

1 **Minding the margins: Evaluating the impact of COVID-19 among Latinx and Black**
2 **communities with optimal qualitative serological assessment tools**

3 Raquel A. Binder^{1†*}, Angela M. Matta^{1†}, Catherine S. Forconi¹, Cliff I. Oduor², Prajakta
4 Bedekar^{3,4}, Paul N. Patrone³, Anthony J. Kearsley³, Boaz Odwar¹, Jennifer Batista⁵,
5 Sarah N. Forrester⁵, Heidi K. Leftwich⁶, Lisa A. Cavacini¹, Ann M. Moormann¹

6

7 [†]Authors contributed equally

8

9 ¹Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School,
10 Worcester, MA, USA

11 ²Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Warren Alpert Medical School,
12 Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

13 ³Applied and Computational Mathematics Division, National Institute of Standards and
14 Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, USA

15 ⁴Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University,
16 Baltimore, MD, USA

17 ⁵Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, University of
18 Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

19 ⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical
20 School, Worcester, MA, USA

21

22 ***Corresponding author:** E-mail: raquel.binder@umassmed.edu (RAB)

23 **Running title:** SARS-CoV-2 among Minorities and Methods

24 **Abstract word count:** 234

25 **Main text word count:** 3914

26

27 **Abstract**

28 COVID-19 disproportionately affected minorities, while research barriers to engage
29 underserved communities persist. Serological studies reveal infection and vaccination
30 histories within these communities, however lack of consensus on downstream evaluation
31 methods impede meta-analyses and dampen the broader public health impact. To reveal
32 the impact of COVID-19 and vaccine uptake among diverse communities and to develop
33 rigorous serological downstream evaluation methods, we engaged racial and ethnic
34 minorities in Massachusetts in a cross-sectional study (April - July 2022), screened blood
35 and saliva for SARS-CoV-2 and human endemic coronavirus (hCoV) antibodies by bead-
36 based multiplex assay and point-of-care (POC) test and developed across-plate
37 normalization and classification boundary methods for optimal qualitative serological
38 assessments. Among 290 participants, 91.4 % reported receiving at least one dose of a
39 COVID-19 vaccine, while 41.7 % reported past SARS-CoV-2 infections, which was
40 confirmed by POC- and multiplex-based saliva and blood IgG seroprevalences. We found
41 significant differences in antigen-specific IgA and IgG antibody outcomes and indication
42 of cross-reactivity with hCoV OC43. Finally, 26.5 % of participants reported lingering
43 COVID-19 symptoms, mostly middle-aged Latinas. Hence, prolonged COVID-19
44 symptoms were common among our underserved population and require public health
45 attention, despite high COVID-19 vaccine uptake. Saliva served as a less-invasive
46 sample-type for IgG-based serosurveys and hCoV cross-reactivity needed to be

47 evaluated for reliable SARS-CoV-2 serosurvey results. Using the developed rigorous
48 downstream qualitative serological assessment methods will help standardize serosurvey
49 outcomes and meta-analyses for future serosurveys beyond SARS-CoV-2.

50

51 **Key words:** SARS-CoV-2, serosurvey, Luminex, saliva, Latino/Latinx/Hispanic, Black,
52 Massachusetts, across-plate normalization, serological threshold calculation methods.

53

54 **Introduction**

55 Differential health care access and exposure risks have led to racial and ethnic COVID-
56 19 disparities in the United States (US), leaving Latinx and Black communities to
57 experience disproportionately high SARS-CoV-2 infection rates and COVID-19 related
58 morbidity and mortality.(1, 2) Seroprevalence studies have become essential public
59 health tools to assess the regional spread and pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2
60 among at-risk populations.(3-5) Further, by distinguishing between anti-SARS-CoV-2
61 spike (S), receptor-binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (N) antibodies, COVID-19
62 vaccine uptake (RBD/S only) can be estimated and compared to past SARS-CoV-2
63 infections.(6) Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin (Ig)G and IgA antibodies can be
64 measured in both blood and saliva, the latter serving as less invasive sample collection
65 alternative.(7)

66 Here, we engaged ethnic and racial minorities to evaluate the impact of COVID-19
67 in the Greater Worcester area from April to July of 2022 and evaluated blood- and saliva-
68 based serosurvey methods. Overall, this study (i) evaluated the impact of COVID-19 and
69 vaccine uptake among marginalized communities, (ii) confirmed the utility of using saliva

70 for serosurveys, (iii) compared the utility of a bead-based multiplex assay vs. a point-of-
71 care (POC) test for SARS-CoV-2 antibody measurements, and (iv) demonstrated the
72 benefit of developing and using classification boundary methods for optimal interpretation
73 of serological assays.

74

75 **Methods**

76 **Participant Recruitment and Sample Collection**

77 This cross-sectional study was approved by the University of Massachusetts Chan
78 Medical School (UMass Chan) Institutional Review Board (IRB Docket # H00023083).
79 Structured interviews with Black and Latinx community members in the Greater
80 Worcester Area in Massachusetts (MA) were conducted to identify recruitment barriers
81 for participation in research and IRB-approved study flyers distributed prior to
82 engagement with local stakeholders. We subsequently joined regular community
83 gatherings organized by Net of Compassion, Centro Hispano, and Central MA YMCA in
84 Worcester, along with the St. John Catholic Church in Clinton for in-person recruitment
85 events implemented both in Spanish and English from April 21st to July 4th of 2022. On
86 site, we provided a fact sheet explaining the purpose of the study and were available to
87 answer questions in Spanish and English. We obtained informed verbal consent from
88 eligible individuals (inclusion criteria: 18+ years of age, exclusion criteria: prisoners and
89 people unable to communicate in English or Spanish) and participants were asked to fill
90 out a brief RedCap survey covering demographic information, COVID-19 vaccine, and
91 SARS-CoV-2 infection history through tablets that were provided by the study team or by
92 QR codes that could be scanned on personal devices. We used verbal (not written)

93 consent for this minimal risk study due to hesitation of documentation and decreased
94 literacy rate among individuals from underserved communities. The verbal consent was
95 documented by the research team member interviewing the participant and this method
96 was approved by the IRB prior to study begin. Subsequently, blood and saliva samples
97 were collected with Tasso SST devices (Tasso, Inc., Seattle, WA) and SuperSal2®
98 devices (Oasis Diagnostics, Vancouver, WA), respectively, as per manufacturer's
99 guidelines. SARS-CoV-2 anti-immunoglobulin (Ig)G and IgM antibodies were detected
100 with an emergency use authorized approved POC test (FaStep from Assure Tech,
101 Hangzhou, China) and results provided to participants, along with a \$50 reimbursement.
102 See Supplemental Methods for more information on sample collection and processing.

103 **Multiplex Luminex Assay**

104 The following SARS-CoV-2 antigens were coupled to Luminex MagPlex Microspheres as
105 indicated by the manufacturer: Wild-type (WT; Wuhan) full-length spike (S), WT
106 nucleocapsid (N), WT receptor-binding domain (RBD), RBD alpha, RBD beta, RBD
107 gamma, RBD delta, RBD lambda, and RBD omicron. Following human endemic
108 coronavirus (hCoV) antigens and a Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) control were coupled:
109 HKU1, OC43, NL63, and 229E, see Supplemental Methods for more details. Briefly, after
110 validation of conjugated beads, the participant samples were screened on 96- or 384-
111 well plates, including a seven- or ten-point serial dilution standard. Conjugated beads
112 covering the antigen panel were combined and washed, incubated, washed again, and
113 biotinylated anti-human secondary IgG or IgA (BD Pharmingen) antibody added. After
114 incubation and washing, phycoerythrin conjugated streptavidin was added (BD
115 Pharmingen). Finally, after incubation, washing, and resuspension, the plate was

116 screened by a FlexMap 3D Luminex instrument. The antigen-specific median
117 fluorescence intensity (MFI) for each sample was recorded and BSA subtracted (including
118 for the standards) to account for non-specific bead binding.(8) Saliva samples were
119 screened for total IgG and total IgA antibodies to account for differential salivation flow
120 rates by coupling anti-human IgG gamma chain (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) and anti-human
121 IgA alpha chain protein (Abcam, Cambridge, UK) respectively.

122 Previously described de-identified banked blood samples served as positive
123 (n=50) and negative blood controls (n=50).(9) Banked saliva samples (n=50), collected
124 with the same SuperSal2 devices, served as alternative control group for the
125 seroprevalence calculation, see qualitative serological assessments below.

126 **Across-plate Normalization**

127 Dilution series of standards for each antigen-plate combination were weighted using a
128 plate-dependent variance while a normalization factor was computed with custom
129 MATLAB scripts. This factor was then applied by multiplying it with each antigen/isotype-
130 specific sample MFI on the plate, see Supplemental Methods for more details.

131 **Qualitative Serological Assessments**

132 Sample MFIs were translated to qualitative (i.e., binary positive/negative) outcomes as
133 described in reference (10) and in the Supplemental Methods. Briefly, for the blood
134 samples, empirical training data were taken as approximate probability models of
135 measurement outcomes for each antigen, conditioned on knowing the class of the
136 underlying sample. The analysis was applied to multidimensional data by treating up to
137 three antigens as distinct axes in a coordinate space, see **S1 Figure** for a three-
138 dimensional analysis example. Due to the lack of collection method- and population-

139 matched controls, the saliva-based IgG seroprevalence calculations were determined
140 with alternative control samples from a 2020 Kenyan study (proxy for negative training
141 data), see Supplemental Methods for more details.

142 **Statistical analysis**

143 Statistical calculations and graphs were done in Prism v9.4.1, R v2023.09.1+494,
144 MATLAB R2023a Update 5 (9.14.0.2337262).

145

146 **Results**

147 **Demographics and Vaccine/Infection History**

148 A total of 290 adult study participants were enrolled in Worcester, Shrewsbury, and
149 Clinton, MA between April and July of 2022. Most participants donated blood (98.6 %,
150 n=286) and saliva (94.8 %, n=275) samples. Participants who did not give a saliva sample
151 mostly lacked saliva production (i.e., dry mouth), especially among elderly, but were not
152 hesitant to donate the sample. The demographic, clinical, and SARS-CoV-2 infection
153 history survey was filled out by 98.3 % participants (n=285), while 47.6 % (n=138) chose
154 to answer in Spanish and 51.7 % (n=150) in English (see Supplemental Materials for full
155 survey). Most participants self-identified as Latinx/Hispanic (67.6 %, n=196), and female
156 (61.0 %, n=177), while the average age was 45 years (range: 18-82, STDV: 16.3), and
157 31.4 % (n=91) of participants received a college or higher education degree, see **Table**
158 **1**. Non-Hispanic White participants constituted 13.4 % (n=39) of the study population.
159 Among the participants, 15.5 % (n=45) reported pre-existing health conditions, most
160 commonly hypertension, obesity, diabetes type II, and asthma, while 13.5 % (n=39)
161 reported smoking or vaping prior to the pandemic, see **S1 Table**.

162

163 **Table 1. Study participant demographics from 290 study participants enrolled in**
 164 **Massachusetts from April to July 2022 and 286 associated blood samples collected**
 165 **during the study period.**
 166

	Overall	Nucleocapsid IgG Positive Serum	Nucleocapsid IgG Negative Serum	χ^2 p-value ³
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Total	290 (100)	136 (49.9±7) [#]	150 (52.5)	
Age (years)				
18-40	126 (43.5)	52 (38.2)	72 (48.0)	0.292
41-60	96 (33.1)	45 (33.1)	51 (34.0)	
>60	59 (20.3)	31 (22.8)	26 (17.3)	
Missing	9 (3.1)	8 (5.9)	1 (0.7)	
Gender				
Female	177 (61.0)	79 (58.1)	96 (64.0)	0.393
Male	109 (37.6)	54 (39.7)	53 (35.3)	
Non-binary	3 (1.0)	2 (1.5)	1 (0.7)	
Missing	1 (0.4)	1 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	
Race				
White	97 (33.5)	39 (28.7)	56 (37.3)	0.039*
Mixed/Mestizo	90 (31.0)	53 (39.0)	37 (24.7)	
Black/African American	29 (10.0)	14 (10.3)	15 (10.0)	
Asian	31 (10.7)	9 (6.6)	21 (14.0)	
Other	43 (14.8)	21 (15.4)	21 (14.0)	
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	196 (67.6)	104 (76.5)	90 (60.0)	0.0013**
non-Hispanic	91 (31.4)	29 (21.3)	60 (40.0)	
Missing	3 (1.0)	3 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	
Education				
High School or less	100 (34.5)	57 (41.9)	40 (26.7)	0.0193*
College or more	91 (31.4)	37 (27.2)	54 (36.0)	
Missing	99 (34.1)	42 (30.9)	56 (37.3)	

SARS-CoV-2 + Test

Yes	121 (41.7)	71 (52.2)	49 (32.7)	0.0003***
No	163 (56.2)	59 (43.4)	101 (67.3)	
Missing	6 (2.1)	6 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	

Fully Recovered^ϕ

Yes	108 (37.2)	54 (39.7)	53 (35.3)	0.0099**
No	21 (7.2)	18 (13.3)	3 (2.0)	
Long COVID	19 (6.6)	12 (8.8)	7 (4.7)	
Never had COVID	136 (46.9)	46 (33.8)	87 (58.0)	
Missing	6 (2.1)	6 (4.4)	0 (0.0)	

167
 168 ^ρThe “Missing” categories, the “Non-binary” category in gender, and the “Never had COVID”
 169 category under “Fully Recovered” were omitted for the χ^2 test comparison; p-value < 0.05. The
 170 gender, ethnicity, education, and SARS-CoV-2 test comparison were done with the Fisher’s
 171 exact test (2x2 categories). * p-value < 0.05, ** p-value < 0.01, ***p-value < 0.001.
 172 [#]136 is the empirical count of positives (equal to a 47.5 % empirical seroprevalence) and 49.9 %
 173 (95% CI: ± 7) is the calculated bias-corrected seroprevalence.

174 ^ϕCOVID-19 recovery among all study participants (including 121 test-confirmed cases). Self-
 175 reporting having fully recovered from a SARS-CoV-2 infections (“Yes”) or not (“No”), whether
 176 infection-associated symptoms lasted past 4 weeks of the initial infection and therefore reported
 177 long COVID-19 symptoms (Long COVID), and those who never had COVID-19 (Never had
 178 COVID). For the χ^2 test comparison the “Missing” and the “Never had COVID” categories were
 179 omitted.
 180

181 A total of 265 (91.4 %) participants received at least one dose of a COVID-19
 182 vaccine; 45.7 % (n=121) Moderna; 40.0 % (n=106) Pfizer; 8.6 % (n=23) Johnson and
 183 Johnson; and 5.7 % (n=15) ‘other’, for the base vaccine series, see **S1 Table**. The vaccine
 184 uptake was lower for the second dose (84.5 %, n=245) and booster (68.3 %, n=198) while
 185 most participants received an influenza vaccine in the past 5 years (79.3 %, n=230). As
 186 for vaccine-related side effects, 37.7 % (n=100), 43.7 % (n=107), and 35.9 % (n=71) of
 187 participants did not experience any post-COVID-19 vaccine symptoms post-first dose, -
 188 second dose and -booster, respectively. Among those who experienced vaccine-
 189 associated symptoms post-base vaccine series and booster, the average severity scores

190 were 4.1 (STDV: 2.4; range: 1-10) and 3.6 (STDV: 2.2; range:1-10) respectively on a
191 scale from 1 to 10, while arm soreness, fever, and fatigue were the most frequently
192 reported symptoms. Further, 16.6 % (n=44), 14.7 % (n=36), and 6.1 % (n=12) of
193 participants experienced severe symptoms (rating ≥ 6) post-first dose, second dose, and
194 booster, respectively, encompassing thrombosis, strokes, fainting, and migraines. A total
195 of 6 participants reported vaccine-associated hospitalizations, encompassing all doses
196 for all participants. Among those who were not vaccinated, participants reported being
197 hesitant because of fear of COVID-19 vaccine side effects, lack of trust in the vaccine,
198 and not knowing enough about the vaccine.

199 A total of 121 (41.7 %) participants reported testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 at
200 least once and the associated average symptom severity score was 5.4 (STDV: 2.4;
201 range: 1-10), while 43.0 % (n=52) experienced severe symptoms (rating ≥ 6) and 9.1 %
202 (n=11) were hospitalized. The most common symptoms were body aches (52.1 %, n=63),
203 fever (51.2 %, n=62), fatigue (51.2 %, n=62), cough (48.8 %, n=59), headache (46.3 %,
204 n=56), sore throat (45.5 %, n=55), congestion/runny nose (38.0 %, n=46), and loss of
205 smell or taste (36.4 %, n=44). A total of 7 individuals (5.8 %) reported not having any
206 symptoms associated with the positive test (i.e., asymptomatic infections). There was an
207 association between reporting pre-existing health conditions and elevated severity scores
208 (rating ≥ 6 , Fisher's exact test, $p=0.0475$) but not between smoking/vaping and elevated
209 severity scores (rating ≥ 6 , Fisher's exact test, $p=>0.999$). Among those with confirmed
210 SARS-CoV-2 infections (n=121), 26.5 % (n=32) reported not having fully recovered from
211 the infection and 14.1 % (n=17) reported long COVID-19 symptoms (persistent symptoms
212 past 4 weeks of diagnosis). For further analysis, the categories "not fully recovered from

213 the infection” and reporting “long COVID-19 symptoms” were collapsed. Within this
214 category, 78.1 % (n=25) were female, 87.5 % (n=28) were Latinx, 59.4 % (n=19) of
215 mixed/mestizo race, and the average age was 48.6 years (STDV: 16.4, range: 19-82).
216 There was a significant association between being 50+ years of age and not having fully
217 recovered from COVID-19 symptoms (Fisher’s exact test, p=0.0135). There was no
218 significant correlation between being female or reporting pre-existing health conditions
219 and not having recovered from COVID-19 symptoms. Since the majority of the study
220 population self-identified as Latinx and/or belonging to racial minorities, we were not able
221 to contrast unresolved COVID-19 symptoms or any other variables among racial/ethnic
222 sub-groups.

223 **Blood-based SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies**

224 Among those who received a SARS-CoV-2 POC antibody results (n=284), 93.7 %
225 (n=266) were positive for IgG and 4.6 % (n=13) for IgM. The POC test covered both
226 SARS-CoV-2 N and S antigens, while the multiplex assay allowed measuring presence
227 of antibodies based on individual antigens and therefore distinguish between vaccine-
228 (S/RBD-only since all currently FDA-approved COVID-19 vaccines in the US are S/RBD-
229 based and do not include the N antigen) and infection-induced antibodies. The serum
230 multiplex-based *IgG* seroprevalences resulted in 97.5 % ± 2.4 % (95 % CI) for RBD/S/N
231 (3 antigens), 99.9 % ± 3.4 % (95 % CI) for RBD/S (2 antigens), 97.2 % ± 2.0 % (95 % CI)
232 for S/N (2 antigens), 96.5 % ± 2.2 % (95 % CI) for RBD/N (2 antigens), 96.5 % ± 2.2 %
233 (95 % CI) for RBD, and 97.9 % ± 1.7% (95 % CI) for S (see **S2 Table**), mirroring the high
234 self-reported vaccination uptake. The serum-based *IgG* N seroprevalence was 49.9 % ±
235 7.0 % (95% CI), indicating past infection rather than vaccination and mirrored self-

236 reported exposures. Statistically significant differences in N-specific serological test
237 outcomes were observed among study participants based on race, ethnicity, education,
238 and having fully recovered from COVID-19 symptom, as well as based on self-reported
239 SARS-CoV-2 test results prior to study participation, see **Table 1**. The S- and RBD-
240 specific serological test outcomes were not contrasted based on the listed categories due
241 to the high overall seroprevalence and self-reported vaccine uptake being close to 100
242 %. As for SARS-CoV-2 variants, the delta variant had the most abundant antibodies
243 among our study population, see **Fig 1**.

244

245 **Fig 1. Serum IgG Outcome Distribution.** Dot plot with means and 95% confidence
246 intervals (CI) of antigen-specific outcomes (MFI - BSA) for serum IgG, covering SARS-
247 CoV-2 (including variants) and human endemic coronaviruses (OC43, HKU1, NL63,
248 229E) with log₁₀ y-axis. See Supplemental Figure 11 for plots with linear y-axis. MFI,
249 median fluorescence intensity. N, Nucleocapsid. S, Spike. RBD, Receptor Binding
250 Protein. hCoV, human endemic coronaviruses. WT, wild-type (Wuhan).

251

252 The concordance between the POC test results and qualitative multiplex assay
253 outcomes was high. While the multiplex assay was more likely to pick up a positive
254 outcome, 94.0 % (267/284) of the outcomes aligned between the POC test and the
255 RBD/S/N (3 antigen) analysis (i.e., 17 outcomes did not match: 14 were positive by
256 multiplex but negative by POC, and 3 were negative by multiplex but positive by POC).
257 Similarly, 94.4 % (268/284) of the outcomes aligned between POC and the S/N (2
258 antigen) analysis, 94.4 % (268/284) of the outcomes aligned between POC and the

259 RBD/N (2 antigen) analysis, and 93.7 % (266/284) of the outcomes aligned between POC
260 and the RBD/S (2 antigen) analysis. Comparing the POC outcomes with antigen specific
261 MFIs revealed a correlation between a positive POC test and increasing MFI multiplex
262 assay measurements for S and RBD, but not for N (see **Fig 2**), indicating that the POC
263 test was reliably detecting the RBD/S antibodies measured by the multiplex assay.

264

265 **Fig 2. Antigen-specific median fluorescence intensity read out broken down by**
266 **point-of-care test outcome.** Comparing the point-of-care test outcome (POC)
267 outcomes with antigen specific median fluorescence intensity (MFIs) revealed a
268 correlation between a positive POC test and increasing MFI multiplex measurements
269 for **(A)** S (ns, $p=0.06$) and **(B)** RBD, but not for **(C)** N (ns, $p=0.19$, $p=0.06$, $p=0.86$). MFI,
270 median fluorescence intensity. N, Nucleocapsid. S, Spike. RBD, Receptor Binding
271 Protein. POC, point-of-care test result. (-), POC negative. (+), POC positive (light band).
272 (++) , POC positive (dark band). Ns, non-significant ($p \geq 0.05$). *** = $p < 0.001$. **** =
273 $p < 0.0001$.

274

275 To analyze the potential cross-reactivity between SARS-CoV-2 and hCoVs, we
276 evaluated IgG OC43, HKU1, 229E, and NL63 antibody levels in the blood samples. Anti-
277 OC43 and anti-229E were the most abundant antibodies among our study population,
278 see **Fig 1**. Given that OC43 is closely related to SARS-CoV-2 (both β -CoV members)
279 (11), we compared SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 antibody measurements (both S-based) and
280 found the correlation to be low ($R^2 = 0.2$), see **Fig 3**. Still, the antibody measurements for
281 both were high, see **Fig 1**, and a paired t-test did not find the paired OC43 and SARS-

282 CoV-2 measurements to be significantly different, see **Fig 3**. Hence, cross-reactivity
283 between IgG S measurements for SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 could not be ruled out. We
284 further analyzed the samples that were non-concordant between the multiplex analysis
285 and the POC test for cross-reactivity (i.e., samples that were positive for the multiplex
286 assay and negative for the POC test across all antigen combinations). The average
287 SARS-CoV-2 S MFI of the non-concordant samples (n=15) was lower compared to the
288 concordant samples (n=265), but the S-based OC43 measurements were not significantly
289 higher (see **S2 Figure**), indicating that the multiplex assay was more sensitive compared
290 to the POC test but not more likely to pick up OC43. Note that the statistical outcomes
291 may be affected by the unequal sample sizes (15 vs 265).

292
293 **Fig 3. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 antibody measurements. (A)** There
294 was no/low correlation ($R^2 = 0.2$) between SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 S-based MFI, both
295 Spike [S]-based MFI. **(B)** Still, the paired antibody measurements for OC43 and SARS-
296 CoV-2 were not significantly different by paired t test ($p=0.84$). Hence, cross-reactivity
297 between IgG S measurements for SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 could not be ruled out. MFI,
298 median fluorescence intensity. Ns, non-significant ($p \geq 0.05$).

299
300 While anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA has been shown to resolve faster than IgG, mucosal
301 and blood-based IgA may provide protection from infections.(7, 12-14) Hence, we
302 measured serum-based *IgA* seroprevalence which resulted in $87.2\% \pm 6.4\%$ (95% CI) for
303 RBD/S/N (3 antigens), $83.1\% \pm 6.7\%$ (95 % CI) for RBD/S (2 antigens), $84.8\% \pm 6.6\%$
304 (95 % CI) for S/N (2 antigens), $39.8\% \pm 12.2\%$ (95 % CI) for RBD/N (2 antigens), 62.7

305 % \pm 14.5 % (95 % CI) for RBD, 84.0 % \pm 6.7 % (95 % CI) for S, and 14.1 % \pm 25.5 % (95
306 % CI) for N, see **S3 Table**. Comparing the antigen-specific outcomes in blood resulted in
307 significantly lower MFIs for IgA compared to IgG for all antigens ($p < 0.0001$; Welch's t
308 test), see **S3, S4**, and **S5 Fig**.

309 **Saliva SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies**

310 The saliva-based *IgG* seroprevalences and uncertainty range (approximating the
311 100 % confidence interval) resulted in 100.0 % (98.7 – 100.0) for RBD/S/N (3 antigens),
312 100.0 % (98.7 – 100.0) for RBD/S (2 antigens), 96.0 % (92.4 – 99.6) for S/N (2 antigens),
313 86.9 % (81.6 – 96.4) for RBD/N (2 antigens), 86.9 % (75.8 – 96.2) for RBD, 96.0 % (92.4
314 – 99.6) for S, and 48.0 % (48.0 – 99.7) for N, see **S4 Table**. The SARS-CoV-2
315 seroprevalences from saliva and serum resulted in comparable outcomes for IgG (see **S2**
316 and **S4 Tables**), and the concordance between the qualitative positive/negative antibody
317 results was high; 97.6 % (279/286) of the results aligned for the IgG RBD/S/N (3 antigen)
318 analysis (i.e., 7 participants had positive saliva samples but negative blood samples by
319 IgG RBD/S/N multiplex analysis). Note that the concordance reflects the underlying high
320 overall seroprevalence. A direct comparison of saliva and blood MFIs was not possible
321 since saliva antibody measurements (MFI minus BSA, divided by total Ig, and multiplied
322 by 1000) were transformed differently than blood/serum (MFI minus BSA) to account for
323 variation in salivary flow rates and comparing the differently transformed MFIs between
324 serum and saliva for each SARS-CoV-2 antigen did not identify a correlation, see **S6 Fig**.

325 The saliva-based *IgA* seroprevalences could not be calculated because the
326 antigen-specific outcomes (transformed MFIs) between the study participant and
327 alternative control samples overlapped significantly, see **S7 Fig**. Hence, no classification

328 boundaries and therefore no percent seroprevalence could be established. However,
329 comparing the antigen-specific measurements (MFI) in saliva resulted in significantly
330 lower reads for IgA compared to IgG for the RBD and S antigen outcomes ($p < 0.0001$;
331 Welch's t test), see **S8 and S9 Fig**. Whereas for the N-specific outcomes in saliva, there
332 were less overall antibodies (e.g., lower transformed MFIs compared to RBD and S), and
333 the IgA reads were significantly higher compared to IgG, see **S10 Fig**.

334

335 **Discussion**

336 This study outlines an effective culturally sensitive recruitment method that overcame
337 research study access barriers generally reported among US minority populations,
338 enrolling 290 participants within four months.(2, 15-17) Among the mostly Latinx young
339 to middle aged peri-urban MA study population, the majority reported being vaccinated
340 (91.4 %), which was confirmed by blood and saliva IgG screening. According to the MA
341 Department of Public Health, 86.9 % of the MA population had received at least one dose
342 of a COVID-19 vaccine by July 2022(18) and 81.4 % of the general US population had
343 received at least one COVID-19 vaccine dose by May 2023.(19) Hence, our diverse study
344 population had a high vaccine uptake and did not reflect the reported vaccine hesitancy
345 among minorities.(16, 17, 20) This may have been due to widely available COVID-19
346 vaccines in MA as vaccine availability and general ease of access has been cited as one
347 of the main uptake barriers among marginalized groups.(16, 17)

348 The self-reported infection history was mirrored by the N-based IgG
349 seroprevalence outcomes in serum (N: 49.9 %) and saliva (N: 48.0 %). Hence, within two
350 years and four months (the first COVID-19 case in MA was confirmed on Feb 1st 2022

351 (21) and the study recruitment ended in July of 2022) about half our diverse study
352 population had been exposed to SARS-CoV-2. Further, the reported average severity
353 scores were higher for infections (5.4) as compared to vaccination (4.1 and 3.6 for
354 baseline doses and booster, respectively) and the overall the number of vaccine-
355 associated hospitalizations were lower (n=6) compared to infection-associated
356 hospitalizations (n=11). Additionally, 26.5 % of individuals who reported past infections
357 had not fully recovered and 14.1 % reported long COVID-19 symptoms. Among those
358 who experienced lingering COVID-19 symptoms, most were female (78.1 %), Latinx (87.5
359 %) (n=28), and from mixed/mestizo race 59.4 % (n=19), while the average age was 48.6
360 years. Hence, indicating that long-term COVID-19 symptoms were prevalent among our
361 community-based study population. Our results were consistent with previous studies that
362 reported being 50+ years old and being from disadvantaged ethnic and socioeconomic
363 groups as a risk factor, although and comorbidities did not correlate with lack of COVID-
364 19 symptom resolution, which could have been due to our small sample size of
365 participants with lingering COVID-19 symptoms.(22)

366 Finding high concordance (93.7 %) between the POC results and the RBD/S (2
367 antigen excluding N) analysis for IgG outcomes in blood and a correlation between a
368 positive POC test and increasing MFI multiplex measurements for IgG S and RBD (but
369 not for N) in blood indicated that the RBD and S measurements (more so than N) were
370 driving the overlapping results between the POC and multiplex outcome in our study
371 population. Our and other studies have found N-based antibody levels to be lower and
372 more variable (i.e., shorter half-life than S/RBD).(23, 24) Hence, while we found that the
373 POC test was an easy to use and reliable IgG vaccine-induced antibody measurement

374 tool, the multiplex assay was more sensitive and is more appropriate for serosurveys
375 targeting and differentiating between infection- and vaccine-induced antibodies.

376 While the majority of SARS-CoV-2 serosurveys do not account for cross-reactivity
377 between SARS-CoV-2 and hCoV measurements, we found that readout overlap for S
378 between SARS-CoV-2 and OC43 could not be ruled out in our setting, indicating the need
379 for further scrutiny in future serosurveys. This is particularly true as most individuals are
380 thought to seroconvert for hCoVs during childhood (25-27) and variation in hCoV infection
381 history has been proposed to induce protective immunity from COVID-19.(27-29)

382 In terms of methods, a current major challenge of serological analytics is (i) the
383 application of validated across-plate normalization methods to pool outcomes from a large
384 sample size, and (ii) the determination of threshold values to reliably convert quantitative
385 (MFIs) outcomes into qualitative (positive/negative) results.(9) We therefore validated a
386 weighted-standard curve across-plate normalization method and two classification
387 boundary methods for optimal qualitative serological assessments (one based on
388 predefined positive and negative controls and one based on an alternate control group),
389 across two isotypes (IgG and IgA) and two sample types (serum and saliva) As shown in
390 the results, applying our methods resulted in the alignment of survey answers, POC
391 results, and IgG-based serological outcomes with high classification accuracy, sensitivity
392 and specificity in serum and saliva for almost all antigen combinations.

393 Specific to saliva-based serological analytics, (i) variation in salivary flow rate due
394 to changes in circadian rhythm, stress, and sample collection method(30), and (ii) across
395 sample variation in isotype specific-outcomes (IgA and IgG) due to inherent biological
396 mechanisms (i.e., antibody source and half-life) are a major challenge.(31-33) Further, it

397 is problematic to pool saliva-based serological outcomes across studies and identify
398 appropriate controls since different saliva collection methods influence the composition
399 and quality of the collected samples.(34) Here, we compared multiplex-based anti-SARS-
400 CoV-2 IgG and IgA antibody measurements in matched serum and saliva samples. Our
401 IgG-based serological outcomes in serum and saliva aligned, supporting the use of saliva
402 as a less-invasive and accessible sample particularly among hesitant research
403 participants. However, we found significant differences in antigen-specific IgA vs. IgG
404 antibody levels, similarly to previous reports.(7, 35) This was likely because (i) the half-
405 life of IgA is shorter compared to IgG, and (ii) mucosal and systemic IgA production are
406 not synchronized.(7, 31, 33, 35) Further, the antigen-specific outcomes (MFI minus BSA
407 for serum and transformed MFI for saliva) between serum and saliva did not correlate,
408 even though the antigen-specific IgG seroprevalences aligned, underlining the
409 importance of including appropriate controls and threshold calculation methods for final
410 outcome comparisons.

411 The main limitation of our study was the restricted sample size. Hence, while our
412 results generally align with previously published data, the statistical analyses and
413 comparisons among infected individuals need to be confirmed among larger diverse
414 populations. Further, most of our population carried anti-SAR-CoV-2 antibodies so
415 subsequent statistical comparisons were restricted by the lack of negative outcomes.

416 In summary, this study successfully engaged marginalized MA communities and
417 evaluated the impact of COVID-19 and vaccine uptake by implementing culturally
418 sensitive recruitment methods and by giving appropriate study participant compensation
419 in the form of immediate antibody results and adequate time and travel reimbursements.

420 We found a high vaccine uptake, and that about half of the participants were infected with
421 SARS-CoV-2 within 2+ years of the beginning of the pandemic. We found that lingering
422 COVID-19 symptoms were prevalent and impacted mostly middle-aged female Latinas,
423 indicating continued need for public health attention despite high COVID-19 vaccine
424 uptake. By comparison of matched blood and saliva samples, we found that saliva served
425 as a reliable non-invasive alternative for IgG but not IgA antibody measurements, and we
426 successfully adapted across plate normalization and classification boundary methods for
427 optimal qualitative serological assessments. We also found that the bead-based multiplex
428 assay was more sensitive and better suited for serosurveys targeting infection- and
429 vaccine-induced antibodies compared to the less labor-intensive POC test and that hCoV
430 cross-reactivity should be evaluated for reliable SARS-CoV-2 serosurvey results.

431

432 **Acknowledgement**

433 We thank the study participants and their families for giving us their valuable time and
434 attention, they are the core of this study. We thank Centro Inc. (Centro las Americas) in
435 Worcester, MA, Dr. Juan A. Gomez, and the amazing team on the ground for partnering
436 with us on this study. We thank Pamela Suprenant from the Central MA YMCA, Pastors
437 Richard (Richie) and Elizabeth Gonzalez from Net of Compassion, the Parish of Saint
438 John the Guardian of Our Lady in Clinton, MA and their welcoming congregation, and the
439 UMass Chan iCELS team for inviting us to recruit and engage their communities. This
440 study would not have been possible without the essential support of these individuals and
441 their institutions. Use of data in this manuscript was approved by the NIST Research
442 Protections Office under study number ITL-2020-0257. Certain commercial equipment,

443 instruments, software, or materials are identified herein to specify the experimental
444 procedure. Such identification does not imply recommendation or endorsement by NIST
445 nor does it imply that the materials or equipment identified are necessarily the best
446 available for the purpose.

447

448 **Financial Support**

449 This work was supported through the National Institutes of Health, NCI Serological
450 Sciences Network (U01 CA261276), UMass Chan COVID-19 pandemic research fund,
451 MassCPR Evergrande Award, and the National Center for Advancing Translational
452 Sciences, National Institutes of Health, through Grant KL2-TR001455. The content is
453 solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official
454 views of the NIH.

455

456 **Conflicts of interests**

457 None of the authors declare a conflict of interest.

458

459 **References**

- 460 1. Kullar R, Marcelin JR, Swartz TH, Piggott DA, Macias Gil R, Mathew TA, et al.
461 Racial Disparity of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in African American Communities. *J Infect*
462 *Dis.* 2020;222(6):890-3.
- 463 2. Mackey K, Ayers CK, Kondo KK, Saha S, Advani SM, Young S, et al. Racial and
464 Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19-Related Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths : A
465 Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2021;174(3):362-73.

- 466 3. Larremore DB, Fosdick BK, Bubar KM, Zhang S, Kissler SM, Metcalf CJE, et al.
467 Estimating SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and epidemiological parameters with
468 uncertainty from serological surveys. *Elife*. 2021;10.
- 469 4. Farnsworth CW, Anderson NW. SARS-CoV-2 Serology: Much Hype, Little Data.
470 *Clin Chem*. 2020;66(7):875-7.
- 471 5. CDC. Interim Guidelines for COVID-19 Antibody Testing 2022 [Available from:
472 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antibody-tests-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antibody-tests-guidelines.html)
473 [guidelines.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antibody-tests-guidelines.html)].
- 474 6. Jones JM, Stone M, Sulaeman H, Fink RV, Dave H, Levy ME, et al. Estimated
475 US Infection- and Vaccine-Induced SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Based on Blood
476 Donations, July 2020-May 2021. *JAMA*. 2021;326(14):1400-9.
- 477 7. Isho B, Abe KT, Zuo M, Jamal AJ, Rathod B, Wang JH, et al. Persistence of
478 serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens in COVID-19
479 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(52).
- 480 8. Pickering JW, Larson MT, Martins TB, Copple SS, Hill HR. Elimination of false-
481 positive results in a luminex assay for pneumococcal antibodies. *Clin Vaccine Immunol*.
482 2010;17(1):185-9.
- 483 9. Binder RA, Fujimori GF, Forconi CS, Reed GW, Silva LS, Lakshmi PS, et al.
484 SARS-CoV-2 Serosurveys: How antigen, isotype and threshold choices affect the
485 outcome. *J Infect Dis*. 2022.
- 486 10. Patrone PN, Binder RA, Forconi CS, Moormann AM, Kearsley AJ. Minimal
487 Assumptions for Optimal Serology Classification: Theory and Implications for
488 Multidimensional Settings and Impure Training Data. *arXiv*. 2023.

- 489 11. Ding X, Liu JQL, and To S. Fung. Human Coronavirus-229E, -OC43, -NL63, and
490 -HKU1 (Coronaviridae). Encyclopedia of Virology 2021.
- 491 12. Takamatsu Y, Omata K, Shimizu Y, Kinoshita-Iwamoto N, Terada M, Suzuki T, et
492 al. SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing humoral IgA response occurs earlier but modest and
493 diminishes faster compared to IgG response. bioRxiv. 2022.
- 494 13. Vata A, Anita A, Manciu CD, Savuta G, Luca CM, Rosu FM, et al. Clinical
495 significance of early IgA anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection in patients from a
496 Romanian referral COVID-19 hospital. Exp Ther Med. 2022;23(6):391.
- 497 14. Montague BT, Wipperman MF, Chio E, Crow R, Hooper AT, O'Brien MP, et al.
498 Elevated serum IgA following vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 in a cohort of high-risk
499 first responders. Sci Rep. 2022;12(1):14932.
- 500 15. Paskett ED, Reeves KW, McLaughlin JM, Katz ML, McAlearney AS, Ruffin MT,
501 et al. Recruitment of minority and underserved populations in the United States: the
502 Centers for Population Health and Health Disparities experience. Contemp Clin Trials.
503 2008;29(6):847-61.
- 504 16. Corbie-Smith G. Vaccine Hesitancy Is a Scapegoat for Structural Racism. JAMA
505 Health Forum. 2021;2(3):e210434.
- 506 17. Quinn SC, Andrasik MP. Addressing Vaccine Hesitancy in BIPOC Communities -
507 Toward Trustworthiness, Partnership, and Reciprocity. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(2):97-
508 100.
- 509 18. Daily COVID-19 Vaccine Report [Internet]. 2022. Available from: chrome-
510 extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/[https://www.mass.gov/doc/daily-covid-
511 19-vaccine-report-july-1-2022/download](https://www.mass.gov/doc/daily-covid-19-vaccine-report-july-1-2022/download).

- 512 19. COVID Data Tracker [Internet]. 2023. Available from: <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid->
513 [data-tracker/#vaccinations_vacc-people-booster-percent-pop5](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#vaccinations_vacc-people-booster-percent-pop5).
- 514 20. Fisher C, Bragard E, Madhivanan P. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy among
515 Economically Marginalized Hispanic Parents of Children under Five Years in the United
516 States. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2023;11(3).
- 517 21. Burke M. Coronavirus case in Boston is 1st in Massachusetts; 8th in the U.S.
518 NBC News. 2020.
- 519 22. Turner S, Khan MA, Putrino D, Woodcock A, Kell DB, Pretorius E. Long COVID:
520 pathophysiological factors and abnormalities of coagulation. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*.
521 2023;34(6):321-44.
- 522 23. Whitcombe AL, McGregor R, Craigie A, James A, Charlewood R, Lorenz N, et al.
523 Comprehensive analysis of SARS-CoV-2 antibody dynamics in New Zealand. *Clin*
524 *Transl Immunology*. 2021;10(3):e1261.
- 525 24. Vogelzang EH, Loeff FC, Derksen NIL, Kruithof S, Ooijevaar-de Heer P, van
526 Mierlo G, et al. Development of a SARS-CoV-2 Total Antibody Assay and the Dynamics
527 of Antibody Response over Time in Hospitalized and Nonhospitalized Patients with
528 COVID-19. *J Immunol*. 2020;205(12):3491-9.
- 529 25. Dijkman R, Jebbink MF, Gaunt E, Rossen JW, Templeton KE, Kuijpers TW, et al.
530 The dominance of human coronavirus OC43 and NL63 infections in infants. *J Clin Virol*.
531 2012;53(2):135-9.
- 532 26. Corman VM, Muth D, Niemeyer D, Drosten C. Hosts and Sources of Endemic
533 Human Coronaviruses. *Adv Virus Res*. 2018;100:163-88.

- 534 27. Li P, Ikram A, Peppelenbosch MP, Ma Z, Pan Q. Systematically Mapping Clinical
535 Features of Infections With Classical Endemic Human Coronaviruses. *Clin Infect Dis*.
536 2021;73(3):554-5.
- 537 28. Sagar M, Reifler K, Rossi M, Miller NS, Sinha P, White LF, et al. Recent endemic
538 coronavirus infection is associated with less-severe COVID-19. *J Clin Invest*.
539 2021;131(1).
- 540 29. Tsinda EK, Mmbando GS. Recent updates on the possible reasons for the low
541 incidence and morbidity of COVID-19 cases in Africa. *Bull Natl Res Cent*.
542 2021;45(1):133.
- 543 30. Sano K, Bhavsar D, Singh G, Floda D, Srivastava K, Gleason C, et al. SARS-
544 CoV-2 vaccination induces mucosal antibody responses in previously infected
545 individuals. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):5135.
- 546 31. van Tetering G, Evers M, Chan C, Stip M, Leusen J. Fc Engineering Strategies to
547 Advance IgA Antibodies as Therapeutic Agents. *Antibodies (Basel)*. 2020;9(4).
- 548 32. Brandtzaeg P. Secretory immunity with special reference to the oral cavity. *J Oral*
549 *Microbiol*. 2013;5.
- 550 33. Ceron JJ, Lamy E, Martinez-Subiela S, Lopez-Jornet P, Capela ESF, Eckersall
551 PD, et al. Use of Saliva for Diagnosis and Monitoring the SARS-CoV-2: A General
552 Perspective. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(5).
- 553 34. Laxton CS, Peno C, Hahn AM, Allicock OM, Perniciaro S, Wyllie AL. The
554 potential of saliva as an accessible and sensitive sample type for the detection of
555 respiratory pathogens and host immunity. *Lancet Microbe*. 2023;4(10):e837-e50.

556 35. Sterlin D, Mathian A, Miyara M, Mohr A, Anna F, Claer L, et al. IgA dominates the
557 early neutralizing antibody response to SARS-CoV-2. *Sci Transl Med.* 2021;13(577).
558





