



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 antibodies in pregnant women admitted to labor and delivery units



OBJECTIVE: Serologic testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies is now broadly available in the United States. The SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels rise within 2 to 3 weeks after infection and can indicate whether an individual has ever been infected, irrespective of symptomatic or asymptomatic presentation. Serology is not recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as a diagnostic test for an active infection but instead can be used to understand the epidemiology of the virus and identify the groups who are at a higher risk of infection.¹

Previous studies utilizing polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests to detect SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal swabs for disease confirmation suggest that pregnancy does not seem to increase the risk of acquiring a SARS-CoV-2 infection when compared with the nonpregnant population.² However, PCR testing at the time of hospitalization for delivery may underestimate the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in pregnancy; infection during an earlier gestational period may only be detectable by antibody testing. Other factors that may affect the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in pregnancy include the viral prevalence in different regions of the country, asymptomatic carriage of the virus, unavailability of testing in particular regions of the country, and whether the patient seeks screening for various indications (eg, screening offered through employment, the presence of symptoms, and protocol-driven routine screening in labor and delivery [L&D] units).

The objective of this study was to determine the seroprevalence rate of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pregnant women admitted to L&D units. A secondary objective was to correlate

the serum antibody status to the results of the PCR tests to determine the prevalence of potential immunity in our population.

STUDY DESIGN: A total of 7 hospitals with L&D units in the Northwell Health system in New York State were included in this study. The participants were all women admitted to the L&D units between May 27, 2020, and July 24, 2020, who had their blood drawn for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody testing. IgG titers were classified as either positive, negative, or equivocal. The serology test used in this study was the Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) test. This test has a false positive rate of 0.2%, secondary to cross reactivity with the cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr virus, and systemic lupus erythematosus. The false negative rate for the test is unknown.³ False negative results may be because of testing before seroconversion or after the waning of antibody levels over time. We used a universal testing approach for SARS-CoV-2 on admission to an L&D unit with a PCR test of a nasopharyngeal swab. The PCR test results were recorded for all study participants, if available.

This study received institutional review board approval from the Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research at Northwell Health. Descriptive statistics were used to evaluate the data.

RESULTS: During the study period, 1671 women delivered in the Northwell Health system and had available SARS-CoV-2 antibody results. Of those, 269 were seropositive (16.1%), 1400 were seronegative (83.7%), and 2 were equivocal (0.11%). The PCR results for each group are presented in [Table 1](#).

TABLE 1
COVID-19 antibody and PCR results for pregnant women admitted to L&D units

	PCR result		
	Positive, n (%)	Negative, n (%)	Not available, n (%)
Antibody status			
Positive (16.1%; n=269)	51 (19)	217 (80.6)	1 (0.4)
Negative (83.7%; n=1400)	15 (1.0)	1372 (98.0)	13 (1.0)
Equivocal (0.11%; n=2)	0	2 (100)	0

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; L&D, labor and delivery; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

Haizler-Cohen. SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2021.

TABLE 2

Seroprevalence studies of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pregnancy

First author, year	Sample size (N)	Timing during pregnancy	Study period	Location	Positive seroprevalence results for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (%)
Flannery et al, ⁴ 2020	1293	Antepartum and delivery admission	April 4, 2020, to June 3, 2020	Philadelphia, PA, USA	6.2
Zöllkau et al, ⁵ 2020	234	Delivery admission	April 6, 2020, to May 13, 2020	Jena, Thuringia, Germany	0.6
Cosma et al, ⁶ 2020	138	First trimester	April 16, 2020, to June 4, 2020	Turin, Piedmont, Italy	10.1
Current study	1671	Delivery admission	May 27, 2020, to July 24, 2020	New York City and Long Island, NY, USA	16.1

SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

Haizler-Cohen. SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2021.

CONCLUSION: To date, 3 other studies have examined the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in pregnancy with prevalence rates between 0.6% and 10.1% (Table 2).^{4–6} In our cohort, 16.1% of pregnant women were seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, which is the highest reported prevalence rate of SARS-CoV-2 in pregnancy. This likely reflects the higher prevalence of the virus in New York State,⁷ which was once the epicenter of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the United States.

The results from both the SARS-CoV-2 PCR and antibody tests can help to determine the timing of infection. An acute infection may be characterized by a positive PCR and negative antibody test result. A past infection may be characterized by a negative PCR and positive antibody test result. If both tests are positive, a recent or past infection may have occurred. The PCR test results for some individuals have been reported to remain positive for weeks after infection.⁸ There is a concern that some patients who were exposed to the virus have a transient elevation in antibody levels, complicating the interpretation of the test results.

Universal testing in L&D units represents a unique opportunity to continuously study the exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in a population. The general public has been practicing social distancing and avoiding healthcare contact, creating a selection bias in seroprevalence studies. Pregnant women, a generally healthy and mostly asymptomatic group, continue to receive routine prenatal and L&D services. A cohort of pregnant women admitted to L&D units is therefore more representative of the general population.

It is still unclear whether SARS-CoV-2 antibodies confer immunity to reinfection and for how long. However, there is growing interest in the literature on SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Antibody testing may be a useful tool for studying exposure rates to the virus in different populations, developing a vaccine, and in treating sick patients with convalescent plasma. Further research is necessary to determine the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 in pregnant women, its accuracy,

and its role in the management of seropositive pregnant women and their fetuses.

Lylach Haizler-Cohen, MD
Adi Davidov, MD
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine
at Hofstra/Northwell
Staten Island University Hospital
Northwell Health
475 Seaview Ave.
Staten Island, NY 10305
lhaizlerco@northwell.edu

Matthew J. Blitz, MD
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine
at Hofstra/Northwell
Southside Hospital
Northwell Health
Bay Shore, NY

Gary Fruhman, MD
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine
at Hofstra/Northwell
Staten Island University Hospital
Northwell Health
Staten Island, NY

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Antibody testing interim guidelines. Testing overview, and information for healthcare professionals. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antibody-tests-guidelines.html>. Accessed September 28, 2020.
- Garg S, Kim L, Whitaker M, et al. Hospitalization rates and characteristics of patients hospitalized with laboratory-confirmed coronavirus disease 2019—COVID-NET, 14 states, March 1–30, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:458–64.

3. United States Food and Drug Administration. Emergency use authorizations for medical devices. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) emergency use authorizations for medical devices. EUA authorized serology test performance. Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/eua-authorized-serology-test-performance>. Accessed August 1, 2020.
 4. Flannery DD, Gouma S, Dhudasia MB, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among parturient women in Philadelphia. *Sci Immunol* 2020;5:eabd5709.
 5. Cosma S, Borella F, Carosso A, et al. The “scar” of a pandemic: cumulative incidence of COVID-19 during the first trimester of pregnancy. *J Med Virol* 2020. [Epub ahead of print].
 6. Zöllkau J, Baier M, Scherag A, Schleußner E, Groten T. Period prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in an unselected sample of pregnant women in Jena, Thuringia. *Z Geburtshilfe Neonatol* 2020;224:194–8.
 7. New York City Health website. COVID-19: data. Available at: <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/covid/covid-19-data.page>. Accessed August 1, 2020.
 8. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26:672–5.
- © 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2020.09.022>

Preprocedural asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019 cases in obstetrical and surgical units



OBJECTIVE: Asymptomatic severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections remain a challenge, accounting for nearly half of all the infections.¹ The infectivity of asymptomatic patients can extend to more than 14 days, and samples isolated from their respiratory tracts have similar viral loads as those of symptomatic patients.^{1,2} To mitigate the surgical risk for patients and exposure of healthcare workers (HCW), universal testing for SARS-CoV-2 has been suggested for all patients before planned procedures,³ including delivery,⁴ regardless of the presence of symptoms. Preprocedural asymptomatic infection (PAI) rates among obstetrical patients have been reported to be as high as 14%,⁴ but the PAI rates in the general surgical population are unknown. We sought to compare the SARS-CoV-2 PAI rates between the obstetrical unit (OU) and surgical units (SUs) in 1 urban tertiary center.

STUDY DESIGN: We conducted a retrospective cohort study on the outcomes of universal preprocedural SARS-CoV-2 tests performed before all surgeries or deliveries at the Barnes-Jewish Hospital from May 28 to July 22, 2020, after the resumption of elective procedures. The study was deemed exempt because it was recognized as a quality improvement initiative. The primary outcome was the rate of PAI with SARS-CoV-2, which was compared between an 18-bed OU and the SUs composed of 72 rooms. All the positive cases underwent a chart review to confirm the asymptomatic presentation. Multivariable logistic regressions were used to adjust for confounders, including age and race. Statistical analyses were conducted using R (version 4.0.2; <https://www.R-project.org/>).

RESULTS: A total of 5543 preprocedural tests were performed: 532 (9.7%) were from the OU and 5011 (90.4%) were from the SUs (Table). The obstetrical patients were younger (median age, 29.0 vs 56.0; $P<.001$), with a greater proportion of females (100% vs 50.4%; $P<.001$) and patients identifying as black (40.4% vs 22.7%;

$P<.001$) or Hispanic (9.4% vs 1.5%; $P<.001$) when compared with the patients from the SUs. Overall, there were 39 (0.7%) cases of PAI (25 of 532 [4.7%] from the OU vs 14 of 5011 [0.3%] from the SUs; $P<.001$). After adjusting for age and race, the obstetrical patients had significantly higher odds of PAI with SARS-CoV-2 compared with the surgical patients (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 4.7; 95% confidence interval [CI], 2.3–10.6). After excluding the male patients, the odds of PAI remained significantly higher in the OU patients (aOR, 9.6; 95% CI, 92.8–48.3) (Table).

CONCLUSION: The SARS-CoV-2 PAI rate is 15.7 times higher in the OU (4.7%) than in the SU (0.3%) in 1 hospital. The significant difference persists after adjusting for age, race, and sex. As hospitals resume their normal surgical volume and enact universal preprocedural testing policies, the testing capacity remains limited, and rationing of the supplies is necessary. Our results emphasize the need to prioritize testing and personal protective equipment in the OUs in which higher rates of asymptomatic infection increase the potential of spread, particularly during the second stage of labor with prolonged HCW exposure in an aerosol-heavy environment.⁴ Whether the different background characteristics of obstetrical and surgical patients can fully account for the discordance in PAI rates or whether pregnancy-induced immunomodulation increases the likelihood of asymptomatic presentation of infection is unknown and remain important questions that require further investigation.

Our study is limited by generalizability owing to sampling at only 1 hospital. However, the substantial difference in PAI rates between the OU and SUs underscores the importance of surveillance in populations that are at an increased risk for the disease. Focused SARS-CoV-2 obstetrical studies could generate valuable information regarding asymptomatic infection, which remains a poorly understood but critically important component of the pandemic. ■