medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 from the US population.

Authors: Julio F. Mateus Nino[1], Julia Wynn[2], Jenny Wiggins-Smith[3], J. Brett Bryant[4], Kris Citty[5], J. Kyle Citty[5], Samir Ahuja[6], Roger Newman[7]

Affiliations

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

Funding: This study was funded by BillionToOne, Inc.

Conflict of Interest: Dr. Samir Ahuja is a paid consultant from BillionToOne, Inc. Julia Wynn is an employee of BillionToOne, Inc. and has options in the company

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

Word Count:

Tweetable Statement: A quantitative cfDNA for fetal RhD prediction is highly accurate in the US population.

Short Title: Cell free DNA for fetal RhD detection

AJOG at a Glance:

A. Why was this study conducted? To examine the performance of a next generation sequencing based quantitative cfDNA assay for detecting the fetal RhD genotype in RhD-negative pregnancies after 10 weeks of gestation.

B. What are the key findings? In 401 cases analyzed, including 10 pregnancies with a non-RhD gene deletion, the fetal D antigen cfDNA result was 100% concordant with the neonatal serology, resulting in 100% (95% CI: 98.6%-100%) sensitivity and 100% (95% CI: 97.4%-100%) specificity. Informative results were obtained in 100% of the cases.

C. What does this study add to what is already known? This RhD cfDNA assay is highly accurate for the diverse US population supporting its implementation in routine prenatal care of RhD-negative pregnant patients.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 July 24, 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:

Background: Approximately 15% of pregnant women in the US are RhD-negative. To prevent alloimmunization, current national guidelines endorse the administration of prophylactic anti-D immune globulin (RhIG) at 28 weeks of gestation and in any other episodes where alloimmunization can occur, such as bleeding, pregnancy loss, trauma or invasive procedures. Alloimmunization only occurs if the fetus is RhD-positive; however, 40% of RhD-negative mothers carry an RhD-negative fetus, resulting in, under the current guidelines, the sometimes repeated, use of unnecessary RhIG.

Objective: We aimed to evaluate the performance of a next generation sequencing (NGS) with quantitative counting template (QCT) technology prenatal cell free DNA (cfDNA) assay in detecting the fetal RhD genotype in a diverse RhD-negative pregnant population in the United States (US).

Study Design: This retrospective 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. 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. Fetal RhD was detected in 261 cases (65%), whereas it was negative in 140 (35%). 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. Despite the fact that 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 based on cfDNA results. This decrease was greater at certain sites and at later study periods. If the cfDNA results were fully utilized during the entire study period, up to 147 RhIG doses (24% of administered doses) could have been avoided, indicating the importance of guideline changes to support the use of cfDNA for fetal RhD detection to conserve this resource.

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. 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.

Key Words: RhD-negative pregnancy, cell-free DNA prenatal screening, non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT), anti-D immune globulin, RhoGAM

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 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 current 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.[3] However, this modified protocol is less than optimal because of the increased risk of alloimmunization.[4] 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 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

shortages.[3] This approach evaluates 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.[6-11] This approach has not been adopted in the US because of concerns of the 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 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.[12]

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.[13, 14] This technology is more precise than European-based assays as NGS is used to sequence the critical exons of the *RHD* gene that distinguish it from the *RHCE* homolog gene. [13, 14] Therefore, it is able to detect both the RHD-gene deletion as well as the 37 base pair insertion that results in the *RhDΨ* and the unique sequence pattern of the *RHD-CE-D* hybrid variant; prevalent in Black and Asian individuals. [12,13] Additionally, quantitative counting technology (QCT) is used to quantify the proportion of *RHD* gene molecules and compare it to the measured fetal fraction, thus ensuring that these values are proportionate. This technology precisely detects the fetal RhD status at low fetal fractions (i.e., early gestational age and obesity). Prior studies of this assay have demonstrated 100% concordance of the cfDNA results with the neonate D antigen genotype or serology. [13, 14]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

The objectives of this study were to examine the 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 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 approved by the WCG IRB (IRB#: 20234135). 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 gestational age of antenatal and postnatal RhIG administration. Newborn serological D antigen and antibody screening results were abstracted from the neonate's clinical chart by research personnel who were not directly informed of the cfDNA results; however, these results may have been viewed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

during the chart review; and therefore, extractors may not have been blinded 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 is RhD positive, or if cfDNA results were RhD not detected and both twins' neonatal serology were RhD negative. Cases in which the neonate did not deliver at the participating institution were classified as unknown. Analysis was completed in Rv4.2 and 95% confidence intervals were calculated for all metrics.

Results

There were 449 non-alloimmunized RhD-negative pregnancies in which the cfDNA RhD assay was performed. An informative fetal RhD result was reported for all pregnancies (0%, no-call rate). Neonatal serology results were available for 401 (89.3%) newborns (Figure S1). More than 25% of the sample identified as non-White (Table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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[a] pregnancies with complete chart extraction

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%

a. In 48 (10.7%) cases, neonatal serology was unknown or not performed because of transfer of care (n=39), fetal loss (n=9) due to multiple congenital anomalies (n=2), trisomy 21 (n=1), and n=6, the reason for no testing was unknown.

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 identified ten cases of non-*RHD* gene deletions with 100% concordance with postnatal serology. In five cases, the *RhDΨ* variant was identified in the pregnant patient (three patients who identified as Black and two patients who identified as Hispanic). The *RHD-CE-D* hybrid was identified in five other pregnancies including three patients

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

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 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%

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 than in those with fetal RhD-negative results (95.7% vs. 76.1%; P <0.0001). 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

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.[2]

Postnatally, 1 (0.7%) of the 140 patients with a negative neonatal serology for RhD received RhIG, indicating the potential challenges of neonatal testing.[15] Antenatal RhIG was not administered to 33 pregnant individuals based on the cfDNA results that identified the fetus as RhD negative; none of the mothers had evidence of sensitization post-delivery. 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.

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%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

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.

COMMENTS

Principal Findings

We demonstrated that cfDNA analysis via NGS with QCT for the detection of fetal RhD status in a highly diverse non-alloimmunized, Rh-negative population in the US is highly accurate. The cfDNA results were 100% concordant with the neonate serology and therefore both the sensitivity and specificity reached 100%. 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 fetal RHD genotype status, a total of 24% of the RhIG doses could have been saved.

Results in the context of what is known

cfDNA has been used for over a decade in the UK and European countries to guide the administration of antenatal RhIG and in some countries postnatal RhIG, without neonatal serology confirmation.[6-11] The assay used in this study can be performed as early as 10 weeks of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

gestation with zero no-call rates and is ideal for a racially and ethnically diverse population. In contrast, European assays often require testing at a later gestational age and have higher no-call or inconclusive rates, particularly in individuals of non-European ancestry or at early gestational ages because these assays rely on qualitative PCR technology.[6-11] Additionally, the use of European-based assays for the US population is logistically complicated and may not be covered by insurance.

Before the current assay, a US-based, clinically available assay used a technically complicated and expensive matrix-based laser desorption/ionization-time-of-flight mass spectrometry to detect *RHD* gene sequences and control gene sequences. However, this assay was discontinued related to accuracy and inclusive issues for US population with unacceptable false positives and false negatives rates and an inconclusive rate of >5%.[16] The performance of this NGS-based with QCT technology cfDNA fetal RhD assay in this current study is consistent with previous studies of this assay, which also demonstrated 100% sensitivity and 100% specificity in detecting fetal red blood cell antigen genotype among 186 alloimmunized individuals and >99.9% precision in 1,683 individuals.[13,14] Furthermore, the assay correctly detected fetal RhD status in ten pregnancies with non-*RHD* gene deletions, which would have yielded inconclusive or no results using other cfDNA assays. Importantly, using QCT technology, the assay was able to determine fetal RhD status when non-RHD gene deletion was present in both the mother and fetus or only in the fetus.

Clinical implications

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

In agreement with previous studies, this study demonstrates that this assay is highly accurate in racial and ethnically diverse US populations.[13,14] This study also showed a significant lower frequency of antenatal RhIG administration in patients with RhD-negative cfDNA results compared to patients with RhD-positive cfDNA results. Additionally, 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 pre pregnancy, indicating providers use the assay to guide administration of RhIG even before the US shortage and change in ACOG recommendations.[17] The use of cfDNA to guide RhIG administration is more efficient than the existing universal administration of RhIG to all non-alloimmunized RhD-negative pregnant individuals.

Conserving RhIG using cfDNA for fetal RhD detection is particularly important during the current national shortage of RhIG. Of the approximate 3.6M births in the US in 2023,[18] it is estimated that 14.6% were born to RhD-negative individuals.[19] 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 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.

The other option of only offering postnatal RhIG to RhD-negative pregnant individuals who deliver RhD-positive neonates is medically problematic.[3] It is well established that the risk for sensitization increases when antenatal RhIG is not administered to RhD-negative pregnant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

individuals carrying an RhD-positive fetus.[4] The risk for sensitization increases from approximately 0.1%-0.5% with antenatal and postnatal RhIG doses to 1% to 1.5% with postnatal RhIG doses only. With 3.6M births/ year in the US, if only postnatal RhIG is administered to RhD-negative pregnant individuals, this will result in savings of over 524,000 RhIG doses, but at the expense of approximately 3,000 additional sensitized individuals. Of these, at least 1,800 would carry a RhD-positive fetus in a subsequent pregnancy and be at risk for hemolytic disease of the fetus and neonate (HDFN), a serious condition associated with major morbidity and mortality resulting in significantly elevated costs to the healthcare system for the antenatal care of the unnecessarily alloimmunized individual and postnatal care of the child with HDFN.[20] 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.

Research implications

The current study further reinforces the accuracy of this cfDNA fetal RhD assay in determining fetal RhD status to guide pregnancy management, including RhIG administration, in a diverse US population. It also suggests the potential for this assay to be more cost-effective than what has been described in previous reports because of the more cost-effective NGS-based technology used in this assay and the higher rate of informative results and lower false-negative rate than other assays considered for the US population.[16] 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

European countries was not based on a predicted economic benefit, and several studies demonstrated minimal to no cost savings.[21-23] Rather the national adoption in these countries was multifaceted process based on other factors including clinical performance of the assay for their populations, the reduction in unnecessary medical interventions, and potential to streamline and improve medical care and neonatal outcomes.[21,22]

Strengths and limitations

This study was conducted on a diverse US population, including over 25% of individuals who identified as non-White. 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 status 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.

Conclusion

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 pregnancies.[13-14] 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 July 24, 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 .

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Minon JM, Gerard C, Senterre JM, Schaaps JP, Foidart JM (2008) Routine fetal RHD genotyping with maternal plasma: a four-year experience in Belgium. Transfusion (Paris) 48:373–381.
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. Daniels, G. (2013). Variants of RhD--current testing and clinical consequences. British Journal of Haematology, 161(4), 461–470.
13. 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.
14. 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. *accepted*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .

15. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. Hamilton BE, Martin JA, Osterman MJK (2024). Births: Provisional Data for 2023. National Vital Statistics Rapid Release, No. 35, April 2024.
19. 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.
20. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics (2018) Number 192: Management of Alloimmunization During Pregnancy | ACOG
21. 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.
22. High-throughput non-invasive prenatal testing for fetal RhD genotype. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Accessed May 24, 2024.
23. 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, 22(13), 1–172.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.24.24310793; this version posted July 24, 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 .



ıd