

1 **SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in a University Community: A Longitudinal Study of the Impact of**
2 **Student Return to Campus on Infection Risk Among Community Members**

3
4 *Arnold, Callum R.K. (MSc)^{1,2}; *Srinivasan, Sreenidhi (PhD)^{2,3}; Herzog, Catherine M.
5 (PhD)^{2,3}; Gontu, Abhinay (MVSc)⁴; Bharti, Nita (PhD)^{1,2}; Small, Meg (PhD)^{5,6}; Rogers,
6 Connie J. (PhD)⁷; Schade, Margeaux M. (PhD)⁵; Kuchipudi, Suresh V^{2,4} (PhD); Kapur,
7 Vivek (PhD)^{2,3,8}; Read, Andrew (D.Phil)^{1,2,3}; Ferrari, Matthew J. (PhD)^{1,2}
8

9 **Author affiliations:**

10 ¹Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA 16802

11 ²Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
12 PA, USA 16802

13 ³Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA,
14 USA 16802

15 ⁴Department of Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, Pennsylvania State University,
16 University Park, PA, USA 16802

17 ⁵College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
18 PA, USA 16802

19 ⁶Social Science Research Institute, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
20 16802

21 ⁷Department of Nutritional Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA,
22 USA 16802

23 ⁸Department of Animal Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
24 16802

25
26 * *Contributed equally*
27

28 **Corresponding author:** Ferrari, Matthew J. mjf283@psu.edu

29 **Word count:** 3056
30

31 **ABSTRACT (250 WORDS)**

32 **Background**

33 Returning university students represent large-scale, transient demographic shifts and a
34 potential source of transmission to adjacent communities during the COVID-19 pandemic.
35

36 **Methods**

37 In this prospective longitudinal cohort study, we tested for IgG antibodies against SARS-
38 CoV-2 in a non-random cohort of residents living in Centre County prior to the Fall 2020
39 term at the Pennsylvania State University and following the conclusion of the Fall 2020 term.
40 We also report the seroprevalence in a non-random cohort of students collected at the end of
41 the Fall 2020 term.
42

43 **Findings**

44 Of 345 community participants, 19 (5.5%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies at
45 their first visit between 7 August and 2 October. Of 625 student participants who returned to
46 campus for fall instruction, 195 (31.2%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies between
47 26 October and 23 November. Twenty-eight (8.1%) community participants returned a
48 positive IgG antibody result by 9 December. Only contact with known SARS-CoV-2-positive

49 individuals and attendance at small gatherings (20-50 individuals) were significant predictors
50 of detecting IgG antibodies among returning students (aOR, 95% CI: 3·24, 2·14-4·91; 1·62,
51 1·08-2·44; respectively).

52 **Interpretation**

53 Despite high seroprevalence observed within the student population, seroprevalence in a
54 longitudinal cohort of community residents was low and stable from before student arrival for
55 the Fall 2020 term to after student departure. The study implies that heterogeneity in SARS-
56 CoV-2 transmission can occur in geographically coincident populations.

57 **Funding**

58 The Pennsylvania State University Office of the Provost, Social Science Research Institute,
59 Huck Institute for the Life Sciences, and Clinical and Translational Science Institute;
60 National Institutes of Health.
61

62 RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

63 Evidence before this study

64 This study was initiated in Spring of 2020, during the pandemic but prior to the return of
65 students to US universities. There was no prior research on the consequences of the return to
66 in-person university instruction on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. While the explicit case of
67 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between student and resident communities was poorly
68 understood at the start of this study, there is a well-established literature that has documented
69 the role that large population movements, consistent with the return of students to campuses,
70 play in the introduction and maintenance of pathogen transmission or diseases. Several
71 studies documented the role of travelers in the introduction of SARS-CoV-2 to populations.
72 The return of students to colleges and universities creates the potential for SARS-CoV-2
73 introduction and transmission with a sustained increase in population size, density, and
74 mixing. No prior study has considered the long-term transmission consequences of such
75 demographic change on the pre-influx population. We searched PubMed, medRxiv, bioRxiv,
76 and Google Scholar between May 2020 and September 2020. We used search terms
77 “seroprevalence”, “anti-SARS-CoV-2”, “IgG”, “COVID antibodies” and “university”,
78 “college”. Several modeling studies had been conducted to project likely prevalence of anti-
79 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in student and resident populations resulting from the return of
80 students to in-person instruction in the Fall 2020 term in the US and UK. Several studies
81 conducted after September 2020 described the county-level incidence of SARS-CoV-2 in
82 counties that contain colleges and universities. None of these studies specifically
83 disaggregated the incidence of COVID in resident and student populations.
84

85 Added value of this study

86 There is clear evidence that in-person university instruction is correlated with high incidence
87 in students and higher incidence in counties with colleges and universities in counties those
88 without such institutions. However, this is the first study to specifically quantify the change
89 in seroprevalence in non-student residents associated with the return of students to in-person
90 instruction in a large university setting. Despite high COVID-19 incidence in the student
91 population, seroprevalence in the community resident cohort was low and stable from before
92 student arrival for the Fall 2020 term until after student departure. The results of this study
93 highlight the potential for significant heterogeneity in incidence in geographically coincident
94 sub-populations.
95

96 Implications of all the available evidence

97 The influx of students into college and university towns reflects a significant increase in
98 population size and density that could result in increases in COVID-19 risk in surrounding
99 communities. Despite the potential risk, it is possible that SARS-CoV-2 transmission may lag
100 behind in surrounding communities This implies the potential to minimize the transmission
101 of SARS-CoV-2 from high prevalence sub-populations with targeted interventions. Future
102 work should investigate the relative efficacy of specific measures to reduce risk of
103 transmission between subpopulations and guide communities with high levels of episodic
104 migration and similar high-density subpopulations.
105

106

107 **BACKGROUND**

108 Demographic shifts, high population densities, and population mobility are known to impact
109 the spread of infectious diseases.¹⁻⁵ While this has been well characterized at large scales⁶⁻⁸,
110 it has proved more challenging to demonstrate at smaller geographic scales.⁹⁻¹¹ In the context
111 of the COVID-19 pandemic, the return of college and university students to in-person and
112 hybrid (in-person and online) instruction in the Fall 2020 term represented a massive
113 demographic shift in many communities in the United States (US); specifically, increased
114 total population and proportion living in high density living facilities, with a concomitant
115 increase in person-to-person interactions.¹² This shift had the potential to increase SARS-
116 CoV-2 transmission within returning student populations and to surrounding community
117 resident populations, particularly for non-urban campuses where incidence lagged behind
118 larger population centers.¹³ Modeling analyses conducted prior to student return raised
119 concerns that university re-opening would result in significant SARS-CoV-2 transmission in
120 both the returning student and community resident populations.^{14,15}

121 During the Fall 2020 term, many universities in the US experienced high rates of COVID-19
122 cases among students,¹⁶ with a 56% increase in incidence among counties home to large
123 colleges or universities relative to matched counties without such institutions.¹² While there is
124 strong evidence of high incidence rates associated with a return to campus at US colleges and
125 universities,¹² the increase in risk in surrounding communities, and the rate of transmission
126 from campuses to communities, have been less well characterized. The observed increases in
127 COVID-19 cases in these communities cannot be explicitly attributed to campus origin,
128 absent detailed contact tracing.

129 This investigation reports the results of a longitudinal serosurvey of community residents in
130 Centre County, Pennsylvania, USA, which is home to The Pennsylvania State University

131 (PSU), University Park (UP) campus. The return of approximately 35,000 students to the UP
132 campus in August 2020 represented a nearly 20% increase in the county population size.¹⁷
133 During the Fall 2020 term, more than 4,500 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infections were detected
134 among the student population.¹⁸ Between 7 August and 2 October 2020 (before and just after
135 student return), we enrolled a cohort of community residents and tested serum for the
136 presence of anti-Spike Receptor Binding Domain (S/RBD) IgG, which would indicate prior
137 SARS-CoV-2 exposure.¹⁹ This was repeated in the same cohort during December 2020 (post-
138 departure of students), and we present seroprevalence for both sampling waves. Additionally,
139 returning students were enrolled in a longitudinal cohort, and IgG seroprevalence results are
140 presented from the first wave of sampling (between October and November 2020, prior to the
141 end of the term). The hypothesis tested was that the rapid influx of students during the Fall
142 2020 term would be correlated with increased prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 within the
143 geographically co-incident community.

144 **METHODS**

145 **Design, Setting, and Participants**

146 This human subjects research was conducted with PSU Institutional Review Board approval
147 and in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study uses a longitudinal cohort
148 design, with two separate cohorts: community residents and returning students. We report on
149 measures from the first two clinic visits for the community resident cohort and the first clinic
150 visit for the returning student cohort.

151 To assist with recruitment into studies under the Data4Action (D4A) Centre County COVID
152 Cohort Study umbrella, a REDCap survey was distributed to residents of Centre County,
153 where respondents could indicate interest in participating in future studies and provide
154 demographic data. Returning students received a similar survey to express interest in study
155 participation and were also recruited through cold-emails and word-of-mouth.

156 Individuals were eligible for participation in the community resident cohort if they were: ≥ 18
157 years old, residing in Centre County at the time of recruitment (June through September
158 2020); expecting to reside in Centre County until June 2021; fluent in English; and capable of
159 providing their own consent. PSU students who remained in Centre County through spring
160 and summer university closure were eligible for inclusion in the community resident cohort
161 as this group experienced similar geographic COVID-19 risks as community residents
162 (versus returning students who experienced variable risk during spring and summer
163 depending on their residence).

164 Participants were eligible for participation in the returning student cohort if they were: ≥ 18
165 years old; fluent in English; capable of providing their own consent; residing in Centre
166 County at the time of recruitment (October 2020); officially enrolled as PSU UP students for
167 the Fall 2020 term; and intended to be living in Centre County through April 2021.

168 In both cohorts, individuals were invited to participate in the survey-only portion of the study
169 if they were: lactating, pregnant, or intended to become pregnant in the next 12 months;
170 unable to wear a mask for the clinic visit; demonstrated acute COVID-19 symptoms within
171 the previous 14 days; or reported a health condition that made them uncomfortable with
172 participating in the clinic visit.

173 Upon enrollment, returning students were supplied with a REDCap survey to examine socio-
174 behavioral phenomena, such as attendance at gatherings and adherence to non-
175 pharmaceutical interventions, in addition to information pertaining to their travel history and
176 contact with individuals who were known or suspected of being positive for SARS-CoV-2.
177 Community residents received similar surveys at both time points with questions relating to
178 potential SARS-CoV-2 household exposures. All eligible participants were scheduled for a
179 clinical visit at each time interval where blood samples were collected for ELISA testing.

180 **Outcomes**

181 The primary outcome was the presence of S/RBD IgG antibodies, measured using an indirect
182 isotype-specific (IgG) screening ELISA developed at PSU.²⁰ Further details in the
183 Supplement. The presence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies has been documented in prior
184 seroprevalence studies as a method of quantifying cumulative exposure.^{21–23}

185 **Statistical Methods**

186 Community resident and returning student cohorts' seroprevalence are presented with
187 binomial 95% confidence intervals. We estimated each subgroup's true prevalence,
188 accounting for imperfect sensitivity and specificity of the IgG assay, using the *truePrev()*
189 function in the *prevalence* package in R. We calculated a 95% binomial confidence interval
190 for test sensitivity of the IgG assay for detecting prior self-reported positive tests in the
191 returning student cohort (students had high access to testing from a common University
192 provider) and assumed a uniform prior distribution between these limits. Estimates of the true
193 prevalence were then calculated across all possible values of specificity between 0.85 and
194 0.99. We did not estimate prevalence corrected for demographics as participants were not
195 enrolled using a probability-based sample. We assessed demographic characteristics of the
196 tested participants relative to all study participants to illustrate potential selection biases
197 (Table 1).

198 For contingency tables and raw odds ratios, we used two-sided Fisher's exact test to
199 determine significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ and present 95% confidence intervals. Pairwise
200 Fisher's exact test of proportions was used with the Bonferroni-Holm correction in the $r \times c$
201 case, and Welch's two-sample t-test to compare distributions.

202 Missing values were deemed "Missing At Random" and imputed, as described in the
203 Supplement. We estimated the adjusted odds ratios (aOR) of IgG positivity in the returning
204 student subgroup using multivariable logistic regression implemented with the *mice* and

205 *finalfit* packages. We considered the following risk factors: close proximity (6 feet or less) to
206 an individual who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2; close proximity to an individual showing
207 key COVID-19 symptoms (fever, cough, shortness of breath); attendance at a small gathering
208 (20-50 people) in the past 3 months; attendance at a medium gathering (51-200 people) in the
209 past 3 months; live in University housing; ate in a restaurant in the past 7 days; ate in a dining
210 hall in the past 7 days; only ate in their room/apartment in the past 7 days; travelled in the 3
211 months prior to returning to campus; and travelled since returning to campus for the Fall
212 term. Given the airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2, all the above variables are potential
213 exposure risks due to the increased contact with individuals outside of a participants'
214 household.²⁴⁻²⁷

215 All statistical analyses were conducted using R – version 4.03 (2020-10-10), with a pipeline
216 created using the *targets* package.

217 **Role of the Funding Source**

218 This research was supported by funding from the Office of the Provost and the Clinical and
219 Translational Science Institute, Huck Life Sciences Institute, and Social Science Research
220 Institutes at the Pennsylvania State University. The project described was supported by the
221 National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health, through
222 Grant UL1 TR002014. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not
223 necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The funding sources had no role in the
224 collection, analysis, interpretation, or writing of the report.

225

226 **RESULTS**

227 A total of 10,369 community residents were identified through an initial REDCap survey that
228 collected eligibility, demographic, and contact information. Of those who identified

229 willingness to participate in a later study, 1,540 were contacted and enrolled. 1,432
230 completed a first clinic visit between 7 August and 2 October 2020, and 345 of those
231 completed a second clinic visit between 30 November and 9 December 2020 and for whom
232 both visit 1 and visit 2 samples were analysed using the in-house ELISA assay; the remaining
233 participants' samples will be analysed in the future. 1,349 returning students were recruited
234 using volunteer sampling and 707 enrolled; of these, 625 completed clinic visits for serum
235 collection between 26 October and 23 November. 642 students indicated willingness to
236 participate but did not complete intake procedures or did not attend their scheduled clinic
237 visit.

238 Among participants with serum samples: the median age community residents was 47 years
239 (IQR: 35·0-60·0), with 81·7% between the ages 18-65 years, and for the returning students
240 the median age was 20·9 years (IQR: 19·7-21·6), with 100% between the ages 18-65 years;
241 62·0% of the community residents identified as female and 33·6% as male; 64·6% of the
242 returning students identified as female and 34·4% as male; 90·1% of the community residents
243 identified as white, as did 81·3% of the students. Similar proportions were seen in those
244 enrolled without samples, and among the initial REDCap survey respondents (Table 1; Table
245 2).

246 Although all county residents were eligible for participation, 77·0% of community resident
247 participants were from the 5 townships (College, Ferguson, Harris, Half Moon, Patton) and 1
248 borough (State College) that form the “Centre Region” and account for ~59% of Centre
249 County's population¹⁷ (Figure 1). The median household income group in the community
250 residents providing samples was \$100,000-149,999 USD (IQR: \$50,000-74,999; \$100,000-
251 149,999). The median household income in the county is \$60,403.¹⁷ 47·4% of the county is
252 female, 87·9% white, and 70·3% are between the ages of 18-65 years old.¹⁷ The study cohort

253 is moderately older and more affluent (in part because of the exclusion of returning students),
254 and disproportionately female compared to the general Centre County population.

255 Of the returning student participants, 665 (94.1%) had at least one test prior to enrollment in
256 the study; of these, 105 (15.8%) self-reported a positive result (Table 3). Of these, 98 (93.3%)
257 indicated that this test result occurred after their return to campus (median: 26 September;
258 IQR: 13 September, 9 October). Of the 625 returning students with an ELISA result, 84 of
259 the 90 (93.3%) with a self-reported prior positive test result were positive for SARS-CoV-2
260 IgG antibodies. Of the 535 returning students with ELISA results who did not report a
261 positive SARS-CoV-2 test, 111 (20.7%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. Of
262 the total 625 returning students with ELISA results, 195 (31.2%) were positive for SARS-
263 CoV-2 IgG antibodies (Figure 2).

264 Among the community resident participants, 19 of 345 (5.5%) were positive for SARS-CoV-
265 2 antibodies at their first visit (Figure 2). Between their first and second visit, 9 participants
266 converted from negative to positive and 9 converted from positive to negative; 28 (8.2%)
267 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies at either visit (Figure 2).

268 To estimate true prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 exposure in our cohorts, the seroprevalence was
269 corrected for the sensitivity and specificity of the assay. 93.3% (95% CI: 86-97%) of
270 returning students with a self-reported prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test had positive IgG
271 antibodies; this was used as an estimate of sensitivity of the IgG assay for detecting
272 previously detectable infection (see Supplement for an alternative calculation of sensitivity
273 that includes community resident responses). For all assumed levels of specificity, the 95%
274 credible intervals for the true prevalence in the community residents overlapped for the pre-
275 and post-term time points, and neither overlapped the 95% credible interval for the true
276 prevalence estimate in the returning student subgroup (Figure 3).

277 Among the returning student subgroup, only close proximity to a known SARS-CoV-2-
278 positive individual and attending small gatherings in the past 3 months (20-50 individuals)
279 were significantly associated with a positive ELISA classification at alpha = 0.05 (aOR: 3.24,
280 2.14-4.91; aOR: 1.62, 1.08-2.44; respectively) in the multivariable model (Table 4). Taken
281 individually, attending small gatherings (20-50 people) (OR: 2.38, 1.66-3.43), attending
282 medium gatherings (51-200 people) (OR: 1.88, 1.19-2.94), and close proximity to an
283 individual showing key COVID-19 symptoms (OR: 1.81, 1.24-2.64) were all associated with
284 the IgG positivity in crude calculations of association. Given the low prevalence observed
285 within the community subgroup, and lack of significant effects observed during crude
286 analysis, models were not fit to the community resident data.

287 Both the returning student and community resident participants self-reported high compliance
288 with masking; 86.4% and 76.9%, respectively, reported always wearing mask or cloth face
289 covering when in public (Table S3, Table S4). By contrast, less than one third of both groups
290 (28.8% and 31.0%, respectively) self-reported always maintaining 6-feet of distance from
291 others in public. Less than half (42.9%) of returning students indicated that they always
292 avoided groups of 25 or greater, in contrast with 65.7% of community residents.

293 **DISCUSSION**

294 The return of students to in-person instruction on the PSU UP campus was associated with a
295 large increase in COVID-19 incidence in the county, as evidenced by over 4,500 student
296 cases at PSU.¹⁸ In a sample of 625 returning students, 31% were positive for SARS-CoV-2
297 antibodies. Out of approximately 35,000 students who returned to campus, this implies that
298 the detected cases may account for ~40% of all infections among PSU UP students. Despite
299 this high incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the county during the Fall 2020 term, a
300 cohort of community residents, who disproportionately identified as female and lived in close
301 proximity to campus, saw only a modest increase in the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG

302 antibodies (5.5 to 8.1%) between September and December 2020, aligning with a nation-wide
303 estimate of seroprevalence for the summer of 2020.²³ The true prevalence of prior SARS-
304 CoV-2 infection in the cohorts depends on the assumed sensitivity and specificity. However,
305 for all realistic values of sensitivity and specificity, there was no evidence of a significant
306 increase in true prevalence in the community resident sample. While in-person student
307 instruction has been associated with an increase in per-capita COVID-19 incidence at the
308 aggregate level,¹² these results suggest that outbreaks in the returning student and the
309 community resident cohort we studied were asynchronous, implying limited between-cohort
310 transmission. A recent analysis of age-specific movement and transmission patterns in the US
311 suggested that individuals between the ages of 20-34 disproportionately contributed to spread
312 of SARS-CoV-2;²⁸ however, despite close geographic proximity to a college-aged
313 population, transmission in our community resident sample appears distinctly lagged;
314 suggestive of the potential for health behaviours to prevent infection.

315 Within the student group, presence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was significantly associated
316 with close proximity to known SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals and attendance of small
317 events, however, no other risk factors were correlated with an increase in SARS-CoV-2 IgG
318 test positivity, aligning with other research.²³ However, it is not possible to discern how much
319 the likelihood of contact with a SARS-CoV-2 positive individual is due to the high campus
320 prevalence versus individual behaviours. When considered independently, eating in dining
321 halls within the past 7 days was weakly associated with testing positive for SARS-CoV-2
322 antibodies and participation in medium-sized events (51-200 individuals) was significantly
323 associated with testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, which is consistent with
324 patterns observed elsewhere.^{26,27} Both community residents and returning students reported
325 high adoption of masking (>75%) and low adoption of distancing in public (31.0% and

326 28.8%, respectively). Returning students reported lower adherence to avoiding gatherings of
327 greater than 25 individuals than community residents.

328 Neither the resident nor the student participants were selected using a probability-based
329 sample. Thus, these participants may not be representative of any particular population.
330 Those who chose to participate in this study may have been more cognizant and compliant
331 with public health mitigation measures than non-participants. Specifically, the resident
332 participants disproportionately lived in the townships immediately surrounding the UP
333 campus, where extensive messaging²⁹ and preventative campaigns were enacted, and they
334 have a higher median income than the residents of Centre County overall.

335 Though the participants reflect a convenience sample, the large differences in SARS-CoV-2
336 seroprevalence suggest that the cohorts did not experience a synchronous, well-mixed
337 epidemic despite their close geographic proximity. College campuses have been observed to
338 have high COVID-19 attack rates, and counties containing colleges and universities have
339 been observed to have significantly higher COVID-19 incidence than demographically
340 matched counties without such institutions.¹² Thus, while college and university operations
341 may present a significant exposure risk (because of large numbers of returning students, high
342 density housing, and frequent in-person socialization), this analysis suggests the possibility
343 that local-scale heterogeneity in mixing may allow for asynchronous transmission dynamics
344 despite close geographic proximity. Thus, the disproportionately high incidence in the student
345 population, which comprises less than one quarter of the county population, may bias
346 assessment of risk in the non-student resident population. Risk assessment in spatial units
347 (e.g., counties) that have strong population sub-structuring should consider these
348 heterogeneities and their consequences for policy.

349 SARS-CoV-2 transmission between the student and community resident populations is likely
350 to have occurred (perhaps multiple times) and these results do not preclude that possibility.
351 However, the large difference in seroprevalence between the student and resident participants
352 after the Fall term are consistent with either rare transmission events between students and
353 residents, non-persistent transmission with the community residents, or both. This suggests
354 that it is possible to minimize risks brought about by sub-populations with high SARS-CoV-2
355 incidence using behavioral interventions. This observation may have implications for
356 outbreak management in other high risk, highly mobile populations (e.g., displaced
357 populations, seasonal workers, military deployment). However, we note that this was
358 achieved in the context of disproportionate investment in prevention education, testing,
359 contact tracing, and infrastructure for isolation and quarantine by PSU in the high-prevalence
360 sub-population (students).

361 With respect to the health behaviors measured, the community resident and returning student
362 groups differed only in their small social group contact, and thus a next step is to identify
363 factors that may explain this difference (e.g., differences in leisure time activity norms and/or
364 perceptions of age-related risk; business closures; university policies and sanctions).
365 Minimizing risk, however, may come at significant social, psychological, educational,
366 economic, and societal costs.³⁰ Thus, operational planning for both institutions of higher
367 education and the communities in which they are embedded should consider both the risk of
368 SARS-CoV-2 transmission and the costs of mitigation efforts.

369

370 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

371

372 **Author Contributions**

373 *Conceptualization:* MJF, NB, MS, AR, VK

374 *Data curation:* MJF, CA

375 *Formal analysis:* CA, MJF, CMH

376 *Funding acquisition:* MJF, AR

377 *Investigation:* SS, AG, MMS, CJR

378 *Methodology:* CA, MJF

379 *Project administration:* MJF, MMS

380 *Software:* CA, MJF, CMH

381 *Supervision:* MJF, VK, SK

382 *Validation:* CA, MJF, CMH, SS

383 *Visualization:* CA, MJF

384 *Writing - original draft:* CA, SS, CMH, VK, MJF

385 *Writing - review and editing:* all authors.

386 **Conflicts of Interest and Financial Disclosures**

387 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

388 **Financial and Material Support**

389 This research was supported by funding from the Office of the Provost and the Clinical and
390 Translational Science Institute, Huck Life Sciences Institute, and Social Science Research
391 Institutes at the Pennsylvania State University. The project described was supported by the
392 National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health, through
393 Grant UL1 TR002014. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not
394 necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.
395

396 **Data Access, Responsibility, and Analysis**

397 Callum Arnold and Dr. Matthew J. Ferrari had full access to all the data in the study and take
398 responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Callum
399 Arnold, Dr. Matthew J. Ferrari (Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University), and
400 Dr. Catherine M. Herzog (Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State
401 University) conducted the data analysis.

402 **Collaborators**

- 403 1. Florian Krammer, Mount Sinai, USA for generously providing the transfection plasmid
404 pCAGGS-RBD
- 405 2. Scott E. Lindner, Allen M. Minns, Randall Rossi produced and purified RBD
- 406 3. The D4A Research Group: Dee Bagshaw, Clinical & Translational Science Institute,
407 Cyndi Flanagan, Clinical Research Center and the Clinical & Translational Science
408 Institute, Thomas Gates, Social Science Research Institute, Margeaux Gray, Dept. of
409 Biobehavioral Health, Stephanie Lanza, Dept. of Biobehavioral Health and Prevention
410 Research Center, James Marden, Dept. of Biology and Huck Institutes of the Life
411 Sciences, Susan McHale, Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies and the
412 Social Science Research Institute, Glenda Palmer, Social Science Research Institute,
413 Rachel Smith, Dept. of Communication Arts and Sciences and Huck Institutes of the Life

414 Sciences, and Charima Young, Penn State Office of Government and Community
415 Relations.
416 4. The authors thank the following for their assistance in the lab: Liz D. Cambron,
417 Elizabeth M. Schwartz, Devin F. Morrison, Julia Fecko, Brian Dawson, Sean Gullette,
418 Sara Neering, Mark Signs, Nigel Deighton, Janhayi Damani, Mario Novelo, Diego
419 Hernandez, Ester Oh, Chauncy Hinshaw, B. Joanne Power, James McGee, Riëtte van
420 Biljon, Andrew Stephenson, Alexis Pino, Nick Heller, Rose Ni, Eleanor Jenkins, Julia
421 Yu, Mackenzie Doyle, Alana Stracuzzi, Brielle Bellow, Abriana Cain, Jaime Farrell,
422 Megan Kostek, Amelia Zazzera, Sara Ann Malinchak, Alex Small, Sam DeMatte,
423 Elizabeth Morrow, Ty Somberger, Haylea Debolt, Kyle Albert, Corey Price, Nazmiye
424 Celik
425

426 **REFERENCES**

427

- 428 1 Bengtsson L, Gaudart J, Lu X, *et al.* Using Mobile Phone Data to Predict the Spatial
429 Spread of Cholera. *Scientific Reports* 2015; **5**: 8923.
- 430 2 Wilson ME. Travel and the emergence of infectious diseases. *Emerg Infect Dis* 1995; **1**:
431 39–46.
- 432 3 Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, *et al.* The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the
433 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science* 2020; **368**: 395–400.
- 434 4 Viboud C, Bjørnstad ON, Smith DL, Simonsen L, Miller MA, Grenfell BT. Synchrony,
435 Waves, and Spatial Hierarchies in the Spread of Influenza. *Science* 2006; **312**: 447–51.
- 436 5 Bharti N, Tatem AJ, Ferrari MJ, Grais RF, Djibo A, Grenfell BT. Explaining seasonal
437 fluctuations of measles in Niger using nighttime lights imagery. *Science* 2011; **334**: 1424–
438 7.
- 439 6 Wells CR, Sah P, Moghadas SM, *et al.* Impact of international travel and border control
440 measures on the global spread of the novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. *PNAS* 2020; **117**:
441 7504–9.
- 442 7 Bogoch II, Creatore MI, Cetron MS, *et al.* Assessment of the potential for international
443 dissemination of Ebola virus via commercial air travel during the 2014 west African
444 outbreak. *The Lancet* 2015; **385**: 29–35.
- 445 8 Jia JS, Lu X, Yuan Y, Xu G, Jia J, Christakis NA. Population flow drives spatio-temporal
446 distribution of COVID-19 in China. *Nature* 2020; **582**: 389–94.
- 447 9 Funk S, Ciglenecki I, Tiffany A, *et al.* The impact of control strategies and behavioural
448 changes on the elimination of Ebola from Lofa County, Liberia. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond*
449 *B Biol Sci* 2017; **372**. DOI:10.1098/rstb.2016.0302.
- 450 10 Sniadack DH, Moscoso B, Aguilar R, Heath J, Bellini W, Chiu MC. Measles
451 epidemiology and outbreak response immunization in a rural community in Peru. *Bull*
452 *World Health Organ* 1999; **77**: 545–52.
- 453 11 Stoddard ST, Forshey BM, Morrison AC, *et al.* House-to-house human movement drives
454 dengue virus transmission. *PNAS* 2012; published online Dec 27.
455 DOI:10.1073/pnas.1213349110.
- 456 12 Leidner AJ, Barry V, Bowen VB, *et al.* Opening of Large Institutions of Higher Education
457 and County-Level COVID-19 Incidence — United States, July 6–September 17, 2020
458 Vaughn Barry, PhD1; Virginia B. Bowen, PhD1; Rachel Silver, MPH1; Trieste Musial,
459 MS2; Gloria J. Kang, PhD1; Matthew D. Ritchey, DPT3; Kelly Fletcher, MPH2; Lisa
460 Barrios, DrPH1; Eric Pevzner, PhD. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021; **70**.
461 DOI:10.15585/mmwr.mm7001a4.
- 462 13 Goetz S, Tian Z, Schmidt C, Meadowcroft D, NERCRD, Pennsylvania State University.
463 Rural COVID-19 Cases Lag Urban Areas but Are Growing Much More Rapidly.
464 Pennsylvania State University Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and

- 465 Education, 2020 [https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-](https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly)
466 [covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly](https://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly) (accessed Feb 6,
467 2021).
- 468 14 Christensen H, Turner K, Trickey A, *et al.* COVID-19 transmission in a university setting:
469 a rapid review of modelling studies. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.09.07.20189688.
- 470 15 Andersen MS, Bento AI, Basu A, Marsicano C, Simon K. College Openings, Mobility,
471 and the Incidence of COVID-19 Cases. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.09.22.20196048.
- 472 16 The New York Times. Tracking the Coronavirus at U.S. Colleges and Universities - The
473 New York Times. Tracking the Coronavirus at U.S. Colleges and Universities. 2020;
474 published online Dec 11. [https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-cases-tracker.html)
475 [cases-tracker.html](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-cases-tracker.html) (accessed Jan 30, 2021).
- 476 17 United States Census Bureau. U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Centre County,
477 Pennsylvania. QuickFacts: Centre County, Pennsylvania. 2019.
478 <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/centrecountypennsylvania> (accessed Jan 30, 2021).
- 479 18 Pennsylvania State University. COVID-19 Dashboard. Virus Info. 2021; published online
480 Jan 29.
481 <https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDY3NjhiMDItOWY0Mi00NzBmLWExNTAtZGIzNjdkMGIOOTM0IiwidCI6IjdjZjQ4ZDQ1LTNkZGIhNDM4OS1hOWMxLWxMTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOiJF9> (accessed Jan 30, 2021).
- 484 19 Long Q-X, Liu B-Z, Deng H-J, *et al.* Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
485 COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020; **26**: 845–8.
- 486 20 Gontu A, Srinivasan S, Nair MS, *et al.* Quantitative Estimation of IgM and IgG Antibodies
487 Against SARS-CoV-2. *protocols.io* 2020; published online Aug 20.
488 DOI:[dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bivgke3w](https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bivgke3w).
- 489 21 Uyoga S, Adetifa IMO, Karanja HK, *et al.* Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
490 antibodies in Kenyan blood donors. *Science* 2021; **371**: 79–82.
- 491 22 Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Perez-Saez J, *et al.* Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
492 antibodies after the second pandemic peak. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021; **0**.
493 DOI:[10.1016/S1473-3099\(21\)00054-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00054-2).
- 494 23 Kalish H, Klumpp-Thomas C, Hunsberger S, *et al.* Mapping a Pandemic: SARS-CoV-2
495 Seropositivity in the United States. *medRxiv* 2021; : 2021.01.27.21250570.
- 496 24 Huang Y-T, Tu Y-K, Lai P-C. Estimation of the secondary attack rate of COVID-19 using
497 proportional meta-analysis of nationwide contact tracing data in Taiwan. *Journal of*
498 *Microbiology, Immunology and Infection* 2020; published online June 11.
499 DOI:[10.1016/j.jmii.2020.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2020.06.003).
- 500 25 Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, *et al.* Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19
501 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and
502 After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020; **180**: 1156–63.

- 503 26Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE, Funk S, Knight GM. What settings have been linked to
504 SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome Open Res* 2020; **5**.
505 DOI:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15889.2.
- 506 27Brooks-Pollock E, Read JM, House T, Medley GF, Keeling MJ, Danon L. The Population
507 Attributable Fraction (PAF) of cases due to gatherings and groups with relevance to
508 COVID-19 mitigation strategies. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.03.20.20039537.
- 509 28Monod M, Blenkinsop A, Xi X, *et al.* Age groups that sustain resurging COVID-19
510 epidemics in the United States. *Science* 2021; : eabe8372.
- 511 29Pennsylvania State University. Mask Up or Pack Up. Virus Info. 2021.
512 <https://virusinfo.psu.edu/mask-up-or-pack-up/> (accessed Feb 6, 2021).
- 513 30Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, *et al.* The psychological impact of quarantine and
514 how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet* 2020; **395**: 912–20.
- 515
516
517

518 **TABLES**

519 **Table 1**

520 Demographic characteristics of study participants. Non-D4A participants are all participants
 521 in the initial anonymous survey from which Data4Action participants were drawn. D4A
 522 participants are divided into subsets for which antibody assays were conducted (N=345) and
 523 those for which assays were not conducted (N=1195).

	D4A Participant (N=1540)		Not D4A Participant (N=8826)
Variable	Assay Subset (N=345)	Non-Assay Subset (N=1195)	
Age			
Median [IQR]	47·0 [35·0, 60·0]	46·0 [36·0, 58·0]	46·0 [33·0, 59·0]
Missing	1 (0·3%)	11 (0·9%)	335 (3·8%)
Race			
White	311 (90·1%)	1057 (88·5%)	6075 (68·8%)
Aggregated Category*	18 (5·2%)	84 (7·0%)	1289 (14·6%)
Listed more than one race or ethnicity	15 (4·3%)	41 (3·4%)	159 (1·8%)
Missing	1 (0·3%)	13 (1·1%)	1303 (14·8%)
Gender			
Female	214 (62·0%)	784 (65·6%)	0 (0%)
Male	116 (33·6%)	337 (28·2%)	0 (0%)
Non-binary / Transgender / Self-described	6 (1·7%)	8 (0·7%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (0·3%)	1 (0·1%)	0 (0%)
Missing	8 (2·3%)	65 (5·4%)	8826 (100%)
Household Income			
\$200,000 and over	28 (8·1%)	134 (11·2%)	677 (7·7%)
\$150,000 to \$199,999	49 (14·2%)	158 (13·2%)	767 (8·7%)
\$100,000 to \$149,999	91 (26·4%)	311 (26·0%)	1502 (17·0%)
\$75,000 to \$99,999	41 (11·9%)	171 (14·3%)	1091 (12·4%)
\$50,000 to \$74,999	47 (13·6%)	149 (12·5%)	963 (10·9%)
\$25,000 to \$49,999	46 (13·3%)	123 (10·3%)	1462 (16·6%)
Under \$25,000	9 (2·6%)	44 (3·7%)	259 (2·9%)
Prefer not to answer	33 (9·6%)	93 (7·8%)	801 (9·1%)
Missing	1 (0·3%)	12 (1·0%)	1304 (14·8%)

524 * Asian; Hispanic, Lantino/a, or Spanish; Black or African American; Middle Eastern or
 525 North African; Native American or Alaska Native; other race or ethnicity. This category is
 526 aggregated to protect participant identities because no single group comprised >4% of
 527 participants.

528 **Table 2**
 529 Demographic characteristics of the returning student participants.
 530

Variable	PSU Subset (N=625)
Age	
Median [IQR]	20.8 [19.7, 21.6]
Missing	10 (1.6%)
Race	
White	508 (81.3%)
Aggregated Category*	81 (13.0%)
Listed more than one race	30 (4.8%)
Missing	6 (1.0%)
Gender	
Female	404 (64.6%)
Male	215 (34.4%)
Genderqueer/nonconforming/ transgender/different identity	5 (0.8%)
Missing	1 (0.2%)
University Housing	
Not Uni housing	445 (71.2%)
Uni housing	178 (28.5%)
Missing	2 (0.3%)

531 * Asian; Black or African American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or
 532 other Pacific Islander; some other race. This category is aggregated to protect participant
 533 identities because no single group comprised >4% of participants.

534
 535
 536

537 **Table 3**
538 IgG ELISA results as a function of self-reported prior SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test outcome
539 among returning student cohort participants.

ELISA Result	Prior Test (N=665)		No Prior Test (N=42)
	Prior Positive (N=105)	No Prior Positive (N=560)	
Positive	84	106	5
Negative	6	390	34
NA	15	64	3

540 **Table 4**
 541 Crude and adjusted odds ratios (aOR) of risk factors among returning PSU UP student cohort
 542

Variable/Response	No/total (%) with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies	Crude OR (95% CI)	MICE Multivariable OR (95% CI)
Close proximity to known COVID-19 Positive Individual			
No	57/316 (18.04)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	137/307 (44.63)	3.65 (2.51-5.37)***	3.24 (2.14-4.91)***
Attended a gathering of 20-50 people since arrival for the Fall Semester			
No	75/332 (22.59)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	119/290 (41.03)	2.38 (1.66-3.43)***	1.62 (1.08-2.44)*
Ate in a dining hall in the past 7 days			
No	150/500 (30.00)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	43/121 (35.54)	1.29 (0.82-1.99)	1.40 (0.79-2.48)
Attended a gathering of 51-200 people since arrival for the Fall Semester			
No	146/510 (28.63)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	46/107 (42.99)	1.88 (1.19-2.94) **	1.26 (0.77-2.06)
Travelled in the 3 months prior to campus arrival			
No	74/263 (28.13)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	114/339 (33.63)	1.29 (0.90-1.87)	1.15 (0.78-1.70)
Ate in a restaurant in the past 7 days			
No	90/317(28.39)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	102/305 (33.44)	1.27 (0.89-1.81)	1.10 (0.75-1.62)
Only ate in their room in the past 7 days			
No	70/214 (32.71)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Yes	123/409 (30.07)	0.88 (0.61-1.28)	0.97 (0.64-1.46)
Close proximity to individual showing COVID-19 symptoms			
No	121/442 (27.38)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]

	Yes	73/180 (40.56)	1.81 (1.24-2.64)**	0.89 (0.59-1.36)
Travelled since campus arrival				
	No	80/255 (31.37)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
	Yes	114/368 (30.98)	0.98 (0.69-1.41)	0.87 (0.59-1.27)
Lives in University housing				
	No	140/445 (31.46)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
	Yes	54/178 (30.34)	0.95 (0.64-1.40)	0.82 (0.50-1.36)

543

544

545 * $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed)

546 ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

547 *** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed)

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558


559

560

561 **FIGURES**

562 **Figure 1**

563 Map of Centre County, Pennsylvania, USA. Blue indicates the 5 townships and 1 borough
564 that comprise the Centre Region. Red indicates the location of The Pennsylvania State
565 University (PSU), University Park (UP) Campus. Inset illustrates the proportion of the county
566 population in each region; PSU indicates the estimated student population that returned to
567 campus for the Fall 2020 term.




Dot Indicates PSU Campus
Each square represents 1000 individuals

568
569
570


571 **Figure 2**

572 Raw seroprevalence (circles) with 95% binomial confidence intervals for the community
573 residents at the first visit at the start of the Fall 2020 term (light blue), returning students at
574 the end of the fall 2020 term (red), and community residents at either the first or the second
575 visit after student departure (dark blue).
576



577

578 **Figure 3**
579 Estimated true prevalence (circles, with 95% confidence intervals) among participants at each
580 sampling interval corrected for estimated assay sensitivity as a function of the assumed assay
581 specificity (x-axis). Light blue indicates community residents at the first visit at the start of
582 the Fall 2020 term, red indicates returning students at the end of the Fall 2020 term, and dark
583 blue indicates community residents at the second visit after student departure.
584



585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592