

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:** 2994

30 **KEY POINTS (75-100 WORDS)**

31 **Question**

32 What was the effect of a large population influx on SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in an
33 immunologically naïve resident population?

34 **Findings**

35 Despite high seroprevalence observed within the student population, seroprevalence in a
36 longitudinal cohort of community residents remained low and stable from before student
37 arrival for the Fall term to after their departure, implying limited transmission between these
38 subpopulations. Contact with an individual known to be SARS-CoV-2 positive and attending
39 small gatherings were the only significant risk factors among returning students.

40 **Meaning**

41 The demographic shift associated with student return to campus was not associated with
42 increased SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in this cohort of community residents.

43 **ABSTRACT (350 WORDS)**

44 **Importance**

45 The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has had wide-spread impacts on
46 health and behavioral patterns. Returning university students represent large-scale, transient
47 demographic shifts and a potential source of transmission risk to adjacent communities.

48 **Objective**

49 Test the *a priori* hypothesis that the Fall 2020 student return-to-campus would correlate with
50 an increase in infection rates in the surrounding community; identify risk factors for SARS-
51 CoV-2 infection within and between the subgroups.

52 **Design**

53 Prospective longitudinal cohort study.

54 **Setting**

55 Conducted in Centre County, Pennsylvania, USA from August 2020 to December 2020.

56 **Participants**

57 Non-random cohorts of county residents 18 years of age or older living in Centre County
58 prior to the return to in-person instruction at the Pennsylvania State University and returning
59 students who were enrolled during the Fall 2020 term.

60 **Exposure(s)**

61 Contact with known SARS-CoV-2-positive and COVID-symptomatic individuals, attending
62 gatherings of various sizes, and adherence to public health non-pharmaceutical interventions.

63 **Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s)**

64 Presence of IgG antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2 surface spike glycoprotein (S) receptor-
65 binding domain (S/RBD), measured using an indirect isotype-specific (IgG) screening
66 enzyme immunoassay.

67 **Results**

68 Of 345 community participants, 19 (5.5%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies at
69 their first visit between 7 August and 2 October. Of 625 returning student participants, 195
70 (31.2%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies between 26 October and 23 November.
71 28 (8.1%) of the community participants had returned a positive result by 9 December. Only
72 contact with known SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals and attendance at small gatherings
73 (20-50 individuals) were significant predictors of IgG antibodies among returning students
74 (aOR, 95% CI: 3.24, 2.14-4.91, $p < 0.001$; 1.62, 1.08-2.44, $p < 0.05$; respectively).

75 **Conclusions and Relevance**

76 Despite high seroprevalence observed within the student population, seroprevalence in a
77 longitudinal cohort of community residents was low and stable from before student arrival for
78 the Fall 2020 term to after student departure, implying limited transmission between these
79 cohorts. This implies the potential to minimize the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from high
80 prevalence, geographically coincident sub-populations. Future work should investigate the
81 relative efficacy of specific measures to reduce risk of transmission from itinerant to resident
82 populations and guide communities with high levels of episodic migration and similar social
83 configurations.

84 **BACKGROUND**

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

98 During the Fall 2020 term, many universities in the US experienced high rates of COVID-19
99 cases among students,¹⁶ with a 56% increase in incidence among counties home to large
100 colleges or universities relative to matched counties without such institutions.¹² While there is
101 strong evidence of high incidence rates associated with a return to campus at US colleges and
102 universities,¹² the increase in risk in surrounding communities, and the rate of transmission
103 from campuses to communities, have been less well characterized.

104 This investigation reports the results of a longitudinal serosurvey of community residents in
105 Centre County, Pennsylvania, USA, which is home to The Pennsylvania State University
106 (PSU), University Park (UP) campus. The return of approximately 35,000 students to the UP
107 campus in August 2020 represented a nearly 20% increase in the county population size.¹⁷

108 During the Fall 2020 term, more than 4,500 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infections were detected
109 among the student population.¹⁸ Between 7 August and 2 October 2020 (before and just after
110 student return), we enrolled a cohort of community residents and tested serum for the
111 presence of anti-Spike Receptor Binding Domain (S/RBD) IgG, which would indicate prior
112 SARS-CoV-2 exposure.¹⁹ This was repeated in the same cohort during December 2020 (post-
113 departure of students), and we present seroprevalence for both sampling waves. Additionally,
114 returning students were enrolled in a longitudinal cohort, and IgG seroprevalence results are
115 presented from the first wave of sampling (between October and November 2020, prior to the
116 end of the term). The hypothesis tested was that the rapid influx of students during the Fall
117 2020 term would be correlated with increased prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 within the
118 geographically co-incident community.

119 **METHODS**

120 **Design, Setting, and Participants**

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

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

131 Individuals were eligible for participation in the community resident cohort if they were: ≥ 18
132 years old, residing in Centre County at the time of recruitment (June through September

133 2020); expecting to reside in Centre County until June 2021; fluent in English; and capable of
134 providing their own consent. PSU students who remained in Centre County through spring
135 and summer university closure were eligible for inclusion in the community resident cohort
136 as this group experienced similar geographic COVID-19 risks as community residents
137 (versus returning students who experienced variable risk during spring and summer
138 depending on their residence).

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

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

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

155 **Outcomes**

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

160 **Statistical Methods**

161 Community resident and returning student cohorts' seroprevalence are presented with
162 binomial 95% confidence intervals. We estimated each subgroup's true prevalence,
163 accounting for imperfect sensitivity and specificity of the IgG assay, using the *truePrev()*
164 function in the *prevalence* package in R. We calculated a 95% binomial confidence interval
165 for test sensitivity of the IgG assay for detecting prior self-reported positive tests in the
166 returning student cohort (students had high access to testing from a common University
167 provider) and assumed a uniform prior distribution between these limits. Estimates of the true
168 prevalence were then calculated across all possible values of specificity between 0.85 and
169 0.99. We did not estimate prevalence corrected for demographics as participants were not
170 enrolled using a probability-based sample. We assessed demographic characteristics of the
171 tested participants relative to all study participants to illustrate potential selection biases
172 (Table 1).

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

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

180 *finalfit* packages. We considered the following risk factors: close proximity (6 feet or less) to
181 an individual who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2; close proximity to an individual showing
182 key COVID-19 symptoms (fever, cough, shortness of breath); attendance at a small gathering
183 (20-50 people) in the past 3 months; attendance at a medium gathering (51-200 people) in the
184 past 3 months; live in University housing; ate in a restaurant in the past 7 days; ate in a dining
185 hall in the past 7 days; only ate in their room/apartment in the past 7 days; travelled in the 3
186 months prior to returning to campus; and travelled since returning to campus for the Fall
187 term. Given the airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2, all the above variables are potential
188 exposure risks due to the increased contact with individuals outside of a participants'
189 household.^{24–27}

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

192 **RESULTS**

193 A total of 10,369 community residents were identified through an initial REDCap survey that
194 collected eligibility, demographic, and contact information. Of those who identified
195 willingness to participate in a later study, 1,540 were contacted and enrolled. 1,432
196 completed a first clinic visit between 7 August and 2 October 2020, and 345 of those
197 completed a second clinic visit between 30 November and 9 December 2020 and for whom
198 both visit 1 and visit 2 samples were analysed using the in-house ELISA assay; the remaining
199 participants' samples will be analysed in the future. 1,349 returning students were recruited
200 using volunteer sampling and 707 enrolled; of these, 625 completed clinic visits for serum
201 collection between 26 October and 23 November. 642 students indicated willingness to
202 participate but did not complete intake procedures or did not attend their scheduled clinic
203 visit.

204 Among participants with serum samples: the median age community residents was 47 years
205 (IQR: 35-0-60-0), with 81·7% between the ages 18-65 years, and for the returning students
206 the median age was 20·9 years (IQR: 19·7-21·6), with 100% between the ages 18-65 years;
207 62·0% of the community residents identified as female and 33·6% as male; 64·6% of the
208 returning students identified as female and 34·4% as male; 90·1% of the community residents
209 identified as white, as did 81·3% of the students. Similar proportions were seen in those
210 enrolled without samples, and among the initial REDCap survey respondents (Table 1; Table
211 2).

212 Although all county residents were eligible for participation, 77·0% of community resident
213 participants were from the 5 townships (College, Ferguson, Harris, Half Moon, Patton) and 1
214 borough (State College) that form the “Centre Region” and account for ~59% of Centre
215 County’s population¹⁷ (Figure 1). The median household income group in the community
216 residents providing samples was \$100,000-149,999 USD (IQR: \$50,000-74,999; \$100,000-
217 149,999). The median household income in the county is \$60,403.¹⁷ 47·4% of the county is
218 female, 87·9% white, and 70·3% are between the ages of 18-65 years old.¹⁷ The study cohort
219 is moderately older and more affluent (in part because of the exclusion of returning students),
220 and disproportionately female compared to the general Centre County population.

221 Of the returning student participants, 665 (94·1%) had at least one test prior to enrollment in
222 the study; of these, 105 (15·8%) self-reported a positive result (Table S3). Of these, 98
223 (93·3%) indicated that this test result occurred after their return to campus (median: 26
224 September; IQR: 13 September, 9 October). Of the 625 returning students with an ELISA
225 result, 84 of the 90 (93·3%) with a self-reported prior positive test result were positive for
226 SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. Of the 535 returning students with ELISA results who did not
227 report a positive SARS-CoV-2 test, 111 (20·7%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG

228 antibodies. Of the total 625 returning students with ELISA results, 195 (31.2%) were positive
229 for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies (Figure 1).

230 Among the community resident participants, 19 of 345 (5.5%) were positive for SARS-CoV-
231 2 antibodies at their first visit (Figure 1). Between their first and second visit, 9 participants
232 converted from negative to positive and 9 converted from positive to negative; 28 (8.2%)
233 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies at either visit (Figure 1).

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

243 Among the returning student subgroup, only close proximity to a known SARS-CoV-2-
244 positive individual and attending small gatherings in the past 3 months (20-50 individuals)
245 were significantly associated with a positive ELISA classification at $\alpha = 0.05$ (aOR: 3.24,
246 2.14-4.91, $p < 0.001$; aOR: 1.62, 1.08-2.44, $p < 0.05$; respectively) in the multivariable model
247 (Table 3). Taken individually, attending small gatherings (20-50 people) (OR: 2.38, 1.66-
248 3.43, $p < 0.001$), attending medium gatherings (51-200 people) (OR: 1.88, 1.19-2.94, $p < 0.01$),
249 and close proximity to a known SARS-CoV-2-positive or symptomatic individual (OR: 3.65,
250 2.51-5.37, $p < 0.001$; 1.81, 1.24-2.64, $p < 0.01$; respectively) were all associated with the IgG
251 positivity in crude calculations of association. Given the low prevalence observed within the

252 community subgroup, and lack of significant effects observed during crude analysis, models
253 were not fit to the community resident data.

254 Both the returning student and community resident participants self-reported high compliance
255 with masking; 86.4% and 76.9%, respectively, reported always wearing mask or cloth face
256 covering when in public (Table S4, Table S5). By contrast, less than one third of both groups
257 (28.8% and 31.0%, respectively) self-reported always maintaining 6-feet of distance from
258 others in public. Less than half (42.9%) of returning students indicated that they always
259 avoided groups of 25 or greater, in contrast with 65.7% of community residents.

260 **DISCUSSION**

261 The return of students to in-person instruction on the PSU UP campus was associated with a
262 large increase in COVID-19 incidence in the county, as evidenced by over 4,500 student
263 cases at PSU.¹⁸ In a sample of 625 returning students, 31% were positive for SARS-CoV-2
264 antibodies. Out of approximately 35,000 students who returned to campus, this implies that
265 the detected cases may account for ~40% of all infections among PSU UP students. Despite
266 this high incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the county during the Fall 2020 term, a
267 cohort of community residents, who disproportionately identified as female and lived in close
268 proximity to campus, saw only a modest increase in the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG
269 antibodies (5.5 to 8.1%) between September and December 2020. The true prevalence of
270 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection in the cohorts depends on the assumed sensitivity and
271 specificity. However, for all realistic values of sensitivity and specificity, there was no
272 evidence of a significant increase in true prevalence in the community resident sample. While
273 in-person student instruction has been associated with an increase in per-capita COVID-19
274 incidence at the aggregate level,¹² these results suggest that outbreaks in the returning student
275 and the community resident cohort we studied were asynchronous, implying limited between-
276 cohort transmission. A recent analysis of age-specific movement and transmission patterns in

277 the US suggested that individuals between the ages of 20-34 disproportionately contributed to
278 spread of SARS-CoV-2;²⁸ however, despite close geographic proximity to a college-aged
279 population, transmission in our community resident sample appears distinctly lagged;
280 suggestive of the potential for health behaviours to prevent infection.

281 Within the student group, presence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was significantly associated
282 with close proximity to known SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals and attendance of small
283 events, however, no other risk factors were correlated with an increase in SARS-CoV-2 IgG
284 test positivity, aligning with other research.²³ However, it is not possible to discern how much
285 the likelihood of contact with a SARS-CoV-2 positive individual is due to the high campus
286 prevalence versus individual behaviours. To the extent that limiting gatherings may reduce
287 risk for students, it is not clear to what extent that will affect transmission from students to
288 community residents. Both community residents and returning students reported high
289 adoption of masking (>75%) and low adoption of distancing in public (31.0% and 28.8%,
290 respectively). Returning students reported lower adherence to avoiding gatherings of greater
291 than 25 individuals than community residents.

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

299 Though the participants reflect a convenience sample, the difference in SARS-CoV-2
300 seroprevalence suggest that the cohorts did not experience a synchronous, well-mixed

301 epidemic despite their close geographic proximity. College campuses have been observed to
302 have high COVID-19 attack rates, and counties containing colleges and universities have
303 been observed to have significantly higher COVID-19 incidence than demographically
304 matched counties without such institutions.¹² Thus, while college and university operations
305 may present a significant exposure risk (because of large numbers of returning students, high
306 density housing, and frequent in-person socialization), this analysis suggests the possibility
307 that local-scale heterogeneity in mixing may allow for asynchronous transmission dynamics
308 despite close geographic proximity. Thus, the disproportionately high incidence in the student
309 population, which comprises less than one quarter of the county population, may bias
310 assessment of risk in the non-student resident population. Risk assessment in spatial units
311 (e.g., counties) that have strong population sub-structuring should consider these
312 heterogeneities and their consequences for policy.

313 SARS-CoV-2 transmission between the student and community resident populations is likely
314 to have occurred (perhaps multiple times) and these results do not preclude that possibility.
315 However, the large difference in seroprevalence between the student and resident participants
316 after the Fall term are consistent with either rare transmission events between students and
317 residents, non-persistent transmission with the community residents, or both. We note that
318 this was achieved in the context of disproportionate investment in prevention education,
319 testing, contact tracing, and infrastructure for isolation and quarantine by PSU in the high-
320 prevalence sub-population (students). Continued research in these cohorts may help identify
321 mechanisms that mitigate transmission from and within high density, mobile sub-populations
322 (e.g., displaced populations, seasonal workers, military deployment).

323 With respect to the health behaviors measured, the community resident and returning student
324 groups differed only in their small social group contact, and thus a next step is to identify

325 factors that may explain this difference (e.g., differences in leisure time activity norms and/or
326 perceptions of age-related risk; business closures; university policies and sanctions).
327 Minimizing risk, however, may come at significant social, psychological, educational,
328 economic, and societal costs.³⁰ Thus, operational planning for both institutions of higher
329 education and the communities in which they are embedded should consider both the risk of
330 SARS-CoV-2 transmission and the costs of mitigation efforts.

331 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

332 **Author Contributions**

333 *Conceptualization:* MJF, NB, MS, AR, VK
334 *Data curation:* MJF, CA
335 *Formal analysis:* CA, MJF, CMH
336 *Funding acquisition:* MJF, AR
337 *Investigation:* SS, AG, MMS, CJR
338 *Methodology:* CA, MJF
339 *Project administration:* MJF, MMS
340 *Software:* CA, MJF, CMH
341 *Supervision:* MJF, VK, SK
342 *Validation:* CA, MJF, CMH, SS
343 *Visualization:* CA, MJF
344 *Writing - original draft:* CA, SS, CMH, VK, MJF
345 *Writing - review and editing:* all authors.

346 **Conflicts of Interest and Financial Disclosures**

347 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

348 **Financial and Material Support**

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

355 **Data Access, Responsibility, and Analysis**

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

361 **Collaborators**

362 1. Florian Krammer, Mount Sinai, USA for generously providing the transfection plasmid
363 pCAGGS-RBD
364 2. Scott E. Lindner, Allen M. Minns, Randall Rossi produced and purified RBD
365 3. The D4A Research Group: Dee Bagshaw, Clinical & Translational Science Institute,
366 Cyndi Flanagan, Clinical Research Center and the Clinical & Translational Science
367 Institute, Thomas Gates, Social Science Research Institute, Margeaux Gray, Dept. of
368 Biobehavioral Health, Stephanie Lanza, Dept. of Biobehavioral Health and Prevention
369 Research Center, James Marden, Dept. of Biology and Huck Institutes of the Life
370 Sciences, Susan McHale, Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies and the
371 Social Science Research Institute, Glenda Palmer, Social Science Research Institute,
372 Rachel Smith, Dept. of Communication Arts and Sciences and Huck Institutes of the Life
373 Sciences, and Charima Young, Penn State Office of Government and Community
374 Relations.

375 4. The authors thank the following for their assistance in the lab: Liz D. Cambron,
376 Elizabeth M. Schwartz, Devin F. Morrison, Julia Fecko, Brian Dawson, Sean Gullette,
377 Sara Neering, Mark Signs, Nigel Deighton, Janhayi Damani, Mario Novelo, Diego
378 Hernandez, Ester Oh, Chauncy Hinshaw, B. Joanne Power, James McGee, Riëtte van
379 Biljon, Andrew Stephenson, Alexis Pino, Nick Heller, Rose Ni, Eleanor Jenkins, Julia
380 Yu, Mackenzie Doyle, Alana Stracuzzi, Brielle Bellow, Abriana Cain, Jaime Farrell,
381 Megan Kostek, Amelia Zazzera, Sara Ann Malinchak, Alex Small, Sam DeMatte,
382 Elizabeth Morrow, Ty Somberger, Haylea Debolt, Kyle Albert, Corey Price, Nazmiye
383 Celik

384 **REFERENCES**

385

386 1. Bengtsson L, Gaudart J, Lu X, et al. Using Mobile Phone Data to Predict the Spatial
387 Spread of Cholera. *Scientific Reports*. 2015;5(1):8923. doi:10.1038/srep08923

388 2. Wilson ME. Travel and the emergence of infectious diseases. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
389 1995;1(2):39-46.

390 3. Chinazzi M, Davis JT, Ajelli M, et al. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the
391 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science*. 2020;368(6489):395-400.
392 doi:10.1126/science.aba9757

393 4. Viboud C, Børnstad ON, Smith DL, Simonsen L, Miller MA, Grenfell BT. Synchrony,
394 Waves, and Spatial Hierarchies in the Spread of Influenza. *Science*.
395 2006;312(5772):447-451. doi:10.1126/science.1125237

396 5. Bharti N, Tatem AJ, Ferrari MJ, Grais RF, Djibo A, Grenfell BT. Explaining seasonal
397 fluctuations of measles in Niger using nighttime lights imagery. *Science*.
398 2011;334(6061):1424-1427. doi:10.1126/science.1210554

399 6. Wells CR, Sah P, Moghadas SM, et al. Impact of international travel and border control
400 measures on the global spread of the novel 2019 coronavirus outbreak. *PNAS*.
401 2020;117(13):7504-7509. doi:10.1073/pnas.2002616117

402 7. Bogoch II, Creatore MI, Cetron MS, et al. Assessment of the potential for international
403 dissemination of Ebola virus via commercial air travel during the 2014 west African
404 outbreak. *The Lancet*. 2015;385(9962):29-35. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61828-6

405 8. Jia JS, Lu X, Yuan Y, Xu G, Jia J, Christakis NA. Population flow drives spatio-temporal
406 distribution of COVID-19 in China. *Nature*. 2020;582(7812):389-394.
407 doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2284-y

408 9. Funk S, Ciglenecki I, Tiffany A, et al. The impact of control strategies and behavioural
409 changes on the elimination of Ebola from Lofa County, Liberia. *Philos Trans R Soc
410 Lond B Biol Sci*. 2017;372(1721). doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0302

411 10. Sniadack DH, Moscoso B, Aguilar R, Heath J, Bellini W, Chiu MC. Measles
412 epidemiology and outbreak response immunization in a rural community in Peru. *Bull
413 World Health Organ*. 1999;77(7):545-552.

414 11. Stoddard ST, Forshey BM, Morrison AC, et al. House-to-house human movement drives
415 dengue virus transmission. *PNAS*. Published online December 27, 2012.
416 doi:10.1073/pnas.1213349110

417 12. Leidner AJ, Barry V, Bowen VB, et al. Opening of Large Institutions of Higher
418 Education and County-Level COVID-19 Incidence — United States, July 6–September
419 17, 2020 Vaughn Barry, PhD1; Virginia B. Bowen, PhD1; Rachel Silver, MPH1;
420 Trieste Musial, MS2; Gloria J. Kang, PhD1; Matthew D. Ritchey, DPT3; Kelly
421 Fletcher, MPH2; Lisa Barrios, DrPH1; Eric Pevzner, PhD. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly
422 Rep*. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7001a4

- 423 13. Goetz S, Tian Z, Schmidt C, Meadowcroft D, NERCARD, Pennsylvania State University.
424 *Rural COVID-19 Cases Lag Urban Areas but Are Growing Much More Rapidly.*
425 Pennsylvania State University Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and
426 Education; 2020. Accessed February 6, 2021.
427 [https://aese.psu.edu/nercard/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-](https://aese.psu.edu/nercard/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly)
428 [urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly](https://aese.psu.edu/nercard/publications/covid-19-issues-briefs/rural-covid-19-cases-lag-urban-areas-but-are-growing-much-more-rapidly)
- 429 14. Christensen H, Turner K, Trickey A, et al. COVID-19 transmission in a university
430 setting: a rapid review of modelling studies. *medRxiv*. Published online September 9,
431 2020:2020.09.07.20189688. doi:10.1101/2020.09.07.20189688
- 432 15. Andersen MS, Bento AI, Basu A, Marsicano C, Simon K. College Openings, Mobility,
433 and the Incidence of COVID-19 Cases. *medRxiv*. Published online September 23,
434 2020:2020.09.22.20196048. doi:10.1101/2020.09.22.20196048
- 435 16. The New York Times. Tracking the Coronavirus at U.S. Colleges and Universities - The
436 New York Times. Tracking the Coronavirus at U.S. Colleges and Universities.
437 Published December 11, 2020. Accessed January 30, 2021.
438 <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/covid-college-cases-tracker.html>
- 439 17. United States Census Bureau. U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Centre County,
440 Pennsylvania. QuickFacts: Centre County, Pennsylvania. Published 2019. Accessed
441 January 30, 2021. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/centrecountypennsylvania>
- 442 18. Pennsylvania State University. COVID-19 Dashboard. Virus Info. Published January 29,
443 2021. Accessed January 30, 2021.
444 [https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDY3NjhiMDItOWY0Mi00NzBmLWExNTA-](https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDY3NjhiMDItOWY0Mi00NzBmLWExNTAtZGIzNjZkMGU0OTM0IiwidCI6IjZjZjQ4ZDQ1LTNkZGItdm40S1hOWMxLWxMTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOjF9)
445 [tZGIzNjZkMGU0OTM0IiwidCI6IjZjZjQ4ZDQ1LTNkZGItdm40S1hOWMxLWxMTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOjF9](https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDY3NjhiMDItOWY0Mi00NzBmLWExNTAtZGIzNjZkMGU0OTM0IiwidCI6IjZjZjQ4ZDQ1LTNkZGItdm40S1hOWMxLWxMTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOjF9)
446 [MTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOjF9](https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDY3NjhiMDItOWY0Mi00NzBmLWExNTAtZGIzNjZkMGU0OTM0IiwidCI6IjZjZjQ4ZDQ1LTNkZGItdm40S1hOWMxLWxMTU1MjZlYjUyZSIsImMiOjF9)
- 447 19. Long Q-X, Liu B-Z, Deng H-J, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
448 with COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(6):845-848. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0897-1
- 449 20. Gontu A, Srinivasan S, Nair MS, et al. Quantitative Estimation of IgM and IgG
450 Antibodies Against SARS-CoV-2. *protocols.io*. Published online August 20, 2020.
451 doi:dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bivgke3w
- 452 21. Uyoga S, Adetifa IMO, Karanja HK, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
453 antibodies in Kenyan blood donors. *Science*. 2021;371(6524):79-82.
454 doi:10.1126/science.abe1916
- 455 22. Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Perez-Saez J, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
456 antibodies after the second pandemic peak. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2021;0(0).
457 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00054-2
- 458 23. Kalish H, Klumpp-Thomas C, Hunsberger S, et al. Mapping a Pandemic: SARS-CoV-2
459 Seropositivity in the United States. *medRxiv*. Published online January 1,
460 2021:2021.01.27.21250570. doi:10.1101/2021.01.27.21250570
- 461 24. Huang Y-T, Tu Y-K, Lai P-C. Estimation of the secondary attack rate of COVID-19
462 using proportional meta-analysis of nationwide contact tracing data in Taiwan. *Journal*

- 463 *of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection*. Published online June 11, 2020.
464 doi:10.1016/j.jmii.2020.06.003
- 465 25. Cheng H-Y, Jian S-W, Liu D-P, et al. Contact Tracing Assessment of COVID-19
466 Transmission Dynamics in Taiwan and Risk at Different Exposure Periods Before and
467 After Symptom Onset. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2020;180(9):1156-1163.
468 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020
- 469 26. Leclerc QJ, Fuller NM, Knight LE, Funk S, Knight GM. What settings have been linked
470 to SARS-CoV-2 transmission clusters? *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020;5.
471 doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15889.2
- 472 27. Brooks-Pollock E, Read JM, House T, Medley GF, Keeling MJ, Danon L. The
473 Population Attributable Fraction (PAF) of cases due to gatherings and groups with
474 relevance to COVID-19 mitigation strategies. *medRxiv*. Published online March 23,
475 2020:2020.03.20.20039537. doi:10.1101/2020.03.20.20039537
- 476 28. Monod M, Blenkinsop A, Xi X, et al. Age groups that sustain resurging COVID-19
477 epidemics in the United States. *Science*. Published online February 2, 2021:eabe8372.
478 doi:10.1126/science.abe8372
- 479 29. Pennsylvania State University. Mask Up or Pack Up. Virus Info. Published 2021.
480 Accessed February 6, 2021. <https://virusinfo.psu.edu/mask-up-or-pack-up/>
- 481 30. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and
482 how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):912-920.
483 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8
- 484

485 **TABLES**

486 **Table 1**

487 Demographic characteristics of study participants. Non-D4A participants are all participants
 488 in the initial anonymous survey from which Data4Action participants were drawn. D4A
 489 participants are divided into subsets for which antibody assays were conducted (N=345) and
 490 those for which assays were not conducted (N=1195).
 491

Variable	D4A Participant (N=1540)		Not D4A Participant (N=8826)
	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%)

492
 493 * Asian; Hispanic, Lantino/a, or Spanish; Black or African American; Middle Eastern or
 494 North African; Native American or Alaska Native; other race or ethnicity. This category is
 495 aggregated to protect participant identities because no single group comprised >4% of
 496 participants.

497 **Table 2**
 498 Demographic characteristics of the returning student participants.
 499

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%)

500
 501 * Asian; Black or African American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or
 502 other Pacific Islander; some other race. This category is aggregated to protect participant
 503 identities because no single group comprised >4% of participants.

504 **Table 3**
 505 Crude and adjusted odds ratios (aOR) of risk factors among returning PSU UP student cohort
 506

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)

507

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

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

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

511


512 **FIGURES**

513 **Figure 1**


514 **A)** Map of Centre County, Pennsylvania, USA. Blue indicates the 5 townships and 1 borough
515 that comprise the Centre Region. Red indicates the location of The Pennsylvania State
516 University (PSU), University Park (UP) Campus. Inset illustrates the proportion of the county
517 population in each region; PSU indicates the estimated student population that returned to
518 campus for the Fall 2020 term. **B)** Raw seroprevalence (circles) with 95% binomial
519 confidence intervals for the community residents at the first visit at the start of the Fall 2020
520 term (light blue), returning students at the end of the fall 2020 term (red), and community
521 residents at either the first or the second visit after student departure (dark blue).

522 **Figure 2**

523 Estimated true prevalence (circles, with 95% confidence intervals) among participants at each
524 sampling interval corrected for estimated assay sensitivity as a function of the assumed assay
525 specificity (x-axis). Light blue indicates community residents at the first visit at the start of
526 the Fall 2020 term, red indicates returning students at the end of the Fall 2020 term, and dark
527 blue indicates community residents at the second visit after student departure.


A


Dot Indicates PSU Campus
Each square represents 1000 individuals



Region

- Not Centre Region
- Centre Region
- PSU

B



Using Sensitivity of 0.933 (0.861 – 0.975)