

1 **Comprehensive Serological Profile and Specificity of Maternal and Neonatal Cord Blood SARS CoV-2**

2 **Antibodies**

3 Rupsa C. Boelig^{1,2}, Sidhartha Chaudhury³, Zubair H. Aghai⁴, Emily Oliver¹, Francesca Manusco⁵ Vincenzo

4 Berghella¹, Elke Bergmann-Leitner⁷

5 1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Sidney Kimmel

6 Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University

7 2. Department of Clinical Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, Sidney Kimmel Medical

8 College, Thomas Jefferson University

9 3. Center for Enabling Capabilities, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Silver Spring, MD, USA

10 4. Division of Neonatology, Department of Pediatrics Nemours

11 5. Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University

12 6. Department of Pathology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University

13 7. Malaria Biologics Branch, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Silver Spring, MD

14 Funding Disclosure: RCB is supported by PhRMA Faculty Development Award. This study funded in part

15 through NIH grant 3R21HD101127-01S1 (PI RCB) and a Pilot Grant (ZA) through an Institutional

16 Development Award (IDeA) from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National

17 Institutes of Health under grant number U54-GM104941 (PI: Hicks).

18 Conflicts of interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, to disclose

19 Key words: COVID-19, pregnancy, passive immunity, immunity, serology,

20 Word Count: 2633

21 Corresponding author:

22 Rupsa C. Boelig, MD MS

23 Rupsa.boelig@jefferson.edu

24 215-955-9196

55 **Abstract**

56 Objective: To describe the profile and specificity of maternal and neonatal cord-blood antibody profile in
57 response SARS-CoV-2 virus exposure

58 Methods: This is a Prospective cohort study of delivering patients at Thomas Jefferson University
59 Hospital from April 2020-February 2021. Primary objective was to describe unique maternal and fetal
60 antibody epitope titers and specificity in those patients with COVID-19 history. Serologic profile assessed
61 with a multiplex platform. Antigens used were: HA-trimer Influenza A (Hong Kong H3), spike trimers for
62 SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and betacoronaviruses HKU-1 and OC43, as well as the spike N-
63 terminal domain (NTD), spike receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid protein (N; full length)
64 for SARS-CoV-2.

65 Results: 112 maternal samples and 101 maternal and cord blood pairs were analyzed. Thirty-seven had a
66 known history of COVID-19 (positive PCR test) in the pregnancy and of those, 17 (47%) were diagnosed
67 with COVID-19 within 30 days of delivery. Fifteen of remaining seventy-six (20%) without a known
68 diagnosis had positive maternal serology. For those with history of COVID-19 we identified robust IgG
69 response in maternal blood to CoV2 nucleocapsid (N), spike (S) full-length and S (RBD) antigens with
70 more modest responses to the S (NTD) antigen. By contrast, the maternal blood IgM response appeared
71 more specific to S (full-length), than N, S (RBD) or S (NTD) epitopes. There were significantly higher
72 maternal and cord blood IgG response not just to CoV2 spike ($p < 10^{-18}$), but also CoV1 spike ($p < 10^{-9}$)
73 and MERS spike ($p < 10^{-8}$). By contrast, maternal IgM responses were more specific to CoV2 ($p < 10^{-19}$),
74 but to a lesser degree for CoV1 ($p < 10^{-5}$), and no significant differences for MERS. Maternal and cord-
75 blood IgG were highly correlated for both S and N ($R^2 = 0.96$ and 0.94).

76 Conclusions: Placental transfer is efficient, with robust N and S responses. Both nucleocapsid and spike
77 antibody responses should be studied for a better understanding of COVID-19 immunity. IgG antibodies
78 are cross reactive with related CoV-1 and MERS spike epitopes while IgM, which cannot cross placenta

79 to provide neonatal passive immunity, is more SARS CoV-2 specific. Neonatal cord blood may have
80 significantly different fine-specificity than maternal blood, despite the high efficiency of IgG transfer.
81

82 Introduction

83 Pregnant women were found to be particularly vulnerable to respiratory pathogens and are
84 more likely to need intensive care and have higher mortality due to SARS-CoV-2 infection¹⁻³. SARS-CoV-2
85 infection (COVID-19) is associated with higher rates of pre-term birth⁴, pre-eclampsia^{5,6}, and placental
86 pathology⁷.

87 Pregnancy significantly alters many elements of adaptive immunity in a gestational age-specific
88 manner⁸⁻¹⁰. These adaptations have been studied in viral infection, e.g., in influenza A infection¹¹. The
89 effect of immunological adaptations in SARS-CoV2 infection during pregnancy has not been delineated.
90 Initial studies on COVID-19 patients highlight several findings: CoV2-specific antibody (ab) responses are
91 measurable 2-3 weeks after onset of symptoms^{12,13}, and almost everyone who recovers from SARS-CoV2
92 infection develops ab responses¹⁴ that show a wide range of neutralization activity¹⁵. However, many
93 questions remain such as the durability of these responses, the isotype profile at different stages of
94 infection, and determinants of neonatal passive immunity. The presence/timing of neonatal immunity
95 following maternal exposure can be a key consideration in repeat vaccination in pregnancy. As such,
96 research into placental transfer of maternal antibodies and production of fetus-derived abs have aided
97 in developing guidelines for timing pertussis and flu vaccinations for maximal maternal and neonatal
98 benefit^{16,17}. A study of serologic positive pregnant women found that IgG responses were higher in
99 symptomatic vs. asymptomatic women, maternal IgM and IgG peaked 15-30 days post symptom onset,
100 and passive IgG-immunity was found in about three-quarters of neonates and associated with maternal
101 IgG levels¹⁸. Another study identified a high placental transfer ratio of antibodies, increased with latency
102 between diagnosis and delivery¹⁹. These studies did not evaluate the range of SARS-CoV-2 antibody
103 epitopes or cross reactivity with related viruses, limiting our understanding of the breadth of SARS CoV-
104 2 antibody response as well as our ability to select optimal epitopes to follow in future research studies.

105 The objective of this study was to describe the profile and specificity of maternal serum and
106 neonatal cord blood antibody response to maternal SARS-CoV-2 virus exposure

107 **Materials and Methods**

108 This study was approved by Thomas Jefferson University Institutional Review Board as minimal
109 risk, and each participant provided written consent. This study followed the Strengthening of Reporting
110 of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines.

111 *Cohort Selection*

112 This is a prospective cohort of pregnant patients consented for collection of samples at delivery,
113 including maternal blood on admission and cord blood at delivery as part of an ongoing delivery cohort
114 biorepository. Patients were consented either on admission for delivery or as an outpatient prior to
115 planned delivery at our hospital. Per the study protocol additional maternal blood was collected on
116 admission and cord blood collected at delivery. This cohort includes participants from April 2020 – Feb
117 2021, however due to COVID related research restrictions, most of the participants were recruited
118 November 2020-Feb 2021. Participants were included if they were consented and had maternal and/or
119 cordblood samples available for this study. Those with prior COVID vaccination were excluded. Subjects
120 were split into two groups- 1) COVID-infected which was indicated by either documented SARS CoV-2
121 PCR test at any time in pregnancy *or* positive maternal spike IgG or IgM at delivery based on assays
122 below or 2) COVID negative: no history of COVID-19 and negative SARS CoV 2 PCR testing on admission

123 *Data Collection*

124 Electronic medical records were reviewed for demographic, medical, and obstetric history, date
125 of first positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test, date of delivery, antenatal complications, delivery outcomes.
126 Latency between COVID-19 diagnosis and delivery was categorized as a binary outcome: within 30 days
127 of delivery or >30 days from delivery. Standard of care at our institution includes universal SARS-CoV-2
128 PCR test on admission and neonatal SARS-CoV-2 PCR test if mother has a positive diagnosis on admission
129 for delivery.

130 *Assays*

131 *Serological assessment:* For assessing antibody specificity, a multiplex testing platform (Meso
132 Scale Diagnostics, Rockville, MD): antigens manufactured in a mammalian expression system (Expi 293 F)
133 are printed onto 10-plex plates. The antigens used were: HA-trimer Influenza A (Hong Kong H3), spike
134 (soluble ectodomain with T4 trimerization domain) trimers for SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and
135 betacoronaviruses HKU-1 and OC43, as well as the spike N-terminal domain (NTD, Q14-L303 of the
136 SARS-CoV-2 spike sequence), receptor binding domain (RBD, R319-F541 of the SARS-CoV-2 spike
137 sequence), and nucleocapsid protein (N; full length) for SARS-CoV-2, and bovine serum albumin (BSA) as
138 negative control. Assays were performed following manufacturer's instructions. In brief, plates were
139 blocked using Blocker A Solution and incubated at room temperature (RT) for 1h on a plate shaker,
140 shaking at 700 rpm. The plates were washed three times with 1x MSD Wash Buffer. Sera were diluted to
141 1:1000 dilution with Diluent 100. Positive samples (pooled human serum from COVID-19 patients) and
142 negative samples (pooled pre-pandemic human serum) were used as controls. Plates were sealed and
143 incubated at RT for 2h on a plate shaker, shaking at 700 rpm, then washed three times with 1x MSD
144 Wash Buffer. The detection antibody, SULFO-TAG either with anti-human IgG (or anti-human IgM
145 antibody (was diluted to 2 µg/ml in Diluent 100 (MSD) and added to the wells and incubated at RT for 1h
146 on a plate shaker. After washing, MSD GOLD Read Buffer B (was added to each well and immediately the
147 plates were read on the MESO QuickPlex SQ 120 (MSD).

148 *Placental histopathology:* Placental histopathology was conducted as per routine clinical
149 indications which includes COVID-19 at our institution. Clinical indications for sending placenta for
150 pathology includes COVID-19 in pregnancy, maternal medical comorbidity such as hypertension or
151 diabetes, antenatal complication such as chorioamnionitis, preterm delivery, nonreassuring fetal heart
152 rate tracing. Placental findings were categorized as described in Supplemental Table 1.

153 *Outcomes*

154 The primary outcome was to describe maternal antibody epitope profile and specificity related
155 to COVID-19 exposure and correlate with cord blood levels. All antibody responses were analyzed
156 following log transformation of the mean luminescence intensity read out of the MSD assay.
157 Seropositivity for the CoV2 spike protein antigen was defined based on a cutoffs of 8.85 for IgM and
158 8.96 for IgG, in log transformed, as previously described²⁰. Additional serological outcomes included:
159 correlation between epitope levels, relation between antibody epitopes and latency to delivery

160 *Statistical Analysis*

161 Statistical analysis conducted using SPSS v. 26.0 (Chicago, SPSS, Inc) and R. Continuous variables
162 were compared with Mann-Whitney U test, categorical with Pearson Chi-Square analysis. Correlation
163 between factors was assessed with bivariate correlation and reported with Pearson correlation
164 coefficient. $P < 0.05$ considered significant for all analyses. Figures were generated using the *stats*,
165 *ggplot2*, and *corrplot* packages in R.

166

167 **Results**

168 During the study period there were 112 maternal samples including 101 maternal and cord
169 blood pairs collected. Thirty-six had a known history of COVID-19 (positive PCR test) in the pregnancy
170 and of those, 17 (47%) were diagnosed with COVID-19 within 30 days of delivery. Fifteen of the
171 remaining seventy-six without a known diagnosis had positive maternal serology (IgG or IgM to SARS-
172 CoV-2 spike) positive serology; this was reflected in positive cordblood IgG as well. This represents a 20%
173 seroprevalence rate among study participants.

174 *Baseline Characteristics*

175 Baseline characteristics are described in Table 1. There were 51 in the COVID infected group
176 (n=40 with maternal and cordblood paired sample available). Black and Hispanic patients were
177 disproportionately represented in the COVID infected group. Severity of COVID illness/symptoms was
178 documented for 32 of 36 known cases with the large majority (N=30) being asymptomatic or mild, and 2
179 being moderate severity.

180 *Maternal SARS-CoV-2 serology*

181 Of the 36 with PCR confirmed COVID-19 infection, 92% had positive S-IgM (N=33) and 92%
182 (N=33) had positive S-IgG. We found that subjects with reported COVID-19 diagnosis have high CoV2 S
183 protein-specific IgM and IgG levels in maternal blood, and high IgG but low IgM levels in cord blood,
184 consistent with the dogma that IgM does not cross the placenta (Figure 1). Among subjects with no prior
185 COVID-19 diagnosis, 20% (15 of 76) were seropositive for CoV2 spike protein which is consistent with
186 serosurveillance studies²¹.

187 In terms of the magnitude and epitope specificity of the CoV2 antibody response, we found that
188 subjects with prior COVID-19 infection had robust IgG response in maternal blood to CoV2 N, S (full-
189 length) and S (RBD) antigens that were approximately 20-fold, 150-fold, and 10-fold higher, respectively,
190 than what was found in subjects without prior infection, with more modest responses to the S (NTD)

191 antigen (Figure 1B). By contrast, the maternal blood IgM response appeared more specific to S (full-
192 length), than N, S (RBD) or S (NTD) epitopes. For example, maternal blood IgM response to S (full-length)
193 was approximately 20-fold higher in COVID-19 subjects than in subjects with no prior COVID-19 infection
194 history, but only 2- to 3-fold higher for N or S (RBD) (Figure 1B).

195 *SARS CoV-2 positive and relation cross reactivity to related viruses*

196 We evaluated maternal IgG and IgM response to different coronavirus spike proteins to assess
197 the cross-reactivity of these antibody responses across coronaviruses. For IgG responses on maternal
198 blood and cordblood, we found that participants with prior COVID-19 history had significantly higher
199 responses not just to CoV2 spike ($p < 10^{-18}$), but also CoV1 spike ($p < 10^{-9}$) and MERS spike ($p < 10^{-8}$),
200 suggesting a largely cross-reactive IgG response. By contrast, for IgM responses in maternal blood, we
201 found the response more specific to CoV2, with participants with prior COVID-19 history showing
202 significantly higher response to CoV2 ($p < 10^{-19}$), but to a lesser degree for CoV1 ($p < 10^{-5}$), and no
203 significant differences for MERS (Figure 1A).

204 *Cordblood SARS CoV-2 Serology*

205 Cordblood responses largely mirrored maternal blood responses for IgG with respect to
206 magnitude and epitope specificity (Figure 1). As expected, cordblood IgM responses were approximately
207 50- to 400-fold lower than their corresponding IgM responses in maternal blood. Finally, principal
208 component analysis (PCA) plot of IgG and IgM responses to CoV2 antigens in the panel shows that
209 samples with prior COVID-19 exposure are clearly distinguishable from samples without prior exposure,
210 and that maternal samples are clearly distinguishable from cordblood samples (Figure 2).

211 We found a high correlation of IgG ($R^2 = 0.96$ and $R^2 = 0.94$), but not IgM responses ($R^2 = 0.13$
212 and $R^2 = 0.01$) between paired maternal and cord blood samples for CoV2 spike and N antigens,
213 respectively (Figure 3). A linear fit between maternal and cordblood IgG responses shows a slope of 1.01
214 for both CoV2 spike and CoV2 N antigens respectively.

215 *SARS CoV-2 Serology and Latency*

216 In a cross-sectional evaluation of examining titers by latency, titers of SARS CoV-2 spike IgG and IgM rise
217 rapidly within the first seven days of infection, while nucleocapsid IgM was similar across time points
218 (Figure 4). In evaluating maternal and cordblood serology in relation to latency, COVID disease >7d from
219 delivery was specifically positively correlated with maternal S-IgG ($r=0.42$, $p=0.01$), N-IgG ($r=0.47$,
220 $p=0.001$), RBD-IgG ($r=0.37$, $p=0.03$), NTD-IgG ($r=0.34$, $p=0.04$) and S-IgM ($r=0.36$, $p=0.03$) and RBD-IgM
221 ($r=0.36$, $p=0.03$), but not N-IgM ($r=0.14$, $p=0.88$).

222

223 *SARS-CoV-2 Serology and Placental Pathology*

224 Placental histopathology was available for N=52 participants (N=27 COVID negative and N=25 COVID
225 exposed) and described in Table 2. In looking at antibody titers, maternal vascular malperfusion was
226 significantly correlated with CoV-2 spike IgG ($r=0.36$, $p=0.009$), CoV-2 RBD IgG ($r=0.32$, $p=0.02$), and CoV-
227 2 N ($r=0.32$, $p=0.02$). More correlations existed with CoV-2 IgM epitopes with maternal vascular
228 malperfusion positively correlated with CoV-2 IgM spike ($r=0.31$, $p=0.03$), RBD ($r=0.29$, $p=0.04$), NTD
229 ($r=0.38$, $p=0.005$), and N ($r=0.33$, $p=0.02$). CoV-2 IgM N was also positively correlated with placental
230 intervillous thrombosis ($r=0.30$, $p=0.03$). Mean maternal N-IgM and S-IgM were significantly higher in
231 those with maternal vascular malperfusion (10.3 ± 1.5 vs 9.6 ± 0.8 , $p=0.03$ and 10.0 ± 2.0 vs 8.8 ± 1.9 , $p=0.02$
232 respectively), as were N-IgG and S-IgG (10.6 ± 2.7 vs 9.1 ± 2.0 , $p=0.02$ and 10.4 ± 2.9 vs 8.3 ± 2.4 , $p=0.01$
233 respectively) (Figure 5).

234

235 Discussion

236 Principle Findings

237 There is highly efficient transfer in maternal to cordblood IgG, with IgG response to nucleocapsid
238 and spike and IgM to spike (full length) showing the highest specificity. IgG antibodies are cross reactive
239 with related CoV-1 and MERS spike epitopes while IgM, which largely does not cross the placenta, is
240 highly SARS Co-V-2 specific. Our results suggest: 1) Both nucleocapsid and full length spike IgG and IgM
241 antibody epitopes should be included in evaluating serologic response in future studies of disease or
242 vaccine development 2) Serological profile functions as a proxy for latency from disease exposure and in
243 the absence of known disease (i.e. lack of access to testing) and 3) Cord blood, which is effectively
244 depleted of the highly specific maternal IgM response, may have significantly different fine-specificity
245 than maternal blood, despite the high efficiency of IgG transfer.

246 Results in the Context of What is Known

247 This study adds to existing studies through a comprehensive evaluation of maternal and
248 cordblood serological response. One study including 83 mother/baby dyads examined only spike-RBD
249 and IgG and IgM and similarly identified strong correlation between mother and cordblood as well as
250 latency to delivery¹⁹. Another study of 88 mother/baby dyads identified that IgM peaked at 15 days
251 while IgG peaked at 30 days, which is consistent with our findings regarding maternal and cordblood N-
252 IgG titers and latency >30 days from delivery, although that testing platform was semi-quantitative using
253 a combination of S-RBD and nucleocapsid antigen to report a “total” IgG and IgM titer response thus did
254 not provide granular detail on antibody epitopes and specificity¹⁸. A third study²² looked at 63
255 mother/baby pairs and examined anti-RBD and anti-N IgG. The limited positive serology reported (65-
256 70% of PCR+ mothers) demonstrates the limitations of examining isolated antibody epitopes, and
257 specifically of RBD only epitope.

258 *SARS CoV-2 Immunity*

259 While prior studies have focused on SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, we evaluated a range of
260 epitopes. Our results demonstrated high sensitivity of our platform with detection of spike (full length)-
261 IgM and IgG in ~90% of documented PCR infection. We found that, as in non-pregnant patients, high
262 levels of N-IgG and IgM titers in those with a history of COVID-19²³. Studies in non-pregnant individuals
263 identified IgM peaks in N and S epitopes in second week of infection²⁴. We found that maternal
264 nucleocapsid antibodies demonstrated the highest specificity for documented COVID-19 infection and
265 were highly expressed in both maternal and cordblood samples. Nucleocapsid proteins of many
266 coronaviruses are highly immunogenic and highly expressed during acute infection²⁵. While the focus of
267 vaccine and monoclonal antibody therapeutics have been on spike antigen, these results, consistent
268 with other studies in non-pregnant adults, highlights the potential import of N-antibodies in SARS-CoV-2
269 immunity and target for therapy. Finally, similar to the reports cited above^{18,19,22}, we found a high degree
270 of correlation and a linear fit with a slope of 1.0, between maternal and cordblood IgG with cordblood
271 IgG concentrations, indicating highly efficient transfer of CoV-2 IgG antibodies. Finally, in examining
272 serology across latency we found that antibody titers rise rapidly after 7 days and persist >100 days is
273 associated with increased antibody responses, specifically against nucleocapsid and spike epitopes
274 demonstrating these antibody responses appear durable rather than short lived.

275 Unique to our study, we also evaluated cross reactivity to related viruses by comparing baseline
276 (COVID-19 negative) antibody response against related coronavirus spike antigen to the antibody
277 response in those with COVID-19. We found that while maternal IgG antibodies were cross reactive with
278 related MERS and CoV-1 spike epitopes, IgM was highly specific for CoV-2 and had similar response to
279 MERS and CoV-1 as those without COVID-19. Given that placental antibody transfer is IgG limited, this
280 suggest that cord blood antibody responses may be more cross-reactive and lack some of the CoV2-
281 specific responses found in the IgM of maternal blood. Previous work on adult patients from South
282 Korea indicate that IgM and IgG have a distinct antibody profiles²⁰. There is also indication that the

283 profile of the IgM vs IgG response is indicative of functional activities and subsequent disease severity²⁶.
284 Cross-reactivity between the different CoVs has been a subject of debate. As the antibody profiles of
285 IgM and IgG differ and are associated with distinct biological functions, it is likely that the lack of IgM in
286 the cord blood may fail to transfer at least some of the protective immunity from the mother to the
287 child. This is further highlighted by recent work demonstrating the importance of IgM in SARS-CoV-2
288 neutralizing activity in adults^{27,28} and another study comparing pediatric and adult responses which
289 found pediatric response was predominantly anti-spike IgG in contrast to adult IgG, IgM, and IgA against
290 both spike and nucleocapsid epitopes, and had reduced neutralizing activity compared to adults²⁹. These
291 systematic differences in isotype and epitope specificity raise the possibility that cordblood, which is
292 effectively depleted of the highly specific maternal IgM response, may have significantly different fine-
293 specificity and may therefore have different neutralizing activity than maternal blood, despite the high
294 efficiency of IgG transfer.

295 *SARS CoV Serology and Perinatal Outcomes*

296 As in prior studies³⁰, we have identified an increased rate of preterm in the setting of COVID-19
297 exposure, even in this small cohort. We also identified a positive correlation with higher SARS CoV-2
298 antibody titers and placental maternal vascular malperfusion. This placental finding with COVID-19 has
299 been previously reported^{31,32}, and our finding of higher titers related to this finding rather than just
300 COVID exposure, suggest that time from illness, and potentially chronic or downstream effects from
301 COVID-19 lead to placental pathology rather than the acute infectious state (ie within 7 days from
302 infection).

303 Strengths and Limitations

304 This study has a number of strengths. Other evaluations of COVID-19 serology in the
305 mother/baby dyad focused on limited antibody epitopes. We have provided a comprehensive evaluation
306 of maternal and neonatal cord blood serological response looking across the array of SARS CoV-2

307 antibody epitopes and specificity of response through evaluation of cross reactivity to related viruses.

308 This is a unique examination of serological profile not only in the mother, but also in what is passively

309 acquired by the neonate, and the implications for passive immunity. Although a single institution, our

310 population is diverse, improving external validity.

311 This study has limitations as well. The number of mother/baby dyads limited our ability to provide a

312 more detailed evaluation of serological changes over time. There may be antibody epitope correlations

313 we were not powered to detect. Finally, while we identified differences in maternal and cord blood

314 antibody signature that could impact immunity, we did not evaluate functional activity.

315 Conclusion

316 Maternal COVID-19 exposure is associated with specific maternal and cord blood antibody

317 signature, with nucleocapsid and full length spike epitopes demonstrating highest specificity in

318 distinguishing exposed vs non-exposed individuals. Serologic profile relates to latency from exposure.

319 There is highly efficient transfer in maternal to cord blood IgG antibodies. IgG antibodies are cross

320 reactive with related CoV-1 and MERS spike epitopes while IgM, which cannot cross placenta to provide

321 neonatal passive immunity, is highly SARS CoV-2 specific, suggesting there may be important qualitative

322 distinctions between maternal immunity and neonatal passive immunity.

323

324 **Acknowledgements**

325 We would like to acknowledge our senior research coordinator Brandy Firman as well as the Thomas
326 Jefferson University Hospital Labor and Delivery teams who assisted in sample collection. We would like
327 to thank Ms. Jessica Bolton (WRAIR) for technical assistance in the serological analysis. Collection of
328 samples was funded in part through NIH grant 3R21HD101127-01S1 (PI RCB) and a Pilot Grant (ZA)
329 through an Institutional Development Award (IDeA) from the National Institute of General Medical
330 Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under grant number U54-GM104941 (PI: Hicks). RCB is
331 supported by PhRMA Faculty Development Award.

332 **Disclaimer**

333 Material has been reviewed by the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. There is no objection to its
334 presentation and/or publication. The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private views of
335 the authors, and are not to be construed as official, or as reflecting the views of the Department of the
336 Army or the Department of Defense. The investigators have adhered to the policies for protection of
337 human subjects as prescribed in AR 70-25. This paper has been approved for public release with
338 unlimited distribution.

339

340 **References**

- 341 1. Hantoushzadeh S, Shamshirsaz AA, Aleyasin A, et al. Maternal death due to COVID-19. *Am J*
342 *Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;223(1):109.e1-109.e16. PMID: 32360108
- 343 2. Woodworth KR, Olsen EO, Neelam V, et al. Birth and Infant Outcomes Following Laboratory-
344 Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Pregnancy — SET-NET, 16 Jurisdictions, March 29–October
345 14, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(44):1635-1640. PMID: 33151917
- 346 3. Zambrano LD, Ellington S, Strid P, et al. Update: Characteristics of Symptomatic Women of
347 Reproductive Age with Laboratory-Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection by Pregnancy Status —
348 United States, January 22–October 3, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(44):1641-
349 1647. PMID: 33151921
- 350 4. Allotey J, Stallings E, Bonet M, et al. Clinical manifestations, risk factors, and maternal and
351 perinatal outcomes of coronavirus disease 2019 in pregnancy: Living systematic review and
352 meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2020;370. PMID: 32873575
- 353 5. Yan J, Guo J, Fan C, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in pregnant women: A report
354 based on 116 cases. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2020.04.014>
- 355 6. Rosenbloom JI, Raghuraman N, Carter EB, Kelly JC. COVID-19 Infection and Hypertensive
356 Disorders of Pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2021;0(0). Accessed March 16, 2021.
357 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0002937821001502>
- 358 7. Shanes ED, Mithal LB, Otero S, Azad HA, Miller ES, Goldstein JA. Placental Pathology in COVID-19.
359 *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2020;154(1):23-32. PMID: 32441303
- 360 8. Aghaeepour N, Ganio EA, Mcilwain D, et al. An immune clock of human pregnancy. *Sci Immunol.*
361 2017;2(15). PMID: 28864494
- 362 9. Kraus TA, Engel SM, Sperling RS, et al. Characterizing the pregnancy immune phenotype: Results
363 of the viral immunity and pregnancy (VIP) study. *J Clin Immunol.* 2012;32(2):300-311. PMID:

- 364 22198680
- 365 10. Le Gars M, Seiler C, Kay AW, et al. Pregnancy-induced alterations in nk cell phenotype and
366 function. *Front Immunol.* 2019;10(OCT). PMID: 31708922
- 367 11. Gars M Le, Kay AW, Bayless NL, et al. Increased proinflammatory responses of monocytes and
368 plasmacytoid dendritic cells to influenza a virus infection during pregnancy. *J Infect Dis.*
369 2016;214(11):1666-1671. PMID: 27655870
- 370 12. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal
371 saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational
372 cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(5):565-574. PMID: 32213337
- 373 13. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, et al. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in Patients with
374 COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis.* Published online April 19, 2020. PMID: 32306047
- 375 14. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat*
376 *Med.* 2020;26(6):845-848. PMID: 32350462
- 377 15. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
378 convalescent individuals. *Nature.* 2020;584(7821):437-442. PMID: 32555388
- 379 16. Abu Raya B, Edwards KM, Scheifele DW, Halperin SA. Pertussis and influenza immunisation
380 during pregnancy: a landscape review. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2017;17(7):e209-e222. PMID: 28433704
- 381 17. Cuningham W, Geard N, Fielding JE, et al. Optimal timing of influenza vaccine during pregnancy:
382 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Influenza Other Respi Viruses.* 2019;13(5):438-452. PMID:
383 31165580
- 384 18. Kubiak JM, Murphy EA, Yee J, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 serology
385 levels in pregnant women and their neonates. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* Published online January
386 2021. PMID: 33497654
- 387 19. Flannery DD, Gouma S, Dhudasia MB, et al. Assessment of Maternal and Neonatal Cord Blood

- 388 SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies and Placental Transfer Ratios. *JAMA Pediatr*. Published online 2021.
389 PMID: 33512440
- 390 20. Chaudhury S, Hutter J, Bolton JS, et al. Serological profiles of pan-coronavirus-specific responses
391 in COVID-19 patients using a multiplexed electro-chemiluminescence-based testing platform
392 Short title: Establishing Pan-CoV serological profiles using multiplex assay 4 5. *medRxiv*. Published
393 online March 26, 2021:2021.03.23.21253460. Accessed May 4, 2021.
394 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.23.21253460>
- 395 21. Flannery DD, Gouma S, Dhudasia MB, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among parturient women
396 in Philadelphia. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(49). PMID: 32727884
- 397 22. Edlow AG, Li JZ, Collier ARY, et al. Assessment of Maternal and Neonatal SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load,
398 Transplacental Antibody Transfer, and Placental Pathology in Pregnancies During the COVID-19
399 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3(12):e2030455. PMID: 33351086
- 400 23. Gaebler C, Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, et al. Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*.
401 2021;591(7851):639-644. PMID: 33461210
- 402 24. Sun B, Feng Y, Mo X, et al. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM and IgG responses in COVID-19
403 patients. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020;9(1):940-948. PMID: 32357808
- 404 25. Zeng W, Liu G, Ma H, et al. Biochemical characterization of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein.
405 *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*. 2020;527(3):618-623. PMID: 32416961
- 406 26. Wu J, Liang B, Chen C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection induces sustained humoral immune responses
407 in convalescent patients following symptomatic COVID-19. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1-9. PMID:
408 33753738
- 409 27. Klingler J, Weiss S, Itri V, et al. Role of Immunoglobulin M and A Antibodies in the Neutralization
410 of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;223(6):957-970. PMID:
411 33367897

- 412 28. Gasser R, Cloutier M, Prévost J, et al. Major role of IgM in the neutralizing activity of convalescent
413 plasma against SARS-CoV-2. *Cell Rep.* 2021;34(9):108790. PMID: 33596407
- 414 29. Weisberg SP, Connors TJ, Zhu Y, et al. Distinct antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in children and
415 adults across the COVID-19 clinical spectrum. *Nat Immunol.* 2021;22(1):25-31. PMID: 33154590
- 416 30. Villar J, Ariff S, Gunier RB, et al. Maternal and Neonatal Morbidity and Mortality among Pregnant
417 Women with and without COVID-19 Infection: The INTERCOVID Multinational Cohort Study.
418 *JAMA Pediatr.* Published online 2021. PMID: 33885740
- 419 31. Menter T, Mertz KD, Jiang S, et al. Placental Pathology Findings during and after SARS-CoV-2
420 Infection: Features of Villitis and Malperfusion. *Pathobiology.* Published online 2020. PMID:
421 32950981
- 422 32. Sharps MC, Hayes DJL, Lee S, et al. A structured review of placental morphology and
423 histopathological lesions associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Placenta.* 2020;101:13-29. PMID:
424 32911234
- 425
- 426

427 **Table 1: Comparison of Baseline Characteristics and Pregnancy Outcomes in Pregnant Women with**
 428 **and without PCR or serological evidence of COVID-19**

Demographics	Maternal COVID PCR and Serology negative (N=61)	Maternal COVID PCR or Serology positive (N=51)	P-value
Race			0.03
White (Non-Hispanic)	35 (57)	18 (35)	
Black (Non-Hispanic)	19 (31)	23 (45)	
Asian	2 (3)	0 (0)	
Hispanic	5 (8)	10 (29)	
Chronic Hypertension	7 (12)	8 (16)	0.56
Pregestational Diabetes	0	2 (4)	0.21
Primiparous	33 (54)	30 (59)	0.62
Preterm birth (<37 weeks)	4 (7)	10 (20)	0.04
Preeclampsia	16 (26)	14 (28)	0.88

429

430

431 **Table 2: Placental pathological findings associated with COVID-19 exposure**

Demographics	Maternal COVID PCR and Serology negative (N=27)	Maternal COVID PCR or Serology positive (N=25)	P-value
Placenta unremarkable	6 (22)	1 (4)	0.10
Acute inflammatory pathology	7 (26)	9 (36)	0.43
Chronic inflammatory pathology	1 (4)	0 (0)	0.33
Maternal vascular malperfusion	8 (30)	14 (56)	0.05
Fetal vascular malperfusion	1 (4)	0 (0)	0.33
Intervillous thrombus	3 (11)	3 (12)	0.92

432

433

434 **Figure 1: Antibody responses from maternal and cord blood samples collected from 91 pregnant**
435 **women.** Maternal and Cord Blood COVID-19 refers to samples from patients with known COVID-19
436 history (PCR confirmed) or positive maternal serology. Data reported as natural log-transformed
437 luminescence signal. A) CoV-specific IgM responses (top) and CoV-specific IgG responses (bottom) in
438 maternal sera and cordblood samples to the spike proteins of SARS-CoV1, SARS-CoV2, MERS-CoV, HKU-1,
439 and OC43. Participants with prior COVID-19 history had significantly higher responses not just to CoV2
440 spike ($p < 10^{-18}$), but also CoV1 spike ($p < 10^{-9}$) and MERS spike ($p < 10^{-8}$). By contrast, for IgM responses
441 in maternal blood, participants with prior COVID-19 history showing significantly higher response to
442 CoV2 ($p < 10^{-19}$), but to a lesser degree for CoV1 ($p < 10^{-5}$), and no significant differences for MERS. B)
443 Fine specificity of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM (top) and IgG ((bottom) responses in maternal sera and
444 cordblood samples to SARS-CoV2 epitopes ,i.e., nucleoprotein (N), the full-length spike protein (spike-FL)
445 and its functional subdomains, i.e., receptor binding domain (RBD) and N-terminal domain (NTD).
446 Subjects with prior COVID-19 infection had robust IgG response in maternal blood to CoV2 N, S (full-
447 length) and S (RBD) antigens that were approximately 20-fold, 150-fold, and 10-fold higher, respectively,
448 than what was found in subjects without prior infection, with more modest responses to the S (NTD)
449 antigen. By contrast, maternal blood IgM response to S (full-length) was approximately 20-fold higher in
450 COVID-19 subjects than in subjects with no prior COVID-19 infection history, but only 2- to 3-fold higher
451 for N or S (RBD).

452
453 **Figure 2: Principal Component Analysis of antibody responses.** IgM and IgG responses to CoV2 antigens
454 N, spike, and RBD clearly distinguish between prior COVID-19 cases and maternal from cord blood.

455

456 **Figure 3: Correlation between maternal and cord blood antibody titers.** Maternal and cord blood IgG
457 and IgM to full length spike and nucleocapsid epitope correlation. A linear fit between maternal and
458 cordblood IgG responses shows a slope of 1.01 for both CoV2 spike and CoV2 N antigens.

459

460 **Figure 4: Relationship between latency and maternal antibody titers for IgG and IgM full length spike**
461 **and nucleocapsid epitopes.** Data from N=36 documented COVID-19 infections. Data reported as natural
462 log-transformed luminescence signal.

463

464 **Figure 5: Relationship between maternal spike and nucleocapsid antibody titers and presence of**
465 **placental maternal vascular malperfusion.** Data from N=22 with maternal vascular malperfusion
466 documented on placental histopathology and N=30 with no evidence of maternal vascular malperfusion.
467 Data reported as natural log-transformed luminescence signal. Mean maternal N-IgM and S-IgM were
468 significantly higher in those with maternal vascular malperfusion (10.3 ± 1.5 vs 9.6 ± 0.8 , $p=0.03$ and
469 10.0 ± 2.0 vs 8.8 ± 1.9 , $p=0.02$ respectively), as were N-IgG and S-IgG (10.6 ± 2.7 vs 9.1 ± 2.0 , $p=0.02$ and
470 10.4 ± 2.9 vs 8.3 ± 2.4 , $p=0.01$ respectively)

471




Figure 2

