1 Distinct immune responses in patients infected with influenza or SARS-

² CoV-2, and in COVID-19 survivors, characterised by transcriptomic and

³ cellular abundance differences in blood.

- Jelmer Legebeke^{1,4}, Jenny Lord¹, Rebekah Penrice-Randal², Andres F. Vallejo³, Stephen Poole^{3,4},
 Nathan J. Brendish^{3,4}, Xiaofeng Dong², Catherine Hartley², John W. Holloway^{1,4}, Jane S. Lucas^{3,4},
 Anthony P. Williams⁵, Gabrielle Wheway¹, Fabio Strazzeri⁶, Aaron Gardner⁶, James P.R. Schofield⁶, Paul
 J. Skipp^{6,7}, Julian A. Hiscox^{2,8,9}, Marta E. Polak^{3,10}, Tristan W. Clark^{3,4,11,*,#} and Diana Baralle^{1,4,*,#}
- 8
- 9 * Joint last authors
- 10 # Corresponding authors: <u>t.w.clark@soton.ac.uk</u> and <u>d.baralle@soton.ac.uk</u>
- 11

12 Institutional affiliations

13	1)	School of Human Development and Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
14	2)	Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
15	3)	School of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
16	4)	NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton
17		NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK
18	5)	Cancer Sciences Division, Faculty of Medicine, University Hospital Southampton, Southampton, UK
19	6)	TopMD Precision Medicine Ltd, Southampton, UK
20	7)	Centre for Proteomic Research, School of Biological Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
21	8)	NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Liverpool, UK
22	9)	A*STAR Infectious Diseases Laboratories (A*STAR ID Labs), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR)
23		Singapore
24	10)	Institute for Life Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

25 NOTE1This propriot provide new tensor shipper because here and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 Abstract

27 Background

The worldwide pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2 has claimed millions of lives and has had a profound effect on global life. Understanding the pathogenicity of the virus and the body's response to infection is crucial in improving patient management, prognosis, and therapeutic strategies. To address this, we performed functional transcriptomic profiling to better understand the generic and specific effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

33

34 Methods

Whole blood RNA sequencing was used to profile a well characterised cohort of patients hospitalised with COVID-19, during the first wave of the pandemic prior to the availability of approved COVID-19 treatments and who went on to survive or die of COVID-19, and patients hospitalised with influenza virus infection between 2017 and 2019. Clinical parameters between patient groups were compared, and several bioinformatic tools were used to assess differences in transcript abundances and cellular composition.

41

42 Results

The analyses revealed contrasting innate and adaptive immune programmes, with transcripts and cell subsets associated with the innate immune response elevated in patients with influenza, and those involved in the adaptive immune response elevated in patients with COVID-19. Topological analysis identified additional gene signatures that differentiated patients with COVID-19 from patients with influenza, including insulin resistance, mitochondrial oxidative stress and interferon signalling. An efficient adaptive immune response was furthermore associated with patient survival, while an inflammatory response predicted death in patients with COVID-19. A potential prognostic signature

50	was found based on a selection of transcript abundances, associated with circulating
51	immunoglobulins, nucleosome assembly, cytokine production and T cell activation, in the blood
52	transcriptome of COVID-19 patients, upon admission to hospital, which can be used to stratify patients
53	likely to survive or die.
54	
55	Conclusions
56	The results identified distinct immunological signatures between SARS-CoV-2 and influenza,
57	prognostic of disease progression and indicative of different targeted therapies. The altered transcript
58	abundances associated with COVID-19 survivors can be used to predict more severe outcomes in
59	patients with COVID-19.
60	
61	Keywords: COVID-19, influenza, immune response signatures, RNA-seq, transcriptomics
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	
68	
00	
69	
70	

71 Introduction

The global pandemic caused by novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 emerged at the end of 2019 (1). By May
 1st, 2021, more than 150 million people had been infected, leading to over 3 million deaths worldwide
 (2).

75

76 Previous studies investigating the differences between patients with COVID-19 or influenza on 77 admission to hospital have found that both patient groups present with similar levels of systemic 78 inflammation markers like C-reactive protein (CRP), white blood cell count (WBC), neutrophil count 79 and neutrophil/lymphocyte (N/L) ratio (3). After admission patients hospitalised with COVID-19 were 80 found to have a higher risk of developing respiratory distress, pulmonary embolism, septic shock and 81 haemorrhagic strokes compared to influenza patients (4). In addition, the median length of stay in the 82 intensive care unit was twice as high for COVID-19 patients compared to influenza patients, and 83 COVID-19 patients were more likely to require mechanical ventilation (4). Furthermore, the in-hospital mortality for COVID-19 patients was 16.9% compared to 5.8% for influenza patients indicating a 84 85 roughly three times higher relative risk of death for COVID-19 (4).

86

87 The viral immune response against influenza is well characterised (5). Briefly, initial defence involves cells of the innate immune system (e.g. macrophages, granulocytes and dendritic cells (DCs)), which 88 release proinflammatory cytokines and type I interferons (IFN) to inhibit viral replication, recruit other 89 90 immune cells to the site of infection, and stimulate the adaptive immune response. The adaptive 91 immune response consists of a humoral and a cellular mediated immunity, initiated principally by 92 virus-specific antibodies and T cells. Current understanding of the immune response specific to SARS-CoV-2 indicates that COVID-19 severity and duration are largely due to a total or early evasion of an 93 94 innate immune and type I and type III interferon (IFN) responses (6–9), while patients infected with

95 influenza are able to express type I and type II IFNs at a significantly higher concentration (3) which 96 correlates with guicker recovery and decreased disease severity and mortality (10,11). Consistent with 97 this observation, early administration of inhaled recombinant IFN-beta for COVID-19 patients was 98 associated with a lowered in-hospital mortality and guicker recovery (12,13). Despite the reduced IFN 99 response in patients with COVID-19 the expression of pro-inflammatory cytokines occurs for a 100 prolonged time at similar levels with influenza patients (3), and interleukin (IL) -6 and IL-10 (14–16) 101 and CCL3 (3) were associated with increased disease severity for COVID-19. The presence of CD4+ and 102 CD8+ T cells, and antibodies were correlated with a positive patient outcome in the case of COVID-19 103 (17). This puts elderly patients at a higher risk due a smaller naïve T cell pool (18–20) and an absence 104 of a pre-existing adaptive immunity (21) resulting in a potential delayed T cell response to a novel virus 105 like SARS-CoV-2 (22). Delaying an adaptive immune response which, when combined with a high viral 106 load, could lead to a poor outcome (23). As discussed by Sette and Crotty (24) an absent T cell response 107 may cause an increased innate response attempting to control the virus resulting in an excessive lung immunopathology. 108

109

110 To investigate unique molecular features associated with COVID-19, a cohort of patients was identified 111 from hospitalised individuals that were positive for SARS-CoV-2. As a comparator an equivalent group 112 of patients hospitalised with influenza virus were identified. An extensive record of clinical parameters and peripheral blood, used for RNA-seq to obtain a global blood transcriptome overview, were taken 113 114 at point of care and could therefore be correlated with any molecular signatures of disease. Through 115 these side-by-side comparisons, we aim to identify distinct patterns of blood transcript abundances 116 and cellular composition related to specific antiviral immune responses. Furthermore, we aim to 117 identify a promising prognostic signature indicative of COVID-19 outcome.

118

120 Materials & Methods

121 Ethics and consent

The study was approved by the South Central - Hampshire A Research Ethics Committee (REC): REC reference 20/SC/0138 (March 16th, 2020) for the COVID-19 point of care (CoV-19POC) trial; and REC reference 17/SC/0368 (September 7th, 2017) for the FluPOC trial. For full inclusion and exclusion criteria details see (25) and (26). Patients gave written informed consent or consultee assent was obtained where patients were unable to give consent. Demographic and clinical data were collected at enrolment and outcome data from case note and electronic systems. ALEA and BC data management platforms were used for data capture and management.

129

130 Study design and participants

131 All participants were recruited within the first 24 hours of admission to two large studies of molecular 132 point-of-care testing (mPOCT) for respiratory viruses (CoV-19POC and FluPOC). Blood samples 133 including whole blood in PAXgene Blood RNA tubes (BRT) (Preanalytix) were collected from SARS-CoV-134 2 positive patients and influenza positive patients, within 24 hours of enrolment, and stored at -80°C. 135 The studies were prospectively registered with the ISRCTN trial registry: ISRCTN14966673 (COV-19POC) (March 18th, 2020), and ISRCTN17197293 (FluPOC) (November 13th, 2017). The COV-19POC 136 137 study was a non-randomised interventional trial evaluating the clinical impact of mPOCT for SARS-138 CoV-2 in adult patients presenting to hospital with suspected COVID-19, using the QIAGEN QIAstat-Dx 139 PCR testing platform with the QIAstat-Dx Respiratory SARS-CoV-2 Panel (27). The trial took place 140 during the first wave of the pandemic, from 20th March to 29th April 2020, and prior to the availability 141 of approved COVID-19 treatments. All patients were recruited from the Acute Medical Unit (AMU), 142 Emergency Department (ED) or other acute areas of Southampton General Hospital. The FluPOC study 143 was a multicentre randomised controlled trial evaluating the clinical impact of mPOCT for influenza in

hospitalised adult patients with acute respiratory illness, during influenza season, using the BioFire
FilmArray platform with the Respiratory Panel 2.1 (28). The trial took place during influenza seasons
over the two winters of 2017/18 and 2018/19. All patients were recruited from the AMU and ED of
Southampton General Hospital and Royal Hampshire County Hospital.

148

149 Extraction of RNA from clinical samples and Illumina sequencing

150 Total RNA was extracted from PAXgene BRT using the PAXgene Blood RNA Kit (PreAnalytix), according 151 to the manufacturer's protocol at Containment Level 3 in a Tripass Class I hood. Extracted RNA was 152 stored at -80°C until further use. Following the manufacturer's protocols, total RNA was used as input 153 material into the QIAseq FastSelect-rRNA/Globin Kit (Qiagen) protocol to remove cytoplasmic and 154 mitochondrial rRNA and globin mRNA with a fragmentation time of 7 or 15 minutes. Subsequently the 155 NEBNext[®] Ultra[™] II Directional RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina[®] (New England Biolabs) was used to 156 generate the RNA libraries, followed by 11 or 13 cycles of amplification and purification using AMPure 157 XP beads. Each library was quantified using Qubit and the size distribution assessed using the Agilent 158 2100 Bioanalyser and the final libraries were pooled in equimolar ratios. Libraries were sequenced 159 using 150 bp paired-end reads on by an Illumina® NovaSeq 6000 (Illumina®, San Diego, USA). Raw 160 fastq files were trimmed to remove Illumina adapter sequences using Cutadapt v1.2.1 (29). The option 161 "-O 3" was set, so that the 3' end of any reads which matched the adapter sequence with greater than 162 3 bp was trimmed off. The reads were further trimmed to remove low quality bases, using Sickle 163 v1.200 (30) with a minimum window quality score of 20. After trimming, reads shorter than 10 bp 164 were removed.

166 Data QC and alignment

167 Quality control (QC) of read data was performed using FastQC (31) (v0.11.9) and compiled and 168 visualised with MultiQC (32) (v1.5). Samples with <20 million total reads were excluded from further 169 analysis. The STAR index was created with STAR's (33) (v2.7.6a) genomeGenerate function using 170 GRCh38.primary_assembly.genome.fa and gencode.v34.annotation.gtf (34) (both downloaded from 171 GENCODE), with -sjdbOverhang 149 and all other settings as default. Individual fastq files were 172 aligned using the --twopassMode Basic flag, with the following parameters specified (following 173 ENCODE standard options): --outSAMmapqUnique 60, outFilterType BySJout, 174 outFilterMultimapNmax 20, --alignSJoverhangMin 8, --outFilterMismatchNmax 999, ---175 outFilterMismatchNoverReadLmax 0.04, --alignIntronMin 20, --alignIntronMax 1000000, -alignMatesGapMax 1000000 and all other options as default. For rMATs (35) (v4.1.0) analysis, STAR 176 177 was run again as before, but with the addition of --alignEndsType EndToEnd. Samtools (36) (v1.8) was 178 used to sort and index the aligned data.

179

180 Comparisons of baseline clinical characteristics

181 Baseline clinical characteristics of the patient groups were assessed using R (37) (v4.0.2) and RStudio 182 (38) (v1.3.959) for comparisons between COVID-19 versus influenza, and COVID-19 survivors versus 183 non-survivors. Extreme outliers (values < Q1 - 3 interquartile range, or > Q3 + 3 interquartile range) 184 were identified with the R package rstatix (39) (v0.7.0) and removed. Statistical testing was performed including a Shapiro-Wilk test to assess for data normality followed with either an unpaired parametric 185 186 T-test (Shapiro-Wilk test p-value > 0.05) or an unpaired non-parametric Wilcoxon test (Shapiro-Wilk 187 test p-value < 0.05) for continuous data, or a Chi-square test for categorical data. The R package Table1 188 (40) (v1.3) was used to plot the baseline clinical characteristics.

190 Systems immunology-based analysis of blood transcript modules

Blood transcript module (BTM) analysis was performed with molecular signatures derived from 5 vaccine trials (41) as a reference dataset, and BTM activity was calculated using the BTM package (41) (v1.015) in Python (42) (v3.7.2) using the normalized counts as input. Module enrichment significance was calculated using CAMERA (43) (v3.46.0). The significance threshold for the linear model was set at false discovery rate (FDR) 0.05 for the comparison between patients with COVID-19 or influenza.

196

197 Unbiased gene clustering analysis

Gene co-expression analysis was performed with BioLayout (44) (v3.4) using a correlation value of 0.95, other settings were kept at default. Clusters were manually assessed to determine gene expression differences depending on for example patient cohort. Genes were subsequently analysed with ToppGene (45) gene list enrichment analysis using the default settings.

202

203 Differential gene expression analysis between patient groups

204 HTSeq (46) (v0.11.2) count was used to assign counts to RNA-seq reads in the Samtools sorted BAM 205 file using GENCODE v34 annotation. Parameters used for HTSeq were --format=bam, --order=pos, --206 stranded=reverse, --type=exon and the other options were kept at default. EdgeR (47) (v3.30.3) was 207 used for differential gene expression analysis with R (v4.0.2) in RStudio (v1.3.959). Genes with low 208 counts across all libraries were filtered out using the filterByExpr command. Filtered gene counts were 209 normalised using the trimmed mean of M-values (TMM) method. Differentially expressed genes were 210 identified, after fitting the negative binomial models and obtaining dispersion estimates, using the 211 exact test and using a threshold criteria of FDR p-value < 0.05 and log2 fold change < -1 and > 1. Genes 212 which were within the threshold criteria were used for ToppGene gene list enrichment analysis. A

principal component analysis (PCA) graph was constructed based on all differentially expressed genes
to assess sample clustering.

215

Assessment of difference in adaptive immune response related gene expression

217 A higher abundance of transcripts from 83 immunoglobulin genes, overlapping with the genes in the 218 Gene Ontology (GO) (48,49) biological process term 'adaptive immune response' (Additional file 1), 219 was found in patients with COVID-19 compared to influenza. To assess gene transcript abundance differences for these 83 genes in each patient a heatmap was generated and Z-scores were summed 220 221 to give an overall positive (high) or negative (low) total Z-score. Patient baseline clinical characteristics 222 were explored, as above, for any explanatory factors for the involvement of a high or low total Z-score 223 between patients with COVID-19 or influenza, and those that survived COVID-19 versus those that 224 died within 30 days of hospital admission. Metadata comparison plots were made with the R package 225 ggplot2 (50) (3.3.2) and statistical testing with the R package ggpubr (51) (v0.4.0).

226

227 Topological mapping of global gene patterns

228 TopMD Pathway Analysis (52) was conducted using the differential transcript abundances identified 229 by differential gene expression analysis, generating a map of the differentially activated pathways 230 between all patients with COVID-19 or influenza. The TopMD pathway algorithm measures the 231 geometrical and topological properties of global differential gene expression embedded on a gene 232 interaction network (53). This enables plotting and measurement of the differentially activated 233 pathways through extrapolation of groups of mechanistically related genes, called TopMD pathways. 234 TopMD pathways possess a natural hierarchical structure and can be analysed for enriched GO terms, 235 by chi-square test.

237 Assessment of differential splicing between patient groups

238 Three different tools were used to assess differential gene splicing between patients with COVID-19 239 or influenza, and COVID-19 survivors or non-survivors after 30 days of hospital admission. rMATs (35) 240 (v4.1.0) was run using BAM files with soft clipping suppressed, generated with STAR and GENCODE 241 v34 gene annotation. Additional settings used were -t paired, --readLength 150 and --libType fr-242 firststrand. Results were filtered for FDR p-value < 0.05. LeafCutter (54) (v0.2.9) was run in stages 243 following the Differential Splicing protocol (55) (bam2junc.sh generated junction files from BAMs, 244 leafcutter cluster.py grouped junctions into clusters, leafcutter ds.R tested for differential splicing, 245 all with default settings, except -min_samples_per_intron was set to be approximately 60% of the 246 smaller group size for each comparison (46 for COVID-19 vs influenza, 9 for COVID-19 survivors vs non-247 survivors), and results were filtered to exclude events with delta PSI <10%, based on recommendations (56). The LeafViz script (57), prepare results.R was used to generate a data table 248 249 from which gene names for significant events were extracted, while the map clusters to genes R 250 function was used to assign genes to non-significant tested events. Overlap between LeafCutter 251 differentially spliced and EdgeR differentially expressed genes was tested for significance using 252 Fisher's Exact Test (fisher.test in R (v3.5.1) using a 2x2 contingency table and two.sided alternative 253 hypothesis). MAJIQ (58) (v2.2) was run in two stages (majiq build and majiq deltapsi) with default 254 settings, and results were filtered (delta PSI >20%, probability >0.95) using Voila (58) (v2.0).

255

256 In silico immune profiling predicting immune cell levels between patient groups

Relative abundance of 22 immune cell types and their statistical significance was deconvoluted from whole blood using the reference gene signature matrix (LM22) using CIBERSORTx (59). CIBERSORTx analysis was conducted on the CIBERSORTx website (60) using 100 permutations. Immune cell distribution between the groups were compared by Mann–Whitney test.

262 Identification of immune signatures as a predictor for COVID-19 outcome

263 Transcript to transcript gene co-expression network analysis with BioLayout 3D (v3.4) (Pearson 264 coefficient 0.85, MCL=1.7) assembled 537 genes differentially expressed (EdgeR, FDR < 0.5 and |log2 265 fold change > 1) in blood taken on admission between patients with COVID-19 who either survived 266 or died of COVID-19 within 30 days of admission to hospital. Combinations of 100 genes from the top 267 4 clusters were assessed as predictor variables for outcome using Boosted Logistic Regression, 268 Bayesian Generalised Linear and RandomForest models within SIMON (61) (v0.2.1) installed with 269 Docker (62) (v20.10.2). TMM normalised gene expression data was centred and scaled. Covariant 270 features were removed based on correlation analysis. Samples were randomly split into train:test 271 subsets at the ratio 75%:25%.

272

273 **Results**

274 Number of participants

275 In total RNA-seq was done for 80 patients with COVID-19 and 88 patients with influenza. Five patients 276 with influenza failed QC (read count < 20M) leaving 83 patients with influenza for analysis, of which 277 76% were infected with the influenza A virus and 22% with influenza B virus. Two patients with COVID-278 19 were identified by PCA as outliers, subsequent assessment revealed an elevated white blood cell 279 and lymphocyte count caused by pre-existing underlying chronic lymphocytic leukaemia, and these 280 patients were excluded from further analyses (Supplementary figure 1). This left 78 patients with 281 COVID-19, of whom 62 survived and 16 died within 30 days of hospital admission, and 83 patients with influenza. 282

284 Clinical differences

285 The baseline clinical characteristics of the patients used in this study for the comparison between influenza and COVID-19 were assessed and no differences in distribution of sex or age were detected 286 287 between patient groups, however, more patients with influenza were of White British ethnicity (pvalue 1.12x10⁻⁰⁵) and more were current smokers (p-value 9.07x10⁻⁰⁵). There were also differences in 288 289 the proportion of cases with underlying comorbidities, with patients with COVID-19 more commonly 290 having hypertension (p-value 1.42x10⁻⁰²), liver disease (p-value 3.63x10⁻⁰²) and diabetes mellitus (pvalue 6.44x10⁻⁰³) than those with influenza. However, underlying respiratory disease was more 291 common in patients with influenza (p-value 1.22x10⁻⁰³). Patients with COVID-19 generally exhibited 292 293 more severe clinical symptoms. While the National Early Warning Score 2 (NEWS2) was not different 294 between patients with COVID-19 or influenza, patients with COVID-19 had a higher respiratory rate 295 (p-value 2.79x10⁻⁰²) and a greater proportion of patients with COVID-19 were on supplementary oxygen at hospital admission (p-value 6.81x10⁻⁰³). Laboratory results indicated higher levels of C-296 297 reactive protein (p-value 1.73x10⁻⁰³) and lymphocytes (p-value 2.76x10⁻⁰²) in patients with COVID-19. 298 Furthermore, COVID-19 patients had a longer duration of symptoms prior to presentation to hospital (p-value 1.17x10⁻⁰⁵) and once admitted a longer length of stay (p-value 5.51x10⁻¹⁰). Longer stay time 299 300 was associated with increased 30 day mortality after hospital admission and patients with COVID-19 301 were more likely to have died compared to patients with influenza (p-value 4.42x10⁻⁰⁵) (**Table 1**).

302

Between patients with COVID-19 who survived and those who died, a fatal outcome occurred in older patients (p-value 2.58x10⁻⁰⁹). COVID-19 non-survivors also had a shorter duration of symptoms before being admitted to hospital (p-value 5.38x10⁻⁰³). COVID-19 non-survivors more commonly had underlying comorbidities including hypertension (p-value 1.93x10⁻⁰³), cardiovascular disease (p-value 3.97x10⁰³), diabetes mellitus (p-value 2.31x10⁻⁰²) and underlying respiratory disease (p-value 1.06x10⁻⁰²). While the NEWS2 scores were not different, COVID-19 survivors had a higher heart rates than

309	COVID-19 non-survivors (p-value 9.27x10 ⁻⁰³). Laboratory results showed an increase of white blood
310	cell count (p-value 3.83x10 ⁻⁰²), total protein levels (p-value 2.5x10 ⁻⁰³), creatinine (p-value 3.87x10 ⁻⁰²),
311	alanine aminotransferase levels (p-value 2.85x10 ⁻⁰²), troponin levels (p-value 2.37x10 ⁻⁰⁴), tumour
312	necrosis factor α (TNF α) (p-value 1.43x10 ⁻⁰²), interleukin (IL)-6 levels (p-value 2.78x10 ⁻⁰³), IL-8 (p-value
313	2.24x10 ⁻⁰²), IL-1 β (p-value 3.78x10 ⁻⁰²) and IL-10 (p-value 7.51x10 ⁻⁰²) in COVID-19 non-survivors. Patient
314	outcome and length of hospital stay were different due to separation based on patient survival (Table
315	2).

316

318

317 Table 1: Baseline clinical characteristics and outcomes of hospitalised patients with COVID-19 or influenza.

Baseline demographic data				Comorbidity (cont.)			
	COVID-19 (N=78)	Influenza (N=83)	P-value		COVID-19 (N=78)	Influenza (N=83)	P-value
Sex				Other respiratory disease			
Female	26 (33.3%)	36 (43.4%)	0.252	Yes	21 (26.9%)	44 (53.0%)	0.00122
Male	52 (66.7%)	47 (56.6%)		Unknown	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	
Age (years)							
Mean (SD)	60.9 (18.0)	57.8 (18.4)	0.367	clinitation and the second			
Ethnic category (Code 2001)				Clinical observations	0.01/10.40		
White - British	47 (60.3%)	79 (95.2%)	1.12e-05		COVID-19 (N=78)	Influenza (N=83)	P-value
Asian - Indian	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)		Heart rate (BPM)	(11.10)	(
Black - African	6 (7.7%)	0 (0%)		Moon (SD)	973 (171)	101 (23.0)	0.30
Black - Caribbean	2 (2.6%)	0 (0%)		Systelia blood prossure (mmHg)	57.5 (17.1)	101 (25.0)	0.55
Other White background	6 (7.7%)	3 (3.6%)		Systolic blood pressure (mining)	122 (10.0)	122 (22.0)	0.000
Other Asian background	13 (16 7%)	0 (0%)		Dessingtons anto (ham)	155 (19.9)	132 (23.0)	0.995
Mixed	0 (0%)	1 (1 2%)		Respiratory rate (opm)	20.0 (7.72)	22.0 (5.00)	0.0070
Not stated	1 (1 3%)	0 (0%)		Mean (SD)	26.6 (1.13)	23.8 (5.96)	0.0279
Current emoking status	1 (1.3%)	0 (0 %)		Temperature (Celsius)		07.7 (4.40)	
Current smoking status	4 (5 40()	24 (25 20()	0.07- 05	Mean (SD)	37.4 (1.01)	37.7 (1.13)	0.0822
res	4 (5.1%)	21 (25.3%)	9.07e-05	Oxygen saturation (%)	04.0 (0.75)	04.0 (0.44)	0.540
No	67 (85.9%)	62 (74.7%)		Mean (SD) Supplementary Q2 in (%)	94.3 (3.75)	94.8 (3.41)	0.548
Unknown	7 (9.0%)	0 (0%)		Supplementary Oz, II (%)	27 (47 40/)	21 (25 20/)	0.00691
Symptom duration (days)				Tes No.	37 (47.476)	21 (25.5%)	0.00001
Median [Min, Max]	7.00 [0, 21.0]	4.00 [1.00, 10.0]	1.17e-05	NO NEWS2	41 (52.6%)	61 (73.5%)	
Comorbidity				Moon (SD)	E 20 (2 70)	4 70 (2 57)	0 171
	COVID-19 (N=78)	Influenza (N=83)	P-value	(SD)	5.20 (2.70)	4.13 (2.31)	0.171
Hypertension		· · ·		Laboratory results			
Yes	29 (37.2%)	20 (24.1%)	0.0142		COVID-19	Influenza	
Unknown	4 (5.1%)	0 (0%)			(N=78)	(N=83)	P-value
Cardiovascular disease				White blood cell count			
Yes	16 (20.5%)	14 (16.9%)	0.152	Mean (SD)	8.73 (4.29)	8.64 (3.89)	0.913
Unknown	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)		Neutrophil cell count			
Renal disease				Mean (SD)	7.06 (4.07)	6 93 (3 67)	0.895
Yes	6 (7.7%)	4 (4.8%)	0.141	l ymphocyte cell count	1.00 (4.07)	0.00 (0.07)	0.000
Unknown	3 (3 8%)	0 (0%)		Mean (SD)	1 01 (0 411)	0 908 (0 541)	0.0276
Liver disease		• (• ••)		C reactive protein	1.01 (0.411)	0.000 (0.041)	0.0210
Vae	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	0.0363	Moon (SD)	121 (110)	90.2 (79.0)	0.00173
Linknown	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	0.0000	Mean (OD)	131 (110)	00.2 (10.3)	0.00175
Diabetes mellitus	0 (0.070)	0 (070)					
Voe	19 (24 4%)	8 (0.6%)	0.00644				
165	13 (24.470)	0 (3.0 %)	0.00044	Outcomes			
Unknown	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)			COVID-19	Influenza	P-value
Active malignancy					(N=78)	(N=83)	
Yes	6 (7.7%)	6 (7.2%)	0.193	Length of stay (days)			
Unknown	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)		Mean (SD)	10.5 (9.51)	3.39 (2.92)	5.51e-10
Immunosuppressed				Died within 30 days after admission			
Yes	4 (5.1%)	5 (6.0%)	0.111	Yes	16 (20.5%)	0 (0%)	4.42e-05
Unknown	4 (5.1%)	0 (0%)		No	62 (79.5%)	83 (100%)	

319 Comparisons are given between patients with COVID-19 or influenza for baseline demographic data, patient outcome, clinical 320 observations, laboratory results and known patient comorbidity. Laboratory results were done on peripheral blood taken on 321 admission to hospital. Similarly, clinical observations were recorded on hospital admission. Statistical testing was done with

322 a Shapiro-Wilk test for data normality followed with either an unpaired parametric T-test or an unpaired non-parametric

323 Wilcoxon test for continuous data, or a Chi-square test for categorical data.

324

325 Table 2: Baseline clinical characteristics and outcomes of hospitalised COVID-19 patients: survivors versus non-survivors.

Baseline demographic data				Laboratory results			
	Non-survivor (N=16)	Survivor (N=62)	P-value	-	Non-survivor (N=16)	Survivor (N=62)	P-value
Sex, n (%)				Haemoglobin count (g/L)			
Female	7 (43.8%)	19 (30.6%)	0.488	Mean (SD)	128 (21.3)	138 (20.7)	0.144
Male	9 (56.2%)	43 (69.4%)		White blood cell count (10*9/L)			
Age (years)				Mean (SD)	10.4 (4.27)	8.31 (4.23)	0.0383
Mean (SD)	81.6 (10.4)	55.6 (15.6)	2.58e-09	Platelet count (10*9/L)			
Ethnic category (Code 2001), n (%)				Mean (SD)	231 (83.9)	249 (90.0)	0.38
White - British	14 (87.5%)	33 (53.2%)	0.203	Neutrophil cell count (10*9/L)			
Asian - Indian	1 (6.2%)	2 (3.2%)		Mean (SD)	8.73 (4.15)	6.66 (3.98)	0.063
Black - African	1 (6.2%)	5 (8.1%)		Lymphocyte cell count (10*9/L)			
Black - Caribbean	0 (0%)	2 (3.2%)		Mean (SD)	0.900 (0.419)	1.04 (0.409)	0.142
Other White background	0 (0%)	0 (9.7%) 13 (21.0%)		Sodium level (mmol/L)	122 (7.04)	120 (2.00)	0.0070
Not stated	0 (0%)	1 (1 6%)		Potassium level (mmol/L)	155 (7.01)	136 (3.90)	0.0070
Current smoking status n (%)	0 (070)	1 (1.070)		Mean (SD)	4 15 (0 971)	4 02 (0 473)	0.824
Yes	0 (0%)	4 (6.5%)	0 0291	Urea levels (mmol/L)	4.10 (0.011)	4.02 (0.470)	0.024
No	12 (75.0%)	55 (88.7%)	0.0201	Mean (SD)	11.6 (5.98)	6.61 (3.32)	0.0025
Unknown	4 (25.0%)	3 (4.8%)		Creatinine level (µmol/L)			
Symptom duration (days)				Mean (SD)	128 (66.7)	83.4 (25.2)	0.0387
Median [Min, Max]	2.00 [0, 14.0]	7.00 [0, 21.0]	0.00538	Albumin level (g/L)			
Comorbidity				Mean (SD)	33.9 (4.66)	32.8 (4.78)	0.443
comorbiardy	Non-survivor	Survivor		 Bilirubin level (µmol/L) 	10.0 (0.00)	41.4 (1.20)	0.005
	(N=16)	(N=62)	P-value	Mean (SD)	12.0 (6.06)	11.1 (4.26)	0.965
Hypertension, n (%)				Moan (SD)	37.0 (37.3)	54 1 (43 4)	0.0285
Yes	12 (75.0%)	17 (27.4%)	0.00193	Alkaline phosphatase level (units/L)	51.0 (51.5)	54.1 (45.4)	0.0205
Unknown	0 (0%)	4 (6.5%)		Mean (SD)	93.2 (46.0)	95.2 (48.1)	0 922
Cardiovascular disease, n (%)				Total protein level (g/L)	55.2 (40.0)	55.2 (40.1)	0.522
Yes	8 (50.0%)	8 (12.9%)	0.00397	Mean (SD)	72.7 (9.98)	69.9 (6.26)	0.367
Unknown	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)		Lactate dehydrogenase level (units/L)			
Renal disease, n (%)				Mean (SD)	841 (357)	914 (486)	0.864
Yes	3 (18.8%)	3 (4.8%)	0.129	Ferritin level (mmol/L)		× /	
	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)		Mean (SD)	1420 (2020)	974 (794)	0.841
Liver disease, n (%)	0 (0%)	2 (4 99/)	0 422	Troponin level (ng/L)			
linknown	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	0.432	Mean (SD)	164 (194)	9.55 (6.67)	0.000237
Diabetes mellitus n (%)	0 (070)	5 (4.070)		C-reactive protein (mg/L)			
Yes	8 (50.0%)	11 (17 7%)	0.0231	Mean (SD)	172 (165)	121 (90.7)	0.662
Unknown	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)	0.0201	IL-1B level (pg/ml)			
Active malignancy, n (%)				Mean (SD)	0.620 (0.474)	0.378 (0.200)	0.0378
Yes	3 (18.8%)	3 (4.8%)	0.129	IL-6 level (pg/ml)			
Unknown	0 (0%)	3 (4.8%)		Mean (SD)	174 (142)	59.9 (47.8)	0.00278
Immunosuppressed, n (%)				IL-8 level (pg/ml)			
Yes	1 (6.2%)	3 (4.8%)	0.946	Mean (SD)	58.6 (29.0)	41.2 (26.5)	0.0224
Unknown	1 (6.2%)	3 (4.8%)		IL-10 level (pg/ml)			
Other respiratory disease, n (%)	0.000.000	10 (10 10)		Mean (SD)	39.5 (36.7)	15.7 (9.35)	0.00181
Yes	9 (56.2%)	12 (19.4%)	0.0106	IL-33 level (pg/ml)			
Clinical oboxcompations	0 (0%)	3 (4.0%)		Mean (SD)	0.543 (0.387)	0.340 (0.277)	0.0751
Clinical operservations	Neg engines	Europhian		_ TNFa level (pg/ml)			
	(N=16)	(N=62)	P-value	Mean (SD)	30.1 (15.6)	19.3 (6.87)	0.0143
Heart rate (beats-per-minute)				- GM-CSF level (pg/ml)			
Mean (SD)	87.6 (15.1)	99.9 (16.8)	0.00927	Mean (SD)	2.08 (2.61)	1.48 (0.972)	0.753
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)				IFNg level (pg/ml)			
Mean (SD)	132 (29.8)	133 (16.8)	0.853	Mean (SD)	35.3 (71.7)	26.6 (55.5)	0.313
Respiratory rate (breaths-per-minute)							
Mean (SD)	27.8 (7.57)	26.3 (7.80)	0.337	Outcomes			
Temperature (Celsius)					Non-survivor	Survivor	P-value
Mean (SD)	37.3 (1.14)	37.4 (0.978)	0.804		(N=16)	(N=6Z)	
Oxygen saturation (%)				Length of stay (days)			
Mean (SD)	93.4 (6.12)	94.6 (2.83)	0.643	Mean (SD)	4.93 (2.34)	11.9 (10.1)	0.00529
Supplementary O2, n (%)	0.(50.00()	20 (40 001)		Median [Min, Max]	5.00 [1.00, 8.00]	9.00 [0, 44.0]	
Yes	8 (50.0%)	29 (46.8%)	1	Missing	1 (6.2%)	3 (4.8%)	
Notional Early Warning Score 2	ō (5U.U%)	33 (53.2%)		Vee Vee	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	<20.10
Mean (SD)	5 40 (2 44)	5 25 (2.89)	0.906	No	0 (0%)	0 (0%) 62 (100%)	×2e-10
wear (SD)	5.40 (Z.44)	5.25 (2.00)	0.900	NU	0 (076)	02 (100%)	

327 Comparisons are given between COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors for baseline demographic data, patient outcome, 328 clinical observations, laboratory results and known patient comorbidity. Laboratory results were done on peripheral blood 329 taken on admission to hospital. Similarly, clinical observations were recorded on hospital admission. Statistical testing was

done with a Shapiro-Wilk test for data normality followed with either an unpaired parametric T-test or an unpaired non-

331 parametric Wilcoxon test for continuous data, or a Chi-square test for categorical data.

332

326

333 Molecular differences

334 RNA-seq was used to investigate potential blood transcriptomic signatures of immune activation

between patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 versus influenza, and COVID-19 survivors versus those

336 that died. A median of 60.4 million reads in patients with COVID-19, and 58.9 million reads in patients 337 with influenza was obtained (Supplementary figure 2A). In patients who died of COVID-19 a median 338 of 55.7 million reads was obtained and for COVID-19 survivors the median was 62.6 million reads 339 (Supplementary figure 2B). Clustering analysis between patients with COVID-19 or influenza indicated 340 a homogeneity of blood transcriptome profiles suggesting any variation between groups to be subtle 341 (Supplementary figure 3A). A partial separation was found between patients who survived or died of 342 COVID-19 based on patient outcome after 30 days of hospital admission, indicative of a larger variation 343 in the blood transcriptome (Supplementary figure 3B).

344

345 Contrasting innate and adaptive immune programmes

346 Previous studies have suggested that severe COVID-19 is associated with aberrant immune pathology 347 (63,64), and therefore BTM analysis and gene co-expression analysis were used to investigate the 348 balance between the innate and adaptive response in patients with either COVID-19 or influenza virus 349 and to identify patterns of changes associated with each arm of the immune system. A systems 350 immunology-based analysis of BTMs between patients with COVID-19 or influenza revealed several 351 differences (Figure 1). For the upregulated BTMs in COVID-19, signatures were observed related to 352 the cell cycle and adaptive immune response, primarily CD4+ T cells, B cells, plasma cells and 353 immunoglobulins. In contrast, the downregulated BTMs showed signatures associated with 354 monocytes, inflammatory signalling and an innate antiviral and type I IFN response.



Figure 1: Blood transcript module (BTM) analysis between patients with COVID-19 or influenza. Upregulated signatures in
 COVID-19 patients are associated with cell cycle and an adaptive immune response, primarily CD4+ T cells, B cells, plasma
 cells and immunoglobulins. While the downregulated signatures, associated with influenza patients, are involved with
 monocytes, inflammatory signalling and an innate antiviral and type I interferon response.

361



abundances in blood of patients with influenza or COVID-19 (Figure 2) and the top 12 clusters are

shown in **Table 3**.

368



369

Figure 2: Top 12 clusters identified with BioLayout. A) Enrichment of gene clusters in blood of patients with influenza (annotated in red) and COVID-19 (annotated in blue). Increased abundances of gene transcripts in influenza patients are involved with an innate immune response, while in COVID-19 clusters are involved with an adaptive immune response, blood coagulation and neutrophil degranulation. B) After TMM normalisation a significant difference in gene clusters between patients with influenza or COVID-19 was detected. The abundance of gene transcripts involved with an innate immune response and plasmacytoid dendritic cell were observed to be higher in influenza patients. In contrast, the abundance of gene transcripts involved with an adaptive immune response and neutrophil degranulation was higher in COVID-19 patients.

377

378

379

380

382

383

Table 3: Summary of the top 12 BioLayout clusters.

Cluster	No. of	Cell type	Top biological process	Disease
	genes	(FDR p-value)	(FDR p-value) (FDR p-value)	
1	362 Myeloid Cell activation		Cell activation	Influenza
		(1.20x10 ⁻²⁴)	(5.16x10 ⁻¹³)	
2	264	Plasmacytoid dendritic cell	Defence response to virus	Influenza
		(4.17x10 ⁻²²)	(1.34x10 ⁻³⁷)	
3	166	Erythroblast	Erythrocyte differentiation	Influenza
		(5.31x10 ⁻²⁰)	(1.70x10 ⁻⁰⁵)	
4	140	Progenitor B cell / T cell	Mitotic cell cycle	COVID-19
		(1.28x10 ⁻¹³¹)	(3.97x10 ⁻⁵⁷)	
5	100	Progenitor pluripotent cells	Translation	COVID-19
		(1.38x10 ⁻⁰²)	(8.48x10 ⁻⁰⁴)	
6	96	Megakaryocytes / platelets	Blood coagulation	COVID-19
		(3.30x10 ⁻⁹²)	(2.84x10 ⁻¹²)	
7	64	Plasma cells	Response to stress	COVID-19
		(1.27x10 ⁻²⁸)	(6.41x10 ⁻⁰⁹)	
8	29	Myeloid cells	Myeloid leukocyte activation	Influenza
		(2.57x10 ⁻⁰³)	(4.15x10 ⁻⁰⁴)	
9	20	Neutrophils	Neutrophil degranulation	COVID-19
		(1.11x10 ⁻⁰³)	(4.43x10 ⁻¹⁹)	
10	18	Antigen presenting cells	Th1 stimulation	Influenza
		(2.21x10 ⁻⁰³)	(4.53x10 ⁻⁰³)	
11	16	Dendritic cells	Cell morphogenesis	Influenza
		(4.32x10 ⁻⁰⁴)	(1.37x10 ⁻⁰²)	
12	14	Not specified	Histone modification	Influenza
			(3.55x10 ⁻⁰²)	

384 Gene clusters were identified with BioLayout (r=0.85, MCL = 1.7). For each cluster the number of genes, predicted cell type 385 and top biological process are given and whether that cluster was enriched in patients with COVID-19 or influenza.

386

387 Interestingly, an increased abundance of gene transcripts in patients with COVID-19 are involved in adaptive immunity, pointing to activation/priming of T cells and B cells, including induction of 388 proliferation (cluster 4, FDR p-value 3.97x10⁻⁵⁷), Additionally, an increased abundance of gene 389 390 transcripts encoding neutrophil degranulation (cluster 9) and blood coagulation (cluster 6) clearly differentiated patients with COVID-19 from patients with influenza (FDR p-value 4.33x10⁻¹⁹ and FDR p-391 value 2.84x10⁻¹² respectively). In contrast, an decreased abundance of gene transcripts in the blood 392 393 transcriptome of patients with COVID-19 in comparison to patients with influenza were associated with innate immunity, including biological processes involved with defence response to virus (cluster 394 2) (FDR p-value 1.34x10⁻³⁷), type 1 helper T cell stimulation (cluster 10) (FDR p-value 4.53x10⁻⁰³), 395 dendritic cell morphogenesis (cluster 11) (FDR p-value 1.37x10⁻⁰²), and myeloid cell activation (clusters 396

1 and 8) (FDR p-value 5.16x10⁻¹³ and FDR p-value 4.15x10⁻⁰⁴ respectively). Importantly, the largest decrease of transcript abundances in patients with COVID-19 comprised genes expressed in plasmacytoid dendritic cells (pDC) (FDR p-value 4.17x10⁻²²), indicating impaired immune responses to viruses (FDR p-value 1.34x10⁻³⁷) and impaired IFN signalling (FDR p-value 5.56x10⁻³⁰). This was suggestive of contrasting innate and adaptive immune programmes between the different infections and these were further investigated.

403

404 High abundance of immunoglobulin genes associated COVID-19

405 A total of 20,542 abundance measures of gene transcripts were obtained after filtering out transcripts 406 with low counts, of which 4,094 transcripts were found to be significantly different between patients with COVID-19 or influenza (FDR p-value < 0.05) of which, 197 transcripts exceeded a log2 fold change 407 408 of < -1 or >1, with 126 transcripts showing higher abundance in patients with COVID-19 and 71 409 transcripts showing higher abundance in patients with influenza (Figure 3A and Additional file 2). 410 Complimentary to the findings from gene co-expression analysis, the transcripts with increased 411 abundance in patients with COVID-19 were found to be involved with humoral immune response, 412 complement activation and B cell mediated immunity (Figure 3B).



413

Figure 3: Increased adaptive immune response in patients with COVID-19 compared to influenza. A) Volcano plot of transcripts falling within the threshold values (FDR < 0.05 and log2 fold change < -1 or >1) which were used for enrichment analysis with ToppGene. B) Enrichment analysis of the transcripts with an increased abundance in patients with COVID-19 identified an increased adaptive immune response. Percentage in annotation is the ratio of the input query genes overlapping with the genes in the pathway database. C) Heatmap of 83 immunoglobulin gene transcripts, which overlap with the GO biological process term 'adaptive immune response', found at a higher abundance in patients with COVID-19. Positive Zscores are seen mostly in patients with COVID-19 while negative Z-scores are mostly seen in patients with influenza.

421

422 83 immunoglobulin genes, associated with the GO biological process term 'adaptive immune
423 response', were found to have higher transcript abundance in the majority of patients with COVID-19

than those with influenza (p-value < 2.22x10⁻¹⁶, Wilcoxon test) (Figure 3C and Supplementary figure 4) and by using a total Z-score, patients with COVID-19 or influenza were classified as having either a high or low abundance of these 83 immunoglobulin genes. A high abundance was associated with a total positive Z-score (1.46 to 175.46) which was identified in 59 patients with COVID-19 and 21 patients with influenza indicating a higher than average abundance of these 83 adaptive immune response related immunoglobulin genes. While a low abundance was associated with a total negative Z-score (-0.12 to -154.93) identified in 19 patients with COVID-19 and 62 patients with influenza indicating a lower than average abundance of adaptive immune response related immunoglobulin genes. COVID-19 patients with lower abundance of adaptive immune response related immunoglobulin genes, a total negative Z-score, were found to be significantly older (p-value 6.32x10⁻ ³, T-test) and had a shorter duration of symptoms before being admitted into hospital (p-value 5.9x10⁻ ⁰⁴, Wilcoxon test). Additionally, COVID-19 patients with high abundance of adaptive immune response related immunoglobulin genes, a total positive Z-score, were significantly more likely to be still alive 30 days after admitted into hospital (x^2 13.39 and p-value 2.52x10⁻⁰⁴, Chi-square test) (Figure 4).



447

Figure 4: Comparison of 83 immunoglobulin gene abundances in patients with COVID-19 or influenza. Metadata of patients with COVID-19 or influenza with a low or high abundance of the 83 immunoglobulin genes related to GO biological process term 'adaptive immune response' were compared. Significant differences were detected based on age (patients with COVID-19, p-value 1.8x10⁻³, Wilcoxon-test) and duration of symptoms (patients with COVID-19, p-value 5.9x10⁻⁰⁴ and patients with influenza, 1.3x10⁻⁰³, Wilcoxon test), with older individuals and shorter symptom duration associated with the low immunoglobulin gene abundance group for COVID-19. Additionally, a low abundance of immunoglobulin genes was

453 *immunoglobulin gene abundance group for COVID-19. Additionally, a low abundance of* 454 *associated with decreased COVID-19 survival (x² 13.39 and p-value 2.52x10⁻⁰⁴, Chi-square test).*

456 Topological mapping of global gene patterns

457 Topological analysis allows the measurement of the global profiles of transcript abundances relative to gene pathways without data reduction and this was used to define a global map of differentially 458 459 activated pathways between COVID-19 and influenza. The first differentially activated TopMD 460 pathway was enriched for ribosomal and insulin related pathways, with peak gene UBA52: named by GO analysis as cytoplasmic ribosomal proteins (adjusted p-value 1.55x10⁻¹⁴⁶). This pathway was also 461 462 found to be enriched for genes expressed by transcription factor Myc (adjusted p-value 7.07x10⁻⁵³) against the ChEA 2016 transcription factor database and of dendritic cells in the ARCHS4 transcription 463 464 factors' co-expression database (adjusted p-value 1.34x10⁻³⁶). Activated Myc represses interferon 465 regulatory factor 7 (IRF7) and a significant lower abundance of IRF7 was found in patients with COVID-466 19 compared to influenza (Supplementary figure 5). The second differentially activated TopMD 467 pathway had peak gene NDUFAB1; named by GO analysis as mitochondrial complex I assembly model OXPHOS system WP4324 (adjusted p-value 2.81x10⁻⁶⁶). The third differentially activated TopMD 468 469 pathway was named by GO analysis as proteasome degradation WP183 (adjusted p-value, 1.46x10⁻ 470 ⁶⁴), with *PSMD14* as the peak gene (Figure 5 with full detail in Additional file 3 and the global map of 471 differentially activated pathways available online (65)).

472

473

474

475



478 Figure 5: Differentially activated pathways between hospitalised patients with COVID-19 or influenza identified with
 479 topological analysis. The difference (Log2 fold change) in patients with COVID-19 compared to patients with influenza is
 480 plotted for the top 20 genes of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd TopMD pathways.

481

482 Cell subsets supporting innate and adaptive immune response differences

483 Analysis of the blood transcriptome can be used to predict the immune cells present (64). Levels of different predicted cell types were assessed to determine whether there were differences in immune 484 485 system associated cells between patients with COVID-19 or influenza (Figure 6). Statistical testing was done on cell type levels identified with CIBERSORTx. M0 macrophages (p-value 3.63x10⁻⁰⁶), plasma 486 cells (p-value 5.05x10⁻⁰⁴), cytotoxic CD8+ T cells (p-value 4.58x10⁻⁰³), regulatory T cells (p-value 487 7.30x10⁻⁰³) and resting natural killer cell (p-value 8.90x10⁻⁰³) were found to be significantly higher in 488 COVID-19 patients, while in influenza patients activated dendritic cells (p-value 2.23x10⁻⁰²) were 489 490 significantly higher.



491

492 Figure 6: Increase of predicted cells associated with an innate and adaptive immune response in COVID-19 patients. M0 493 macrophages, plasma cells, cytotoxic CD8+ T cells, regulatory T cells and resting natural killer (NK) cells were found to be 494 significantly higher in COVID-19 patients. In influenza patients a significantly higher proportion of activated dendritic cells

495 was detected.

Predicted cell type levels between COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors indicated an increase of
neutrophils (p-value 2.84x10⁻⁰⁴) in patients who died of COVID-19. In contrast, an increase of naïve
CD4+ T cells (p-value 1.92x10⁻⁰³), M0 macrophages (p-value 1.20x10⁻⁰²), M2 macrophages (p-value
1.48x10⁻⁰²), naïve B cells (p-value 1.57x10⁻⁰²) and naïve cytotoxic CD8+ T cells (p-value 2.31x10⁻⁰²), were
identified in patients who went on to survive COVID-19 (Figure 7).

502



Figure 7: Differences in immune response indicated by predicted cell types in COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors. A) A
 statistically significant higher count of neutrophils in COVID-19 patients who died after 30 days indicating the presence of an
 elevated innate immune response. B) Adaptive immune response in COVID-19 survivors as can be seen by the statistically
 significant higher count of naïve B cells, and CD4+ and CD8+ T cells.

508

509 Efficient adaptive immune response associates with COVID-19 survival

510 As already noted, a high abundance of the GO biological process 'adaptive immune response' related

- 511 transcripts, mostly immunoglobulin genes, was associated with COVID-19 survival (Figure 4). Here a
- 512 direct assessment was done of the blood transcriptome differences between patients who, at 30 days

after hospital admission, survived or who died of COVID-19. A total of 23,850 abundance measures of
gene transcripts were obtained after filtering out transcripts with low counts, of which 6.645
transcripts were found to be significant (FDR p-value < 0.05) of which, 537 transcripts exceeded a log2
fold change of < -1 or > 1, with 265 transcripts showing higher abundance in patients who survived
COVID-19 and 272 transcripts showing a higher abundance in patients who died of COVID-19 (Figure
8A and Additional file 4).



Figure 8: Increased innate immune response in COVID-19 non-survivors and increased adaptive immune response in COVID-19 survivors. A) Volcano plot of transcripts falling within the threshold values (FDR < 0.05 and log fold change < -1 or >1) which were used for enrichment analysis with ToppGene. B) Enrichment analysis identified an increased innate immune response in patients who died of COVID-19 after 30 days of hospital admission. Percentage in annotation is the ratio of the input query genes overlapping with the genes in the pathway database. C) An enrichment of adaptive immune response related pathways was detected in patients with COVID-19 who were still alive 30 days after hospital admission. Percentage

in annotation is the ratio of the input query genes overlapping with the genes in the pathway database. D) Increase of T cell
 and B cell proliferation in COVID-19 survivors (paired non-parametric T-test).

528

In patients who died of COVID-19 an enrichment for biological processes involved with an inflammatory response including interleukin signalling and neutrophil activation and degranulation was detected (Figure 8B). While in COVID-19 survivors biological processes involved with the adaptive immune system including complement activation, B cell mediated immunity and a humoral immune response mediated by circulating immunoglobulins was found to be enriched (Figure 8C). Additionally, transcript abundances associated with T cell and B cell proliferation were significantly higher in COVID-19 survivors (p-value < 1.0x10⁻⁰⁴, paired non-parametric T-test) (Figure 8D).

536

537 Immune signatures as predictors of COVID-19 outcome

538 Distinct immune signature genes were selected and assessed for their prediction accuracy in 539 stratifying patients with COVID-19 for disease outcome, fatality or survival. A signature of 47 genes 540 was identified (Figure 9A), representative of the four biggest clusters of genes associated with either 541 patients with COVID-19 who survived or died. The associated GO biological process terms were 542 'humoral immune response mediated by circulating immunoglobulin' (FDR p-value 2.23x10⁻⁴⁶), 'nucleosome assembly' (FDR p-value 5.46x10⁻¹⁹), 'regulation of T-helper 1 cell cytokine production' 543 (FDR p-value 4.24x10⁻⁰³) and 'regulation of T cell activation' (FDR p-value 4.51x10⁻⁰⁴) (**Supplementary** 544 545 figure 6). This was highly predictive for outcome, with a maximum specificity of 75% and sensitivity of 546 93% (Figure 9B and Table 4).



548

549 Figure 9: Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves showing prediction accuracy COVID-19 survivors and non-550 survivors. A) Genes identified with EdgeR and gene co-expression analysis and used for subsequent modelling. B) ROC curves

551 according to the three models used (Boosted Logistic Regression (LogitBoost), Bayesian Generalised Linear (Bayesglm) and 552 RandomForest (rf)).

553

554 Table 4: Potential for stratifying patients with COVID-19 upon admission to hospital on likely disease outcome.

ModelName	Accuracy	TrainAUC	PredictAUC	Sensitivity	Specificity
rf	0.7368	0.96	0.9	0	0.9333
LogitBoost	0.8421	0.9381	0.875	0.75	0.8667
Bayesglm	0.8421	0.895	0.7333	0.25	1

555 In total three different models were used (RandomForest (rf), Boosted Logistic Regression (LogitBoost) and Bayesian 556 Generalised Linear (Bayesglm)). The 47 genes identified with gene co-expression and differential gene expression analysis

557 were used as input. The highest sensitivity obtained was 75% and for specificity 93%.

558

559

560

561

563 Discussion

564 As previously reported transcriptomic analysis of blood samples provide a relatively non-invasive window on the immune response, as previously shown by differentiating patients with Ebola virus 565 566 disease at the acute stage (66). In this study we explored the functional blood transcriptomic 567 differences, focussing mainly on the immune response, between patients with COVID-19, admitted to 568 hospital during the first wave of the pandemic, and patients with a well-characterised stereotypical 569 seasonal respiratory virus infection, influenza. Furthermore, we compared the blood transcriptomes 570 of COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors for promising prognostic signatures indicative of COVID-19 571 survival.

572

573 35 variables that can provide prognostic information on COVID-19 associated mortality and 14 574 variables that can provide prognostic information on COVID-19 severity have previously been reported 575 (67). We compared these known COVID-19 prognostic variables (67) between patients with COVID-19 576 or influenza and found more active smokers among influenza patients. High C-reactive protein (CRP), 577 which previously has been reported to be similar upon admission to hospital between patients with 578 COVID-19 or influenza (3), hypertension and diabetes were more common among patients with 579 COVID-19. We also found an increase of liver disease, which has been classified as a low or very low 580 certainty predictor (67), in patients with COVID-19. In our cohort more patients with influenza had an 581 underlying respiratory disease. Similar to what has been previously reported (3) upon admission to 582 hospital both patients with COVID-19 or influenza presented with similar WBC and neutrophil counts, 583 and although we detected a difference in lymphocytes between patients with COVID-19 or influenza, 584 there was no difference the N/L ratio. Similar to Piroth et al. (4) we found that the average length of 585 stay was higher for patients with COVID-19 compared to influenza, and more patients with COVID-19 586 needed supplementary oxygen, and finally while Piroth et al. (4) report a roughly three times higher 587 relative risk of death for COVID-19, in our cohort no influenza patients died whilst admitted to hospital 588 and so this could not be assessed. In addition, we compared COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors, 589 and as reported the high certainty prognostic variables for mortality and/or severity of increased age, 590 hypertension, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, underlying respiratory disease (including COPD) and a 591 high WBC (67) were increased in non-survivors. While it has previously been reported that CRP and 592 N/L ratio were elevated in patients with COVID-19 who became critically ill (3), in our study we saw 593 no difference in CRP, neutrophil count and lymphocyte count between COVID-19 survivors and non-594 survivors. However, we found that urea, creatinine, alanine aminotransferase, troponin and several 595 cytokines, including IL-1 β , IL-6, IL-8, IL-10 and TNF α , to be higher in patients who died of COVID-19.

596

597 Our initial global analysis of blood transcriptomic differences between patients with COVID-19 or 598 influenza detected contrasting innate and adaptive immune programmes. An impaired immune 599 response to viruses and interferon signalling in patients with COVID-19 was found, as described 600 previously (6–9), compared to patients with influenza, which are known to produce an IFN response (3). Furthermore, in accordance with accumulating evidence of aberrant blood clotting in patients with 601 602 COVID-19 (68,69), transcripts expressed by megakaryocytes and platelets associated with blood 603 coagulation were in a higher abundance in COVID-19 patients. Gene clusters associated with an innate 604 immune response were found to be associated with influenza. While, in contrast, gene clusters 605 associated with an adaptive immune response and an increase of predicted plasma cells and CD8+ T 606 cells with COVID-19, pointing to T cell and B cell activation / priming.

607

Further analysis revealed various immunoglobulin genes had increased transcript abundance in patients with COVID-19 compared to patients with influenza. This significant over representation of a wide range of heavy chain and light chain V genes in patients with COVID-19 has been described before (70) and the implementation of antibody analysis in plasma samples has been used as an additional tool in diagnosing COVID-19 (71). We found that the 86.8% (53/61) of patients who survived COVID-19 had a higher than average transcript abundance of 83 immunoglobulin genes, which overlap with the GO biological term 'adaptive immune response', while this was 37.5% among the patients who died of COVID-19. Further analysis revealed that the aforementioned higher than average transcript abundance is associated with a younger age of the patient, a longer symptom duration before admittance into hospital and a positive survival outcome 30 days after hospital admission. A lower than average transcript abundance of 83 immunoglobulin genes was detected in 62.5% (10/16) of patients who died of COVID-19, compared to 14.8% (9/61) of patients who survived COVID-19.

620

621 We subsequently detected an increased transcript abundance from genes associated with T cell and 622 B cell proliferation, an enrichment for gene pathways involved with an adaptive immune response, 623 and an increase in predicted CD4+ and CD8+ T cells and naïve B cells in patients who survived COVID-624 19, highlighting the importance of an efficient adaptive immune response as previously reported (17). 625 The predicted cell fraction of naïve CD4+ T cell was found to be higher compared to CD8+ T cells 626 indicating a higher CD4+ T cell response to SARS-CoV-2 than a CD8+ T cell response, supporting 627 previous observations (17,72), which has been found to control primary SARS-CoV-2 infection (22). 628 We note that the CD8+ T cells were mostly seen in COVID-19 survivors, compared to COVID-19 non-629 survivors, which has been associated with a positive COVID-19 outcome (22,73).

630

631 In contrast, we detected in COVID-19 non-survivors an enrichment of pathways involved with the 632 negative regulation of lymphocyte activation and increased neutrophil activation and degranulation, 633 supported by a significant decrease in predicted cell fraction of naïve B cells and naïve CD4+ and CD8+ 634 T cells and an increase of the neutrophil cell fraction. This is consistent with previous studies finding elevated levels of neutrophils in blood (74) and lungs (75–78) in severe COVID-19. Furthermore, gene 635 636 pathways involved with an inflammatory response and cytokine signalling were enriched in COVID-19 637 non-survivors and we detected that a higher transcript abundance of several IL genes (IL1-RAP, IL-10, 638 *IL1-R1*, *IL1-R2*, *IL18-R1* and *IL18-RAP*) and laboratory results indicated a increase of TNF α , IL-1 β , IL-8, 639 and IL-33 with the largest increase for IL-6 and IL-10. This is consistent with the previously reported

positive regulation of genes encoding the activation of innate immune system, viral and IFN response
(3), and increase of proinflammatory macrophages (79) and elevated IL-6 and IL-10 in severe COVID19 cases (14–16).

643

644 When comparing the immune response between patients who either survived or died of COVID-19 it 645 appears that, as Sette and Crotty (24) summarised, that COVID-19 severity is largely due to an early 646 virus-driven evasion of innate immune recognition leading to a subsequent delayed adaptive immune 647 response with a fatal COVID-19 outcome, as shown by Lucas et al. (80), where the innate immune 648 response is ever-expanding due to an absence of a quick T cell response. A delayed adaptive immune 649 response to COVID-19 can occur in the elderly due to their reduced ability to mount a successful 650 adaptive immune response leading to an increased risk of death (22). This reduced ability to mount 651 an adaptive immune response in the elderly is due to a scarcity of naïve T cells caused by aging (18-652 20) and the association of age and severe or fatal COVID-19 is already known, for example, as of April 653 15th 2021 in the United States 95.4% of COVID-19 deaths have occurred in 50-year-olds and older, and 654 59.3% in 75-year-olds and older (81). Similarly, we found that patients who survived COVID-19 were 655 younger, had a higher predicted naïve CD4+ T cell and naïve B cell fraction, and had an increased heart 656 rate compared to non-survivors. Further research is needed to assess the causality of these factors, 657 for example the relationship between increased age and heart rate in non-survivors.

658

Topological analysis was performed to identify the global map of gene pathways differentially activated between COVID-19 and influenza. The first differentially activated pathway was enriched for genes related to ribosomal and insulin pathways indicating differences in effects on translational machinery and supporting the reported roles of insulin resistance linked to COVID-19 severity (82). Although highly speculative, insulin signalling differences may reflect the role of angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2), the binding site for SARS-CoV-2, which degrades angiotensin 2, protecting against oxidative stress and insulin resistance driven by the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone

666 system (83). Additionally, ACE2 expression has been found to be increased in rats given a high sucrose 667 diet or insulin sensitisers (84). Furthermore, the first pathway was also found to be enriched for genes 668 transcribed by Myc. Activated Myc represses IRF7 which regulates type I IFN production (85), and 669 correspondingly we found a significant lower *IRF7* expression and a lower induction of IFN in patients 670 with COVID-19 compared to influenza. This low IFN induction in COVID-19 may be due to the virus 671 avoiding or delaying an intracellular innate immune response to type I and type III IFNs (6–9). The 672 second most differentially activated pathway, peak gene NDUFAB1, involved with the mitochondrial 673 complex I assembly model OXPHOS system supports reported increased COVID-19 disease severity 674 linked to SARS-CoV-2 being able to highjack mitochondria of immune cells, replicate and disrupt 675 mitochondrial dynamics (86). The third differentially activated pathway was associated with the 676 cellular ubiquitin-proteasome pathways which are known to play important roles in coronavirus 677 infection cycles (87). The protein synthesis and ubiquitination-related pathways might reflect 678 mechanisms of increased viral replication and suppression of host interferon signalling pathways, 679 including increased degradation of $I \kappa B \alpha$ which suppresses the IFN-induced NF- κB activation pathway. 680 Also, in SARS-CoV, accessory protein P6, whose sequence is conserved in SARS-CoV-2 (88), promotes 681 the ubiquitin-dependent proteasomal degradation of N-Myc interactor, thus limiting IFN signalling 682 (89). However, the peak marker of this pathway PSMD14 which prevents interferon regulatory factor 3 (IRF3) autophagic degradation and therefore, permits IRF3-mediated type I IFN activation (90); 683 684 shedding light on the complex mechanistic differences regulating interferon production between 685 COVID-19 and influenza.

686

687 Conclusions

In this study, we have compared side-by-side SARS-CoV-2 and a stereotypical respiratory viral infection
 (influenza), and COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors. Distinct patterns of transcript abundances and
 cellular composition were found in whole blood that can differentiate the infection source, furthering

our understanding of the antiviral immune response differences. Additionally, we observed a
 proinflammatory signature associated with a negative outcome in patients with COVID-19. Finally, a
 signature of transcript abundances in the blood transcriptome of COVID-19 patients, upon admission
 to hospital, was identified with prognostic potential to stratify patients into those likely to survive or
 die.

697 **Declarations**

- 698 Ethics approval and consent to participate
- 699 The COV-19POC trial was approved by the South Central Hampshire A Research Ethics Committee
- 700 (REC): REC reference 20/SC/0138 (March 16th, 2020); and REC reference 17/SC/0368 (September 7th,
- 701 2017) for the FluPOC trial. For full inclusion and exclusion criteria details see (25) and (26). Written
- informed consent was given by the patients, or consultee assent was obtained where patients were
- 703 unable to give consent.

704

696

- 705 Consent for publication
- 706 Not applicable.
- 707

708 Availability of data and materials

Following publication of major outputs all anonymised data will be made available on reasonable request to the corresponding author providing this meets local ethical and research governance criteria.

713 Competing interests

714 TWC has received speaker fees, honoraria, travel reimbursement, and equipment and consumables 715 free of charge for the purposes of research from BioFire diagnostics LLC and BioMerieux. TWC has 716 received discounted equipment and consumables for the purposes of research from QIAGEN. TWC 717 has received consultancy fees from Biofire diagnostics LLC, BioMerieux, Synairgen research Ltd, 718 Randox laboratories Ltd and Cidara therapeutics. TWC has been a member of advisory boards for 719 Roche and Janssen and has received reimbursement for these. TWC is member of two independent 720 data monitoring committees for trials sponsored by Roche. TWC has previously acted as the UK chief 721 investigator for trials sponsored by Janssen. TWC is currently a member of the NHSE COVID-19 Testing 722 Technologies Oversight Group and the NHSE COVID-19 Technologies Validation Group. JPRS is a 723 founding director, CEO, employee and shareholder in TopMD Precision Medicine Ltd. FS is a founding 724 director, CTO, employee and shareholder in TopMD Precision Medicine Ltd. PJS is a founding director, 725 employee and shareholder in TopMD Precision Medicine Ltd. AG is an employee and shareholder in 726 TopMD Precision Medicine Ltd. No competing interest were reported by the other authors.

727

728 Funding statement

729 The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or 730 publication of this article: the CoV-19POC trial was funded by University Hospital Southampton 731 Foundation Trust (UHSFT) and the FluPOC trial by the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) 732 Post-Doctoral Fellowship Programme. In addition, the CoV-19POC and FluPOC trials were supported 733 by the NIHR Southampton Clinical Research Facility and NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research 734 Centre (BRC). J Legebeke was supported by a PhD studentship from the NIHR Southampton BRC (no. 735 NIHR-INF-0932). RP-R was supported by a PhD studentship from the Medical Research Council 736 Discovery Medicine North Doctoral Training Partnership (no. MR/N013840/1). NJB was supported by 737 the NIHR Clinical Lecturer scheme. JAH, CH and XD were supported by the US Food and Drug Administration (no. 75F40120C00085), and this work was partly supported by U.S. Food and Drug Administration Medical Countermeasures Initiative (no 75F40120C00085) awarded to JAH. MEP was supported by a Sir Hendy Dale Fellowship from Welcome Trust and The Royal Society (no. 109377/Z/15/Z). TWC was supported by a NIHR Post-Doctoral Fellowship (no. 2016-09-061). DB was supported by a NIHR Research Professorship (no. RP-2016-07-011). The views expressed are those of the authors and not those of the funding agencies.

744

745 Authors' contributions

TWC and DB conceptualized the study. SP and NJB screened and recruited the patients and collected
the data in the FluPOC and CoV-19POC trials. RP-R and CH sample processing and experiments. J
Legebeke, J Lord, RP-R, AFP, XD, FS, AG, JPRS, JAH and MEP performed data analysis. J Legebeke, J
Lord, RP-R, AFP, FS, AG, JPRS, JAH and MEP drafted the article, and editing by J Legebeke, J Lord, RPR, SP, NJB, GW, JPRS, PJS, JAH, MEP, TWC and DB. Project advice was given by JH, JSL, JAH, MP and
TW. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

752

753 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge and gives thanks to all the patients who kindly participated in the FluPOC and CoV-19POC studies and to all the clinical staff at University Hospital Southampton Foundation Trust who cared for them. In addition, the authors acknowledge the use of the IRIDIS High Performance Computing Facility, and associated support services at the University of Southampton, in the completion of this work.

759

761 Supplementary information

762 Supplementary figures

- 763 Additional file 1: Eighty-three immunoglobulin genes associated with the GO biological process term
- 764 'adaptive immune response' and their Z-scores.
- Additional file 2: Differential gene expression results between patients with COVID-19 or influenza.
- 766 Additional file 3: Gene pathways identified by TopMD topological analysis between patients with
- 767 COVID-19 or influenza.
- 768 Additional file 4: Differential gene expression results between COVID-19 survivors and non-survivors.
- 769 Additional file 5: Differential splicing results and discussion
- 770 Additional file 6: Differential splicing results between patients with COVID-19 or influenza.
- 771

772 References

- 7731.ProMED. Promed Post [Internet]. Undiagnosed Pneumonia China (Hubei): Request for information. 2019 [cited 2021774Jan 6]. Available from: https://promedmail.org/promed-post/?id=6864153%20#COVID19
- World Health Organisation. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 May 1]. Available
 from: https://covid19.who.int
- Galani I-E, Rovina N, Lampropoulou V, Triantafyllia V, Manioudaki M, Pavlos E, et al. Untuned antiviral immunity in COVID-19 revealed by temporal type I/III interferon patterns and flu comparison. Nat Immunol. 2021 Jan;22(1):32– 40.
- Piroth L, Cottenet J, Mariet A-S, Bonniaud P, Blot M, Tubert-Bitter P, et al. Comparison of the characteristics, morbidity, and mortality of COVID-19 and seasonal influenza: a nationwide, population-based retrospective cohort study. Lancet Respir Med. 2021 Mar;9(3):251–9.
- 5. Kreijtz JHCM, Fouchier R a. M, Rimmelzwaan GF. Immune responses to influenza virus infection. Virus Res. 2011
 Dec;162(1-2):19-30.
- Arunachalam PS, Wimmers F, Mok CKP, Perera RAPM, Scott M, Hagan T, et al. Systems biological assessment of immunity to mild versus severe COVID-19 infection in humans. Science. 2020 Sep 4;369(6508):1210–20.
- Blanco-Melo D, Nilsson-Payant BE, Liu W-C, Uhl S, Hoagland D, Møller R, et al. Imbalanced Host Response to SARS-CoV-2 Drives Development of COVID-19. Cell. 2020 May 28;181(5):1036-1045.e9.
- 8. Laing AG, Lorenc A, Del Molino Del Barrio I, Das A, Fish M, Monin L, et al. A dynamic COVID-19 immune signature
 includes associations with poor prognosis. Nat Med. 2020 Oct;26(10):1623–35.

- Bastard P, Rosen LB, Zhang Q, Michailidis E, Hoffmann H-H, Zhang Y, et al. Autoantibodies against type I IFNs in patients with life-threatening COVID-19. Science. 2020 Oct 23;370(6515).
- Channappanavar R, Fehr AR, Vijay R, Mack M, Zhao J, Meyerholz DK, et al. Dysregulated Type I Interferon and Inflammatory Monocyte-Macrophage Responses Cause Lethal Pneumonia in SARS-CoV-Infected Mice. Cell Host Microbe. 2016 Feb 10;19(2):181–93.
- 796 11. Galani IE, Triantafyllia V, Eleminiadou E-E, Koltsida O, Stavropoulos A, Manioudaki M, et al. Interferon-λ Mediates
 797 Non-redundant Front-Line Antiviral Protection against Influenza Virus Infection without Compromising Host Fitness.
 798 Immunity. 2017 May 16;46(5):875-890.e6.
- Monk PD, Marsden RJ, Tear VJ, Brookes J, Batten TN, Mankowski M, et al. Safety and efficacy of inhaled nebulised interferon beta-1a (SNG001) for treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2021 Feb 1;9(2):196–206.
- Wang N, Zhan Y, Zhu L, Hou Z, Liu F, Song P, et al. Retrospective Multicenter Cohort Study Shows Early Interferon Therapy Is Associated with Favorable Clinical Responses in COVID-19 Patients. Cell Host Microbe. 2020 Sep 9;28(3):455-464.e2.
- 805 14. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, Cao Y, Huang D, Wang H, et al. Clinical and immunological features of severe and moderate coronavirus disease 2019. J Clin Invest. 2020 May 1;130(5):2620–9.
- Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet Lond Engl. 2020 Feb 15;395(10223):497–506.
- Liu T, Zhang J, Yang Y, Ma H, Li Z, Zhang J, et al. The role of interleukin-6 in monitoring severe case of coronavirus disease 2019. EMBO Mol Med. 2020 Jul 7;12(7):e12421.
- 811 17. Grifoni A, Weiskopf D, Ramirez SI, Mateus J, Dan JM, Moderbacher CR, et al. Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV 812 2 Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. Cell. 2020 Jun 25;181(7):1489-1501.e15.
- 813 18. Briceño O, Lissina A, Wanke K, Afonso G, Braun A von, Ragon K, et al. Reduced naïve CD8+ T-cell priming efficacy in elderly adults. Aging Cell. 2016;15(1):14–21.
- 815 19. Qi Q, Liu Y, Cheng Y, Glanville J, Zhang Z, Lee J-Y, et al. Diversity and clonal selection in the human T-cell repertoire.
 816 Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014 Aug 25;111(36):13139–44.
- 817 20. Wertheimer AM, Bennett MS, Park B, Uhrlaub JL, Martinez C, Pulko V, et al. Aging and cytomegalovirus infection
 818 differentially and jointly affect distinct circulating T cell subsets in humans. J Immunol. 2014 Mar 1;192(5):2143–55.
- 819 21. Morens DM, Fauci AS. Emerging Pandemic Diseases: How We Got to COVID-19. Cell. 2020 Sep 3;182(5):1077–92.
- 820 22. Moderbacher CR, Ramirez SI, Dan JM, Grifoni A, Hastie KM, Weiskopf D, et al. Antigen-Specific Adaptive Immunity to
 821 SARS-CoV-2 in Acute COVID-19 and Associations with Age and Disease Severity. Cell. 2020 Nov 12;183(4):996 822 1012.e19.
- Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, Simon MS, Rajan M, Park J, et al. Impact of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
 Coronavirus 2 Viral Load on Risk of Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients With Coronavirus Disease
 2019. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 Jun 30;(ciaa851).
- 826 24. Sette A, Crotty S. Adaptive immunity to SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. Cell. 2021 Feb 18;184(4):861–80.
- Clark T. Evaluating the clinical impact of routine molecular point-of-care testing for COVID-19 in adults presenting to hospital: A prospective, interventional, non-randomised, controlled study (CoV19POC) [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021
 Mar 23]. Available from: https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/439309/2/CoV_19POC_Protocol_v2_0_eprints.pdf
- Beard K, Brendish N, Malachira A, Mills S, Chan C, Poole S, et al. Pragmatic multicentre randomised controlled trial
 evaluating the impact of a routine molecular point-of-care 'test-and-treat' strategy for influenza in adults hospitalised
 with acute respiratory illness (FluPOC): trial protocol. BMJ Open. 2019 Dec 1;9(12):e031674.

- Brendish NJ, Poole S, Naidu VV, Mansbridge CT, Norton NJ, Wheeler H, et al. Clinical impact of molecular point-ofcare testing for suspected COVID-19 in hospital (COV-19POC): a prospective, interventional, non-randomised, controlled study. Lancet Respir Med. 2020 Dec;8(12):1192–200.
- Clark TW, Beard KR, Brendish NJ, Malachira AK, Mills S, Chan C, et al. Clinical impact of a routine, molecular, point-of-care, test-and-treat strategy for influenza in adults admitted to hospital (FluPOC): a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2021 Apr 1;9(4):419–29.
- 839 29. Martin M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal. 2011 May
 840 2;17(1):10-2.
- 30. Joshi NA, Fass JN. Sickle: A sliding-window, adaptive, quality-based trimming tool for FastQ files [Internet]. 2011.
 Available from: https://github.com/najoshi/sickl
- Andrews S. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. [Internet]. 2010. Available from:
 http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc
- 845 32. Ewels P, Magnusson M, Lundin S, Käller M. MultiQC: summarize analysis results for multiple tools and samples in a single report. Bioinformatics. 2016 Oct 1;32(19):3047–8.
- 847 33. Dobin A, Gingeras TR. Mapping RNA-seq Reads with STAR. Curr Protoc Bioinforma. 2015;51(1):11.14.1-11.14.19.
- 848 34. Harrow J, Frankish A, Gonzalez JM, Tapanari E, Diekhans M, Kokocinski F, et al. GENCODE: the reference human genome annotation for The ENCODE Project. Genome Res. 2012 Sep;22(9):1760–74.
- Shen S, Park JW, Lu Z, Lin L, Henry MD, Wu YN, et al. rMATS: Robust and flexible detection of differential alternative splicing from replicate RNA-Seq data. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2014 Dec 23;111(51):E5593–601.
- 852 36. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.
 853 Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2009 Aug 15;25(16):2078–9.
- 854 37. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
 855 https://cloud.r-project.org/index.html
- 856 38. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
 857 http://www.rstudio.com/
- 858 39. Kassambara A. rstatix: Pipe-Friendly Framework for Basic Statistical Tests [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Apr 23].
 859 Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rstatix
- Rich B. table1: Tables of Descriptive Statistics in HTML [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Apr 23]. Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=table1
- Li S, Rouphael N, Duraisingham S, Romero-Steiner S, Presnell S, Davis C, et al. Molecular signatures of antibody responses derived from a systems biology study of five human vaccines. Nat Immunol. 2014 Feb;15(2):195–204.
- 42. Van Rossum G, Drake F. Python 3 Reference Manual. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace; 2009.
- Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, et al. limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015 Apr 20;43(7):e47.
- Theocharidis A, Dongen S van, Enright AJ, Freeman TC. Network visualization and analysis of gene expression data using BioLayout Express 3D. Nat Protoc. 2009 Oct;4(10):1535–50.
- Ken J, Bardes EE, Aronow BJ, Jegga AG. ToppGene Suite for gene list enrichment analysis and candidate gene prioritization. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009 Jul;37(Web Server issue):W305-311.
- 46. Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W. HTSeq—a Python framework to work with high-throughput sequencing data.
 Bioinformatics. 2015 Jan 15;31(2):166–9.

- 873 47. Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics. 2010 Jan 1;26(1):139–40.
- 48. Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, Botstein D, Butler H, Cherry JM, et al. Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology.
 Nat Genet. 2000 May;25(1):25–9.
- 49. Gene Ontology Consortium. The Gene Ontology resource: enriching a GOld mine. Nucleic Acids Res. 2021 Jan
 878 8;49(D1):D325–34.
- Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2021 Apr 26]. Available from: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org/authors.html
- Kassambara A. ggpubr: "ggplot2" Based Publication Ready Plots [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 23]. Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr
- Strazzeri F, Schofield J, Skipp PJ, Sanchez-Garcia R, Koskela A, Sam M, et al. TopMD [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 1].
 Available from: https://www.topmd.co.uk/
- Franceschini A, Szklarczyk D, Frankild S, Kuhn M, Simonovic M, Roth A, et al. STRING v9.1: protein-protein interaction
 networks, with increased coverage and integration. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013 Jan;41(Database issue):D808-815.
- Li YI, Knowles DA, Humphrey J, Barbeira AN, Dickinson SP, Im HK, et al. Annotation-free quantification of RNA splicing using LeafCutter. Nat Genet. 2018 Jan;50(1):151–8.
- 55. Knowles D, Li Y, Humphrey J, Pritchard J, Jenkinson G. Differential Splicing protocol [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 3].
 Available from: https://davidaknowles.github.io/leafcutter/articles/Usage.html
- 89156.LeafCutter Google group. Re: Leafcutter results [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 3]. Available from:892https://groups.google.com/g/leafcutter-users/c/REkONdzrPfE/m/Jmm9rcLbBwAJ
- 89357.Humphrey J, Knowles D, Li Y. LeafViz [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 3]. Available from:894https://leafcutter.shinyapps.io/leafviz/
- 58. Vaquero-Garcia J, Barrera A, Gazzara MR, González-Vallinas J, Lahens NF, Hogenesch JB, et al. A new view of transcriptome complexity and regulation through the lens of local splicing variations. Valcárcel J, editor. eLife. 2016
 Feb 1;5:e11752.
- 898 59. Newman AM, Steen CB, Liu CL, Gentles AJ, Chaudhuri AA, Scherer F, et al. Determining cell type abundance and expression from bulk tissues with digital cytometry. Nat Biotechnol. 2019 Jul;37(7):773–82.
- 90060.Alizadehlab,Newmanlab.CIBERSORTx[Internet].2021[cited2021May3].Availablefrom:901https://cibersortx.stanford.edu/
- 902 61. Tomic A, Tomic I, Waldron L, Geistlinger L, Kuhn M, Spreng RL, et al. SIMON: Open-Source Knowledge Discovery
 903 Platform. Patterns. 2021 Jan 8;2(1):100178.
- 90462.Merkel D. Docker: lightweight Linux containers for consistent development and deployment. Linux J. 2014 Mar9051;2014(239):2:2.
- 90663.Dorward DA, Russell CD, Um IH, Elshani M, Armstrong SD, Penrice-Randal R, et al. Tissue-Specific Immunopathology907in Fatal COVID-19. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2021 Jan 15;203(2):192–201.
- 908 64. Liu X, Speranza E, Muñoz-Fontela C, Haldenby S, Rickett NY, Garcia-Dorival I, et al. Transcriptomic signatures 909 differentiate survival from fatal outcomes in humans infected with Ebola virus. Genome Biol. 2017 Jan 19;18(1):4.
- 91065.Strazzeri F, Schofield J, Skipp PJ, Sanchez-Garcia R, Koskela A, Sam M, et al. TopMD Global map between patients with
COVID-19 or influenza [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 10]. Available from: https://topmd.co.uk/research/covidvflu
- 91266.Bosworth A, Rickett NY, Dong X, Ng LFP, García-Dorival I, Matthews DA, et al. Analysis of an Ebola virus disease survivor913whose host and viral markers were predictive of death indicates the effectiveness of medical countermeasures and914supportive care. Genome Med. 2021 Jan 11;13(1):5.

- 915 67. Izcovich A, Ragusa MA, Tortosa F, Lavena Marzio MA, Agnoletti C, Bengolea A, et al. Prognostic factors for severity 916 and mortality in patients infected with COVID-19: A systematic review. PloS One. 2020;15(11):e0241955.
- 917 68. Loo J, Spittle DA, Newnham M. COVID-19, immunothrombosis and venous thromboembolism: biological mechanisms.
 918 Thorax. 2021 Apr 1;76(4):412–20.
- 69. Eslamifar Z, Behzadifard M, Soleimani M, Behzadifard S. Coagulation abnormalities in SARS-CoV-2 infection:
 overexpression tissue factor. Thromb J. 2020 Dec 15;18(1):38.
- 70. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, Lorenzi JCC, Wang Z, Cho A, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV 2 in convalescent individuals. Nature. 2020 Aug;584(7821):437–42.
- 923 71. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, Xiao M, Chang D, Yang F, et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel Coronavirus
 924 Disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis. 2020 Jul 28;71(15):778–85.
- 925 72. Sekine T, Perez-Potti A, Rivera-Ballesteros O, Strålin K, Gorin J-B, Olsson A, et al. Robust T Cell Immunity in
 926 Convalescent Individuals with Asymptomatic or Mild COVID-19. Cell. 2020 Oct 1;183(1):158-168.e14.
- 92773.Peng Y, Mentzer AJ, Liu G, Yao X, Yin Z, Dong D, et al. Broad and strong memory CD4 + and CD8 + T cells induced by928SARS-CoV-2 in UK convalescent individuals following COVID-19. Nat Immunol. 2020 Nov;21(11):1336–45.
- Yerren Kuri-Cervantes L, Pampena MB, Meng W, Rosenfeld AM, Ittner CAG, Weisman AR, et al. Comprehensive mapping of immune perturbations associated with severe COVID-19. Sci Immunol [Internet]. 2020 Jul 15 [cited 2021 Apr 27];5(49).
 Available from: https://immunology.sciencemag.org/content/5/49/eabd7114
- 932 75. Li S, Jiang L, Li X, Lin F, Wang Y, Li B, et al. Clinical and pathological investigation of patients with severe COVID-19. JCI
 933 Insight. 2020 Jun 18;5(12).
- P34 76. Liao M, Liu Y, Yuan J, Wen Y, Xu G, Zhao J, et al. Single-cell landscape of bronchoalveolar immune cells in patients with
 COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020 Jun;26(6):842–4.
- 93677.Schurink B, Roos E, Radonic T, Barbe E, Bouman CSC, de Boer HH, et al. Viral presence and immunopathology in
patients with lethal COVID-19: a prospective autopsy cohort study. Lancet Microbe. 2020 Nov;1(7):e290–9.
- 93878.Radermecker C, Detrembleur N, Guiot J, Cavalier E, Henket M, d'Emal C, et al. Neutrophil extracellular traps infiltrate939the lung airway, interstitial, and vascular compartments in severe COVID-19. J Exp Med. 2020 Sep 14;217(2):1-11.
- 940 79. Schultze JL, Aschenbrenner AC. COVID-19 and the human innate immune system. Cell. 2021 Apr 1;184(7):1671–92.
- 80. Lucas C, Klein J, Sundaram ME, Liu F, Wong P, Silva J, et al. Delayed production of neutralizing antibodies correlates
 with fatal COVID-19. Nat Med. 2021 May 5;1–9.
- 94381.Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID Data Tracker [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and944Prevention.2020 [cited 2021 Apr 15].Available from: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-945tracker/index.html#demographics
- 946 82. Finucane FM, Davenport C. Coronavirus and Obesity: Could Insulin Resistance Mediate the Severity of Covid-19
 947 Infection? Front Public Health. 2020;8(184):1–5.
- 948 83. Gheblawi M, Wang K, Viveiros A, Nguyen Q, Zhong J-C, Turner AJ, et al. Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2: SARS-CoV949 2 Receptor and Regulator of the Renin-Angiotensin System: Celebrating the 20th Anniversary of the Discovery of ACE2.
 950 Circ Res. 2020 May 8;126(10):1456–74.
- 95184.Takeda M, Yamamoto K, Takemura Y, Takeshita H, Hongyo K, Kawai T, et al. Loss of ACE2 exaggerates high-calorie952diet-induced insulin resistance by reduction of GLUT4 in mice. Diabetes. 2013 Jan;62(1):223–33.
- Honda K, Yanai H, Negishi H, Asagiri M, Sato M, Mizutani T, et al. IRF-7 is the master regulator of type-I interferon dependent immune responses. Nature. 2005 Apr 7;434(7034):772–7.
- 955 86. Singh KK, Chaubey G, Chen JY, Suravajhala P. Decoding SARS-CoV-2 hijacking of host mitochondria in COVID-19
 956 pathogenesis. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 2020 Aug 1;319(2):C258–67.

- 95787.Raaben M, Posthuma CC, Verheije MH, te Lintelo EG, Kikkert M, Drijfhout JW, et al. The ubiquitin-proteasome system958plays an important role during various stages of the coronavirus infection cycle. J Virol. 2010 Aug;84(15):7869–79.
- 88. Naqvi AAT, Fatima K, Mohammad T, Fatima U, Singh IK, Singh A, et al. Insights into SARS-CoV-2 genome, structure, evolution, pathogenesis and therapies: Structural genomics approach. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA Mol Basis Dis. 2020
 961 Oct 1;1866(10):165878.
- 962 89. Cheng W, Chen S, Li R, Chen Y, Wang M, Guo D. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus protein 6 mediates
 963 ubiquitin-dependent proteosomal degradation of N-Myc (and STAT) interactor. Virol Sin. 2015 Apr;30(2):153–61.
- 964 90. Wu Y, Jin S, Liu Q, Zhang Y, Ma L, Zhao Z, et al. Selective autophagy controls the stability of transcription factor IRF3
 965 to balance type I interferon production and immune suppression. Autophagy. 2020 May 31;1–14.