

1 **Markers of immune activation and inflammation in individuals with post-acute sequelae of**  
2 **SARS-CoV-2 infection**

3 Michael J. Peluso,<sup>1^</sup> Scott Lu,<sup>2</sup> Alex F. Tang,<sup>1</sup> Matthew S. Durstenfeld,<sup>3</sup> Hsi-en Ho,<sup>4</sup> Sarah A.  
4 Goldberg,<sup>2</sup> Carrie A. Forman,<sup>1</sup> Sadie E. Munter,<sup>5</sup> Rebecca Hoh,<sup>1</sup> Viva Tai,<sup>1</sup> Ahmed Chenna,<sup>6</sup> Brandon  
5 C. Yee,<sup>6</sup> John W. Winslow,<sup>6</sup> Christos J. Petropoulos,<sup>6</sup> Bryan Greenhouse,<sup>1</sup> Peter W. Hunt,<sup>5</sup> Priscilla  
6 Y. Hsue,<sup>3</sup> Jeffrey N. Martin,<sup>2</sup> J. Daniel Kelly,<sup>2</sup> David V. Glidden,<sup>2</sup> Steven G. Deeks<sup>1\*</sup>, Timothy J.  
7 Henrich<sup>5\*</sup>

8 \*Contributed equally

9  
10 <sup>1</sup> Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California, San Francisco,  
11 CA, USA

12 <sup>2</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

13 <sup>3</sup> Division of Cardiology, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

14 <sup>4</sup> Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

15 <sup>5</sup> Division of Experimental Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

16 <sup>6</sup> Monogram Biosciences Inc., South San Francisco, CA, USA

17 ^ To whom correspondence should be addressed:

18 Michael J. Peluso, MD

19 995 Potrero Ave.

20 San Francisco, CA 94110

21 michael.peluso@ucsf.edu

22  
23 Short Title: Immune activation during COVID-19 recovery

24 Stats: Abstract = 188 words, Text = words, References = 50, Tables = 2, Figures = 2

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 BACKGROUND: The biological processes associated with post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2  
3 infection (PASC) are unknown.

4  
5 METHODS: We measured soluble markers of inflammation in a SARS-CoV-2 recovery cohort at early  
6 (<90 days) and late (>90 days) timepoints. We defined PASC as the presence of one or more  
7 COVID-19-attributed symptoms beyond 90 days. We compared fold-changes in marker values  
8 between those with and without PASC using mixed effects models with terms for PASC and early and  
9 late recovery time periods.

10  
11 RESULTS: During early recovery, those who went on to develop PASC generally had higher levels of  
12 cytokine biomarkers including TNF-alpha (1.14-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI 1.01-1.28, p=0.028)  
13 and IP-10 (1.28-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI 1.01-1.62, p=0.038). Among those with PASC, there  
14 was a trend toward higher IL-6 levels during early recovery (1.28-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI  
15 0.98-1.70, p=0.07) which became more pronounced in late recovery (1.44-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI:  
16 1.11-1.86, p<0.001). These differences were more pronounced among those with a greater number of  
17 PASC symptoms.

18  
19 CONCLUSIONS: Persistent immune activation may be associated with ongoing symptoms following  
20 COVID-19. Further characterization of these processes might identify therapeutic targets for those  
21 experiencing PASC.

22  
23 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; coronavirus; COVID-19; post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection  
24 (PASC); long COVID; biomarker; inflammation; immune activation; IL-6; TNF-alpha

## 1 BACKGROUND

2 The acute phase of SARS-CoV-2 infection is characterized by inflammation and immune  
3 dysregulation [1,2], but the recovery phase that follows acute infection is poorly understood. A  
4 significant proportion of individuals recovering from COVID-19 do not demonstrate a full return to  
5 baseline health and experience post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC), a condition  
6 that is often associated with the persistence or recurrence of symptoms not explained by an  
7 alternative medical diagnosis [3]. Multidisciplinary efforts are underway to characterize the  
8 epidemiology, natural history, and biology of this condition [4,5], but there is limited biological  
9 information regarding its predictors and correlates.

10  
11 Inflammation during early infection has been associated with adverse outcomes, particularly in those  
12 who were hospitalized with COVID-19 [1,2,6–10]. Emerging data suggest that inflammation related to  
13 acute SARS-CoV-2 infection can persist for weeks to months [11,12]. For example, individuals well  
14 enough to donate convalescent plasma have elevations in certain markers of inflammation, as  
15 compared to pre-pandemic plasma donors [11]. These markers include interferon (IFN)-gamma,  
16 certain interleukin (IL) proteins, and monocyte chemoattractant protein (MCP)-1. Furthermore, viral  
17 proteins and nucleic acids have been detected months after the acute phase in some small studies  
18 [13]. However, there are limited data from COVID-19 recovery cohorts with large numbers of  
19 individuals managed in the outpatient setting, which constitute the majority of those infected with  
20 SARS-CoV-2 and from cohorts with careful prospective clinical phenotyping of symptoms present  
21 during COVID-19 recovery.

22  
23 The clinical implications of persistent inflammation have been established for chronic infections,  
24 including HIV [10,11], but are less well understood for acute infections like SARS-CoV-2. We  
25 therefore implemented in April 2020 a prospective cohort study of individuals who had documented

1 SARS-CoV-2 infection (Long-term Impact of Infection with Novel Coronavirus, LIINC,  
2 [www.liincstudy.org](http://www.liincstudy.org); NCT04362150). The majority of participants had not been hospitalized, and  
3 biologic specimens and detailed clinical data were collected at regular time points. Here, we report on  
4 clinical data and markers of systemic immune activation and inflammation that may contribute to the  
5 early understanding of PASC pathogenesis. A better understanding of these pathogenic processes is  
6 critical for identifying therapies to treat and/or prevent this condition among the millions of individuals  
7 who have recovered from acute SARS-CoV-2 infection.

## 9 **METHODS**

### 10 ***Study participants and procedures***

11 Volunteers with a documented history of SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by nucleic acid  
12 amplification testing were enrolled at our clinical research center at San Francisco General Hospital in  
13 San Francisco, California [14]. At each study visit, participants were systematically queried regarding  
14 the presence of 32 individual symptoms derived from the Centers for Disease Control list of COVID-  
15 19 symptoms [15] and from the Patient Health Questionnaire Somatic Symptom Scale [16]. A  
16 symptom was considered to be present if it was new in onset since the time of SARS-CoV-2 infection  
17 or, for pre-existing symptoms, if it had worsened since the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
18 Symptoms that had been present prior to SARS-CoV-2 infection and did not worsen were not  
19 considered to represent PASC. At each visit, blood was collected by venipuncture. Plasma was  
20 isolated via centrifugation of heparinized blood and stored at -80°C. Due to the known associations  
21 between HIV infection and chronic inflammation [10,11], we excluded people living with HIV infection  
22 from the current analyses.

### 24 ***Clinical measurements***

1 We assessed the presence or absence of symptoms at a visit occurring more than 90 days from initial  
2 COVID-19 symptom onset. The primary outcome (PASC) was defined as the presence of one or  
3 more symptoms at this timepoint. A subset of participants (92/121, 76%) had an additional blood  
4 sample that had been collected at an earlier (i.e., before 90 days) timepoint. For further sensitivity and  
5 exploratory analyses we defined the top 25% most symptomatic individuals (based on the number of  
6 symptoms reported) as having severe PASC.

### 7 8 ***Biomarker and antibody assays***

9 The fully automated HD-X Simoa platform was used to measure biomarkers in blood plasma  
10 including monocyte chemoattractant protein 1 (MCP-1), Cytokine 3-PlexA (IL-6, IL-10, TNF $\alpha$ ),  
11 interferon gamma-induced protein-10 (IP-10), interferon-gamma (IFN $\gamma$ ), and SARS-CoV-2 receptor  
12 binding domain (RBD) IgG according to the manufacturer's instructions. These markers were  
13 selected based upon their biological importance during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection [1,2]. Samples  
14 were assayed blinded with respect to associated patient and clinical information. Assay performance  
15 was consistent with the manufacturer's specifications.

### 16 17 ***Statistical analysis***

18 We used descriptive statistics to characterize the cohort and non-parametric analyses to compare the  
19 groups with and without PASC. We  $\log_{10}$ -transformed all biomarkers as they were not normally  
20 distributed. We then compared the ratio of the mean transformed values for each biomarker between  
21 those with and without persistent symptoms using mixed effects models with terms for PASC and  
22 time period (early versus late recovery). This approach permits comparison of the values at early and  
23 late time points as well as assessment of whether trajectories in marker values differ between those  
24 with and without persistent symptoms. We calculated fold-changes and 95% confidence intervals by  
25 exponentiating the coefficients to give the ratio between the untransformed biomarker values. We

1 used Spearman correlations to evaluate relationships between levels of binding antibodies and  
2 immune markers. All p-values are two sided. We used Stata (version 16.1; StataCorp, College  
3 Station, TX) and Prism (version 9.1.2, GraphPad Software, L.L.C., San Diego, CA).

#### 5 ***Ethics approval***

6 All participants provided written informed consent. The study was approved by the Institutional  
7 Review Board at the University of California, San Francisco.

## 9 **RESULTS**

### 10 *Study participants*

11 Our analysis cohort included 121 participants and was diverse in terms of sex, gender, race, ethnicity,  
12 and level of education (Table 1). Medical comorbidities present in more than 10% of the cohort  
13 included lung problems, diabetes, and obesity. Nine participants had a history of an autoimmune  
14 disorder, which included autoimmune thyroid disease (n=4), gastrointestinal disease (n=2), multiple  
15 sclerosis (n=1), rheumatoid arthritis (n=1), and an unspecified autoimmune condition (n=1). A majority  
16 of participants (78%) had been managed as outpatients during their COVID-19 illness.

17  
18 Although we did not identify significant demographic differences between groups, those reporting  
19 PASC tended to be more likely to have been assigned female sex at birth (61.6% vs 43.8%, p=0.053)  
20 and to report a history of autoimmune disease preceding their COVID-19 diagnosis (11% vs 2.1%,  
21 p=0.087). The presence of PASC did not differ according to hospitalization status during acute  
22 COVID-19.

23  
24 The early recovery measurement occurred at a median of 52 (interquartile range [IQR] 38-64) days  
25 from symptom onset and the late recovery measurement occurred at a median of 124 (IQR 116-136)

1 days from symptom onset. The timing of the early follow-up sample among those with PASC was  
2 slightly later than those without PASC (median 57 vs 50 days after symptom onset,  $p=0.04$ ); the  
3 timing of the late sample did not differ (median 123 vs 124 days after symptom onset,  $p=0.26$ ).

#### 4 5 *Persistent symptoms*

6 Seventy-three individuals reported one or more symptoms at the late recovery timepoint. The median  
7 number of symptoms reported by individuals with PASC was 5 (IQR 2-8, absolute range 1-18).  
8 Common symptoms (Table 2) included problems with memory or concentration (57%), fatigue (56%),  
9 shortness of breath (38%), and anosmia/dysgeusia (37%).

#### 10 11 *Levels of plasma biomarkers among those with and without PASC*

12 In our cross-sectional analyses, we first compared levels of each plasma marker measured during  
13 early recovery between those with and without PASC (Figure 1). Those who went on to develop  
14 PASC demonstrated significantly higher levels of TNF-alpha (1.14-fold higher mean ratio, 95% CI  
15 1.01-1.28,  $p=0.028$ ) and IP-10 (1.28-fold higher mean ratio, 95% CI 1.01-1.62,  $p=0.038$ ). The mean  
16 IL-6 level during early recovery was on average 29% higher among those with PASC, although the  
17 difference did not achieve statistical significance (95% CI 0.98-1.70,  $p=0.07$ ). Several other markers  
18 showed higher levels among those with PASC even when the comparisons were not significant.

19  
20 We next compared levels of each biomarker measured during late recovery between those with and  
21 without PASC (Figure 1). During the late recovery period, the mean IL-6 level was on average 44%  
22 higher among those with PASC (95% CI:1.11-1.86,  $p=0.0005$ ). No other markers differed between the  
23 groups.

1 Levels of SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG did not differ between groups at either the early or late timepoints.  
2 Among those with PASC, levels of binding antibodies correlated with TNF-alpha ( $r=0.33$ ,  $p=0.018$ ),  
3 interferon-gamma ( $r=0.30$ ,  $p=0.038$ ), and MCP-1 ( $r=0.39$ ,  $p=0.005$ ) at the early timepoint; at the later  
4 timepoint, levels of binding antibodies correlated with IL-6 ( $r=0.29$ ,  $p=0.015$ ), TNF-alpha ( $r=0.28$ ,  
5  $r=0.016$ ), and MCP-1 ( $r=0.40$ ,  $p=0.0006$ ). In the group without PASC, these antibodies correlated only  
6 with interferon-gamma at the early timepoint ( $r=0.38$ ,  $p=0.024$ ) and IP-10 at the late timepoint ( $r=0.33$ ,  
7  $p=0.025$ ).

8

### 9 *Changes in levels of plasma biomarkers over time*

10 In our longitudinal analyses, we used mixed models to indicate changes in levels of biomarkers  
11 among those with and without PASC between the early and late recovery period time points (Figure  
12 2). Overall, there were no statistically significant differences in the trends of biomarkers over time  
13 between the PASC and non-PASC groups. As would be predicted from cross-sectional analyses,  
14 higher levels of IL-6 were observed across time points in those with PASC compared to those without  
15 persistent symptoms.

16

### 17 *Sensitivity analyses*

18 To further assess the effects of certain demographic factors potentially important in PASC, we  
19 performed adjustment for age, sex, and hospitalization status during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
20 These adjustments did not fundamentally change the interpretation of the earlier analyses, although  
21 the IP-10 elevation during early recovery was no longer statistically significant (mean ratio 1.24  
22 95%CI 0.98-1.57,  $p=0.071$ ; see Supplemental Table 1).

23

24 To determine whether the relationships observed in the primary analysis would be more pronounced  
25 among those with the most severe manifestations of PASC, we examined the subset of individuals

1 reporting the greatest number of symptoms (upper 25% of symptom count) in comparison to those  
2 without any persistent symptoms. During early recovery, severe PASC was associated with the  
3 presence of elevated levels of IL-6 (mean ratio 1.47 95% CI 1.10-1.97,  $p=0.009$ ), interferon-gamma  
4 (mean ratio 1.35 95% CI 1.00-1.81,  $p=0.049$ ), IL-10 (mean ratio 1.25 95% CI 1.00-1.57,  $p=0.05$ ), and  
5 TNF-alpha (mean ratio 1.16 95% CI 1.03-1.31,  $p=0.017$ ). IL-6 levels were persistently elevated during  
6 late follow-up, although the relationship did not remain statistically significant (mean ratio 1.47 95% CI  
7 1.10-1.97,  $p=0.089$ ).

## 9 DISCUSSION

10 Post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC) is now recognized as a public health priority  
11 [3]. In a variety of cohorts and electronic medical record-based studies [4,5,12,17], approximately 10-  
12 40% of individuals report new symptoms that persist for weeks to months. Risk factors for PASC may  
13 include more severe acute infection, advanced age, female sex, and socioeconomic factors [5,17,18].  
14 However, the study of the pathogenesis of PASC is only just beginning. Leveraging a prospective  
15 cohort designed to study how SARS-CoV-2 infection affects long-term health, we measured a variety  
16 of potential biomarkers in individuals recovering from COVID-19, a substantial proportion of whom  
17 reported symptoms beyond 3 months following initial infection. Importantly, we did not prospectively  
18 seek to enroll individuals with PASC. We identified several biomarkers – particularly IL-6 and TNF-  
19 alpha – that differ during early and late recovery among those who continue to experience symptoms  
20 at a median of 124 days following infection. These elevations are part of a consistent pattern  
21 suggesting persistent immune activation among those who go on to develop PASC. These  
22 observations may inform on biological pathways contributing to PASC and aid in the identification of  
23 potential therapeutic strategies.

1 IL-6 and TNF-alpha are both pro-inflammatory cytokines that contribute to leukocyte recruitment,  
2 activation, and differentiation, as well as B cell maturation and the expansion of T helper cell subsets  
3 [19,20]. Both have been identified as key factors in the immune response during acute COVID-19  
4 [2,9,10,21,22], although in general IL-6 levels appear to be more predictive of poor outcomes such as  
5 respiratory failure and the need for mechanical ventilation [2,8,10,23]. Results from interventions to  
6 reduce the inflammatory milieu during acute infection by targeting cytokines, such as IL-6, however,  
7 have been mixed [24–29]. While various immune activating cytokines can have protective or  
8 homeostatic effects [30–32], their dysregulation may lead to detrimental clinical conditions. For  
9 example, IL-6 has been implicated in models of chronic inflammatory diseases [30], and  
10 overexpression in mouse models is associated with tissue-specific manifestations such as lung or  
11 neurologic disease [33–35]. Similarly, TNF-alpha induces tissue inflammation and endothelial  
12 activation and uncontrolled activity of this cytokine underlies various inflammatory diseases that can  
13 involve multiple organ systems [36].

14  
15 Among those recovering from COVID-19, there are limited data on immunologic trends over time and  
16 in association with ongoing clinical symptoms. Although our findings need to be supported with larger  
17 studies, we found that individuals with persistent symptoms were likely to demonstrate higher levels  
18 of markers of inflammation and immune activation during the first 90 days of COVID-19 recovery.  
19 While not all markers achieved statistical significance, there was a consistent trend across all markers  
20 of interest during this period. Furthermore, we found that elevations in IL-6 persisted into the late  
21 recovery period during which we defined the primary clinical outcome (PASC). This observation  
22 builds upon prior work identifying persistent elevations in levels of cytokines in COVID-19  
23 convalescent plasma donors [11] and individuals who were previously hospitalized with COVID-19  
24 [12]. In the latter study, previously hospitalized individuals who reported persistent symptoms had  
25 higher levels of MCP-1 and platelet derived growth factor (PDGF) during early convalescence, but

1 these differences were no longer detected at 6 months and the study included a lower proportion of  
2 participants with persistent symptoms. Our findings suggest that differences in cytokines and  
3 chemokines may also be relevant among individuals who were not hospitalized during the acute  
4 phase, and that persistent immune activation might be associated with the processes that drive some  
5 persistent symptoms.

6  
7 The factors driving persistent inflammation during COVID-19 recovery have yet to be determined.  
8 One possibility is that residual inflammation from the acute phase of infection persists among certain  
9 individuals, either those with the most severe illness or in relation to other unknown factors. This  
10 could be supported by the fact that most differences in the levels of these markers appear to resolve  
11 by the late recovery timepoint. Although antibody levels, which consistently correlate with disease  
12 severity [37–46] and have been shown to be predictive of persistent symptoms at 6 months in other  
13 cohorts [4], did not differ between the groups, among those with PASC antibody levels did correlate  
14 with levels of several inflammatory markers. In addition, IL-6 levels remained elevated throughout the  
15 observation period. Many factors could contribute to persistent IL-6 elevations including antigen  
16 persistence in tissues, compromised mucosal barrier integrity with increased microbial translocation,  
17 and/or autoreactive immunity, or an intrinsic failure of the host immune system to return to baseline  
18 homeostasis. Further work will be needed to determine whether our findings represent a persistent  
19 inflammatory response that is slower to resolve among those with PASC, or whether there is ongoing  
20 pathology that would benefit from intervention during either early or later recovery.

21  
22 It is notable that 8/9 participants with a history of previously diagnosed autoimmune disorders  
23 experienced PASC. It has been theorized that elevated autoantibodies may be present during acute  
24 hospitalization with COVID-19 and may persist during convalescence [47,48], although the  
25 association with persistent symptoms has yet to be established. Others have observed new

1 diagnoses or exacerbations of clinical entities with autoimmune mechanisms, such as diabetes and  
2 thyroiditis, following SARS-CoV-2 infection [49,50]. The relationship between SARS-CoV-2 infection,  
3 autoreactive immunity, and the inflammatory milieu that may persist following COVID-19 warrants  
4 further investigation, particularly if it can be tied to specific PASC phenotypes.

5  
6 Strengths of this analysis include the inclusion of a large number of individuals with deeply  
7 characterized persistent symptoms and the large proportion who had not been hospitalized during  
8 acute infection, which is reflective of the majority of people recovering from COVID-19. Limitations of  
9 this study include the use of a convenience sample that may not be representative of the SARS-CoV-  
10 2 epidemic and lack of specimens from the acute infection period. There is currently no widely agreed  
11 upon case definition for PASC, and we adopted a broad case definition which might be overly  
12 sensitive. We also used a rough temporal cutoff to classify PASC, which may have led to  
13 misclassification bias in our results. Still, our sensitivity analyses showed similar findings, suggesting  
14 the presence of a true effect. We measured a relatively small number of biomarkers based on  
15 hypotheses derived from published signatures during acute infection, but more in depth biomarker  
16 characterization may be more revealing. While we performed multiple statistical analyses, our  
17 findings were consistent with our prespecified hypotheses. Nonetheless, our observation will help  
18 inform on mechanistic pathways that could contribute to PASC and direct future research leading to  
19 the identification of potential therapeutic targets.

## 20 **FOOTNOTES**

### 21 **Acknowledgements**

22 We are grateful to the study participants. We are grateful to the LIINC study participants and to the  
23 clinical staff who provided care to these individuals during their acute illness period and during their  
24 recovery. We thank Dr. Isabel Rodriguez-Barraquer and Dr. Rachel Rutishauser for their contributions

1 to the LIINC leadership team. We acknowledge current and former LIINC clinical study team  
2 members Tamara Abualhsan, Andrea Alvarez, Mireya Arreguin, Emily Fehrman, Monika Deswal,  
3 Heather Hartig, Yanel Hernandez, Marian Kerbleski, Lynn Ngo, Ruth Diaz Sanchez, Cassandra  
4 Thanh, Leonel Torres, Fatima Ticas, and Meghann Williams; and LIINC laboratory team members  
5 Joanna Donatelli, Jill Hakim, Nikita Iyer, Owen Janson, Christopher Nixon, and Keirstinne Turcios.  
6 We thank Elnaz Eilkhani for coordination with the Institutional Review Board. We acknowledge the  
7 contributions of the UCSF Clinical and Translational Science Unit, Core Immunology Laboratory, and  
8 AIDS Specimen Bank.

### 9 **Author Contributions**

10 MJP, HH, JDK, JNM, SGD, and TJH designed the study, which was supported through funding to  
11 JDK, JNM, SGD, and TJH. MJP, SEM, RH, VT collected clinical data and biospecimens. Specimens  
12 were analyzed by AC, BCY, JWW, and CJP. MJP, SL, AT, MSD, JDK, and DVG performed and/or  
13 interpreted the statistical analyses. MJP, SL, AT, HH, CF, JDK, SGD, and TJH drafted the initial  
14 manuscript with input from AC, JWW, PWH, PSY, and JNM. All authors edited, reviewed, and  
15 approved the final manuscript.

### 16 **Funding**

17 This work was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIH/NIAID  
18 3R01AI141003-03S1 [to TJ Henrich] and by the Zuckerberg San Francisco Hospital Department of  
19 Medicine and Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine. MJP is supported on NIH  
20 T32 AI60530-12 and by the UCSF Resource Allocation Program.

### 21 **Conflicts of Interest**

22 AC, BCY, JWW, and CJP are employees of Monogram Biosciences, Inc., a division of LabCorp.  
23 DVG reports grants and/or personal fees from Merck and Co. and Gilead Biosciences outside the  
24 submitted work. SGD reports grants and/or personal fees from Gilead Sciences, Merck & Co., Viiv,

1 AbbVie, Eli Lilly, ByroLogyx, and Enochian Biosciences outside the submitted work. TJH reports  
2 grants from Merck and Co., Gilead Biosciences, and Bristol-Myers Squibb outside the submitted  
3 work. The remaining authors report no conflicts.

4

5

6

## 7 REFERENCES

- 8 1. Lucas C, Wong P, Klein J, et al. Longitudinal analyses reveal immunological misfiring in severe  
9 COVID-19. *Nature* **2020**; 584:463–469.
- 10 2. Del Valle DM, Kim-Schulze S, Huang H-H, et al. An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts  
11 COVID-19 severity and survival. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:1636–1643.
- 12 3. Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, et al. Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome. *Nat Med* **2021**;  
13 Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z>.
- 14 4. Blomberg B, Mohn KG-I, Brokstad KA, et al. Long COVID in a prospective cohort of home-  
15 isolated patients. *Nat Med* **2021**; Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01433-3>.
- 16 5. Al-Aly Z, Xie Y, Bowe B. High-dimensional characterization of post-acute sequelae of COVID-19.  
17 *Nature* **2021**; 594:259–264.
- 18 6. Lavillegrand J-R, Garnier M, Spaeth A, et al. Elevated plasma IL-6 and CRP levels are  
19 associated with adverse clinical outcomes and death in critically ill SARS-CoV-2 patients:  
20 inflammatory response of SARS-CoV-2 patients. *Ann Intensive Care* **2021**; 11:9.
- 21 7. Sharifpour M, Rangaraju S, Liu M, et al. C-Reactive protein as a prognostic indicator in  
22 hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15:e0242400.

- 1 8. Tobias Herold MD, Arnreich C, Hellmuth JC, Matthias Klein MD, Tobias Weinberger MD. Level of  
2 IL-6 predicts respiratory failure in hospitalized symptomatic COVID-19 patients. Available at:  
3 [https://www.allergy.org.au/images/stories/about/attach-IL-](https://www.allergy.org.au/images/stories/about/attach-IL-6_as_a_marker_of_outcome_in_COVID-19.pdf)  
4 [6\\_as\\_a\\_marker\\_of\\_outcome\\_in\\_COVID-19.pdf](https://www.allergy.org.au/images/stories/about/attach-IL-6_as_a_marker_of_outcome_in_COVID-19.pdf).
- 5 9. Laing AG, Lorenc A, del Molino del Barrio I, et al. A dynamic COVID-19 immune signature  
6 includes associations with poor prognosis. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:1623–1635.
- 7 10. Han H, Ma Q, Li C, et al. Profiling serum cytokines in COVID-19 patients reveals IL-6 and IL-10  
8 are disease severity predictors. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2020**; 9:1123–1130.
- 9 11. Bonny TS, Patel EU, Zhu X, et al. Cytokine and Chemokine Levels in Coronavirus Disease 2019  
10 Convalescent Plasma. *Open Forum Infect Dis* **2021**; 8:ofaa574.
- 11 12. Ong SWX, Fong S-W, Young BE, et al. Persistent Symptoms and Association With Inflammatory  
12 Cytokine Signatures in Recovered Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients. *Open Forum Infect Dis*  
13 **2021**; 8:ofab156.
- 14 13. Gaebler C, Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, et al. Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*  
15 **2021**; Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03207-w>.
- 16 14. Peluso MJ, Kelly JD, Lu S, et al. Rapid implementation of a cohort for the study of post-acute  
17 sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection/COVID-19. *medRxiv* **2021**; Available at:  
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.11.21252311>.
- 19 15. CDC. Symptoms of COVID-19. 2021. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html)  
20 [ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html). Accessed 7 July 2021.
- 21 16. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-15: validity of a new measure for evaluating the

1 severity of somatic symptoms. *Psychosom Med* **2002**; 64:258–266.

2 17. Ayoubkhani D. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in  
3 the UK - Office for National Statistics. Office for National Statistics, 2021. Available at:  
4 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddisea](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1april2021)  
5 [ses/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1april20](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1april2021)  
6 21. Accessed 7 April 2021.

7 18. Sudre CH, Murray B, Varsavsky T, et al. Attributes and predictors of long COVID. *Nat Med* **2021**;  
8 Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01292-y>.

9 19. Jones SA, Jenkins BJ. Recent insights into targeting the IL-6 cytokine family in inflammatory  
10 diseases and cancer. *Nat Rev Immunol* **2018**; 18:773–789.

11 20. Fong Y, Tracey KJ, Moldawer LL, et al. Antibodies to cachectin/tumor necrosis factor reduce  
12 interleukin 1 beta and interleukin 6 appearance during lethal bacteremia. *J Exp Med* **1989**;  
13 170:1627–1633.

14 21. Thwaites RS, Sanchez Sevilla Uruchurtu A, Siggins MK, et al. Inflammatory profiles across the  
15 spectrum of disease reveal a distinct role for GM-CSF in severe COVID-19. *Sci Immunol* **2021**; 6.  
16 Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/sciimmunol.abg9873>.

17 22. Chen Q, Yu B, Yang Y, et al. Immunological and inflammatory profiles during acute and  
18 convalescent phases of severe/ critically ill COVID-19 patients. *Int Immunopharmacol* **2021**;  
19 97:107685.

20 23. Galván-Román JM, Rodríguez-García SC, Roy-Vallejo E, et al. IL-6 serum levels predict severity  
21 and response to tocilizumab in COVID-19: An observational study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* **2021**;  
22 147:72–80.e8.

- 1 24. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby PW, Pessoa-Amorim G, et al. Tocilizumab in patients  
2 admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): preliminary results of a randomised,  
3 controlled, open-label, platform trial. bioRxiv. 2021; Available at:  
4 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.02.11.21249258>.
- 5 25. REMAP-CAP Investigators, Gordon AC, Mouncey PR, et al. Interleukin-6 Receptor Antagonists  
6 in Critically Ill Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2021**; 384:1491–1502.
- 7 26. Hermine O, Mariette X, Tharaux P-L, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Usual Care in Adults  
8 Hospitalized With COVID-19 and Moderate or Severe Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial.  
9 *JAMA Intern Med* **2021**; 181:32–40.
- 10 27. Stone JH, Frigault MJ, Serling-Boyd NJ, et al. Efficacy of Tocilizumab in Patients Hospitalized  
11 with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 383:2333–2344.
- 12 28. Salvarani C, Dolci G, Massari M, et al. Effect of Tocilizumab vs Standard Care on Clinical  
13 Worsening in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Randomized Clinical Trial.  
14 *JAMA Intern Med* **2021**; 181:24–31.
- 15 29. Salama C, Han J, Yau L, et al. Tocilizumab in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19 Pneumonia. *N*  
16 *Engl J Med* **2021**; 384:20–30.
- 17 30. Hunter CA, Jones SA. IL-6 as a keystone cytokine in health and disease. *Nat Immunol* **2015**;  
18 16:448–457.
- 19 31. Arnett HA, Mason J, Marino M, Suzuki K, Matsushima GK, Ting JP-Y. TNF $\alpha$  promotes  
20 proliferation of oligodendrocyte progenitors and remyelination. *Nat Neurosci* **2001**; 4:1116–1122.
- 21 32. Papathanasiou S, Rickelt S, Soriano ME, et al. Tumor necrosis factor- $\alpha$  confers cardioprotection

1 through ectopic expression of keratins K8 and K18. *Nat Med* **2015**; 21:1076–1084.

2 33. Suematsu S, Matsuda T, Aozasa K, et al. IgG1 plasmacytosis in interleukin 6 transgenic mice.  
3 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **1989**; 86:7547–7551.

4 34. Campbell IL, Abraham CR, Masliah E, et al. Neurologic disease induced in transgenic mice by  
5 cerebral overexpression of interleukin 6. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **1993**; 90:10061–10065.

6 35. Steiner MK, Syrkina OL, Kolliputi N, Mark EJ, Hales CA, Waxman AB. Interleukin-6  
7 overexpression induces pulmonary hypertension. *Circ Res* **2009**; 104:236–44, 28p following 244.

8 36. Kalliolias GD, Ivashkiv LB. TNF biology, pathogenic mechanisms and emerging therapeutic  
9 strategies. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* **2016**; 12:49–62.

10 37. Seow J, Graham C, Merrick B, et al. Longitudinal observation and decline of neutralizing  
11 antibody responses in the three months following SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans. *Nat*  
12 *Microbiol* **2020**; 5:1598–1607.

13 38. Long Q-X, Tang X-J, Shi Q-L, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic  
14 SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:1200–1204.

15 39. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, et al. Humoral Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 in  
16 Iceland. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 383:1724–1734.

17 40. Naaber P, Hunt K, Pesukova J, et al. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody response in PCR  
18 positive patients: Comparison of nine tests in relation to clinical data. *PLoS One* **2020**;  
19 15:e0237548.

20 41. Chen Y, Zuiani A, Fischinger S, et al. Quick COVID-19 Healers Sustain Anti-SARS-CoV-2  
21 Antibody Production. *Cell* **2020**; 183:1496–1507.e16.

- 1 42. Chen X, Pan Z, Yue S, et al. Disease severity dictates SARS-CoV-2-specific neutralizing  
2 antibody responses in COVID-19. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* **2020**; 5:180.
- 3 43. Kowitdamrong E, Puthanakit T, Jantarabenjakul W, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in  
4 patients with differing severities of coronavirus disease 2019. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15:e0240502.
- 5 44. Lei Q, Li Y, Hou H-Y, et al. Antibody dynamics to SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic COVID-19  
6 infections. *Allergy* **2020**; Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/all.14622>.
- 7 45. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in Patients With Novel  
8 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; 71:2027–2034.
- 9 46. Peluso MJ, Takahashi S, Hakim J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody magnitude and detectability are  
10 driven by disease severity, timing, and assay. *medRxiv* **2021**; Available at:  
11 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.03.21251639>.
- 12 47. Chang SE, Feng A, Meng W, et al. New-Onset IgG Autoantibodies in Hospitalized Patients with  
13 COVID-19. *medRxiv* **2021**; Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.27.21250559>.
- 14 48. Bhadelia N, Belkina AC, Olson A, et al. Distinct autoimmune antibody signatures between  
15 hospitalized acute COVID-19 patients, SARS-CoV-2 convalescent individuals, and unexposed  
16 pre-pandemic controls. *bioRxiv*. 2021; Available at:  
17 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.01.21.21249176>.
- 18 49. Rubino F, Amiel SA, Zimmet P, et al. New-Onset Diabetes in Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2020**;  
19 383:789–790.
- 20 50. Brancatella A, Ricci D, Viola N, Sgrò D, Santini F, Latrofa F. Subacute Thyroiditis After Sars-  
21 COV-2 Infection. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* **2020**; 105. Available at:

1 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgaa276>.

2

3

4

5

Characteristic	All (n=121)	No PASC (n=48)	PASC (n=73)	P-Value (PASC vs no PASC)
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>				
Age (IQR)	44 (37-57)	44.5 (37-58.5)	44 (36-56)	P=0.78
Sex assigned at birth				P=0.053
Female	66 (54.5%)	21 (43.8%)	45 (61.6%)	
Male	55 (45.5%)	27 (56.3%)	28 (38.4%)	
Gender				P=0.063
Cisgender Female	65 (53.7%)	21 (43.8%)	44 (60.3%)	
Cisgender Male	54 (44.6%)	27 (56.3%)	27 (37.0%)	
Transgender Male	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.7%)	
Race and ethnicity				P=0.20
Hispanic/Latino	30 (24.8%)	8 (16.7%)	22 (30.1%)	
White	69 (57.0%)	28 (58.3%)	41 (56.2%)	
Black/African American	3 (2.5%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (2.7%)	
Asian	14 (11.6%)	8 (16.7%)	6 (8.2%)	
Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	1 (0.8%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	
Not Provided	4 (3.3%)	2 (4.2%)	2 (2.7%)	
Highest level of education completed				P=0.46
At least some high school	21 (17.4%)	9 (18.8%)	12 (16.4%)	
At least some college	46 (38.0%)	15 (31.3%)	31 (42.5%)	
At least some graduate school	54 (44.6%)	24 (50.0%)	30 (41.1%)	
Tobacco use history	27 (22.3%)	9 (18.8%)	18 (24.7%)	P=0.45
<b>Clinical characteristics</b>				
<b>Pre-existing medical conditions</b>				
Autoimmune disease	9 (7.4%)	1 (2.1%)	8 (11.0%)	P=0.085
Cancer (with treatment received within 2 years prior to COVID-19 diagnosis)	3 (2.5%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (2.7%)	P=0.65
Diabetes	14 (11.6%)	6 (12.5%)	8 (11.0%)	P=0.82
Lung problems	23 (19.0%)	10 (20.8%)	13 (17.8%)	
Body mass index category				P=0.20
24.9 or less	46 (38.0%)	20 (41.7%)	26 (35.6%)	
25 to 29.9	34 (28.1%)	16 (33.3%)	18 (24.7%)	
30 or greater	39 (32.2%)	11 (22.9%)	28 (38.4%)	
Hospitalized during acute COVID-19	27 (22.3%)	8 (16.7%)	19 (26.0%)	P=0.23

**Table 1. Characteristics of study cohort.** IQR, interquartile range. P-values represent either Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables or chi-square test for categorical variables. Fisher's exact test was used when individual cell counts were <5 for categorical variables.

Symptoms reported at late follow-up	N=73 n (%)
Constitutional	
<i>Fatigue</i>	41 (56.2%)
<i>Subjective fever</i>	2 (2.7%)
<i>Chills</i>	2 (2.7%)
<i>Objective fever</i>	2 (2.7%)
Upper Respiratory	
<i>Rhinorrhea</i>	14 (19.2%)
<i>Sore throat</i>	7 (9.6%)
Cardiopulmonary	
<i>Cough</i>	13 (17.8%)
<i>Shortness of breath</i>	28 (38.4%)
<i>Chest pain</i>	18 (24.7%)
<i>Palpitations</i>	15 (20.5%)
<i>Fainting</i>	0 (0.0%)
Gastrointestinal	
<i>Diarrhea</i>	9 (12.3%)
<i>Nausea</i>	17 (23.3%)
<i>Loss of appetite</i>	12 (16.4%)
<i>Abdominal pain</i>	6 (8.2%)
<i>Vomiting</i>	1 (1.4%)
<i>Constipation</i>	3 (4.1%)
Genitourinary	
<i>Menstrual cramps</i>	2 (2.7%)
<i>Dyspareunia</i>	0 (0.0%)
Rash	10 (13.7%)
Musculoskeletal	
<i>Myalgia</i>	20 (27.4%)
<i>Back pain</i>	7 (9.6%)
<i>Joint pain</i>	9 (12.3%)
Anosmia/Dysgeusia	27 (37.0%)
Neurologic	
<i>Headache</i>	18 (24.7%)
<i>Concentration problems</i>	42 (57.5%)
<i>Dizziness</i>	18 (24.7%)
<i>Balance problems</i>	13 (17.8%)
<i>Neuropathy</i>	17 (23.3%)
<i>Vision problems</i>	13 (17.8%)
<i>Parosmia</i>	8 (11.0%)
Trouble Sleeping	32 (43.8%)

**Table 2. Symptoms reported at late follow-up among those with PASC.** Participants were systematically asked about 32 individual symptoms at the late follow-up visit, which took place a median of 124 days from initial COVID-19 symptom onset.



