



**WESTERN  
MICHIGAN**  
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

---

Volume 48  
Issue 2 June

Article 4

---

2021

## The Interlinkage between Blood Plasma Donation and Poverty in the United States

Analidis Ochoa

*University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, aoch@umich.edu*

H. Luke Shaefer

*University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, lshaefer@umich.edu*

Andrew Grogan-Kaylor

*University of Michigan - Ann Arbor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

---

### Recommended Citation

Ochoa, Analidis; Shaefer, H. Luke; and Grogan-Kaylor, Andrew (2021) "The Interlinkage between Blood Plasma Donation and Poverty in the United States," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 48 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol48/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



**WESTERN  
MICHIGAN**  
UNIVERSITY

# The Interlinkage Between Blood Plasma Donation and Poverty in the United States

Analidis Ochoa

*University of Michigan—Ann Arbor*

H. Luke Shaefer

*University of Michigan—Ann Arbor*

Andrew Grogan-Kaylor

*University of Michigan—Ann Arbor*

*In 2019, plasma centers in the United States received a record 53.5 million blood donations, roughly triple that collected during the Great Recession. Recent ethnographic research and journalistic accounts connect plasma sales and poverty, an association that would carry important public health implications given the vulnerability of disadvantaged populations. This study is the first to examine a range of socioeconomic characteristics of communities where commercial plasma centers situate. We geocode locations of all U.S. commercial plasma centers and merge with census tract demographic data from the American Community Survey. Findings indicate greater odds that plasma centers will locate in urban tracts with high rates of deep poverty, poverty, and near poverty. There is a bivariate association with high percentages of residents identifying as Black and Hispanic. These findings indicate a clear interrelationship between persistent economic hardship and the raw material sustaining a major healthcare industry.*

*Keywords: Plasma, Poverty, Racial Disparities, Inequality*

In 2019, plasma centers in the United States received a record 53.5 million paid plasma donations, roughly three times than what was recovered during the Great Recession. (Plasma Protein Therapeutics Association, 2011, 2019). The number of plasma donation centers have expanded from fewer than 300 in 2005 to over 900 in 2020, supporting a growing industry that was worth \$4 billion in 2008, \$21 billion in 2016, and is forecast to reach \$48 billion by 2025 (Hotchko & Robert, 2018; Market Research Bureau, 2020; Mitchum, 2008; U.S. Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2020; Wellington, 2014). Ethnographic research and journalistic accounts suggest that a key motivating factor fueling plasma donation in the U.S. is the financial compensation associated with the transaction (Edin & Shaefer, 2015; Goldstein, 2017; Guendelsberger, 2019; Kretzmann, 1992; Tirado, 2014; Valiente et. al., 2017).

These accounts suggest that paid plasma donation has become a common economic coping strategy among Americans with low incomes, who over the past decades have experienced: high rates of poverty and hardship; steep increases in the costs of essential expenses; declines of the cash safety net; and a corresponding rise in extreme poverty (Edin & Shaefer, 2015; Valiente et.al., 2017; Wellington, 2014; Woolf et. al., 2006). Because U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations permit American donors to sell plasma up to twice a week (U.S. FDA, 2019), these donations can add a few hundred dollars a month to household income, an important source of economic support for low-income families.

Despite the large growth in plasma donations since the Great Recession, recent literature has not examined the demographic characteristics of the growing number of plasma donors, reportedly low-income Americans who are already prone to poor health outcomes (National Center for Health Statistics, 2012). Such evidence would hold clear public health implications, particularly given the limited evidence on the impact of plasma donation on donor health. In the absence of publicly available data on the characteristics of plasma donors, this study examines the socioeconomic characteristics of the communities where plasma centers are situated.

## Background

Plasma donation, or plasmapheresis, is a procedure that involves the extraction of plasma from the blood for the use of medical therapies. The plasma exclusively extracted from voluntary donors is known as *source plasma*, defined by the FDA as the fluid portion of human blood intended as source material for further manufacturing use (U.S. FDA, 2019). Plasma is used in medical therapies called plasma protein therapies (PPT) (Market Research Bureau, 2018). These therapies primarily benefit patients suffering from rare diseases (namely antibody deficiencies) and hemophiliacs (Farrugia & Robert, 2006).

As worldwide demand for plasma-derived therapies has expanded, so has the presence of plasma centers across the U.S. (Hotchko & Robert, 2018). The global plasma industry relies heavily on U.S. donors, because the U.S. holds the least restrictive plasma regulations in the world (Hotchko & Robert, 2018; Robert, 2017). A single U.S. donor can yield far more donations than in any other country because most countries limit plasma donation to once every 2 weeks and prohibit paid donation (*The Lancet Haematology*, 2017). In 2016, the United States accounted for 74% of the world's source plasma supply, while North America accounted for 44 percent of the demand (Hotchko & Robert, 2018; Robert, 2017), meaning plasma from U.S. donors is used all across the world.

Figure 1 charts total paid plasma donations in the United States by year, 1999–2019. While the number of donations remained steady between 1999 and 2005—with some slight counter-cyclical variation—donations began to increase rapidly starting after 2006, quadrupling by 2018.

### *Health Implications of Plasma Donation*

The limited evidence available on the impact of plasma donation on donor health focuses on: (1) the linkage between plasma donation and distribution of risk behaviors associated with transfusion-transmissible infections; and (2) donor physiological health implications. In an earlier paper examining the location of commercial plasma centers in the U.S. from the period 1980–1995 relative to geographic distribution of risk behaviors, Robert C.




Figure 1: US Source Plasma Collections 1999–2019

Source: Plasma Protein Therapeutics Association 2011 and 2019

James and Cameron Mustard (2004) found that commercial plasma centers were overrepresented in neighborhoods with very active drug economies. These neighborhoods had high concentrations of households in deep poverty—with incomes below half the official poverty threshold. That this pattern persisted even after contaminated plasma products had infected thousands of patients with HIV and Hepatitis C was an alarming finding (HIV and Hepatitis C testing was not readily available during this time period). Technological advancements since the 1990s that introduced viral inactivation techniques during the production of plasma derivatives manufactured from paid donors have made blood products safer for patients (World Health Organization, 2004). However, ethnographic research and journalistic accounts of plasma donors suggest that plasma donation is still primarily undertaken by vulnerable populations (Edin & Shaefer, 2015; Valiente et. al., 2017).

With regards to the impacts of plasma donation on donor health, short-term side effects such as fatigue, tingling sensations, anemia, and black outs have been chronicled in firsthand accounts published in *The New York Times*, *The Atlantic*, and *Huffington Post* (Greenberg, 2019; McCollum, 2020; Wellington, 2014). Additional physiological implications were examined in a 1994 study that sought to determine

whether long-term plasma donation altered plasma proteins or lymphocyte phenotypes (Lewis et al., 1994). The authors found that plasma donors had increased percentages of B cells as compared to non-donor controls and whole blood donors. The authors hypothesized that the increase in B cells may be a compensatory mechanism to make more immunoglobulin to replace what was lost in plasmapheresis, suggesting physiological consequences to plasma donation. Another study found that performance in exhaustive, severe-intensity exercise was “markedly reduced immediately following the removal of plasma. The only likely explanation is that anaerobic energy pathways must have been compromised” (Hill et. al., 2013, p. 554). This study measured time to exhaustion before and after plasma donation at different time intervals. The authors noted that while performance declined initially, performance levels were re-established thereafter. However, because each participant only donated plasma once during this study, possible consequences of repeated withdrawals could not be determined.

A 2010 study investigating the long-term effects of plasma donation in the United States found that high frequency U.S. plasma donors had fewer proteins in their blood when compared to European plasma donors (Hellstern et al., 2001). In this study, all subjects were regular plasmapheresis donors over a period of at least 6 weeks. The median interval between two plasma donations was 5 days among U.S. donors and 14 days among German donors. The results indicate that plasma collected from frequent donors yielded lower quality plasma.

In another study that examined the risk of iron depletion among frequent plasma donors, the authors found that frequent source plasma donation in the U.S. did not adversely impact iron stores (Schreiber et al., 2018). However, donor samples were taken once at the beginning of the donor’s routine plasma donation instead of after, and the period of time between which the donor had last given plasma and the sample was not considered. These factors lead to questions about the validity of the results of this study. It is also important to note that the study was a collaborative effort between the Plasma Protein Therapeutics Association and other leaders in the plasma industry.

## Data and Statistical Methods

To examine the association between the location of plasmapheresis centers and the demographic characteristics of the surrounding communities, the addresses of active (as of May 2017) FDA-approved plasmapheresis centers were geocoded and analyzed in 2017–2019 in conjunction with Census tract level data from the American Community Survey (ACS) (2011–2015 5-year estimates) using ArcGIS. The ACS is a nationally-representative household survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that randomly samples addresses in every state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The ACS is the primary source of data for the socio-economic characteristics of small units of geography (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). In addition, to provide a population density measure, primary rural-urban commuting area (RUCA) codes classifications were incorporated in our data set. RUCA codes classify U.S. census tracts using measures of population density, urbanization, and daily commuting. Primary codes range from a whole number scale of 1–10 to delineate metropolitan, micropolitan, small town, and rural commuting areas. The RUCA codes used in this study are from the 2010 decennial census.

Plasma center addresses were retrieved from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Blood Establishment Registration Database in May 2017 (U.S. FDA, 2017). Geocoding these addresses revealed 638 locations throughout the continental United States. Of these centers, eight were not-for-profit establishments and one was located in a tract with no population. These nine centers were dropped from the dataset. Our data consists of the remaining addresses of 629 commercial plasmapheresis centers. Data were sorted into two groups: (1) Census tracts with plasma centers; and (2) Census tracts without plasma centers. There were initially 72,065 census tracts in our data set. Of these, 331 tracts were dropped because they had no population, 473 tracts were omitted because they had unreported poverty data, and an additional two tracts were dropped because they were missing data on educational attainment. This left 71,590 census tracts. Of these, 617 census tracts had plasma centers and 70,973 did not.

Two sample t-tests were used to assess statistical significance of differences in selected characteristics. Logistic regression was then



employed to estimate the association of community characteristics—such as racial and ethnic composition, educational attainment, poverty status, and population density—with the presence of a plasma center in that community. The outcome variable indicated whether or not a plasma center existed in the census tract (1 = yes, 0 = no).

Race and ethnicity were measured using the following variables from the ACS: total percent White alone, total percent non-Hispanic black, total percent Hispanic, and total percent other (this is the aggregate of all categories other than non-Hispanic black and Hispanic). The educational attainment variable was measured using the following variables, as a proportion of the census tract population: level of education less than high school, level of education more than high school and some college, and Bachelor's degree or more. Poverty was measured by variables of the proportion of people living below cash incomes of 50% of the poverty line, 50–99.9%, and 100–200% of the poverty line. Population density was measured by a dichotomous variable constructed from 2010 RUCA codes. RUCA codes 1–3 denote metropolitan areas, 4–6 denote micropolitan areas, 7–9 denote small towns, and 10 denotes rural areas. We created an urban variable which categorizes RUCA codes 1–3 as urban (urban = 1) and codes 4–10 as not urban (urban = 0). Lastly, a variable for state was included in model 3 to control for underlying state characteristics.

## Results

Figure 2 plots the locations of commercial plasmapheresis centers in the continental United States. Concentrations of plasma centers exist in the South and Midwest. As per FDA blood establishment registration records, Texas had the highest number of active plasma centers of any state in the United States (84), with many along the southern border, followed by Florida (47). The upper Northeast and West regions exhibited lower concentrations.

Results from Table 1 indicate that 597 census tracts with plasma centers are located in urban areas and 20 are located in rural areas. While 96.8 percent of plasma centers are located in urban areas, only 82.0 percent of all census tracts in the United States are urban. Another primary difference between the two groups of census tracts is in the concentration of racial and ethnic minorities. Non-Hispanic



Location of plasma centers and proportion of population living below 100% poverty level




Figure 2: Location of plasma centers and proportion of county population living below 100% poverty level

Blacks make up 21.5 percent of the population in census tracts with plasma centers, compared to 13.4 percent of those without plasma centers. The results are similar for Hispanic origin. In contrast, while 50.8 percent of residents in census tracts with plasma centers are non-Hispanic White, the proportion of non-Hispanic White residents is 12 percentage points higher in census tracts without plasma centers at 62.8.

The differences are not as striking by educational attainment, although they move in the hypothesized direction. A somewhat larger proportion of residents in census tracts with plasma centers had not graduated from high school (16.8 percent versus 13.7 percent) and correspondingly a somewhat lower fraction had a bachelor's degree (29.0 percent versus 23.9 percent). The rates of high school degree attainment and some college are roughly comparable.

Those living in census tracts with plasma centers were also more likely to live in poverty, most noticeably deep poverty, below 50% of the poverty line, and below 100% of the poverty line. While on average 7.3 percent of the population residing in census tracts

Table 1. Selected Socio-economic Characteristics for Census Tracts with and without plasma centers (Means)

| Characteristics               | No plasma centers |                    | With plasma centers |                    | t      |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------|
|                               | Mean              | Standard Deviation | Mean                | Standard Deviation |        |
| <b>Urban (dichotomous)</b>    | .818              | .386               | .968                | .177               | -9.6*  |
| <b>Race and Ethnicity</b>     |                   |                    |                     |                    |        |
| Non-Hispanic White            | 62.8              | 30.0               | 50.8                | 28.6               | 9.9*   |
| Non-Hispanic Black            | 13.4              | 21.7               | 21.5                | 25.1               | -9.3*  |
| Hispanic                      | 16.1              | 21.3               | 20.7                | 24.7               | -5.4*  |
| Other                         | 7.8               | 10.2               | 6.9                 | 6.1                | 2.0*   |
| <b>Educational Attainment</b> |                   |                    |                     |                    |        |
| < High School                 | 13.7              | 11.0               | 16.8                | 11.7               | -7.0*  |
| HS, Some college, No BA       | 57.3              | 14.3               | 59.3                | 10.8               | -3.5*  |
| Bachelor's degree +           | 29.0              | 18.8               | 23.9                | 14.6               | 6.8*   |
| <b>Income-to-Poverty</b>      |                   |                    |                     |                    |        |
| < 50% poverty                 | 7.3               | 7.0                | 12.0                | 10.0               | -16.7* |
| 50 to <100% poverty           | 8.9               | 7.1                | 13.4                | 7.9                | -15.6* |
| 101 to 199% poverty           | 19.0              | 9.4                | 23.8                | 8.3                | -12.7* |
| >200% poverty                 | 64.8              | 18.9               | 50.8                | 18.9               | 18.4*  |

\* p<0.05 or beyond

Source: Census tract data retrieved from ACS 2011-2015 (5-year estimates) and plasma center addresses retrieved from FDA Blood Establishment Registration Database on May 31, 2017

Notes: Table 1 compares the socio-economic characteristics for census tracts with and without plasma centers. The table shows statistically significant results at p=0.5 for all selected socioeconomic characteristics.

without plasma centers live below half the poverty line, 12.0 percent of those in census tracts with plasma centers did so, a figure 64 percent higher. The rate of residents between 50 and 100% of poverty was 51 percent higher in tracts with a plasma center than in tracts without plasma centers.

Table 2 reports the results from three multivariate logistic regression models that estimate the odds that a plasma center will be located in a census tract. Census tracts are the unit of observation, and the dichotomous outcome is equal to 1 if there is a plasma center in the census tract, and 0 if there are no plasma centers present. Model 1 includes poverty, race and ethnicity variables. Model 2 adds educational attainment, and model 3 includes all variables in the previous models, adds a variable indicating urbanicity, and controls for states to adjust for underlying state characteristics. State coefficients have been omitted from the table. In each model, standard errors are clustered by state.

The odds ratios for all the poverty variables (below 50% poverty, 50–99% and 100–200%) in each model are substantively meaningful and all are statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  across all three model variations; the odds of finding a plasma center in census tracts is positively associated with the proportion of individuals living in deep poverty, poverty, and near poverty. Odds ratios for all three levels of poverty are roughly similar in magnitude.

With regard to race and ethnicity, when income-to-poverty variables and race and ethnicity are entered into the same model, the bivariate differences seen by race and ethnicity in Table 1 are not evident. In no model is the percentage of Black non-Hispanic population associated with greater odds of a plasma center. In model three, the odds of a plasma center are somewhat higher and are statistically significant for the percent Hispanic only. Thus, of the inter-related factors of community-level poverty rates and composition by race and ethnicity, poverty appears to be the stronger predictor in these models.

Interestingly, the odds associated with higher levels of educational attainment (percent high school and/or some college and percent more than BA) are above one, and are statistically significant at above the .001 level. In models two and three, the odds of finding a plasma center in areas where a greater proportion of the population has some college as well as a bachelor's degree are greater when

Table 2: Odds Ratios From Logistic Regression Models: Predicting the Association of Characteristics of Communities With Presence of a Plasma Center In That Community

| Variables                      | (1)                | (2)                | (3)                 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Income-to-Poverty</b>       |                    |                    |                     |
| Percent Poverty <50%           | 1.040***<br>(.003) | 1.043***<br>(.003) | 1.040***<br>(.003)  |
| Percent Poverty 50–99%         | 1.032***<br>(.005) | 1.053***<br>(.006) | 1.044***<br>(.006)  |
| Percent Poverty 100–200%       | 1.035***<br>(.006) | 1.053***<br>(.005) | 1.045***<br>(.005)  |
| <b>Race and Ethnicity</b>      |                    |                    |                     |
| Percent Black non-Hispanic     | 1.001<br>(.002)    | 1.003<br>(.002)    | 1.001<br>(.001)     |
| Percent Hispanic               | 0.999<br>(.006)    | 1.010<br>(.006)    | 1.013***<br>(.004)  |
| Percent Other                  | 0.997<br>(.008)    | 0.994<br>(.009)    | 1.008<br>(.004)     |
| <b>Education</b>               |                    |                    |                     |
| Percent HS and/or Some College | ---                | 1.045***<br>(.006) | 1.033***<br>(.007)  |
| Percent More than BA           | ---                | 1.050***<br>(.006) | 1.033***<br>(.006)  |
| <b>Urban/Rural Designation</b> |                    |                    |                     |
| Urban                          | ---                | ---                | 9.297***<br>(2.105) |
| State controls                 | ---                | ---                | X                   |
| Constant                       | 0.002              | .00002             | .00002              |
| Observations                   | 71,590             | 71,590             | 68,372              |

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$

Reference category for income-to-poverty is percent poverty >200%

Reference category for race and ethnicity is White non-Hispanic

Reference category for educational attainment is percent < high school

Reference category for urban is percent rural

Robust standard errors are in parentheses

compared to the fraction with less than a high school degree. Thus, after controlling for income-to-poverty and race and ethnicity, the odds of a plasma center being located in a community is positively associated with educational attainment. Finally, given that 96.8 percent of plasma centers in the U.S. are located in urban census tracts, the odds ratio for the urban variable is large and statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

## Discussion

This study establishes that there is a clear linkage between the location of plasma centers in the United States—the most important market for the industry—and the presence of disadvantage. Census tracts with higher levels of individuals just above the poverty line, as well as higher levels of individuals in poverty and deep poverty, were most likely to have a plasma center. In the absence of data on the demographic characteristics of the actual people who sell their blood plasma, this study expands our understanding of the characteristics of the people who are most likely to donate plasma—those who are poor. This finding allows researchers to begin to interrogate the impact of plasma donation on the donor population, an area of research that remains largely unexplored. Interestingly, in multivariate models, economic deprivation appears to be a stronger predictor of the location of plasma centers than does the race or ethnicity of those living in a particular census tract.

Counter-intuitively, however, higher levels of education are associated with greater odds of a plasma center being located in a particular community, after controlling for the level of poverty and other factors. Anecdotal evidence suggests that low-income student populations are likely to engage in plasma donations. It may be that plasma centers are more likely to be located in areas where there are campuses with lower levels of economic resources. However, further investigation of these issues—preferably with individual level data—is warranted.

An understanding of the donor population carries compelling public health implications because evidence on the short- and long-term health repercussions experienced by plasma donors is largely absent from the literature. Because likely donors are presumably poor, additional evidence on the impact of plasma donation on

vulnerable bodies must be considered. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic highlights the vulnerability of poor Americans, whose social and environmental circumstances have historically led to worse health outcomes (Abrams & Szeffler, 2020; Raifman & Raifman, 2020). This is due to a range of factors, from decreased access to health care services to an increased likelihood of experiencing chronic health conditions (Adler & Newman, 2002).

Pharmaceutical companies that manufacture and profit from the sale of plasma protein therapies have little incentive to investigate this line of inquiry further; their focus is on the patient, not the donor. While there is an abundance of scholarship that examines the benefits of plasma-derived products for patients, deeper examination of how plasma donation impacts purveyors of the *raw material* that patients and pharmaceutical companies depend on is equally important. However, the privatized nature of the pharmaceutical industry hinders access to donor data, hampering efforts for independent research in this area. Still, generating this kind of data is paramount to ensuring that low-income donors are not inadvertently debilitating their bodies in an effort to combat their poverty.

In the absence of evidence examining the ramifications of plasma donation to donor health, we encourage policymakers to consider the ethical implications of the reliance of low-income Americans on plasma donations. To safeguard the well-being of likely donors, policymakers should continue to expand policies that have sought to mitigate the rise in hardship during the COVID pandemic, such as the 2021 expansion of the child tax credit.

## References

- Adler, N. E., & Newman, K. (2002). Socioeconomic disparities in health: Pathways and policies. *Health Affairs*, 21(2), 60-76. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.21.2.60>
- Abrams, E. M. & Szeffler, S. J. (2020). COVID-19 and the impact of social determinants of health. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. Advance online publication. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30234-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30234-4)
- Edin, K. J., & Shaefer, H. L. (2015). *\$2.00 a day: Living on almost nothing in America*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

- Farrugia, A., & Robert, P. (2006). Plasma protein therapies: Current and future perspectives. *Best Practice and Research Clinical Hematology*, 19(1), 243–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beha.2005.01.002>
- Goldstein, A. (2017). *Janesville: An American story*. Simon and Schuster.
- Greenberg, Z. (2019, February 1). What is the blood of a poor person worth? *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/01/sunday-review/blood-plasma-industry.html#:~:text=A%20donation%20of%20plasma%2C%20for,the%20UCLA%20School%20of%20Medicine>.
- Guendelsberger, E. (2019). *On the clock: What low-wage work did to me and how it drives America insane*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Hellstern, P., Bach, J., Haubelt, H., Hitzler, W. E., Mathis, S., & Vogt, A. (2001). The impact of the intensity of serial automated plasmapheresis and the speed of deep-freezing on the quality of plasma. *Transfusion*, 41(12), 1601–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1537-2995.2001.41121601.x>
- Hill, D. W., Vingren, J. L., & Burdette, S. D. (2013). Effect of plasma donation and blood donation on aerobic and anaerobic responses in exhaustive, severe-intensity exercise. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism*, 38(5), 551–557. <https://doi.org/10.1139/apnm-2012-0361>
- Hotchko, M., & Robert, P. (2018). Recent market status and trends of fractionated plasma products. *Annals of Blood*, 3(2), 19. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aob.2018.01.06>
- James, R. C., & Mustard, C. A. (2004). Geographic location of commercial plasma donation clinics in the United States, 1980–1995. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(7), 1224–1229. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.94.7.1224>
- Kretzmann, M. (1992). Bad blood: The moral stigmatization of paid plasma donors. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 20(4), 416–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124192020004002>
- Lewis, S. L., Kutvirt, S. G., Bonner, P. N., & Simon, T. L. (1994). Plasma proteins and lymphocyte phenotypes in long-term plasma donors. *Transfusion*, 34(7), 578–585. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1537-2995.1994.34794330011.x>
- Market Research Bureau. (2018). *Plasma procurement and safety*. <https://marketingresearchbureau.com/plasma-industry/current-uses-affecting-the-plasma-industry/>
- Market Research Bureau. (2020). *Blood plasma market by product (immunoglobulin, albumin, protease inhibitors, coagulation factor concentrates); By application (hospitals, and clinics, research laboratories, Academic institutions) and by regional analysis—global forecast by 2021–2026*. <https://www.marketresearchengine.com/blood-plasma-market>
- McCollum, N. (2020, April 15). *I'm desperate for money due to coronavirus, so I donated plasma. It was alarming*. HuffPost. [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/covid-19-plasma-treatment-donation\\_n\\_5e9484e0c5b6d97d91f0c3da](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/covid-19-plasma-treatment-donation_n_5e9484e0c5b6d97d91f0c3da)



- Mitchum, R. (2008, November 20). In weak economy, plasma centers pulsate with donors seeking dollars. *The Pantagraph*. [https://www.pantagraph.com/news/in-weak-economy-plasma-centers-pulsate-with-donors-seeking-dollars/article\\_e8c9e3b3-f93f-58db-8ee5-9451e097f38e.html?mode=comments](https://www.pantagraph.com/news/in-weak-economy-plasma-centers-pulsate-with-donors-seeking-dollars/article_e8c9e3b3-f93f-58db-8ee5-9451e097f38e.html?mode=comments)
- National Center for Health Statistics. (2012). Health, United States, 2011: With special feature on socioeconomic status. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus11.pdf>
- Plasma Protein Therapeutics Association. (2011). *United States total donations 1999–2011*.
- Plasma Protein Therapeutics Association. (2019). *United States total collections 2008–2019*.
- Raifman, M. A., & Raifman, J. R. (2020). Disparities in the population at risk of severe illness from COVID-19 by race/ethnicity and income. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 59(1), 137–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2020.04.003>
- Robert, P. (2017). Setting the scene for the future of blood and plasma donations. IPFA/BCA 3rd Global Symposium, Atlanta, GA, September 11–12, 2017.
- Schreiber, G. B., Brinser, R., Rosa-Bray, M., Yu, Z. F., & Simon, T. (2018). Frequent source plasma donors are not at risk of iron depletion: The ferritin levels in plasma donor (FLIPD) study. *Transfusion*, 58(4), 951–959. <https://doi.org/10.1111/trf.14489>.
- Schwartz, N., D., Casselman, B., & Koeze, E. (2020, May 8). How bad is unemployment? “Literally off the charts” *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/05/08/business/economy/april-jobs-report.html>
- Shaefer, H. L., Edin, K., Fusaro, V., & Wu, P. (2019). The decline of cash assistance and the well-being of poor households with children. *Social Forces*, 98(3), 1000–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soz020>
- The Lancet Haematology*. (2017). Editorial: The big business of blood plasma. 4(10), E452. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026\(17\)30183-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(17)30183-7)
- Tirado, L. (2014). *Hand to mouth: Living in bootstrap America*. Penguin Books.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2018). *American community survey information guide*. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/about/information-guide.html>
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2017). *Blood establishment registration database*.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2020). *Blood establishment registration database*. <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cber/CFAppsPub/>

- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2019). CFR—Code of Federal Regulations Title 21 Part 640.65. Retrieved June 14, 2020, from <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/CFRSearch.cfm?fr=640.65>
- World Health Organization. (2004). *Annex 4: Guidelines on viral inactivation and removal procedures intended to assure the viral safety of human blood plasma products*. (WHO Technical Report, Series No. 924).
- Wellington, D. L. (2014, May 28). The twisted business of donating plasma. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/05/blood-money-the-twisted-business-of-donating-plasma/362012/>
- Wolf, S., Johnson, R., & Geiger, J. (2006). The rising prevalence of severe poverty in America: A growing threat to public health. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 31(4), 332-341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.06.022>
- World Bank. (2020, June 8). *COVID-19 to plunge global economy into worst recession since World War II* [Press Release]. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2020/06/08/covid-19-to-plunge-global-economy-into-worst-recession-since-world-war-ii>
- Valiente, A., Abdelmalek, M., & Pearle, L. (2017, January 13). Why thousands of low-income Americans “donate” their blood plasma to for-profit centers *ABC News*. <https://abcnews.go.com/US/thousands-low-income-americans-donate-blood-plasma-profit/story?id=44710257>