

Reduced Likelihood of Hospitalization with the JN.1 or HV.1 SARS-CoV-2 Variants Compared to the EG.5 Variant

Matthew E. Levy¹, Vanessa Chilunda¹, Richard E. Davis², Phillip R. Heaton³, Pamala A. Pawloski⁴, Jason D. Goldman^{5,6}, Cynthia A. Schandl⁷, Lisa M. McEwen¹, Elizabeth T. Cirulli¹, Dana Wyman¹, Andrew Dei Rossi¹, Hang Dai¹, Magnus Isaksson¹, Nicole L. Washington¹, Tracy Basler¹, Kevin Tsan¹, Jason Nguyen¹, Jimmy Ramirez¹, Efren Sandoval¹, William Lee¹, James Lu¹, Shishi Luo¹

¹Helix, San Mateo, California, USA; ²Providence Sacred Heart Medical Center and Children's Hospital, Spokane, Washington, USA; ³Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, HealthPartners, Bloomington, Minnesota, USA; ⁴HealthPartners Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA; ⁵Swedish Center for Research and Innovation, Providence Swedish Medical Center, Seattle, Washington, USA; ⁶Division of Allergy and Infectious Disease, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA; ⁷Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, USA

Corresponding author: Matthew Levy, PhD. Helix. Mail: 101 S. Ellsworth Avenue, Suite 350, San Mateo, CA 94401. Email: matt.levy@helix.com.

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 Within a multi-state viral genomic surveillance program, proportions of SARS-CoV-2 infections
21 attributed to the JN.1 and HV.1 variants, compared to EG.5, were each lower among inpatients
22 versus outpatients (aOR=0.33 [95% CI: 0.20-0.55] and aOR=0.62 [95% CI: 0.44-0.86],
23 respectively). JN.1 and HV.1 variants may be associated with a lower risk of severe illness.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout 2023, Omicron XBB-lineage variants were responsible for most SARS-CoV-2 infections in the U.S. [1]. Between January and May 2023, XBB.1.5 accounted for the majority of infections. This period was followed by multiple XBB variants and their sublineages cocirculating at lower levels. By August and October 2023, two sublineages of XBB.1.9.2 – EG.5 and its descendant HV.1 (see Supplementary Figure 1 for alternative pangolin designations) – each sequentially emerged as the most prevalent variants, respectively. By late December 2023, a descendant of BA.2.86, JN.1, became predominant. Compared to XBB variants, JN.1 possesses more than 30 mutations in the spike protein, including the notable L455S mutation, which may contribute to increased immune escape and infectivity [2,3].

The clinical severity of COVID-19 has differed across previous SARS-CoV-2 variants. On average, the Delta variant resulted in more severe illness than the Alpha variant [4,5], while the Omicron variant resulted in less severe illness than the Delta variant [6,7]. Among early Omicron sublineages, findings have been mixed, with some studies indicating more severe illness with BA.5 versus BA.1 or BA.2 variants and others reporting no difference [8,9]. Little is known regarding the relative severity of XBB lineages. In one study, XBB.1.16 was associated with a greater risk of severe outcomes compared to XBB.1.5 and XBB.1.9 [10]. Empirical data comparing severity between JN.1 and XBB-lineage variants is also scarce. One study suggests that severity is attenuated with BA.2.86 lineages (predominantly JN.1) [11].

Within a multi-state respiratory virus genomic surveillance program, we assessed whether the proportions of SARS-CoV-2 infections attributed to EG.5, HV.1, and JN.1 variants during periods of cocirculation differed among patients in inpatient care settings (considered more severe) versus outpatient care settings (considered more mild). This investigation offers

valuable insights into whether the clinical severity of illness differs among the two most recently predominant XBB-lineage variants and the currently predominant JN.1 variant.

METHODS

Within a pan-respiratory virus genomic surveillance program, residual clinical samples from patients who tested positive for a respiratory virus (molecular or antigen) were obtained from three health systems spanning five U.S. states (Supplementary Table 1). This analysis included samples collected starting on 14 May 2023 (i.e., the first 2-week period with EG.5 detected) through 20 January 2024. Only SARS-CoV-2-positive samples that were initially collected during outpatient or inpatient visits were included. Samples from emergency departments or other/unknown visit types were excluded. Patients' demographic characteristics and COVID-19 vaccination history were extracted from electronic health records (EHRs) and state vaccine registries. Study protocols were approved by institutional review boards (central or local).

Viral sequencing was performed by Helix using a hybridization-capture based assay (Twist Biosciences) and short-read genome sequencing technology (Illumina) [12]. SARS-CoV-2 was identified in samples with reads that aligned to the reference genome, and lineages were assigned using pangolin version 4.3.1. Further details are provided in the Supplementary Methods.

The clinical visit type associated with sample collection served as a surrogate measure of the severity of illness at time of testing. Inpatient visits represented more severe illness compared to outpatient visits. The reason for the visit and patients' specific symptoms were not available for analysis. COVID-19 vaccination status was assigned using the date of the most recent dose received prior to the specimen collection date (Supplementary Methods).

Proportions of outpatients and inpatients with EG.5, HV.1, and JN.1 variants were compared and plotted over 2-week intervals. EG.5 proportions were plotted up to the time of $\geq 5\%$ HV.1 prevalence, and HV.1 proportions were plotted up to the time of $\geq 5\%$ JN.1 prevalence (since the rise of emerging variants, which would be newly included in denominators, could influence observed proportions for previous variants). In multivariable logistic regression, the odds of infection with each variant were compared between outpatients and inpatients, adjusting for collection date (natural cubic spline), health system and state of residence, age group, sex, race/ethnicity, and COVID-19 vaccination status. Three pairwise comparisons were performed among EG.5, HV.1, and JN.1 during their full respective periods of cocirculation. We implemented a Bonferroni correction, whereby $p < 0.0167$ was considered statistically significant. In exploratory analyses, these variants were also compared to other cocirculating XBB variants. Analyses were performed using R version 4.2.3.

RESULTS

Between 14 May 2023 and 20 January 2024, 6,654 of 10,118 total samples (65.8%) that were collected during outpatient or inpatient visits were successfully assigned a SARS-CoV-2 lineage. Of those, 1,089 samples (16.4%) were collected during inpatient visits, compared to 5,565 samples (83.6%) collected during outpatient visits. XBB-lineage variants accounted for $\geq 90\%$ of samples through the 2-week period ending 25 November 2023. The two most highly prevalent XBB-lineage variants, EG.5 and HV.1, reached peak prevalences of 29.3% and 26.7% during the 2-week periods ending 30 September and 25 November 2023, respectively. The prevalence of JN.1 increased from 20.3% during the 2-week period ending 9 December 2023 to 72.2% during the 2-week period ending 20 January 2024. Temporal patterns in variant prevalence for EG.5, HV.1, and JN.1 are shown in Supplementary Figure 2.

Patient characteristics overall and by visit type are described in Supplementary Table 2. Median age was higher among inpatients (74 years; IQR: 60-83) than among outpatients (50 years; IQR: 30-67). Female sex was less likely among inpatients compared to outpatients (52.2% vs 60.3%), and fewer inpatients than outpatients had ever received a COVID-19 vaccine (63.9% vs 68.4%).

Prior to HV.1 emergence, EG.5 accounted for a similar proportion of SARS-CoV-2 infections among outpatient and inpatient visits (Figure 1A). However, once HV.1 emerged, HV.1 consistently accounted for a greater proportion of infections among outpatient vs inpatient visits, prior to JN.1 emergence (Figure 1B). Once JN.1 emerged, JN.1 also accounted for more infections among outpatient vs inpatient visits (Figure 1C).

Both HV.1 and JN.1 were significantly less likely than EG.5 to account for infections among inpatients compared to outpatients, with adjusted odds ratios (aORs) of 0.62 (95% CI: 0.44-0.86, $p=0.004$) and 0.33 (95% CI: 0.20-0.55, $p<0.001$), respectively (Figure 1D). The distribution of JN.1 vs HV.1 did not show a significant difference between inpatient and outpatient visits (aOR=0.74; 95% CI: 0.48-1.13, $p=0.16$). Although precision was somewhat limited in additional exploratory comparisons, aOR point estimates for HV.1 and JN.1 were consistently <1 when compared to other cocirculating XBB-lineage variants, a trend not seen with EG.5 (Supplementary Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

This study is among the first to provide empirical evidence regarding the relative severity of the currently predominant JN.1 variant and previously predominant XBB-lineage variants, which was enabled by the linkage of viral sequencing and patient-level EHR data. Among adults with medically attended SARS-CoV-2 infection, JN.1 and HV.1 infections were less prevalent among hospitalized patients and more prevalent among outpatients, compared to EG.5 infections

during the same time period. This inverse association was nearly twice as strong for JN.1 than for HV.1, although the direct comparison of JN.1 versus HV.1 did not reach statistical significance. These variant differences were observed after adjusting for calendar time, demographics, and COVID-19 vaccination status. Our findings provide evidence that disease severity may have attenuated over the course of the 2023-2024 respiratory illness season, as the common circulating SARS-CoV-2 lineages have shifted from EG.5 to HV.1 to JN.1.

Our results are based on variant associations among infected individuals who accessed health system-administered SARS-CoV-2 testing. Healthcare-seeking and testing behaviors, which could vary by medical visit type and change over time, may have introduced differences between inpatients and outpatients beyond individuals' disease severity and the patient characteristics measured. However, such behaviors are unlikely to correlate with one's likelihood of infection with a specific variant over another at a given time point. Thus, primary findings are not likely to be explained by selection bias.

JN.1 has exhibited enhanced immune evasion and higher transmissibility compared to XBB variants, which might explain its rapid rise to predominance [2,3]. Although our findings suggest that JN.1 may be linked to less severe illness than EG.5, COVID-19 hospitalization rates could still be elevated during JN.1 predominance if the overall incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection is higher. During the winter wave of 2023-2024, new COVID-19 hospital admissions reached their peak during the week ending 6 January 2024, just as JN.1 achieved predominance, which was then followed by a consistent decline [1]. It is uncertain whether this pattern can be partially attributed to JN.1 supplanting XBB lineages or if it was primarily driven by broader seasonal or temporal SARS-CoV-2 patterns.

Study limitations include the absence of data on symptoms, reasons for visits, and subsequent clinical outcomes. We also lacked information on social factors and underlying comorbid

conditions. Visit type was determined at the time of sample collection for SARS-CoV-2 testing, and it is unknown whether outpatients were later hospitalized. Potential misclassification is likely to be non-differential with respect to variant. The precision of estimates was reduced when comparing JN.1, HV.1, and EG.5 to other cocirculating variants due to smaller sample sizes.

While an inverse association for JN.1 and HV.1 with hospitalization is reassuring, ongoing surveillance and further studies comparing patient outcomes across variants are essential. This study highlights the importance of timely linkage of viral genomic surveillance data with clinical records for monitoring outcomes associated with emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants.

NOTES

Author contributions. All authors contributed substantively to this manuscript in the following ways: conceptualization (MEL, VC, SL), investigation (MEL, VC, RED, PRH, PAP, JDG, CAS, LMM, DW, ADR, HD, MI, NLW, TB, KT, JN, JR, ES, SL), data curation (MEL, VC, LMM, DW, ADR, HD, MI, NLW, SL), formal analysis (MEL), project administration (RED, PRH, PAP, JDG, CAS, ETC, NLW, WL, JL, SL), writing - original draft (MEL), and writing - review and editing (MEL, VC, RED, PRH, PAP, JDG, CAS, SL).

Acknowledgements. We acknowledge the Helix Clinical Informatics and Bioinformatics teams for their contributions to electronic health record data and viral sequencing pipelines. We also acknowledge Catherine Clinton for her oversight and guidance in ensuring research compliance. We thank the investigators and staff at HealthPartners, Providence Health, and the Medical University of South Carolina who contributed to the ViEW Network™.


Financial support. This work was supported by Helix.

Potential conflicts of interest. MEL, VC, LMM, ETC, DW, ADR, HD, MI, NLW, TB, KT, JN, JR, ES, WL, JL, and SL are employees of Helix, Inc. MEL, MI, and SL report contracted research from Pfizer. MEL, MI, WL, and SL report contracted research from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). MEL reports contracted research and travel support from Novavax. PRH reports contracted research from Seegene USA and Helix, Inc. JDG reports contracted research from Helix, Gilead, Eli Lilly, and Regeneron; grants from Merck (BARDA) and Gilead; speaking honoraria and personal fees from Gilead Sciences, Inc, and Eli Lilly & Co; and collaborative services agreements with Adaptive Biotechnologies, Monogram Biosciences, and LabCorp; and serving as a speaker or advisory board member for Gilead and Eli Lilly. CAS reports giving educational lectures sponsored by Eli Lilly. RED and PAP report no potential conflicts.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID data tracker: variant proportions. 2024. Available from: <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker>. Accessed 9 April 2024.
2. Planas D, Staropoli I, Michel V, et al. Distinct evolution of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron XBB and BA.2.86/JN.1 lineages combining increased fitness and antibody evasion. *Nat Comm* **2024**; 15:2254.
3. Yang S, Yu Y, Xu Y, et al. Fast evolution of SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 to JN.1 under heavy immune pressure. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2024**; 24:e70–e72.
4. Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, et al. Hospital admission and emergency care attendance risk for SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) compared with alpha (B.1.1.7) variants of concern: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2022**; 22:35–42.
5. Lin L, Liu Y, Tang X, He D. The Disease Severity and Clinical Outcomes of the SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern. *Front Public Health* **2021**; 9:775224.
6. Bager P, Wohlfahrt J, Bhatt S, et al. Risk of hospitalisation associated with infection with SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant versus delta variant in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2022**; 22:967–976.
7. Nyberg T, Ferguson NM, Nash SG, et al. Comparative analysis of the risks of hospitalisation and death associated with SARS-CoV-2 omicron (B.1.1.529) and delta (B.1.617.2) variants in England: a cohort study. *Lancet* **2022**; 399:1303–1312.
8. Lewnard JA, Hong V, Kim JS, et al. Association of SARS-CoV-2 BA.4/BA.5 Omicron lineages with immune escape and clinical outcome. *Nat Commun* **2023**; 14:1407.
9. Hansen CH, Friis NU, Bager P, et al. Risk of reinfection, vaccine protection, and severity of infection with the BA.5 omicron subvariant: a nation-wide population-based study in Denmark. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2023**; 23:167–176.

- 196 10. Pung R, Kong XP, Cui L, et al. Severity of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron XBB subvariants in
197 Singapore. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac* **2023**; 37:100849.
- 198 11. Lewnard JA, Mahale P, Malden D, et al. Immune escape and attenuated severity
199 associated with the SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86/JN.1 lineage. *medRxiv* **2024**; Available at:
200 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305964v1>.
- 201 12. Bolze A, Basler T, White S, et al. Evidence for SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron co-
202 infections and recombination. *Med* **2022**; 3:848–859.e4.



Comparison	Date range of cocirculation	Variant	Outpatient, No. (%)	Inpatient, No. (%)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	P-value
HV.1 vs EG.5	06-Aug-23 to 20-Jan-24	EG.5	895 (54.1)	197 (60.4)	1.00 [Reference]	1.00 [Reference]	0.004
		HV.1	758 (45.9)	129 (39.6)	0.77 (0.61-0.99)	0.62 (0.44-0.86)	
JN.1 vs EG.5	15-Oct-23 to 20-Jan-24	EG.5	424 (31.9)	86 (37.4)	1.00 [Reference]	1.00 [Reference]	<0.001
		JN.1	905 (68.1)	144 (62.6)	0.78 (0.59-1.05)	0.33 (0.20-0.55)	
JN.1 vs HV.1	15-Oct-23 to 20-Jan-24	HV.1	595 (39.7)	109 (43.1)	1.00 [Reference]	1.00 [Reference]	0.161
		JN.1	905 (60.3)	144 (56.9)	0.87 (0.66-1.14)	0.74 (0.48-1.13)	




Figure 1. Biweekly prevalence of EG.5, HV.1, and JN.1 variants among samples collected during outpatient and inpatient visits and variant associations with inpatient visits. Proportions for EG.5 are shown during the period of EG.5 circulation up until the time of $\geq 5\%$ HV.1 prevalence. Proportions for HV.1 are then shown up until the time of $\geq 5\%$ JN.1 prevalence. Proportions for

207 JN.1 are then shown through 20 January 2024. Pairwise variant associations were calculated among samples collected during all 2-
208 week periods with variant cocirculation. Odds ratios (ORs) were adjusted for specimen collection date (as a natural cubic spline with
209 4 degrees of freedom), health system and state of residence, age group (0-4 y, 5-11 y, 12-17 y, 18-49 y, 50-64 y, 65-74 y, 75-84 y,
210 and ≥ 85 y), sex, race/ethnicity (Asian, non-Hispanic; Black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; white, non-Hispanic; and other or unknown), and
211 COVID-19 vaccination status (XBB.1.5-vaccinated, BA.4/BA.5-vaccinated, wild-type-vaccinated, and unvaccinated, based on the
212 date of the most recent vaccine dose received prior to the sample collection date).