev.* **22**, 103310 (2023).
- 515 50. Silva, M. J. A. *et al.* Hyperinflammatory Response in COVID-19: A Systematic Review.
516 *Viruses* **15**, (2023).
- 517 51. Manson, J. J. *et al.* COVID-19-associated hyperinflammation and escalation of patient
518 care: a retrospective longitudinal cohort study. *Lancet Rheumatol.* **2**, e594–e602 (2020).
- 519 52. Freire, P. P. *et al.* The relationship between cytokine and neutrophil gene network
520 distinguishes SARS-CoV-2-infected patients by sex and age. *JCI insight* **6**, (2021).
- 521 53. Schimke, L. F. *et al.* Severe COVID-19 Shares a Common Neutrophil Activation
522 Signature with Other Acute Inflammatory States. *Cells* **11**, (2022).
- 523 54. Kill, A. *et al.* Autoantibodies to angiotensin and endothelin receptors in systemic sclerosis
524 induce cellular and systemic events associated with disease pathogenesis. *Arthritis Res.*
525 *Ther.* **16**, (2014).
- 526 55. Ruhl, L. *et al.* Endothelial dysfunction contributes to severe COVID-19 in combination
527 with dysregulated lymphocyte responses and cytokine networks. *Signal Transduct. Target.*
528 *Ther.* **2021 61** **6**, 1–15 (2021).
- 529 56. Papola, F. *et al.* Anti-AT1R autoantibodies and prediction of the severity of Covid-19.
530 *Hum. Immunol.* **83**, 130 (2022).
- 531 57. Hirano, T. & Murakami, M. COVID-19: A New Virus, but a Familiar Receptor and
532 Cytokine Release Syndrome. *Immunity* **52**, 731–733 (2020).
- 533 58. Cabral-Marques, O. & Riemekasten, G. Vascular hypothesis revisited: Role of stimulating
534 antibodies against angiotensin and endothelin receptors in the pathogenesis of systemic
535 sclerosis. *Autoimmun. Rev.* **15**, 690–694 (2016).
- 536 59. Matucci-Cerinic, M., Hughes, M., Taliani, G. & Kahaleh, B. Similarities between
537 COVID-19 and systemic sclerosis early vasculopathy: A “viral” challenge for future
538 research in scleroderma. *Autoimmun. Rev.* **20**, 102899 (2021).
- 539 60. Miedema, J. *et al.* Antibodies Against Angiotensin II Receptor Type 1 and Endothelin A
540 Receptor Are Associated With an Unfavorable COVID19 Disease Course. *Front.*
541 *Immunol.* **12**, (2021).
- 542 61. Jiang, Y. *et al.* Angiotensin II receptor I auto-antibodies following SARS-CoV-2

- 543 infection. *PLoS One* **16**, (2021).
- 544 62. Reitsma, S., Slaaf, D. W., Vink, H., Van Zandvoort, M. A. M. J. & Oude Egbrink, M. G.
545 A. The endothelial glycocalyx: composition, functions, and visualization. *Pflugers Arch.*
546 **454**, 345 (2007).
- 547 63. Teuwen, L. A., Geldhof, V., Pasut, A. & Carmeliet, P. COVID-19: the vasculature
548 unleashed. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* 2020 207 **20**, 389–391 (2020).
- 549 64. Varga, Z. *et al.* Endothelial cell infection and endotheliitis in COVID-19. *Lancet (London,*
550 *England)* **395**, 1417–1418 (2020).
- 551 65. Jin, Y. *et al.* Endothelial activation and dysfunction in COVID-19: from basic
552 mechanisms to potential therapeutic approaches. *Signal Transduct. Target. Ther.* **5**,
553 (2020).
- 554 66. Evans, S. S., Repasky, E. A. & Fisher, D. T. Fever and the thermal regulation of
555 immunity: the immune system feels the heat. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **15**, 335 (2015).
- 556 67. Richter, R. P., Payne, G. A., Ambalavanan, N., Gaggar, A. & Richter, J. R. The
557 endothelial glycocalyx in critical illness: A pediatric perspective. *Matrix Biol. Plus* **14**,
558 100106 (2022).
- 559
- 560



Inflammatory condition








Steady-state



SARS-CoV-2



-  Immune cells
-  Cytokines
-  Autoantibodies
-  Endothelial glycocalyx






Figure 1: Biological processes linked to antibody targets. **a)** The Venn diagram shows the AAB targets belonging to either the GPCR or RAS group. Only gene sets present in significant pathways according to the FDR are shown. Additionally, the graphic on the left exhibits the enriched biological processes (BPs) associated with these AAB targets, and **b)** the different systems to which these BPs are linked.





Figure 2: AAB levels according to COVID-19 severity and symptoms. **a**) A hierarchical clustering heatmap displays AAB levels (after z-score transformation), indicated by the scale bar. The presence or absence of symptoms, sex, and age range categories (<50 and ≥50, represented by gray and black circles) are shown below the heatmap. **b**) Multistudy factor analysis of AABs. Heatmaps shows the result of multistudy factor analysis (MSFA), indicating estimated factor loadings for common and specific latent factors between controls and COVID-19 patients. The color scale bar ranging from orange (-1 to 1) to blue corresponds to negative and positive factor loadings. Loadings close to -1 or 1 indicate aab that strongly influence factors in opposite directions.




Figure 3: Relative effect of aabs on COVID-19 symptoms. **a)** A flowchart of COVID-19 severity and healthy groups as labeled for random forest analysis. The control group consists of healthy individuals or SARS-CoV-2 negative controls presenting at least one symptom of gastrointestinal or respiratory disease. They were classified as individuals without (0) or with the presence of symptoms (1). **b)** A dot plot portrays the importance score from random forest analysis of COVID-19 symptoms. Red dots represent symptoms with an importance score above 0.5 (50%). The circle size increases according to the importance score. **c)** ROC curves show the False Positive Rate (FPR) and True Positive Rate (TPR) for symptoms with the highest importance scores (anosmia, muscle ache, fever, and dysgeusia). **d)** The relative effects were calculated using MANOVA test. The circle size indicates the probabilistic measure (relative effect size). Confidence intervals are shown by shadows. Black and blue lines/dots represent individuals with and without symptoms, respectively. Furthermore the significance interval is identified by blue asterisks. **e)** The bubble heatmap shows the canonical correlation results. The size and color spectrum of the bubbles represent the r^2 value between symptoms and AAB levels.




Figure 5: AABs stratify COVID-19 according to symptoms. **a**) The PCA graphic illustrates the stratification of COVID-19 groups based on the number of symptoms (0 = no symptoms; 1 = one symptom; 2 = two symptoms; 3 = three symptoms; 4 = four symptoms). Variables with positive correlation are plotted on the same side, while negatively correlated variables are plotted on opposite sides. Only AABs that highly contribute to stratifying moderate and severe COVID-19 patients from mild patients and healthy controls are displayed. Small circles represent concentration ellipses around the mean points of each group. Histograms alongside the PCA plot represent the density of the sample (individual) distribution. **b**) The scatter plot shows the contribution of variables (AABs clusters 1, 2, and 3 are represented by the colors black, blue, and orange, respectively) to dimensions 1 and 2. These variables indicate the contribution of AABs to the group stratification. **c**) The heatmap displays factorial load values between AABs, indicating the strength of the relationship (ranging between 1 and -1) between the variable and the factor.






Figure 6: AAB levels dysregulate with the accumulation of COVID-19 symptoms. **a)** Violin plots display AAB levels for each group in the x-axis (0 = no symptoms; 1 = one symptom; 2 = two symptoms; 3 = three symptoms; 4 = four symptoms). Asterisks indicate the Kruskal-Wallis test with post-hoc Dunn test significance levels (* = $p < 0.01$; ** = $p < 0.001$; *** = $p < 0.0001$; **** = $p < 0.00001$). Adjusted p -values (FDR) are also shown. **b)** Forest plots depict odds ratios (ORs) and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (whiskers) for various AABs across COVID-19 symptoms. Blue dots and lines indicate significantly increased or decreased AAB levels compared to those in healthy controls. This significance is based on FDR and CI. The dashed line represents the intercept.

a



b







Figure 6: Functional effects of anti-AGTR1 on the glycocalyx height & stiffness. a) Dose response curve of anti-AGTR1 antibodies or isotype control on heights and stiffness of glycocalyx. **b)** Decreased endothelial glycocalyx (eGC) height and elevated stiffness after treatment with anti-AGTR1 antibodies is reversed by Losartan.



Supplementary Figure 1: Number of patients with symptoms in COVID-19 severity groups.



Supplementary Figure 2: Heatmap showing AAB levels (after z-score transformation), indicated by the scale bar. The presence or absence of symptoms, sex, and age range categories (<50 and ≥ 50 , represented by gray and black circles), are displayed below the heatmap. This heatmap excludes healthy individuals with symptoms and the patient in the severe group without any symptoms.



Supplementary Figure 3: The heatmap categorizes individuals into groups 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 based on the PCA analysis (**Figure 5a** and **Figure 6**), illustrating the distribution of individuals in each group.