

1 **SARS-CoV-2 antibody response among COVID-19 patients is not affected by**
2 **parasite co-infection**

3 Teklay Gebrecherkos¹, Yazezew Kebede Kiros¹, Feyissa Challa², Atsbeha Gebreegzabher², Saro
4 Abdella², Dereje Leta², Abraham Desta³, Ataklti Hailu³, Geremew Tasew², Mahmud Abdulkader¹,
5 Masresha Tessema², Getachew Tollera², Zekarias Gessesse Arefaine¹, Henk HDF Schallig⁴, Britta
6 C. Urban⁵, Tobias F. Rinke de Wit^{6,7}, Dawit Wolday^{1,2}

7 **Running title:** Antibody response in parasite co-infected SARS-CoV-2 patients

8 ¹Mekelle University College of Health Sciences, Mekelle, Ethiopia

9 ²Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

10 ³Tigray Health Research Institute, Mekelle, Ethiopia

11 ⁴Department of Medical Microbiology, and Infection Prevention, Experimental Parasitology Unit,
12 Amsterdam Institute for Infection and Immunity, Academic Medical Center at the University of
13 Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

14 ⁵Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine

15 ⁶Amsterdam Institute Global Health and Development, Academic Medical Center, University of
16 Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

17 ⁷Joep Lange Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

18

19 ***Correspondence:** Teklay Gebrecherkos. Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, CHS,
20 MU, Ethiopia. Email: estiftg17@gmail.com

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background:** B-cell hypo-responsiveness has been associated with intestinal parasitic co-
32 infection. The effect of parasite co-infection on antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 is unknown.
33 Here, we aimed to determine antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 among COVID-19 patients co-
34 infected with intestinal parasites and those without parasite co-infection.

35 **Methods:** In this prospective cohort study, a total of 589 samples were serially collected from 72
36 RT-PCR-confirmed patients. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) antibody titers were
37 measured longitudinally during hospitalization. SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by RT-PCR on
38 samples obtained from nasopharyngeal swabs, while direct microscopic examination, modified Ritchie
39 concentration, and Kato-Katz methods were used to identify parasites and ova from fresh stool samples.
40 Data were analyzed using STATA version 14.

41 **Results:** Of the 72 COVID-19 patients, 39 (54.2%) were co-infected with intestinal parasites while
42 33 (45.8%) had no parasitic co-infection. Overall, the median cut-off index (COI) for anti-NP
43 antibody titer among COVID-19 patients co-infected with parasites was 6.91 (IQR: 0.55-40.7)
44 compared to 7.51 (IQR: 0.21-59.21) in those without parasites ($p=0.764$). In addition, 174/261
45 [66.7% (95% CI: 60.68-72.16)] and 231/328 [70.4% (95% CI: 65.23-75.14)] specimens from COVID-
46 19 patients with parasite co-infection and without parasites, respectively, had anti-SARS-CoV-2
47 antibody above the cut-off COI value ($p=0.328$). The positivity rate for anti-SARS-CoV-2 NP < 14
48 days after symptom onset was 66.3% (95% CI: 60.21-71.85) and 70.0% (95% CI: 64.72-74.74) for
49 those not infected and co-infected with parasites, respectively ($p=0.343$). In addition, 31/72
50 (41.9%) of the patients who were negative at the time of enrollment were seroconverted. The
51 trend in anti-NP antibodies among seroconverted individuals with and without parasites is also
52 similar.

53 **Conclusions:** Co-infection with parasitic infection has very little effect on the anti-SARS-CoV-2
54 antibody immune response. Further studies on the profile of neutralizing antibodies in parasite-
55 endemic areas are warranted to ascertain vaccine efficacy.

56 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, antibody, Ig, anti-NP antibody, parasite, helminth, protozoa

57 **Author's summary**

58 Pre-existing co-infection with intestinal parasites has been shown to diminish antibody response
59 to a multitude of heterologous pathogens or vaccines. However, the effect of parasite co-
60 infection on antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 is unknown. We determined the anti-nucleocapsid
61 protein (NP) antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 among COVID-19 patients co-infected with
62 intestinal parasites and compared their response to those without parasites. There was no
63 difference in anti-NP positivity rate, seroconversion, or titer level among COVID-19 patients with
64 or without parasitic co-infection. Further studies on the profile of neutralizing antibodies in
65 parasite-endemic areas are warranted to ascertain vaccine efficacy.

66 **Introduction**

67 Antibody testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is used for
68 epidemiological surveillance, in aiding the diagnosis of (previous) coronavirus disease 2019
69 (COVID-19), and in the assessment of herd immunity following natural infection or after vaccine
70 administration [1-9]. Several reports have demonstrated a lack of specificity for SARS-CoV-2
71 antibodies in evaluations of samples both pre-pandemic as well as samples collected during the
72 COVID-19 pandemic period [10-18]. Such samples derived from parasite-endemic areas may
73 cross-react to some of the SARS-CoV-2 antigenic epitopes [19, 20]. On the other hand, antibody
74 response, including neutralizing antibody titers may be influenced in individuals with profound
75 immune suppression, such as HIV-1 [21], though others have not demonstrated such effects [22,
76 23].

77 B-cell hypo-responsiveness is associated with intestinal parasite co-infection in endemic areas
78 [24]. Indeed, pre-existing co-infection with parasites has been shown to diminish antibody
79 response to influenza, hepatitis B, pneumococcal, cholera, tetanus, and malarial vaccines [25-
80 31].

81 Nonetheless, the effect of parasite co-infection on antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 among
82 COVID-19 patients remains to be elucidated. In addition, seroconversion might also be reduced
83 or delayed in SARS-CoV-2-infected patients with pre-existing parasite co-infection. Here, we

84 determined whether pre-existing co-infection with parasites impacts SARS-CoV-2 antibody
85 responses and seroconversion.

86 **Materials and Methods**

87 **Study design, period, and setting**

88 The study is part of the ongoing Profile-Cov study, a prospective observational cohort study in
89 Ethiopia with rapid diagnostic profiling of SARS-CoV-2 in the context of persistent immune
90 activation (Clinicaltrials.gov: NCT04473365). Consecutive patients with confirmed Real-Time
91 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test results were enrolled. They were recruited from Mekelle
92 University College of Health Sciences (Kuyha COVID-19 Isolation and Treatment Center), Mekelle
93 City, Northern Ethiopia, prospectively between July 15 and October 28, 2020.

94 Individuals presenting to the Isolation and Treatment Center were screened for SARS-CoV-2
95 infection with a nasopharyngeal swab and an RT-PCR confirmed patients. Following the
96 declaration by the WHO that COVID-19 has become a pandemic, the Ethiopian Ministry of Health
97 implemented a mass screening of all travelers, people who had come in contact with COVID-19
98 patients, those from high-risk settings (e.g. healthcare workers), as well as those with symptoms
99 and signs suggestive of SARS-CoV-2 infection [32]. All cases with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2
100 infection were admitted to dedicated COVID-19 Isolation and Treatment Centers. Patients were
101 admitted irrespective of clinical severity status. Whenever patients progress to severe or critical
102 COVID-19, they were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU). None of the patients received
103 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination as they were enrolled before the introduction of a vaccine to the country.

104 **Data and specimen collection**

105 Sociodemographic, clinical data, and laboratory data were collected using standardized Case
106 Record Forms (CRFs) adapted from the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging
107 Infection Consortium's (ISARIC) CRFs for emerging severe acute respiratory infections [33]. All
108 data were then entered onto electronic medical records.

109 For analysis of anti-NP antibody kinetics, samples were drawn serially from 72 SARS-CoV-2
110 RT-PCR-confirmed patients. Overall, patients were followed for a median of 31 [interquartile

111 range (IQR): 17-32] days, and ranging between 7 to 37 days. Whenever possible, samples were
112 drawn every 3 days during follow-up. Thus, multiple samples were drawn per individual at a given
113 time interval (0–3, 4–6, 7–9, 10–12, 13–15, 16–18, 19–21, 22–24, 25–27, 28–30, 31–33, 34–36,
114 37–39, and ≥ 40 days after onset of symptoms). Notably, only one sample per time interval was
115 included from a single participant. Specimens were immediately transported to the Central
116 Laboratory of the university hospital, and separated plasma was frozen at -80°C until further
117 analysis.

118 **Laboratory assays**

119 SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by RT-PCR on samples obtained from nasopharyngeal
120 swabs, as described previously [32]. The antibody profile in this study was determined using the
121 Roche Elecsys electrochemiluminescent immunoassay (ECLIA) that targets the nucleocapsid
122 protein (NP). Testing, including the cut-off index (COI) for anti-NP total immunoglobulin (Ig) titer was
123 done following the manufacturer's instructions, as described previously [34]. Seroconversion was
124 ascertained if a patient with a negative antibody test at the time of enrollment becomes positive
125 with the assays tested during follow-up. For estimating the day of seroconversion, the day's post-
126 symptom onset was determined for symptomatic cases. For asymptomatic patients, we added 6
127 days (median time between symptom onset and date of positive PCR testing among symptomatic
128 cases) to the PCR testing date. Fresh stool sample specimens were also obtained for examination
129 for parasites and ova. The analysis included direct microscopic examination, modified Ritchie
130 concentration method, and Kato-Katz method, as described previously [35].

131 **Statistical Analysis**

132 Baseline characteristics for continuous variables were expressed as the median with IQR, and for
133 categorical variables as proportions. Categorical variables were compared using Fisher's exact
134 test or χ^2 test, and continuous variables were compared by Mann–Whitney U or Kruskal–Wallis
135 tests as appropriate. The primary outcomes for this study were anti-NP total Ig positivity rate or
136 titers above the COI value, according to sampling time (days after symptom onset). The positivity
137 rate was presented as proportion and 95% confidence interval (CI) limits. Data were analyzed
138 using STATA (Statistical package v. 14.0, StataCorp, Texas, USA).

139 **Ethical considerations**

140 Participants provided written informed consent to participate in the Profile-Cov study. The study
141 protocol was reviewed and approved by the Health Research Ethics Review Committee (HRERC)
142 of Mekelle University College of Health Sciences (#ERC 1769/2020). Written informed consent
143 was obtained from all study participants. However, specimens used as controls from pre-
144 pandemic period were specimens from biobank and individual study participant consent was not
145 obtained. Nonetheless, all personal identifiers were-linked from the sources, and the HRERC has
146 reviewed and approved it.

147

148 **Results**

149 ***General characteristics***

150 Detailed demographic and clinical characteristics of the cohort have been described previously
151 in detail in our published articles [34, 35]. For this sub-study, 72 PCR-confirmed COVID-19
152 patients were enrolled and contributed a total of 589 samples [median of 9 (IQR: 5 – 11) paired
153 samples per patient] collected serially over time. Of the 72 COVID-19 patients, 39 (54.2%) were
154 co-infected with intestinal parasites while 33 (45.8%) had no parasitic co-infection. Details in
155 sociodemographic characteristics and prevalence of parasite co-infection are summarized in
156 **Table 1**. Frequent symptoms were fever, dyspnoea, cough, and headache. Except for dyspnoea
157 which was significantly higher among those without parasites, clinical symptoms were similar in
158 both groups. In addition, the groups did not differ by age, sex, comorbidities, or severity.

159 ***Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 antibody response***

160 The overall antibody NP total Ig response is summarized in **Table 2**. A total of 589 specimens
161 derived at different time points were evaluated. The overall positivity rate for anti-SARS-CoV-2
162 NP total Ig was 68.8% (95% CI: 65.01-72.51); 70.4% (95% CI: 65.46-75.39) for those infected with
163 parasites and 66.7% (95% CI: 60.91-72.42) for those not co-infected with parasites (p=0.328).
164 Additionally, the positivity rate was 69.7% (95% CI: 62.61-76.78) for those infected with
165 helminths and 68.4% (95% CI: 63.95-72.84) for those not co-infected with helminths (p=0.760).

166 Whereas the anti-SARS-CoV-2 NP total Ig was 68.8% (95% CI: 65.01-72.51) among those infected
167 with protozoa, it was 67.4% (95% CI: 62.62-72.13) among those without protozoa ($p=0.333$).
168 Moreover, we did not observe differences in the anti-NP total Ig titers between those infected
169 with parasites and those without parasite co-infection (**Table 2**).

170 The kinetics of the anti-NP total Ig response are shown in **Figure 1**. The seropositivity rate was
171 low at the time of enrollment in the study. Overall the positivity rate for anti-NP total Ig was
172 11.1% in those co-infected with parasites and 14.3% in those without parasites (**Figure 1A**).
173 Similar trends were observed among those with or without helminth (**Figure 1B**), or with or
174 without protozoa (**Figure 1C**). However, during the first 15 days after the onset of symptoms, the
175 positivity rate increased significantly reaching above 50% positivity rate, irrespective of parasite
176 co-infection status. During the period 2- to 3 weeks after the onset of symptoms, the positivity
177 rate of all the assays was increased, ranging between 67.3% and 81.3%. Between 3 and 6 weeks
178 after the onset of symptoms, the positivity rate continued to increase for all the assays, ranging
179 from 84.6% to 90.9%. Positive anti-NP total Ig titer was detectable (i.e. $COI \geq 1.0$) as early as 7 to
180 12 days after onset of symptoms for all patients (**Figure 1D–F**). Because of the small sample size,
181 we did not determine trends stratified by severity status.

182 ***Seroconversion of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies***

183 Patients who were antibody–negative at the time of enrollment in the study, but who became
184 antibody–positive during follow–up were considered seroconverters. Overall, a total of 31
185 (41.9%) were seroconverted. A total of 256 sample pairs were evaluated. Seroconversion trends
186 are shown in **Figure 2**. Patients started to seroconvert as early as 4 to 9 days after the onset of
187 symptoms, reaching around 25%. The rate of seroconversion within the first 15 days after the
188 onset of symptoms increased to 44.4%. During the same period, the rate of seroconversion for
189 those with parasites was 47.1% (95% CI: 20.61-76.94), and for those without parasitic co-
190 infection was 40.0% (95% CI: 3.06-76.94), and the difference was not statistically significant
191 ($p=0.722$). In addition, the seroconversion rate increased further during 2- to 3 weeks after the
192 onset of symptoms, ranging between 61.5% and 68.0%, respectively. The seroconversion rate
193 continued to increase reaching 100% after ≥ 39 days of symptom onset in all groups (**Figure 2A**).

194 Trends in anti-NP total Ig titers were also similar in patients irrespective of the presence of
195 parasite co-infection or not (**Figure 2B**). Whereas the median seroconversion time for those with
196 parasites was 13 (IQR: 7-21) days, it was 15 (IQR: 10-16) days for those without parasitic co-
197 infection ($p=0.927$). Overall, there was no difference in seroconversion trend between those who
198 were co-infected with parasites and those without parasites. Due to the small sample size,
199 however, we did not do an analysis stratified by helminths and protozoa.

200 **Discussion**

201 In this study, we determined antibody responses among SARS-CoV-2 patients co-infected with
202 parasites. To the best of our knowledge, this report is the first to determine the longitudinal
203 SARS-CoV-2 antibody response in COVID-19 patients also co-infected with intestinal parasites.
204 SARS-CoV-2 patients with parasite co-infection did not exhibit different profiles in antibody
205 response or seroconversion patterns.

206 Several reports have previously documented that parasites downregulate antibody responses to
207 heterologous pathogen and vaccine responses [25-31]. Likewise, we expected an impaired
208 antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 among COVID-19 patients co-infected with parasites [24].
209 Given the presence of a high level of cross-reactivity between SARS-CoV-2 and parasites [10-20],
210 the expected reduction in antibody response might have been compensated by the presence of
211 cross-reacting antibodies also in patients with COVID-19. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated
212 that a reduced frequency of SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD4+ T helper cells without an effect on the
213 expression of SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD8+ T cells [36]. Thus, it is plausible to postulate that
214 parasite-induced reduced CD4+ T helper cells do not affect anti-NP antibody responses to SARS-
215 CoV-2.

216 The strength of the current study is the use of longitudinal samples derived from the same
217 patient. However, limitations include smaller sample sizes and a lack of determination of
218 neutralizing antibody titers. In addition, anti-NP antibody response has not been stratified by
219 severity status, though in our set-up we did not find differences in antibody profile by severity
220 status [34].

221 The impact of parasite co-infection on the efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in endemic areas is
222 unknown [37]. Unraveling the differential antibody response profile between individuals with the
223 parasite and those without parasite co-infection may have implications in the development and
224 interpretation of diagnostic tools as well as the monitoring of vaccines in parasite-endemic areas.
225 Further studies are needed to investigate the effects of co-infection with parasites on the efficacy
226 and durability of antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines.

227 **Informed Consent Statement:** Written informed consent was obtained from all study
228 participants. All personal identifiers were de-linked from the sources.

229 **Acknowledgments:** The investigators thank EDCTP for providing funding to the project, COVID-
230 19 patients and all individuals who provided specimens for control, and the medical staff who
231 provided care of the patients.

232

233 **References**

- 234 1. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, Gunnarsdottir K, Holm H, Eythorsson E, et al.
235 Humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 in Iceland. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 383:1724 -1734.
- 236 2. Pollan M, Perez-Gomez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al.
237 Prevalence of SARS -CoV -2 in Spain (ENE -COVID): a nationwide, population-based
238 seroepidemiological study. *Lancet* 2020; 396:535-544.
- 239 3. Wajnberg A, Mansour M, Leven E, Bouvier NM, Patel G, Firpo-Betancourt A, et al. Humoral
240 response and PCR positivity in patients with COVID -19 in the New York City region, USA: an
241 observational study. *Lancet Microbe* 2020; 1: e283-e289.
- 242 4. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2
243 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020; 26:845-848.
- 244 5. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, et al. Severe acute
245 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2-specific antibody responses in coronavirus disease 2019
246 patients. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020; 26: 1478–1488.

- 247 6. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
248 patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; 71: 2027-2034.
- 249 7. Yongchen Z, Shen H, Wang X, Shi X, Li Y, Yan J, et al. Different longitudinal patterns of nucleic
250 acid and serology testing results based on disease severity of COVID-19 patients. *Emerg*
251 *Microbes Infect.* 2020; 9: 833-836.
- 252 8. Rijkers G, Murk JL, Wintermans B, van Looy B, van den Berge M, Veenemans J, et al.
253 Differences in antibody kinetics and functionality between severe and mild severe acute
254 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infections. *J Infect Dis* 2020; 222:1265-1269.
- 255 9. Margolin E, Burgers WA, Sturrock ED, Mendelson M, Chapman R, Douglass N, et al. Prospects
256 for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines in Africa. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2020; 18:
257 690-704.
- 258 10. Steinhardt LC, Ige F, Iriemenam NC, Greby SM, Hamada Y, Uwandu M, et al. Cross-reactivity
259 of two SARS-CoV-2 serological assays in a setting where malaria is endemic. *J Clin Microbiol*
260 2021; 59: e0051421. doi:10.1128/JCM.00514-21
- 261 11. Vanroye F, Bossche DVD, Brosius I, Tack B, Esbroeck MV, Jacobs J. COVID-19 antibody
262 detecting rapid diagnostic tests show high cross-reactivity when challenged with pre-
263 pandemic malaria, schistosomiasis and dengue samples. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2021; 11: 1163.
264 doi:10.3390/diagnostics11071163
- 265 12. Mveang Nzoghe A, Essone PN, Leboueny M, Maloupazoa Siawaya AC, Bongho EC, Mvoundza
266 Ndjindji O, et al. Evidence and implications of pre-existing humoral cross-reactive immunity
267 to SARS-CoV-2. *Immun Inflamm Dis* 2021; 9: 128-133. doi:10.1002/iid3.367
- 268 13. Baker OR, Grabowski MK, Galiwango RM, Nalumansi A, Serwanga J, Clarke W, et al.
269 Differential performance of CoronaCHEK SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow antibody assay by
270 geographic origin of samples. *J Microbiol* 2021; doi:10.1101/2021.04.12.21255284
- 271 14. Tso FY, Lidenge SJ, Peña PB, Clegg AA, Ngowi JR, Mwaiselage J, et al. High prevalence of pre-
272 existing serological cross-reactivity against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2
273 (SARS-CoV-2) in sub-Saharan Africa. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021; 102: 577-583.
274 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.10.104

- 275 15. Yadouleton A, Sander AL, Moreira-Soto A, Tchibozo C, Hounkanrin G, Badou Y, et al. Limited
276 specificity of serologic tests for SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection, Benin. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;
277 27: 233–237. doi:10.3201/eid2701.203281
- 278 16. Emmerich P, Murawski C, Ehmen C, von Possel R, Pekarek N, Oestereich L, et al. Limited
279 specificity of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISAs in serum samples of African
280 origin. *Trop Med Int Health* 2021; 26: 621-631. doi:10.1111/tmi.13569
- 281 17. Woodford J, Sagara I, Dicko A, Zeguime A, Doucoure M, Kwan J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroassay
282 optimization and performance in a population with high background reactivity in Mali. *J Infect*
283 *Dis* 2021; doi:10.1093/infdis/jiab498/6382154
- 284 18. Egwang TG, Owalla TJ, Okurut E, Apungia G, Fox A, De Carlo C, et al. Differential pre-pandemic
285 breast milk IgA reactivity against SARS-CoV-2 and circulating human coronaviruses in
286 Ugandan and American mothers. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021: S1201-9712(21)00747-5.
287 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.09.039
- 288 19. Hassan MM, Sharmin S, Hong J, Lee HS, Kim HJ, Hong ST. T cell epitopes of SARS-CoV-2 spike
289 protein and conserved surface protein of *Plasmodium malariae* share sequence homology.
290 *Open Life Sci.* 2021; 16:630-640. doi:10.1515/biol-2021-0062
- 291 20. Lapidus S, Liu F, Casanovas-Massana A, Dai Y, Huck JD, Lucas C, et al. *Plasmodium* infection
292 induces cross-reactive antibodies to carbohydrate epitopes on the SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein.
293 medRxiv [Preprint]. 2021 May 12; doi:10.1101/2021.05.10.21256855
- 294 21. Spinelli MA, Lynch KL, Yun C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence, and IgG concentration and
295 pseudovirus neutralizing antibody titers after infection, compared by HIV status: a matched
296 case-control observational study. *Lancet HIV* 2021. DOI: 10.1016/S2352-3018(21)00072-2.
- 297 22. Snyman J, Hwa SH, Krause R, Muema D, Reddy T, Ganga Y, et al. Similar antibody responses
298 against SARS-CoV-2 in HIV-uninfected and infected individuals on antiretroviral therapy
299 during the first South African infection wave. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; Sep 2 [Epub ahead of print].
300 doi:10.1093/cid/ciab758
- 301 23. Martín-Vicente M, Berenguer J, Muñoz-Gómez MJ, Díez C, Micán R, Pérez-Elías MJ, et al.
302 Similar humoral immune responses against the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in HIV and non-HIV
303 individuals after COVID-19. *J Infect* 2021; 84:418-467. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.11.002

- 304 24. Wolday D, Ndungu FM, Gómez-Pérez GP, Rinke de Wit TF. Chronic immune activation and
305 CD4+ T cell lymphopenia in healthy African individuals: Perspectives for SARS-CoV-2 vaccine
306 efficacy. *Front Immunology* 2021; 12: 693269.
- 307 25. Kilian HD, Nielsen G. Cell-mediated and humoral immune response to tetanus vaccinations in
308 onchocerciasis patients. *Trop Med Parasitol* 1989; 40:285–291.
- 309 26. Harris JB, Podolsky MJ, Bhuiyan TR, Chowdhury F, Khan AI, Larocque RC, Logvinenko T, et al.
310 Immunologic responses to *Vibrio cholerae* in patients co-infected with intestinal parasites in
311 Bangladesh. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2009; 3:e403. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000403
- 312 27. Esen M, Mordmüller B, de Salazar PM, Adegnika AA, Agnandji ST, Schaumburg F, Hounkpatin
313 AB, et al. Reduced antibody responses against *Plasmodium falciparum* vaccine candidate
314 antigens in the presence of *Trichuris trichiura*. *Vaccine* 2012; 30:7621–7624.
315 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.10.026
- 316 28. Nono JK, Kamdem SD, Netongo PM, Dabee S, Schomaker M, Oumarou A, et al.
317 Schistosomiasis Burden and Its Association With Lower Measles Vaccine Responses in School
318 Children From Rural Cameroon. *Front Immunol* 2018; 9:2295.
319 doi:10.3389/fimmu.2018.02295
- 320 29. Riner DK, Ndombi EM, Carter JM, et al. *Schistosoma mansoni* infection can jeopardize the
321 duration of protective levels of antibody responses to immunizations against hepatitis B and
322 tetanus toxoid. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2016; 10:e0005180.
- 323 30. Apiwattanakul N, Thomas PG, Iverson AR, McCullers JA. Chronic helminth infections impair
324 pneumococcal vaccine responses. *Vaccine* 2014; 32:5405–5410.
325 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.07.107
- 326 31. Hartmann W, Brunn ML, Stetter N, Gagliani N, Muscate F, Stanelle-Bertram S, et al. Helminth
327 infections suppress the efficacy of vaccination against seasonal influenza. *Cell Reports* 2019;
328 29:2243–2256. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2019.10.051
- 329 32. Abraha HE, Gessesse Z, Gebrecherkos T, Kebede Y, Weldegiargis AW, Tequare MH, et al.
330 Clinical features and risk factors associated with morbidity and mortality among COVID-19
331 patients in Northern Ethiopia. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021; 105: 776–783.

- 332 33. International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection Consortium (ISARIC). COVID-
333 19 CRF. [https://isaric.tghn.org/COVID-19- CRF/](https://isaric.tghn.org/COVID-19-CRF/). (Accessed Aug 28, 2020).
- 334 34. Gebrecherkos T, Kiros YK, Challa F, Abdella S, Gebreegzabher A, Leta D, et al. Longitudinal
335 profile of antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19 in a setting from Sub-
336 Saharan Africa: A prospective longitudinal study. *PLoS One* 2022; 17:e0263627.
337 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0263627
- 338 35. Wolday D. Gebrecherkos T, Arefaine ZG, Kiros YK, Gebreegzabheer A, Tasew G, et al. Effect of
339 co-infection with parasites on COVID-19 severity: A prospective cohort study.
340 *eClinicalMedicine* 2021; 39: 101054. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101054
- 341 36. Adjobimey T, Meyer J, Terkeš V, Parcina M, Hoerauf A. Helminth antigens differentially
342 modulate the activation of CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T lymphocytes of convalescent COVID-19 patients
343 in vitro. *BMC Med* 2022;20: 241-252. doi:10.1186/s12916-022-02441-x
- 344 37. Egwang TG, Owalla TJ, Kemigisha M. COVID-19 vaccine trials must include helminth-infected
345 cohorts. *Nat Immunol* 2022; 23:148. doi: 10.1038/s41590-021-01116-8

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361 **Table 1: Clinical features among COVID-19 patients without, or with parasite co-infection**

Characteristic	All patients N=74	Without parasite N= 35 (47.3)	With parasite N=39 (52.7)	p-value
Socio–demographic features:				
Male sex	57 (77.0)	26 (75.3)	31 (79.5)	0.595
Age in years (median, IQR)	35 (28-50)	37 (28-55)	34 (28-43)	0.368
Clinical symptoms:				
Fever	23 (31.1)	12 (34.3)	11 (28.2)	0.573
Dyspnea	30 (40.5)	19 (54.3)	11 (28.2)	0.023
Cough	34 (46.0)	19 (54.3)	15 (38.5)	0.173
Chest pain	7 (9.5)	3 (8.6)	4 (10.3)	0.805
Sore throat	5 (6.8)	3 (8.6)	2 (5.1)	0.556
Headache	21 (28.4)	13 (37.1)	8 (20.5)	0.113
Nasal congestion	5 (6.8)	1 (2.9)	4 (10.3)	0.205
Loss of smell and/or taste	3 (4.1)	1 (2.9)	2 (5.1)	0.621
Nausea/vomiting	5 (6.8)	3 (8.6)	2 (5.1)	0.556
Myalgia	8 (10.8)	4 (11.4)	4 (10.3)	0.871
Comorbidities				
Comorbidity (at least 1)	21 (28.4)	10 (28.6)	11 (28.2)	0.972
Non–communicable diseases (NCDs)	18 (24.3)	8 (22.9)	10 (25.6)	0.780
Outcomes				
Severe COVID–19	29 (39.2)	17 (48.6)	12 (30.8)	0.117
Parasite co-infection	39 (52.7)	-	-	-
Protozoa - any	26 (35.1)	-	-	-
<i>Entamoeba spp. cyst</i>	18 (24.3)	-	-	-
<i>Entamoeba histolytica trophozoite</i>	5 (6.8)	-	-	-
<i>Giardia lamblia trophozoite</i>	3 (4.1)	-	-	-
Helminth – any	19 (25.7)	-	-	-
<i>Hymenolopis nana</i>	15 (20.3)	-	-	-
<i>Schistosoma mansoni</i>	2 (2.7)	-	-	-
<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>	3 (4.1)	-	-	-
Poly–parasitism – any	9 (12.2)	-	-	-

362 *Data are presented as proportion (%) unless indicated

363

364 **Table 2. Profile of anti-SARS-CoV-2 NP total Ig response among COVID-19 patients with or without intestinal parasite co-infection**

Anti-NP total Ig*	Parasite			Helminth			Protozoa		
	Negative	Positive	P-value	Negative	Positive	P-value	Negative	Positive	P-value
Positivity rate	174/261 (66.7)	231/328 (70.4)	0.328	290/424 (68.4)	115/165 (69.7)	0.760	254/377 (67.4)	151/212 (71.2)	0.333
Anti-NP total Ig titer (COI)	7.51 (0.21-59.21)	6.91 (0.55-40.70)	0.764	6.84 (0.28-48.99)	7.49 (0.58-42.35)	0.676	7.51 (0.23-50.57)	6.79 (0.62-39.86)	0.737

365 Data presented as numbers and percentage positivity rate, or median (IQR) cut-off index (COI). The COI for positive anti-NP total Ig is ≥ 1.0 .

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376


377

378

379

380

381 Figure legends:




382

383 **Figure 1.** Anti-NP total Ig positivity rate (A-C) and titer levels (D-F) at different time points after onset of symptoms stratified by the
384 parasite (A, D), helminth (B, E) and protozoa (C, F) co-infection status. The red dashed horizontal line (D-F) represents the cut-off value
385 of the limit of detection of the anti-NP total Ig assay.

386

387



388

389 **Figure 2.** Seroconversion rate (A) and titers levels (B) of anti-NP total Ig at different time points after onset of symptoms stratified by
390 parasite co-infection status. The red dashed horizontal line (B) represents the cut-off value of the limit of detection of the anti-NP total
391 Ig assay.

392

393

394

395