



Association between ABO blood groups and susceptibility to COVID-19

HalaRidha Abbas AlFahham¹, Hadeel Haider Aldujaili²

1Pharmacy college, Jabir ibn Hayyan Medical University

2Department of Medical Laboratory Techniques, Faculty of Medical and Health Techniques, University of Alkafeel, Najaf, Iraq.

Submitted: 10-07-2021

Revised: 20-07-2021

Accepted: 23-07-2021

ABSTRACT:

Growing evidence suggests that ABO blood group may play a role in the immunopathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, with group O individuals less likely to test positive and group A conferring a higher susceptibility to infection and propensity to severe disease. The level of evidence supporting an association between ABO type and SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 ranges from small observational studies, to genome-wide association analyses and country-level meta-regression analyses. ABO blood group antigens are oligosaccharides expressed on red cells and other tissues (notably endothelium). There are several hypotheses to explain the differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection by ABO type. For example, anti-A and/or anti-B antibodies (e.g. present in group O individuals) could bind to corresponding antigens on the viral envelope and contribute to viral neutralization, thereby preventing target cell infection. The SARS-CoV-2 virus and SARS-CoV spike (S) proteins may be bound by anti-A isoagglutinins (e.g. present in group O and group B individuals), which may block interactions between virus and angiotensin-converting-enzyme-2-receptor, thereby preventing entry into lung epithelial cells. ABO type-associated variations in angiotensin-converting enzyme-1 activity and levels of von Willebrand factor (VWF) and factor VIII could also influence adverse outcomes, notably in group A individuals who express high VWF levels. In conclusion, group O may be associated with a lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection and group A may be associated with a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection along with severe disease. However, prospective and mechanistic studies are needed to verify several of the proposed associations. Based on the strength of available studies, there are insufficient data for guiding policy in this regard.

Keywords: Covid-19, ABO blood group

I. INTRODUCTION:

This new CoV infection called as COVID-19 originated in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China in

December 2019 (Zhu et al., 2020). The causative agent for this respiratory illness is severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). These epidemics have a high infection transmission rate and in general, the direct cause of death is severe atypical pneumonia (Yin and Wunderink, 2018). The disease spread rapidly from the initial epicenter, Wuhan to rest of the world and has become a pandemic (Isam et al., 2021). The main risk factors include pneumonia, acute kidney failure, acute heart failure. People with underlying health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory disease and the elderly above 60 years are most susceptible to COVID-19. Hospitals announced a cluster of cases of unknown cause pneumonia in Wuhan, Hubei, China on 31 December 2019, attracting great national and worldwide attention. Coronavirus (CoV) is a wide family of single-stranded, positive-sense RNA viruses belonging to the Nidovirales order. The order includes families of the Roniviridae, Arteriviridae, and Coronaviridae. The family Coronaviridae is subdivided into subfamilies Torovirinae and Coronavirinae. Coronavirinae is further subclassified into alpha, beta, gamma and delta COVs (Fehr and Perlman, 2015). Phylogenetic clustering accounts for certain virus subtypes being named. The viral RNA genome varies in length from 26 to 32 kilobases. They can be separated from various species of animals. Those include birds, cattle and mammals such as camels, bats and masks Civets of leaves, rats, pigs, cats The widespread COV distribution and infectivity make it a major pathogen. The moderate clinical signs are associated with human pathogenic subtypes of CoV. Yet extreme coronavirus-related acute respiratory syndrome (SARS-CoV) and the Middle East The two notable exceptions are respiratory coronavirus syndrome (MERS-CoV). In Saudi Arabia MERS-CoV was first observed in 2012. It has been responsible for 2,494 confirmed cases which have resulted in 858 deaths. In 2002, a Beta-COV subtype spread rapidly in Guangdong, China. In 37 countries this epidemic resulted in 8,000



infections and 774 deaths (Lauet al., 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic spurred a crisis that is unprecedented in modern times (Zhu et al., 2019). The disease course varies substantially among individuals, from mild or even sub-clinical infection to severe disease. Indeed, more than 1 million COVID-19-related deaths have been reported globally. There is interest in potential risk factors that affect susceptibility to infection and disease progression. Multiple medical (e.g. diabetes, hypertension) and sociodemographic (e.g. sex, age and race/ethnicity) risk factors for severe outcomes were already established (Wiersinga et al., 2019). Growing evidence suggests that the ABO blood group may also play a role in the immune pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, with group O being protective and group A conferring risks of higher disease susceptibility and severity (Barnkob et al., 2020). An international group of experts in transfusion medicine and haematology were assembled by the International Society of Blood Transfusion (ISBT). To this end, we provide an overview of the ABO blood group system, ABO population frequencies and distributions, its role as a histo-blood group antigen, not just a blood group antigen, and the known associations between ABO type and various infectious and non-infectious diseases.

Susceptibility ABO blood group to Covid

During the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV-1) epidemic, several observations suggested that ABO type may contribute to disease, with less susceptibility in group O individuals (Chen et al., 2005).

Most studies identified a higher proportion of group A, and a lower proportion of group O, among COVID-19 patients, as compared to healthy controls (Zhao et al., 2020).

Some study described a higher rate of infection in group AB patients and a lower rate in group O patients. In contrast, an additional study did not find any correlation between group A status and COVID-19; nonetheless, group O individuals had a lower risk of COVID-19 and group B and AB individuals had a higher risk (Latz et al., 2020). One potential reason for these varying results is that many such studies did not account for various confounders (e.g. age), including comorbidities. Another potential confounder for some of the studies could be the use of randomly selected volunteer blood donors as controls, because of the risk of group O epidemiological predominance due to blood collectors selectively recruiting group O donors. Importantly, volunteer blood donors are not necessarily representative of general populations;

although convenient, their use as a control group is not. It has also been hypothesized that anti-A and anti-B antibodies could interfere with virus-cell interactions. In a secondary analysis of data from ~1900 patients with COVID-19, subjects with circulating anti-A were significantly less represented in the disease group as compared to those lacking anti-A. In addition, anti-A in group O individuals was more protective than anti-A in group B individuals; this may relate to the increased presence of IgG anti-A, B in group O plasma (Stussiet al., 2005). One study attempted a meta-regression analysis of 101 nations using their known blood group distributions, including ~9-million COVID-19 cases and ~450 000 deaths in a total population of ~7 billion. Although there was no association of group A or B with overall mortality, group O significantly correlated with lower mortality ($p = 0.02$). The authors proposed that COVID-19 mortality was lower in nations with higher group O prevalence because overall population ABO blood group prevalence was analysed as the control. Studies have also examined the relationship between the Rhesus blood group (e.g. Rh(D) type) and COVID-19. One study suggested that Rh(D)-positive individuals were more likely to test positive for SARS-CoV-2 (Latz et al., 2020).

Mechanisms for associations between ABO blood group and COVID-19

Several pathophysiological mechanisms were proposed to explain the association between ABO type and SARS-CoV-2 infection. Anti-A and/or anti-B antibodies might bind to A and/or B antigens expressed on the viral envelope, thereby preventing infection of target cells; that is, these naturally occurring antibodies could function as viral neutralizing antibodies. If true, this would help explain differences in initial susceptibility for SARS-CoV-2 infection. For example, an anti-A viral neutralizing antibody in a potentially susceptible group O host would bind the A antigen on virus produced by, and inhaled from, an infected group A (or group AB) host (Breiman et al., 2020). Why this mechanism would be relevant to disease severity per se is less obvious, because subsequent rounds of viral proliferation in a group O host would produce virus expressing the H antigen on its envelope. However, assuming that disease severity relates to the size of the infecting inoculum and yielding the subsequent viral load, a neutralizing isoagglutinin (e.g. anti-A) could attenuate infection, if not preventing infection altogether. Finally, the entry barrier for this virus is the epithelium of the respiratory tract and,



possibly, the digestive tract. Thus, to prevent infection, circulating antibodies may need to reach these cell surfaces; although, presumably, the most effective antibodies for this purpose are of the secretory IgA isotype, to date, no data are available about the IgA isotype for either anti-A and/or anti-B in this regard. Glycan structures at various N-glycosylation sites of the SARS-CoV S protein were previously described (Liet al., 2005).

In addition, N-glycans of recombinant SARS-CoV-2 S protein were recently characterized; although ABH antigen structures were not described, this may be due to the cell line used to produce the recombinant protein. Interestingly, the receptor-binding domains of the SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV S proteins are structurally nearly identical; in addition, glycosylation yields S trimers in which the receptor-binding domains are covered by N-glycans. Thus, it is conceivable that SARS-CoV-2 S protein could be specifically bound by human anti-A antibodies, which could then block the interaction between the virus and the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 receptor (ACE2R), thereby preventing entry into the lung epithelium. Relevant to this hypothesis, monoclonal or naturally occurring anti-A antibodies dose-dependently inhibited interaction between SARS-CoV S protein and ACE2R, in a model where the A antigen was associated with S protein (Guillon et al., 2008).

To our knowledge, there are no published studies to date that address this. Other potential mechanisms may explain the epidemiological results. For example, if ABH oligosaccharides are on SARS-CoV-2 S protein, they may modify the affinity of SARS-CoV-2 for ACE2R, its cellular receptor. This could be evaluated formally by producing recombinant S protein in otherwise identical host cell lines (e.g. by transfecting in the relevant glycosyltransferases) and then quantifying the affinity of the purified proteins for their receptor. Analogously, if the virus could be produced in vitro in these ABH-expressing cell lines and purified, the infectivity of a given target cell line could then be quantified. Given the published human population data, one might expect 'group O virions' to be less infectious in these experiments, thereby correlating with decreased COVID-19 disease severity. A different, but not mutually exclusive, mechanism may involve ACE2R, which is also a glycoprotein and may express ABH glycans. It is possible that these glycans affect SARS-CoV-2 viral binding to ACE2R, the number of ACE2R proteins on a given cell surface, and/or the efficacy of internalization of the virus: receptor complex. In this case, ACE2R

expressing H-antigen glycans may not be as effective at binding and internalizing SARS-CoV-2 produced by any source, irrespective of ABO type. This could also underlie COVID-19 disease severity. It is also possible that the ABH glycans themselves could serve as (alternative) lower-affinity receptors for SARS-CoV-2 S protein or bind other viral envelope structures. Although current evidence suggests that this is unlikely, if it were relevant, then ABH glycan levels on cell surfaces, in plasma, and in secretions would be important and could affect initial infection and disease severity. For this purpose, determining the 'secretor phenotype' and Lewis blood group types would be helpful (Cooling, 2015).

II. CONCLUSIONS

The role of ABO blood group in SARS-CoV-2 infectivity and COVID-19 disease severity requires additional study; however, accumulating evidence suggests that, at biochemical and physiological levels, there may be a contribution of ABO blood type to disease biology.

REFERENCE

- [1]. -Barnkob MB: Reduced prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in ABO blood
- [2]. -Breiman A, Ruven-Clouet N, Le Pendu J: Harnessing the natural anti-glycan immune response to limit the transmission of enveloped viruses such as SARS-CoV-2. *PLoS Pathog* 2020; 16: e1008556.
- [3]. -Cheng Y, Cheng G, Chui CH, et al.: ABO blood group and susceptibility to
- [4]. -Cooling L: Blood groups in infection and host susceptibility. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2015; 28:801–70.
- [5]. diagnosis, and treatment of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a
- [6]. -Fehr AR, Perlman S. Coronaviruses: an overview of their replication and pathogenesis. (2015).
- [7]. -Group and the COVID-19 Susceptibility. *medRxiv* 2020.
- [8]. -group O. *Blood Adv* 2020; 4(20):4990–4993.
- [9]. -Guillon P, Clément M, Sebille V, et al.: Inhibition of the interaction between the SARS-CoV spike protein and its cellular receptor by anti-histo-blood group antibodies. *Glycobiology* 2008; 18:1085–93.
- [10]. -Isam, J. Z., Kamil, K. Z., & Banoon, S. R. (2021). Review about COVID-19. *Research Journal of Biotechnology* Vol, 16, 4
- [11]. -Latz CA, DeCarlo C, Boitano L, et al.: Blood type and outcomes in patients



- [12]. -Lau FH, Majumder R, Torabi R, et al.(2020). Vitamin D insufficiency is
- [13]. -Li F, Li W, Farzan M, et al.: Structure of SARS coronavirus spike receptorbinding domain complexed with receptor. *Science* 2005; 309.
- [14]. -Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. (2020).
- [15]. pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:727–33.
- [16]. prevalent in severe COVID-19.
- [17]. review. *JAMA* 2020; 324:782–93.
- [18]. severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Jama* 2005; 293:1450–1.
- [19]. -Stussi G, Huggel K, Lutz H, et al.: Isotype-specific detection of ABO bloodgroup antibodies using a novel flowcytometric method. *Br J Haematol*2005; 130:954–63.
- [20]. -Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health concern. *Lancet*.2020 Jan 14.
- [21]. -Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, et al.: Pathophysiology, transmission, with COVID-19. *Ann Hematol* 2020;1–6.
- [22]. -Yin Y, Wunderink RG. MERS, SARS and other coronaviruses as causes of pneumonia. *Respirology* (2018);23:130–7.
- [23]. -Zhao J, Yang Y, Huang H-P, et al. Relationship between the ABO Blood-Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al.(2020). A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*.328:727–33.
- [24]. -Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al.: A Novel Coronavirus from patients with