medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title: Clinical performance of cell free DNA for fetal RhD detection in RhD-negative pregnant individuals in the US.

Authors: Julio F. Mateus Nino[1], Julia Wynn[2], Jenny Wiggins-Smith[4], J. Brett Bryant[5], J. Kris Citty[6], J. Kyle Citty[6], Samir Ahuja[7], Roger Newman[2]

Affiliations

1. Atrium Health, Charlotte, NC, US
2. BillionToOne Inc., Menlo Park, CA, US
3. Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, US
4. Shannon Health, San Angelo, TX, US
5. Unity Health Searcy, Searcy, AR, USA
6. Wellstar Health System, Marietta, GA, US
7. University Hospital, Mentor, OH, US

Corresponding Author: Julio F. Mateus Nino, MD
200 Medical Park Dr NE Ste 250, Concord, NC 28025, United States
Julio.MateusNino@atriumhealth.org

Funding: This study was sponsored by BillionToOne, Inc.and participating clinical sites received research funding from BillionToOne to conduct the study.

Short Title: Cell free DNA for fetal RhD detection

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Shannon Rego for her assistance with data analysis and manuscript preparation. We would like to thank individuals who conducted the chart extractions including Todd Morgan, Lindsey Hendry, Arghal Ahmad, Anita K. LaMonica, Becky J. Covington, Brittany Nugent, and Gretchen Hoelscher.

Conflict of Interest: Dr. Samir Ahuja is a paid consultant from BillionToOne, Inc. Julia Wynn is an employee of BillionToOne, Inc. and has stock options in the company. Drs. Jenny Wiggins-Smith, J. Bret Bryant, J. Kris Citty, J. Kyle Citty and Samir Ahuja received funding for this research project from BillionToOne, Inc.

Word Count 2,869

Precis: cfDNA analysis via NGS is 100% accurate in detecting fetal RhD status in 401 racial and ethnically diverse pregnancies with 100% follow up of all live births.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objective: We aimed to evaluate the performance of a cell free DNA (cfDNA) assay that uses next generation sequencing (NGS) with quantitative counting templates (QCT) for the clinical detection of the fetal RhD genotype in a diverse RhD-negative pregnant population in the United States (US).

Study Design: This retrospective cohort study was conducted in four US healthcare centers. The same NGS QCT cfDNA fetal RhD assay was offered to non-alloimmunized, RhD-negative pregnant individuals as part of clinical care. Rh immune globulin (RhIG) was administered at the discretion of the provider. The assay's sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy were calculated considering the neonatal RhD serology results.

Results: A total of 401 non-alloimunized RhD-negative pregnancies were included in the analysis. The D antigen cfDNA result was 100% concordant with the neonatal serology, resulting in 100% sensitivity and positive predictive value and (both 95% CI: 98.6%-100%) 100% specificity and negative predictive value (both 95% CI: 97.4%-100%). There were 10 pregnancies where the cfDNA analysis identified a non-*RHD* gene deletion, including *RhDΨ* (n=5) and *RHD-CE-D* hybrid variants (n=5). A total of 616 doses of RhIG were administered. Even though the study occurred prior to the current RhIG shortage and the recent American College (ACOG) advisory change, there was a marked decrease in the use of antenatal RhIG in pregnancies when cfDNA results indicated an RhD-negative fetus, indicating providers were using the results to guide pregnancy management.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusion: This cfDNA analysis via NGS for detecting fetal RhD status is highly accurate with no false positive or false negative results in 401 racial and ethnically diverse pregnancies with 100% follow up of all live births. Our data support implementing this assay for the routine management of non-alloimmunized RhD-negative individuals. This approach will result in more efficient and targeted prenatal care with administration of RhIG only when medically indicated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 15% of pregnant individuals in the US are RhD-negative.[1,2] These pregnancies are at risk for alloimmunization and, consequently, hemolytic disease of the fetus and neonate (HDFN) in subsequent pregnancies. Current national guidelines support the administration of prophylactic anti-D immunoglobulin (RhIG) at 28 weeks of pregnancy and in any other circumstances where alloimmunization can occur, such as bleeding episodes, pregnancy loss, trauma or invasive procedures.[1] However, in 35-40% of these pregnancies, the fetus is negative for the D antigen and therefore the pregnant person is not at risk for sensitization and RhIG is unnecessary.[2] The current clinical approach is inefficient and results in many unnecessary doses of RhIG, exposing individuals to unnecessary treatment and risks that might be associated with the receipt of a blood-born product as well as burdensome to the healthcare system and wasteful of medical resources.

The protocol for prophylactic RhIG has received increased scrutiny as there is a shortage of RhIG in the US. In response to the shortage, the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG) issued a practice advisory prioritizing postnatal over antenatal administration when necessary.[4] However, this modified protocol is less than optimal because of the increased risk of alloimmunization.[5] It is unknown how long the current shortage will last, but this could be a recurrent problem, as the supply of RhIG depends on volunteer plasma donation.[5]

Prenatal cell-free DNA (cfDNA) analysis, also knowns as non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT), to predict fetal RhD status is an alternative to prophylactic RhIG administration in all RhD-negative pregnant patients. In April 2024, the ACOG stated that fetal RhD cfDNA analysis is a reasonable approach for practices experiencing RhIG shortages.[4] This approach evaluates

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cfDNA to detect the fetal RHD genotype to predict the phenotype, thereby limiting the use of RhIG only to patients carrying an identified RhD-positive fetus. The United Kingdom (UK) and several other European countries have used cfDNA analysis to guide the administration of RhIG for over a decade.[7-13] This approach has not been adopted in the US because of concerns of the inclusivity and accuracy of the European based assays for the US population.[1] Specifically, the European assays use qualitative polymerase chain reactions (PCR) to look for the *RHD* gene and most of these assays are not able to determine the fetal RhD phenotype in the setting of non-*RHD* gene deletions; present in up to 50% of RhD-negative individuals of non-European ancestry; resulting in inconclusive results for these individuals.[14, 15]

Next generation sequencing (NGS) with quantitative counting template (QCT) technology prenatal cfDNA assay for detecting the fetal RhD genotype is currently available in the US.[16, 17] This assay uses NGS sequence the critical exons of the *RHD* gene that distinguish it from the *RHCE* homolog gene, [16] enabling the detection of both the *RHD*-gene deletion as well other genotypes that result in an RhD-negative phenotype including the 37 base pair insertion that results in the *RhDΨ* and the unique sequence pattern of the RhD-negative *RHD-CE-D* hybrid variant; prevalent in Black and Asian individuals.[14,15] The detection of these non-*RHD* gene deletion variants result in a lower inconclusive rate and therefore a more inclusive and efficient assay for the diverse US population. [16, 17] The use of quantitative counting technology (QCT) in this assay to quantify the proportion of *RHD* gene molecules and compare it to the measured fetal fraction, ensures precise detection of the fetal RhD status at low fetal fractions (i.e., early gestational age and obesity). An analytical validation of this assay demonstrated >99% overall accuracy and 100% concordance of the cfDNA results with the neonate D antigen

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

genotype or serology and a clinical validation of this assay in a sample of alloimmunized patients also demonstrated 100% concordance.[16, 17]

The objectives of this study were to examine the clinical accuracy of NGS QCT cfDNA analysis for the detection of fetal *RHD*-genotype for the prediction of fetal RhD phenotype in a diverse non-alloimmunized, Rh-negative US pregnant population and to evaluate the potential of cfDNA analysis-based management to guide RhIG administration in these pregnancies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This retrospective study was conducted at four healthcare institutions in the US from August 2020 to November 2023, on pregnancies with an expected delivery before May 2024. The same cfDNA fetal RhD assay was offered to non-alloimmunized, RhD-negative pregnant individuals ≥ 10 weeks of gestation, not conceived with an egg donor, or carried by a gestational surrogate (the clinical inclusion criteria for this assay). The patient blood sample was collected at the provider office as part of clinical care and shipped to the central testing laboratory; BillionToOne Inc., a CLIA and CAP accredited clinical lab. The methodology and algorithm of the cfDNA fetal RhD laboratory developed test (LDT) did not change during the study. All participating institutions and the sponsor site received IRB approval. The study was exempted from patient consent as it was a retrospective study of medical records from clinical care.

Patient demographic and clinical data were extracted from the electronic medical records by research personnel at the participating clinical sites. Abstracted data included maternal age, race and ethnicity, and gestational age at the time of testing. We also extracted maternal antigen serology, red blood cell antibody screening, and the frequency and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

gestational age of antenatal and postnatal RhIG administration. Newborn serological D antigen and antibody screening results were abstracted by research personnel who were not directly informed of the cfDNA results; however, cfDNA results were in the medical records as testing was done as part of clinical care and may have been inadvertently viewed during the chart review; and therefore, extractors may not have been completely 30ed to the prenatal results.

The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and accuracy of the fetal cfDNA RhD assay were calculated by comparing the predicted fetal RhD status with neonatal RhD serology. Results were considered concordant if cfDNA reported RhD detected, and the neonatal serology was RhD-positive or the cfDNA reported RhD not detected and neonatal serology was RhD-negative. Twin cases were classified as concordant if cfDNA results were RhD detected and neonatal serology for one or both twins was RhD positive, or if cfDNA results were RhD not detected and both twins' neonatal serology were RhD negative. Analysis was completed in Rv4.2 and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for all metrics. A sample size of 335 cell-free DNA assays was selected on the basis of a conservative predicted sensitivity of 98% to allow the calculation of the assay analytics with a marginal error of 1.5%.

Results

There were 410 non-alloimmunized RhD-negative pregnancies in which the cfDNA fetal RhD assay was performed across the four clinical sites during the study time period. Pregnancies were excluded if cfDNA RhD was not performed as part of clinical care, if the pregnant person's serology indicated they were not RhD-negative or had D-antibodies (were alloimmunized), or the pregnancy was not deliver at the study site. An informative fetal RhD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

result was reported for all 410 pregnancies (0%, no-call rate). Neonatal serology results were available for the 401 pregnancies that resulted in a livebirth. There were 9 pregnancies that had a fetal loss related to multiple congenital anomalies (n=2), trisomy 21 (n=1), and unknown reasons (n=6) More than 25% of the sample identified as non-White (Table 1).

Of the 401 cases with neonatal serology, 140 (34.9%) were RhD-negative and 261 (65.1%) were RhD-positive. The predicted fetal D antigen cfDNA result was 100% concordant with the neonatal serology results; resulting a 100% sensitivity (95% CI: 98.6%-100%), 100% specificity (95% CI: 97.4%-100%), 100% PPV (95% CI: 98.6%-100%), and 100% NPV (95% CI: 97.4%-100%; Table 2). Notably, the cfDNA assay also correctly identified the fetal D antigen phenotype in ten cases of non-*RHD* gene deletions. For all of these cases the predicted fetal D phenotype was concordant with postnatal serology neonate D phenotype. In five cases, the *RhDΨ* variant was identified in the pregnant patient including three patients who identified as Black and two patients who identified as Hispanic (Table S1). The *RHD-CE-D* hybrid was identified in five other pregnancies including three patients who identified as White, Non-Hispanic, one patient who identified as Black, and one patient identified as more than one race. In three cases, cfDNA detected the *RHD-CE-D* hybrid variant was present in the fetus, but not in the pregnant individual, whereas in two cases the variant was present in the pregnant individual (Table S1).

In our cohort, a total, 616 doses of RhIG were administered to 399 individuals. Of these, 364 (59%) were administered antenatally including 16 individuals who received two antenatal RhIG doses, and 252 (41%) were administered postnatally (Table 3). The frequency of antenatal RhIG administration was significantly higher in pregnancies with the fetal RhD-positive results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

than in those with fetal RhD-negative results (95.7% vs. 76.1%; *P* <0.001). When examined by study site, the difference in RhIG administration based on cfDNA results was significant at three sites (one site had no difference and one site contributed only one case). At one site, no RhIG was administered (antenatally or postnatally) to cases with an RhD-negative fetus identified by cfDNA. Additionally, there was a significant reduction in RhIG administration in pregnancies with fetal RHD-negative cfDNA results over time, with 88% of these pregnancies receiving RhIG between August 2020 and December 2022 versus 67% receiving RhIG after January 2023 (p-value =0.004) reflecting a change in clinical practice among practitioners from the participating sites. Notably, the cfDNA testing of the pregnancies included in this study was completed on or before November 2023 and therefore prior to national RhIG shortage which was first noted in January 2024 and the change in ACOG recommendations regarding prophylactic RhIG issued in April 2024 in response to the RhIG shortage.[3]

Postnatally, 1 (0.7%) of the 140 patients with a negative neonatal serology for RhD received RhIG, indicating the potential challenges of neonatal testing. Antenatal RhIG was not administered to 33 pregnant individuals based on the cfDNA results that identified the fetus as RhD negative. If all patients in this sample had been managed based on the fetal cfDNA result, an additional 112 unnecessary doses of RhIG would have been prevented, in addition to the 33 doses already saved secondary to clinical practice changes that occurred during the study.

DISCUSSION

Principal Findings

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We demonstrated that cfDNA analysis via NGS with QCT for the detection of fetal RhD status is highly accurate in a diverse US clinical population of non-alloimmunized, Rh-negative pregnant individuals. Consistent with the validation study of this assay and the study of the performance of this in alloimmunized pregnancies, in this study the assay results were 100% concordant with the postnatal RhD serology in non-alloimmunized individuals and therefore both sensitivity and specificity were 100%.[16, 17] Furthermore, the fetal RhD assay was informative in all cases, with a 0% no-call rate, as early as 10 weeks of gestation. The assay also correctly identified fetal RhD phenotype in the presence of non *RHD*-gene deletions with 100% concordance with postnatal RhD serology results. This is especially important in the racially and ethnically diverse population of the US, where Black and Hispanic individuals have a higher frequency of non-*RHD* gene deletions. If all cases were managed based on the results of the cfDNA fetal RhD assay, an additional 30% of antenatal doses of RhIG doses could have been saved.

Cell free DNA has been used for over a decade in the UK and European countries to guide the administration of antenatal RhIG.[7-13] However, European assays use PCR technology to qualitatively (rather than quantitatively measuring the amount of *RHD* DNA present) assess the presence or absence of the *RHD* gene thereby requiring a later gestational age at the time of testing and resulting in a higher no-call or inconclusive rates, particularly in individuals of non-European ancestry. [7-13] Additionally, the use of European-based assays for the US population is logistically complicated and may not be covered by insurance. An assay with different performance for individuals of European ancestry and non-European ancestry and access based on insurance and financial means results in greater medical risk and healthcare

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

burden to marginalized individuals contributing to health care inequities. The current assay is NGS-based with QCT technology which allows for the detection and quantification of critical allogeneic exons of the *RHD* gene.[14, 16] This includes detection of 37 base pair insertion associated with the *RhDΨ* variant and differentiation between the *RHD* gene and the homolog *RHCE* gene with detection of *RHD-CE-D* hybrid variants. Quantification with the QCT technology enables accurate fetal D identification at low fetal fractions (early gestational age) with detection of fetal RhD phenotype in the setting of non-*RHD* gene deletions in both the pregnant person and fetus. The current data set illustrates the assay capabilities as it correctly detected fetal RhD status in ten pregnancies with non-*RHD* gene deletions. In other assays this would have resulted in a 2.5% no call rate overall and an 8% no call rate among Black and Hispanic individuals in the study sample. Additionally, in this study and prior publications the assay call rate and performance are unaffected by fetal fraction.[16]

This study showed a significantly lower frequency of antenatal RhIG administration in patients with RhD-negative cfDNA results compared to patients with RhD-positive cfDNA results. The average number of RhIG doses of 1.54 per pregnancy was lower than a prior report in a US population which found 1.80 doses per pregnancy, indicating providers used the assay to guide administration of RhIG even before the US shortage and change in ACOG recommendations.[18] Conserving RhIG by using cfDNA for fetal RhD detection to guide management is particularly important during the current national shortage of RhIG. Of the approximate 3.6M births in the US in 2023,[19] it is estimated that 14.6% were born to RhD-negative individuals.[2] Assuming a minimum of one antenatal dose of RhIG for all RhD-negative pregnancies and a second postnatal dose for approximately 65% of patients who delivered an

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RhD-positive neonate, it is estimated that approximately 865,000 RhIG doses are administered annually. Conversely, if antenatal RhIG administration was based on the results of this cfDNA fetal RhD assay and RhIG was administered only in pregnancies where the fetus was predicted to be RhD-positive or the results were inconclusive (conservatively 0.04%), the result would be a savings of more than 180,000 RhIG doses per year. Considering the current shortage of RhIG, the ACOG statement supporting the use of cfDNA to guide the management of non-alloimmunized RhD-negative pregnancies, and the accuracy of the fetal RhD assay demonstrated in the study, we anticipate that the current guidelines in the US will shift to cfDNA-based management similar to current European guidelines.

Previously a challenge to the implementation of a cfDNA fetal RhD assay to guide pregnancy management in the US was the availability of an assay that was both sensitive and cost effective for the population. Evaluations of other cfDNA fetal RhD assays for the US population have been shown to be both clinical and economically inferior to a prophylactic RhIG protocol.[20, 21] This is related to a high rate of inconclusive results leading to unnecessary RhIG administration, lower sensitivity resulting in an increased frequency of sensitization, and high cost. The current assay has greater than 99.9% call rate and sensitivity and is run on a cost-effective NGS-based platform indicating the potential for it to have much higher utility and be more cost-effective than prior assays studied. However, a formal US-based health economics study that considers the potential for an ongoing or recurring RhIG shortage may be beneficial. Importantly, the implementation of this assay in the UK and other European countries was not based on predicted economic benefits. Rather the national adoption in these countries was a multifaceted process based on factors including clinical performance of the assay for their

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

populations, the reduction in unnecessary medical interventions, and potential to streamline and improve medical care and neonatal outcomes.[22, 23]

This study was conducted on a diverse US population, including over 25% of individuals who identified as non-White, and neonatal serology available for all livebirths. There were ten cases where a non-*RHD* gene deletion genotype with a predicted RhD-negative phenotype was detected using cfDNA and for all ten cases the cfDNA-predicted phenotype was concordant with neonatal serology showing the robustness of assay to detect fetal RhD phenotype in the setting of non-*RHD* gene deletions which are more common in Black and Asian individuals. While the assay correctly predicted RhD status of the one twin pregnancy included in the study, the assay performance for twins cannot be determined from this study. Finally, as with many prenatal cfDNA assays, this assay is not indicated for pregnancies conceived with a donor egg, carried by a surrogate, with three or more gestations and pregnant individuals with a history of a bone marrow transplant or solid organ transplant.

These data demonstrate the excellent sensitivity and specificity of this quantitative cfDNA analysis via NGS with QCT technology for the detection of fetal RhD status in a diverse US population. These data and the data previously published support the implementation of this assay in routine clinical practice for non-alloimmunized RhD-negative pregnant individuals.[16, 17] This implementation will result in more efficient prenatal care and conservation of RhIG by use only in pregnancies where it is medically necessary.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Demographics of the 401 pregnancies with neonatal serology.

Race and Ethnicity	**N**	**% of Total**
Number of Gestations		
Singleton	400	99.8%
Twin	1	0.2%
Maternal Race and Ethnicity		
Asian	3	0.8%
Black	31	7.8%
Hispanic	68	17.1%
More than one race	3	0.8%
White	293	73.6%
Unknown	3	
	Mean	**Range**
Maternal Age	28	17-45
Gestational Age At Testing (wk)	13.82	10-34
Fetal Fraction	8.2%	1.6%-28.9%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Concordance of the cfDNA fetal RhD assay and neonatal D antigen serology and assay performance metrics.

	Neonatal Serology	
cfDNA	**RhD-**	**RhD+**
RhD Not Detected	140	0
RhD Detected	0	261
	%	95% CI
Sensitivity	100%	98.6%-100%
Specificity	100%	97.4%-100%
Positive Predictive Value	100%	98.6%-100%
Negative Predictive Value	100%	97.4%-100%
Accuracy	100%	99.1%-100%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Clinical antenatal and postnatal RhIG administration. A total of 616 doses of RhIG were administered antenatally or postnatally across the 401 cases.

	Neonate RhD status[a]			
Antenatal RhIG	**RhD-**	**%**	**RhD+**	**%**
No	33	23.9%	11	4.3%
Yes	105	76.1%	243	95.7%
Unknown	2		7	
Postnatal RhIG	**RhD-**	**%**	**RhD+**	**%**
No	134	99.3%	7	2.7%
Yes	1	0.7%	251	97.3%
Unknown	5		3	

a. Fetal and Neonatal RhD status is the same as all fetal cfDNA results were concordant with neonate serology

There were 2 cases with Rh-positive neonates, and it was unknown if RhIG was administered. All other cases with Rh-positive neonates received at least one dose of RhIG. There were 33 cases with Rh-negative neonates who did not receive RhIG at any time point.

Supplemental Table 1. Demographics and cfDNA predicted genotype and phenotype for the 10 cases where a non-RHD gene deletion was detected by cfDNA. The data includes whether or not the amplicon for the exon was detected and if it is was at a quantity suggestive for fetal and/or maternal origin. In an RhD-negative person with the RhDΨ variant only this variant would be present without any other *RH*D exons. In a RhD-negative person with the RHD-CE-D hybrid variant, only *RH*D exon 10 is present. All other exons are from the *RHC*E gene.

Case	TAT	Fetal Fraction	Race and Ethnicity	Exon 4	37 bp insertion (RhDΨ)	Exon 5	Exon 7	Exon 10	cfDNA Internal Results	cfDNA Reported Results	Neonate RhD Serology
1	5	5.7%	Black	ND	ND	ND	ND	fetal	RHD-CE-D hybrid_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
2	7	7.1%	White	ND	ND	ND	ND	fetal	RHD-CE-D hybrid_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
3	10	7.1%	White, Hispanic	ND	ND	ND	ND	pregnant person	PSI_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
4	9	11.0%	More than one	ND	ND	ND	ND	pregnant person	RHD-CE-D hybrid_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
5	9	11.3%	White, Non-Hispanic	ND	ND	ND	ND	pregnant person	RHD-CE-D hybrid_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
6	10	3.4%	White, Non-Hispanic	ND	ND	ND	ND	fetal	RHD-CE-D hybrid_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
7	3	5.2%	Black	ND	pregnant person	ND	pregnant person	pregnant person	PSI_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
8	8	9.2%	Black	ND	pregnant person	ND	pregnant person	pregnant person	PSI_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
9	5	3.2%	Black	ND	pregnant person	ND	pregnant person	pregnant person	PSI_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative
10	7	7.8%	Hispanic	ND	pregnant person	ND	pregnant person	pregnant person	PSI_NEG	D not detected	RhD Negative

not detected (ND)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References:

1. Prevention of Rh D alloimmunization. Practice Bulletin No. 181. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Obstet Gynecol 2017;130:e57-70.
2. Garratty G, Glynn SA, McEntire R; Retrovirus Epidemiology Donor Study. ABO and Rh(D) phenotype frequencies of different racial/ethnic groups in the United States. Transfusion. 2004 May;44(5):703-6.
3. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. CBER-regulated products: current shortages. FDA; 2024. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/safety-availability-biologics/cber-regulated-products-current-shortages. Accessed May 23, 2024.
4. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). Rho(D) Immune Globulin Shortages: Practice Advisory. https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2024/03/rhod-immune-globulin-shortages?utm_source=higherlogic&utm_medium=email&utm_content=Apr-26&utm_campaign=acog2024-rounds. Accessed May 24, 2024.
5. Koelewijn JM, de Haas M, Vrijkotte TG, Bonsel GJ, van der Schoot CE. One single dose of 200 microg of antenatal RhIG halves the risk of anti-D immunization and hemolytic disease of the fetus and newborn in the next pregnancy. Transfusion. 2008 Aug;48(8):1721-9.
6. Jones JM, Sapiano MRP, Mowla S, Bota D, Berger JJ, Basavaraju SV. Has the trend of declining blood transfusions in the United States ended? Findings of the 2019 National Blood Collection and Utilization Survey. Transfusion. 2021 Sep;61 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S1-S10.
7. Minon, J. M., Gerard, C., Senterre, J. M., Schaaps, J. P., & Foidart, J. M. (2008). Routine fetal RHD genotyping with maternal plasma: a four-year experience in Belgium. Transfusion, 48(2), 373–381.
8. Kent J, Farrell AM, Soothill P (2014) Routine administration of Anti-D: the ethical case for offering pregnant women fetal RHD genotyping and a review of policy and practice. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 14:87.
9. Liu S, Ajne G, Wikman A, Lindqvist C, Reilly M, Tiblad E (2021) Management and clinical consequences of red blood cell antibodies in pregnancy: A population-based cohort study. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 100:2216–2225.
10. Koelewijn JM, Vrijkotte TGM, Van Der Schoot CE, Bonsel GJ, De Haas M (2008) Effect of screening for red cell antibodies, other than anti-D, to detect hemolytic disease of the fetus and newborn: a population study in the Netherlands. Transfusion (Paris) 48:941–952.
11. Clausen FB, Steffensen R, Christiansen M, et al (2014) Routine noninvasive prenatal screening for fetal RHD in plasma of RhD-negative pregnant women-2 years of screening experience from Denmark. Prenat Diagn 34:1000–1005.
12. Chitty LS, Finning K, Wade A, Soothill P, Martin B, Oxenford K, Daniels G, Massey E. Diagnostic accuracy of routine antenatal determination of fetal RHD status across gestation: population based cohort study. BMJ. 2014 Sep 4;349:g5243.
13. High-throughput non-invasive prenatal testing for fetal RhD genotype. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/dg25. Accessed May 24, 2024.
14. Daniels, G. (2013). Variants of RhD--current testing and clinical consequences. British Journal of Haematology, 161(4), 461–470.
15. Wang D, Lane C, Quillen K. Prevalence of RhD variants, confirmed by molecular genotyping, in a multiethnic prenatal population. Am J Clin Pathol. 2010 Sep;134(3):438-42.
16. Alford, B., Landry, B. P., Hou, S., Bower, X., Bueno, A. M., Chen, D., Husic, B., Cantonwine, D. E., McElrath, T. F., Carozza, J. A., Wynn, J., Hoskovec, J., & Gray, K. J. (2023). Validation of a non-invasive prenatal test for fetal RhD, C, c, E, K and Fya antigens. Scientific Reports 2023 13:1, 13(1), 1–12.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Rego S, Ashimi Balogun O, Emanuel K, Overcash R, Gonzalez JM, Denomme GA, Hoskovec J, King H, Wilson A, Wynn J, Moise KJ. (2024). Cell-free DNA analysis for determination of fetal red blood cell antigen genotype in individuals with alloimmunized pregnancies. Obstetrics & Gynecology. July 25, 2024.
18. Gajic-Veljanoski, O., Li, C., Schaink, A. K., Guo, J., Shehata, N., Charames, G. S., de Vrijer, B., Clarke, G., Pechlivanoglou, P., Okun, N., Kandel, R., Dooley, J., Higgins, C., Ng, V., & Sikich, N. (2022). Cost-effectiveness of noninvasive fetal RhD blood group genotyping in nonalloimmunized and alloimmunized pregnancies. Transfusion, 62(5), 1089–1102.
19. Hamilton BE, Martin JA, Osterman MJK (2024). Births: Provisional Data for 2023. National Vital Statistics Rapid Release, No. 35, April 2024.
20. Moise, K. J., Gandhi, M., Boring, N. H., O'Shaughnessy, R., Simpson, L. L., Wolfe, H. M., Baxter, J. K., Polzin, W., Eddleman, K. A., Hassan, S. S., Skupski, D. W., Ryan, G., Walker, M., Lam, G., Brown, R., Skoll, M. A., Robinson, C., Sheikh, A., Bronsteen, R., Paladino, T. (2016). Circulating Cell-Free DNA to Determine the Fetal RHD Status in All Three Trimesters of Pregnancy. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 128(6), 1340–1346.
21. Ma KK, Rodriguez MI, Cheng YW, Norton ME, Caughey AB. Should cell-free DNA testing be used to target antenatal rhesus immune globulin administration? J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med. 2016;29(11):1866-70.
22. Saramago, P., Yang, H., Llewellyn, A., Walker, R., Harden, M., Palmer, S., Griffin, S., & Simmonds, M. (2018). High-throughput non-invasive prenatal testing for fetal rhesus D status in RhD-negative women not known to be sensitised to the RhD antigen: a systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England), 22(13), 1–172.
23. High-throughput non-invasive prenatal testing for fetal RhD genotype. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Accessed May 24, 2024.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted September 23, 2024. 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Author contributions

JFMN contributed conceptualization, data curation, writing the original draft and review and edition the manuscript. JW contributed to conceptualization, project administration, formal analysis and review and editing of the manuscript. JWS, JBB, KC, KC, and SA contributed to data curation, supervision and review and editing of the manuscript. RN contributed to formal review and editing of the manuscript.