

1 **Antibodies against type-I Interferon: detection and association with**
2 **severe clinical outcome in COVID-19 patients**

3 Goncalves David¹, Mezidi Mehdi², Bastard Paul^{3,4,5}, Perret Magali^{1,6}, Saker Kahina⁷, Fabien Nicole¹,
4 Pescarmona Rémi^{1,6}, Lombard Christine¹, Walzer Thierry⁶, Casanova Jean-Laurent^{3,4,5}, Belot
5 Alexandre^{6,8,9}, Richard Jean-Christophe², Trouillet-Assant Sophie^{6,7}

6 ¹Immunology Department, Lyon Sud Hospital, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Pierre-Bénite, France.

7 ²Lyon University, CREATIS, CNRS UMR5220, Inserm U1044, INSA, Lyon, France, Intensive Care Unit,
8 Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

9 ³Laboratory of Human Genetics of Infectious Diseases, Necker Branch, INSERM U1163, Necker
10 Hospital for Sick Children, Paris, France.

11 ⁴University of Paris, Imagine Institute, Paris, France.

12 ⁵St. Giles Laboratory of Human Genetics of Infectious Diseases, Rockefeller Branch, The Rockefeller
13 University, New York, NY, USA.

14 ⁶International Center of Research in Infectiology, Lyon University, INSERM U1111, CNRS UMR 5308,
15 ENS, UCBL, Lyon, France

16 ⁷Infective Agents Institute, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

17 ⁸ National Referee Centre for Rheumatic and AutoImmune and Systemic diseases in childrEn (RAISE),
18 France

19 ⁹ Pediatric Nephrology, Rheumatology, Dermatology Unit, Hospices Civils de Lyon, France

20

21 **Corresponding author:**

22 Sophie Trouillet-Assant, PhD

23 Centre Hospitalier Lyon Sud, Pierre-Bénite

24 69495 Lyon, France.

25 Phone: + 33 (0) 472 00 37 70. sophie.assant@chu-lyon.fr

26

27 **Running head:** Anti-interferon antibodies in COVID-19 patients

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Objectives** Impairment of type I interferon (IFN-I) immunity has been reported in critically-ill COVID-
31 19 patients. This defect can be explained in a subset of patients by the presence of circulating
32 autoantibodies (auto-Abs) against IFN-I. We set out to improve the detection and the quantification
33 of IFN-I auto-Abs in a cohort of critically-ill COVID-19 patients, in order to better evaluate the
34 prevalence of these Abs as the pandemic progresses, and how they correlate with the clinical course
35 of the disease.

36 **Methods** The concentration of anti-IFN- α_2 Abs was determined in the serum of 84 critically-ill COVID-
37 19 patients who were admitted to ICU in *Hospices Civils de Lyon*, France using a commercially
38 available kit (Thermo-Fisher, Catalog #BMS217).

39 **Results** A total of 21/84 (25%) critically-ill COVID-19 patients had circulating anti-IFN- α_2 Abs above
40 cut-off ($>34 \text{ ng.mL}^{-1}$). Among them, 15/21 had Abs with neutralizing activity against IFN- α_2 , *i.e.* 15/84
41 (18%) of critically-ill patients. In addition, we noticed an impairment of the IFN-I response in the
42 majority of patients with neutralizing anti-IFN- α_2 Abs. There was no significant difference in the
43 clinical characteristics or outcome of with or without neutralizing anti-IFN- α_2 auto-Abs. We detected
44 anti-IFN- α_2 auto-Abs in COVID-19 patients' sera throughout their ICU stay. Finally, we also found
45 auto-Abs against multiple subtypes of IFN-I including IFN- ω .

46 **Conclusions** We reported that 18% of critically-ill COVID-19 patients were positive for IFN-I auto-Abs,
47 confirming that the presence of these antibodies is associated with higher risk of developing a
48 critical COVID-19 form.

49 **Keywords** – Type I interferon; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2 virus; Intensive care unit; viral infection; auto-
50 antibodies.

51
52

53 **Introduction**

54 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV2) infection leads to coronavirus disease
55 19 (COVID-19), whose spectrum of clinical presentations is wide and includes severe pneumonia. The
56 anti-SARS-CoV-2 immune response has been extensively studied and defects in antiviral mechanisms
57 have been linked to disease severity. In particular, impairment of type I interferon (IFN-I) immunity
58 has been reported in critically-ill COVID-19 patients. Such defect can be due to either inherited
59 genetic deficiencies in the IFN-I pathway or the occurrence of circulating auto-antibodies (auto-Abs)
60 directed against 14 or the 17 individual IFN-I¹⁻⁴. These auto-Abs have also been detected in a third of
61 patients from a small international cohort who had suffered from severe adverse events following
62 Yellow Fever vaccination (YFV-17D)⁵. These findings advocate for the development of diagnostic tools
63 for the detection of IFN-I auto-Abs in routine laboratories, in order to identify early patients at risk of
64 developing severe forms of COVID-19 and to analyze the prevalence of IFN-I Abs as the pandemic
65 progresses and the virus evolves. To this aim, we tested a commercially available kit measuring IFN-I
66 auto-Abs levels in the serum of COVID-19 patients.

67

68 Results

69 A total of 84 critically-ill COVID-19 patients, 11 patients with autoimmune polyendocrinopathy type 1
70 syndrome (APS-1), 10 mildly-symptomatic COVID-19 healthcare workers, and 76 healthy controls
71 were included in the study. The critically-ill COVID-19 patients were admitted to ICU in the Lyon
72 University Hospital, France, between September and December 2020. The presence of anti IFN- α_2
73 Abs was investigated: we first sought to determine a positive cut-off value for Abs detection by
74 performing measurements in 76 putative control sera, *i.e.* from healthy donors retrieved before the
75 COVID-19 outbreak. The mean value +3 standard deviation of these measurements provided a cut-
76 off value at 34 ng.mL⁻¹. We then assessed the presence of IFN- α_2 Abs in putative positive sera, *i.e.*
77 sera from patients with autoimmune polyendocrinopathy type 1 syndrome (APS-1), a condition
78 known to be associated with anti-cytokine auto-Abs. All APS-1 patients tested (n=11) had high titers
79 of circulating anti-IFN- α_2 auto-Abs (>100ng.mL⁻¹). We also evaluated the presence of anti-IFN- α_2
80 auto-Abs in 10 mildly-symptomatic COVID-19 healthcare workers and none of them was found
81 positive.

82 We then measured anti-IFN- α_2 Abs levels in the sera from the critically-ill COVID-19 patients: 21/84
83 (25%) were positive and had values above the cut-off (>34 ng.mL⁻¹). The neutralizing capacity of their
84 sera against IFN- α was then evaluated as previously described⁵. A neutralizing activity was observed
85 in 15/21 positive sera; in other words, 15/84 (18%) critically-ill COVID-19 patients had neutralizing
86 anti-IFN- α auto-Abs (Figure 1a). Importantly, all sera with a titer of anti-IFN- α_2 auto-Abs above 1
87 μ g.mL⁻¹ potently neutralized IFN- α *in vitro*. In addition, in most patients with neutralizing IFN-I Abs,
88 we noticed an impairment of the IFN-I response, which was determined by the measurement of i)
89 plasma IFN- α_2 levels using the new digital ELISA technology single-molecule arrays (Simoa) and ii)
90 blood Interferon Stimulating Genes (ISG) expression using the Nanostring nCounter technology in
91 blood samples collected in the first 15 days after symptom onset (Figure 1b-c). Moreover, there was
92 no significant difference in the clinical characteristics (age, sex ratio, co-morbidity) or outcome

93 (death, O₂ support) of critically-ill COVID-19 patients with or without neutralizing anti-IFN-I auto-Abs
94 (Table 1). Then, serial measurement of IFN-I auto-Abs level during ICU stay was performed for 7
95 positive patients. The level of IFN- α_2 auto-Abs remained relatively stable across measurements
96 performed up to 40 days apart (Figure 1d). Finally, we assessed the presence of auto-Abs against
97 other IFNs-I in all sera positive for IFN- α_2 auto-Abs (n=21). Consistently with previous results¹, we
98 observed that sera with anti-IFN- α_2 auto-Ab titers above 1 $\mu\text{g.mL}^{-1}$ also contained auto-Abs against
99 other subtypes of IFN- α and 10/12 contained anti-IFN- ω auto-Abs (Figure 2). Of note, these sera
100 were able to neutralize IFN- ω *in vitro*. Only one serum contained auto-Abs targeting IFN- β at a low
101 titer, and none contained auto-Abs against IFN- ϵ or IFN- κ .

102 Discussion and conclusions

103 A previous study has reported that IFN-I auto-Abs were present in 10.2% of life-threatening COVID-
104 19 patients, undetectable in 663 individuals with asymptomatic or mild COVID-19, and detected in
105 only 0.33% of healthy individuals¹. Here, 18% of critically-ill COVID-19 patients were positive for IFN-I
106 auto- Abs whereas all mild-COVID19 patients were negative. We noticed that only a part of auto-Abs
107 detected were able to neutralize IFN-I in the conditions we used, which confirms previous studies in
108 COVID-19 patients and systemic lupus erythematosus subjects^{1, 6}. This finding further confirms the
109 deleterious role of IFN-I autoAbs in the antiviral immune response and the importance of the IFN-I
110 pathway in the defense against SARS-CoV2 infection. Based on its antiviral properties, recombinant
111 IFN-I has been tested as therapy for severe COVID-19, but the treatment showed little or no benefit
112 7-
113 8. Yet, the potential of such treatment may have been hindered by the presence of IFN-I auto-Abs in
114 patient sera, and this question could therefore be revisited by determining the level of these Abs, for
115 example using the ELISA method we used here. Moreover, patients could be treated with
116 recombinant
117 IFN-I that are not targeted by auto-Abs (*e.g.* IFN- β).

118 Finally, the detection of anti IFN-I auto-Abs in COVID-19 patients could be useful in routine to identify
119 patients at risk of developing a severe form of the disease. The technique we described here is
120 adequate for this purpose as it can rapidly provide quantitative measurements, and has a cut-off
121 correlated with neutralization assays ($1 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$). However, the presence of auto-Abs was not
122 associated with poorer outcome in critically-ill patients and does not explain all the severe forms of
123 COVID-19, other causes should therefore be sought (e.g. cytokine release syndrome, presence of
124 other risk factors such as obesity, hypertension).

125

126 **Methods**

127 ***Participants*** *Critically-ill COVID-19 patients*

128 Plasma samples and Paxgene® tubes were collected from COVID-19 patients hospitalized in the
129 university hospital of Lyon (Hospices Civils de Lyon), France. Diagnosis of COVID-19 was established in
130 all patients by RT-PCR.

131 All critically-ill patients positive for SARS-CoV-2 virus, admitted to ICU (Croix-Rousse Hospital,
132 Hospices Civils de Lyon), were included in the MIR-COVID study. This study was registered to the
133 *Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés* (CNIL, French data protection agency) under
134 the number 20-097 and was approved by an ethics committee for biomedical research (*Comité de*
135 *Protection des Personnes HCL*) under the number N°20-41. In agreement with the General Data
136 Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and Directive 95/46/EC) and the French data
137 protection law (Law n°78-17 on 06/01/1978 and Décret n°2019-536 on 29/05/2019), we obtained
138 consent from each patient or his/her next of kin.

139 *Mildly-symptomatic COVID-19 patients*

140 Plasma samples and Paxgene® tubes were collected from symptomatic healthcare workers upon
141 COVID-19 diagnosis. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. The study was
142 approved by the national review board for biomedical research in April 2020 (Comité de Protection

143 des Personnes Sud Méditerranée I, Marseille, France; ID RCB 2020-A00932-37). The study was
144 registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04341142) where the eligibility, inclusion, and exclusion criteria
145 are previously described ⁹.

146 *Healthy controls*

147 Prepandemic serum were selected from healthy controls who were recruited among donors to the
148 Lyon blood transfusion centre (Etablissement Français du Sang, EFS). According to French
149 procedures, a written non-opposition to the use of donated blood for research purposes was
150 obtained from HCs. The donors' personal data were anonymized before transfer to our research
151 laboratory. We obtained approval from the local ethical committee and the French ministry of
152 research (DC-2008-64) for handling and conservation of these samples.

153

154 *Auto-Abs anti IFN-I*

155 The presence of anti IFN- α 2 auto-Abs was assessed in the plasma using a commercially available kit
156 (Thermo-Fisher, Catalog # BMS217). The positive cut-off value for Ab detection was 34 ng.mL⁻¹. The
157 presence of auto-Abs against other IFNs-I was assessed using an ELISA technique, as previously
158 described ¹. Briefly, 96-well ELISA plates were coated with different cytokines (rhIFN- α 2 (Milteny
159 Biotec, ref. number 130-108-984), rhIFN- ω (Merck, ref. number SRP3061) or cytokines from PBL
160 Assay Science (catalog #11002-1), or IFN- β (Milteny Biotec, ref. number: 130-107-888)) and
161 incubated overnight at 4°C. Plates were then washed (PBS 0.005% Tween), then incubated with 5%
162 nonfat milk powder in the same buffer, washed again, and again incubated with 1:50 dilutions of
163 plasma from patients or controls for 2 h at room temperature (or with specific mAbs as positive
164 controls). Horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated Fc-specific IgG fractions from polyclonal goat
165 antiserum against human IgG, IgM, or IgA (Nordic Immunological Laboratories) were added to a final
166 concentration of 2 μ g/mL after thorough washing. Plates were then incubated for 1 h at room
167 temperature and washed. HRP substrate was added and the optical density (OD) was measured.

168 The neutralization capacity of antibodies against IFN- α 2 and - ω was determined as previously
169 described ⁵. Briefly, HEK-293T cells were transfected with a plasmid encoding the firefly Luciferase
170 under the control of human *ISRE* promoters. Cells were then cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle
171 medium (DMEM, Thermo Fisher Scientific) supplemented with 10% healthy control or patient
172 serum/plasma, and were either left unstimulated or were stimulated with IFN- α 2, IFN- ω , or IFN- β (10
173 ng.mL⁻¹) for 16 hours at 37°C. Finally, Luciferase level was measured using the Dual-Glo reagent,
174 according to the manufacturer's instructions (Promega).

175 *Plasma protein quantification*

176 The concentration of plasmatic IFN- α (fg.mL⁻¹) was measured using single molecule array (Simoa)
177 using a commercial kit for IFN- α 2 quantification (Quanterix™, Lexington, MA, USA). The assay was
178 based on a 3- step protocol and an HD- 1 Analyzer (Quanterix).

179 *IFN score assessment*

180 Total RNA was extracted from whole blood stored in Paxgene® tubes (Kit PreAnalytix, Qiagen©, SW)
181 and was quantified using a spectrophotometer (Nanodrop 2000, Thermo Scientific™, MA, USA). RNA
182 integrity was then assessed using the Agilent RNA microarray (Agilent Technologies©, Santa Clara,
183 CA, USA). The expression of 6 ISGs (*interferon alpha inducible protein 27 (IFI27)*, *interferon induced*
184 *protein 44 like (IFI44L)*, *Interferon Induced Protein With Tetratricopeptide Repeats 1 (IFIT1)* , *ISG15*
185 *Ubiquitin Like Modifier (ISG15)*, *Radical S-Adenosyl Methionine Domain Containing 2 (RSAD2)*, *Sialic*
186 *Acid Binding Ig Like Lectin 1 (SIGLEC1)*) and 3 housekeeping genes (*Actin Beta (ACTB)*, *Hypoxanthine*
187 *Phosphoribosyltransferase 1 (HPRT1)*, *RNA Polymerase II Subunit A (POLR2A)*) was quantified at the
188 transcript level using the Nanostring technology (Nanostring Technologies©, WA, USA). Data
189 standardization was performed using the geometric mean of internal control and housekeeping
190 genes counts. The ISG score was calculated as previously described ¹⁰.

191

192 **Conflict of interest:** All authors declare no conflict of interest

193 **Funding:** This research was supported by the *Hospices Civils de Lyon* and by the *Fondation des*
194 *Hospices Civils de Lyon*.

195

196

197

198

199

200 **References**

201 1. Bastard P, Rosen LB, Zhang Q, *et al.* Autoantibodies against type I IFNs in patients with life-
202 threatening COVID-19. *Science* 2020; **370**: eabd4585.

203 2. Hadjadj J, Yatim N, Barnabei L, *et al.* Impaired type I interferon activity and inflammatory
204 responses in severe COVID-19 patients. *Science* 2020; **369**: 718-724.

205 3. Trouillet-Assant S, Viel S, Gaymard A, *et al.* Type I IFN immunoprofiling in COVID-19 patients.
206 *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2020; **146**: 206-208.

207 4. Zhang Q, Bastard P, Liu Z, *et al.* Inborn errors of type I IFN immunity in patients with life-
208 threatening COVID-19. *Science* 2020; **370**: eabd4570.

209 5. Bastard P, Michailidis E, Hoffmann HH, *et al.* Auto-antibodies to type I IFNs can underlie
210 adverse reactions to yellow fever live attenuated vaccine. *J Exp Med* 2021; **218**: e20202486.

211 6. Gupta S, Nakabo S, Chu J, Hasni S, Kaplan M. Association between anti-interferon- α
212 autoantibodies and COVID-19 in systemic lupus erythematosus. *medrxiv* 2020; doi:
213 10.1101/2020.10.29.20222000

214 7. Pan H, Peto R, Henao-Restrepo AM, *et al.* Repurposed Antiviral Drugs for Covid-19 - Interim
215 WHO Solidarity Trial Results. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**: 497-511.

216 8. Alavi Darazam I, Shokouhi S, Pourhoseingholi MA, *et al.* Role of interferon therapy in severe
217 COVID-19: the COVIFERON randomized controlled trial. *Sci Rep* 2021; **11**: 8059.

218 9. Trouillet-Assant S, Albert Vega C, Bal A, *et al.* Assessment of serological techniques for
219 screening patients for COVID-19 (COVID-SER): a prospective, multicentric study. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**:
220 e041268.

221 10. Pescarmona R, Belot A, Villard M, *et al.* Comparison of RT-qPCR and Nanostring in the
222 measurement of blood interferon response for the diagnosis of type I interferonopathies. *Cytokine*
223 2018; **113**: 446-452.

224

225

226

227 **Figure 1- Anti-Type I IFN antibodies (Abs) in patients with life-threatening COVID-19**

228 (a) Concentration of auto-Abs against IFN- α_2 (ng.mL⁻¹) determined by a ThermoFisher kit (Catalog
229 # BMS217) in serum samples collected from COVID-19 patients admitted in ICU (n=84) and COVID-19
230 patients with mild respiratory symptoms (n=10). Auto-Abs concentrations with neutralizing capacity
231 against IFN- α . (b-c) IFN- α_2 concentration (fg.mL⁻¹) (b) and ISG score (c) in plasma and whole blood
232 collected from COVID-19 patients in the first 15 days after symptom onset (critically-ill COVID-19

233 patients (n=54) and mildly-symptomatic COVID-19 patients (n=10)). (d) Longitudinal detection of
234 auto-Abs against IFN- α_2 in COVID-19 patients' serum during their ICU stay according to the delay
235 post-symptom. Dotted lines represent positive cut-off value (threshold), lower limit of quantification
236 (LLOQ), and upper limit of quantification (ULOQ). Solid black lines represent median. Comparisons
237 were performed using the Kruskal Wallis test followed by Dunn's test. *** P -value ≤ 0.001 ; **** P -
238 value ≤ 0.0001 .

239

240 **Figure 2 - Auto-Abs against other subtypes of IFN-I.**

241 The presence of auto-Abs against other subtypes of IFN-I was assessed by ELISA in all sera with anti-
242 IFN- α_2 auto-Abs (n=21, from left to right, increasing order of concentration of anti-IFN- α_2). APS-1
243 patient's serum was used as positive control and sera from 2 healthy controls were used as negative
244 controls.

| Clinical features | Auto-nAb Negative (n=69) | Auto-nAb Positive (n=15) | P-value |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| Age (years) | 67 [58-72] | 65 [55-74] | 0.75 |
| Male sex | 54 (78%) | 13 (87%) | 0.72 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 29 [26-34] | 29 [25-32] | 0.49 |
| Auto-immune disease | 7 (10%) | 2 (13%) | 0.66 |
| Time between 1 st symptoms and ICU admission (days) | 9 [7-12] | 10 [7-11] | 0.80 |
| Maximal ventilatory support | | | |
| • Standard oxygen only | 4 (6%) | 0 (0%) | 0.33 |
| • High flow oxygen only | 19 (28%) | 7 (47%) | |
| • Invasive mechanical ventilation | 46 (67%) | 8 (53%) | |
| ARDS criteria | 44 (64%) | 8 (53%) | 0.65 |
| Worst PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ day 1 in ICU (mmHg) | 75 [62-103] | 89 [62-116] | 0.40 |
| ECMO | 15 (22%) | 2 (13%) | 0.72 |
| SOFA Day 1 in ICU | 4 [3-8] | 3 [2-5] | 0.11 |
| SAPS2 Day 1 in ICU | 40 [31-47] | 43 [38-48] | 0.41 |
| Vasopressor requirement in ICU | 45 (65%) | 9 (60%) | 0.77 |
| Renal replacement therapy in ICU | 27 (39%) | 4 (27%) | 0.56 |
| ICU length of stay (days) | 13 [7-35] | 13 [6-24] | 0.74 |
| ICU mortality | 29 (42%) | 5 (33%) | 0.58 |

246

247 **Table 1 - Clinical characteristics of critically-ill COVID-19 patients admitted in intensive care unit**

248 Data are expressed as median [IQR] or count (percentage). Mann-Whitney and Fisher tests were used for quantitative and qualitative variables, respectively.
 249 ICU - Intensive Care Unit, BMI - Body Mass Index, nAb – neutralizing Auto-Abs against IFN- α , ECMO- Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, SOFA -
 250 sequential organ failure assessment score, SAPS2 - Simplified Acute Physiology Score II, ARDS - Acute respiratory distress syndrome



