medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Evidence of recent Epstein-Barr virus reactivation in individuals experiencing Long COVID

Michael J. Peluso,[1] Tyler-Marie Deveau,[2] Sadie E. Munter,[2] Dylan Ryder,[2] Amanda Buck,[2] Scott Lu,[3] Sarah A. Goldberg,[3] Rebecca Hoh,[1] Viva Tai,[1] Leonel Torres,[2] Nikita S. Iyer,[2] Monika Deswal,[1] Lynn H. Ngo,[1] Melissa Buitrago,[1] Antonio Rodriguez,[1] Jessica Y. Chen,[1] Brandon C. Yee,[4] Ahmed Chenna,[4] John W. Winslow,[4] Christos J. Petropoulos,[4] Amelia N. Deitchman,[5] Peter W. Hunt,[2] Matthew S. Durstenfeld,[6] Priscilla Y. Hsue,[6] J. Daniel Kelly,[3] Jeffrey N. Martin,[3] Steven G. Deeks,[1] Timothy J. Henrich[2]^

[1] Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

[2] Division of Experimental Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

[3] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

[4] Monogram Biosciences Inc., South San Francisco, CA, USA

[5] School of Pharmacy, University of California, San Francisco CA, USA

[6] Division of Cardiology, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

^ To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Timothy J. Henrich, MD, MMSc
Division of Experimental Medicine
University of California San Francisco
1001 Potrero Avenue, Bld 3, Rm 525a
San Francisco CA 94110 USA
timothy.henrich@ucsf.edu

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC), Long COVID, Epstein-Barr Virus

Short Title: Epstein-Barr virus in post-acute COVID-19

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

SUMMARY (40 words)

The authors found that Long COVID symptoms in a post-acute cohort were associated with serological evidence of recent EBV reactivation when adjusted for participant factors, sample timing, comorbid conditions and prior hospitalization, but not with ongoing presence of EBV viremia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT (160 words)

Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) reactivation has been proposed as a driver of Long COVID (LC), but studies in well-characterized post-acute COVID-19 cohorts of individuals with and without Long COVID symptoms over a time course consistent with current case definitions of LC are limited. In a cohort of 294 hundred adults with a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection, we observed that LC symptoms such as fatigue and neurocognitive dysfunction at a median of 4 months following initial diagnosis were associated with serological evidence of recent EBV reactivation (early antigen-D IgG positivity or nuclear antigen IgG levels >600 U/mL), but not with ongoing EBV viremia.. Importantly, Long COVID was also observed in the small proportion without evidence of prior or recent EBV infection, suggesting that EBV reactivation is not a prerequisite for this condition. Overall, these findings expand our knowledge of the relationships between EBV reactivation and LC and suggest that further assessment during the acute phase of COVID-19 is warranted.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

BACKGROUND

Intense efforts are underway to understand the biologic mechanisms that drive Long COVID (LC), a type of post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC) characterized by persistent or recurrent symptoms that interfere with quality of life (Nalbandian et al., 2021; 2021). Prior work has identified immune activation (Peluso et al., 2021a; Phetsouphanh et al., 2022), microvascular dysfunction (Pretorius et al., 2021; Wenzel et al., 2021), autoimmunity (Seeßle et al., 2021; Su et al., 2022), and SARS-CoV-2 viral persistence (Chertow et al., 2021; Gaebler et al., 2021; Natarajan et al., 2022; Zollner et al., 2022) as pathophysiologic mechanisms potentially contributing to LC. However, not all studies have confirmed these processes (Peluso et al., 2021b; Sneller et al., 2022), and identification of the determinants of PASC is essential to efforts to prevent and/or treat this condition (Peluso and Deeks, 2022).

Latent Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) is a ubiquitous human herpesvirus harbored by the vast majority (90-95%) of adults in high-income settings (Dunmire et al., 2018). EBV can reactivate in immunocompromised individuals, as well as in the setting of physiologic stressors including acute infection (Middeldorp, 2015). In some cases, EBV reactivated in tissues may not manifest with detectable circulating DNA in blood (Fechtner et al., 2022; Guo et al., 2019). While reactivation of EBV is often considered to be a marker of physiologic stress rather than an independent pathophysiologic process, recent studies have demonstrated that EBV infection may drive multiple sclerosis (Bjornevik et al., 2022), perhaps due to changes in homeostatic interactions between the host and virus (Aloisi and Salvetti, 2022).

Prior studies have demonstrated EBV reactivation as defined by detectable circulating EBV DNA or viral capsid antigen (VCA) IgM positivity during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection (Chen et al., 2021; Lehner et al., 2020; Paolucci et al., 2021; Simonnet et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2021). However, these studies typically involved hospitalized patients and the high rates of reactivation (e.g., >80% of patients) were observed primarily in those receiving positive-pressure ventilation or other ICU-level care. EBV reactivation has also been proposed as a driver of Long COVID. One small but intriguing study identified EBV early antigen-diffuse (EA-D) IgG positivity among two-thirds of individuals experiencing LC (Gold et al., 2021), levels of which were higher in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

those with more PASC symptoms, and more recent work has shown that EBV DNA detectability during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection predicted the presence of symptoms at 30-60 days post-COVID (Su et al., 2022). Although limited by small sample size, sex imbalance, and over-representation of hospitalized individuals, as well as relatively short duration of follow-up, these studies suggest that further investigation of the relationship between EBV-related pathology and Long COVID is urgently warranted. Also needed are studies controlling for potentially confounding factors in the interpretation of EBV reactivation, such as timing of sample collection, hospitalization and severity of disease during initial infection, underlying health conditions, LC symptom phenotypes, and other participant demographics.

In this study, we sought to investigate the prevalence of serological and virological evidence of EBV reactivation in a well-characterized post-acute COVID-19 cohort of individuals with and without Long COVID symptoms approximately four months following initial SARS-CoV-2 infection. This allows us to assess the independent impact of EBV reactivation on variety of different LC symptom groups controlled for various clinical and demographic factors, including details about acute infection. We hypothesized that the group experiencing LC symptoms would be enriched for evidence of EBV reactivation in comparison to individuals reporting complete recovery from COVID-19.

RESULTS

Relationship between participant factors, EBV antibodies and post-acute sequelae

Participant demographics, pre-existing health conditions, COVID-19-related hospitalization and EBV antibody test results were compared by PASC group in 280 participants at the time point beyond 60 days that was closest to 4 months (median 123 days) following nucleic acid-based diagnosis of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection as shown in **Table 1**. Overall, the median age was 45 years, 55.7% were cisgender men, 17.9% had hospitalized during acute infection, 64.6% had a body mass index (BMI) of >30, and 19.3% were living with HIV. In univariate analyses, there were significantly higher percentages of participants with PASC or PASC with greater than 5 symptoms reported (PASC>5) compared to those without PASC symptoms who were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

hospitalized (20.9% and 26% versus 8.8%, respectively; all P <0.05) or had an EBV nuclear Ag IgG level greater than the limit of quantitation of 600 U/mL (44.6% and 47.4% versus 27.5%; all P<0.05).

EBV serological testing involves quantitation of several different antibody responses, all of which provide somewhat different information about prior infection and recent viral reactivation (Klutts et al., 2009). For example, viral capsid antigen (VCA) IgM antibodies become positive within several weeks of acute infection, but also wane over the subsequent months to undetectable levels. In contrast VCA IgG antibodies start rising several weeks after acute infection and often remain elevated for life. Up to 95% of the adult population will have detectable VCA IgG responses at any given time (Dunmire et al., 2018). Nuclear antigen (NA) IgG antibodies, on the other hand, typically increase later than VCA IgG, and often correspond with the timing of establishment of viral latency. These responses are also typically long-lived. In contrast, EBV EA-D IgG responses become detectable following acute infection, typically lagging behind VCA IgM responses. However, unlike VCA IgG responses, the EA-D IgG responses wane over the next several months and are not maintained over longer periods of time. As a result, detection of EA-D IgG responses in people with pre-existing EBV infection have been used as a marker of recent viral reactivation (along with VCA IgM responses) (Gold et al., 2021; Middeldorp, 2015). It is also possible that NA or VCA IgG levels may increase following viral reactivation.

In order to determine the independent associations between demographic factors, pre-existing medical conditions and EBV NA and EA-D IgG results with LC and in those with specific symptoms, we performed covariate-adjusted binary logistic regression modeling as shown in **Figure 1** (adjusted for timing of sample collection >100 days, prior COVID-related hospitalization, age >50 years, sex, body mass index >30, pre-existing medical conditions such as HIV, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, renal disease, autoimmune disease, EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL, and EBV EA-D IgG positivity). EBV antibody variables were selected for inclusion in the final regression models based on antibody measures that may represent recent EBV reactivation (EBV EA-D IgG) or from univariate results (EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL). EBV VCA IgG+, VCA IgG > limit of quantitation (750 U/mL), and VCA IgM results were not significant across any adjusted analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

In adjusted analyses, the odds of severe LC (>5 symptoms), as well as LC characterized by fatigue, gastrointestinal symptoms and smell/taste disturbances was higher in those who had been hospitalized during acute infection (with larger odds ratios nearing significance for any LC symptoms and for those with cardiopulmonary symptoms; **Figure 1a-b**). Female sex also correlated with gastrointestinal and neurocongitive symptoms and smell/taste disturbances (**Figure 1b**).

Interestingly, participants reporting pre-existing autoimmune disease (mainly thyroiditis) and those who had detectable EBV EA-D IgG responses had a higher odds of experiencing fatigue (**Figure 1b**) a median of four months following COVID-19 diagnosis. In addition, participants with high levels of EBV NA IgG levels (>600 U/mL) had higher odds of experiencing neurocognitive symptoms. Furthermore, the NA IgG >600 U/mL odds ratios were higher in those with any LC symptoms and those who experienced fatigue, although the P values was of borderline significance (P =0.063; **Figure 1a**).

Given potential collinearity between hospitalization and EBV reactivation, we repeated logistic regression modeling as above without hospitalization. The association between EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL and any PASC symptoms became significant [OR 2.0 (1.04 – 3.85), P = 0.038] and the association with neurocognitive symptoms was strengthened [OR 1.84 (1.06 – 3.20), P = 0.03). The association between detectable EBV EA-D IgG levels and fatigue was essentially unchanged (OR 2.05 (1.17 – 3.60), P = 0.012).

EBV DNA measurements

In order to determine if circulating EBV DNA is detectable during convalescence and whether any association between EBV DNA persistence and LC is present, we performed quantitative EBV PCR on plasma samples from a random subgroup of 50 participants who underwent EBV serological testing stratified by EA-D positivity (the subgroup demographics and participant phenotypes were similar to the larger cohort as shown in **Supplemental Table 1**). Only one of the fifty participants had detectable plasma EBV DNA, and the level was below the limit of quantitation (<390 copies/mL). This participant had no reported pre-existing medical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

conditions, had no detectable EA-D IgG or VCA IgM at the time of sampling, EBV NA and VCA IgG greater than the limit of quantitation, and reported 2 LC symptoms (persistent cough and heart palpitations) at the time of sampling.

Association between demographic characteristics, severity of acute infection and EBV antibodies

We investigated the associations between participant demographic factors, underlying health conditions and the severity of acute infection and EBV antibody responses in 294 participants with available serological measurements during a convalescent visit, including those with sampling time points <90 days from initial SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. The median time from diagnosis to sample collection was 122. Important factors distinguishing higher and lower levels of EBV responses are shown in **Table 2** and included older age (EBV VCA >750 U/mL, EBV NA IgG >600, EBV EA-D IgG positive), body mass index (BMI) >30 (EBV VCA >750 U/mL, undetectable EBV VCA IgM), HIV status (EBV VCA IgG >750 U/mL, EBV EA-D IgG positive), and history of conditions like diabetes (EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL), heart disease (EBV VCA IgM positive), hypertension (EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL), and lung disease (EBV VCA IgM positive).

Next, we analyzed the relationships between EBV antibody status during the post-acute period and the severity of acute infection, determined by hospitalization status, the number of unique symptoms present during the first 30 days following COVID-19 symptom onset and the self-described decline in overall health associated with the worst point of their COVID-19 illness (calculated as pre-COVID health score minus the health score at the worst point in the illness, measured using the 100-point visual-analogue scale) as in **Table 2**. Those sick enough to be hospitalized were more likely to have EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL. We did not identify differences in the number of acute symptoms or the change from baseline health associated with the worst point in the illness across antibody responses.

We used covariate-adjusted binary logistic regression modeling to examine independent relationships between demographics and pre-existing medical conditions on the number of unique reported symptoms during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and changes from pre-COVID health scores. Participants with a history of HIV infection

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

or who were hospitalized for acute COVID-19 had higher odds of reporting more than 10 unique acute symptoms, whereas male participants and those greater than 50 years of age had lower odds of reporting more than 10 acute symptoms (**Figure 2a**). No variables were significant when compared across those with a greater decrease in health scores associated with acute illness (**Figure 2a**).

Logistic regression was also used to determine relationships between these factors and the number of acute symptoms with the development of EBV VCA, NA and EA-D IgG responses as shown in **Figure 2b**. Interestingly, participants with greater than 10 symptoms had lower odds of having an EBV VCA IgG >750 U/mL during the convalescent study visit. In contrast, a history of HIV infection was significantly and positively associated with the odds of having an EBV VCA IgG >750 U/mL or detectable EA-D IgG.

Association between circulating markers of inflammation, SARS-CoV-2 spike RBD IgG levels and EBV antibody results

We previously identified significant correlations between various markers of inflammation and PASC symptoms, such as IL-6 and TNFα. As a result, we examined the relationship between EBV antibody results in a subset of 143 participants who had circulating biomarker data available. Overall, there were no significant differences between any EBV antibody result and circulating markers of inflammation, immune activation and neuronal injury including GFAP, NF-L, MCP-1, IFNγ, IL-6, IL-10, TNFα, and IP-10 (All P <0.05; **Supplemental Figure 1**). There was also no difference in SARS-CoV-2 RBD total IgG levels in any of the EBV antibody groups (All P <0.05; **Supplemental Figure 2**).

DISCUSSION

In a cohort of several hundred individuals with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, we found that Long COVID symptoms such as fatigue and neurocognitive dysfunction were independently associated with serological evidence of recent EBV reactivation (EA-D IgG positivity or NA IgG >600 U/mL) when adjusted for various participant factors, sample timing, underlying health conditions and prior hospitalization, but not with ongoing presence of EBV viremia. We also identified a relationship between serological markers of recent EBV

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

reactivation as well as hospitalization, suggesting that EBV reactivation may be particularly important in severe COVID-19, which is consistently associated with a higher incidence of PASC. Finally, we identified Long COVID even in the small proportion of individuals without evidence of prior or recent EBV infection, suggesting that reversal of EBV latency is not a prerequisite for Long COVID.

The prior study by Gold et al. was pivotal in identifying an association between EBV EA-D positivity and LC symptoms and raised the intriguing hypothesis that EBV reactivation may be mechanistically related to PASC. Overall, these findings greatly expand on prior observations of a potential relationship between EBV reactivation and Long COVID by demonstrating relationships with various clinically relevant symptom phenotypes and over a longer time course compatible with current case definitions of PASC. First, we had the ability to assess a variety of different PASC symptoms, some of which have been or not been previously associated with acute EBV infection. Second, we had the ability to adjust for acuity of initial SARS-CoV-2 infection, which gives further credence to a possible causal role of EBV, and third, we were able to show that serological evidence of recent EBV reactivation was independence from other markers of inflammation further supporting the hypothesis that EBV may play an etiological role in PASC.

There is also a paucity of data regarding EBV reactivation in non-hospitalized patients with COVID-19, despite the fact that many of these individuals go on to develop Long COVID (Al-Aly et al., 2021; Ayoubkhani, 2021; Groff et al., 2021; Nalbandian et al., 2021; Peluso et al., 2021c; Yomogida et al., 2021). Our post-COVID cohort includes a majority of participants who were not hospitalized during acute infection and we observed relationships between potential serological markers of recent EBV reactivation and certain LC symptoms approximately 4 months following COVID-19 symptom onset. Whether or not EBV reactivation is the root cause of these symptoms, it should be noted that primary EBV infection (*e.g.,* mononucleosis) may lead to prolonged fatigue, and EBV seroconversion has recently been shown to be common prior to the development of MS, an autoimmune condition that may be precipitated by aberrant, autoreactive immune responses to this virus (Bjornevik et al., 2022). Since systemic inflammatory responses and autoimmunity have both been proposed as pathophysiologic mechanisms underlying LC (Peluso and Deeks, 2022), further investigation of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

their relationship with EBV in this patient population is warranted. Nonetheless, it is interesting that we identified independent associations between pre-existing autoimmune disease, EBV EA-D IgG positivity and fatigue.

The biological mechanisms leading to high levels of EBV NA IgG (*i.e.,* greater than the assay limit of detection of 600 U/mL) observed in association with LC symptoms is not entirely clear. Whereas EA-D IgG responses are generally understood to be a result of recent EBV reactivation in those with pre-existing latent EBV infection (Gold et al., 2021), nearly 90% of our cohort had detectable NA IgG, consistent with the long-lasting nature of this antibody and high proportion of participants with pre-existing EBV latency. It is possible that those with higher levels experienced a recent increase following EBV reactivation, but given the lack of sampling during or before acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, we do not know for certain. Nonetheless, NA IgG responses usually peak during establishment (or perhaps re-establishment) of EBV latency, the timing of which is consistent with the post-acute sample collection timing here. We also note that highly symptomatic acute infection (>10 symptoms) was negatively associated with EBV VCA IgG >750 U/mL, but not with high levels of NA IgG. It is possible that pre-existing high levels of VCA IgG are protective during acute infection, perhaps resulting in reduced incidence of EBV reactivation. Further study in acute COVID-19 cohorts to explore these relationships is needed.

Despite the independent association between serological markers of recent EBV reaction and various LC symptoms, we observed no differences in levels of circulating markers of inflammation, persistent immune activation and neuronal injury in those with and without these antibody responses. We and others have previously reported associations between several of these markers (*e.g.* IL-6, TNFα) and LC symptoms (Durstenfeld et al., 2022a, 2022b; Peluso et al., 2021a, 2022a; Phetsouphanh et al., 2022). The lack of association between EBV serology and these markers suggest that there are additional important etiological factors driving PASC and LC symptoms that are not directly related to EBV reactivation. These data also highlight the likely heterogenous nature of PASC and may help determine inclusion in various future interventional trials. In fact, it will likely be difficult to prove any causal role of PASC (*e.g.* EBV reactivation,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

long-term SARS-CoV-2 viral persistence, autoreactive immunity, etc.) without targeted interventional studies. Given that there is paucity of circulating EBV during convalescence, the potential impact of EBV reactivation on the development of LC is likely to be greatest during acute COVID-29, and factors such as this, will need to be considered in the design of such interventional studies,

Of note, we observed an independent association between pre-existing autoimmune conditions and fatigue in our cohort. These data suggest that reversal of EBV latency in those with a pre-existing propensity to autoimmunity may contribute to certain LC symptoms. Also of interest, we observed that HIV status was associated with greater odds of having detectable EA-D IgG levels, as well as more symptomatic acute infection (>10). This suggests that HIV may predispose to more severe disease and higher rates of EBV reactivation. Although not statistically significant, a higher proportion of participants with HIV experienced LC (20.2% versus 16.7%), and we have previously reported differences in the post-acute immune responses between people with and without HIV infection (Peluso et al., 2022b). Further study of autoreactive and other post-EBV infectious processes in this specific participant cohort is warranted.

Strengths of this study include the large sample of well-characterized post-acute COVID-19 patients, most of whom were not hospitalized during acute infection, at a time point consistent with consensus case definitions of Long COVID. However, the study has several limitations. Although diverse, our cohort is a convenience sample not representative of all individuals with COVID-19 or Long COVID. We did not have access to biospecimens from acute or very early convalescent infection (<30 days). Direct evaluation of EBV dynamics during these early phases is warranted, although we believe our results strongly suggest that investigation of EBV viremia during post-acute stages is of limited utility. EBV reactivation is often a tissue-based process and such samples may be needed in order to identify persistent, smoldering infection. As a result, tissue studies will be critical to understanding the full pathophysiological mechanisms underlying LC.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

In summary, this study expands our understanding of the relationships between EBV reactivation and a range of LC symptoms, and shows that serological evidence of recent EBV activity may contribute, at least in part, to some aspects of LC. However, this study also highlights that not all PASC is related to EBV. In fact, other mechanisms, such as persistent SARS-CoV-2 infection in various tissues, may play an even more important role in LC as reflected by the growing case-series level evidence that LC symptoms dramatically improve in the setting of SARS-CoV-2 directed antiviral therapies (Boglione et al., 2022; Geng et al., 2022; Peluso et al., 2022c). Ultimately, further investigation of SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses during both acute infection and convalescence will be needed to clarify the mechanisms driving Long COVID and suggest interventions that may reverse or ameliorate these processes.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Study participants

All participants in the Long-term Impact of Infection with Novel Coronavirus cohort (LIINC; NCT04362150) with biospecimens available outside the acute window of SARS-CoV-2 infection were studied; the cohort procedures have been described in detail previously (Peluso et al., 2021c). Briefly, any adult with a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection identified on nucleic acid amplification testing, regardless of the presence of acute or post-acute symptoms, was eligible to enroll >14 days following symptom onset and followed approximately every 4 months thereafter. Data regarding the acute period of COVID-19 (including number, type, and severity of symptoms, hospitalization and COVID-19 treatment), as well as demographics, and medical comorbidities, were collected by self-report at the first visit and verified through review of medical records whenever possible. At each visit, participants were queried regarding the presence of 32 symptoms derived from the CDC COVID-19 symptom list [18] and the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ) somatic symptom scale (Kroenke et al., 2002). Importantly, participants were specifically asked to describe symptoms only if they were new or worse compared to the period prior to COVID-19. Participants were also asked to assign themselves a score using a visual-analogue scale from 0-100 to indicate their overall health prior to COVID-19, at the worst point in their illness, and in the week prior to the visit.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Biospecimen collection

At each visit, whole blood was collected in EDTA tubes followed by density gradient separation and isolation of peripheral blood mononuclear cells and plasma as previously described (Peluso et al., 2021d). Serum was obtained concomitantly from serum-separation tubes for antibody testing. Both plasma and serum samples were stored at -80F.

EBV assays

EBV antibody testing was performed on participant serum by ARUP laboratories. The EBV antibody panel included quantitative measures of anti-Viral Capsid Antigen (VCA) IgG and IgM, anti-Nuclear Antigen (NA) IgG, and early antigen-diffuse IgG. Results were considered positive in this analysis if units (U) per mL were within or higher than the indeterminate range of the assay (VCA IgG $\geq$ 18 U/mL; VCA IgM $\geq$ 36 U/mL; NA IgG $\geq$ 18 U/mL; early D Ag $\geq$ 9 U/mL). The VCA IgG, NA IgG and EA-D IgG assays had upper limits of quantitation (>750 U/mL, >600 U/mL and >150 U/mL, respectively). Quantitative EBV PCR testing was performed on a random subset of 50 study participants stratified by EA-D IgG positivity by ARUP laboratories (quantitative range 2.6-7.6 log copies/mL). This assay also identifies detectable EBV DNA above and below the limit of quantitation.

Biomarker and SARS-CoV-2 IgG analyses

A subset of participants (n=143) had circulating biomarker data available from previous testing (Peluso et al., 2021a, 2021e). Briefly, the fully automated HD-X Simoa platform was used to measure biomarkers in blood plasma including monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 (MCP-1), Cytokine 3-PlexA (interleukin 6 [IL-6], interleukin 10 [IL-10], tumor necrosis factor alpha [TNF-α]), IFN-γ–induced protein 10 (IP-10), IFN-γ, neurofilament light chain (NfL), glial fibrillary acidic protein (GFAP), and SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain (RBD) immunoglobulin G (IgG) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Assay performance was consistent with the manufacturer's specifications.

Statistical methods

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the cohort including median and 25% and 75% quartiles for continuous variables. In univariate analyses of binary variables, we performed chi square testing or Fisher's exact testing (if any expected cell value was less than 5) for cross-tabular data and Mann-Whitney U or Kruskal-Wallis tests (for multiple comparisons with unadjusted Dunn correction) to compare variables across Long COVID groups, symptom groups, and EBV antibody results. Covariate-adjusted binary logistic regression models were performed to determine independent associations between variables and PASC/symptom/antibody results. All P values are 2 sided. Prism version 9.1.2 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, California) and SPSS version 28.0.1.1 (IBM) software was used for analyses.

Human subjects

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

FOOTNOTES

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the LIINC study participants and to the clinical staff who provided care to these individuals during their acute illness period and during their recovery. We thank Dr. Isabel Rodriguez-Barraquer, Dr. Bryan Greenhouse, and Dr. Rachel Rutishauser for their contributions to the LIINC leadership team. We thank Elnaz Eilkhani for coordination with the Institutional Review Board. We acknowledge the contributions of the UCSF Clinical and Translational Science Unit, Core Immunology Laboratory, and AIDS Specimen Bank. We thank Jeremy Lambert from Quanterix for his advice and assistance with the SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assay kits.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIH/NIAID 3R01AI141003-03S1 [to TJ Henrich] and by the Zuckerberg San Francisco Hospital Department of Medicine and Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine.

Conflicts of Interest

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

AC, BCY, JWW, and CJP are employees of Monogram Biosciences, Inc., a division of LabCoSGD reports grants and/or personal fees from Gilead Sciences, Merck & Co., Viiv, AbbVie, Eli Lilly, ByroLogyx, and Enochian Biosciences outside the submitted work. TJH reports consulting for Roche and Regeneron, and grants from Merck and Co., Gilead Biosciences, and Bristol-Myers Squibb outside the submitted work. The remaining authors report no conflicts.

Author Contributions

MJP, SGD, and TJH designed the study, which was supported through funding to SGD and TJH. MJP, RH, JDK, JNM, SGD, and TJH designed the cohort. DR, SEM, RH, VT, LT, MD, LHN, MB, and AR collected clinical data and biospecimens, which were processed by TMD, DR, SEM, LT, NI in the laboratory of TJH. Specimens were analyzed by TMD, DR, SEM, BCY, AC, JWW, and CJP. SL, SAG, JYC processed and managed data. MJP and TJH performed and/or interpreted the statistical analyses. MJP, SGD, and TJH drafted the initial manuscript with input from AD, PWH, MSD, PYH, JDK, and JNM. All authors edited, reviewed, and approved the final manuscript.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Results from covariate adjusted logistic regression analysis of predictors of PASC and long COVID symptoms. Demographic, underlying health conditions and EBV antibody positivity as predictors of participants with any persistent symptom (PASC) or greater than 5 symptoms across organ systems compared with those without PASC are shown in (**a**). Predictors of fatigue, cardiopulmonary symptoms (sx), gastrointestinal symptoms, neurocognitive symptoms, and disturbances in smell and taste are shown in (**c**). N = 257 (cases with missing values excluded from regression model). Dots and bars represent odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. P values from regression analyses are shown. BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; NA = nuclear antigen; EA-D = early antigen-D.; PASC = post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Figure 2. Results from covariate adjusted logistic regression analysis of predictors of the number of symptoms during acute infection, change in quality of life and EBV-specific antibody responses 4 months following COVID-19 PCR diagnosis. Covariate adjusted odds ratios of demographic and underlying disease factors as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

predictors of participants with greater than 10 unique symptoms at the time of presentation and a greater than 30 point drop in reported EQ5 health scores from pre-COVID-19 to the time of worst score are show (**a**). Odds ratios of participant phenotypes at the time of initial presentation as predictors of EBV serology results. Dots and bars represent odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. P values from regression analyses are shown. BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; NA = nuclear antigen; EA-D = early antigen-D.

REFERENCES

Al-Aly, Z., Xie, Y., and Bowe, B. (2021). High-dimensional characterization of post-acute sequelae of COVID-19. Nature *594*, 259–264. .

Aloisi, F., and Salvetti, M. (2022). Epstein-Barr virus and multiple sclerosis: supporting causality. Lancet Neurol. *21*, 300–301. .

Ayoubkhani, D. (2021). Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in the UK - Office for National Statistics (Office for National Statistics).

Bjornevik, K., Cortese, M., Healy, B.C., Kuhle, J., Mina, M.J., Leng, Y., Elledge, S.J., Niebuhr, D.W., Scher, A.I., Munger, K.L., et al. (2022). Longitudinal analysis reveals high prevalence of Epstein-Barr virus associated with multiple sclerosis. Science *375*, 296–301. .

Boglione, L., Meli, G., Poletti, F., Rostagno, R., Moglia, R., Cantone, M., Esposito, M., Scianguetta, C., Domenicale, B., Di Pasquale, F., et al. (2022). Risk factors and incidence of long-COVID syndrome in hospitalized patients: does remdesivir have a protective effect? QJM *114*, 865–871. .

Chen, T., Song, J., Liu, H., Zheng, H., and Chen, C. (2021). Positive Epstein-Barr virus detection in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients. Sci. Rep. *11*, 10902. .

Chertow, D., Stein, S., Ramelli, S., Grazioli, A., Chung, J.-Y., Singh, M., Yinda, C.K., Winkler, C., Dickey, J., Ylaya, K., et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 infection and persistence throughout the human body and brain.

Dunmire, S.K., Verghese, P.S., and Balfour, H.H., Jr (2018). Primary Epstein-Barr virus infection. J. Clin. Virol.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

102, 84–92. .

Durstenfeld, M.S., Peluso, M.J., Kaveti, P., Hill, C., Li, D., Sander, E., Swaminathan, S., Arechiga, V.M., Sun, K., Ma, Y., et al. (2022a). Inflammation during early post-acute COVID-19 is associated with reduced exercise capacity and Long COVID symptoms after 1 year. medRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.17.22275235.

Durstenfeld, M.S., Peluso, M.J., Kelly, J.D., Win, S., Swaminathan, S., Li, D., Arechiga, V.M., Zepeda, V.A., Sun, K., Shao, S.J., et al. (2022b). Role of antibodies, inflammatory markers, and echocardiographic findings in post-acute cardiopulmonary symptoms after SARS-CoV-2 infection. JCI Insight https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.157053.

Fechtner, S., Berens, H., Bemis, E., Johnson, R.L., Guthridge, C.J., Carlson, N.E., Demoruelle, M.K., Harley, J.B., Edison, J.D., Norris, J.A., et al. (2022). Antibody Responses to Epstein-Barr Virus in the Preclinical Period of Rheumatoid Arthritis Suggest the Presence of Increased Viral Reactivation Cycles. Arthritis Rheumatol *74*, 597–603. .

Gaebler, C., Wang, Z., Lorenzi, J.C.C., Muecksch, F., Finkin, S., Tokuyama, M., Cho, A., Jankovic, M., Schaefer-Babajew, D., Oliveira, T.Y., et al. (2021). Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Nature https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03207-w.

Geng, L.N., Bonilla, H.F., Shafer, R.W., Miglis, M.G., and Yang, P.C. (2022). Case report of breakthrough long COVID and the use of nirmatrelvir-ritonavir.

Gold, J.E., Okyay, R.A., Licht, W.E., and Hurley, D.J. (2021). Investigation of Long COVID Prevalence and Its Relationship to Epstein-Barr Virus Reactivation. Pathogens *10*. https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10060763.

Groff, D., Sun, A., Ssentongo, A.E., Ba, D.M., Parsons, N., Poudel, G.R., Lekoubou, A., Oh, J.S., Ericson, J.E., Ssentongo, P., et al. (2021). Short-term and Long-term Rates of Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Systematic Review. JAMA Netw Open *4*, e2128568. .

Guo, X., Li, T., Li, F., Xu, Y., Wang, H., Cheng, W., Tang, J., Zhou, G., Chen, H., Ng, M., et al. (2019). Intermittent abortive reactivation of Epstein-Barr virus during the progression of nasopharyngeal cancer as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

indicated by elevated antibody levels. Oral Oncol. *93*, 85–90. .

Klutts, J.S., Ford, B.A., Perez, N.R., and Gronowski, A.M. (2009). Evidence-based approach for interpretation of Epstein-Barr virus serological patterns. J. Clin. Microbiol. *47*, 3204–3210. .

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R.L., and Williams, J.B.W. (2002). The PHQ-15: validity of a new measure for evaluating the severity of somatic symptoms. Psychosom. Med. *64*, 258–266. .

Lehner, G.F., Klein, S.J., Zoller, H., Peer, A., Bellmann, R., and Joannidis, M. (2020). Correlation of interleukin-6 with Epstein-Barr virus levels in COVID-19. Crit. Care *24*, 657. .

Middeldorp, J.M. (2015). Epstein-Barr Virus-Specific Humoral Immune Responses in Health and Disease. Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol. *391*, 289–323. .

Nalbandian, A., Sehgal, K., Gupta, A., Madhavan, M.V., McGroder, C., Stevens, J.S., Cook, J.R., Nordvig, A.S., Shalev, D., Sehrawat, T.S., et al. (2021). Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome. Nat. Med. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z.

Natarajan, A., Zlitni, S., Brooks, E.F., Vance, S.E., Dahlen, A., Hedlin, H., Park, R.M., Han, A., Schmidtke, D.T., Verma, R., et al. (2022). Gastrointestinal symptoms and fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA suggest prolonged gastrointestinal infection. Med (N Y) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2022.04.001.

Paolucci, S., Cassaniti, I., Novazzi, F., Fiorina, L., Piralla, A., Comolli, G., Bruno, R., Maserati, R., Gulminetti, R., Novati, S., et al. (2021). EBV DNA increase in COVID-19 patients with impaired lymphocyte subpopulation count. Int. J. Infect. Dis. *104*, 315–319. .

Peluso, M.J., and Deeks, S.G. (2022). Early clues regarding the pathogenesis of long-COVID. Trends Immunol. *43*, 268–270. .

Peluso, M.J., Lu, S., Tang, A.F., Durstenfeld, M.S., Ho, H.-E., Goldberg, S.A., Forman, C.A., Munter, S.E., Hoh, R., Tai, V., et al. (2021a). Markers of Immune Activation and Inflammation in Individuals With Postacute Sequelae of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection. J. Infect. Dis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiab490.

Peluso, M.J., Thomas, I.J., Munter, S.E., Deeks, S.G., and Henrich, T.J. (2021b). Lack of Antinuclear Antibodies in Convalescent COVID-19 Patients with Persistent Symptoms. Clin. Infect. Dis. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab890.

Peluso, M.J., Kelly, J.D., Lu, S., Goldberg, S.A., Davidson, M.C., Mathur, S., Durstenfeld, M.S., Spinelli, M.A., Hoh, R., Tai, V., et al. (2021c). Persistence, Magnitude and Patterns of Post-acute Symptoms and Quality of Life Following Onset of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: Cohort Description and Approaches for Measurement. Open Forum Infect Dis https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofab640.

Peluso, M.J., Deitchman, A.N., Torres, L., Iyer, N.S., Munter, S.E., Nixon, C.C., Donatelli, J., Thanh, C., Takahashi, S., Hakim, J., et al. (2021d). Long-term SARS-CoV-2-specific immune and inflammatory responses in individuals recovering from COVID-19 with and without post-acute symptoms. Cell Rep. 109518. .

Peluso, M.J., Sans, H.M., Forman, C.A., Nylander, A.N., Ho, H.-E., Lu, S., Goldberg, S.A., Hoh, R., Tai, V., Munter, S.E., et al. (2021e). Plasma markers of neurologic injury and systemic inflammation in individuals with self-reported neurologic post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC).

Peluso, M.J., Sans, H.M., Forman, C.A., Nylander, A.N., Ho, H.-E., Lu, S., Goldberg, S.A., Hoh, R., Tai, V., Munter, S.E., et al. (2022a). Plasma Markers of Neurologic Injury and Inflammation in People With Self-Reported Neurologic Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm *9*. https://doi.org/10.1212/NXI.0000000000200003.

Peluso, M.J., Spinelli, M.A., Deveau, T.-M., Forman, C.A., Munter, S.E., Mathur, S., Tang, A.F., Lu, S., Goldberg, S.A., Arreguin, M.I., et al. (2022b). Post-acute sequelae and adaptive immune responses in people living with HIV recovering from SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Peluso, M.J., Anglin, K., Durstenfeld, M.S., Martin, J.N., Kelly, J.D., Hsue, P.Y., Henrich, T.J., and Deeks, S.G. (2022c). Effect of oral nirmatrelvir on Long COVID symptoms: a case series.

Phetsouphanh, C., Darley, D.R., Wilson, D.B., Howe, A., Munier, C.M.L., Patel, S.K., Juno, J.A., Burrell, L.M.,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Kent, S.J., Dore, G.J., et al. (2022). Immunological dysfunction persists for 8 months following initial mild-to-moderate SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat. Immunol. 1–7. .

Pretorius, E., Vlok, M., Venter, C., Bezuidenhout, J.A., Laubscher, G.J., Steenkamp, J., and Kell, D.B. (2021). Persistent clotting protein pathology in Long COVID/Post-Acute Sequelae of COVID-19 (PASC) is accompanied by increased levels of antiplasmin. Cardiovasc. Diabetol. *20*, 172. .

Seeßle, J., Waterboer, T., Hippchen, T., Simon, J., Kirchner, M., Lim, A., Müller, B., and Merle, U. (2021). Persistent symptoms in adult patients one year after COVID-19: a prospective cohort study. Clin. Infect. Dis. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab611.

Simonnet, A., Engelmann, I., Moreau, A.-S., Garcia, B., Six, S., El Kalioubie, A., Robriquet, L., Hober, D., and Jourdain, M. (2021). High incidence of Epstein-Barr virus, cytomegalovirus, and human-herpes virus-6 reactivations in critically ill patients with COVID-19. Infect Dis Now *51*, 296–299. .

Singh, V., Upadhyay, P., Reddy, J., and Granger, J. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 respiratory co-infections: Incidence of viral and bacterial co-pathogens. Int. J. Infect. Dis. *105*, 617–620. .

Sneller, M.C., Liang, C.J., Marques, A.R., Chung, J.Y., Shanbhag, S.M., Fontana, J.R., Raza, H., Okeke, O., Dewar, R.L., Higgins, B.P., et al. (2022). A Longitudinal Study of COVID-19 Sequelae and Immunity: Baseline Findings. Ann. Intern. Med. https://doi.org/10.7326/M21-4905.

Su, Y., Yuan, D., Chen, D.G., Ng, R.H., Wang, K., Choi, J., Li, S., Hong, S., Zhang, R., Xie, J., et al. (2022). Multiple Early Factors Anticipate Post-Acute COVID-19 Sequelae. Cell *0*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.01.014.

Wenzel, J., Lampe, J., Müller-Fielitz, H., Schuster, R., Zille, M., Müller, K., Krohn, M., Körbelin, J., Zhang, L., Özorhan, Ü., et al. (2021). The SARS-CoV-2 main protease Mpro causes microvascular brain pathology by cleaving NEMO in brain endothelial cells. Nat. Neurosci. 1–12. .

Yomogida, K., Zhu, S., Rubino, F., Figueroa, W., Balanji, N., and Holman, E. (2021). Post-Acute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Adults Aged ≥18 Years - Long Beach, California, April 1-December 10, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. *70*, 1274–1277. .

Zollner, A., Koch, R., Jukic, A., Pfister, A., Meyer, M., Rössler, A., Kimpel, J., Adolph, T.E., and Tilg, H. (2022). Post-acute COVID-19 is characterized by gut viral antigen persistence in inflammatory bowel diseases. Gastroenterology https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2022.04.037.

(2021). A clinical case definition of post COVID-19 condition by a Delphi consensus, 6 October 2021 (World Health Organization).

Table 1. Participant demographics, pre-existing health conditions, prior hospitalization, and EBV serology results by PASC definitions.

	All Participants	No PASC	PASC	PASC >5 Symptoms
N	280[a]	72	208	97
Timing in days of data collection following acute COVID diagnosis [median (QR)][b]	123 (114, 134)	124 (116, 132)	123 (112, 135)	123 (109, 145)
Age [median (QR)]	45 (36, 56)	44 (32, 54)	46 (36, 56)	45 (35, 56)
Male Sex [n (%)][b]	156 (55.7)	42 (58.3)	114 (54.8)	46 (47.4)
BMI >30 [n (%)]	177 (64.6)	40 (58.8)	137 (66.5)	67 (70.5)
Pre-existing Health Condition [n (%)]				
HIV	54 (19.3)	12 (16.7)	42 (20.2)	21 (21.6)
Autoimmune Disease	18 (6.4)	3 (4.2)	15 (7.2)	7 (7.2)
Diabetes	25 (9.1)	7 (9.7)	18 (8.9)	12 (12.8)
Heart Disease	8 (2.9)	3 (4.2)	5 (2.4)	3 (3.2)
Hypertension	53 (19.1)	11 (15.5)	42 (20.4)	21 (22.1)
Lung Disease	48 (17.3)	11 (15.5)	37 (18.0)	20 (21.1)
Hospitalized [n (%)]	49 (17.9)	6 (8.8)	**43 (20.9)***	**25 (26.0)****
EBV Serology[d] [n (%)]				
EBV VCA IgG+	259 (94.9)	64 (92.8)	195 (95.6)	90 (94.7)
EBV VCA IgG >750	105 (38.5)	28 (40.6)	77 (37.7)	36 (37.9)
EBV VCA IgM+	10 (3.7)	2 (2.9)	8 (3.9)	2 (2.1)
EBV NA IgG+	243 (89.0)	61 (88.4)	182 (89.2)	84 (88.4)
EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL	110 (40.0)	19 (27.5)	**91 (44.6)***	**45 (47.4)***
EBV EA-D IgG+	98 (35.9)	23 (33.3)	75 (36.8)	39 (41.1)

BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; PASC = post-acute sequalae of SARS-CoV-2 infection; NA = anti-nuclear antigen; EA-D = anti-early antigen D

[a] Variables with missing data (missing N): BMI (6), diabetes (6), heart disease (4), hypertension (3), lung disease (3), hospitalized (5), EBV antibody results (7)

[b] QR = 25%, 75% quartiles

[c] n = number of participants with underlying condition or positive laboratory results, % = percent within column

[d] Plasma EBV DNA was tested in a subgroup of 50 participants; one participant with one PASC symptom had detectable DNA below the limit of quantitation (<390 copies/mL)

* P <0.05, ** P <0.01 by Chi Square Testing comparing LC >5 symptoms or All PASC to No PASC

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Results from covariate adjusted logistic regression analysis of predictors of PASC and long COVID symptoms. Demographic, underlying health conditions and EBV antibody positivity as predictors of participants with any persistent symptom (PASC) or greater than 5 symptoms across organ systems compared with those without PASC are shown in (**a**). Predictors of fatigue, cardiopulmonary symptoms (sx), gastrointestinal symptoms, neurocognitive symptoms, and disturbances in smell and taste are shown in (**c**). N = 257 (cases with missing values excluded from regression model). Dots and bars represent odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. P values from regression analyses are shown. Regression models were adjusted for all covariates listed in the Figure. BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; NA = nuclear antigen; EA-D = early antigen-D.; PASC = post-acute sequalae of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2. EBV Antibody Results by participant demographics, pre-existing health conditions, prior hospitalization, and severity of acute infection.

	All Participants	EBV VCA IgG <750 U/mL	EBV VCA IgG >750 U/mL	EBV VCA IgM-	EBV VCA IgM+	EBV NA IgG <600 U/mL	EBV NA IgG >600 U/mL	EBV EA-D Ag IgG-	EBV EA-D Ag IgG+
N	**294** [a]	**178**	**116**	283	11	**175**	**119**	**186**	**108**
Age in Years [median (QR)][b]	45 (36, 55)	**41.5 (33, 52)**	**50 (39, 60)****	43 (34, 54)	47 (38, 57)	**43 (34, 54)**	**47 (38, 57)***	**42.5 (33, 52)**	**51.5 (39, 59)****
Male Sex [n (%)][c]	165 (56.1)	95 (53.4)	70 (60.3)	161 (56.9)	4 (36.4%)	98 (56.0)	67 (56.3)	108 (58.1)	57 (52.8)
BMI >30 [n (%)]	185 (64.5)	**98 (56.3)**	**87 (77.0) ****	**182 (65.9)**	**3 (27.3) ***	106 (62.0)	79 (68.1)	117 (64.6)	68 (64.2)
Pre-existing Health Condition [n (%)]									
HIV	56 (19.0)	**19 (10.7)**	**37 (31.9)****	54 (19.1)	2 (18.2)	31 (17.7)	25 (21.0)	**26 (14.0)**	**30 (27.8)****
Autoimmune Dx	19 (6.5)	12 (6.7)	7 (6.0)	19 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	13 (7.4)	6 (5.0)	13 (7.0)	6 (5.6)
Diabetes	28 (9.7)	14 (8.0)	14 (12.4)	28 (10.1)	0 (0.0)	**11 (6.3)**	**17 (14.9)***	16 (8.8)	12 (11.3)
Heart Disease	7 (2.4)	**1 (0.6)**	**6 (5.2)***	**5 (1.8)**	**2 (18.2)***	3 (1.7)	4 (3.4)	2 (1.1)	5 (4.8)
Hypertension	55 (18.9)	28 (15.8)	27 (23.7)	54 (19.3)	1 (9.1)	**25 (14.3)**	**30 (25.9)***	30 (16.3)	25 (23.4)
Lung Disease	51 (17.5)	27 (15.3)	24 (21.1)	**46 (16.4)**	**5 (45.5)***	31 (17.7)	20 (17.2)	31 (16.8)	20 (18.7)
Hospitalized [n (%)]	55 (19.0)	32 (18.4)	23 (20.0)	55 (19.8)	0 (0.0)	**24 (13.9)**	**31 (26.7)****	39 (21.3)	16 (15.1)
# Acute Symptoms	9.5 (6, 13)	10 (6, 13)	9 (5, 12)	9 (6, 13)	10 (7, 15)	9 (6, 12)	10 (7, 13)	10 (6, 13)	9 (6, 13)
Change from Pre-COVID Health Score[d]	30 (20, 48)	30 (20, 49)	30 (20, 43)	45 (36, 56)	40 (15, 53)	30 (20, 45)	30 (20, 50)	30 (20, 48)	30 (20, 48)

BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; Ag = antigen;

[a] Variables with missing data (missing N): BMI (7), diabetes (6), heart disease (5), hypertension (3) , lung disease (3), hospitalized (5)

[b] QR = 25%, 75% quartiles

[c] n = number of participants with underlying condition or positive laboratory results, % = percent within column

[d] Difference in EQ5 health score (0-100) from pre-COVID-19 to time of worst score

* P <0.05, ** P <0.01 by Chi Square Test or Fisher Exact Test if any expected value <5 for cross-tabular data comparing positive versus negative antibody result; continuous data analyzed by Mann-Whitney U test.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Results from covariate adjusted logistic regression analysis of predictors of the number of symptoms during acute infection, change in quality of life and EBV-specific antibody responses 4 months following COVID-19 PCR diagnosis. Covariate adjusted odds ratios of demographic and underlying disease factors as predictors of participants with greater than 10 unique symptoms at the time of presentation and a greater than 30 point drop in reported EQ5 health scores from pre-COVID-19 to the time of worst score are show (**a**). Odds ratios of participant phenotypes at the time of initial presentation as predictors of EBV serology results. Dots and bars represent odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. P values from regression analyses are shown. BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; VCA = viral capsid antigen; NA = nuclear antigen; EA-D = early antigen-D.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Supplemental Table 1. Subgroup analysis of plasma EBV DNA testing and other factors in subgroups of randomly selected participants stratified by Early Antigen-Diffuse (EA-D) IgG positivity.

	EA-D IgG Negative	EA-D IgG Positive
N	25	25
Plasma EBV DNA Positive [n (%)]	1 (4)[a]	0 (0)
Days Post Acute Sx [Median (QR)[b]]	126 (120, 144)	121 (101, 128)
Age [Median (QR)]	42 (32, 55)	49 (37, 61)
Male Sex	18 (72)	12 (48)
BMI >30	15 (60)	17 (68)
Pre-existing Health Conditions		
HIV	3 (12)	5 (20)
Autoimmune Disease	0 (0)	3 (12)
Diabetes	1 (4)	2 (8)
Heart Disease	0 (0)	1 (4)
Hypertension	1 (4)	6 (24)
Lung Disease	5 (20)	7 (28)
Hospitalized	3 (12)	4 (16)
PASC All	18 (72)	18 (72)
PASC >5 Symptoms	9 (36)	9 (36)
Fatigue	10 (40)	13 (52)
Cardiopulmonary Symptoms	9 (36)	10 (40)
Gastrointestinal Symptoms	10 (40)	9 (36)
Neurocognitive Symptoms	13 (52)	15 (60)
Smell/Taste Disturbance		

BMI = body mass index; EBV = Epstein Barr Virus; Ag = antigen; PASC = post-acute sequalae of SARS-CoV-2 infection

[a] one participant with one PASC symptom had detectable DNA below the limit of quantitation (<390 copies/mL)

[b] QR = 25%, 75% quartiles)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Supplemental Figure 1. Circulating markers of Inflammation grouped by EBV antibody result. No significant differences in inflammation marker levels were observed within each antibody group (*e.g.* EA-D IgG + versus EA-D IgG -) by Kruskal-Wallis with uncorrected Dunn's testing (all double-sided P values >0.05). Bars and lines represent mean and standard deviation (all data points are shown). Units are in pg/mL.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.22276660; this version posted June 22, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Supplemental Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain (RBD) IgG levels grouped by EBV antibody result. No significant differences in RBD IgG levels were observed within each antibody group (*e.g.* EA-D IgG + versus EA-D IgG -) by Kruskal-Wallis with uncorrected Dunn's testing (all double-sided P values >0.05). Bars and lines represent mean and standard deviation (all data points are shown).