

Assessing Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies Among US College Students after School Reopening

Scott E. Feeder¹, Tamar Ratishvili¹, Beth L. Carlson², Diane E. Grill¹, Krista M. Goergen¹, Richard B. Kennedy¹, Inna G. Ovsyannikova¹, Gregory A. Poland¹

¹*Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group,*

Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

²*Geneva College*

Beaver Falls, PA, USA

Email: poland.gregory@mayo.edu

Mailing address:

Gregory A. Poland, M.D., Director, Mayo Vaccine Research Group, Mayo Clinic, Guggenheim 611C, 200 First Street SW, Rochester, Minnesota 55905

Phone: (507) 284-4968; Fax: (507) 266-4716

Abstract word count: 150

Word count: 4518

ABSTRACT

Objective:

This study assessed the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at two timepoints to evaluate the effectiveness of COVID-19 precautions in two colleges.

Participants:

The study enrolled students, faculty, and staff from Covenant and Geneva Colleges.

Methods:

During the fall of 2020 the Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group partnered with Vibrant America to hand out self-administered finger stick antibody tests at the start of the fall semester and again two months later.

Results:

The study enrolled 305 participants from Covenant and 671 from Geneva College at timepoint 1 and 198 participants from Covenant and 554 from Geneva College at timepoint 2. Seroprevalence rates were 2.3% and 1.6% at timepoint 1, and 0.5% and 3.97% at timepoint 2 at Covenant and Geneva Colleges, respectively.

Conclusion:

The results of this study suggest that implementation of strict preventive measures may have kept the spread of COVID-19 low at these colleges during the study period.

Keywords: COVID-19, College, SARS-CoV-2, Antibody Testing, Finger Stick Testing, Dried Blood Spot (DBS) Testing

INTRODUCTION

In March of 2020 the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 to be a global pandemic.¹ In the same month the United States declared a National Public Health Emergency due to COVID-19 outbreaks.² As COVID-19 infection rates continued to climb across the United States, several nonpharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) such as shelter-in-place orders, social distancing, mask wearing, and travel restrictions, were enacted including the closures of schools.³ Between March and April of 2020 the majority of schools had closed across all 50 states including K-12 schools, universities, and colleges affecting the spring semester.⁴ As the Fall school 2020 semester approached the United States President recommended that schools reopen for in-person learning,⁵ and national guidelines for reopening were put forward by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and other professional organizations such as the American College Health Association.^{6,7} The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that over a third of colleges and universities decided to allow students to return to campus in the fall of 2020, each implementing preventive measures and monitoring strategies of varying degrees of stringency.^{8,9}

Because of different factors including dense housing, large social gatherings, classroom and virtual learning, sporting events and other group activities, as well as varying degrees of concern and risk perception among college students and their parents, institutions of higher education (IHE), especially those with high-density residential housing were considered high-risk settings for the spread of infectious agents including SARS-CoV-2.¹⁰⁻¹³ In order to keep students, faculty, and staff safe during reopening, IHE which chose to resume on-campus learning had to plan for and implement policies and safety measures in accordance with federal, state, local, tribal, institutional, and other relevant health authority regulations.¹⁴ Considering the

individual context of a college or university and consequently the need and practicality of specific COVID-19 prevention strategies, safety measures ranging from social distancing and mandatory masking to providing students, faculty, and staff with COVID-19 educational materials on a variety of screening and testing approaches were instituted.¹⁵ Notably, during the Fall of 2020 a unified guidance on SARS-CoV-2 testing in educational institutions was lacking and schools had to plan their strategies individually.

Several outbreaks were reported soon after the start of the Fall 2020 semester at a number of IHEs in the U.S. as well as worldwide.^{16,17} These outbreaks provided opportunities to understand the true impact of IHE reopening and the relative effectiveness of preventive efforts against SARS-CoV-2 infection among students, faculty, and staff. However, case numbers and the magnitude of outbreaks can be underestimated in the absence of aggressive mass screening at frequent intervals, and these undetected cases can significantly contribute to disease spread in communities and limit outbreak control options.¹⁸ This is especially true for outbreaks at schools and IHE, as children, adolescents and young adults are more likely to have asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection and thus COVID-19 may go undetected in these age groups.^{19,20} Therefore, an assessment of the true prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among college/university students after resuming on-campus learning is crucial for informing the optimal strategies to minimize COVID-19 risks related to IHE.

Previous reports concerning COVID-19 prevalence in educational settings have mainly focused on detecting cases through PCR-based testing of symptomatic individuals and their contacts, generally targeted K-12 schools, involved single timepoint studies of seroprevalence and/or did not specifically address reopening.²¹⁻²⁹ Our study aimed to identify trends in antibody seroprevalence in residential college students, faculty, and staff at two timepoints; at the

beginning of the Fall 2020 semester and 2 months thereafter, to evaluate the prevalence and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 antibody positivity and the effectiveness of COVID-19 preventive measures (i.e., social distancing, mask wearing) put in place by campuses during the fall semester. Thus, the goal of this study was to assess baseline prevalence and incidence rates of SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies among students, faculty, and staff approximately 8 weeks after reopening for in-person learning.

METHODS

Study Design and Subject Recruitment

During the summer of 2020 the Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group (VRG) based in Rochester, MN partnered with Vibrant America (San Carlos, CA) to design a study to ascertain SARS-CoV-2 antibody rates in college students, faculty, and staff returning to campus for the Fall 2020 semester. The VRG partnered with two colleges for this study: Covenant College located on Lookout Mountain in Dade County, GA and Geneva College located in Beaver Falls, PA. While both schools draw a small number of students from across the world and nationally, their primary demographic is regional.

Covenant College had an enrollment rate of 837 undergraduate students and 304 faculty and staff members on campus during the Fall of 2020. The college had 5 dormitories, including apartments, which housed 78% of the enrolled students. Since Covenant did not have separate IDs to distinguish between students and faculty/staff members; participants born before 1998 were categorized as faculty/staff and those born after 1998 as students (see Table 1 for demographic characteristics). If participants did not provide a student ID or date of birth, they could not be classified as a student or faculty/staff and were thus excluded from the study.

Geneva College had an enrollment rate of 965 undergraduate and 116 graduate students and 405 faculty and staff members on campus during the Fall of 2020. The campus had 9 residence halls which housed 73% of the enrolled students. Students and faculty/staff members were distinguished by college ID.

Testing for both colleges was completed at two timepoints. The first wave of testing started at the end of August 2020 as students, faculty, and staff returned to campus and ended in the first week of September 2020. A second wave of testing started during mid-October 2020 and ended mid-November 2020 (prior to Thanksgiving school breaks) and only included participants who completed the first wave of testing.

IRB approval was obtained from Mayo Clinic Rochester. Once approved, each College had their own IRB review and approve the study prior to recruitment. During the time of finger stick test kit distribution, participants were given a waiver of consent which explained the purpose of the study, how long they would be in the study (two testing periods), how data would be collected, stored, and used, any direct benefits to participant, and contact information for questions and concerns. No remuneration was offered with this study.

Vibrant America provided the finger stick kits which included an instruction booklet for completing the finger stick test. Shipping containers were also provided for sending the kits back to Vibrant America for testing. Participants either completed the testing themselves or could ask for assistance from a healthcare worker on campus. An online app was used to capture de-identified demographic information and conduct a brief questionnaire where study participants could self-report COVID-19 symptoms, any previous COVID-19 testing test type (nasal/PCR or serum antibody) and outcome (positive/negative). This information was paired with the antibody

testing results during the analysis. The app was also used to provide participants the results of the Vibrant fingerstick antibody test and explanation of results.

Since each college campus is setup and run differently, a brief description of how each college implemented the study can be found in Appendix 1.

SARS-CoV-2 Antibody (Ab) Testing

SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays were conducted on dried blood spot (DBS) samples self-collected by participants using finger stick kits. Antibody testing was completed on a Whatman 903TM DBS finger stick card (GE Healthcare Ltd. Chicago, IL) eluates using the Vibrant COVID-19 Ab chemiluminescence immunoassay (CLIA) developed for qualitative detection and differentiation of IgG and IgM antibodies directed at four major SARS-CoV-2 viral antigens (Wuhan strain): spike (S) [S1 and S2], receptor binding domain (RBD) and nucleocapsid (N) antigens. The Vibrant COVID-19 Ab Assay was granted an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) by the FDA in June, 2020.^{30, 31} Test results are classified as positive or negative based on the reactivity of each sample calculated as the ratio of the sample intensity to the cut-off control intensity established by the manufacturer, with calculated values ≤ 1.0 indicating the absence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 (negative result) whereas values > 1.0 are considered preliminary for the presence of antibodies to one or more of the included antigens (positive result). The assay performed on serum specimens collected 4-26 days (median = 14 days) after a positive nasopharyngeal swab test demonstrated 98.11% (95% CI 90.06% - 99.67%) Positive Percent Agreement (PPA) with RT-PCR results. The Negative Percent Agreement (NPA) with SARS-CoV-2 antibody-negative serum specimens collected before the pandemic was reported as 98.60% (95% CI 97.14% - 99.32%). The total Coefficient of Variation (CV) for precision as well as lot to lot reproducibility was $< 15\%$.

RESULTS

Our study enrolled 305 (45%) participants from Covenant College and 671 (37%) from Geneva College at timepoint 1 from August 17 to September 16, 2020. The Covenant College cohort consisted of 35% faculty/staff members and 65% students. The Geneva College cohort consisted of 21% faculty/staff and 79% students.

For the second timepoint (visit 2) we enrolled 198 (26%) participants from Covenant College and 554 (17%) from Geneva College in the period from October 9 to November 17, 2020. Since participants needed to complete both timepoints 1 and 2 to be in the study, participants who only tested during time point 2 but had not completed the timepoint 1 visit were excluded.

As the COVID-19 CLIA assay measures antibodies to N, S1, S2 and RBD domains of SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-2, IgM and IgG seropositivity were defined in our study as antibody positivity (value >1.00) to any one of the viral proteins. Table 2 below the results for IgG, IgM, self-reported PCR test, and previous antibody test results for timepoint 1.

Overall antibody positivity at Covenant College at timepoint 1 was 2.3%. Of the 7 seropositive participants, 5 reported a positive PCR test and 1 reported a positive antibody test. At Geneva College, antibody positivity at visit 1 was 1.6%. Of the 11 seropositive participants, 3 reported a positive PCR test and 1 reported a positive antibody test.

Interestingly, of the 23 total individuals at both Colleges who self-reported PCR positivity, only 8 (34.8%) were seropositive (IgM or IgG) for at least one of the SARS-CoV-2 protein at timepoint 1.

With several exceptions, most IgM positive participants were positive for more than one SARS-CoV-2 antigen, with anti-RBD IgM antibodies being most prevalent with median values

of 1.92 (IQR 1.36; 3.05) and 2.15 (IQR 1.47; 2.42) chemiluminescence units (CU) for Covenant and Geneva cohorts, respectively. Of the total of 10 IgM positive participants at both Colleges, 9 (90%) were positive for RBD-specific antibodies, while only 4 (40%) possessed N-specific antibodies. Notably, all 17 IgG seropositive participants demonstrated positive antibody responses to all four SARS-CoV-2 antigens included in the DBS testing assay. Table 3 shows the results for IgG, IgM, self-reported PCR test and previous antibody test results for timepoint 2.

Only 1 participant from Covenant College tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at time point 2. This individual also self-reported a positive PCR result. Notably, of the 7 participants identified as seropositive at timepoint 1, 3 did not participate in the second round of testing, while 4 participants were now seronegative.

Antibody positivity at Geneva College at timepoint 2 of the study was 3.97% with 16 new seropositive participants (i.e., participants who were SARS-CoV-2 antibody negative at time point 1). Of the total 22 seropositive participants, 11 (50%) reported a positive PCR test, and 4 (18.2%) reported a prior positive antibody test result. Of the 9 participants who were seropositive at timepoint 1 and returned for the second visit, 6 (66.7%) remained IgM or IgG seropositive. Two previously seropositive participants did not return their second finger stick tests. Of all 22 subjects self-reporting a positive PCR test at both colleges by time point 2, only 12 (54%) were seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 antigens.

Similar to the trend observed at timepoint 1, 7 (77.8%) of 9 IgM positive participants were seropositive for RBD-specific antibodies, 4 (44.4%) for S1 and S2 domains of Spike protein, and only 3 (33.3%) were seropositive for N-specific IgM antibodies among participants at timepoint 2 from Geneva College. Of the 22 IgG positive participants from Geneva College, twenty (90.9%) were positive for IgG antibodies to all four included antigens, with 21 (95.5%)

being seropositive for anti-S1 and 20 (90.9%) for anti-N, anti-S2 and anti-RBD. One seropositive participant at Covenant College was positive for IgG antibodies to N and S1 proteins at time point 2. Antibody response (in CUs) to one of any of the four antigens was positively correlated with antibody response to other antigens in both Geneva and Covenant College cohorts (Supplemental Figure 1).

Since our study was not able to enroll all students, faculty, and staff, and in order to assess the true magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 spread at colleges, at the conclusion of the study we requested data collected by the college health offices on the number of reported COVID-19 positives and those quarantined during the Fall semester (Table 4). The clinical cases documented by college nursing staff on the number of reported positive cases of COVID-19 reveals that our study did not capture the majority of these cases due to subject non-participation.

DISCUSSION

Our two-timepoint study conducted among students, faculty, and staff members of two residential colleges from August to November 2020 assessed antibody seroprevalence to four major SARS-CoV-2 antigens using self-administered Dried Blood Spot (DBS) tests. Unsurprisingly, from time point 1 to time point 2 we found an increase in the prevalence of seropositivity to SARS-CoV-2 antigens (as defined by antibody positivity to at least one of the antigens included in the DBS array [N, RBD, S1, S2]) of 1.6% to 3.97% among participants from Geneva College. This was likely related to the rise in COVID-19 incidence rates in Pennsylvania as well as most of the United States within the study period. This is also reflected in increased rates of self-reported positive PCR test results from 1.3% to 2.9%. However, in the Covenant College cohort measured antibody seropositivity and self-reported positive PCR test rates dropped from 2.3% to 0.8% and 4.6% to 3%, respectively within the study timeframe. This

could, in part, be attributable to participants who tested positive for antibodies at visit 1 not returning for the 2nd study time point. This decrease could also be linked to lower community rates of COVID-19 in the state of Georgia compared to Pennsylvania at the time and perhaps antibody waning (see below); however, our sample size is too limited to make this conclusion.

A considerable proportion of the seropositive individuals identified in our study did not report a previous positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test result (Covenant College: 2/7 (28.5%) and 1/1 (100%); Geneva College: 8/11 (72.7%) and 11/22 (50%) at time points 1 and 2, respectively). This is likely due to high rates of asymptomatic infection which account for approximately a third of all COVID-19 cases based on large meta-analyses.^{32, 33} The likelihood of developing symptoms following SARS-CoV-2 infection increases with age, with younger individuals demonstrating asymptomatic infections at a higher rate, reaching 80% in some reports.^{34, 35}

SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity in our study cohort at both timepoints was similar to or lower as compared to reported seroprevalence rates among U.S. students as well as the general population in the same time frame. This aligns with findings of other studies done at educational settings during circulation of earlier SARS-CoV-2 variants and could suggest that with adequate countermeasures in place, it is realistic to keep in-school virus transmission rates, including asymptomatic transmission levels, similar to that of the community, despite the increased risk factors for transmission that are present on most college campuses.^{25, 27, 29, 36} It is, nevertheless, important to note that as seroprevalence rates vary greatly by geographic region, race, living conditions, occupation, income, socioeconomic status, climate, and the assay used for antibody detection, and perhaps most importantly, by variant of concern; therefore such rates should always be interpreted cautiously depending on such variables.³⁷⁻⁴⁰

It is known that a majority of individuals with COVID-19 develop detectable IgM and IgG antibodies to at least one of the major SARS-CoV-2 antigens independent of disease severity in the acute period following infection.⁴¹⁻⁴⁷ Almost all seroconverted individuals develop IgM or IgG antibodies within 20 days of infection, with IgM levels declining rapidly afterwards and IgG levels often peaking later but persisting for months after infection. While most infected individuals exhibit IgM seroconversion followed by IgG seroconversion, other patterns of seroconversion, such as: synchronous IgM and IgG or IgM preceding IgG, have been reported.^{41, 48} Interestingly, a significant proportion (34.8% at time point 1 and 54% at time point 2) of study participants who self-reported a positive nasal swab PCR result were seronegative for SARS-CoV-2 antigen-specific antibodies. This could be due to several possible factors such as interindividual variations in the development and durability of antibody responses, timing between disease onset and sample collection, and assay limitations as follows. Following acute infection, persistence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies over the period of months is variable depending on demographic factors, clinical course, antigen of interest, and the assay used for quantification, with some reports demonstrating rapid antibody waning and others showing high durability of antibody responses.⁴⁹⁻⁵⁶ As the dates of self-reported PCR and clinical diagnoses in our study cohort are unknown to us, antibody waning can at least partly explain why COVID-19 recovered participants subsequently tested seronegative during our study. Seronegativity in all individuals who self-reported positive PCR at timepoint 2 only (assumed to have had the disease in the interval between two study time points) was unexpected. As seroconversion can take up to three weeks after disease onset,^{43, 45, 57} it is possible that samples of at least some study participants self-reporting PCR positivity had been self-collected early in the disease course before the development of detectable IgM or IgG antibodies. Albeit uncommon, the likelihood of

false-positive PCR results should also be considered.⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰ Although DBS tests have been shown to reliably detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and their utility for seroprevalence studies has been validated,⁶¹⁻⁶⁴ assay limitations such as the occurrence of false negative results in individuals with low antibody titers suggests that confirmatory testing on serum/plasma samples should be considered.^{64, 65}

IgM and IgG antibody kinetics to different SARS-CoV-2 antigens also vary considerably. The vast majority of seroconverted individuals develop measurable antibodies to S1, N, and RBD protein domains.⁶⁶⁻⁷¹ In our study, IgG antibody seropositivity was substantially higher than IgM seropositivity to SARS-CoV-2 antigens, which is in line with other reports as IgM titers to all SARS-CoV-2 antigens rapidly decrease following the acute phase of the disease.^{72, 73} Notably, IgG seropositivity to any one of the tested antigens was highly correlated with IgG seropositivity to the other three SARS-CoV-2 antigens in our cohort. However, IgM seropositivity to RBD antigen was more commonly observed in our cohorts than IgM seropositivity to S1, S2, and N. Several groups have reported faster decline of N-specific antibodies and longer persistence of RBD-induced antibody responses.⁷⁴⁻⁷⁸ Higher seroconversion rates to S1 and RBD domains versus nucleocapsid (N) protein in individuals with milder disease have also been observed.⁵⁰ Moreover, Spike-based assays have been reported to surpass N-based assays in sensitivity of IgM detection.⁷⁹ These factors could be contributing to a lower prevalence IgM of antibodies directed against N protein in our study. However, more insights into differential decline of IgM antibodies to different SARS-CoV-2 antigens and its possible biological significance are needed.

Overall, the increase in SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity as well as the rise in self-reported PCR positivity from time point 1 to time point 2 was unsurprising as COVID-19 cases continued

to climb across the country and in both Georgia and Pennsylvania. According to the reported number of positive COVID-19 cases tracked by each of the College's health services (Table 4), the true number of positive cases were higher than what was captured by this study (Tables 2 and 3). This is most likely explained by the lower-than-expected enrollment of students, faculty, and staff (Geneva 45% and Covenant 26%) at timepoint 1 and even lower retention numbers (Geneva 37% and Covenant 17%) at timepoint 2. Based on our seropositivity results and published literature on differences between observed and estimated actual numbers of COVID-19 cases in the United States, taking asymptomatic, minimally symptomatic, and untested individuals into account, we suggest that SARS-CoV-2 infection rates in both colleges were much higher than accounted for in our study or even the campus-wide numbers reported in Table 4.

The numbers of positive COVID-19 PCR tests provided by colleges reveal that more positive cases were reported at Geneva College as compared to Covenant College as outlined in Table 4. This makes sense for several reasons. First, Geneva had a larger enrollment of students and more faculty and staff members. Second, the possibility for exposure may have been greater at Geneva College as they have a graduate program. Graduate students may have lived off campus during the semester as compared to undergraduates and may have had more opportunities for exposure. Third, with a larger number of faculty and staff, Geneva College may have been at an increased risk of more off-campus exposure as faculty and staff were not living on campus. Importantly, there could have been differences in adherence to NPIs such as masking and social distancing between colleges.

Based on several reports to date, provided vigorous preventive measures are in place, educational institutions and dormitories usually do not represent major drivers of COVID-19 spread in communities.⁸⁰ It has been shown that schools with multi-layered precautions and/or

mask mandates have been more successful at limiting SARS-CoV-2 spread in classes and/or campuses and limiting outbreaks.⁸¹⁻⁸³ Nevertheless, even though observations have been somewhat reassuring regarding a similar level of transmission in schools as in the community, some demonstrating even lower rates in children enrolled in on-site classes,^{24, 84, 85} several reports point to increases in county-level COVID-19 incidence following outbreaks at colleges with in-person instructional formats,^{86, 87} perhaps also indicative of differences between K-12 schools and higher educational settings. Further, during the period of our study COVID-19 vaccines were not yet authorized. Safe and effective vaccines are now available to everyone 5 and older, including students and faculty of institutions of higher education, which greatly lowers the risks of large outbreaks at colleges and in communities with high vaccination coverage.⁸⁸

The emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VOCs) is another factor to consider in the context of COVID-19 infections in educational settings due to higher transmissibility of emerging variants compared to the original (Wuhan-Hu-1 or USA/WA1/2020) and earlier VOCs that predominated during the previous academic year. This remains important in immunized students as well due to lower susceptibility of emerging variants to vaccine- and illness-induced immunity, specifically, lower magnitude of neutralization by both infection and vaccine-induced antibodies, the effect most pronounced with Omicron variant.⁸⁹⁻⁹¹ The problem of waning of vaccine-induced antibodies should also be factored in as protection conferred by vaccination can also decrease over time in immunized students, faculty, and staff members, highlighting the importance of continuation of non-pharmaceutical precautions.⁹²

While two-timepoint seroprevalence studies have been conducted in K-12 schools worldwide and in non-U.S. colleges/universities, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study of this kind conducted in U.S. colleges at the time of the Fall 2020 semester reopening.

The information obtained from our study regarding prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at the start of the Fall 2020 semester and 2 months later will hopefully provide knowledge on viral spread in the face of various preventive measures in place on campuses and can help inform future decision-making and planning.

The strengths of our study included the fact that even though enrollment and retention were lower than expected (45% and 37% at time point 1; 26% and 17% at time point 2 for Covenant and Geneva Colleges, respectively), timepoint 1 did give us a sampling of SARS-COV-2 antibody titer results for a sizeable number of returning students, faculty, and staff. These results were presented to each college to help guide them, if desired, in policy and safety precautions on their campuses. It is unknown how the results were interpreted by each college and if COVID-19 policy or practices were changed or updated as a result. Our study also benefited from the use of a self-administered finger stick test. The test itself is less invasive than a venipuncture blood draw and can be completed by the participant at their leisure and from their preferred location, demonstrating the utility of such self-administered assays in future outbreaks.

This study has several limitations that should be considered and could be addressed in future studies of similar design. First, enrollment and retention rates in the study were lower than expected. This could partly be explained by the relative novelty of COVID-19 and attendant testing and safety precautions at the period. Another plausible explanation could be that the waiver of consent did not offer enough education on the benefit of knowing one's SARS-CoV-2 antibody titer and thus participants were not interested in the study. Second, the fingerstick test itself may have led to low recruitment and retention. Some may have found the concept of self-pricking their finger not appealing or found that it was painful or difficult and declined a second testing. Third, participants may have been satisfied with their antibody result at timepoint 1 and

had no interest in completing a second testing. Fourth, no remuneration was offered for this study which also could have affected enrollment and retention. Lastly, the recruitment effort was very limited on resources and availability as the new semester started. The nursing staff that led this effort had little extra time available while trying to prepare the campus for the return of students and faculty during the pandemic.

In addition, the results of the study are limited in that they represent two unique small Christian liberal arts colleges with lower student, faculty, and staffing numbers as compared to larger public state universities. Additionally, as stated above, the administered questionnaire did not include questions regarding dates of reported infection or PCR tests which would be beneficial in interpreting seroprevalence rates in these individuals. Another important factor not addressed in the questionnaire was the clinical course of the reported infection, which would aid us in comparing our results with other reports of antibody seroprevalence based on disease presentation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study revealed increased rates of seropositivity to SARS-CoV-2 at study timepoint 2. Regardless, the occurrence of COVID-19 cases in institutions of higher education is inevitable. However, we believe that the implementation of strict preventive measures ranging from mandatory masking to quarantine requirements seem to be able to keep these risks close to that of the general population in the setting of high nationwide community transmission and surge of COVID-19 cases during the study period.

Currently, we are unaware of another research group attempting to track COVID-19 seroprevalence in US institutions of higher education during the start and end of a semester. Studies like these are important for better understanding whether current COVID-19 precautions

are sufficient or should be reassessed. We hope that our approach and study design will be of interest and benefit for others studying the prevalence and spread of SARS-CoV-2 or other emerging pathogens in select populations.

Funding: Intramurally funded by Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group

Acknowledgements

Covenant College and Geneva College, health Staff: Peyton B Carlson, MPAS, PA-C, Rebecca Mack RN, BSN and student workers: Connor Gilchrest, Audrey Kenney, Jacob Neiderhiser, Katryn Gatchell, and also the students and faculty and the President and administrators of these schools. Vibrant America: Vasanth Jayaraman.

Competing Interest

Dr. Poland offers consultative advice to Johnson & Johnson/Janssen Global Services LLC, and is the chair of a Safety Evaluation Committee for novel investigational vaccine trials being conducted by Merck Research Laboratories. Dr. Poland also offers consultative advice on vaccine development to Merck & Co., Medicago, GlaxoSmithKline, Sanofi Pasteur, Emergent Biosolutions, Dynavax, Genentech, Eli Lilly and Company, Kentucky Bioprocessing Inc, Bavarian Nordic, AstraZeneca, Exelixis, Regeneron, Janssen, Vyriad, Moderna, and Genevant Sciences, Inc. Drs. Poland and Ovsyannikova hold patents related to vaccinia and measles peptide vaccines. Drs. Kennedy, Poland, and Ovsyannikova hold a patent related to vaccinia peptide vaccines. Drs. Poland, Kennedy and Ovsyannikova hold a patent related to the impact of single nucleotide polymorphisms on measles vaccine immunity. Drs. Poland, Kennedy, and Ovsyannikova have received grant funding from ICW Ventures for preclinical studies on a peptide-based COVID-19 vaccine. Dr. Kennedy has received funding from Merck Research Laboratories to study waning immunity to mumps vaccine. Dr. Kennedy also offers consultative advice on vaccine development to Merck & Co. and Sanofi Pasteur. These activities have been reviewed by the Mayo Clinic Conflict of Interest Review Board and are conducted in compliance

with Mayo Clinic Conflict of Interest policies. This research has been reviewed by the Mayo Clinic Conflict of Interest Review Board and was conducted in compliance with Mayo Clinic Conflict of Interest policies.

REFERENCES

1. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. World Health Organization 2020. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>
2. COVID-19 Emergency Declaration. Federal Emergency Management Agency; 14 March 2020, 2020. <https://www.fema.gov/disaster/coronavirus/disaster-declarations>
3. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat Hum Behav.* Apr 2021;5(4):529-538. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8
4. Ballotpedia. School responses to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic during the 2020-2021 academic year. Accessed November 2, 2021. [https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_to_the_coronavirus_\(COVID-19\)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_academic_year](https://ballotpedia.org/School_responses_to_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic_during_the_2020-2021_academic_year)
5. Phillips M. Trump, in push to reopen schools amid coronavirus outbreak, vows 'pressure' on governors. Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/trump-reopen-schools-coronavirus-governors-pressure>
6. Redden E. CDC Issues New Guidance to Colleges. *Inside Higher Ed.* May 21, 2020 2020;
7. American College Health Association (ACHA). Considerations for Reopening Institutions of Higher Education in the COVID-19 Era. May 7, 2020 2020;
8. Gardner L. How College Leaders Are Planning for the Fall. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* April 17, 2020 2020;
9. Here's a List of Colleges' Reopening Models. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* August 28, 2020 2020;
10. Iuliano AD, Dawood FS, Silk BJ, et al. Investigating 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) in US schools: what have we learned? *Clin Infect Dis.* Jan 1 2011;52 Suppl 1:S161-7. doi:10.1093/cid/ciq032
11. Zivich PN, Eisenberg MC, Monto AS, et al. Transmission of viral pathogens in a social network of university students: the eX-FLU study. *Epidemiol Infect.* Aug 14 2020;148:e267. doi:10.1017/S0950268820001806
12. Soeters HM, McNamara LA, Blain AE, et al. University-Based Outbreaks of Meningococcal Disease Caused by Serogroup B, United States, 2013-2018. *Emerg Infect Dis.* Mar 2019;25(3):434-440. doi:10.3201/eid2503.181574
13. Kim A, Weeden BC. The Small-World Network of College Classes: Implications for Epidemic Spread on a University Campus. *Sociological Science.* 2020;7(9):222-241. doi:10.15195/v7.a9
14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guidance for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). CDC. Updated February 7, 2022. Accessed April 13, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-universities/considerations.html>

15. Walke HT, Honein MA, Redfield RR. Preventing and Responding to COVID-19 on College Campuses. *JAMA*. Nov 3 2020;324(17):1727-1728. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.20027
16. Salvatore PP, Sula E, Coyle JP, et al. Recent Increase in COVID-19 Cases Reported Among Adults Aged 18-22 Years - United States, May 31-September 5, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Oct 2 2020;69(39):1419-1424. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6939e4
17. Tracking the Coronavirus at U.S. Colleges and Universities. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-cases-tracker.html>
18. Kronbichler A, Kresse D, Yoon S, Lee KH, Effenberger M, Shin JI. Asymptomatic patients as a source of COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis*. Sep 2020;98:180-186. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.052
19. Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Sah P, et al. The implications of silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Jul 28 2020;117(30):17513-17515. doi:10.1073/pnas.2008373117
20. Nikolai LA, Meyer CG, Kreamsner PG, Velavan TP. Asymptomatic SARS Coronavirus 2 infection: Invisible yet invincible. *Int J Infect Dis*. Nov 2020;100:112-116. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.076
21. Doyle T, Kendrick K, Troelstrup T, et al. COVID-19 in Primary and Secondary School Settings During the First Semester of School Reopening - Florida, August-December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Mar 26 2021;70(12):437-441. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7012e2
22. Ismail SA, Saliba V, Lopez Bernal J, Ramsay ME, Ladhani SN. SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission in educational settings: a prospective, cross-sectional analysis of infection clusters and outbreaks in England. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Mar 2021;21(3):344-353. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30882-3
23. Stein-Zamir C, Abramson N, Shoob H, et al. A large COVID-19 outbreak in a high school 10 days after schools' reopening, Israel, May 2020. *Euro Surveill*. Jul 2020;25(29)doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.29.2001352
24. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics*. Apr 2021;147(4)doi:10.1542/peds.2020-048090
25. Snyder T, Ravenhurst J, Cramer EY, et al. Serological surveys to estimate cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in adults (Sero-MAss study), Massachusetts, July-August 2020: a mail-based cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. Aug 17 2021;11(8):e051157. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-051157
26. Cass AL, Slining MM, Carson C, et al. Risk Management of COVID-19 in the Residential Educational Setting: Lessons Learned and Implications for Moving Forward. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Sep 16 2021;18(18)doi:10.3390/ijerph18189743
27. Tilley K, Ayvazyan V, Martinez L, et al. A Cross-Sectional Study Examining the Seroprevalence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Antibodies in a University Student Population. *J Adolesc Health*. Dec 2020;67(6):763-768. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.09.001
28. Ladhani SN, Ireland G, Baawuah F, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection, antibody positivity and seroconversion rates in staff and students following full reopening of secondary schools in England: A prospective cohort study, September-December 2020. *EClinicalMedicine*. Jul 2021;37:100948. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100948
29. Kianersi S, Ludema C, Macy JT, et al. A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Demographic and Behavioral Risk Factors of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Seropositivity

- Among a Sample of U.S. College Students. *J Adolesc Health*. Aug 2021;69(2):219-226. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.05.003
30. US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). ACCELERATED EMERGENCY USE AUTHORIZATION (EUA) SUMMARY VIBRANT COVID-19 AB ASSAY (VIBRANT AMERICA CLINICAL LABS). Accessed November 2, 2021. <https://www.fda.gov/media/138629/download>
31. FDA. Vibrant COVID-19 Ab Assay - Letter of Authorization. <https://www.fda.gov/media/138626/download>
32. Sah P, Fitzpatrick MC, Zimmer CF, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Aug 24 2021;118(34)doi:10.1073/pnas.2109229118
33. Alene M, Yismaw L, Assemie MA, et al. Magnitude of asymptomatic COVID-19 cases throughout the course of infection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(3):e0249090. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0249090
34. Poletti P, Tirani M, Cereda D, et al. Association of Age With Likelihood of Developing Symptoms and Critical Disease Among Close Contacts Exposed to Patients With Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Italy. *JAMA Netw Open*. Mar 1 2021;4(3):e211085. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.1085
35. Jung CY, Park H, Kim DW, Choi YJ, Kim SW, Chang TI. Clinical Characteristics of Asymptomatic Patients with COVID-19: A Nationwide Cohort Study in South Korea. *Int J Infect Dis*. Oct 2020;99:266-268. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.001
36. Bajema KL, Wiegand RE, Cuffe K, et al. Estimated SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in the US as of September 2020. *JAMA Intern Med*. Apr 1 2021;181(4):450-460. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.7976
37. CDC. Nationwide Blood Donor Seroprevalence Survey. November 2, 2021. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#nationwide-blood-donor-seroprevalence>
38. Rostami A, Sepidarkish M, Leeftang MMG, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence worldwide: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Mar 2021;27(3):331-340. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.10.020
39. Bobrovitz N, Arora RK, Cao C, et al. Global seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0252617. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252617
40. Mugunga JC, Tyagi K, Bernal-Serrano D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 serosurveys in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*. Jan 30 2021;397(10272):353-355. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00188-4
41. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med*. Jun 2020;26(6):845-848. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0897-1
42. Arkhipova-Jenkins I, Helfand M, Armstrong C, et al. Antibody Response After SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Implications for Immunity : A Rapid Living Review. *Ann Intern Med*. Jun 2021;174(6):811-821. doi:10.7326/M20-7547
43. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, et al. Persistence and decay of human antibody responses to the receptor binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol*. Oct 8 2020;5(52)doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abe0367
44. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med*. Jul 2020;26(7):1033-1036. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0913-5

45. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in Patients With Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*. Nov 19 2020;71(16):2027-2034. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa344
46. Prevost J, Gasser R, Beaudoin-Bussieres G, et al. Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Humoral Responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike. *Cell Rep Med*. Oct 20 2020;1(7):100126. doi:10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100126
47. Masia M, Telenti G, Fernandez M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion and Viral Clearance in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19: Viral Load Predicts Antibody Response. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. Feb 2021;8(2):ofab005. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofab005
48. Orner EP, Rodgers MA, Hock K, et al. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG seroconversion profiles among hospitalized patients in two US cities. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. Apr 2021;99(4):115300. doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2020.115300
49. Wajnberg A, Amanat F, Firpo A, et al. Robust neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 infection persist for months. *Science*. Dec 4 2020;370(6521):1227-1230. doi:10.1126/science.abd7728
50. Roltgen K, Powell AE, Wirz OF, et al. Defining the features and duration of antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with disease severity and outcome. *Sci Immunol*. Dec 7 2020;5(54):doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abe0240
51. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science*. Feb 5 2021;371(6529):doi:10.1126/science.abf4063
52. Ibarondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. Sep 10 2020;383(11):1085-1087. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2025179
53. Di Germanio C, Simmons G, Kelly K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody persistence in COVID-19 convalescent plasma donors: Dependency on assay format and applicability to serosurveillance. *Transfusion*. Sep 2021;61(9):2677-2687. doi:10.1111/trf.16555
54. Prus K, Alquist CR, Cancelas JA, Oh D. Decrease in serum antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent plasma donors over time. *Transfusion*. Feb 2021;61(2):651-654. doi:10.1111/trf.16172
55. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*. Aug 2020;26(8):1200-1204. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0965-6
56. Perreault J, Tremblay T, Fournier MJ, et al. Waning of SARS-CoV-2 RBD antibodies in longitudinal convalescent plasma samples within 4 months after symptom onset. *Blood*. Nov 26 2020;136(22):2588-2591. doi:10.1182/blood.2020008367
57. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis*. Jul 28 2020;71(15):778-785. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa310
58. CDC. Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers, CDC 2019-nCoV Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. Updated July 21, 2021. Accessed November 2, 2021. <https://www.fda.gov/media/134920/download>
59. Healy B, Khan A, Metezai H, Blyth I, Asad H. The impact of false positive COVID-19 results in an area of low prevalence. *Clin Med (Lond)*. Jan 2021;21(1):e54-e56. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2020-0839

60. Basile K, Maddocks S, Kok J, Dwyer DE. Accuracy amidst ambiguity: false positive SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid tests when COVID-19 prevalence is low. *Pathology*. Dec 2020;52(7):809-811. doi:10.1016/j.pathol.2020.09.009
61. Morley GL, Taylor S, Jossi S, et al. Sensitive Detection of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibodies in Dried Blood Spot Samples. *Emerg Infect Dis*. Dec 2020;26(12):2970-2973. doi:10.3201/eid2612.203309
62. McDade TW, McNally EM, Zelikovich AS, et al. High seroprevalence for SARS-CoV-2 among household members of essential workers detected using a dried blood spot assay. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(8):e0237833. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0237833
63. Thevis M, Knoop A, Schaefer MS, et al. Can dried blood spots (DBS) contribute to conducting comprehensive SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests? *Drug Test Anal*. Jul 2020;12(7):994-997. doi:10.1002/dta.2816
64. Turgeon CT, Sanders KA, Granger D, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in dried blood spots. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. Sep 2021;101(1):115425. doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2021.115425
65. Brinc D, Biondi MJ, Li D, et al. Evaluation of Dried Blood Spot Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Serology Using a Quantitative Commercial Assay. *Viruses*. May 22 2021;13(6)doi:10.3390/v13060962
66. Dogan M, Kozhaya L, Placek L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody and neutralization assays reveal the wide range of the humoral immune response to virus. *Commun Biol*. Jan 29 2021;4(1):129. doi:10.1038/s42003-021-01649-6
67. Li K, Huang B, Wu M, et al. Dynamic changes in anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies during SARS-CoV-2 infection and recovery from COVID-19. *Nat Commun*. Nov 27 2020;11(1):6044. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19943-y
68. Algaissi A, Alfaleh MA, Hala S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 S1 and N-based serological assays reveal rapid seroconversion and induction of specific antibody response in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Rep*. Oct 6 2020;10(1):16561. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-73491-5
69. Li D, Li J. Immunologic Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Infection from the Antigen Perspective. *J Clin Microbiol*. Apr 20 2021;59(5)doi:10.1128/JCM.02160-20
70. de Assis RR, Jain A, Nakajima R, et al. Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in COVID-19 convalescent blood using a coronavirus antigen microarray. *Nat Commun*. Jan 4 2021;12(1):6. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-20095-2
71. Semmler G, Traugott MT, Graninger M, et al. Assessment of S1-, S2-, and NCP-Specific IgM, IgA, and IgG Antibody Kinetics in Acute SARS-CoV-2 Infection by a Microarray and Twelve Other Immunoassays. *J Clin Microbiol*. Apr 20 2021;59(5)doi:10.1128/JCM.02890-20
72. Maine GN, Lao KM, Krishnan SM, et al. Longitudinal characterization of the IgM and IgG humoral response in symptomatic COVID-19 patients using the Abbott Architect. *J Clin Virol*. Dec 2020;133:104663. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104663
73. Luo C, Liu M, Li Q, et al. Dynamic changes and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM antibodies: Analysis of multiple factors. *Int J Infect Dis*. Jul 2021;108:57-62. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.04.078
74. Terpos E, Stellas D, Rosati M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody kinetics eight months from COVID-19 onset: Persistence of spike antibodies but loss of neutralizing antibodies in 24% of convalescent plasma donors. *Eur J Intern Med*. Jul 2021;89:87-96. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2021.05.010

75. Woo PC, Lau SK, Wong BH, et al. Longitudinal profile of immunoglobulin G (IgG), IgM, and IgA antibodies against the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) coronavirus nucleocapsid protein in patients with pneumonia due to the SARS coronavirus. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol*. Jul 2004;11(4):665-8. doi:10.1128/CDLI.11.4.665-668.2004
76. Ortega N, Ribes M, Vidal M, et al. Seven-month kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and role of pre-existing antibodies to human coronaviruses. *Nat Commun*. Aug 6 2021;12(1):4740. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-24979-9
77. Choudhary HR, Parai D, Dash GC, et al. IgG antibody response against nucleocapsid and spike protein post-SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Infection*. Oct 2021;49(5):1045-1048. doi:10.1007/s15010-021-01651-4
78. Angelika Wagner AG, Johanna Ruff, Joanna Jasinska, Ute Scheickl, Ines Zwazl, Michael Kundi, Hannes Stockinger, Maria R. Farcet, Thomas R. Kreil, Eva Hoeltl, Ursula Wiedermann. Neutralising SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific antibodies persist for at least six months independently of symptoms in adults. *Communications Medicine*. 2021;113. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-021-00012-4>
79. Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, et al. Evaluation of Nucleocapsid and Spike Protein-Based Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays for Detecting Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol*. May 26 2020;58(6)doi:10.1128/JCM.00461-20
80. Torres Reyes CRS, E.; Timmesfeld, N.; Trampisch, H.-J.; Stein, J.; Schütte, C.; Skrygan, M.; Meyer, T.; Sakinc-Güler, T.; Schlottmann, R.; Brüggemann, Y.; Todt, D.; Walker, A.; Lübke, N.; Quast, D.R.; Schmidt, W.E. . Students in Dormitories Were Not Major Drivers of the Pandemic during Winter Term 2020/2021: A Cohort Study with RT-PCR and Antibody Surveillance in a German University City. . *COVID 2021*. 2021;1(1):345-356. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/covid1010029>
81. Jehn M, Mac McCullough J, Dale AP, et al. Association Between K-12 School Mask Policies and School-Associated COVID-19 Outbreaks - Maricopa and Pima Counties, Arizona, July-August 2021. *Mmwr-Morbid Mortal W*. Oct 1 2021;70(39):1372-1373.
82. Budzyn SE, Panaggio MJ, Parks SE, et al. Pediatric COVID-19 Cases in Counties With and Without School Mask Requirements - United States, July 1-September 4, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Oct 1 2021;70(39):1377-1378. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7039e3
83. Boutzoukas AE, Zimmerman KO, Inkelas M, et al. School Masking Policies and Secondary SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. *Pediatrics*. Mar 9 2022;doi:10.1542/peds.2022-056687
84. Cooper DM, Zulu MZ, Jankeel A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 acquisition and immune pathogenesis among school-aged learners in four diverse schools. *Pediatr Res*. Jul 24 2021;doi:10.1038/s41390-021-01660-x
85. Gillespie DL, Meyers LA, Lachmann M, Redd SC, Zenilman JM. The Experience of 2 Independent Schools With In-Person Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Sch Health*. May 2021;91(5):347-355. doi:10.1111/josh.13008
86. Leidner AJ, Barry V, Bowen VB, et al. Opening of Large Institutions of Higher Education and County-Level COVID-19 Incidence - United States, July 6-September 17, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Jan 8 2021;70(1):14-19. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7001a4
87. Lu H, Weintz C, Pace J, Indana D, Linka K, Kuhl E. Are college campuses superspreaders? A data-driven modeling study. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin*. Aug 2021;24(10):1136-1145. doi:10.1080/10255842.2020.1869221
88. Moghadas SM, Vilches TN, Zhang K, et al. The impact of vaccination on COVID-19 outbreaks in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 30 2021;doi:10.1093/cid/ciab079

89. Planas D, Veyer D, Baidaliuk A, et al. Reduced sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta to antibody neutralization. *Nature*. Aug 2021;596(7871):276-280. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03777-9
90. Mlcochova P, Kemp SA, Dhar MS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 Delta variant replication and immune evasion. *Nature*. Sep 6 2021;doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03944-y
91. Liu C, Ginn HM, Dejnirattisai W, et al. Reduced neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 by vaccine and convalescent serum. *Cell*. Aug 5 2021;184(16):4220-4236 e13. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.06.020
92. Gozzi N, Bajardi P, Perra N. The importance of non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. *PLoS Comput Biol*. Sep 2021;17(9):e1009346. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009346

Appendices

Appendix 1.

Study implementation for each college

Geneva College:

The study was advertised in the student and parent “FYI” news email sent out prior to arriving on campus in August 2020. Each student was also given a study flyer during the dorm check-in time. Faculty and staff also received study flyers. Students, Faculty, and staff were also reminded to complete the study several additional times with study flyers put in their campus mailboxes and via college emails. Information was also posted on Geneva’s health services social media accounts (Facebook and Instagram).

Finger stick kits and waivers of consent were distributed by health services staff and nursing students from a tent setup on the campus grounds. Participants were informed about a drop-box outside of the campus mail room to deposit test kits. Kits were then sent back to Vibrant America for testing.

During the second wave of testing, a distribution center was setup in a campus building or via tents, weather permitting. Qualifying participants were sent emails during the second wave of testing reminding participants to complete the finger stick test. Lastly, finger stick test kits were placed in campus mailboxes of those who still had not completed the study during the final days of testing.

Covenant College:

The study was advertised to students, faculty, and staff through email, campus study flyers, and an article printed in the student newspaper. Finger stick kits were picked up and dropped off at several locations around campus. Finger stick kits and waivers of consent were distributed by Student Development and Health Services staff.

During the second wave of testing, finger stick kits were picked up and dropped off at the same locations around campus. Qualifying participants were sent emails during the second wave of testing reminding participants to complete the finger stick test. Lastly, finger stick test kits were placed in campus mailboxes of those who still had not completed the study during the final days of testing.

Each college had their own approach to preparing and advocating for COVID-19 precautions during the Fall semester. These precautions fit into 6 criteria (screening, sanitization, social distancing, quarantining, masking, and college culture) which are outlined in Appendix 2.

Appendix 2.

Covenant College COVID-19 precautions

COVID-19 Screening

Students needed to have a negative PCR nasal swab test or negative antigen test 5-7 days prior to their arrival date on campus. Students could also present a positive case from the previous 90 days (not to include the previous 10 days) or a positive antibody test from the past 30 days. Once on campus, all students, faculty, and staff were asked to review COVID-19 screening questions and take their temperature daily access for COVID-19 symptoms, daily.

Sanitization

All students, faculty and staff were asked to follow public health practices including frequent handwashing or usage of alcohol-based hand sanitizer, proper respiratory etiquette including covering coughs and sneezes, and observing all rules for wiping down equipment and workstations on campus as directed.

Social Distancing

All students, faculty and staff were asked to stay at least six feet apart from others and eliminate nonessential physical touch (for example, replace handshakes and hugs with elbow bumps). All classrooms were set up to permit six feet of distance between seats. Plexiglass shields were installed in high traffic/high concentration service areas to protect the most vulnerable.

Quarantining

Students diagnosed who tested positive for COVID-19 were required to quarantine. Students who reported close contact with or cared for someone with documented or suspected COVID-19 within the last 14 days or had a new onset of symptoms consistent with viral illness such as fever of 100.4° or greater, cough, shortness of breath or difficulty breathing, chills, muscle pain, sore throat, nausea/diarrhea, or new loss of taste or smell were told to remain in their place of residence and monitor themselves for other symptoms. Along with empty rooms on each hall, the college set aside two halls, three apartments, and rental houses where students who tested positive or were symptomatic could be isolated should they be unable to return home.

Masks

All students, faculty and staff were required to wear face coverings when indoors in public areas.

College Culture

As a Christian College, Covenant communicated to students, faculty, and staff it was because they did not want to get others sick and that they should faithfully maintain good hygienic practices, daily self-screening, and stay home if necessary and it was out of concern for the most vulnerable that they wear masks and physically distance themselves when the situation called for it, regardless of personal preferences or convictions.

A document called the Covenant Commitment was created by Covenant College outlining the precautions above was handed out to students, staff, and employees. This information was also made available electronically on the college's website.

At the conclusion of this study, campus staff acknowledged that students, staff, and employees overall adhered to the standards set forth. However, they acknowledged that these standards were not fully upheld by all members on campus.

Geneva College COVID-19 precautions

COVID-19 Screening

All members of the Geneva College community, including students, faculty, staff, visitors, and independent contractors, were asked to review COVID-19 screening questions and take their temperature daily. Unlike Covenant College, Geneva did not require students to have a negative PCR or antibody SARS-CoV-2 test prior to returning to campus.

Sanitization

Hand sanitizer stations were placed at entrances and exits to every building. Cleaning products were made available to wipe down tables and desks before and after classes.

Social Distancing

All students, faculty, and staff were asked to stay at least six feet apart to avoid SARS-CoV-2 exposure and slow its spread. Plexiglass dividers were installed in cafeteria areas and seats were spaced at 6-foot intervals. A 10-12-foot buffer space was put in place between faculty to the first row of students in each classroom.

Quarantining

If a student answered yes to a COVID-19 screening question (i.e., a fever $\geq 100.4^{\circ}$ F) with either a temporal or oral thermometer, and/or symptoms of acute respiratory illness (i.e. dry cough, shortness of breath, new onset of lack of taste and/or smell, new onset of nasal congestion or runny nose, new onset of nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, chills or repeated shaking chills, headache, sore throat, and/or muscle aches) the student was quarantined in a quarantine room and roommates were quarantined in their house or apartment until the sick student's test was reported. If the sick student was in a traditional dorm with a shared bathroom, then the roommate was also placed in a quarantine room with their own bathroom until the sick roommate's COVID-19 test results were available. If the sick roommate tested positive, then all roommates and contacts were tested for COVID-19 via PCR testing.

Masks

All students, staff, faculty, and independent contractors were asked to wear a mask while on campus parameters.

College Culture

As a Christian College, Geneva communicated to students, faculty, and staff that they are committed to cultivating a living and learning community consistent with their mission to equip students for faithful and fruitful service to God and neighbor but also stressed the need to be vigilant, unified, and follow CDC safety guidelines.

A document outlining the precautions above was handed out to students, staff, and faculty. This information was also made available electronically on the college's website. At the conclusion of this study, campus staff acknowledged screening efforts by students, staff, faculty as poor starting about mid-semester.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Study Participants

	Covenant (N=305)	Geneva (N=671)	Total (N=976)	P-Value
Age				
N-Miss	8	22	30	0.284 ¹
Median	21	21	21	
Q1, Q3	20, 32	19, 30	19, 31	
Range	18 - 74	18 - 83	18 - 83	
Job				
N-Miss	8	3	11	< 0.001 ²
Student	192 (64.6%)	527 (78.9%)	719 (74.5%)	
Faculty	105 (35.4%)	141 (21.1%)	246 (25.5%)	
Sex				
N-Miss	1	1	2	< 0.001 ²
Female	191 (62.8%)	341 (50.9%)	532 (54.6%)	
Male	113 (37.2%)	329 (49.1%)	442 (45.4%)	
Race				
N-Miss	3	10	13	0.865 ²
African	4 (1.3%)	15 (2.3%)	19 (2.0%)	
American				
American Indian	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.3%)	3 (0.3%)	
Asian	8 (2.6%)	13 (2.0%)	21 (2.2%)	

Hispanic	6 (2.0%)	19 (2.9%)	25 (2.6%)
Native Hawaiian	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.2%)
Other	4 (1.3%)	11 (1.7%)	15 (1.6%)
White	278 (92.1%)	600 (90.8%)	878 (91.2%)

1. Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test
2. Pearson's Chi-squared test
3. Miss: missing

Table 2. Antibody seropositivity, prior COVID-19 and antibody testing history at timepoint 1

	Covenant College		Geneva College	
	Student (N=192)	Faculty/Staff (N=105)	Student (N=527)	Faculty/Staff (N=141)
SARS-CoV2 IgG Positive	3 (1.6%)	3 (2.9%)	9 (1.7%)	2 (1.4%)
SARS-CoV2 IgM Positive	3 (1.6%)	2 (1.9%)	3 (0.6%)	2 (1.4%)
SARS-CoV2 IgG and IgM Positive	2 (1.0%)	2 (1.9%)	3 (0.6%)	2 (1.4%)
SARS-CoV2 IgG or IgM Positive	4 (2.1%)	3 (2.9%)	9 (1.7%)	2 (1.4%)
Total Self-Reported prior PCR Positives	13 (6.8%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (0.9%)	4 (2.8%)
Total Self-Reported prior Antibody Positives	1 (0.5%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)

* 8 participants at Covenant College and 3 at Geneva College who we were unable to classify as student or faculty are excluded from table.


Table 3. Antibody seropositivity, prior COVID-19 and antibody testing history at timepoint 2




	Covenant College		Geneva College	
	Student (N=121)	Faculty/Staff (N=77)	Student (N=431)	Faculty/Staff (N=122)
SARS-CoV2 IgG Positive	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (4.4%)	3 (2.5%)
SARS-CoV2 IgM Positive	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.4%)	3 (2.5%)
SARS-CoV2 IgG and IgM Positive	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.4%)	3 (2.5%)
SARS-CoV2 IgG or IgM Positive	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (4.4%)	3 (2.5%)
Total Self-Reported prior PCR Positives	6 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (2.3%)	6 (4.9%)
Total Self-Reported prior Antibody Positives	1 (0.8%)	3 (3.9%)	7 (1.6%)	4 (3.3%)

Table 4. Total Students and Faculty with a Positive COVID-19 Test or Quarantined

	Covenant College		Geneva College	
	Student	Faculty	Student	Faculty
COVID-19 Positive Cases	25 (3%)	10 (3%)	64 (6%)	15 (4%)
Quarantined	155 (18%)	6 (2%)	546 (50%)	76 (19%)

Supplemental Figure 1. Correlations between antibody responses (in CUs) to each of the tested antigens in Geneva (**a**) and Covenant (**b**) cohorts at two timepoints



a**Visit 1****Visit 2****b****Visit 1****Visit 2**