

1 Increased vulnerability to SARS-CoV-2 infection among 2 indigenous peoples living in the urban area of Manaus

3

4 Gemilson Soares Pontes^{1,2,3*}, Jean de Melo Silva², Renato Pinheiro-Silva³, Anderson Nogueira
5 Barbosa¹, Luciano Cardenes Santos⁴, Antônio de Pádua Quirino Ramalho⁵, Carlos Eduardo de
6 Castro Alves², Danielle Furtado da Silva⁶, Leonardo Calheiros de Oliveira³, Allyson Guimarães da
7 Costa^{2,3,7} and Ana Carla Bruno¹

8

9 ¹Instituto Nacional de Pesquisa da Amazônia (INPA), Av. André Araújo, 2,936, Petrópolis, CEP 69067-375,
10 Manaus, Brazil; anderson.nb6@gmail.com (A.N.B); abruno@inpa.gov.br (A.C.B)

11 ²Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM), Programa de Pós-graduação em Imunologia Básica e Aplicada,
12 Av. General Rodrigo Octavio Jordão Ramos, 1200, CEP 69067-005, Manaus, Brazil;
13 alveseduardo71@gmail.com (C.E.C.A); biomedicojean@gmail.com (J.M.S.)

14 ³Universidade do Estado do Amazonas, Programa de Pós-graduação em Ciências Aplicadas à Hematologia,
15 Av. Djalma Batista, 3578, -CEP 69050-010, Manaus, Brazil; fernandesmp3@gmail.com (R.P.S.);
16 leocalheiros7@gmail.com (L.C.O.); allyson.gui.costa@gmail.com (A.G.C)

17 ⁴Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso, Campus do Araguaia. Av. Valdon Varjão, 6390, CEP 78.605-091, Barra
18 das Garças, Mato Grosso, Brazil; lucscardenes@gmail.com

19 ⁵Faculdade de Medicina, Departamento de Saúde Coletiva, Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM), Av.
20 General Rodrigo Octavio Jordão Ramos, 1200, CEP 69067-005, Manaus, Brazil; paduaramalho@ufam.edu.br

21 ⁶Programa de Pós-graduação em Biodiversidade e Biotecnologia da Amazônia Legal - PPG-BIONORTE, Brazil;
22 daniellefurtado.silva93@gmail.com

23 ⁷Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM), Escola de Enfermagem de Manaus, Rua Terezina, 495, CEP
24 69057-070, Manaus, Brazil; allyson.gui.costa@gmail.com (A.G.C)

25

26 ***Correspondence author:** Gemilson Soares Pontes, Laboratório de Imunologia e Virologia, Instituto Nacional
27 de Pesquisas da Amazônia, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. Av. André Araújo, 2936 – Petrópolis, CEP 69.067-375,
28 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. Tel: + 55 92 3643-3288.

29 E-mail: gemilson.pontes@inpa.gov.br

30

31

32

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** The COVID-19 pandemic threatens indigenous peoples living in suburban areas of
37 large Brazilian cities and has thus far intensified their pre-existing socio-economic inequalities. This
38 study evaluated the epidemiological situation of SARS-CoV-2 infection among residents of the
39 biggest urban multiethnic indigenous community of the Amazonas state, Brazil.

40 **Methods:** Blood samples of 280 indigenous people who live in the urban community known as
41 Parque das Tribos, which is located in the surrounding area of Manaus, were tested for the presence
42 of anti- SARS-CoV-2 IgA or IgG antibodies using an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. An
43 epidemiological standardized interviewer-administered questionnaire was applied to assess the risk
44 factors and sociodemographic information of the study population.

45 **Results:** We found a total positivity rate of 64.64% (95% CI 59.01-70.28) for SARS-CoV-2 infection.
46 IgA and IgG were detected in 55.71% (95% CI 49.89-61.54) and 60.71% (95% CI 54.98-66.45) of
47 the individuals tested, respectively. From the total number (n=280), 80.11% of positive individuals
48 (95%; CI 74.24-85.98) were positive for both IgA and IgG Abs. All individuals with COVID-19-related
49 symptoms on the day of blood collection (n=11) were positive for IgG, while IgA was detected in
50 84.61% (n=55) of individuals who had presented symptoms several weeks before the blood
51 collection. Individuals aged 30-39 were more susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection (prevalence ratio
52 [PR] 0.77; 95% CI 0.58-1.03; p=0.033). People whose main source of information on COVID-19 was
53 religious leaders or friends showed higher susceptibility to infection (PR 1.22; 95% CI 1.00-1.49;
54 p=0.040). In addition, individuals who left home more frequently were at higher risk of infection (PR
55 1.22; 95% CI 1.00-1.49; p=0.048). Five or more individuals per household increased almost 5-fold
56 the risk of virus transmission (Odds ratio [OR] 2.56; 95% CI; 1.09-6.01; p=0.019). Over 95% of the
57 study population had no access to clean water and/or sanitation.

58 **Conclusions:** The disproportionate dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 infection observed in the Parque
59 das Tribos urban indigenous community might be driven by typical cultural behavior and
60 socioeconomic inequalities. Despite the pandemic threat, this population is not being targeted by
61 public policies and appears to be chronically invisible to the Brazilian authorities.

62 **Keywords:** COVID-19, prevalence, urban indigenous communities, epidemiology, SARS-CoV-2

63

64 **1. Introduction**

65

66 The state of Amazonas in northern Brazil is one of the states that has been hit hardest by the current
67 pandemic. In the period between the WHO declaring the COVID-19 pandemic on March 11, 2020
68 and the end of March 2021 (1), the death toll from COVID-19 in the Amazonas state has surpassed
69 the twelve thousand mark. The Amazonas state is located in a region of paramount environmental
70 and demographic importance. The state comprises one-fifth of the Brazilian territory and contains
71 approximately 40% of the world's rainforests (2). The majority of the population in the state has an
72 indigenous mixed-heritage background, and sixty percent of its 4 four million inhabitants live in the
73 capital Manaus (3).

74 Based on the last population census, around 168,000 indigenous peoples distributed in 641
75 communities and 62 ethnic groups live within Amazonas state (4). Indigenous populations have to
76 deal with many social inequalities resulting from socio-economic marginalization, including poor
77 nutrition, lack of access to health services and proper sanitation (5). This situation put indigenous
78 communities under worrying threat during public health emergencies, such as the coronavirus
79 pandemic.

80 The number of indigenous people affected by COVID-19 in Brazil is not accurately notified.
81 According to the Special Secretariat of Indigenous Health (SESAI), over 600 individuals died from
82 COVID-19 in Brazil and the state of Amazonas is responsible for 25% of this number(6). However,
83 the death rates must be much higher than the official numbers. Also the epidemiological data is not
84 stratified by ethnicity, which could allow identifying related risk factors. On top of this, Brazil's
85 indigenous agencies do not monitor the COVID-19 epidemiological situation in urban indigenous
86 communities.

87 There are approximately 315,000 indigenous people grouped in 300 ethnicities living close to the
88 large cities of Brazil (4). However, the true number of indigenous populations residing in the
89 surrounding areas of Manaus is unknown, though, it is estimated that 20,000 individuals from 92
90 ethnicities live in 62 urban indigenous communities (7). This population is completely invisible to the
91 Brazilian public health agenda, especially regarding COVID-19. Thus, this study assessed the
92 magnitude of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 and its transmission risk factors among the biggest
93 multiethnic urban indigenous community located on the west side of Manaus, Amazonas state,
94 Brazil.

95 **2. Material and Methods**

96 **2.1 Ethical approval**

97 This study was approved by the Brazilian Commission for Ethics in Research - CONEP (approval
98 number: 4.260.763). The confidentiality and the right to leave the study at any time were guaranteed
99 to all participants. All individuals signed the informed consent form before taking part in this study.

100 **2.2 Study design and Population**

101 Between October 10 and 14, 2020, we randomly recruited indigenous residents in the community of
102 Parque das Tribos, the biggest multiethnic urban indigenous community in Manaus. Over 1,300
103 indigenous people from 35 different ethnicities live in this community, which is located in the Tatumã
104 district, west Manaus, Amazonas state, Brazil.

105 From a total of 280 individuals of both genders aged from 1 to 83 years, and from different
106 ethnicities, approximately 5 ml of peripheral blood was collected by venipuncture for posterior
107 serological analysis. A standardized interviewer-administered questionnaire was used to obtain
108 information on sociodemographic and risk factor variables. Because of the questionnaire's
109 complexity, it was decided by a multidisciplinary team (composed of anthropologists, physicians,
110 virologists and epidemiologists) that only individuals over 13 years old would answer the
111 questionnaire in order to guarantee the quality of the results obtained in the survey (8). Some adults
112 (n=43) agreed to have blood collected, but refused to respond the questionnaire due to cultural
113 issues or due to feeling uncomfortable doing so (Figure 1).

114

115 **2.3 Serological analysis**

116 Serum samples from the study population were tested for SARS-CoV-2 IgA and IgG antibodies (Abs)
117 through an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (*Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA/IgG ELISA-euroimmun,*
118 *Germany*), which was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. The optical density
119 was measured in a spectrophotometer (Epoch Microplate, Biotek Instruments Inc. USA) using a 450
120 nm filter, and the test positivity was determined according to the cut-off formula indicated by the
121 manufacturer. Cut-off ranges were obtained by calculating a ratio of the optical density (OD) values
122 of the control or patient sample over the OD of the calibrator, according to the following formula: OD
123 of the control or patient sample/OD of calibrator = ratio. Ratios <0.8 were considered negative and

124 ratios > 1.1 positive. Ratios $0.8 \geq$ to ≤ 1.1 were considered indeterminate. The serological tests were
125 performed at the Laboratory of Virology and Immunology of the National Institute of Amazonian
126 Research (INPA).

127 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

128 Descriptive statistical analysis was used to evaluate the sociodemographic variables and serum
129 levels of SARS-Cov-2 antibodies observed in the study population. The prevalence ratio (PR)
130 analysis, using chi-square statistic test with Yates correction was performed to assess the
131 relationship between sociodemographic characteristics and positivity to SARS-CoV-2 infection. The
132 prevalence ratio analysis was performed on the following variables: genders, age, marital status,
133 level of schooling, housing type, COVID-19 information sources and frequency of leaving the home.
134 One-way ANOVA and a Tukey post hoc test were used to compare serum levels of SARS-CoV-2
135 antibodies (optical density values) among age ranges. The effect of household crowding on the risk
136 of exposure to infection was evaluated through odds ratio (OR) analysis and Fisher's exact test. All
137 descriptive statistical analyses in graph format, ANOVA and Tukey's test were performed using the R
138 program v.4.0.4, while the prevalence ratio (PR) was performed using the Toolkit program v.3.0.1. In
139 all analyses, a value of $p < 0.05$ was considered significant. A flowchart showing the steps taken in
140 the study is shown below (Figure 1).

141

142 **3. Results**

143 **3.1. Positivity rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection**

144 The study population was composed of 28 different indigenous ethnic groups. Baré, Tukano, Tikuna
145 and Kokama were the most common ethnicities (Figure 2A). A total of 181 individuals (64.64%; 95%
146 CI 59.01-70.28) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 specific IgA or IgG antibodies (Abs). The positivity
147 rates for IgA and IgG observed in the study population were 60.71% (95% CI 54.98-66.45) and
148 55.71% (95% CI 49.89-61.54), respectively. From the total number of individuals positive for SARS-
149 CoV-2, 145 (80.11%;95% CI 74.24-85.98) tested positive for both IgA and IgG, whereas 11
150 (6.07%;95% CI 2.56-9.59) and 25 (13.81%; 95% CI 8.72-18.85) individuals were positive only for IgA
151 or IgG, respectively (Figure 2B).

152 Mild or moderate COVID-19-related symptoms were present in 107 individuals (59.11%) who were
153 positive for SARS-CoV-2. The most common symptoms were headache, fever, body aches, loss of

154 taste or smell and/or joint pain (Figure 3A). All individuals with symptoms on the day of blood
155 collection (n=11) were positive for both IgA and IgG, while 88.71% (n=55) of the individuals were still
156 displaying high serum levels of IgA even 4 weeks after the onset of their symptoms (Figure 3B).

157 **3.2 Serological profile according to the social demographical characteristics**

158 The positivity rates were similar between women and men (p=0.207) and the age range 30-39 years
159 was found to be the most susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection (95% CI: 0.58-1.03; p=0.033) (Table
160 1). However, when the IgG positivity rates were compared based on antibody ratios, the difference
161 observed between the following age groups was statistically significant: ages 20-29 and 40-49
162 (p=0.044); 13-19 and ≥ 60 (p=0.002); 20-29 and ≥ 60 (p=0.0004) (Supplementary 1A). People
163 belonging to the age group ≥ 60 years old showed the highest antibody ratios (IgA mean ratio=3.080
164 \pm 1.623; IgG mean ratio=4.221 \pm 1.832), while the age groups 13-19 and 20-29 showed the lowest
165 IgA (mean ratio=2.268 \pm 0.919) and IgG ratios (mean ratio= 2.207 \pm 1.246), respectively. These
166 values may indicate the serum level of antibodies in these individuals, however, in order to confirm
167 this information it is necessary to perform antibody titration. Due to budget limitations, we were not
168 able to assess the antibody serum levels.

169 The level of education of the study population was considered low. Only 29.7% of the study
170 population had received a high school diploma (Table 1). Susceptibility to the SARS-CoV-2 infection
171 was greater among the individuals for whom the main source of COVID-19-related information was
172 religious leaders or friends (95% CI: 1.00-1.49; p=0.040). The level of social isolation was directly
173 related to the increased risk of infection. People who declared leaving the home 2-4 times a week
174 were more susceptible to infection (95% CI: 1.00-1.49; p=0.044) (Table 1). The main reasons for
175 leaving the home were either to work or buy food.

176 As a typical Brazilian indigenous house is small and overcrowded, since usually it serves as a
177 collective house (2 or more families), we evaluated the influence of dwelling size on the prevalence
178 of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our findings demonstrate that the higher the number of individuals per
179 house the higher the susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection. The susceptibility of people living with 5
180 people or more is almost 4-fold higher when compared with people living with 2 people and almost 5-
181 fold higher when compared with people living with one other person (95% CI: 1.96-6.01; p=0.010)
182 (Figure 4A). The prevalence observed also progressively increased as the number of individuals per

183 home rose (Figure 4B). The highest prevalence (64.77%) was observed among individuals living with
184 5 or more people.

185 The level of purchasing power of the study population was very low. Over 83% of individuals earn up
186 to one minimum wage (approximately \$192,00 US dollars in Brazil), which hampers effective access
187 to adequate nutrition and healthcare assistance (Figure 4A). Additionally, the majority of the study
188 population (90%) declared using traditional medicine to treat or prevent COVID-19 and other
189 infectious diseases. Most of the individuals (>60%) declared that they partially trust the official
190 Brazilian government COVID-19-related information. According to their answers, only 5.13% did not
191 practice social distancing.

192

193 **4. Discussion**

194 The Brazilian northern region poses the highest rate of SARS-CoV-2 infection vulnerability. By late
195 March 2021, Amazonas state concentrated the most deaths per million people (9). As such, the
196 effectiveness of pandemic response management demands a better comprehension on the impact of
197 social asymmetries in relation to SARS-CoV-2 exposure risk within different population groups,
198 especially amid ethnic minorities living in poverty, such as the indigenous populations of this region.

199 To our knowledge, this is the first report on the epidemiological situation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
200 a Brazilian indigenous urban community. Our findings demonstrate that SARS-CoV-2 is highly
201 disseminated among the study population since it showed a prevalence rate of 60.11%. Similar
202 prevalence was observed in the rural indigenous village of Xikrin of Bacajá (Kayapó), in the Brazilian
203 state of Pará, which is also in the northern region (10). Moreover, a population- based study
204 conducted in Manaus during the same period of our study identified a prevalence of 30.34% while
205 the Brazilian National SARS-CoV-2 prevalence estimated in June of 2020 was 3.1% (11,12). These
206 data clearly show that indigenous people are disproportionately hit by SARS-CoV-2 infection. This
207 scenario might be a result of social vulnerabilities associated with cultural practices, which in turn
208 maximize dissemination of the virus and put this population at greater risk.

209 SARS-CoV-2 strikes ethnic minorities who experience multidimensional poverty much harder,
210 principally the indigenous peoples that constitute about 15% of the population living in extreme
211 poverty in Brazil (13). This population struggles to adopt measures to prevent and mitigate the

212 SARS-CoV-2 spread since they have limited access to basic services like adequate sanitation and
213 clean water. The study population was composed of families of low education and income levels.
214 Our findings showed that over 95% of the residents of Parque das Tribos had no access to clean
215 drinking water and adequate sanitation. The precarious and chaotic social conditions of the study
216 population could be the main reason for the high positivity rates observed.

217 The positivity rates for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA Abs found in this study was 55%. IgA is a dimeric
218 polyvalent antibody found predominantly in mucosal surfaces of humans and other mammals (14).
219 The role of this antibody in the course of SARS-CoV-2 infection is not completely understood, but it
220 might be crucial to the pathogenesis of COVID-19. IgA seems to more effectively neutralize the
221 SARS-CoV-2 than other antibody subclasses (15). Furthermore, serum IgA appears earlier than IgM
222 and IgG in SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals and may persist for several weeks after complete
223 recovery (16). In the present study, a high IgA ratio was detectable in almost 90% of individuals after
224 more than four weeks of the onset of their symptoms. All individuals with symptoms on the day of
225 blood collection were positive for both IgA and IgG. It is possible that the seroconversion for IgA and
226 IgG happened simultaneously in these individuals, as previously reported (17). From the total
227 number of infected individuals, 80.11% were positive for both IgA and IgG. As IgA has a high
228 potential for virus neutralization and may last for a long time, the course of SARS-CoV-2 infection
229 could be influenced by its serum levels. However, we did not follow-up the study population to
230 observe the clinical outcome of the infection. More comprehensive studies are necessary in order to
231 confirm this speculation.

232 The anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA and IgG ratios gradually rose with age and elderly individuals (≥ 60 years
233 old) showed the highest antibody ratios. However, the age group with the highest risk of SARS-CoV-
234 2 infection was that of 30-39 years old, just as observed in the non-indigenous Brazilian population
235 (12). Probably these individuals are more susceptible or exposed to SARS-CoV-2 infection because
236 they are working adults who must leave home to support their families. A nationwide study
237 conducted in the United States showed that working adults (20-49 years old) are a higher
238 transmission risk (18). Indeed, the individuals of the study population who left home more often (2-4
239 times a week) had an increased infection risk. The main reasons for leaving home were either to
240 work or to buy food.

241 Housing is also an important factor that affects SARS-CoV-2 dissemination among indigenous
242 people. Keeping your distance from others in an indigenous home is not often feasible because they
243 are often overcrowded and very small, which enhances the transmission of the virus (9). Our findings
244 demonstrated that individuals living in households with six or more people had an almost 5-fold
245 increase in risk. This situation is worsened by poor-quality housing. The dwellings of Parque das
246 tribos are very small buildings constructed with low-quality materials, without essential basic
247 infrastructure such as a supply of safe drinking water or effective sewerage. Thus, housing
248 conditions are completely inadequate for keeping them safe from many communicable diseases,
249 including COVID-19.

250 The majority of the study population declared to adopt distancing measures during the pandemic.
251 However, this might be a huge challenge to these individuals due to their socioeconomic liabilities
252 along with the difficult access to COVID-19-related information (19). Although access to information
253 is a human right, providing accurate information about COVID-19 to indigenous peoples is very
254 complicated. They face difficulties due to language barriers and in accessing different platforms to
255 get updated information. As a consequence, many individuals do not trust the official government
256 information and consult religious leaders for guidance related to different aspects of their lives,
257 including health issues (20). Our data also showed that most of the individuals partially trust the
258 information coming from the Brazilian government and those who get COVID-19-related information
259 from religious leaders or friends are at increased risk for SARS-CoV-2 infection.

260 Furthermore, about 90% of the study population reported using medicinal plants or herbs to treat or
261 prevent SARS-CoV infection. The use of medicinal herbs is an important part of indigenous culture
262 and must be respected. Traditional knowledge is the foundation of the available conventional
263 treatments and is the cornerstone of pharmacological research (21,22). However, the use of herbs
264 can cause a false sensation of protection, which may result in the discontinuation of important
265 measures to prevent COVID-19 and enhance the vulnerability of these populations.

266 Despite the limitation of our data, this study indicates that indigenous peoples living in urban areas
267 are being dramatically affected by SARS-CoV-2, especially because of their poor socioeconomic
268 conditions and lack of access to adequate health assistance. This population is fighting a double
269 battle due to the fact that a) in the Brazilian national health system (SUS), their indigenous identity is
270 not recognized by the patient management system and b) They cannot be assisted by SESAI

271 because they are outside their villages or reservations. Both situations reinforce the invisibility of
272 these populations. Thus, we need coordinated national actions that prioritize ethnic vulnerable
273 groups in the battle against COVID-19. We need public policies that promote health, adequate
274 housing and sanitation for these populations. Otherwise, indigenous people living in urban areas are
275 doomed to suffer on unprecedented levels during the current pandemic.

276

277 **Acknowledgments:** The authors thank the community chief Miqueias Kokama and the community
278 residents Vanderlecia Ortega dos Santos, Milton Clézio Gaspar Fidelis, Elizangela Pastor Machado
279 de Freitas, Marigilda da Silva Melgueiro, Cristina Quirino Mariano, Alcinea Martins Albuquerque and
280 Ana Cláudia Martins Tomas for all support provided during this study.

281

282 **Funding:** This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de
283 Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) under Finance code PROCAD AMAZÔNIA 88881.200581/201801
284 and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (FAPEAM - Pró-Estado Program).

285 **Data availability:** All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in the main article or
286 its supplementary information files.

287 **Authors' Contributions:** Conceptualization: Gemilson Soares Pontes, Ana Carla Bruno, Luciano
288 Cardenes Santos and Antônio de Pádua Quirino Ramalho; methodology: Jean de Melo Silva, Carlos
289 Eduardo de Castro Alves, Leonardo Calheiros de Oliveira and Danielle Furtado da Silva; formal
290 analysis: Gemilson Soares Pontes, Anderson Nogueira Barbosa, Jean de Melo Silva and Renato
291 Pinheiro-Silva; investigation: Antônio de Pádua Quirino Ramalho, Gemilson Soares Pontes, Ana
292 Carla Bruno, Luciano Cardenes Santos, Jean de Melo Silva, Renato Pinheiro-Silva and Danielle
293 Furtado da Silva; validation: Gemilson Soares Pontes and Anderson Nogueira Barbosa; resources:
294 Gemilson Soares Pontes and Allyson Guimarães da Costa; data curation: Gemilson Soares Pontes
295 and Anderson Nogueira Barbosa; writing—original draft preparation: Gemilson Soares Pontes, Jean
296 de Melo Silva and Renato Pinheiro-Silva; writing—review and editing: Gemilson Soares Pontes and
297 Allyson Guimarães da Costa; supervision: Gemilson Soares Pontes; project administration,
298 Gemilson Soares Pontes; funding acquisition: Gemilson Soares Pontes and Allyson Guimarães da
299 Costa. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

300 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

301

302 **REFERENCES**

- 303 1. Amazonas F. Boletim diário COVID-19 no Amazonas 23/3/2021.
304 2021;354:http://www.fvs.am.gov.br/transparenciacovid19_dado.
- 305 2. Moran EF, Brondízio ES, VanWey LK. Population and environment in Amazônia: Landscape
306 and household dynamics. In: Population, Land Use, and Environment: Research Directions.
307 2005. p. 5.
- 308 3. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE). População estimada. Diretoria de
309 Pesquisas, Coordenação de População e Indicadores Sociais, Estimativas da população
310 residente com data de referência 1o de julho de 2019. 2020.
- 311 4. IBGE. Senso demográfico IBGE. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Geoestatística. 2010.
- 312 5. Meneses-Navarro S, Freyermuth-Enciso MG, Pelcastre-Villafuerte BE, Campos-Navarro R,
313 Meléndez-Navarro DM, Gómez-Flores-Ramos L. The challenges facing indigenous
314 communities in Latin America as they confront the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal
315 for Equity in Health. 2020.
- 316 6. Saúde M da, Indígena. SE de S. Boletim epidemiológico. 2021.
- 317 7. Pereira JCM. Indígenas na cidade de Manaus (AM). Novos Cad NAEA. 2021;23(3):11–31.
- 318 8. Borgers N, Hox J, Sikkel D. Response quality in survey research with children and
319 adolescents: The effect of labeled response options and vague quantifiers. Int J Public Opin
320 Res. 2003;15(1):83–94.
- 321 9. Tavares FF, Betti G. The pandemic of poverty, vulnerability, and COVID-19: Evidence from a
322 fuzzy multidimensional analysis of deprivations in Brazil. World Dev. 2021;139.
- 323 10. Rodrigues EPS, Abreu IN, Lima CNC, da Fonseca DLM, Pereira SFG, dos Reis LC, et al.
324 High prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody in the Xikrin of Bacajá (Kayapó)
325 indigenous population in the Brazilian Amazon. International Journal for Equity in Health.
326 2021.
- 327 11. Lalwani P et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and associated factors in Manaus,
328 Brazil:baseline results from the DETECTCoV-19 cohort study. 2021;

- 329 12. Hallal PC, Hartwig FP, Horta BL, Silveira MF, Struchiner CJ, Vidaletti LP, et al. SARS-CoV-2
330 antibody prevalence in Brazil: results from two successive nationwide serological household
331 surveys. *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2020;8(11):e1390–8.
- 332 13. Nathaniel Berger D, Bulanin N, García-Alix L, Wiben Jensen M, Leth S, Alvarado Madsen E,
333 et al. 2 IWGIA-The Indigenous World-2020. In.
- 334 14. Woof JM, Russell MW. Structure and function relationships in IgA. *Mucosal Immunol.*
335 2011;(4):590–597.
- 336 15. Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, Muecksch F, Finkin S, Viant C, Gaebler C, et al. Enhanced SARS-
337 CoV-2 neutralization by dimeric IgA. *Sci Transl Med.* 2021;3(577):eabf1555.
- 338 16. Yu HQ, Sun BQ, Fang ZF, Zhao JC, Liu XY, Li YM, et al. Distinct features of SARS-CoV-2-
339 specific IgA response in COVID-19 patients. *Eur Respir J.* 2020;56(2):2001526.
- 340 17. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-
341 CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;(26):845–8.
- 342 18. Monod M, Blenkinsop A, Xi X, Hebert D, Bershan S, Tietze S, et al. Age groups that sustain
343 resurging COVID-19 epidemics in the United States. *Science (80-).*
344 2021;1336(March):eabe8372.
- 345 19. Cupertino GA, do Carmo Cupertino M, Gomes AP, Braga LM, Siqueira-Batista R. COVID-19
346 and Brazilian indigenous populations. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103(2):609–12.
- 347 20. Oliveira RNDC, Rosa LCDS. SAÚDE INDÍGENA EM TEMPOS DE BARBÁRIE: política
348 pública, cenários e perspectivas. *Rev Políticas Públicas.* 2015;18(2):481.
- 349 21. Sharma M, Anderson SA, Schoop R, Hudson JB. Induction of multiple pro-inflammatory
350 cytokines by respiratory viruses and reversal by standardized Echinacea, a potent antiviral
351 herbal extract. *Antiviral Res.* 2009;83(2):165–70.
- 352 22. Hudson J, Vimalanathan S. Echinacea-A source of potent antivirals for respiratory virus
353 infections. *Pharmaceuticals.* 2011;4(7):1019–31.

354

355

356 **Figures Legends**

357 **Figure 1.** Flow chart shows study design and the number of individuals included.

358 **Figure 2.** Ethnic diversity of the study population and positivity rates. (A) SARS-CoV-2 positivity
359 according to ethnicity. (B) Pattern of IgA, IgG and IgA/IgG positivity among infected
360 individuals. Smaller dots represent the antibody ratio from each individual. Larger dots and
361 vertical lines represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Dashed line represent
362 cut-off values specified by the manufacturer.

363 **Figure 3.** Main clinical symptoms and pattern of positivity according to the day of onset of the
364 individual's symptoms. (A) Number of symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals positive for
365 SARS-CoV-2. (B) IgA and IgG positivity rates according to the day of the onset of the
366 symptoms. Number 0 means the individuals presented symptoms on the day of blood
367 collection. Dots and vertical lines represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.
368 Dashed line represent cut-off values specified by the manufacturer.

369 **Figure 4.** Prevalence rates by household size. (A) Correlation between the risk of exposure to
370 infection and the household size (number of members). (B) SARS-CoV-2 prevalence rates
371 according to the number of individuals per residence. OR Fisher's exact test (* $p < 0.05$)

372 **Figure 5.** (A) Purchasing power and behavior characteristics (B) of study population.

373 **Figure Supplementary 1.** SARS-CoV-2 positivity based on the antibody ratios of age groups.
374 Difference of IgG (A) and IgA (B) ratios between the age groups. Smaller dots represent the
375 antibody ratio from each individual. Larger dots and vertical lines represent mean and
376 standard deviation, respectively. Dashed line represent cut-off values specified by the
377 manufacturer. One-way ANOVA ($p < 0.001$) with Tukey's post hoc test (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$,
378 *** $p < 0.001$).

379

380

381

382

383

384 **Table 1.** SARS-CoV-2 positivity according to sociodemographic characteristics of the study
385 population

Sociodemographic Characteristics	N (%)	Age Range	IgA N (%)	IgG N (%)	IgA and IgG N (%)	IgA or IgG ^a N (%)	PR (95% CI)	p-value ^b
Gender								
Female	162 (57.9)	03-83	83 (51.2)	95 (58.6)	77 (47.5)	101 (62.3)	0.92 (0.77-1.09)	0.207
Male	118 (42.1)	01-79	73 (61.9)	75 (63.6)	68 (57.6)	80 (67.8)	1.09 (0.92-1.29)	0.207
Age								
1-12	39 (13.9)		20 (51.3)	24 (61.5)	20 (51.3)	24 (61.5)	0.94 (0.72-1.23)	0.399
13-19	36 (12.9)		18 (50.0)	23 (63.9)	16 (44.4)	25 (69.4)	1.09 (0.86-1.38)	0.323
20-29	39 (13.9)		23 (59.0)	24 (61.5)	20 (51.3)	27 (69.2)	1.08 (0.86-1.36)	0.321
30-39	48 (17.1)		18 (37.5)	25 (52.1)	18 (37.5)	25 (52.1)	0.77 (0.58-1.03)	0.033*
40-49	48 (17.1)		35 (72.9)	33 (68.8)	33 (68.8)	35 (72.9)	1.16 (0.95-1.41)	0.125
50-59	36 (12.9)		23 (63.9)	24 (66.7)	21 (58.3)	26 (72.2)	1.14 (0.91-1.42)	0.203
≥60	34 (12.2)		19 (55.9)	17 (50.0)	17 (50.0)	19 (55.9)	0.85 (0.62-1.16)	0.171
Marital status								
Single	89 (45.6)	14-71	51 (57.3)	54 (60.7)	44 (49.4)	61 (68.5)	1.12 (0.91-1.37)	0.184
Married or living together	101 (51.8)	18-83	55 (54.5)	59 (58.4)	52 (51.5)	62 (61.4)	0.90 (0.73-1.11)	0.204
Widower	5 (2.6)	43-71	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)	0.93 (0.45-1.91)	0.399
Level of schooling								
Up to middle school	46 (23.6)	13-83	22 (47.8)	23 (50.0)	19 (41.3)	26 (56.5)	0.83 (0.63-1.10)	0.111
middle school completed	19 (9.7)	15-73	11 (57.9)	11 (57.9)	10 (52.6)	12 (63.2)	0.97 (0.67-1.39)	0.475
High school incomplete	45 (23.1)	14-64	25 (55.6)	26 (57.8)	22 (48.9)	29 (64.4)	0.99 (0.77-1.26)	0.473
High school completed	58 (29.7)	17-68	33 (56.9)	35 (60.3)	29 (50.0)	39 (67.2)	1.05 (0.84-1.30)	0.406
In higher education	27 (13.9)	18-79	19 (70.4)	21 (77.8)	19 (70.4)	21 (77.8)	1.23 (0.98-1.56)	0.103
COVID-19 information sources								
TV	63 (32.3)	14-83	31 (49.2)	35 (55.6)	29 (46.0)	37 (58.7)	0.86 (0.68-1.09)	0.129
Internet	20 (10.3)	13-56	11 (55.0)	11 (55.0)	9 (45.0)	13 (65.0)	1.00 (0.71-1.40)	0.407
TV and Internet	34 (17.4)	16-79	16 (47.1)	18 (52.9)	14 (41.2)	20 (58.8)	0.89 (0.65-1.20)	0.258
Others (religious leader or friends)	78 (40)	13-75	52 (66.7)	52 (66.7)	47 (60.3)	57 (73.1)	1.22 (1.00-1.49)	0.04*
Frequency of leaving the home								
Rarely	34 (17.4)	14-74	16 (47.1)	17 (50.0)	15 (44.1)	18 (52.9)	0.78 (0.56-1.09)	0.075
Once a week	102 (52.3)	13-83	57 (55.9)	59 (57.8)	51 (50.0)	65 (63.7)	0.96 (0.78-1.17)	0.390
2-4 times a week	59 (30.3)	15-64	37 (62.7)	40 (67.8)	33 (55.9)	44 (74.6)	1.22 (1.00-1.49)	0.048*

PR = Prevalence Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval; p<0.05 (*); ^aFisher Exact; ^bYates corrected X²


386

387

388

389

Figure 1



390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402


403

404


405

Figure 2

A



B



406

407

408

409


410

411 Figure 3

412

413

414



B






Figure 4



B



415

416

417

418

419

Figure 5

420

421

A


422

423


424

425

426




B




Supplementary Figure 1

A



B



427

428

429

430

431