



HAL
open science

Evaluation of lupus anticoagulant, damage, and remission as predictors of pregnancy complications in systemic lupus erythematosus: the French GR2 study

Maddalena Larosa, Véronique Le Guern, Gaëlle Guettrot-Imbert, Nathalie Morel, Noémie Abisror, Chafika Morati-Hafsaoui, Pauline Orquevaux, Elisabeth Diot, Andrea Doria, Françoise Sarrot Reynauld, et al.

► To cite this version:

Maddalena Larosa, Véronique Le Guern, Gaëlle Guettrot-Imbert, Nathalie Morel, Noémie Abisror, et al.. Evaluation of lupus anticoagulant, damage, and remission as predictors of pregnancy complications in systemic lupus erythematosus: the French GR2 study. *Rheumatology*, 2022, 10.1093/rheumatology/keab943 . hal-03528855

HAL Id: hal-03528855

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03528855v1>

Submitted on 17 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Evaluation of lupus anticoagulant, damage, and remission as predictors of pregnancy complications in lupus women: the French GR2 study.

Maddalena Larosa^{1,2}, Véronique Le Guern¹, Gaëlle Guettrot-Imbert¹, Nathalie Morel¹, Noémie Abisoror³, Chafika Morati-Hafsaoui⁴, Pauline Orquevaux⁵, Elisabeth Diot⁶, Andrea Doria², Françoise Sarrot Reynauld⁷, Nicolas Limal⁸, Viviane Queyrel⁹, Odile Souchaud-Debouverie¹⁰, Laurent Sailler¹¹, Maëlle Le Besnerais¹², Tiphaine Goulenok¹³, Anna Molto^{14,15}, Emmanuelle Pannier-Metzger¹⁶, Loic Sentilhes¹⁷, Luc Mouthon^{1,18}, Estibaliz Lazaro¹⁹, Nathalie Costedoat-Chalumeau^{1,15} and the GR2 Group.

¹ Service de Médecine interne, Centre de référence maladies autoimmunes et systémiques rares Île de France, APHP, Hôpital Cochin, F-75014 Paris, France

² Rheumatology Unit, Department of Medicine-DIMED, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

³ Service de Médecine Interne, Hôpital Saint Antoine, Paris, France

⁴ Service d'Infectiologie et médecine interne, CH Annecy Genevois - Site d'Annecy, Annecy, France

⁵ Service de Médecine interne, Hôpital Robert Debré, CHU de Reims, Reims, France

⁶ Service de Médecine interne, CHRU de Tours - Hôpital Bretonneau, Tours, France

⁷ Service de Médecine Interne, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France

⁸ Service de Médecine Interne, CHU Henri Mondor, Créteil, France

⁹Service de Rhumatologie, CHU l'Archet, Nice, France

¹⁰Service de Médecine Interne, CHU Poitiers, Poitiers, France

¹¹Service de Médecine Interne, CHU Toulouse, Toulouse, France

¹²Service de Médecine Interne, CHU Rouen, Rouen, France

¹³Service de Médecine Interne, Hôpital Bichat Claude Bernard, Paris, France

¹⁴Service de Rhumatologie, AP-HP, Hôpital Cochin, Paris, France

1
2
3 ¹⁵Université de Paris, Paris, France, Centre de recherche épidémiologie et bio statistiques de Sorbonne
4
5 Paris Cité, F-75004 Paris, France
6

7
8 ¹⁶Service de Maternité Gynécologie Obstétrique Port-Royal, Hôpital Cochin, Paris, France
9

10 ¹⁷Service de Gynécologie Obstétrique, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France
11

12 ¹⁸Université de Paris, Paris, France, INSERM U1016, CNRS UMR8104, F-75006 Paris, France.
13

14 ¹⁹Service De Médecine Interne et Maladies Infectieuses (Sud), Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de
15
16 Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France.
17

18
19
20
21 **Corresponding Author:** Nathalie Costedoat-Chalumeau, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris,
22
23 Service de Médecine Interne, Centre de Référence Maladies Auto-immunes et Systémiques Rares,
24
25 Hôpital Cochin, Centre for Clinical Epidemiology, Hôpital Hôtel-Dieu, Université de Paris, Centre of
26
27 Research in Epidemiology and Statistics, Paris, France,
28

29
30
31 e-mail: [nathalie.costedoat @aphp.fr](mailto:nathalie.costedoat@aphp.fr)
32

33 [ORCID iD: 0000-0002-1555-9021](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1555-9021)
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The specific roles of remission status, lupus low disease activity state (LLDAS), and damage accrual on the prognosis of pregnancies in women with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) are unknown. We analysed their impact on maternal flares and adverse pregnancy outcomes (APOs).

Methods: We evaluated all women (≥ 18 years) with SLE enrolled in the prospective GR2 study with an ongoing singleton pregnancy at 12 weeks (one pregnancy/woman). Several sets of criteria were used to define remission, disease activity, and damage. APOs included: foetal/neonatal death, placental insufficiency with preterm delivery, and small-for-gestational-age birth weight. First trimester maternal and disease features were tested as predictors of maternal flares and APOs.

Results: The study included 238 women (98.3% on hydroxychloroquine) with 230 live births. Thirty-five (14.7%) patients had at least one flare during the second/third trimester. At least one APO occurred in 34 (14.3%) women.

Hypocomplementemia in the first trimester was the only factor associated with maternal flares later in pregnancy ($P=0.02$), while several factors were associated with APOs. In the logistic regression models, damage by SLICC-Damage Index (OR 1.8, 95% CI: 1.1-2.9 for model 1 and OR 1.7, 95% CI: 1.1-2.8 for model 2) and lupus anticoagulant (LAC, OR 4.2, 95% CI: 1.8-9.7 for model 1; OR 3.7, 95% CI: 1.6-8.7 for model 2) were significantly associated with APOs.

Conclusion: LAC and damage at conception were predictors of APOs, and hypocomplementemia in the first trimester was associated with maternal flares later in pregnancy in a cohort of pregnant patients with well-controlled SLE.

1
2
3
4
5 **Clinical trial registration number:** ClinicalTrials.gov, <https://clinicaltrials.gov>, NCT02450396.
6
7

8 **Keywords:** systemic lupus erythematosus, pregnancy, adverse pregnancy outcome, damage, remission.
9
10

11
12 **KEY MESSAGES**
13

- 14 • First trimester positive LAC predicts adverse pregnancy outcome (APO)
 - 15 • Chronic irreversible damage in the first trimester also predicts APOs
 - 16 • Damage should be considered in preconception counseling and in early pregnancy
- 17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) mainly affects women of childbearing age, and optimal management of lupus pregnancies is essential [1,2]. Historically, we have moved from pregnancy being contraindicated in SLE to considering it not as a contraindication but as an indicator of high risk for flares and adverse pregnancy outcomes (APOs), to a progressive decline in these risks, which nonetheless continue to be higher than in the general population [3]. Guidelines issued by both the European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) in 2016 [1] and American College of Rheumatology (ACR) in 2020 [2] currently recommend treating women with hydroxychloroquine during pregnancy and planning pregnancy when their SLE is in either remission or a lupus low disease activity state (LLDAS). The level of the risk reduction when these recommendations are applied remains unknown. Moreover, the lack of available data prevents from defining precisely which of these states should be achieved before attempting pregnancy [2]. While several definitions of remission and LLDAS [4] have been validated, those proposed by the DORIA/Zen [5] and DORIS [6] groups for remission and by Franklyn for LLDAS [7] have not been tested in pregnant women [8].

Optimizing the management of pregnancy in SLE requires the analysis of large prospective cohorts of pregnancies. The American PROMISSE study [9] was a major advance, showing that severe flares were uncommon in pregnant women with inactive or stable mild or moderate SLE [9] and that lupus anticoagulant (LAC), antihypertensive drug use, a physician global assessment (PGA) score >1, and a low platelet count were the main baseline predictors of APOs, while non-Hispanic white ethnicity/race was protective against them [9]. However, these findings may not be applicable to other settings, especially since hydroxychloroquine was given to only 64.7% of cases and severe SLE patients were excluded from the PROMISSE study [9].

In 2014, we set up a French prospective study of pregnancies in women affected with rare diseases including SLE (the GR2 study, clinicaltrial.gov NCT02450396). Here, we aim to report pregnancy

1
2
3 outcomes (maternal flares and APOs) in this large cohort of pregnant women with SLE. We tested
4
5 remission definitions and LLDAS as well as cumulative damage (Systemic Lupus International
6
7 Collaborating Clinics-SLICCC-Damage Index) in the first trimester as predictors of poor outcome (flares
8
9 and APOs) later in pregnancy.
10
11
12
13

14 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

15
16
17 We report data from the GR2 (“Groupe de recherche sur la Grossesse et les Maladies Rares”) study,
18
19 a French multicentre prospective observational study of pregnant women with rare and/or
20
21 rheumatological diseases, including SLE and antiphospholipid syndrome (APS), conducted since
22
23 October 2014 in 63 active centres (not all recruiting patients with SLE as the cohort is intended to study
24
25 several rare and rheumatological diseases). Pregnant women are included by their clinicians (internists,
26
27 rheumatologists, and nephrologists) and are followed up to 12 months postpartum. The treating
28
29 physicians made all treatment decisions.
30
31
32

33 The GR2 study is part of the European network of pregnancy registers in Rheumatology (EuNeP)
34
35 supported by FOREUM (Foundation for Research in Rheumatology) [10] and follow EULAR
36
37 recommendations regarding core data sets for pregnancy registers in rheumatology [11].
38
39

40 **Inclusion criteria.** Criteria for the current analysis required inclusion in the GR2 before 13
41
42 weeks, SLE classified according to the SLICC 2012 criteria [12], and conception before July 15, 2019
43
44 (to have complete data at delivery), with an ongoing singleton pregnancy that reached 12 weeks. Only
45
46 the first singleton pregnancy per woman was analysed.
47
48

49 **Data collected.** At first-trimester consultations, we assessed demographic, clinical, serological,
50
51 and treatment features. Anti-phospholipid (aPL) status included anticardiolipin (aCL), anti-Beta2
52
53 glycoprotein type I antibodies (anti- β 2GPI), and LAC. In France, all laboratories are regularly audited
54
55 and certified by a central agency. More details on the variety and types of assays are reported in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Supplementary Data S1, available at *Rheumatology* online. Triple positive aPL status was defined by
4
5 positive aCL, anti- β 2GPI, and LAC.
6

7
8 All data were prospectively collected in electronic case report forms at each consultation. Because all
9
10 women received standard treatment, written informed consent was not required by French law. The
11
12 women were, however, informed of their right to oppose the use of their data for the study and orally
13
14 stated their lack of objection. This project adheres to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and
15
16 was approved by the Local Ethics Committee (CPP Ile de France VI, Groupe Hospitalier Pitié-
17
18 Salpêtrière, 29/08/2012).
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Definitions of remission, LLDAS, disease activity, and damage.** Disease activity was scored
25
26 by the SLE Disease Activity Index-2000 (SLEDAI-2K) [13] adapted to pregnancy (SLEPDAI) [14] and
27
28 we considered the first SLEPDAI available during the first trimester. Remission status was assessed by
29
30 the DORIA/Zen [5] and DORIS [6] criteria and by clinical SLEPDAI=0 [8]. Damage was scored by the
31
32 SLICC-Damage Index [15] (see definitions in Supplementary Data S2, available at *Rheumatology*
33
34 online).
35
36

37
38 **Definition of outcomes.** Maternal flares were defined according to the SELENA-SLEDAI Flare
39
40 Index, SFI [16]. This score divides flares into mild/moderate and severe flares and notably captures any
41
42 increase in the PGA or in the steroid dose, any introduction of an immunosuppressive drug, and any
43
44 hospitalization.
45

46
47 To make our results comparable to those of the PROMISSE study [9], we defined APO by a
48
49 composite binary variable (the occurrence of at least one of the following events versus the non-
50
51 occurrence of any of them): an otherwise unexplained intrauterine fetal death (IUFD) \geq 12 weeks, a
52
53 neonatal death (within 28 days after birth), placental insufficiency (fetal growth restriction, i.e. FGR,
54
55 preeclampsia/eclampsia, HELLP syndrome, and/or placental abruption, see Supplementary Data S3,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 available at *Rheumatology* online) leading to preterm delivery <37 weeks, small-for-gestational-age
4
5 (SGA: birth weight below the third percentile according to the French AUDIPOG curve) [17].
6
7

8 **Statistical analyses.** Continuous variables normally and not-normally distributed were
9
10 expressed, respectively, by their means and standard deviations (SD) and medians with interquartile
11
12 ranges (IQR). Incidence and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were assessed for both maternal flares and
13
14 APOs. To identify their predictors, we tested the following variables during the first trimester: 1)
15
16 continuous: maternal age, disease duration, SLEPDAI, PGA, SLICC-Damage Index scores; 2)
17
18 categorical: family geographical origins (European descent, African descent and Asian descent), see
19
20 Supplementary Table S1, available at *Rheumatology* online), overweight (body mass index (BMI) ≥ 25
21
22 kg/m^2), tobacco and alcohol consumption (at least 10 units per week), associated APS, nulliparity,
23
24 previous thrombosis, IUFD, or renal involvement, low platelet count (platelets $< 100 \times 10^9/\text{l}$), positive anti-
25
26 double-stranded (ds)-DNA, hypocomplementemia, positive aPL, 24-hour (h) proteinuria, concomitant
27
28 treatment, remission, and LLDAS.
29
30
31
32

33 Pearson's chi square test (or Fisher's exact test when appropriate) was used to evaluate univariate
34
35 associations between categorical variables. Student's t-test and Wilcoxon's rank-sum test were used to
36
37 compare the parametric and non-parametric continuous variables, respectively. The choice of
38
39 independent variables added to the logistic regression model in the multivariate analysis was based on
40
41 current knowledge and the variables significant at the univariate analysis ($P < 0.1$). Significance for the
42
43 logistic regression analyses was set at 5%. When the univariate analysis found significant associations
44
45 between variables with high collinearity, separate multivariate models were tested for complete cases
46
47 only.
48
49
50

51 All analyses were conducted with STATA v.16.1.
52
53
54
55

56 RESULTS

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Patient characteristics at enrolment.** This study includes 238 women with SLE from 34 centres
4 (see Supplementary Tables S2 and S3 and Figure S1, available at *Rheumatology* online). Their mean age
5 was 31.6 (SD 4.5 years), 88 (37.0%) were nulliparous, and 34 (14.3%) had an associated APS.
6
7

8
9
10 Previous lupus nephritis (LN) was reported in 67 women (28.2%) and was biopsy-proven in 62
11 (92.5%): 1 had class I, 1 class II, 12 class III, 19 class IV, 16 class V, 1 class VI, 5 class III+V, and 7
12 class IV+V. Nine women had positive 24-hour proteinuria (>0.5 g/g or 0.5 g/day), attributed to active
13 renal disease in only three.
14
15

16
17
18 All but four women (98.3%) took hydroxychloroquine, 119 (50%) prednisone, 56 (23.5%)
19 immunosuppressive drugs, and 165 (69.3%) low-dose aspirin. Finally, five women (2.1%) received
20 antihypertensive drugs.
21
22

23
24
25 The median (IQR) SLEPDAI was 2 (0-3). Remission was achieved by 200 women (86.6%) with
26 the clinical SLEPDAI=0, by 154 women (64.7%) with the DORIA/Zen definition, and by 147 (61.8%)
27 with the DORIS definition. LLDAS was achieved by 157 patients (71.7%).
28
29

30
31
32 Irreversible chronic damage was reported in 30 women (12.7%, missing data for 2). All had been
33 treated with prednisone, 7 (23.3%) also had APS, and 16 (53.3%) had a history of renal involvement.
34 Details of SLICC-Damage Index domains are reported in Supplementary Table S4, available at
35 *Rheumatology* online.
36
37

38
39
40 **Maternal flares.** Thirty-five women (14.7%, 95% CI: 10.7-19.8) had at least one flare during the
41 second or third trimesters; most of them were articular (n=18, 7.6%) and/or cutaneous (n=15, 6.3%).
42 Eight (3.4%) women had other types of flares: serositis in 5 (2.1%), renal in 3 (1.3%), and/or
43 haematological in 2 (0.8%).
44
45

46
47
48 A severe flare occurred in only three women during the second trimester: two renal flares and one
49 pericarditis associated with cutaneous rash. All three women required the addition of an
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 immunosuppressive drug to the background treatment and had liveborn children, with an early delivery
4
5 at 28 weeks for early preeclampsia in the woman with pericarditis and a rash.
6

7
8 At univariate analysis, only first-trimester hypocomplementemia was associated with flares
9
10 ($P=0.02$) (Table 1). Since hypocomplementemia is included in the SLEPDAI, no multivariate analysis
11
12 could be performed for flares.
13

14
15 Finally, we found no association between maternal flare and APOs ($P>0.99$). Neither the
16
17 percentage of live births nor their median gestational age at delivery differed between patients with and
18
19 without flares (97.1 vs 96.5% and 37.4 vs 37.7 weeks, respectively).
20

21
22 **Obstetric and adverse pregnancy outcomes.** Almost the entire cohort (230, 96.6%) had a live
23
24 birth (median gestational age 37.7 ± 2.6 weeks). For the remaining eight women, one had a termination
25
26 of pregnancy because of chromosomal abnormalities, and seven had an IUFD.
27

28
29 At least one APO occurred in 34 women (14.3%, 95%CI: 10.4-19.4) (Table 2), including 22
30
31 (9.2%) preterm births due to placental insufficiency at a median gestational age of 33 weeks, 7 (2.9%)
32
33 IUFDs, 5 (2.1%, 5 missing data for the weight) SGA infants, and one (0.4%) neonatal death. Among
34
35 patients with placental insufficiency leading to preterm delivery, 8 had FGR, 6 HELLP syndrome, 14
36
37 preeclampsia/eclampsia, and/or one placental abruption.
38

39
40 At univariate analysis, women with at least one APO were more likely to have LAC ($P<0.001$),
41
42 at least one positive aPL ($P<0.001$), an associated APS ($P=0.01$), or prior thrombotic event ($P=0.04$)
43
44 (Table 2). They were also more likely to have positive anti-dsDNA ($P=0.01$) and, accordingly, a higher
45
46 SLEPDAI ($P=0.01$). APOs were also associated with damage accrual (SLICC-Damage Index) ($P=0.01$),
47
48 immunosuppressive drug use ($P=0.03$), low-dose aspirin ($P=0.03$), and low molecular weight heparin
49
50 ($P=0.01$). Finally, APOs were not associated with antihypertensive drugs ($P=0.15$), a low platelet count
51
52 ($P>0.99$), or skin colour ($P=0.40$) (Table 2).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To minimize collinearity, two different logistic regression models were tested for DORIA/Zen
4 remission and LLDAS (Tables 3, 4). Because prednisone, prednisone dosage, immunosuppressants, and
5 SLEPDAI are already included in the DORIA/Zen and LLDAS definitions, we did not consider them
6 although they were significant on univariate analysis. Similarly, to facilitate comparison with the
7 PROMISSE study, we chose LAC instead of other related (and thus subject to collinearity) significant
8 variables on univariate analysis (i.e., anti-aggregants, heparin, previous thrombosis, associated APS). Of
9 note, age at pregnancy was forced in both models, based on the current literature, since the older the
10 maternal age, the worse the obstetric outcome. Predictors of APOs in both analyses were SLICC-Damage
11 Index (per 1 unit increase) and positive LAC in the first trimester (adjusted (a)ORs of 1.8 and 4.2 in
12 Model 1 and 1.7 and 3.7 in Model 2, respectively) (Tables 3,4). Neither DORIA/Zen remission nor
13 LLDAS predicted APO. Multicollinearity was ruled out in both models (VIF<2).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 **Analysis of the PROMISSE predictors of APOs.** Among the 121 women of European descent
31 (corresponding to the White women of PROMISSE) who were concomitantly antihypertensive-free,
32 LAC-negative, and had a PGA ≤ 1 in the first trimester and a platelet count $> 100 \times 10^9/l$, only 8 (6.6%)
33 had an APO at any time; one of these foetuses died in utero and another after birth. By contrast, among
34 the combined group of all but those of European descent women treated with antihypertensive drugs
35 (n=2) or women with positive LAC (n=41), 15 (34.9%) had an APO at any time: two of these fetuses
36 died in utero but no neonatal deaths occurred.

37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 **DISCUSSION**

50
51 After the large North American PROMISSE study, where 385 women with SLE were
52 prospectively included between 2003 and 2012, we report the second largest prospective study carried
53 out on 238 pregnant women with SLE included between 2014 and 2019. Overall, we found that flares,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 especially severe ones, were uncommon and did not influence pregnancy outcomes. APOs were also rare
4
5 (14.3%) and mainly associated with positive LAC and damage accrual.
6
7

8 In contrast to the PROMISSE study [9], which aimed to identify risk factors for and mechanisms
9
10 of APOs specifically attributable to SLE and/or aPL, and because we wanted a sample closer to real-life
11
12 practice, we did not apply any of the following exclusion criteria: prednisone>20 mg/day, urinary
13
14 protein-creatinine ratio>1000 mg/g, erythrocyte casts on urine analysis, serum creatinine level>1.2
15
16 mg/dl, diabetes mellitus, or hypertension [9]. Apart from inclusion/exclusion criteria, several aspects
17
18 distinguish the populations of the two studies: their genetic background, with 12.3% of African descent
19
20 in our study vs 20.3% in PROMISSE, and the rate of overweight women (30.3% vs 39.7%, respectively).
21
22 The frequency of several baseline characteristics, which are well-known risk factors for APOs, was
23
24 similar or slightly higher in our cohort than in PROMISSE: previous biopsy-proven LN (26.1% vs
25
26 20.5%), positive LAC (17.7% vs 8.8%), at least one positive aPL test (26.3% vs 12.5%), and a history
27
28 of thrombosis (17.2% vs 8.1%) (the number of patients with APS in the PROMISSE study is not available
29
30 for comparison). However, SLE was probably better controlled in our study: fewer patients had
31
32 hypocomplementemia (26.4% vs 34.0%) and their disease activity was lower (mean SLEPDAI=1.96 vs
33
34 2.79). This latter difference may be due to the higher percentage of our patients on hydroxychloroquine
35
36 (98.3% vs 64.7%) as well as to the routine monitoring of hydroxychloroquine levels in France, which
37
38 leads to a better treatment adherence [18]. Finally, besides the difference in hydroxychloroquine
39
40 exposure, we had more patients on low-dose aspirin (69.3% vs 35.1%). The publication of the
41
42 PROMISSE study in 2015 before the current recommendations (1, 2, 9) may explain this difference
43
44 (Table 5).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Importantly, 71.6% of our patients with previous renal involvement and 91.8% of those with at
52
53 least one positive aPL received low-dose aspirin. This finding might explain the lower rate of APOs in
54
55 our cohort, and confirms the good application of current guidelines [1,2].
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Severe maternal flares occurred in three women (1.2%) in our study: among them only one
4 woman gave birth preterm, due to placental insufficiency at 28 weeks (with preeclampsia/eclampsia and
5 HELLP syndrome); by contrast, both women with severe renal flares gave birth to healthy children at
6 term. In the multicentre PROMISSE study [9], 5.5% patients had severe flares, even though patients with
7 severe disease at conception were excluded. As we did not exclude such women in our study, a higher
8 rate of flares (mild/moderate and severe) might theoretically be expected. Nevertheless, more than 60%
9 of our patients were in remission/LLDAS in the first trimester, possibly because nearly all of our patients
10 were on hydroxychloroquine, as recently recommended [1,19]. Antimalarials have been widely
11 demonstrated to mitigate the risk of flares both during pregnancy and in the postpartum period [1,20]. A
12 recent retrospective study of 398 pregnancies in 304 patients reported a higher flare rate during pregnancy
13 (HR: 1.59; 95%CI, 1.27–1.96), but this was no longer true for patients on hydroxychloroquine: the HR
14 for flares during pregnancy compared with non-pregnant/non-postpartum periods was 1.83 (95%CI:
15 1.34–2.45) in patients not treated with hydroxychloroquine vs 1.26 (95%CI: 0.88–1.69) in those who
16 were on hydroxychloroquine [20].
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Maternal flares were associated with hypocomplementemia ($P=0.02$), consistently with previous
36 reports [9,21]. Notably, flares during the second and third trimesters were not associated with APOs
37 ($P>0.99$), in contrast to older cohorts and the PROMISSE study [9,22]. The discrepancies between our
38 study and prior cohorts are probably due to the low rate of patients with severely active SLE in our study,
39 which likely prevented us from finding an association between disease activity and APOs. This difference
40 may be due also to the improvement in the management of SLE; both physicians and patients now
41 understand the importance of achieving remission/LLDAS before conception as well as of maintaining
42 hydroxychloroquine during pregnancy.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 We evaluated three definitions of remission and found no substantial differences between them
54 in terms of association with maternal flares or APO. This could be due to the high frequency of patients
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on remission in the first trimester and consequently, to a lack of power. It may also be explained by the
4 fact that the definitions of remission that were assessed are indeed relatively close and partially use the
5 same variables. Hence, analyses of wider cohorts are needed to test each remission sub-class during
6 pregnancy, including those with serologically active but clinical quiescent disease.
7
8
9

10
11 Overall, 230 (96.6%) women had liveborn infants who survived to discharge. APOs were
12 observed in 14.3% of women, whereas they occurred in 19% of patients in the PROMISSE study. This
13 difference might be due to the different definition of SGA (below the third percentile in our cohort vs.
14 the fifth in PROMISSE) and the high proportion of patients treated with aspirin (69.3% vs 35.1%).
15
16
17
18

19
20 In our study, LAC and damage accrual predicted APOs. The PROMISSE study [9] had previously
21 shown that LAC is a predictor of APOs, pinpointing that the risk of pregnancy complication in women
22 with SLE is due to aPL antibodies more than SLE itself. In addition, we demonstrated for the first time
23 that damage accrual is associated with APOs. Analysis of patients with damage (n=30, supplementary
24 table S4) showed diverse irreversible damage, driven both by disease activity and glucocorticoid
25 treatment, but also aPL status and/or associated APS. This finding suggests that damage should be
26 considered in preconception counselling and in early pregnancy. It also reinforces the importance of
27 achieving remission/LLDAS to prevent the accrual of additional damage [23–25].
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 In contrast to PROMISSE [9], we did not find any significant association between APOs and
42 active disease or ethnicity. This finding may be due to different health-care systems and socioeconomic
43 status of patients included in both cohorts [9].
44
45
46

47
48 Our study has some limitations. First, the assessment of aPL/anti-dsDNA antibodies was not
49 centralized as in the PROMISSE study due to the real-life design of our study and the large number of
50 centres. This limitation is at least partially offset by the fact that all laboratories in France require regular
51 accreditation. The exact impact of disease activity in the first trimester could not be assessed since
52 patients had to have an ongoing pregnancy at 12 weeks to be included, and it could be hypothesized that
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 some active patients were excluded because their pregnancies ended spontaneously during the first
4 trimester. This limitation also applies to the PROMISSE study as we chose to have a similar design to
5 enable comparison.
6
7
8
9

10 In conclusion, we confirmed that positive LAC predicts APOs and observed for the first time that
11 chronic irreversible damage in the first trimester also predicts APOs. Neither remission nor LLDAS
12 appeared to influence APOs in this cohort of women with stable, well-controlled SLE treated with
13 hydroxychloroquine. These results should be helpful to physicians caring for pregnant women with SLE.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Acknowledgements:** We thank all the investigators of the GR2 group. We also thank Miss Ada Clarke
22 for her assistance, the patients for agreeing to participate, and the patient associations for their strong
23 support. Finally, we acknowledge the French Society of Internal Medicine (SNFMI), the French Society
24 of Rheumatology (SFR), and the FAI2R (filiale de santé des maladies auto-immunes et auto-
25 inflammatoires rares) for their scientific, technical and financial support.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Contributors.** ML, NCC, VLG, and GGI designed the study; ML and AM performed the statistical
4 analyses. NCC, VLG, and GGI analysed and interpreted the data. NCC, VLG, GGI, EL, NM, NA, CMH,
5 PO, ED, FSR, and AM collected clinical data on behalf of the GR2 study group. AD helped to critically
6 revise the manuscript for important intellectual content. NCC, VLG, GGI, and ML wrote the manuscript.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Conflict of interest.** The authors have declared no conflicts of interest.
14

15 **Funding:** This work was supported by grants from patient associations (Lupus France; association des
16 Sclérodermiques de France, association Gougerot Sjögren, AFPCA - Association Francophone contre la
17 Polychondrite chronique atrophiante), from the AFM-Telethon, the French Society of Internal Medicine
18 (SNFMI), the French Society of Rheumatology (SFR), the CMEL commission for Research and
19 Innovation of Cochin Hospital, the Ministère de la Santé (the Clinical REsearch Contract – Database
20 CRCBDD17003), FOREUM (Foundation for Research in Rheumatology), ORRICK society (Price
21 Véronique ROUALET), and an unrestricted grant from UCB (the company had no role in the initiation,
22 planning, conduct, data assembly, analysis or interpretation of the study).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The ‘Direction de la Recherche Clinique et du Développement’ provided logistic and administrative
34 support.
35
36
37

38
39 **Data Availability Statement:** The data underlying this article are available in the article and in its online
40 supplementary material. The data will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author, Prof
41 N. Costedoat-Chalumeau (ORCID 0000-0002-1555-9021).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Contributors of the GR2 group:** Béatrice Banneville, Antoine Baudet, Constance Beaudouin-Bazire,
49 Cristina Belizna, Rakiba Belkhir, Ygal Benhamou, Alice Berezne, Sabine Berthier, Emilie Berthoux,
50 Holy Bezanahary, Lisa Biale, Boris Bienvenu, Claire Blanchard-Delaunay, Anne Calas, Pascal
51 Cathebras, Claire Cazalets, Benjamin Chaigne, Olivia Chandesris, Jérémy Chatelais, Emmanuel
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Chatelus, Elodie Chauvet, Fleur Cohen, Pascal Coquerelle, Marion Couderc, Mathilde de Menthon,
4
5 Claire de Moreuil, Juliette Delforge, Azeddine Dellal, Catherine Deneux-Tharaux, Amélie Denis,
6
7 Emmanuelle Dernis, Alban Deroux, Sandra Desouches, Guillaume Direz, Maxime Dougados, Marine
8
9 Driessen, Aurélie Du Thanh, Laetitia Dunogean, Cécile Durant, Isabelle Durieu, Elisabeth Elefant, Marc
10
11 Fabre, Olivier Fain, Nicole Ferreira-Maldent, René-Marc Flipo, Aline Frazier, Antoine Froissart, Sophie
12
13 Georgin-Lavialle, Elisabeth Gervais, Bertrand Godeau, François Goffinet, Anne Gompel, Laure Gossec,
14
15 Phillipe Goupille, Claire Grange, Constance Guillaud-Danis, Eric Hachulla, Aurélie Hummel, Moez
16
17 Jallouli, Patrick Jego, Stéphane Jobard, Laurence Josselin-Mahr, Noémie Jourde-Chiche, Anne-Sophie
18
19 Korganow, Marc Lambert, Vincent Langlois, Delphine Lariviere, Claire Larroche, Céline Lartigau-
20
21 Roussin, Augustin Latourte, Christian Lavigne, Thomas Le Gallou, Gaëlle Leroux, Hervé Levesque,
22
23 Frédéric Lioté, Laurence Loeuillet, Jonathan London, Valentine Loustau, Emmanuel Maheu, Matthieu
24
25 Mahevas, Hélène Maillard, Xavier Mariette, Hubert Marotte, Nicolas Martin-Silva, Nihal Martis, Agathe
26
27 Masseur, François Maurier, Arsène Mekinian, Sara Melboucy-Belkhir, Martin Michaud, Marc Michel,
28
29 Jacques Morel, Guillaume Moulis, Jérémy Ora, Elisabeth Pasquier, Jean-Loup Pennaforte, Antoinette
30
31 Perlat, Hélène Petit Bauer, Laurent Perard, Evangeline Pillebout, Jean-Maxime Piot, Geneviève Plu-
32
33 Bureau, Vincent Poindron, Agnès Portier, Gregory Pugnet, Loïc Raffray, Alexis Regent, Christophe
34
35 Richez, Mélanie Roriz, Gaëtan Sauvetre, Léa Savey, Nicolas Schleinitz, Jeremy Sellam, Raphaelle Seror,
36
37 Vincent Sobanski, Christelle Sordet, Martin Soubrier, Katia Stankovic-Stojanovic, Nathalie Tieulé,
38
39 Thierry Thomas, Marie-Agnès Timsit, Vassilis Tsatsaris, Maria Letizia Urban, Geoffrey Urbanski,
40
41 Cécile Yelnik.

REFERENCES:

1. Andreoli L, Bertsias GK, Agmon-Levin N, Brown S, Cervera R, Costedoat-Chalumeau N, et al.
EULAR recommendations for women's health and the management of family planning, assisted

- 1
2
3 reproduction, pregnancy and menopause in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and/or
4 antiphospholipid syndrome. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017;76:476–85.
- 5
6
7
8
9 2. Sammaritano LR, Bermas BL, Chakravarty EE, Chambers C, Clowse MEB, Lockshin MD, et al.
10 2020 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Management of Reproductive Health
11 in Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Diseases. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2020;72:529–56.
12
13
14
15
16
17 3. Mehta B, Luo Y, Xu J, Sammaritano L, Salmon J, Lockshin M, et al. Trends in Maternal and Fetal
18 Outcomes Among Pregnant Women With Systemic Lupus Erythematosus in the United States: A
19 Cross-sectional Analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;171:164.
20
21
22
23
24
25 4. Gatto M, Zen M, Iaccarino L, Doria A. New therapeutic strategies in systemic lupus erythematosus
26 management. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2019;15:30–48.
27
28
29
30
31 5. Zen M, Iaccarino L, Gatto M, Bettio S, Nalotto L, Ghirardello A, et al. Prolonged remission in
32 Caucasian patients with SLE: prevalence and outcomes. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015;74:2117–22.
33
34
35
36
37 6. van Vollenhoven R, Voskuyl A, Bertsias G, Aranow C, Aringer M, Arnaud L, et al. A framework
38 for remission in SLE: consensus findings from a large international task force on definitions of
39 remission in SLE (DORIS). *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017;76:554–61.
40
41
42
43
44 7. Franklyn K, Lau CS, Navarra SV, Louthrenoo W, Lateef A, Hamijoyo L, et al. Definition and initial
45 validation of a Lupus Low Disease Activity State (LLDAS). *Ann Rheum Dis* 2016;75:1615–21.
46
47
48
49
50 8. Saccon F, Zen M, Gatto M, Margiotta DPE, Afeltra A, Ceccarelli F, et al. Remission in systemic
51 lupus erythematosus: testing different definitions in a large multicentre cohort. *Ann Rheum Dis*
52 2020;79:943–50.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 9. Buyon JP, Kim MY, Guerra MM, Laskin CA, Petri M, Lockshin MD, et al. Predictors of Pregnancy
4
5 Outcomes in Patients With Lupus: A Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163:153.
6
7
- 8
9 10. Meissner Y, Strangfeld A, Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Förger F, Goll D, Molto A, et al. European
10
11 Network of Pregnancy Registers in Rheumatology (EuNeP)—an overview of procedures and data
12
13 collection. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2019;21:241.
14
15
- 16
17 11. Meissner Y, Fischer-Betz R, Andreoli L, Costedoat-Chalumeau N, De Cock D, Dolhain RJEM, et
18
19 al. EULAR recommendations for a core data set for pregnancy registries in rheumatology. *Ann*
20
21 *Rheum Dis* 2021;80:49–56.
22
23
- 24
25 12. Petri M, Orbai A-M, Alarcón GS, Gordon C, Merrill JT, Fortin PR, et al. Derivation and validation
26
27 of the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics classification criteria for systemic lupus
28
29 erythematosus. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:2677–86.
30
31
- 32
33 13. Gladman DD, Ibañez D, Urowitz MB. Systemic lupus erythematosus disease activity index 2000.
34
35 *J Rheumatol* 2002;29:288–91.
36
37
- 38
39 14. Buyon JP, Kalunian KC, Ramsey-Goldman R, Petri MA, Lockshin MD, Ruiz-Irastorza G, et al.
40
41 Assessing disease activity in SLE patients during pregnancy. *Lupus* 1999;8:677–84.
42
43
- 44
45 15. Gladman DD, Goldsmith CH, Urowitz MB, Bacon P, Fortin P, Ginzler E, et al. The Systemic Lupus
46
47 International Collaborating Clinics/American College of Rheumatology (SLICC/ACR) Damage
48
49 Index for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus International Comparison. *J Rheumatol* 2000;27:373–6.
50
51
- 52
53 16. Buyon JP, Petri MA, Kim MY, Kalunian KC, Grossman J, Hahn BH, et al. The Effect of Combined
54
55 Estrogen and Progesterone Hormone Replacement Therapy on Disease Activity in Systemic Lupus
56
57 Erythematosus: A Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;142:953.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 17. Mamelle N, Cochet V, Claris O. Definition of Fetal Growth Restriction According to Constitutional
4
5 Growth Potential. *Neonatology* 2001;80:277–85.
6
7
- 8
9 18. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Houssiau F, Izmirly P, Guern VL, Navarra S, Jolly M, et al. A Prospective
10
11 International Study on Adherence to Treatment in 305 Patients With Flaring SLE : Assessment by
12
13 Drug Levels and Self-Administered Questionnaires. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 2019;106:374–82.
14
15
- 16
17 19. Fanouriakis A, Kostopoulou M, Alunno A, Aringer M, Bajema I, Boletis JN, et al. 2019 update of
18
19 the EULAR recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum*
20
21 *Dis* 2019;78:736–45.
22
23
- 24
25 20. Eudy AM, Siega-Riz AM, Engel SM, Franceschini N, Howard AG, Clowse MEB, et al. Effect of
26
27 pregnancy on disease flares in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;
28
29 77:855-860.
30
31
- 32
33 21. Ueda A, Chigusa Y, Mogami H, Kawasaki K, Horie A, Mandai M, et al. Predictive factors for flares
34
35 of established stable systemic lupus erythematosus without anti-phospholipid antibodies during
36
37 pregnancy. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* 2020;1–6.
38
39
- 40
41 22. Clowse MEB, Magder LS, Witter F, Petri M. The impact of increased lupus activity on obstetric
42
43 outcomes. *Arthritis Rheum* 2005;52:514–21.
44
45
- 46
47 23. Bruce IN, O’Keeffe AG, Farewell V, Hanly JG, Manzi S, Su L, et al. Factors associated with
48
49 damage accrual in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus: results from the Systemic Lupus
50
51 International Collaborating Clinics (SLICC) Inception Cohort. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015;74:1706–13.
52
53
- 54
55 24. Petri M, Purvey S, Fang H, Magder LS. Predictors of organ damage in systemic lupus
56
57 erythematosus: The Hopkins Lupus Cohort. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:4021–8.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 25. Petri M, Magder LS. Comparison of Remission and Lupus Low Disease Activity State in Damage
4 Prevention in a United States Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Cohort. *Arthritis Rheumatol*
5 2018;70:1790–5.
6
7
8
9
10
11 26. Sibai BM. Diagnosis, Controversies, and Management of the Syndrome of Hemolysis, Elevated
12 Liver Enzymes, and Low Platelet Count: *Obstet Gynecol* 2004;103:981–91.
13
14
15
16
17 27 ACOG Committee on Obstetric Practice. Practice bulletin #33: diagnosis and management of
18 preeclampsia and eclampsia. *Obstet Gynecol* 2002;99:159–67.
19
20
21
22 28 Melamed N, Baschat A, Yinon Y, Athanasiadis A, Mecacci F, Figueras F, et al. FIGO (International
23 Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics) initiative on fetal growth: Best practice advice for
24 screening, diagnosis, and management of fetal growth restriction. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 2021;152:3–
25 57.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Baseline patient characteristics associated with flares in the second and third trimesters

Maternal characteristics	Total (N=238)	Flare (N=35)	No flare (N=203)	P value
Age at pregnancy, mean (SD)	31.6 (4.5)	30.9 (4.9)	31.7 (4.4)	0.37
Nulliparity	88 (37.0)	15 (42.9)	73 (36.0)	0.44
Family geographical origin (N=235)				
-European descent	166 (70.6)	25 (71.4)	141 (70.5)	
-African descent	29 (12.3)	4 (11.4)	25 (12.5)	
-Asian descent	17 (7.2)	2 (5.7)	15 (7.5)	0.99
-Others	23 (9.8)	4 (11.4)	19 (9.5)	
Overweight (BMI \geq 25 kg/m ²) (N=234)	71 (30.3)	7 (20.0)	64 (32.2)	0.17
Active smokers (N=233)	21 (9.0)	3 (8.6)	18 (9.1)	>0.99
Alcohol consumption (N=226) [§]	6 (2.7)	1 (2.9)	5 (2.6)	>0.99
Previous IUFD (N=237)	16 (6.8)	2 (5.9)	14 (6.9)	1.00
Previous thrombosis	41 (17.2)	5 (14.3)	36 (17.7)	0.81
Associated APS	34 (14.3)	5 (14.3)	29 (14.3)	>0.99
SLE duration, years, median (IQR)	7.2 (3.6-12.4)	7.7 (3.3-12.9)	7.2 (3.6-12.4)	0.92
Previous renal involvement	67 (28.2)	12 (34.3)	55 (27.1)	0.38
Laboratory characteristics				
Low platelets (<100 \times 10 ⁹ /l)	3 (1.3)	1 (2.9)	2 (1.0)	0.38
24 h proteinuria>0.5 g/d (or >0.5 g/g)	9 (3.8)	2 (5.7)	7 (3.5)	0.62
Positive anti-dsDNA (N=222)	104 (46.9)	19 (55.9)	85 (45.2)	0.25
Hypocomplementemia (N=216)	57 (26.4)	15 (42.9)	42 (23.2)	0.02
At least one positive aPL (N=232)	61 (26.3)	9 (26.5)	52 (26.3)	>0.99
IgG/IgM anti- β 2GPI (N=232)	26 (11.2)	4 (11.8)	22 (11.1)	>0.99
IgG/IgM aCL (N=232)	37 (16.0)	4 (11.8)	33 (16.7)	0.62
LAC (N=232)	41 (17.7)	6 (17.7)	35 (17.7)	>0.99
Triple positive aPL (N=232)	17 (7.3)	2 (5.9)	15 (7.6)	>0.99
SLE activity and damage				
PGA, median (IQR) (N=235)	0.1 (0-0.2)	0.1 (0-0.9)	0.1 (0-0.2)	0.65
SLEPDAI, median (IQR) (N=212)	2 (0-3)	2 (0-4)	2 (0-2)	0.06
SLICC-Damage Index, median (IQR) (N=236)	0 (0-0)	0 (0-0)	0 (0-0)	0.87
Clinical SLEPDAI=0	206 (86.6)	28 (80.0)	178 (87.7)	0.28
Remission (DORIA/Zen definition)	154 (64.7)	21 (60.0)	133 (65.5)	0.53
Remission (DORIS definition)	147 (61.8)	20 (57.1)	127 (62.6)	0.54
LLDAS (N=219)	157 (71.7)	25 (71.4)	132 (71.7)	0.97
Current treatment				
Prednisone	119 (50.0)	21 (60.0)	98 (48.3)	0.20
Prednisone mg/d, median (IQR) (N=119)	7 (5-10)	7 (5-10)	7 (5-10)	0.71
Immunosuppressive drugs*	56 (23.5)	12 (34.3)	44 (21.7)	0.10
Hydroxychloroquine**	234 (98.3)	34 (97.1)	200 (98.5)	0.47
Low-dose aspirin***	165 (69.3)	24 (68.6)	141 (69.5)	0.92
Low molecular weight heparin	61 (25.6)	8 (22.9)	53 (26.1)	0.68
Antihypertensive agents	5 (2.1)	1 (2.9)	4 (2.0)	0.55

SD: standard deviation; BMI: body mass index; IUFD: intrauterine fetal death (>10 weeks); APS: antiphospholipid syndrome; SLE: systemic lupus erythematosus; IQR: interquartile range; g/d: grams per day; anti-dsDNA: anti-double stranded DNA; aPL: antiphospholipid; aCL: anti-cardiolipin; anti- β 2GPI: anti-

1
2
3 beta2 Glycoprotein I; LAC: lupus anticoagulant; PGA: physician global assessment; SLEPDAI: Systemic
4
5 Lupus Erythematosus Pregnancy Disease Activity Index; SLICC: Systemic Lupus International
6
7 Collaborating Clinics; LLDAS: lupus low disease activity state.
8
9

10 §: at least 10 units per week.

11
12 *: Immunosuppressive drugs: azathioprine (n=53, 22.3%) and tacrolimus (n=5, 2.1%); two women received
13
14 both.
15

16
17 **: All but four women (98.3%) took hydroxychloroquine; among those four, intolerance accounted for the
18
19 lack of hydroxychloroquine treatment for two, retinopathy for one, and non-adherence for the fourth.
20

21
22 ***: Low-dose aspirin was given to 165 women (69.3%). In particular, 52 of 67 patients (71.6%) with
23
24 previous renal involvement and 56 of 61 patients (91.8%) with at least one positive aPL during pregnancy
25
26 were treated with low-dose aspirin.
27

28
29 More details on geographical origins are available in Supplementary Table S1. Bold text highlights
30
31 significance.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Baseline patient characteristics associated with APOs in the second and third trimesters

Maternal characteristics	Total (N=238)	APO (N=34)	No APO (N=204)	P value
Age at pregnancy, mean (SD)	31.6 (4.5)	30.7 (4.8)	31.7 (4.4)	0.22
Nulliparity	88 (37.0)	11 (32.4)	77 (37.8)	0.55
Family geographical origins (N=235)				
- European descent	166 (70.6)	21 (61.8)	145 (72.1)	
- African descent	29 (12.3)	7 (20.6)	22 (11.0)	
- Asian descent	17 (7.2)	2 (5.9)	15 (7.5)	0.40
- Others	23 (9.8)	4 (11.8)	19 (9.5)	
Overweight (BMI \geq 25 kg/m ²) (N=234)	71 (30.3)	14 (41.2)	57 (28.5)	0.14
Active smokers (N=233)	21 (9.0)	5 (15.2)	16 (8.0)	0.19
Alcohol consumption (N=226) [§]	6 (2.7)	2 (6.3)	4 (2.1)	0.20
Previous IUFD (N=237)	16 (6.8)	5 (14.7)	11 (5.4)	0.06
Previous thrombosis	41 (17.2)	10 (29.4)	31 (15.2)	0.04
Associated APS	34 (14.3)	10 (29.4)	24 (11.8)	0.01
SLE duration, years, median (IQR)	7.2 (3.6-12.4)	10.0 (3.7-15.3)	7.0 (3.5-11.9)	0.13
Previous renal involvement	67 (28.2)	13 (38.2)	54 (26.5)	0.16
Laboratory characteristics				
Low platelets (<100 \times 10 ⁹ /l)	3 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.5)	>0.99
24 h proteinuria>0.5 g/d (or >0.5 g/g)	9 (3.8)	3 (8.8)	6 (2.9)	0.12
Positive anti-dsDNA (N=222)	104 (46.9)	21 (67.7)	83 (43.5)	0.01
Hypocomplementemia (N=216)	57 (26.4)	13 (40.6)	44 (23.9)	0.05
At least one positive aPL (N=232)	61 (26.3)	18 (52.9)	43 (21.7)	<0.001
IgG/IgM aCL (N=232)	37 (16.0)	9 (26.5)	28 (14.1)	0.08
IgG/IgM anti- β 2GPI (N=232)	26 (11.2)	6 (17.7)	20 (10.1)	0.24
LAC (N=232)	41 (17.7)	15 (44.1)	26 (13.1)	<0.001
Triple positive aPL (N=232)	17 (7.3)	5 (14.7)	12 (6.1)	0.08
Disease activity and damage				
PGA, median (IQR) (N=235)	0.1 (0-0.2)	0.1 (0.0-0.4)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	0.06
SLEPDAI, median (IQR) (N=212)	2 (0-3)	2 (2-4)	2 (0-2)	0.01
SLICC-Damage Index, median (IQR) (N=236)	0 (0-0)	0 (0-1)	0 (0-0)	0.01
Clinical SLEPDAI=0	206 (86.6)	28 (82.4)	178 (87.3)	0.42
Remission (DORIA/Zen definition)	154 (64.7)	17 (50.0)	137 (67.2)	0.05
Remission (DORIS definition)	147 (61.8)	17 (50.0)	130 (63.7)	0.13
LLDAS (N=219)	157 (71.7)	19 (57.6)	138 (74.2)	0.05
Current treatment				
Prednisone	119 (50.0)	23 (67.7)	96 (47.1)	0.03
Prednisone mg/d, median (IQR) (N=119)	7 (5-10)	7.5 (5-10)	7 (5-10)	0.13
Immunosuppressive drugs*	56 (23.5)	13 (38.2)	43 (21.1)	0.03
Hydroxychloroquine**	234 (98.3)	34 (100.0)	200 (98.0)	>0.99
Low-dose aspirin***	165 (69.3)	29 (85.3)	136 (66.7)	0.03
Low molecular weight heparin	61 (25.6)	15 (44.1)	46 (22.6)	0.01
Antihypertensive agents	5 (2.1)	2 (5.9)	3 (1.5)	0.15

APO: adverse pregnancy outcome; SD: standard deviation; BMI: body mass index; IUFD: intrauterine fetal death (>10 weeks); APS: antiphospholipid syndrome; SLE: systemic lupus erythematosus; IQR: interquartile

1
2
3 range; g/d: grams per day; anti-dsDNA: anti-double stranded DNA; aPL: antiphospholipid; aCL: anti-
4
5 cardiolipin; anti- β 2GPI: anti-beta2 Glycoprotein I; LAC: lupus anticoagulant; PGA: physician global
6
7 assessment; SLEPDAI: Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Pregnancy Disease Activity Index; SLICC: Systemic
8
9 Lupus International Collaborating Clinics; LLDAS: lupus low disease activity state.

10
11
12 §: at least 10 units per week.

13
14 *: Immunosuppressive drugs: azathioprine (n=53, 22.3%) and tacrolimus (n=5, 2.1%); two women received
15
16 both.

17
18 **: All but four women (98.3%) took hydroxychloroquine; among those four, intolerance accounted for the
19
20 lack of hydroxychloroquine treatment for two, retinopathy for one, and non-adherence for the fourth.

21
22 ***: Low-dose aspirin was given to 165 women (69.3%). In particular, 52 of 67 patients (71.6%) with
23
24 previous renal involvement and 56 of 61 patients (91.8%) with at least one positive aPL during pregnancy
25
26 were treated with low-dose aspirin.
27
28

29
30 More details on geographical origins are available in Supplementary Table S1. Bold text highlights
31
32 significance.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3. Risk factors for APO: multivariate analysis

Variables	Model 1 [§]		
	Crude OR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	P value
Age at pregnancy	0.9 (0.9-1.0)	1.0 (0.9-1.1)	0.45
DORIA/Zen remission	0.5 (0.2-1.1)	0.5 (0.2-1.2)	0.11
SLICC-Damage Index (per 1-unit increase)	1.9 (1.2-3.0)	1.8 (1.1-2.9)	0.02
Positive LAC in the 1 st trimester	5.2 (2.4-11.5)	4.2 (1.8-9.7)	0.001

[§]: multivariate analysis performed on complete cases for the tested variables: N=230. OR: odds ratio; aOR: adjusted odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; LAC: lupus anticoagulant; SLICC: Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics. Age at pregnancy was also forced into the analysis, as a known risk factor for APO. We included LAC, and because of high collinearity, we excluded associated APS, at least one positive aPL test, and treatments such as low-dose aspirin and LMWH (as most women with APS or carrying aPL were treated with these drugs) from our regression models. Finally, we excluded prednisone dose, immunosuppressants, SLEPDAI, hypocomplementemia, and anti-dsDNA from both models, since both the DORIA/Zen definition of remission and LLDAS are composite scores that already include these factors (see Supplementary Material). Bold text highlights significance.

Table 4: Risk factors for APO: multivariate analysis

Variables	Model 2 [§]		
	Crude OR (95%CI)	aOR (95%CI)	P value
Age at pregnancy	0.9 (0.9-1.0)	1.0 (0.9-1.1)	0.45
LLDAS	0.5 (0.2-1.1)	0.5 (0.2-1.1)	0.07
SLICC-Damage Index (per 1-unit increase)	1.9 (1.2-3.0)	1.7 (1.1-2.8)	0.03
Positive LAC in the 1 st trimester	5.2 (2.4-11.5)	3.7 (1.6-8.7)	0.002

[§]: multivariate analysis performed on complete cases for tested variables: N=212. OR: odds ratio; aOR: adjusted odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; LLDAS: lupus low disease activity state; LAC: lupus anticoagulant; SLICC: Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics. Age at pregnancy was also forced into the analysis, as a known risk factor for APO. We included LAC, and because of high collinearity, we excluded associated APS, at least one positive aPL test, and treatments such as low-dose aspirin and LMWH (as most women with APS or carrying aPL were treated with these drugs) from our regression models. Finally, we excluded prednisone dose, immunosuppressants, SLEPDAI, hypocomplementemia, and anti-dsDNA from both models, since both the DORIA/Zen definition of remission and LLDAS are composite scores that already include these factors (see Supplementary Material). Bold text highlights significance.

Table 5. Major differences between GR2 and PROMISSE [9] studies

	GR2	PROMISSE [9]
Time frame	2014-2019	2003-2012
Exclusion criteria	Twin pregnancy	Twin pregnancy UPCR >1000 mg/g Creatinine level > 1.2 mg/dl Prednisone > 20 mg/d
Ethnicity (African descent/Black)	12.3%	20.3%
History of thrombosis	17.2%	8.1%
Positive LAC	17.7%	8.8%
At least one positive aPL	26.3%	12.5%
Previous renal involvement	28.2%	20.5%
Hydroxychloroquine exposure	98.3%	64.7%
Mean SLEPDAI at 1st trimester	1.96	2.79

UPCR: urinary protein creatinine ratio; LAC: lupus anticoagulant; aPL: anti-phospholipid; SLEPDAI: Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Pregnancy Disease Activity Index.