(Check for updates



Transmembrane protease serine 2 (*TMPRSS2*) rs75603675, comorbidity, and sex are the primary predictors of COVID-19 severity

Gonzalo Villapalos-García^{1,*}, Pablo Zubiaur^{1,2,*}, Rebeca Rivas-Durán³, Pilar Campos-Norte³, Cristina Arévalo-Román³, Marta Fernández-Rico³, Lucio García-Fraile Fraile³, Paula Fernández-Campos¹, Paula Soria-Chacartegui¹, Sara Fernández de Córdoba-Oñate⁴, Pablo Delgado-Wicke⁴, Elena Fernández-Ruiz⁴, Isidoro González-Álvaro⁵, Jesús Sanz³, Francisco Abad-Santos^{1,2}, Ignacio de los Santos³

By the end of December 2021, coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) produced more than 271 million cases and 5.3 million deaths. Although vaccination is an effective strategy for pandemic control, it is not yet equally available in all countries. Therefore, identification of prognostic biomarkers remains crucial to manage COVID-19 patients. The aim of this study was to evaluate predictors of COVID-19 severity previously proposed. Clinical and demographic characteristics and 120 single-nucleotide polymorphisms were analyzed from 817 patients with COVID-19, who attended the emergency department of the Hospital Universitario de La Princesa during March and April 2020. The main outcome was a modified version of the 7-point World Health Organization (WHO) COVID-19 severity scale (WHOCS); both in the moment of the first hospital examination (WHOCS-1) and of the severest WHOCS score (WHOCS-2). The TMPRSS2 rs75603675 genotype (OR = 0.586), dyslipidemia (OR = 2.289), sex (OR = 0.586), and the Charlson Comorbidity Index (OR = 1.126) were identified as the main predictors of disease severity. Consequently, these variables might influence COVID-19 severity and could be used as predictors of disease development.

DOI 10.26508/lsa.202201396 | Received 31 January 2022 | Revised 12 May 2022 | Accepted 13 May 2022 | Published online 30 May 2022

Introduction

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic started in Wuhan, China, in December 2019. This virus causes the new coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). By the end of

December 2021, more than 271 million cases and 5.3 million deaths had been reported (1). Although vaccination is a proved effective strategy for pandemic control, it is not yet equally available in all countries of the world (2). Even in some developed countries, the slowdown in vaccination hinders the achievement of herd immunity (3, 4). Hence, reaching worldwide herd immunity seems highly unlikely in the medium to long term, and it is expected that the virus will remain a health problem in the following months and years. Therefore, the authorization of effective therapies and identification of prognostic biomarkers remains crucial to manage COVID-19 patients more rationally. This is of particular importance because strains emerge that may be potentially more infectious, could cause more severe disease and, above all, could escape the protection of vaccines. This could be the case for the emerging strain omicron (B.1.1.529), a novel variant of concern (5).

Although several studies were published to date evaluating genetic biomarkers associated with COVID-19 severity, most were exploratory, showing heterogenic results, and still nowadays, a clinically relevant genetic biomarker was not described. The first were genes involved in virus entrance to the host, such as angiotensin converting enzyme 2 gene (*ACE2*) and transmembrane serine protease 2 gene (*TMPRSS2*). Different research groups have suggested several candidate variants of *ACE2*, namely rs2285666 or rs4646116 (6, 7). On the other hand, for the *TMPRSS2*, variants such as rs2298659, rs17854725, rs12329760, and rs75603675 were found to be different in the frequency in populations more affected by the disease (8, 9). However, a later genome-wide association study (GWAS) of severe COVID-19 with respiratory failure reported two clusters of genes associated with two different polymorphisms: rs11385942 in leucine zipper transcription factor like 1 gene (*LZTFL1*)

Correspondence: pablo.zubiaur@salud.madrid.org; francisco.abad@salud.madrid.org; isantosg@salud.madrid.org *Gonzalo Villapalos-García and Pablo Zubiaur contributed equally to this work.

¹Clinical Pharmacology Department, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto Teófilo Hernando, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa (IIS-IP), Madrid, Spain ²Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain ³Infectious Diseases Unit, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa (IIS-IP), Madrid, Spain ⁴Molecular Biology Unit, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa (IIS-IP), Madrid, Spain ⁴Molecular Biology Unit, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa, IIS-IP), Madrid, Spain ⁵Rheumatology Service, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria La Princesa (IIS-IP), Madrid, Spain

	Male	Female	N		Male	Female	N
WHOCS-1				WHOCS-2			
1,2	96 (45.28%)	116 (54.72%)	212 (25.59%)	1,2	96 (44.5%)	116 (55.5%)	212 (25.59%)
3	88 (53.33%)	77 (46.67%)	165 (20.2%)	3	65 (52%)	60 (48%)	125 (15.3%)
4	263 (61.16%)	167 (38.84%)	430 (52.63%)	4	211 (56.42%)	163 (43.58%)	374 (45.78%)
5	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (0.49%)	5	23 (79.31%)	6 (20.69%)	29 (3.55%)
6	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	6 (0.73%)	6	45 (78.95%)	12 (21.05%)	57 (6.98%)
				7	13 (65%)	7 (35%)	20 (2.45%)
CCI							
				7	15 (62.5%)	9 (37.5%)	24 (2.94%)
0	72 (49.32%)	74 (50.68%)	146 (17.87%)	8	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)	7 (0.86%)
1	75 (49.67%)	76 (50.33%)	151 (18.48%)	9	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	7 (0.86%)
2	106 (12.97%)	80 (9.79%)	186 (22.77%)	10	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	3 (0.37%)
3	66 (55.93%)	52 (44.07%)	118 (14.44%)	11	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.12%)
4	44 (55.7%)	35 (44.3%)	79 (9.67%)	12	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (0.12%)
5	36 (61.02%)	23 (38.98%)	59 (7.22%)	13	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.24%)
6	23 (69.7%)	10 (30.3%)	33 (4.04%)	Total	453 (55.45%)	364 (44.55%)	817 (100%)

Table 1. World Health Organization COVID-19 score at admission (WHOCS-1), maximum World Health Organization COVID-19 score (WHOCS-2), and Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI).

and rs657152 in the *ABO* gene (10). Because of the disparity of the observed findings, additional confirmatory and exploratory studies are warranted. The aim of this work was to perform a review of the published single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) related to COVID-19 prognosis or severity by the end of 2020 and to evaluate them in an independent validation cohort. For this purpose, we genotyped 817 patients managed at Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, for a panel of 120 SNPs selected based on an extensive literature search.

Results

The population consisted on 817 patients, 453 (55.45%) males and 364 (44.55%) females. The range of age was 19 to 97 yr, where the mean age was 60 yr. The baseline characteristics of the study population are shown in Table 1. Biogeographical origin of patients was inferred by their country of birth: 636 were European, 161 were American, 7 were East Asian, 6 were Near Eastern, and 1 was Central/ South Asian. Most patients were symptomatic and required hospitalization with oxygen supplementation at the moment of the first hospital visit (WHOCS-1 = 4, 51.38%), followed by asymptomatic or mild patients (WHOCS-1 = 1 and 2, 27.92%) and by symptomatic without need for oxygen supplementation (WHOCS-1 = 3, 19.74%). As for the severest clinical situation, 77 died or required ICU admission (WHOCS-2 = 6-7, 9.27%), and the remaining severity groups were distributed similarly like in WHOCS-1. Most patients presented a CCI of 2-8 (93.50%), patients with CCI = 1 accounted for 3.97%, and patients with CCI between 9 and 13 accounted for 2.53% of the population.

Treatments received before the first emergency room visit and during the admission in the hospital are described in Table 2. The

Table 2. Treatments used (a) before first emergency room visit and (b) for the treatment of COVID-19 during admission.

Before first emergency room visit (n = 190, 23.25%)						
108 (13.22%)						
123 (15.06%)						
8 (0.98%)						
32 (3.92%)						
22 (2.69%)						
21 (2.57%)						
607 (74.30%)						
354 (43.33%)						
107 (13.10%)						
459 (56.18%)						
8 (0.98%)						
406 (49.69%)						
9 (1.10%)						

most frequently prescribed treatments prior first emergency room were ACE inhibitors (ACEIs) and angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARA-II), received by 13.22% and 15.06% of patients, respectively. The most frequently used treatments for the management of the disease were hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine (74.30%), heparin (56.18%), lopinavir/ritonavir combination (49.69%), and corticoids (43.33%).

The univariate analysis of severity 1 and 2 variables is shown in Table S1, including a summary of nominally significant variables



Figure 1. Forest-plot showing statistically significant associations and their odds ratio (OR) between the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI), sex, dyslipidemia, and the *TMPRSS2* rs75603675 genotype and COVID-19 severity at the moment of the first hospital emergency room visit (severity 1) and the severest COVID-19 status (severity 2).

and those who reached a corrected P' < 0.05, which were included in the multivariate analysis. Biogeographical group resulted nonsignificant. Males compared with females (OR = 0.586), a higher CCI (OR = 1.126) (covariates), dyslipidemia (OR = 2.289), and *TMPRSS2* rs75603675 (C/C or C/A diplotypes, compared with the A/A diplotype) (OR =2.140) were significantly related to a higher severity 1 and 2 status, after multivariate analysis and Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons (Fig 1).

The univariate analysis of WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 is shown in Table S1, including a summary of nominally significant variables and those who reached a corrected P' < 0.05, which were included in the multivariate analysis. The same variables identified in the multivariate analysis of severities 1 and 2 were now observed in the multivariate analysis of WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 (Table 3).

Based on the estimates obtained from the multivariate analysis, the following equations were proposed to calculate WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 scales in infected in Table 4.

The remaining variables, that is, drugs used before COVID-19 infection, drugs used for the treatment of the disease, the remaining polymorphisms, etc., were unrelated to disease severity in both analyses.

Discussion

The scientific community's effort to investigate biomarkers for predicting the risk and severity of infection was strenuous since December 2019 to date. A huge amount of works were published in this regard, including reviews and systematic reviews (11). Although there is some consensus on which biomarkers can track disease progression (mainly pro-inflammatory cytokines, ferritin, etc.), there is no biomarker that can predict disease progression from baseline. Baseline health status and demographic characteristics, including sex, age, and comorbidities have been described as the main predisposing factors (12, 13, 14, 15, 16). However, a percentage of severity is not explained by the latter factors (12, 13). Genetic polymorphism may explain part of this susceptibility, which resulted in dozens of publications proposing several SNPs and other genetic alterations associated with susceptibility to COVID-19 infection and severity (Table 5). However, to our knowledge, very few studies validated these associations and their potential clinical relevance. Our intention was, therefore, to design a panel of polymorphisms to validate their usefulness in an independent set of patients.

To prevent bias, first, we proposed a very strict statistical analysis to avoid obtaining spurious results. Second, we proposed to correct for confounding factors in all the statistical tests performed and therefore decided to consider the CCI, which included known COVID-19 severity predictors such as age and obesity, and the sex as covariates. Third, we decided not to analyze some variables dependent on the pandemic situation at the time of recruitment. For example, we did not consider ICU admission as a valid measure of COVID-19 severity as this was restricted because of hospital collapse. In other words, some patients who reached sufficient severity

Table 3.	Multivariate analysis	of WHOCS-1	and WHOCS-2	variability.
----------	-----------------------	------------	-------------	--------------

Multivariate									
WHOCS-1					WHOCS-2				
	Estimate	SE	Р	P'		Estimate	SE	Р	P'
(Intercept)	1.962	0.156	<0.001	<0.001	(Intercept)	2.597	0.141	<0.001	<0.001
Dyslipidemia	0.579	0.137	<0.001	<0.001	Dyslipidemia	0.551	0.124	<0.001	<0.001
TMPRSS2 rs75603675 C/C + C/A versus A/A	0.591	0.138	<0.001	<0.001	TMPRSS2 rs75603675 C/C + C/A versus A/A	0.405	0.125	0.001	0.005
CCI	0.101	0.030	0.001	0.003	CCI	0.120	0.027	<0.001	<0.001
Sex	-0.326	0.122	0.008	0.032	Sex	-0.415	0.111	<0.001	0.001

WHOCS-1, modified World Health Organization COVID-19 severity scale at first hospital examination; WHOCS-2, highest score on the modified World Health Organization COVID-19 severity scale; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; SE, standard error; P, nominal significance; P', significance after Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.

to merit admission to an intensive care unit were not admitted because there was no bed available.

Our findings on the predictors of COVID-19 severity are consistent with previous publications in the literature. The CCI was previously related to COVID-19 prognosis (89, 90), which is consistent with the correlation observed in this work between a higher score and higher WHOCS-1 and -2 scores. Furthermore, males get infected, require ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, and die more frequently than women (91), which is consistent with the protective effect observed here for the female sex regarding WHOCS-1 and more intensely with WHOCS-2. Additional studies are required to determine the underlying differences behind this sexual dimorphism. Moreover, dyslipidemia was previously related to severe COVID-19 prognosis (92), which is consistent with our findings, where the presence of dyslipidemia was related to a 0.579 and 0.551 higher WHOCS-1 or WHOCS-2 scores, respectively. Finally, TMPRSS2 rs75603675 C/C or C/A diplotypes, compared with the A/A diplotype, were related to 0.591 higher WHOCS-1 and 0.405 higher WHOCS-2 scores, respectively. The contribution of this polymorphism requires further discussion.

The transmembrane serine protease 2, encoded by the TMPRSS2 gene, participates in several physiological and pathological situations, being up- and down-regulated by several hormonal processes. It is used by several viruses to enter host cells, including the Influenza virus and the human coronaviruses HCoV-229E, MERS-CoV, SARS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2 (93, 94). Genetic polymorphism of this gene was described to affect disease severity. Particularly, the P.Val197Met (rs12329760) variant is defined as deleterious and previously reported to have a protective effect on the patients (95). Here, this variant had no effect on WHOCS-1 or -2 variability, whereas the P.Gly8Val (rs75603675) missense variant (C > A) was related to a significantly higher WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2. In contrast, in one study, the prevalence of the TMPRSS2 rs75603675 A allele was similar between infected patients, compared with uninfected (96). Unfortunately, no information about infection severity is provided in the latter article. Therefore, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to propose that this variant has a significant impact on COVID-19 prognosis and severity. Probably, the reason behind this association is explained by the down-regulation of the protein in TMPRSS2 rs75603675 A allele carriers or the expression of a protein

Table 4. Equations for the prediction of WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 for COVID-19 severity of patients.

WHOCS-1		
	1.962	Basal severity
+	0.579	If patient has dyslipidemia
+	0.591	If TMPRSS2 rs75603675 C/C or C/A genotypes are present
+	0.101	x CCI
-	0.326	If patient is female
Total:		
WHOCS-2		
	2.597	Basal severity
+	0.551	If patient has dyslipidemia
+	0.405	If TMPRSS2 rs75603675 C/C or C/A genotypes are present
+	0.120	x CCI
-	0.415	If patient is female
Total:		

Table 5. Genes, single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) identifiers, maximum allele frequencies in Iberians and Americans, and the impact of the reviewed and included variants.

Gene	SNPs (rs)	MAF IBS	MAF AMR	Variant impact	References
	rs1045642	0.46 (A)	0.43 (A)	Synonymous variant	17
40.001	rs1128503	0.38 (A)	0.40 (A)	Synonymous variant	17
ADCDI	rs2032582	0.41 (A)	0.37 (A)	Missense variant	17
	rs2032582	0.02 (T)	0.06 (T)	Missense variant	17
ABO	rs657152	0.37 (A)	0.30 (A)	Intron variant	18
	rs4291	0.36 (T)	0.28 (T)	Regulatory region variant	19
ACE	rs1799752	Not available	Not available	Intron variant	20
	rs4343	0.44 (A)	0.39 (G)	Synonymous variant	7
	rs143695310	0.04 (A)	0.03 (A)	Intergenic variant	21
	rs2106809	0.28 (G)	0.32 (G)	Intron variant	22
	rs1978124	0.43 (T)	0.29 (T)	Intron variant	23
	rs5936029	0.47 (C)	0.29 (C)	Intron variant	21
	rs1996225	0.47 (T)	0.45 (C)	Intron variant	21
	rs4646156	0.34 (A)	0.25 (A)	Intron variant	7
ACE2	rs2285666	0.25 (T)	0.34 (T)	Splice region variant	24
	rs2074192	0.40 (T)	0.40 (T)	Intron variant	7
	rs35803318	0.10 (T)	0.07 (T)	Synonymous variant	25
	rs4830542	0.35 (C)	0.28 (C)	Intergenic variant	7
	rs4646116	0.01 (C)	<0.01 (C)	Missense variant	26
	rs4646188	0.14 (G)	0.03 (G)	Intron variant	27
	rs41303171	0.03 (C)	<0.01 (C)	Missense variant	21
404447	rs55790676	0.24 (T)	0.13 (T)	5' UTR variant	28
ADAM17	rs12692386	0.30 (G)	0.48 (G)	5' UTR variant	29
AGT	rs699	0.58 (G)	0.37 (A)	Missense variant	30
4205	rs7412	0.06 (T)	0.05 (T)	Missense variant	31
Арое	rs429358	0.14 (C)	0.10 (C)	Missense variant	31
CCL2	rs1024611	0.29 (G)	0.49 (G)	Regulatory region variant	32
CCL5	rs2107538	0.12 (T)	0.23 (T)	5' UTR variant	32
CD14	rs2569190	0.49 (G)	0.47 (G)	Intron variant	32
CD147	rs8259	0.33 (A)	0.38 (A)	3' UTR variant	33
CD69	rs11052877	0.36 (G)	0.34 (G)	3' UTR variant	34
CLEC2D	rs1560011	0.41 (A)	0.36 (A)	Intron variant	34
CRP	rs1130864	0.32 (A)	0.33 (A)	3' UTR variant	35
CSF3	rs2227322	0.40 (G)	0.33 (G)	5' UTR variant	36
CVD2C10	rs12248560	0.21 (T)	0.12 (T)	Intron variant	17
CYP2CI9	rs4244285	0.15 (A)	0.10 (A)	Synonymous variant	17
CVD2CO	rs1799853	0.14 (T)	0.10 (T)	Missense variant	17
CYP2C9	rs1057910	0.08 (C)	0.04 (C)	Missense variant	17
CVD24/	rs67666821	<0.01 (T x 6)	<0.01 (T x 6)	Frameshift variant	17
CTP3A4	rs35599367	0.04 (A)	0.03 (A)	Intron variant	17
СҮРЗА5	rs776746	0.08 (T)	0.20 (T)	Splice acceptor variant	17
CYP4V2	rs13146272	0.40 (A)	0.47 (A)	Missense variant	37

(Continued on following page)

Table 5. Continued

netshype 0.01 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 9, 38, and 39 n755% 0.01 (C) 0.06 (C) Splice acceptor variant 9, 38, and 39 n757% 0.36 (C) 0.06 (C) Missense variant 9, 38, and 39 EROX1 r959/087 0.46 (C) 0.49 (C) Intron variant 9, 38, and 39 EROX1 r959/087 0.46 (C) 0.32 (C) Missense variant 40 r1 r2529222 0.41 (T) 0.34 (T) Nancoding transcript exon variant 41 r66 r2050858 0.22 (A) 0.21 (A) Intron variant 77 G67 r2050954 0.01 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 77 G67 r205095 0.01 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 77 G67 r205095 0.01 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 77 G67 r205091 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 44 G67 r205092 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript	Gene	SNPs (rs)	MAF IBS	MAF AMR	Variant impact	References
DPP4 stitistat788 0.01 (.C) 0.016 (.C) Splite acceptor variant 9, 38, and 39 FM0A7 1975/4 0.33(G) 0.017(G) Missense variant 9, 38, and 39 FM0A7 1998/9897 0.48 (.C) 0.49 (.C) Intron variant 34 EPMA7 19051740 0.20 (.C) 0.32 (.C) Missense variant 40 FM 12333914 0.46 (T) 0.46 (T) Intron variant 41 FM 12333914 0.46 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 17 G66P 15303663 0.27 (A) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 17 G67P 15303663 0.02 (A) 0.04 (A) Missense variant 17 G67P 15303663 0.02 (A) 0.02 (A) Missense variant 44 HCPS 15303663 0.02 (A) 0.02 (A) Missense variant 47 G67P 15303663 0.02 (A) 0.03 (C) Intron variant 47 G67P 15303663 0.02 (C) 0.02 (C)		rs56179129	0.01 (T)	0.01 (T)	Missense variant	9, 38, and 39
Defm 1757/A 0.38(c) 0.17(c) Missense variant 9, 38, and 39 FM281 rs5944916 0.01(C) 0.01 (C) intron variant 9, 34, and 39 FM281 rs505490 0.48 (C) 0.04 (C) intron variant 40 FM1 rs505490 0.29 (C) 0.32 (C) Missense variant 40 FM3 rs505490 0.48 (C) 0.47 (C) Noncoding transcript son variant 41 FM3 rs505490 0.46 (C) 0.45 (C) Missense variant 72 FM3 rs505486 0.27 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 43 FM3 rs505486 0.21 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 72 FM3 rs505486 -0.01 (A) -0.01 (A) Missense variant 74 FM4 0.43 (A) -0.02 (C) Missense variant 74 74 FM3 rs50549 0.02 (C) 0.02 (C) Noncoding transcript son variant 74 FM4 rs2295029 0.02 (C) 0.04 (C)	DPP4	rs116302758	0.01 (C)	0.016 (C)	Splice acceptor variant	9, 38, and 39
Intern variant 9,38, and 39 ENCXT re5940687 0.48 (C) 0.49 (C) intran variant 34 FMRI rs155740 0.99 (C) 0.33 (C) Missense variant 40 F1 rs258925 0.41 (T) 0.34 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 41 F66 rs208956 0.22 (A) 0.21 (A) intern variant 43 G67 rs508069 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 17 G67 rs508069 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 44 G67 rs508068 0.22 (T) 0.20 (T) Missense variant 44 HCPS rs508068 0.21 (T) 0.20 (T) Missense variant 44 HCPS rs29509 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 44 HCPS rs29509 0.02 (G) 0.21 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 45 HCPS rs29509 0.01 (C) 0.02 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 7		rs17574	0.38(G)	0.17(G)	Missense variant	9, 38, and 39
FN00 response 0.48 (C) 0.49 (C) Intron variant 34 EPHA1 ro1017-0 0.29 (C) 0.32 (C) Missene variant 40 F3 response response 41 41 F4 response response 41 F6 ro106666 0.20 (A) 0.46 (T) Intron variant 42 F6 ro106668 0.20 (A) 0.10 (C) Missense variant 7 F6 ro506282 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 7 F6 ro506292 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 44 F6 ro5071 0.02 (G) Noncoling transcript exon variant 44 F7 ro50722 0.33 (G) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 44 F17 ro50728 0.33 (G) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 44 F17 ro50759 0.33 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 50 F17 ro50759 0.33 (G) 0.16		rs17848916	0.01(C)	0.03 (C)	Intron variant	9, 38, and 39
FPMOrs0517400.29 (C)0.32 (C)Missens variant40P31rs2280520.41 (T)0.34 (T)Monoding transcript son variant41F66rs2806860.22 (A)0.21 (A)Intera variant42F66rs2806860.22 (A)0.21 (A)Intera variant17G6P0rs150828-0.01 (C)0.02 (C)Missense variant17G6P0rs150828-0.01 (A)-0.01 (A)Missense variant44G7rs280686-0.01 (A)Missense variant44G7rs280790.02 (G)0.02 (C)Missense variant45HCP5rs2807920.02 (G)0.02 (C)Monocing transcript son variant46HCP5rs2807920.02 (C)0.02 (C)Monocing transcript son variant46HCP5rs2807920.02 (C)0.03 (T)Intern variant32HCP5rs2807920.02 (C)0.31 (T)Intern variant32HCP5rs28079860.30 (T)0.40 (T)Intern variant32H713rs2807910.26 (A)0.33 (A)57 UTR variant32H714rs2807910.26 (A)0.33 (A)57 UTR variant51H714rs2807910.26 (A)0.33 (A)57 UTR variant51H714rs2807910.26 (A)0.33 (A)57 UTR variant51H715rs2979800.01 (A)0.21 (A)Intern variant51H715rs2979910.02 (C)0.31 (C) <td< td=""><td>ENOX1</td><td>rs9594987</td><td>0.48 (C)</td><td>0.49 (C)</td><td>Intron variant</td><td>34</td></td<>	ENOX1	rs9594987	0.48 (C)	0.49 (C)	Intron variant	34
FT rs228952 0.41 (1) 0.34 (1) Nencoding transcript exon variant 41 FGG rs208954 0.46 (T) 0.46 (T) Intron variant 42 FGG rs206885 0.22 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 17 GEPD rs1050829 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 17 GC (DBP) rs203068 4.001 (A) -<0.01 (A)	EPHX1	rs1051740	0.29 (C)	0.32 (C)	Missense variant	40
PT rs2039914 0.46 (T) 0.46 (T) Intron variant 42 FGG rs206868 0.22 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 43 G6PD rs1056629 0.01 (C) 0.01 (C) Missense variant 17 GC (D8P) rs5030868 <0.01 (A)	F 11	rs2289252	0.41 (T)	0.34 (T)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	41
FGG rs206865 0.22 (Å) 0.21 (Å) Intergenic variant 43 G6P0 rs1050828 <0.01 (T)	FII	rs2036914	0.46 (T)	0.46 (T)	Intron variant	42
G6PD rs1050823 -0.01 (T) 0.01 (T) Missense variant 77 G6PD rs1050829 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 77 GC (DBP) rs503086 -0.01 (A) -0.01 (A) Missense variant 77 GC (DBP) rs503086 -0.01 (A) -0.01 (A) Missense variant 44 HCP5 rs295029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript on variant 45 HCP3 rs295029 0.02 (G) 0.01 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 HFM3 rs1257 0.31 (G) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 HFM3 rs1259 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 50 H7M3 rs180085 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 50 H7M3 rs180085 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 H7M3 rs180095 0.37 (A) 0.24 (A) Intron variant 50 H27A rs180095 0.57 (C)	FGG	rs2066865	0.22 (A)	0.21 (A)	Intergenic variant	43
G6P0 rst050829 0.01 (C) 0.03 (C) Missense variant 17 GC (0BP) rst040 0.43 (A) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 44 HCP rst2041 0.43 (A) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 44 HCP rst205029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 45 HO-1 fs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 HTM3 rs12979860 0.30 (C) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 47, 48, and 49 HTM3 rs12979860 0.30 (C) 0.40 (C) Intron variant 52 H10 rs1800871 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 52 H13 rs1800975 0.81 (T) 0.23 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint H24 rs12632 0.27 (A) 0.24 (A) Intron variant 50 H17 rs180075 0.37 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 50 H24 rs126324 0.20 (O)		rs1050828	<0.01 (T)	0.01 (T)	Missense variant	17
rs5030868 <0.01 (Å) <0.01 (Å) Missense variant 17 GC (DBP) rs7041 0.43 (Å) 0.46 (Å) Missense variant 44 HOPs rs4588 0.27 (T) 0.20 (T) Missense variant 44 HOPs rs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.20 (G) Noncoling transcript exon variant 45 HO-1 rs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 HFM3 rs12752 0.03 (G) 0.38 (G) Splice region variant 47, 48, and 49 HFM3 rs1297860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 32 L10 rs1800871 0.26 (Å) 0.33 (Å) Intron variant 50 H17A rs1800871 0.26 (Å) 0.33 (Å) Intron variant 50 H17A rs1810627 0.37 (Å) 0.21 (Å) Intergenic variant 50 H17A rs1143627 0.25 (C) 0.21 (Å) Missense variant 50 H17A rs1145627 0.32 (Å) 0.33 (Å)	G6PD	rs1050829	0.01 (C)	0.03 (C)	Missense variant	17
C (DBP) rs7041 0.43 (Å) 0.46 (Å) Missense variant 44 RCPS rs2395029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 45 HCPS rs2395029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 46 HTM3 rs12971746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 JFNL3 rs12979860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 17 L10 rs1800895 0.14 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 L13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 L17A rs1800925 0.07 (A) 0.24 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint L17B rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) Strutant 50 11 Strutant 50 L18N rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.31 (A) Synomous variant 50 11 11 11 110 110 110 110 110		rs5030868	<0.01 (A)	<0.01 (A)	Missense variant	17
CL (DBP) rs4588 0.27 (T) 0.20 (T) Missense variant 44 HCP5 rs2395029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 45 HO-1 rs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 46 HTM3 rs12252 0.03 (G) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 47, 48, and 49 HTM3 rs12278 0.03 (C) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 7 H10 rs1800896 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 H113 rs1800897 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 H114 rs1800925 0.81 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 H174 rs1800925 0.07 (A) 0.24 (A) Intron variant 50 H174 rs180075 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) S' UTR variant 50 H18 rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.41 (A) Intron variant 9 9 H18 rs1143627 0.32 (C)		rs7041	0.43 (A)	0.46 (A)	Missense variant	44
HCPS rs2395029 0.02 (G) 0.02 (G) Noncoding transcript exon variant 45 HO-1 rs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 46 HFM3 rs12979860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 47, 48, and 49 IFNL3 rs12979860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 17 IL10 rs1800966 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 IL13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs1800925 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint IL17A rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) S' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL18 rs143634 0.20 (A) 0.31 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL18 rs1830796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 IL6 </td <td>GC (DBP)</td> <td>rs4588</td> <td>0.27 (T)</td> <td>0.20 (T)</td> <td>Missense variant</td> <td>44</td>	GC (DBP)	rs4588	0.27 (T)	0.20 (T)	Missense variant	44
H0-1 rs2071746 0.42 (T) 0.31 (T) Intron variant 46 IFITM3 rs12252 0.03 (G) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 47, 48, and 49 IFN13 rs12379860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 17 IL10 rs1800896 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 IL13 rs18008971 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 IL13 rs180025 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs2180025 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint IL17A rs180025 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 50 IL17B rs143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL17B rs143624 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL17B rs1800796 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 51 s54, s54, and 56 IL16 rs1800796	НСР5	rs2395029	0.02 (G)	0.02 (G)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	45
IFTM3 rs12252 0.03 (G) 0.18 (G) Splice region variant 47, 48, and 49 IFN.3 rs12979860 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Intron variant 17 IL10 rs1800896 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 IL13 rs1800871 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 IL13 rs1800875 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs1800925 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intron variant 53 IL18 rs143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs1143634 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL18 rs1143634 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL18 rs1143654 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs1800796 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs1818879 0	HO-1	rs2071746	0.42 (T)	0.31 (T)	Intron variant	46
IFNL3 rs12979860 0.30 (1) 0.40 (1) Intron variant 17 IL10 rs1800896 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 IL13 rs1800871 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 IL13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs3279913 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 53 IL18 rs143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs110595 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 rs1180796 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs1280796 0.15 (C) 0.21 (C) Intron variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 59 </td <td>IFITM3</td> <td>rs12252</td> <td>0.03 (G)</td> <td>0.18 (G)</td> <td>Splice region variant</td> <td>47, 48, and 49</td>	IFITM3	rs12252	0.03 (G)	0.18 (G)	Splice region variant	47, 48, and 49
IL10 rs1800896 0.41 (C) 0.30 (C) Intron variant 32 IL13 rs1800871 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 IL13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs3819025 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs1143634 0.20 (A) 0.31 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 32, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs180796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 59 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.44 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 <	IFNL3	rs12979860	0.30 (T)	0.40 (T)	Intron variant	17
IL10 rs1800871 0.26 (A) 0.33 (A) 5' UTR variant 32 IL13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs3819025 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint IL17A rs3819025 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 53 IL18 rs114.3627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs114.3627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18W rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL16W rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 IL6R rs180796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 59 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 59 rs1818879 0.31 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs6329805 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C)		rs1800896	0.41 (C)	0.30 (C)	Intron variant	32
IL13 rs1800925 0.18 (T) 0.23 (T) Noncoding transcript exon variant 50 IL17A rs3819025 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant 51 and 52 Preprint IL17A rs275913 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 53 IL18 rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL1RN rs1143624 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL6 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs180796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 59 rs429505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs7529229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1208357 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant <td>IL10</td> <td>rs1800871</td> <td>0.26 (A)</td> <td>0.33 (A)</td> <td>5' UTR variant</td> <td>32</td>	IL10	rs1800871	0.26 (A)	0.33 (A)	5' UTR variant	32
IL17A rs3819025 0.07 (A) 0.34 (A) Intron variant S1 and 52 Preprint IL18 rs2275913 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 53 IL18 rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL18 rs1143634 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL6 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs188879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 IL6R rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs522929 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 17 IL6R rs1208357 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 IL6R rs1208210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant	IL13	rs1800925	0.18 (T)	0.23 (T)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	50
IL17A rs2275913 0.07 (A) 0.21 (A) Intergenic variant 53 IL1B rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL1RN rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL6 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs522929 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1026518 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1028337 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 62 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 Intergenic region		rs3819025	0.07 (A)	0.34 (A)	Intron variant	51 and 52 Preprint
IL1B rs1143627 0.32 (G) 0.45 (A) 5' UTR variant 50 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL1RN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL6 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1208337 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs1322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62	IL1/A	rs2275913	0.07 (A)	0.21 (A)	Intergenic variant	53
ILTB rs1143634 0.20 (A) 0.13 (A) Synonymous variant 50 ILTRN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 ILTRN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 ILTRN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 ILE6 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs752929 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1203537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 61 Intergenic region rs102810 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1		rs1143627	0.32 (G)	0.45 (A)	5' UTR variant	50
ILTRN rs315952 0.25 (C) 0.21 (C) Missense variant 9 IL6 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 IL6 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs732929 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 61 Intergenic region rs1022783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 <td< td=""><td>IL1B</td><td>rs1143634</td><td>0.20 (A)</td><td>0.13 (A)</td><td>Synonymous variant</td><td>50</td></td<>	IL1B	rs1143634	0.20 (A)	0.13 (A)	Synonymous variant	50
IL6 rs1800795 0.35 (C) 0.18 (C) Intron variant 50, 54, 55, and 56 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs752929 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs1126518 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs3504562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs180113	IL1RN	rs315952	0.25 (C)	0.21 (C)	Missense variant	9
IL6 rs1800796 0.05 (C) 0.30 (C) Noncoding transcript exon variant 32, 54, and 57 rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs7529229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs1008210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs30504562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs10113 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB		rs1800795	0.35 (C)	0.18 (C)	Intron variant	50, 54, 55, and 56
rs1818879 0.33 (A) 0.48 (A) Regulatory region variant 58 IL6R rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs52229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZ7FL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 <td< td=""><td>IL6</td><td>rs1800796</td><td>0.05 (C)</td><td>0.30 (C)</td><td>Noncoding transcript exon variant</td><td>32, 54, and 57</td></td<>	IL6	rs1800796	0.05 (C)	0.30 (C)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	32, 54, and 57
ILGR rs2228145 0.40 (C) 0.46 (A) Missense variant 59 rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs7529229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 65 <td></td> <td>rs1818879</td> <td>0.33 (A)</td> <td>0.48 (A)</td> <td>Regulatory region variant</td> <td>58</td>		rs1818879	0.33 (A)	0.48 (A)	Regulatory region variant	58
ILGR rs4329505 0.15 (C) 0.12 (C) Intron variant 17 rs7529229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs1265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs3044562 0.05 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 65		rs2228145	0.40 (C)	0.46 (A)	Missense variant	59
ILGR rs7529229 0.37 (T) 0.41 (T) Intron variant 60 rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs1008210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 65		rs4329505	0.15 (C)	0.12 (C)	Intron variant	17
rs11265618 0.16 (T) 0.13 (T) Intron variant 17 rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 LZTFL1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	IL6R	rs7529229	0.37 (T)	0.41 (T)	Intron variant	60
rs12083537 0.20 (G) 0.16 (G) Intron variant 17 INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67		rs11265618	0.16 (T)	0.13 (T)	Intron variant	17
INFL4 rs11322783 0.30 (T) 0.40 (T) Frameshift variant 61 Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 Intergenic region rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67		rs12083537	0.20 (G)	0.16 (G)	Intron variant	17
Intergenic region rs10108210 0.49 (C) 0.28 (C) Intron variant 62 rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	INFL4	rs11322783	0.30 (T)	0.40 (T)	Frameshift variant	61
Intergenic region rs703297 0.48 (T) 0.36 (C) Regulatory region variant 62 KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67		rs10108210	0.49 (C)	0.28 (C)	Intron variant	62
KCNMB1 rs703505 0.38 (G) 0.47 (G) Intron variant 62 LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	Intergenic region	rs703297	0.48 (T)	0.36 (C)	Regulatory region variant	62
LZTFL1 rs35044562 0.05 (G) 0.05 (G) Intron variant 63 MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 rs1801133 0.44 (A) 0.47 (A) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	KCNMB1	rs703505	0.38 (G)	0.47 (G)	Intron variant	62
MTHFR rs1801131 0.27 (G) 0.15 (G) Missense variant 64 rs1801133 0.44 (A) 0.47 (A) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	LZTFL1	rs35044562	0.05 (G)	0.05 (G)	Intron variant	63
MTHFR rs1801133 0.44 (A) 0.47 (A) Missense variant 64 NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67		rs1801131	0.27 (G)	0.15 (G)	Missense variant	64
NFKB rs28362491 0.42 (-) 0.49 (-) Noncoding transcript exon variant 65 NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	MTHFR	rs1801133	0.44 (A)	0.47 (A)	Missense variant	64
NLRP3 rs10754555 0.39 (G) 0.42 (G) Intron variant 66 and 67	NFKB	rs28362491	0.42 (-)	0.49 (-)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	65
	NLRP3	rs10754555	0.39 (G)	0.42 (G)	Intron variant	66 and 67

(Continued on following page)

Table 5. Continued

Gene	SNPs (rs)	MAF IBS	MAF AMR	Variant impact	References
PEAR1	rs12041331	0.15 (A)	0.20 (A)	Intron variant	68
PTGS1	rs10306114	0.06 (G)	0.03 (G)	Regulatory region variant	69
SLCO1B1	rs4149056	0.12 (C)	0.13 (C)	Missense variant	17 and 70
TLR1	rs5743551	0.29 (C)	0.47 (C)	Intron variant	32
	rs1898830	0.29 (G)	0.50 (G)	Intron variant	32
	rs7656411	0.36 (G)	0.24 (G)	Regulatory region variant	32
TLR2	rs11938228	0.33 (A)	0.49 (C)	Intron variant	71
	rs3804099	0.43 (C)	0.33 (C)	Synonymous variant	72
	rs1816702	0.08 (T)	0.16 (T)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	73 and 74
TLR4	rs1927911	0.22 (A)	0.33 (A)	Intron variant	32
TLR4	rs5030728	0.27 (A)	0.24 (A)	Intron variant	75 and 76
TLDO	rs187084	0.43 (G)	0.43 (G)	Intron variant	32
TLR9	rs352162	0.45 (T)	0.46 (T)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	32
	rs55964536	0.50 (T)	0.29 (T)	Intron variant	32
	rs383510	0.50 (T)	0.38 (T)	Intron variant	32, 77, and 78
	rs464397	0.47 (T)	0.29 (T)	Noncoding transcript exon variant	78
	rs463727	0.49 (A)	0.27 (A)	Intergenic variant	32
	rs713400	0.12 (T)	0.11 (T)	5' UTR variant	79
TMDDCCC	rs8134378	0.09 (A)	0.05 (A)	Intron variant	80
IMPR332	rs469390	0.36 (G)	0.45 (A)	Missense variant	78
	rs734056	0.47 (C)	0.32 (A)	Intron variant	32
	rs2070788	0.50 (G)	0.49 (G)	Intron variant	32, 77, and 78
	rs12329760	0.18 (T)	0.15 (T)	Missense variant	8, 79, and 81
	rs77675406	0.08 (A)	0.09 (A)	3' UTR variant	79
	rs75603675	0.38 (A)	0.27 (A)	Missense variant	9
	rs1800610	0.13 (A)	0.18 (A)	Intron variant	82
TNF	rs1799964	0.18 (C)	0.20 (C)	Regulatory region variant	83
	rs361525	0.06 (A)	0.08 (A)	Regulatory region variant	84
TNF/TNKA	rs1800629	0.15 (A)	0.07 (A)	Regulatory region variant	32 and 54
ΤΝΚΑ	rs1800630	0.13 (A)	0.13 (A)	Regulatory region variant	32
	rs13190932	0.07 (G)	0.06 (G)	Missense variant	85
TRAF3IP2	rs33980500	0.08 (T)	0.12 (T)	Missense variant	62
	rs13196377	0.06 (G)	0.07 (G)	Intron variant	86
VDR	rs2228570	0.33 (A)	0.48 (A)	Start lost	32

MAF, maximum allele frequency; IBS, Iberians; AMR, Americans, UTR, untranslated region. Frequency data were obtained from Ensembl (87) and dbSNP (88).

with a structural change that causes a less specific or impaired interaction with viral proteins, causing a less efficient internalization of viruses inside human cells. This is congruent with Latini et al observations: *TPMRSS2* rs75603675 (C > A) A allele was in significantly lower frequency in populations that suffered more severe cases of COVID-19 (57). This suggested a possible protective effect toward COVID-19 infection.

Other nominally significant associations were established between WHOCS scales and: *IFNL4* rs12979860, ACEIs, obesity, ARA-II, *HCP5* rs2395029, *ACE* rs1799752, *DPP4* rs17574, *HMOX1* rs2071746, *IL10* rs1800896, *IL6* rs1818879, *NFKB1* rs28362491, and *MX1* rs469390. Although some of these associations were previously observed, others were also persistently rejected. For instance, the use of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS) inhibitors was proposed to cause the up-regulation of the ACE2 receptor, the receptor for SARS-CoV-2 protein S, which enables cell infection; therefore, the use of this drugs was related to a higher risk for COVID-19 infection and worse prognosis (97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103). However, a bias was identified in this assumption as it were the conditions associated with the use of RAAS inhibitors (e.g., hypertension or

heart disease) which actually led to a higher risk of worse prognosis (104). Consequently, we decided to use a sufficiently strict statistical approximation to control for this bias. Hence, we considered all associations mentioned above as negative, and not worth discussing, because this would contribute to confusion.

One noteworthy disparity with our study is the GWAS study by the Severe COVID-19 GWAS Group (18). They report different genetic markers to ours. The explanation that we can elucidate to address this discrepancy is that our outcome variable is different. Our analysis focus in all COVID-19 severity stages, whereas they focus in the most severe cases. Thus, our findings may explain the susceptibility to infection in the early stages of the disease, whereas other factors such as 3p21.31 gene cluster and the ABO blood-group system may determine terminal status of COVID-19. Definitely, more research must be performed in other to clarify the true effect of the *TMPRSS2* rs75603675 polymorphism in the outcome of this disease.

With this work, we integrate multiple clinical factors and genetic factors to COVID-19 severity prediction. A variable that excellently captures the comorbidity of patients is used, the CCI index. The presence or absence of dyslipidemia complements the CCI index. Only with this information, for instance, a significantly higher WHOCS-1 and -2 scores can be predicted for a patient with dyslipidemia and a CCI of five versus a patient without dyslipidemia and CCI of 1. Although this was previously known, that is, patients with higher comorbidities are related to worse COVID-19 prognosis, our scale signifies a clinically relevant tool to better manage patients because it is clear and numerical. Furthermore, sex and TMPRSS2 rs75603675 stand as additional clinically relevant predictors of COVID-19 severity, which were included in the scales. Continuing with the previous example, if the first patient carried the C/C diplotype and was male and the second patient was female and carried the A/A diplotype, the predicted WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 scales would be: 3.637 and 4.153 for the first patient and 1.737 and 2.302 for the second. These predictions are related to specific clinical requirements (e.g., hospitalization or oxygen supplementation). This quantitative measurement could help in the optimization of clinical resources.

Despite the merits of this work, it presents limitations that should be considered. First, patients were recruited from the first COVID-19 wave, which might be considered more than a limitation; it can be considered a strength. As this work was carried with patients infected during March-April 2020, the circulating strains were different from those circulating now. In this sense, the conclusions regarding TMPRSS2 rs75603675 should be confirmed in the currently circulating strains. Nonetheless, new strains, such as the omicron variant, could be more infectious or pathogenic, being the underlying mechanism of such pathogenicity an enhanced interaction between viral antigens and TMPRSS2. This interaction could be affected by genetic variants of this gene and cause an even greater difference of severity with new strains. Nevertheless, new studies shall confirm the relevance of TMPRSS2 rs75603675 in new circulating variants. Another limitation is that hospital protocols were severely affected by the emergency healthcare situation of the first COVID-19 wave, and adequacy of the therapeutic effort was needed. This, in combination with the retrospective nature of the study produces relative scarcity of severe and asymptomatic individuals. Consequently, the severity distribution might be skewed. In addition, the nature of the WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 analysis by means of the

generalized linear model assumes a normal distribution of these variables. To avoid bias, we performed a strict statistical analysis, in exchange for assuming greater type II error. Moreover, the fact that the exact same variables related to severity 1 and 2 variables were identified is reassuring, along with the strict control for type-1 error.

Conclusions

The *TMPRSS2* rs75603675 C/C or C/A genotypes compared with A/A, males compared with females, the presence of dyslipidemia, and a higher CCI score were associated with more severe COVID-19, at the first hospital visit and at the most severe point of disease progression. The integration of all these variables into the proposed equations could be a useful clinical tool for the rational management of patients with COVID-19. To our knowledge, this is the first work to propose a similar tool that integrates genetic data capable of predicting the prognosis of COVID-19.

Materials and Methods

Study design and participants

This study was designed with an observational and retrospective approach. A total of 817 patients with COVID-19, who attended the emergency department of the Hospital Universitario de La Princesa between 29 March and 29 April 2020, were recruited. Both inpatients and outpatients were considered. Patients were recruited consecutively according to their first visit to the emergency department. To avoid imbalances in the proportions of the severity groups because of the retrospective and consecutive nature of recruitment, checkpoints were applied to prioritize the selection of under-represented patients, that is, severe and mild patients. The first checkpoint was performed at the beginning of May 2021, with 617 patients recruited: 83 (13.5%) mild, 466 (75.5%) moderate, and 68 (11%) severe; and the second was performed at the end of May 2021, with 743 patients: 159 (21.5%) mild, 502 (67.5%) moderate, and 82 (11%) severe. The Ethics Research Committee of Hospital Universitario de La Princesa approved the study protocol. All subjects provided informed consent, except for the deceased. They were scheduled for sampling at the Department of Internal Medicine of Hospital Universitario de La Princesa; stored samples were retrieved from the deceased patients. Research compiled with Spanish and European legislation on biomedical research and with the revised Declaration of Helsinki.

Variables

Hospital and primary care medical records were used to retrieve disease and clinical information. The main outcome (dependent variable) was a modified version of the 7-point World Health Organization (WHO) COVID-19 severity scale (WHOCS) (105). Briefly, individuals are classified according to the following COVID-19 severity groups: (1) infected, asymptomatic; (2) symptomatic not requiring hospitalization; (3) COVID-19 requiring hospitalization without oxygen supplementation; (4) oxygen supplementation with mask or nasal prongs; (5) noninvasive ventilation or high flow

oxygen; (6) intubation and mechanical ventilation in an intensive care unit (ICU); and (7) death. This scale was evaluated in the moment of the first hospital examination (WHOCS-1) and of the severest WHOCS score (WHOCS-2). For this work, WHOCS levels were grouped as follows: levels 1–2 were considered mild severity, levels 3–4 were considered moderate severity, and levels 5 or greater were considered severe COVID-19. The resulting variables were named "severity-1" and "severity-2," that is, a transformed variable of the severity at admission and at the worst severity status.

As independent variables or covariates, the following ones were analyzed: demographic characteristics (age and sex), comorbidity (obesity, dyslipidemia, tobacco or alcohol use, and the Charlson Comorbidity Index, CCI), biogeographical group (106) (inferred from the country of birth), relevant drugs used before COVID-19 infection, that is, angiotensin converter enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs) (e.g., enalapril, lisinopril), angiotensin receptor II antagonists (ARA-II) (e.g., losartan, irbesartan), aldosterone antagonists (e.g., eplerenone, spironolactone), oral anticoagulants (e.g., acenocoumarol, dabigatran), systemic corticosteroids (e.g., dexamethasone) or systemic immunosuppressants (e.g., tacrolimus or methotrexate), drugs for COVID-19 treatment (hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine, remdesivir, corticosteroids, tocilizumab, heparin, lopinavir/ritonavir, plasma transfusion), and SNPs.

Genotyping

Published articles evaluating SNPs and COVID-19 were addressed since January 2020 until December 2020. Moreover, articles evaluating polymorphism in important genes related to COVID-19 (e.g., ACE2, ACE, IL-6, or IFNs) or the coagulation cascade (e.g., F11, CRP) were screened however not necessarily published during the pandemic. Finally, variants related to safety and effectiveness of the drugs used for the treatment of the disease were included, that is, pharmacogenetic variants. Sample collection occurred in a period after discharge of the patients, during the months of January to May 2021. Patients who gave informed consent provided 5 ml of blood collected in an EDTA K2 tube. For deceased patients, samples were retrieved from stored collection. Genomic DNA was extracted from peripheral blood samples with a Maxwell RSC automated DNA extractor (Promega) following the manufacturer's instructions. For genotype analysis, a QuantStudio 12K flex thermal cycler along with an OpenArray thermal block was used (Thermo Fisher Scientific). A customized genotyping array was designed with variants shown in Table 5. The references justifying the inclusion of these variants are included.

Statistical analysis

An online tool for sample size calculation was used (Sample Size Calculator available at https://riskcalc.org/samplesize/). The study was a retrospective observational cohort study. The α or type-1 error rate was set at 0.05, and the power, or 1- β , was set at 0.9. Exposure was defined as the presence or absence of one or several SNPs related to severe COVID-19. The event to be analyzed was severe COVID-19, defined as the event, that is, WHO COVID-19 severities 5, 6, and 7. Depending on the SNP prevalence, the k value (unexposed to exposed ratio) was set. For SNPs with low prevalence (e.g., 5%), k = 20. For SNPs with 20% prevalence, k = 4. For SNPs with 40% prevalence, k = 1.5. Assuming a probability of the event in the

unexposed group (P0) of 0.4 (40%) and of 0.55 (55%) in the risk group (P1), the following sample sizes were required: 2,667 for k = 20 (127 exposed and 2,540 unexposed patients), 760 for k = 4 (127 exposed and 608 unexposed patients), and 510 for k = 1.5 (204 exposed and 306 unexposed). Therefore, a sample size between 510 and 2,667 was considered. Assuming greater differences (e.g., P0 = 0.3 and P =0.7), significantly lower sample sizes were required. Finally, the sample size was determined according to the capacity of the genotyping platform, the available budget, and the latter estimations. A genotyping array containing 120 SNPs with a capacity for 920 samples was designed and purchased. Full coverage of the 920 samples genotyping capacity could not be achieved because of failures or the need for repetitions.

Statistical analysis was conducted in R (107). To analyze severity 1 and 2 variables, a univariate analysis was initially performed by ordinal logistic regression with the MASS package (108). As independent variables, the following ones were explored: genetic variables (all SNPs were transformed into *dummy* variables, that is, grouping heterozygous subjects with the most frequent homozygous diplotype), biogeographic group, previous treatments and other comorbidities (e.g., dyslipidemia or tobacco use); CCI and sex were included as covariates, and the level of significance was adjusted based on the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Those variables with corrected P' < 0.05 were introduced as independent variables in a multiple logistic regression analysis of severities 1 and 2, that is, the multivariate analysis. In this analysis, significance was similarly adjusted based on the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.

A secondary analysis of WHOCS-1 and WHOCS-2 was performed to provide a predictive equation of disease severity. For the univariate analysis, a generalized lineal model was performed by means of individual linear regression, with the CCI and sex as covariates and applying the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Those variables with P' < 0.05 were introduced as independent variables in the multivariate analysis, in this case, by means of a generalized lineal model with CCI and sex as covariates again.

Availability of Data and Materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary information is available at https://doi.org/10.26508/lsa. 202201396.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Belén Gutiérrez Calvo and Ana Fuentes Valera for their contribution in blood sample extraction for this project; Rosa Carracedo Rodríguez for her contribution in DNA extraction and storage and Emilia Roy-Vallejo for her assistance in DNA sample identification. This research received funding from the Community of Madrid through the COVID-19

grants of the year 2020, Fondo Supera COVID-19 from Banco de Santander and CRUE (grant Predinmun-COVID) to I de los Santos, I González-Álvaro, and E Fernández-Ruiz and Instituto de Salud Carlos III (ISCIII) from the Spanish Ministry of Science Innovation and Universities and the European Regional Development Fund (ISCIII-FEDER) "A way to achieve Europe." G Villapalos-García is supported by a PFIS predoctoral grant (FI20/00090), and P Zubiaur's contract with CIBERehd is financed by the "Infraestructura de Medicina de Precisión asociada a la Ciencia y Tecnología (IMPaCT, IMP/00009)" (ISCIII). S Fernández de Córdoba-Oñate and P Delgado-Wicke were supported by Predinmun-COVID and PI19/00096 grants, respectively.

Author Contributions

G Villapalos-Garcia: conceptualization, resources, data curation, formal analysis, supervision, investigation, visualization, methodology, and writing—original draft, review, and editing.

P Zubiaur: conceptualization, resources, data curation, formal analysis, supervision, investigation, visualization, methodology, project administration, and writing—original draft, review, and editing.

R Rivas-Duran: data curation, investigation, and writing-review and editing.

P Campos-Norte: data curation, investigation, and writing-review and editing.

C Arevalo-Roman: data curation, investigation, and writing—review and editing.

M Fernandez-Rico: data curation, investigation, and writing—review and editing.

L Garcia-Fraile Fraile: conceptualization, data curation, visualization, methodology, and writing—review and editing.

P Fernadez-Campos: investigation and writing-review and editing.

P Soria-Chacartegui: investigation and writing—review and editing.

S Fernandez de Cordoba-Onate: resources and writing—review and editing.

P Delgado-Wicke: resources and writing-review and editing.

E Fernandez-Ruiz: resources and writing—review and editing.

I Gonzalez-Alvaro: resources, methodology, and writing—review and editing.

J Sanz: resources and writing-review and editing.

F Abad-Santos: conceptualization, resources, supervision, funding acquisition, investigation, visualization, methodology, project administration, and writing—review and editing.

I de los Santos: conceptualization, resources, supervision, funding acquisition, investigation, visualization, methodology, project administration, and writing—review and editing.

Conflict of Interest Statement

F Abad-Santos has been consultant or investigator in clinical trials sponsored by the following pharmaceutical companies: Abbott, Alter, Chemo, Cinfa, FAES, Farmalíder, Ferrer, GlaxoSmithKline, Galenicum, Gilead, Italfarmaco, Janssen-Cilag, Kern, Normon, Novartis, Servier, Silver Pharma, Teva, and Zambon. I de los Santos has received grants from Gilead, ViiV, and Janssen. The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. The World Health Organization (2021) COVID-19 weekly epidemiological update. Published 19 October 2021. [cited 2021 Oct 25]. Edition 62;

Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19—19-october-2021.

- WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. [cited 2022 Jan 14]; Available from: https://covid19.who.int/.
- Singh B, Chattu VK (2021) Prioritizing [L8S2Q1M6]equity[R8S2Q1M7] in COVID-19 vaccine distribution through global health diplomacy. *Health Promot Perspect* 11: 281–287. doi:10.34172/hpp.2021.36
- Neely SR, Eldredge C, Ersing R, Remington C (2021) Vaccine hesitancy and exposure to misinformation: A survey analysis. J Gen Intern Med 37: 179–187. doi:10.1007/s11606-021-07171-zAvailable from:.
- WHO News (2021) Update on Omicron. [cited 2021 Dec 12]; Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/28-11-2021-update-on-omicron.
- Bakhshandeh B, Sorboni SG, Javanmard AR, Mottaghi SS, Mehrabi MR, Sorouri F, Abbasi A, Jahanafrooz Z (2021) Variants in ACE2; potential influences on virus infection and COVID-19 severity. *Infect Genet Evol* 90: 104773. doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2021.104773
- 7. Devaux CA, Rolain JM, Raoult D (2020) ACE2 receptor polymorphism: Susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2, hypertension, multi-organ failure, and COVID-19 disease outcome. J Microbiol Immunol Infect 53: 425–435. doi:10.1016/j.jmii.2020.04.015
- Asselta R, Paraboschi EM, Mantovani A, Duga S (2020) ACE2 and TMPRSS2 variants and expression as candidates to sex and country differences in COVID-19 severity in Italy. *Aging* 12: 10087–10098. doi:10.18632/aging.103415
- 9. Latini A, Agolini E, Novelli A, Borgiani P, Giannini R, Gravina P, Smarrazzo A, Dauri M, Andreoni M, Rogliani P, et al (2020) COVID-19 and genetic variants of protein involved in the SARS-CoV-2 entry into the host cells. *Genes (Basel)* 11: 1010. doi:10.3390/genes11091010
- Ellinghaus D, Degenhardt F, Bujanda L, Buti M, Albillos A, Invernizzi P, Fernández J, Prati D, Baselli G, Asselta R, et al (2020) Genomewide association study of severe covid-19 with respiratory failure. N Engl J Med 383: 1522–1534. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2020283
- Israni A, Goulden CJ, Harky A (2021) Laboratory biomarkers and prognosis in Covid-19, where do we stand? *Rev Med Virol* 31: e2296. doi:10.1002/rmv.2296Available from:.
- Dite GS, Murphy NM, Allman R (2021) Development and validation of a clinical and genetic model for predicting risk of severe COVID-19. *Epidemiol Infect* 149: e162. doi:10.1017/S095026882100145X
- Dite GS, Murphy NM, Allman R (2021) An integrated clinical and genetic model for predicting risk of severe COVID-19: A population-based casecontrol study. *PLoS One* 16: e0247205. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247205
- Ejaz H, Alsrhani A, Zafar A, Javed H, Junaid K, Abdalla AE, Abosalif KOA, Ahmed Z, Younas S (2020) COVID-19 and comorbidities: Deleterious impact on infected patients. J Infect Public Health 13: 1833–1839. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2020.07.014
- Haitao T, Vermunt JV, Abeykoon J, Ghamrawi R, Gunaratne M, Jayachandran M, Narang K, Parashuram S, Suvakov S, Garovic VD (2020) COVID-19 and sex differences. *Mayo Clinic Proc* 95: 2189–2203. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2020.07.024
- Bienvenu LA, Noonan J, Wang X, Peter K (2020) Higher mortality of COVID-19 in males: Sex differences in immune response and cardiovascular comorbidities. *Cardiovasc Res* 116: 2197–2206. doi:10.1093/cvr/cvaa284
- Zubiaur P, Koller D, Saiz-Rodríguez M, Navares-Gómez M, Abad-Santos F (2020) Important pharmacogenetic information for drugs prescribed during the SARS-CoV-2 infection (COVID-19). *Clin Transl Sci* 13: 1023–1033. doi:10.1111/cts.12866
- The Severe Covid-19 GWAS Group (2020) Genomewide association study of severe covid-19 with respiratory failure. *New Engl J Med* 383: 1522–1534. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2020283
- 19. Evangelou E, Warren HR, Mosen-Ansorena D, Mifsud B, Pazoki R, Gao H, Ntritsos G, Dimou N, Cabrera CP, et al;The Million Veteran Program,

(2018) Genetic analysis of over 1 million people identifies 535 new loci associated with blood pressure traits. *Nat Genet* 50: 1412–1425. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0205-x

- Cook J, Pressler ML, Damle B, Alemayehu D, Knirsch CA (2021) The weight of evidence from electrophysiology, observational, and cardiovascular end point studies demonstrates the safety of azithromycin. *Clin Transl Sci* 14: 106–112. doi:10.1111/cts.12867
- Cao Y, Li L, Feng Z, Wan S, Huang P, Sun X, Wen F, Huang X, Ning G, Wang W (2020) Comparative genetic analysis of the novel coronavirus (2019nCoV/SARS-CoV-2) receptor ACE2 in different populations. *Cell Discov* 6: 11. doi:10.1038/s41421-020-0147-1
- Bosso M, Thanaraj TA, Abu-Farha M, Alanbaei M, Abubaker J, Al-Mulla F (2020) The two faces of ACE2: The role of ACE2 receptor and its polymorphisms in hypertension and COVID-19. *Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev* 18: 321–327. doi:10.1016/j.omtm.2020.06.017
- Chen J, Jiang Q, Xia X, Liu K, Yu Z, Tao W, Gong W, Han JJ (2020) Individual variation of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 gene expression and regulation. *Aging Cell* 19: e13168. doi:10.1111/acel.13168Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/acel.13168.
- 24. Srivastava A, Bandopadhyay A, Das D, Pandey RK, Singh V, Khanam N, Srivastava N, Singh PP, Dubey PK, Pathak A, et al (2020) Genetic association of ACE2 rs2285666 polymorphism with COVID-19 spatial distribution in India. *Front Genet* 11: 564741. doi:10.3389/ fgene.2020.564741
- Torre-Fuentes L, Matías-Guiu J, Hernández-Lorenzo L, Montero-Escribano P, Pytel V, Porta-Etessam J, Gómez-Pinedo U, Matías-Guiu JA (2021) ACE2, TMPRSS2, and furin variants and SARS-CoV-2 infection in Madrid, Spain. J Med Virol 93: 863–869. doi:10.1002/jmv.26319
- Chiu RWK, Tang NLS, Hui DSC, Chung GTY, Chim SSC, Chan KCA, Sung Y-m, Chan LYS, Tongkwan Y, Lee W-s, et al (2004) ACE2 gene polymorphisms do not affect outcome of severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Clin Chem* 50: 1683–1686. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2004.035436
- Sieńko J, Kotowski M, Bogacz A, Lechowicz K, Drożdzal S, Rosik J, Sietnicki M, Sieńko M, Kotfis K (2020) COVID-19: The influence of ACE genotype and ACE-I and ARBs on the course of SARS-CoV-2 infection in elderly patients. CIA 15: 1231–1240. doi:10.2147/CIA.S261516
- Shao Y, He J, Chen F, Cai Y, Zhao J, Lin Y, Yin Z, Tao H, Shao X, Huang P, et al (2016) Association study between promoter polymorphisms of ADAM17 and progression of sepsis. *Cell Physiol Biochem* 39: 1247–1261. doi:10.1159/000447830
- Brest P, Refae S, Mograbi B, Hofman P, Milano G (2020) Host polymorphisms may impact SARS-CoV-2 infectivity. *Trends Genet* 36: 813–815. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2020.08.003
- Park HK, Kim MC, Kim SM, Jo DJ (2013) Assessment of two missense polymorphisms (rs4762 and rs699) of the angiotensinogen gene and stroke. *Exp Ther Med* 5: 343–349. doi:10.3892/etm.2012.790
- Kuo CL, Pilling LC, Atkins JL, Masoli JAH, Delgado J, Kuchel GA, Melzer D (2020) APOE e4 genotype predicts severe COVID-19 in the UK Biobank Community Cohort. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 75: 2231–2232. doi:10.1093/gerona/glaa131
- Ghafouri-Fard S, Noroozi R, Vafaee R, Branicki W, Pospiech E, Pyrc K, Łabaj PP, Omrani MD, Taheri M, Sanak M (2020) Effects of host genetic variations on response to, susceptibility and severity of respiratory infections. *Biomed Pharmacother* 128: 110296. doi:10.1016/ j.biopha.2020.110296
- Ulrich H, Pillat MM (2020) CD147 as a target for COVID-19 treatment: Suggested effects of azithromycin and stem cell engagement. Stem Cell Rev Rep 16: 434–440. doi:10.1007/s12015-020-09976-7
- Maldonado-Montoro M, Cañadas-Garre M, González-Utrilla A, Plaza-Plaza JC, Calleja-Hernández M-Y (2016) Genetic and clinical biomarkers of tocilizumab response in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Pharmacol Res* 111: 264–271. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2016.06.016

- Zhou F, Zhou Y, Zhou L, Guo T, Yu D (2017) Association of CRP gene rs1130864 polymorphism with ischemic stroke and coronary artery disease: A meta-analysis. Int J Clin Exp Med 10: 15032–15039.
- Nunnari G, Sanfilippo C, Castrogiovanni P, Imbesi R, Li Volti G, Barbagallo I, Musumeci G, Di Rosa M (2020) Network perturbation analysis in human bronchial epithelial cells following SARS-CoV2 infection. *Exp Cell Res* 395: 112204. doi:10.1016/j.yexcr.2020.112204
- 37. Bezemer ID (2008) Gene variants associated with deep vein thrombosis. JAMA 299: 1306. doi:10.1001/jama.299.11.1306
- Li F (2016) Structure, function, and evolution of coronavirus spike proteins. Annu Rev Virol 3: 237–261. doi:10.1146/annurev-virology-110615-042301
- Song Z, Xu Y, Bao L, Zhang L, Yu P, Qu Y, Zhu H, Zhao W, Han Y, Qin C (2019) From SARS to MERS, thrusting coronaviruses into the spotlight. *Viruses* 11: 59. doi:10.3390/v11010059
- Lacut K, Ayme-Dietrich E, Gourhant L, Poulhazan E, Andro M, Becquemont L, Mottier D, Le Gal G, Verstuyft C (2012) Impact of genetic factors (VKORC1, CYP2C9, CYP4F2 and EPHX1) on the anticoagulation response to fluindione: Genetic factors and fluindione response. Br J Clin Pharmacol 73: 428–436. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2125.2011.04095.x
- Jiang J, Liu K, Zou J, Ma H, Yang H, Zhang X, Jiao Y (2017) Associations between polymorphisms in coagulation-related genes and venous thromboembolism: A meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis. *Medicine* 96: e6537. doi:10.1097/MD.000000000006537
- Harrington LB, Wiggins KL, Sitlani CM, Blondon M, Vlieg AvanH, Rosendaal FR, Heckbert SR, Psaty BM, Smith NL (2016) The association of F11 genetic variants with the risk of incident venous thrombosis among women, by statin use. *Thromb Haemost* 115: 682–684. doi:10.1160/TH15-08-0683
- Paulsen B, Skille H, Smith EN, Hveem K, Gabrielsen ME, Brækkan SK, Rosendaal FR, Frazer KA, Gran OV, Hansen JB (2020) Fibrinogen gamma gene rs2066865 and risk of cancer-related venous thromboembolism. *Haematologica* 105: 1963–1968. doi:10.3324/haematol.2019.224279
- Speeckaert MM, De Buyzere ML, Delanghe JR (2021) Vitamin D binding protein polymorphism and COVID-19. J Med Virol 93: 705–707. doi:10.1002/jmv.26508
- 45. Kulski JK (2019) Long noncoding RNA HCP5, a hybrid HLA class I endogenous retroviral gene: Structure, expression, and disease associations. *Cells* 8: E480. doi:10.3390/cells8050480
- Cao L, Zhang Z, Cai B, Bai W, Zhang Y, Sun W, Xie X, Sun W, Cai Q, Li Z, et al (2014) Association of heme oxygenase-1 gene rs2071746 polymorphism with vascular outcomes in patients with atherosclerotic stroke. *J Neurol Sci* 344: 154–157. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2014.06.046
- 47. Zhang Y, Qin L, Zhao Y, Zhang P, Xu B, Li K, Liang L, Zhang C, Dai Y, Feng Y, et al (2020) Interferon-induced transmembrane protein 3 genetic variant rs12252-C associated with disease severity in coronavirus disease 2019. J Infect Dis 222: 34–37. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa224
- von der Thüsen J, Eerden M (2020) Histopathology and genetic susceptibility in COVID-19 pneumonia. *Eur J Clin Invest* 50: e13259. doi:10.1111/eci.13259Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/ doi/10.1111/eci.13259.
- Pati A, Mahto H, Padhi S, Panda AK (2020) ACE deletion allele is associated with susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection and mortality rate: An epidemiological study in the Asian population. *Clin Chim Acta* 510: 455–458. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.08.008
- Ahmadi A, Ghaedi H, Salimian J, Azimzadeh Jamalkandi S, Ghanei M (2019) Association between chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and interleukins gene variants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cytokine* 117: 65–71. doi:10.1016/j.cyto.2019.02.003
- Keramat F, Kazemi S, Saidijam M, Zamani A, Kohan HF, Mamani M, Eini P, Moghimbigi A, Alikhani MY (2019) Association of interleukin-17 gene polymorphisms and susceptibility to brucellosis in Hamadan, western Iran. *Microbiol Immunol* 63: 139–146. doi:10.1111/1348-0421.12675

- Batur LK, Hekim N (2020) Correlations of IL-6, IL-6R, IL-10 and IL-17 gene polymorphisms with the prevalence of COVID-2019 infection and its mortality rate. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-82662/v1. (Preprint posted September 23, 2020). Available from: https://www.researchsquare. com/article/rs-82662/v1.
- Rogo LD, Rezaei F, Marashi SM, Yekaninejad MS, Naseri M, Ghavami N, Mokhtari-Azad T (2016) Seasonal influenza A/H3N2 virus infection and IL-1B, IL-10, IL-17, and IL-28 polymorphisms in Iranian population. J Med Virol 88: 2078–2084. doi:10.1002/jmv.24572
- Zhao X, He J, Xie G, Xu S, Xie J, Chen Y, Wu H (2019) Genetic variations in inflammation-related genes and their influence on the susceptibility of pediatric acute lung injury in a Chinese population. *Gene* 687: 16–22. doi:10.1016/j.gene.2018.11.009
- Ulhaq ZS, Soraya GV (2020) Anti-IL-6 receptor antibody treatment for severe COVID-19 and the potential implication of IL-6 gene polymorphisms in novel coronavirus pneumonia. *Medicina Clínica* 155: 548–556. doi:10.1016/j.medcli.2020.07.002
- Kirtipal N, Bharadwaj S (2021) Interleukin 6 polymorphisms as an indicator of COVID-19 severity in humans. J Biomol Struct Dyn 39: 4563–4565. doi:10.1080/07391102.2020.1776640
- Fang M, Huang Y, Zhang Y, Ning Z, Zhu L, Li X (2017) Interleukin-6 -572C/G polymorphism is associated with serum interleukin-6 levels and risk of idiopathic pulmonary arterial hypertension. J Am Soc Hypertens 11: 171–177. doi:10.1016/j.jash.2017.01.011
- Ambrocio-Ortiz E, Pérez-Rubio G, Abarca-Rojano E, Montaño M, Ramos C, Hernández-Zenteno RDJ, Del Angel-Pablo AD, Reséndiz-Hernández JM, Ramírez-Venegas A, Falfán-Valencia R (2018) Influence of proinflammatory cytokine gene polymorphisms on the risk of COPD and the levels of plasma protein. *Cytokine* 111: 364–370. doi:10.1016/ j.cyto.2018.09.017
- Szpakowicz A, Pepinski W, Waszkiewicz E, Skawronska M, Niemcunowicz-Janica A, Musial WJ, Kaminski KA (2017) The rs2228145 polymorphism in the interleukin-6 receptor and its association with long-term prognosis after myocardial infarction in a pilot study. Arch Med Sci 13: 93–99. doi:10.5114/aoms.2016.58636
- Swerdlow DI, Holmes MV, Kuchenbaecker KB, Engmann JEL, Shah T, Sofat R, Guo Y, Chung C, Peasey AInterleukin-6 Receptor Mendelian Randomisation Analysis (IL6R MR) Consortium, (2012) The interleukin-6 receptor as a target for prevention of coronary heart disease: A mendelian randomisation analysis. *Lancet* 379: 1214–1224. doi:10.1016/ S0140-6736(12)60110-X
- Amodio E, Pipitone RM, Grimaudo S, Immordino P, Maida CM, Prestileo T, Restivo V, Tramuto F, Vitale F, Craxì A, et al (2020) SARS-CoV-2 viral load, IFNλ polymorphisms and the course of COVID-19: An observational study. JCM 9: 3315. doi:10.3390/jcm9103315
- 62. Perricone C, Conigliaro P, Ciccacci C, Marcucci E, Cafaro G, Bartoloni E, Perricone R, Novelli G, Borgiani P, Gerli R (2020) The differential response to anti IL-6 treatment in COVID-19: The genetic counterpart. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 38: 580.
- 63. Zeberg H, Pääbo S (2020) The major genetic risk factor for severe COVID-19 is inherited from Neanderthals. *Nature* 587: 610–612. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2818-3
- Banerjee I, Gupta V, Ganesh S (2007) Association of gene polymorphism with genetic susceptibility to stroke in asian populations: A metaanalysis. J Hum Genet 52: 205–219. doi:10.1007/s10038-006-0098-x
- 65. López-Mejías R, García-Bermúdez M, González-Juanatey C, Castañeda S, Miranda-Filloy JA, Gómez-Vaquero C, Fernández-Gutiérrez B, Balsa A, Pascual-Salcedo D, Blanco R, et al (2012) NFKB1-94ATTG ins/del polymorphism (rs28362491) is associated with cardiovascular disease in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Atherosclerosis* 224: 426–429. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2012.06.008
- 66. Schunk SJ, Kleber ME, März W, Pang S, Zewinger S, Triem S, Ege P, Reichert MC, Krawczyk M, Weber SN, et al (2021) Genetically determined

NLRP3 inflammasome activation associates with systemic inflammation and cardiovascular mortality. *Eur Heart J* 42: 1742–1756. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehab107

- Day TG, Ramanan AV, Hinks A, Lamb R, Packham J, Wise C, Punaro M, Donn RP (2008) Autoinflammatory genes and susceptibility to psoriatic juvenile idiopathic arthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 58: 2142–2146. doi:10.1002/ art.23604
- Qayyum R, Becker LC, Becker DM, Faraday N, Yanek LR, Leal SM, Shaw C, Mathias R, Suktitipat B, Bray PF (2015) Genome-wide association study of platelet aggregation in African Americans. *BMC Genet* 16: 58. doi:10.1186/s12863-015-0217-9
- 69. Motovska Z, Kvasnicka J, Hajkova J, Kala P, Simek S, Bobcikova P, Petr R, Bilkova D, Poloczek M, Miklik R, et al (2010) Platelet gene polymorphisms and risk of bleeding in patients undergoing elective coronary angiography: A genetic substudy of the PRAGUE-8 trial. *Atherosclerosis* 212: 548–552. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2010.07.006
- Zubiaur P, Benedicto MD, Villapalos-García G, Navares-Gómez M, Mejía-Abril G, Román M, Martín-Vílchez S, Ochoa D, Abad-Santos F (2021) SLCO1B1 phenotype and CYP3A5 polymorphism significantly affect atorvastatin bioavailability. J Pers Med 11: 204. doi:10.3390/jpm11030204
- Budulac SE, Boezen HM, Hiemstra PS, Lapperre TS, Vonk JM, Timens W, Postma DSThe GLUCOLD study group, (2012) Toll-like receptor (TLR2 and TLR4) polymorphisms and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *PLoS One* 7: e43124. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043124
- Gao Y, Xiao H, Wang Y, Xu F (2017) Association of single-nucleotide polymorphisms in toll-like receptor 2 gene with asthma susceptibility: A meta-analysis. *Medicine* 96: e6822. doi:10.1097/ MD.00000000006822
- 73. Bank S, Skytt Andersen P, Burisch J, Pedersen N, Roug S, Galsgaard J, Ydegaard Turino S, Broder Brodersen J, Rashid S, Kaiser Rasmussen B, et al (2014) Polymorphisms in the inflammatory pathway genes TLR2, TLR4, TLR9, LY96, NFKBIA, NFKB1, TNFA, TNFRSF1A, IL6R, IL10, IL23R, PTPN22, and PPARG are associated with susceptibility of inflammatory bowel disease in a Danish cohort. Heimesaat MM. *PLoS One* 9: e98815. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0098815
- 74. Bank S, Andersen PS, Burisch J, Pedersen N, Roug S, Galsgaard J, Turino SY, Brodersen JB, Rashid S, Rasmussen BK, et al (2014) Associations between functional polymorphisms in the NFκB signaling pathway and response to anti-TNF treatment in Danish patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *Pharmacogenomics J* 14: 526–534. doi:10.1038/tpj.2014.19
- 75. Brandão SCS, de Oliveira Xavier Ramos J, Dompieri LT, Godoi ETAM, Figueiredo JL, Sarinho ESC, Chelvanambi S, Aikawa M (2021) Is Toll-like receptor 4 involved in the severity of COVID-19 pathology in patients with cardiometabolic comorbidities? *Cytokine Growth Factor Rev* 58: 102–110. doi:10.1016/j.cytogfr.2020.09.002
- Norde MM, Fisberg RM, Marchioni DML, Rogero MM (2020) Systemic lowgrade inflammation–associated lifestyle, diet, and genetic factors: A population-based cross-sectional study. *Nutrition* 70: 110596. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2019.110596
- 77. Chiappelli F (2020) CoViD-19 susceptibility. *Bioinformation* 16: 501–504. doi:10.6026/97320630016501
- Irham LM, Chou WH, Calkins MJ, Adikusuma W, Hsieh SL, Chang WC (2020) Genetic variants that influence SARS-CoV-2 receptor TMPRSS2 expression among population cohorts from multiple continents. *Biochem Biophysical Res Commun* 529: 263–269. doi:10.1016/ j.bbrc.2020.05.179
- Senapati S, Kumar S, Singh AK, Banerjee P, Bhagavatula S (2020) Assessment of risk conferred by coding and regulatory variations of TMPRSS2 and CD26 in susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection in human. J Genet 99: 53. doi:10.1007/s12041-020-01217-7
- 80. Clinckemalie L, Spans L, Dubois V, Laurent M, Helsen C, Joniau S, Claessens F (2013) Androgen regulation of the TMPRSS2 gene and the

effect of a SNP in an androgen response element. *Mol Endocrinol* 27: 2028–2040. doi:10.1210/me.2013-1098

- Hou Y, Zhao J, Martin W, Kallianpur A, Chung MK, Jehi L, Sharifi N, Erzurum S, Eng C, Cheng F (2020) New insights into genetic susceptibility of COVID-19: An ACE2 and TMPRSS2 polymorphism analysis. *BMC Med* 18: 216. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01673-z
- Talaat RM, Abdelkhalek MS, El-Maadawy EA, Abdel-Mageed WS, El-Shenawy SZ, Osman MA (2017) Association of TNF-Alpha gene polymorphisms and susceptibility to hepatitis B virus infection in Egyptians. *Hum Immunol* 78: 739–746. doi:10.1016/j.humimm.2017.10.006
- Tong Q, Zhao DB, Bajracharya P, Xu X, Kong RN, Zhang J, Dai SM, Cai Q (2012) *TNF-* α -857 and -1031 polymorphisms predict good therapeutic response to TNF-α blockers in Chinese Han patients with ankylosing spondylitis. *Pharmacogenomics* 13: 1459–1467. doi:10.2217/pgs.12.133
- Maxwell JR, Potter C, Hyrich KL, Barton A, Worthington J, Isaacs JD, Morgan AW, Wilson AGBRAGGSS, (2008) Association of the tumour necrosis factor-308 variant with differential response to anti-TNF agents in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Hum Mol Genet* 17: 3532–3538. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddn245
- Li Z, Hu J, Bao C, Li X, Li X, Xu J, Spindler AJ, Zhang X, Xu J, He D, et al (2020) Baricitinib in patients with rheumatoid arthritis with inadequate response to methotrexate: Results from a phase 3 study. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 38: 732–741. doi:10.1007/s12325-020-01572-y
- Macaluso F, Guggino G, Ciccia F (2021) Reply to: Safety and efficacy of secukinumab treatment in a patient with ankylosing spondylitis and concomitant multiple sclerosis: A commentary. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 39: 224. doi:10.55563/clinexprheumatol/engrer
- Howe KL, Achuthan P, Allen J, Allen J, Alvarez-Jarreta J, Amode MR, Armean IM, Azov AG, Bennett R, Bhai J, et al (2021) Ensembl 2021. Nucleic Acids Res 49: D884–D891. doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa942
- Sherry ST, Ward M, Sirotkin K (1999) dbSNP-database for single nucleotide polymorphisms and other classes of minor genetic variation. *Genome Res* 9: 677–679. doi:10.1101/gr.9.8.677
- Tuty Kuswardhani RA, Henrina J, Pranata R, Anthonius Lim M, Lawrensia S, Suastika K (2020) Charlson comorbidity index and a composite of poor outcomes in COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Clin Res Rev* 14: 2103–2109. doi:10.1016/ j.dsx.2020.10.022
- Varol Y, Hakoglu B, Kadri Cirak A, Polat G, Komurcuoglu B, Akkol B, Atasoy C, Bayramic E, Balci G, Ataman S, et al (2021) The impact of charlson comorbidity index on mortality from SARS-CoV-2 virus infection and A novel COVID-19 mortality index: CoLACD. *Int J Clin Pract* 75: e13858. doi:10.1111/ijcp.13858Available from: https:// onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ijcp.13858.
- Vahidy FS, Pan AP, Ahnstedt H, Munshi Y, Choi HA, Tiruneh Y, Nasir K, Kash BA, Andrieni JD, McCullough LD (2021) Sex differences in susceptibility, severity, and outcomes of coronavirus disease 2019: Cross-sectional analysis from a diverse US metropolitan area. *PLoS One* 16: e0245556. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0245556
- 92. Hariyanto TI, Kurniawan A (2020) Dyslipidemia is associated with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Clin Res Rev* 14: 1463–1465. doi:10.1016/j.dsx.2020.07.054
- Strope JD, PharmD CHC, Figg WD (2020) TMPRSS2: Potential biomarker for COVID-19 outcomes. J Clin Pharmacol 60: 801–807. doi:10.1002/ jcph.1641
- Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, Schiergens TS, Herrler G, Wu NH, Nitsche A, et al (2020) SARS-CoV-2 cell entry depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and is blocked by a clinically proven protease inhibitor. *Cell* 181: 271–280.e8. doi:10.1016/ i.cell.2020.02.052

- Monticelli M, Hay Mele B, Benetti E, Fallerini C, Baldassarri M, Furini S, Frullanti E, Mari F, Andreotti G, et al;GEN-COVID Multicenter Study, (2021) Protective role of a TMPRSS2 variant on severe COVID-19 outcome in young males and elderly women. *Genes* 12: 596. doi:10.3390/ genes12040596
- Torre-Fuentes L, Matías-Guiu J, Hernández-Lorenzo L, Montero-Escribano P, Pytel V, Porta-Etessam J, Gómez-Pinedo U, Matías-Guiu JA (2021) ACE2, TMPRSS2, and furin variants and SARS-CoV-2 infection in Madrid, Spain. Journal Med Virol 93: 863–869. doi:10.1002/jmv.26319
- 97. Fang L, Karakiulakis G, Roth M (2020) Are patients with hypertension and diabetes mellitus at increased risk for COVID-19 infection? *Lancet Respir Med* 8: e21. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30116-8
- Zhangjin J, Dong X, Caoyuan Y, Yuandong Y, Yang Ybin, qin YanY, Akdis CA, Gaodong Y (2020) Clinical characteristics of 140 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China. *Allergy* 75: 1730–1741. doi:10.1111/ all.14238
- 99. Kickbusch I, Leung G (2020) Response to the emerging novel coronavirus outbreak. *BMJ* 368: m406. doi:10.1136/bmj.m406
- Watkins J (2020) Preventing a covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ* 368: m810. doi:10.1136/bmj.m810
- 101. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, Xiang J, Wang Y, Song B, Gu X, et al (2020) Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: A retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 395: 1054–1062. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3
- 102. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, Wu Y, Zhang L, Yu Z, Fang M, et al (2020) Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: A single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med* 8: 475–481. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5
- Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, Liu L, Shan H, Lei CL, Hui DSC, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med 382: 1708–1720. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032
- 104. de Abajo FJ, Rodríguez-Martín S, Lerma V, Mejía-Abril G, Aguilar M, García-Luque A, Laredo L, Laosa O, Centeno-Soto GA, Ángeles Gálvez M, et al (2020) Use of renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system inhibitors and risk of COVID-19 requiring admission to hospital: A casepopulation study. *Lancet* 395: 1705–1714. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20) 31030-8
- 105. Marshall JC, Murthy S, Diaz J, Adhikari NK, Angus DC, Arabi YM, Baillie K, Bauer M, Berry S, Blackwood B, et al (2020) A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical research. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20: e192–e197. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30483-7
- 106. Huddart R, Fohner AE, Whirl-Carrillo M, Wojcik GL, Gignoux CR, Popejoy AB, Bustamante CD, Altman RB, Klein TE (2019) Standardized biogeographic grouping system for annotating populations in pharmacogenetic research. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 105: 1256–1262. doi:10.1002/cpt.1322
- 107. R Core Team (2020) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available from: https://www.R-project.org/.
- Venables WN, Ripley BD (2002), 4th edn. edn Modern Applied Statistics with S. New York: Springer. Available from: http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/ pub/MASS4/.



License: This article is available under a Creative Commons License (Attribution 4.0 International, as described at https://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by/4.0/).