

Self-reported symptoms, self-reported viral testing result and seroprevalence of SARS CoV-2 among a community sample in Essex County New Jersey: A brief report.

Henry F. Raymond, DrPH, MPH¹, Pratik Datta, PhD², Rahul Ukey, PhD², Peng Wang,¹ Richard J. Martino, MPH¹, Kristen D. Krause PhD, MPH¹, Corey Rosmarin-DeStefano³, Abraham Pinter, PhD², Perry N. Halkitis PhD, MS, MPH¹, Maria L. Gennaro, MD, MSc².

1. School of Public Health, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ
2. Public Health Research Institute, New Jersey Medical School, Rutgers University, Newark NJ
3. North Jersey Community Research Initiative, Newark, NJ

Word Counts

Abstract: 370

Text: 1710

References: 15

Tables: 1

Figures: 2

Acknowledgements:

Funding: This study was partially funded by Pfizer # 61618273 and the Turell Foundation.

Neither funder had a role in the design, implementation or analysis of this study.

None of the authors have a conflict of interest.

Abstract

Background: SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, has rapidly spread globally beginning in late 2019. Early areas impacted by this pandemic in the US include Essex County, New Jersey. Beyond understanding the prevalence of active infections and deaths, it is important to understand the true burden of infection in the community, as indicated by seroprevalence of antibodies directed to the virus. Understanding the spectrum of disease is key to the effectiveness of primary prevention and control measures and the design of interventions against transmission of infection.

Methods: We utilized venue-based-sampling (VBS), implemented by a community partner, to sample members of the community in Essex County. In VBS the venues are randomized as a proxy for randomizing the attendees of the venues. We asked standard demographic questions, questions about symptoms and PCR testing and previous antibody testing. Participants provide a blood sample collected by finger stick with the Neoteryx Mitra Collection device. Samples were tested using a novel ELISA based approach developed by our team.

Results: From September 15, 2020 to December 22, 2020, we conducted 92 randomly selected sampling events where we approached 1349 individuals for screening. Of these, 924 consented and had complete data for analysis. Only 6.5% of the sample reported any COVID-19 like symptoms while 45.9% had sought out a COVID-19 test. In total 13 (1.4%) participants received a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test result. While 33 participants (2.6%) sought a SARS-CoV-2 antibody test, only 0.5% of the sample reported a positive antibody result. Testing in this study identified 83 (9.0%) participants positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.

Conclusion: We recruited a large sample of the population of Essex County, New Jersey using VBS, electronic surveys, novel sample collection and lab methods. Our findings suggest that the

burden of SARS-Cov-2 is slightly more than six times than that suggested by PCR testing. This burden is higher than most estimates obtained through studies of remnant blood samples from hospitals (4.2%), samples from staff at a public-school system (2.9%), and residents of a California county recruited with targeted Facebook ads (1.5%). (9-11) Moreover, with only 6.5% of the sample reporting any COVID-19-like symptoms, our finding suggests that the number of asymptomatic persons may be close to 1.5 times greater than anyone reporting symptoms.

Keywords: SARS CoV-2; seroprevalence.

Introduction

SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, has rapidly spread globally beginning in late 2019. As of mid-February 2021, 109,659,317 cases of SARS-CoV-2 have been identified worldwide with a corresponding 2,423,307 deaths. At the same time 27,762,686 cases have been identified with a corresponding 488,352 deaths in the US. Early areas impacted by this pandemic in the US centered around the New York metropolitan area and parts of New Jersey. One of these jurisdictions is Essex County, New Jersey.

Essex County is densely populated (6,000 residents per square mile) and diverse (largely African American and Latinx; 62.7%). Moreover, Essex County has large numbers of people living in poverty (15.8%), with moderate income inequality, and over 12% uninsured.(1) Thus, it is likely that a large proportion of the population may not have had the ability to take precautionary measures (e.g., social distancing, self-quarantine) or adequate access to testing and medical care. Indeed, as of mid-February 2021 Essex County ranks second in terms of cases and deaths in New Jersey with 64,287 cases and 2,348 deaths among a population of approximately 795,404 people.(1)

In addition to understanding the prevalence of active infections and deaths, it is important to understand the actual pervasiveness of the burden of infection in the community, as indicated by seroprevalence of antibodies directed to the virus, for a number of reasons. Populations, such as those in Essex County are frequently high-risk for health challenges, and health disparities often go hand in hand with social conditions.(2) In effect, capturing antibody prevalence data helps better understand the cause of spread of infection and how it correlates to the upstream determinants of health and the impact of COVID-19 on communities. Moreover, understanding the spectrum of disease in communities is key to the effectiveness of primary prevention and

control measures and the design of rational interventions against transmission of infection moving forward. The total number of infected individuals, those with symptoms, and those with SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies can help monitor the epidemic and may be helpful for the roll out of immunization programs. With this in mind, we present estimates of COVID-19 symptoms, self-reported results of PCR testing for virus, self-reported antibody results for the virus, and our results of antibody testing in a sample of the community in Essex County, New Jersey.

Methods

We utilized venue-based-sampling (VBS) to sample members of the community in Essex County. VBS is often employed as an alternative sampling method where simple random sampling is not feasible. In VBS the venues are randomized as a proxy for randomizing the attendees of the venues. For example, VBS is the standard to sample certain populations at high-risk for HIV infection where the population is known to attend identifiable venues. VBS is also the standard sampling method used by CDC for men who have sex with men in the US in National HIV Behavioral Surveillance (NHBS) and is used for other populations internationally.(3-5) North Jersey Community Research Initiative (NJCRI), which has over 20 years' experience in VBS as the implementing partner in NHBS for New Jersey, performed the VBS sampling for the present study by utilizing their mobile units, which have medical equipment, survey and phlebotomy space, and a private exam room. These units were also outfitted for COVID- 19 by adding additional air filtration units and plexi-glass dividers to keep participants and staff safe. We identified venues using Google.com searches using the key words “Supermarkets in Essex County” and “Groceries in Essex County” to search for all potential locations. We identified 205 potential locations. Days and hours of operation were verified by contacting each venue directly. Venues, days, and times of operation were entered in an Excel

spreadsheet. To map the venues, we used R 4.0.2 GUI (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Austria) to manipulate and analyze the data. Specifically, we used “tidygeocoder” package 1.0.1 to extract coordinates of each store from US Census and OpenStreetMap (OSM) dataset. For each month of sampling approximately 42 venue-day-times were randomly sampled and scheduled for a sampling event. NJCRI’s mobile units and staff used the VBS schedule and travelled to these grocery store sites. At the site, potential participants were systematically approached for a standard two-hour period of time, asked to stop for screening (intercept), screened for eligibility and, if eligible, invited to participate and provide verbal informed consent. Participants who agreed to participate completed a short computer-based survey administered by study staff, using a tablet computer.

The survey included questions on basic self-reported demographics, COVID-19 symptoms (including: fever, dry cough, shortness of breath, chills, headache, sore throat, muscle pain/ aches, new loss of taste or smell, GI issues, neurologic symptoms) since January 2020, seeking viral PCR testing, PCR results, seeking antibody testing and antibody results. Participants were then asked to provide a blood sample collected by finger stick with the Neoteryx Mitra Collection device to use for SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing.(6) Dried sticks were preserved by the NJCRI collection team or at the testing laboratory at room temperature for up to a week, according to manufacturer’s instructions. At the time of testing, dried blood from the Mitra device was eluted overnight at 4C, based on published protocols.(6) The eluate was diluted with 2% non-fat dry milk to 1:80 and utilized for detection of IgG antibodies to recombinant receptor binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike (100 ng/well), utilizing standard enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) protocols.(7, 8) To interpret the ELISA data, we

calculated a cut off of $OD_{405} = 0.3$ (mean +3 standard deviations) by testing finger-stick eluates from 50 COVID-19 PCR-negative subjects.

Participants were given a result-return card to enable them to call in to the study team for their antibody results a week after sample receipt by the laboratory. Participants received \$25 in cash for their participation. This study had ethical approval from the Rutgers IRB. Survey data and lab data were merged in SAS (v9.4). All analyses were conducted in SAS (v9.4) using tabulations.

Results

From September 15, 2020 to December 22, 2020, we conducted 92 randomly selected sampling events from geographically diverse locations in Essex County where we systematically approached patrons for screening (Figure 1.). We approached 1349 individuals for screening. Of these, 928 (68.8%) stopped and agreed to be screened, 928 (100%) were eligible and agreed to participate, and 924 (99.6%) consented and had complete survey and laboratory data for analysis.

Our sample population was mostly over 39 years of age ($n=593$, 64.2%) with a mean age of 44.7 years, mostly male at birth ($n=584$, 63.2%), predominantly Black ($n=656$, 71.0%) and Latino ($n=194$, 21.0%). A majority had a high school diploma or some college education ($n=652$, 70.5%). Only 343 (37.1%) were employed full or part-time, while 398 (43.1%) reported being unemployed. Personal annual income reported by participants was low, with almost half, 442 (47.8%), reporting a personal annual income of less than \$15,000 while another 300 (32.5%) reported an income of between \$15,000 and \$35,000. Homelessness was common in our sample, with 251 (27.2%) reporting being homeless sometime in the 12 months preceding the survey and 181 (19.6%) reporting being homeless at the time of the study. A majority of the sample reported

living in Newark (n=704, 76.2%). Finally, 77.9% (n=720) of the sample reported having some sort of health insurance at the time of the study. (Table 1.)

Only 6.5% of the sample reported any COVID-19 like symptoms since January, 2020 while 45.9% reported having sought out a COVID-19 test. In total 13 (1.4%) participants reported receiving a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test result. While 33 participants (2.6%) sought a SARS-CoV-2 antibody test outside of the study, only 0.5% of the sample reported a positive antibody result. Testing conducted in this study identified 83 (9.0%) participants as positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. (Figure 2.)

Discussion

We successfully recruited a large sample of the population of Essex County, New Jersey for this seroprevalence study. Our sample was predominantly Black and Latino and residing in Newark. Importantly, our findings suggest that the true burden of SARS-Cov-2 and the pool of persons potentially spreading the virus is slightly more than six times than that suggested by PCR testing. This burden from our robustly sampled community-based study, is higher than most estimates obtained through studies of remnant blood samples from hospitals (4.2% antibody prevalence), samples from staff at a public-school system (2.9% antibody prevalence), and residents of a California county recruited with targeted Facebook ads (1.5% antibody prevalence). These differences underscore the importance of conducting robust community-based sampling to determine the true burden of disease. (9-11) Moreover, with only 6.5% of the sample reporting any COVID-19-like symptoms, our finding suggests that the number of asymptomatic persons may be close to 1.5 times greater than anyone reporting symptoms (it is noted however that the symptoms listed might include other conditions).

Our selection of Spike RBD as viral antigen for antibody detection has at least two advantages over commercial serological assays for SARS-CoV-2 infection, which are mostly based on detecting antibodies against the viral Nucleocapsid (N) protein. One is that circulating RBD-specific antibodies may last longer than N-specific antibodies (13) and are therefore more reliable markers of infection for seroprevalence studies (at least in non-vaccinated subjects). In addition, RBD is the portion of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein that establishes direct contact with the receptor on the host cells (14) and, consequently, is the main target of neutralizing antibodies (15), which are protective. Thus, our results indirectly suggest that at least 9.0% of the study population likely expresses some protective immunity.

Our study has limitations. VBS may not reach individuals who do not do their own shopping or live in settings where food is provided, thus introducing some form of sampling bias. Secondly, while Essex County is predominantly populated by Black / Latino individuals, our study oversampled these groups. This may be due to lower enthusiasm for participation among other race/ethnicity groups that may not be as altruistic or interested in the incentive provided by the study.

Despite these limitations, we were able to sample a large number of individuals and estimate SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in a county highly impacted by the current pandemic. Our findings underscore the importance of conducting seroprevalence studies in addition to case reporting to understand the true magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 impact on communities and plan for mitigation strategies to reduce transmission.

References

1. Census US. American Fact Finder 2018 [Available from: <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>].
2. Halkitis PN. A new public health psychology to mend the chasm between public health and clinical care. *Am Psychol*. 2020;75(9):1289-96.
3. Gallagher KM, Sullivan PS, Lansky A, Onorato IM. Behavioral surveillance among people at risk for HIV infection in the U.S.: the National HIV Behavioral Surveillance System. *Public Health Rep*. 2007;122 Suppl 1:32-8.
4. MacKellar DA, Gallagher KM, Finlayson T, Sanchez T, Lansky A, Sullivan PS. Surveillance of HIV risk and prevention behaviors of men who have sex with men--a national application of venue-based, time-space sampling. *Public Health Rep*. 2007;122 Suppl 1:39-47.
5. Weir SS, Merli MG, Li J, Gandhi AD, Neely WW, Edwards JK, et al. A comparison of respondent-driven and venue-based sampling of female sex workers in Liuzhou, China. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2012;88 Suppl 2:i95-101.
6. Wang J, Li D, Wiltse A, Emo J, Hilchey SP, Zand MS. Application of volumetric absorptive microsampling (VAMS) to measure multidimensional anti-influenza IgG antibodies by the mPlex-Flu assay. *J Clin Transl Sci*. 2019;3(6):332-43.
7. Davidow A, Kanaujia GV, Shi L, Kaviar J, Guo X, Sung N, et al. Antibody profiles characteristic of Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection state. *Infect Immun*. 2005;73(10):6846-51.
8. Gennaro ML, Affouf M, Kanaujia GV, Brusasca PN, Mangura B, Reichman L. Antibody markers of incident tuberculosis among HIV-infected adults in the USA: a historical prospective study. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2007;11(6):624-31.
9. Routledge I, Epstein A, Takahashi S, Hakim J, Janson O, Duarte E, et al. Citywide serosurveillance of the initial SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in San Francisco. *Res Sq*. 2021.
10. Lopez L, Nguyen T, Weber G, Kleimola K, Bereda M, Liu Y, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies in the Staff of a Public School System in the Midwestern United States. *medRxiv*. 2020.
11. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, Shah S, Ling E, Bromley-Dulfano R, et al. COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. 2020:2020.04.14.20062463.
12. Breton G, Mendoza P, Hagglof T, Oliveira TY, Schaefer-Babajew D, Gaebler C, et al. Persistent cellular immunity to SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Exp Med*. 2021;218(4).
13. Wagner A, Guzek A, Ruff J, Jasinska J, Scheikl U, Zwazl I, et al. A longitudinal seroprevalence study in a large cohort of working adults reveals that neutralising SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific antibodies persist for at least six months independent of the severity of symptoms. 2020:2020.12.22.20248604.
14. Lan J, Ge J, Yu J, Shan S, Zhou H, Fan S, et al. Structure of the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain bound to the ACE2 receptor. *Nature*. 2020;581(7807):215-20.
15. Piccoli L, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Czudnochowski N, Walls AC, Beltramello M, et al. Mapping Neutralizing and Immunodominant Sites on the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Receptor-Binding Domain by Structure-Guided High-Resolution Serology. *Cell*. 2020;183(4):1024-42 e21

Table 1 Demographics, symptoms, testing seeking indicators and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in a community sample, Essex County, NJ, 2020.

Variable		N (924)	% (100)
Age	18-21	63	6.8
	22-29	111	12.0
	30-39	157	17.0
	40-49	185	20.0
	50+	408	44.2
Sex at birth	Female	340	36.8
	Male	584	63.2
Race / ethnicity	Native American	2	0.2
	Asian	6	0.6
	Black	656	71.0
	White	44	4.8
	Latino	194	21.0
	Other	11	1.2
	Mixed	6	0.6
	Missing	5	0.5
Educational Attainment	None	2	0.2
	Grade 1-8	29	3.1
	Grade 9-11	170	18.4
	HS diploma / GED	466	50.4
	Some college	186	20.1
	Bachelors	53	6.4
	Any grad school	12	1.3
Employment Status	Full time	248	26.8
	Part time	95	10.3
	Homemaker	11	1.02
	Student	9	1.0
	Retired	42	4.6
	Disabled	120	13.0
	Unemployed	398	43.1
	Missing	1	0.1
Personal annual income	<=14,999	442	47.8
	15,000-35,000	300	32.5
	36,000-50,000	72	7.8
	51,001-80,000	34	3.7
	>80,000	76	8.2
Homeless 12 months prior to survey		251	27.2
Homeless at time of survey		181	19.6
Residential locality within Essex County	Belleville	1	0.1
	Bloomfield	15	1.6
	East Orange	56	6.1

	Elizabeth	19	2.1
	Hillside	2	0.2
	Irvington	59	6.4
	Maplewood	2	0.2
	Montclair	3	0.3
	Newark	704	76.2
	Orange	52	5.6
	Roselle	1	0.1
	Short Hills	1	0.1
	Verona	2	0.2
	West Orange	6	0.7
	Homeless	1	0.1
Has health insurance		720	77.9
Any COVID-19 symptoms		60	6.5
Sought a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) virus test		424	45.9
Got PCR test		407	44.1
Got PCR result		383	41.5
PCR Result			
	Negative	368	39.8
	Positive	13	1.4
	No Test	541	58.5
	Missing	2	0.2
Sought Antibody (AB) test		33	3.6
Got Ab test outside study		29	3.1
Got Ab result outside study		23	2.5
Ab result outside study			
	Negative	18	1.9
	Positive	5	0.5
	No test	900	94.4
	Missing	1	0.1
Ab result from study			
	Negative	841	91.0
	Positive	83	9.0

Figure 1. Spatial distribution of venues in Essex County, NJ: study of SARS-Cov-2 seroprevalence, 2020.




Figure 2. COVID-19 and SARS-CoV-2 indicators among a community sample, Essex County, NJ, 2020.

