

Protocol for rapid implementation of a SARS-CoV-2 sero-survey during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic – who, where, how?

1 Daniel Smith, MS, RN, CNE^{1*}, Valerie Mac, PhD, APRN, FNP-C, ENP-C¹, Irene Yang, PhD,
2 RN¹, Brittany Butts, PhD, RN¹, Morgan Hecker, BS¹, J. Christina Howell, BS², Tugba Ozturk,
3 MS², Shama Pirmohammed, BS², Hanfeng Huang, BS^{1,3}, Andrea Kippels, MSN, FNP-C²,
4 Glenna Brewster, PhD, RN, FNP-C¹, Danielle D Verble, MA¹, Winnie Jacobs, MPH¹, William
5 T. Hu, MD, PhD², and Whitney Wharton, PhD^{1,2}

6

7 ¹Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing, Emory University

8 ²School of Medicine, Department of Neurology, Emory University

9 ³School of Public Health, Department of Biostatistics, Yale University

10

11 * Correspondence:

12 Daniel Smith

13 daniel.smith2@emory.edu

14 **Keywords:** healthcare workers, inflammation, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Serology

15 **Abstract**

16 Introduction: The 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has had devastating
17 consequences in the US, yet clinical research on its natural history and transmission outside
18 hospitalized settings has faced tangible and intangible challenges due to uncertainty in testing, case
19 ascertainment, and appropriate safety measures. To better understand temporal evolution of COVID-
20 19 related serological and other immune responses during a pandemic, we designed and implemented
21 a baseline cross-sectional study of asymptomatic community volunteers and first responders in
22 metro-Atlanta before the predicted infection peak in 2020.

23 Methods: We recruited healthy community volunteers and first responders for health history,
24 serology, and biobanking. Through an iterative process, we identified one location on our campus
25 and one community location which were accessible, vacant, distant from COVID-19 testing sites,
26 open for social distancing, private for informed consent, and operational for sanitation and
27 ventilation. Research and cleaning supplies were obtained from other researchers and private online
28 vendors due to shortages, and faculty directly participated in consenting and phlebotomy.

29 Results: A total of 369 participants completed the study visits over six full and three half days. Over
30 half of Phase 1 (174/299, 58.2%) and Phase 2 (45/70, 64.3%) self-reported as healthcare workers,
31 and there was a high percentage of participants reporting exposure to known COVID-19 cases
32 (48.2% and 61.4%).

33 Conclusions: Rigorous prospective clinical research with informed consents and is possible during a
34 pandemic. Effective recruitment for moderately large sample size is facilitated by direct faculty
35 involvement, connections with the community, and non-financial support from colleagues and the
36 institution.

37 1 Introduction

38 The 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) quickly grew into a global pandemic (1), with cases
39 continuing to rise in the US (2). COVID-19, caused by SARS-CoV-2, can induce symptoms ranging
40 in phenotype (e.g. cough, diarrhea, loss of smell) and severity (e.g. cough to acute respiratory failure
41 and death (3). Accurate tracking of spread in the US has been delayed by inconsistent case definitions
42 and shifting diagnostic algorithms. People at greatest risk for COVID-19 include the elderly (4),
43 those with pre-existing conditions (4), healthcare workers (5), and disenfranchised populations (6, 7).
44 Negative health outcomes due to COVID-19 in these groups are hypothesized to stem from chronic
45 and altered inflammation (8, 9), occupational exposure (10), social determinants of health (11), or
46 genetics. Conducting research to investigate these factors during the pandemic is challenging due to
47 quarantine orders, fear of infection, personal protective equipment (PPE) shortage, and evolving
48 procedures for expedited regulatory review. As exemplified by retracted articles using fabricated data
49 from high-impact journals (12, 13) and controversies surrounding treatments of unclear benefits (14,
50 15), desire for rigor could give way to thirst for information in the midst of a pandemic. Therefore,
51 there remains an urgent need for thoughtful design and implementation of prospective studies during
52 an evolving crisis.

53 A major obstacle in designing a prospective study related to COVID-19 is inconsistent
54 availability of reliable testing (16). Early shortages in reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction
55 (RT-PCR) reagents and nasopharyngeal swabs introduced numerous commercial tests – many with
56 limited or no performance characteristics – into clinical practice through the now revised US Food
57 and Drug Administration’s COVID-19 Emergency Use Authorization. Many current COVID-19
58 tests have suboptimal sensitivity (as low as 66% for RT-PCR and 67% for lateral flow rapid serology
59 testing; 17) and single use devices do not afford the opportunity for re-testing or longitudinal, within-
60 subject tracking using advanced technology. Most non-hospitalized Georgia residents with upper
61 respiratory symptoms could not reliably access SARS-CoV-2 testing until early June, and disparities
62 in access to testing along racial and socioeconomic lines further contribute to already poor outcomes
63 in Black/African Americans and Hispanic Americans. It thus became virtually impossible to
64 distinguish between those with mild COVID-19 infection but did not have testing, those with
65 symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 but did not have the infection, and those who were never
66 exposed to SARS-CoV-2. To mitigate these challenges, which jeopardize the validity of subsequent
67 pandemic-related investigations, we rapidly recruited a large cohort of asymptomatic individuals
68 between April and May 2020 – before the COVID-19 peak in Georgia - for cross-sectional sero-
69 surveillance, biobanking, and future follow-up.

70 The aims of our serosurvey were to.... Our sero-survey of 369 people involved two phases.
71 Phase one recruited healthy community adults (older and middle-aged without current symptoms of
72 influenza like illness) during campus and outpatient clinic shutdown, and phase two was a directed
73 recruitment of first responders (firefighters, emergency medical technicians [EMTs], and police
74 officers) at the DeKalb County Fire and Rescue. The aims of this manuscript are to present the study
75 design; recommendations for personnel, resources and study protocol; and lessons learned during a
76 novel pandemic marked by public uncertainty, societal closure, resource limitation, and evolving best
77 practices.

78 2 Design

79 **Phase 1.** We collected survey data and blood samples from 299 healthy community
80 volunteers on April 14-17, and April 23-24, 2020 at Emory University during the statewide shelter-

81 in-place orders. Procedures lasted approximately 40 minutes, and included informed consent,
82 symptom checklist of previous flu-like illness, and blood draw. Participants were consented alone or
83 with other members of their household to minimize wait times.

84 **Phase 2.** On May 12-13, 2020, we collected survey data and blood samples from 70 first
85 responders at the DeKalb County Fire Rescue Headquarters. Procedures took approximately 40
86 minutes. Participants were recruited in groups to reduce time away from their posts. Participant were
87 offered the option of being consented individually or with others.

88 **2.1 IRB approval**

89 This sero-survey was approved by Emory Institutional Review Board (IRB). A pre-existing
90 inflammation-focused biobanking protocol which included healthy adults and those with aging-
91 related diseases was expanded to include plasma testing for novel SARS-CoV-2 serology tests
92 developed in our (WTH) lab. Due to closure of clinical testing sites for the pre-existing protocol,
93 new physical sites were required.

94 **2.2 Recruitment of Healthy Community Volunteers (Phase 1)**

95 Initial recruitment strategies leveraged pre-existing research relationships with community
96 members from the Atlanta area. Recruitment teams reached out to participants from author WW's
97 and author WTH's cohort studies via email to describe the SARS-CoV-2 sero-survey. Unexpectedly,
98 a number of participants challenged their social network to participate through their own electronic
99 means (e.g., Nextdoor, listserv) reminiscent of online, crowdsourced fundraising challenges. In
100 response to the high number of participants who contacted us as a result of this word-of-mouth
101 campaign, we expanded our initial recruitment phase from one to two weeks, and developed a wait
102 list in case additional resources were allocated for expanding the cohort. Given our use of a
103 convenience sample methodology, the only exclusion criteria were those less than 18 years of age
104 and those *currently* having symptoms of influenza like illness.

105 **2.3 Recruitment of First Responders (Phase 2)**

106 SARS-CoV-2 poses a high occupational risk to first responders (18). Based on a long-term
107 relationship between WTH and the DeKalb County Human Services Department, the study team
108 connected with DeKalb County Office of Public Safety and DeKalb County Fire Rescue. DeKalb
109 County is the fourth most populous county in Georgia and has the highest population density in the
110 metropolitan Atlanta area. Discussions with the Fire Chief and about current COVID-19-related
111 protocols and our study design led to a joint protocol development. First responders were scheduled
112 on May 13 and 14, 2020.

113 **2.4 Environmental design**

114 Based on evolving knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, we sought to identify locations
115 permitting: isolation but easy access from the general public, social distancing, privacy during
116 consent and study procedures, and thorough decontamination. Early options were eliminated due to
117 potential confusion with COVID-19 testing sites, inadequate privacy, parking difficulties, and the
118 need for building ventilation and custodial operations during campus shut-down. With support from
119 the Emory University School of Medicine (SOM) leadership, the SOM building was selected for
120 Phase I as it provided space for social distancing, remained operational with janitorial and HVAC
121 services, had restricted access by card keys, offered visitor parking, and recently hosted a American

122 Red Cross blood drive (Fig 1). The University Staging Department provided tables, chairs, and
123 privacy dividers.

124 For Phase 2, criteria similar to Phase 1 were used to at the DeKalb County Fire Rescue
125 Headquarters. This building was closed to the public but accessible by first responders. The location
126 was 0.7 mile from freeway ramps, and allowed for easy fire engine access to the parking lot. A large
127 vacant classroom was converted into the study site. Participants arrived individually or as an engine
128 crew (any crew member not participating in the study stayed in the waiting area).

129 2.5 Sero-survey Procedures

130 On day 1 (April 14), we piloted our study (10 participants) to assess protocol design and
131 participant flow. Minimal changes were made following the pilot, and the first full day of
132 data/specimens collection began on April 15.

133 **Personnel.** Projects were staffed by two off-site schedulers, a greeter to perform temperature
134 and symptom check, three consenters, three phlebotomists, and additional personnel for sample
135 transport/processing, sanitation, and stocking of supplies. Faculty (8 on-site) and staff (4 on-site, 2
136 off-site) from the Schools of Nursing and Medicine served on the project.

137 **Equipment.** Due to the scarcity of PPE at the time, participants were not provided PPE.
138 Study team members were provided 3M N95 face masks and medical grade gloves. Faculty
139 responsible for phlebotomy wore disposable cleanroom Tyvek suits, masks and gloves. PPE was
140 donated by Emory School of Nursing and purchased from online vendors.

141 **Standard Operation Procedures.** Following best practices for field laboratory research (19),
142 we created a standard operating procedure (SOP) for our field laboratory methods. Included in our
143 SOPs were procedures for creating participant packets (prelabeled specimen collection tubes, two
144 copies of the consent form, a time stamp, and a copy of the participant demographic survey). We also
145 pre-labeled tubes for sample processing to minimize time spent in data collection areas with
146 participants, allowing for safe and efficient sample collection. Lastly, the SOPs required specimens
147 to be stored on ice until transported for laboratory processing within 2 hrs of collection described
148 above.

149 **Packet and Material Preparations.** Preparations for sero-survey sessions required a range of
150 preparatory tasks averaging six to eight hours per session. Study packets were created according to
151 anticipated participant volume and included: unique research ID, consent and HIPPA forms,
152 demographic questionnaire, COVID-19 symptom checklist, blood draw timesheet, and three, pre-
153 labeled 10 mL K₂-EDTA tubes. Due to high throughput (up to 80 people a day) and the need to
154 divide samples into aliquots to avoid freeze-thawing, large numbers of microcentrifuge tubes were
155 pre-labeled.

156 **Study Visit Flow.** Protocol for participant movement was governed to maintain physical
157 distancing. Consenting and phlebotomy stations were at least 6 feet apart (Figure 1). See below for an
158 explanation of the study visit flow:

159 1. A member of the study team greeted participants upon arrival and administered a verbal
160 symptom checklist/temperature check to screen for any *current* influenza like illness before
161 participants entered the building.

- 162 2. Upon entry, participants sat in a designated waiting area. Tables were arranged 10 feet apart.
163 Tables and chairs were cleaned after each use with healthcare grade disinfectant.
164 3. Participants were then escorted to sanitized consenting stations for informed consent and
165 collection of self-reported health histories related to past COVID-19 exposure and past
166 symptoms of influenza like illness.
167 4. Participants were next escorted to a sanitized phlebotomy station.
168 5. Once the blood draw was completed, participants checked out with the Study PI.

169 **Infection Control.** During the study visit, each consenting station (tables, chairs, and pens)
170 was sanitized with healthcare grade sanitizing wipes in between each participant. Study personnel
171 were expected to wear the provide 3M N95 masks at all times and were provided a new mask only if
172 integrity of the mask was compromised. Each phlebotomy station was also sanitized with healthcare
173 grade sanitizing wipes in between each participant. For faculty conducting phlebotomy, they were
174 expected to put on a new pair of healthcare grade gloves with each participant. These faculty also
175 wore disposable cleanroom Tyvek suits and, due to PPE shortages, were provided a new suit every 2
176 days or until the suit's physical integrity was lost, whichever came first.

177 **Laboratory Safety.** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends routine
178 diagnostic testing for specimens suspected or confirmed for SARS-CoV-2 to be conducted in a BSL-
179 2 laboratory using standard precautions (20). However, Emory University implemented guidelines to
180 require a BSL-2 laboratory with unidirectional airflow and BSL-3 safety precautions (PPE), also
181 known as BSL-2+ or BSL-2 enhanced. Laboratory personnel were given SARS-CoV-2 online and
182 in-person training, and were required to receive medical clearance.

183 3 Participant Demographics and Past Symptoms of Influenza Like Illness

184 **Phase 1.** 299 healthy community volunteers were recruited for this phase. Mean age was $43.2 \pm$
185 12.7 years. Most participants were female (56.9%), non-Latino/Hispanic (92.5%), and White
186 (77.3%). The vast majority of participants had ≥ 4 -year college education (90.2%) and over half
187 reported being a healthcare worker (58.2%; Table 1). Just under half reported exposure to someone
188 with COVID-19 (48.2%) and 52% reported previously having experienced one or more symptoms
189 associated with SARS-Cov-2. The most frequently reported symptoms were cough (74.4%), followed
190 by nasal congestion (62.8%) and muscle aches (61.5%; Table 2).

191 **Phase 2.** Seventy first responders were recruited for Phase 2. Mean age was 41.9 ± 9.6 years.
192 Participants were predominantly male (84.3%), non-Latino/Hispanic (95.7%), and White (68.6%).
193 The majority also identified as healthcare workers (64.3%; Table 1). Over half reported having had
194 exposure to a person with COVID-19 (61.4%), and 28.6% reported previously having experienced
195 symptoms suspected to be related to COVID-19. Notably, 100% of participants in this phase who
196 experienced symptoms reported loss of taste, pneumonia, and dizziness. The next most frequently
197 reported symptoms among Phase 2 participants were cough (75.0%) and nasal congestion (70.0%;
198 Table 2).

199 4 Lessons Learned

200 This rapid study was accomplished through institutional space support, community
201 partnership, and creative solutions to address logistical challenges. The following were insights
202 gained from the implementation of our protocol:

203 Institutional Space Support. One of the first lessons learned during this baseline cross-
204 sectional study was identifying and securing a location. This study took place when the city of
205 Atlanta, Emory University, and most out-patient Emory Healthcare operations were shut down. As
206 such, outpatient spaces where human subject research would routinely take place were closed (except
207 dedicated COVID-19 testing sites) or unavailable out of concerns for surface contamination. Most
208 campus buildings did not have adequate space to facilitate social distancing or support for all-day
209 activities. Because we recruited healthy subjects, space near campus COVID-19 testing sites– even
210 if we utilized separate entrances – could not be secured for this sero-survey. In identifying space for
211 human subject research across the two phases of this study, we found the ideal space must:

- 212 1. Be operational with janitorial and HVAC services
- 213 2. Have no active utilization of classrooms or closed spaces on the same floor,
214 and have alternate access to other floors, which may be in use.
- 215 3. Accommodate participant movements to allow and encourage social distancing
- 216 4. Provide privacy for the informed consent and data collection procedures
- 217 5. Be geographically distant from active COVID-19 testing locations
- 218 6. Gain approval and support from university administration, IRB, and EHSO.

219 Community Partnership. Conducting research during a pandemic highlighted the importance
220 of strong partnerships in implementing successful community based clinical research. This was true
221 pre-pandemic, and perhaps even more so during the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, author
222 WW’s connections with her past participants lead to having to double our expected enrollment
223 numbers for phase one of the study. Additionally, without author WTH’s ties with Dekalb County
224 from non-COVID-19 projects, Phase 2 of this sero-survey would not have been possible.

225 Solutions for Logistical Challenges. A major logistical hurdle of this study was the
226 coordination of sample collection and transport to the laboratory. Whereas routine biobanking
227 protocols allowed each study coordinator to enter the collection times into an electronic database (for
228 calculation of time-to-freeze), such set-up was discovered to be not possible during the pilot run.
229 Consequentially, we had to hand label specimen collection times. In order to overcome logistical
230 challenges related to specimen collection and transport we recommend:

- 231 1. Batch-transporting samples over a 2-hr block for processing.
- 232 2. Providing copious reminders to study staff about changes in routine
233 methodology, such as switching from electronic documentation to hand
234 labeling specimen collection times.

235 We also noticed many other logistical challenges related to minimizing the time that
236 participants were present at the study site. In order to overcome these logistical challenges, we
237 recommend the following for sample collection and biobanking during a pandemic related shut
238 down:

- 239 1. Creating participant packets that contain all needed paperwork for the study
240 visit.
- 241 2. Pre-label all specimen collection tubes.

243 Feasibility and Next Steps. Much discussion has taken place regarding the feasibility of randomized,
244 double-blinded placebo-controlled clinical trials during the pandemic (28-30). A prospective
245 observational study is typically associated with lower direct and overhead costs than a clinical trial,
246 and outcomes from the former can bridge the gap between retrospective series and epidemiological

247 studies to best inform natural history, disease resistance, and transmission. Our team plans to repeat
248 the sero-survey within the same cohort in late-October/Early November 2020. This will allow us to
249 investigate the persistence of confirmed antibody responses in this cohort, transition from early to
250 late antibody responses, and emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 serological responses in people with no
251 such response earlier this year.

252 **5 Limitations**

253 There were a number of unexpected developments during the execution of our study. One
254 initial goal for Phase 1 was to recruit within communities with whom author WW had previously
255 worked, including older adults from the metro-Atlanta LGBTQIA and Black/African American
256 communities (21). Greater health concerns from disenfranchised and older adults during the
257 pandemic, were not surprising to us (22, 23), but in addition to self-imposed travel restrictions,
258 retirement communities' mandatory quarantines limited older adults' participation. With inconsistent
259 information and policies across Atlanta, our recruitment goals for older adults and particularly
260 individuals from underrepresented groups, were not met despite our team's best effort to create a safe
261 study site.

262 Another development was the result of peer-to-peer communication about our study. Word
263 quickly spread to major Atlanta hospitals through Emory listservs and non-Emory social media sites,
264 and a significant portion of participants subsequently self-reported as healthcare workers,
265 subsequently increasing the education level of our sample. These workers may be more likely to
266 commute to and from work during the shutdown than others in the city, which could increase the
267 likelihood that they will participate in a medical research study. Given their occupational exposure
268 (24, 25) and the strain on COVID-19 testing supplies (26, 27), it was no surprise that they wished to
269 know their infection or serological status after working with COVID-19 patients. After our study
270 began, we learned of two serological studies targeting healthcare workers sponsored by the US
271 Center for Disease Control and Prevention. We thereafter referred to these other studies if we found
272 a potential participant to work in a clinic or a hospital, but the pace of our recruitment made it
273 challenging to verify each participant's occupation. We do not believe deception on the participants'
274 part to be common or to greatly influence the outcome from our convenience sample, but it may have
275 more significant impact on studies examining transmission dynamics and immunity durations.
276 Future studies should prepare for these behaviors to be more common during pandemic than non-
277 pandemic times, and accordingly adjust sample size and objective measures.

278 **6 Conclusion**

279 The COVID-19-related statewide shutdown seemingly halted clinical research overnight.
280 However, the need for knowledge and rigor led to the creation of this sero-survey. As clinical
281 investigators, we at times found the process to be more fragmented and reactive than pre-pandemic
282 research. We were ultimately able to carry out a cross-sectional study of SARS-CoV-2 serology
283 while following regulatory, ethical, and scientific principles in a modified community setting due to
284 teamwork not only involving investigators actively guiding the study but also addressing logistical
285 challenges by providing PPE, words of encouragement, and intellectual input. Lessons here could
286 help others launch similar rapid prospective studies, while others – including dedication and
287 collaboration of co-investigators who brought willingness and skillsets to the frontline – do not have
288 easy prescriptions. Nevertheless, we show here that, with intentional and non-financial support,
289 prospective recruitment, informed consent, and biobanking can be accomplished to add much needed
290 scientific rigor and research ethics during a pandemic.

291 **Tables**

292 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of health community volunteers (n=299) and first responders
 293 (n=70) that participated in this SARS-CoV-2 sero-survey.

	Healthy Community Volunteers (n=299)	First Responders (n=70)
	n (%) or mean (SD)	n (%) or mean (SD)
Age	43.21 (12.69)	41.90 (9.63)
Biological Sex		
Male	129 (43.1%)	59 (84.3%)
Female	170 (56.9%)	11 (15.7%)
Ethnicity		
Non-Latino/Hispanic	273 (92.5%)	67 (95.7%)
Latino/Hispanic	26 (7.5%)	3 (4.3%)
Race		
African American	33 (11%)	15 (21.4%)
Asian	30 (10.0%)	4 (5.7%)
Multiracial	3 (0.9%)	3 (4.2%)
White	231 (77.3%)	48 (68.6%)
Other	2 (0.7%)	
Highest Education Completed		13 (18.6%)
High School or less	10 (3.3%)	13 (18.6%)
2-year College	19 (6.4%)	28 (40.0%)
4-year College	73 (24.7%)	10 (14.3%)
Masters	75 (25.3%)	4 (5.7%)
Doctorate/Professional Doctorate	119 (40.2%)	2 (2.9%)
Height (in)	67.34 (5.44)	69.49 (4.11)
Weight (lbs)	171.16 (41.62)	210.71 (45.80)
BMI	26.24 (5.40)	30.65 (6.33)
Healthcare worker		
Yes	174 (58.2%)	45 (64.3%)
No	125 (41.8%)	25 (45.7%)

294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310

Table 2. Self-reported exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-Cov-2 symptoms previously experienced.

	Healthy Community Volunteers n (%)	First Responders n (%)
Known Exposure to Person with COVID-19	144 (48.2%)	43 (61.4%)
Symptoms Experienced	N=155	n=20
Fever	73 (47.1%)	10 (50.0%)
Cough	116 (74.4%)	15 (75.0%)
Rhinorrhea/Nasal Congestion	98 (62.8%)	14 (70.0%)
Shortness of Breath	51 (32.7%)	9 (45.0%)
Muscle/Body Aches	96 (61.5%)	10 (50.0%)
Sore Throat	81 (51.9%)	6 (30.0%)
Headache	91 (58.3%)	9 (45.0%)
Vomiting	7 (4.5%)	3 (15.0%)
Diarrhea	37 (23.7%)	5 (25.0%)
Loss of smell	22 (14.1%)	5 (25.0%)
Loss of taste	4 (2.6%)	20 (100.0%)
Fatigue	9 (5.8%)	1 (5.0%)
Pneumonia	4 (2.6%)	19 (100.0%)
Chills	2 (1.3%)	1 (5.0%)
Dizziness	3 (1.9%)	20 (100.0%)
Other	24 (15.5%)	4 (20.0%)

311 **Conflict of Interest**

312 *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial*
313 *relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*

314 **7 Author Contributions**

315 DS: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of manuscript; critical revision of
316 manuscript.

317 VM: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of manuscript; critical revision
318 of manuscript.

319 IY: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; critical revision of manuscript.

320 BB: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; critical revision of manuscript.

321 MH: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

322 JCH: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

323 TO: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

324 SP: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

325 HF: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

326 AK: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

327 GB: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; critical revision of manuscript.

328 DDB: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

329 WJ: acquisition of data; drafting of manuscript; administrative, technical or material support.

330 WTH: conception and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of
331 manuscript; critical revision of manuscript; obtaining funding; administrative, technical or material
332 support; supervision

333 WW: conception and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of
334 manuscript; critical revision of manuscript; obtaining funding; administrative, technical or material
335 support; supervision

336 **Funding**

337 The team would like to thank the Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing Dean's Rapid Response
338 COVID-19 Pilot Grant Award for funding this research.

339 **Reference styles**

- 340 1. Kannan S, Shaik Syed Ali P, Sheeza A, Hemalatha K. COVID-19 (Novel Coronavirus 2019) -
341 recent trends. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*. 2020;24(4):2006-11.
- 342 2. Xu B, Kraemer MUG, Xu B, Gutierrez B, Mekaru S, Sewalk K, et al. Open access
343 epidemiological data from the COVID-19 outbreak. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(5).
- 344 3. Tang D, Comish P, Kang R. The hallmarks of COVID-19 disease. *PLoS Pathog*.
345 2020;16(5):e1008536.
- 346 4. Dhama K, Patel SK, Pathak M, Yatoo MI, Tiwari R, Malik YS, et al. An update on SARS-CoV-
347 2/COVID-19 with particular reference to its clinical pathology, pathogenesis, immunopathology and
348 mitigation strategies. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020:101755.
- 349 5. Ferioli M, Cisternino C, Leo V, Pisani L, Palange P, Nava S. Protecting healthcare workers
350 from SARS-CoV-2 infection: practical indications. *Eur Respir Rev*. 2020;29(155).
- 351 6. Millett GA, Jones AT, Benkeser D, Baral S, Mercer L, Beyrer C, et al. Assessing Differential
352 Impacts of COVID-19 on Black Communities. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2020.
- 353 7. Baggett TP, Keyes H, Sporn N, Gaeta JM. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Residents of
354 a Large Homeless Shelter in Boston. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 355 8. Guzik TJ, Mohiddin SA, Dimarco A, Patel V, Savvatis K, Marelli-Berg FM, et al. COVID-19 and
356 the cardiovascular system: implications for risk assessment, diagnosis, and treatment options.
357 *Cardiovasc Res*. 2020.
- 358 9. Zhu L, She ZG, Cheng X, Qin JJ, Zhang XJ, Cai J, et al. Association of Blood Glucose Control and
359 Outcomes in Patients with COVID-19 and Pre-existing Type 2 Diabetes. *Cell Metab*.
360 2020;31(6):1068-77 e3.
- 361 10. Lockhart SL, Duggan LV, Wax RS, Saad S, Grocott HP. Personal protective equipment (PPE)
362 for both anesthesiologists and other airway managers: principles and practice during the COVID-19
363 pandemic. *Can J Anaesth*. 2020.
- 364 11. Ryan BJ, Coppola D, Canyon DV, Brickhouse M, Swienton R. COVID-19 Community
365 Stabilization and Sustainability Framework: An Integration of the Maslow Hierarchy of Needs and
366 Social Determinants of Health. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2020:1-7.
- 367 12. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. RETRACTED: Hydroxychloroquine or
368 chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry
369 analysis. *Lancet*. 2020.
- 370 13. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Kuy S, Henry TD, Patel AN. Retraction: Cardiovascular Disease, Drug
371 Therapy, and Mortality in Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2007621. *N Engl J Med*.
372 2020;382(26):2582.
- 373 14. Sattui SE, Liew JW, Graef ER, Coler-Reilly A, Berenbaum F, Duarte-Garcia A, et al. Swinging
374 the pendulum: lessons learned from public discourse concerning hydroxychloroquine and COVID-
375 19. *Expert Rev Clin Immunol*. 2020:1-8.

- 376 15. Joyner MJ, Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Mills JR, Johnson PW, Theel ES, et al. Effect of
377 Convalescent Plasma on Mortality among Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: Initial Three-Month
378 Experience. medRxiv. 2020.
- 379 16. Shear MD, Goodnough A, Kaplan S, Fink S, Thomas K, Weiland N. The lost month: how a
380 failure to test blinded the US to Covid-19. The New York Times. 2020.
- 381 17. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection -
382 Challenges and Implications. N Engl J Med. 2020.
- 383 18. Mackler N, Wilkerson W, Cinti S. Will first-responders show up for work during a pandemic?
384 Lessons from a smallpox vaccination survey of paramedics. Disaster Manag Response. 2007;5(2):45-
385 8.
- 386 19. Smith PG, Morrow RH, Ross DA, editors. Field Trials of Health Interventions: A Toolbox. 3rd
387 edition. Oxford (UK): OUP Oxford; 2015 Jun 1. Chapter 17, Field laboratory methods. Available from:
388 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK305520/>
- 389 20. Interim Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines for Handling and Processing Specimens Associated
390 with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): CDC; 2020 [Available from:
391 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/lab-biosafety-guidelines.html>.
- 392 21. Burkholder K. Creating Equality in Caregiving. Georgia Voice: The Premier Media Source for
393 LGBTQ Georgia 2020.
- 394 22. Van Orden KA, Bower E, Lutz J, Silva C, Gallegos AM, Podgorski CA, et al. Strategies to
395 Promote Social Connections Among Older Adults During 'Social Distancing' Restrictions. Am J Geriatr
396 Psychiatry. 2020.
- 397 23. Baker E, Clark LL. Biopsychopharmacosocial approach to assess impact of social distancing
398 and isolation on mental health in older adults. Br J Community Nurs. 2020;25(5):231-8.
- 399 24. Belingheri M, Paladino ME, Riva MA. COVID-19: Health prevention and control in non-
400 healthcare settings. Occupational medicine (Oxford, England). 2020;70(2):82-3.
- 401 25. Koh D. Occupational risks for COVID-19 infection. Occupational medicine (Oxford, England).
402 2020;70(1):3-5.
- 403 26. Trubey JS. Georgia sees testing system strained with rise in COVID-19 cases. The Atlanta
404 Journal-Constitution 2020.
- 405 27. Fowler S. Georgia Coronavirus Updates: With 'Record' Numbers, Only 1.3% Of Georgians
406 Tested. National Public Radio 2020.
- 407 28. Lane HC, Fauci AS. Research in the Context of a Pandemic. N Engl J Med. 2020.
- 408 29. Group RC, Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, Mafham M, Bell JL, et al. Dexamethasone in
409 Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 - Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med. 2020.
- 410 30. Mulangu S, Dodd LE, Davey RT, Jr., Tshiani Mbaya O, Proschan M, Mukadi D, et al. A
411 Randomized, Controlled Trial of Ebola Virus Disease Therapeutics. N Engl J Med. 2019;381(24):2293-
412 303.

413 **Data Availability Statement**

414 The data generated by this study is available from the authors with reasonable request.

Figure 1. Lay-out of Emory SOM collection site. After greeter (star) saw participants outside access-controlled door, greeter proceeds to area between doors (1) to check for symptoms and take temperature using a non-contact thermometer. Participants then waited in the appropriately spaced waiting area (2) until the greeter identified an available consentor. Participants were consented individually or as a family in open but private space (3) surrounded by pre-existing walls (thick black lines) and/or privacy dividers (red). Consentors then identified available phlebotomy space before guiding participants there (4). A very small SOM staff could enter through same locked doors and access offices via elevator (elv), or through a separate entrance near the uppermost lecture hall (with a separate elevator). Windows near the phlebotomy space were blacked out for privacy.

Figure 1.

