

1 **Seroprevalence and risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection in middle-sized cities of Burkina Faso: a**
2 **descriptive cross-sectional study**

3 **Adama Sana^{1¶*}, Elodie Djemai^{2¶}, Philippe De Vreyer², Thomas Thivillon³, Hermann Badolo^{4&},**
4 **Abdramane Berthé^{5,6&}, Dramane Kania^{6&}**

5 ¹ **Département biomédical et santé publique, Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IRSS),**
6 **Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (CNRST), Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso**

7 ² **Université PSL, LEDa, CNRS, IRD, [DIAL], Paris, France.**

8 ³ **Université de Bordeaux, UMR CNRS 6060 Bordeaux Sciences Economiques, Pessac, France.**

9 ⁴ **Observatoire National de la Santé de la population, Institut National de Santé Publique,**
10 **Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso**

11 ⁵ **Université de Dédougou, Dédougou, Burkina Faso**

12 ⁶ **Centre Muraz, Institut National de Santé Publique, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso**

13

14 *** Corresponding author: Elodie Djemai**

15 **E-mail: elodie.djemai@dauphine.psl.eu**

16

17

18 **¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.**

19 **& These authors also contributed equally to this work**

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background**

22 Since March 2020, COVID-19 has evolved from a localized outbreak to a global pandemic. We assessed
23 the seroprevalence of COVID-19 in three towns in the Centre Sud region of Burkina Faso.

24 **Methods**

25 A population-based cross-sectional survey was conducted in three medium-sized towns in Burkina
26 Faso's Centre Sud region, from June to July 2021. Subjects aged 16 or over at the time of the survey
27 were considered for this seroprevalence study. The Biosynex COVID-19 BSS rapid test was used to
28 detect immunoglobulin G (IgG) and immunoglobulin M (IgM) against SARS-CoV-2. A standardized
29 questionnaire was also administered to collect additional information.

30 **Results**

31 A total of 2449 eligible participants (age ≥ 16 years) were identified. Serological tests for COVID-19
32 were performed in 2155 individuals. Finally, 2143 valid tests were retained and analyzed. Out of the
33 entire sample, 246 positive tests were observed, corresponding to a prevalence of 11.48%. Prevalence
34 was 9.35% (58 cases) in Kombissiri, 12.86% (80 cases) in Manga and 11.99% (108 cases) in Pô. By
35 gender, 13.37% of women (164 cases) tested positive, and 8.95% of men (82 cases). Women accounted
36 for 66.67% of all positive test subjects. The results show a significantly higher seroprevalence in women
37 ($P = 0.007$), people over 55 years old ($P = 0.004$), overweight or obese people ($P = 0.026$) and those with
38 drinking water sources at home (0.013).

39

40 **Conclusions**

41 The results of this study show that the COVID-19 virus also circulates in the population of medium-
42 sized towns in Burkina Faso, far more than is officially reported in the country. The study also
43 highlighted the greater vulnerability of women to the epidemic, and the challenge of access to water
44 in the face of diseases such as COVID-19. The preventive measures put in place to fight the pandemic
45 must take these different factors into account.

46

47 **Keywords :** Seroprevalence, COVID-19, Centre Sud, Burkina Faso

48 Introduction

49 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is an infectious disease whose initial cases were first reported in
50 Wuhan, Hubei Province, China, in December 2019 [1]. Rapidly evolving from a localized outbreak, it
51 transformed into a global pandemic [2].

52 Burkina Faso, like many other countries worldwide, was also affected. The country recorded its
53 first confirmed case of SARS-CoV-2 infection, the virus responsible for COVID-19, on March 9, 2020. As
54 of July 3, 2022, there were officially 21,134 confirmed COVID-19 cases in the country, with 387 deaths
55 [3]. The capital-city, Ouagadougou, situated in the Center region, and Bobo-Dioulasso, the country's
56 second-largest city located in the Hauts-Bassins region, were the main affected areas, and benefited
57 the most from response measures.

58 Data from the countries earliest affected by the pandemic indicate that approximately 40% of
59 infected individuals will exhibit a mild form of the disease, often asymptomatic [4]. Despite the absence
60 or presence of mild signs and symptoms, these individuals are contagious and thus capable of
61 transmitting the disease to others [4].

62 Fragility of healthcare systems, limited access to hygiene and sanitation facilities, and lack of
63 early treatment options during the initial stages of the pandemic raised concerns about a potentially
64 rapid increase in infections in sub-Saharan Africa. Governments had few strategies available other than
65 slowing down the virus transmission as much as possible. This study aims to assess the epidemic
66 situation in medium-sized cities in the Center-South region of Burkina Faso and to identify the risk
67 factors for COVID-19 infection.

68

69

70 **Materials and Methods**

71 **Study Design**

72 This study was a descriptive cross-sectional investigation based on survey data collected from June 7
73 to July 3, 2021.

74 **Study Site**

75 The study was conducted in three cities in the Center-South region of Burkina Faso: Kombissiri, Manga,
76 and Pô.

77 **Study Population and Sampling**

78 The sample of households comes from a list of households that had been surveyed between November
79 2019 and March 2020 for a study on domestic cooking fuel choices and exposure to air pollution. The
80 households were initially randomly selected using a spatial sampling strategy, with GPS points drawn
81 in the three study locations. Data collectors followed a predetermined random walk to select one
82 household per GPS point.

83 The analysis relies on 813 households. 739 were already surveyed before the COVID-19 and 74
84 are replacement households.

85 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

86 Eligible households were those without access to gas or electricity for cooking. This is a reasonable
87 restriction as most households in Burkina Faso rely on solid fuels for cooking. Using the living standard
88 measurement surveys collected in 2014 [5], it turns out that 83% of the households mostly rely on
89 wood as primary cooking fuel at the national level, and only 13.4% have access to a cleaner cooking

90 solution such as LPG or electricity. In addition, households declaring dolo brewing as one of their
91 income-generating activities or reporting no cooking at home were excluded from the study.

92 **Consent**

93 The project obtained approval from the Burkina Faso Health Research Ethics Committee on July 1,
94 2020, and from the International Review Board of the Paris School of Economics on March 16, 2021.

95 An information form outlining the terms and conditions of the research was read and explained to the
96 members of the sampled households. Only after ensuring that the information contained in the
97 information form is fully understood, is the participant's consent requested by the data collector. To
98 take part in the study, free, informed consent signed by the head of household or his/her
99 representative was required. This consent was in both electronic (on tablet) and written (on paper)
100 format. A signed and dated copy was given to the household before the start of the interviews. In
101 addition, free and informed verbal consent was requested from each respondent. For minors, the
102 consent of a parent or legal guardian was mandatory.

103 All participation was voluntary, and each participant was notified of his or her right to end participation
104 at any time without having to provide a reason or suffer prejudice of any kind.

105 **Data Collection**

106 As part of this study we administered questionnaires and did capillary blood sampling for rapid COVID-
107 19 tests. The data collection started on June 7, 2021 and ended on July 2, 2021. Household members
108 were interviewed using a standardized electronic questionnaire. Data collection covered
109 sociodemographic characteristics, self-reported health, weight, height, blood pressure, and COVID-19
110 serological testing. Other variables were also studied and will be the subject of future publications.

111 For COVID-19 serological testing, a capillary blood sample was taken from study participants. The
112 serological tests were only conducted among members of sampled households aged 16 and more. The

113 rapid test used was the Biosynex COVID-19 BSS, an immunochromatographic test that detects anti-
114 SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM antibodies. The theoretical performance provided by Biosynex was at least
115 96% sensitivity and 100% specificity.

116 **Data management and analysis**

117 The SurveyCTO software was used for questionnaire programming and data recording on tablets,
118 including serological test results. Data cleaning and analysis were performed using STATA (version
119 16.0). The analysis was primarily descriptive, with an analytical component considering
120 sociodemographic variables that could potentially influence COVID-19 serological status.

121 **Results**

122 **Sociodemographic characteristics of the study population**

123 A total of 823 households were covered in the survey, encompassing 3,834 individuals, with 1,161 in
124 Kombissiri, 937 in Manga, and 1,736 in Pô. Approximately 61% of households had more than five
125 members. Serological testing for COVID-19 was conducted on 2,155 individuals out of the eligible 2,449
126 (aged 16 years and above). Among them, 12 tests were considered invalid due to the absence of the
127 control line (C) on the cassette. Eventually, 2,143 valid and analyzed tests were retained, comprising
128 1,227 women and 916 men. Among the women, 38 declared being pregnant at the time of testing.

129 The analysis sample is made of 813 households in which at least one member was tested for
130 COVID-19 during our survey and has a valid test. On average, there are 2.6 people tested by households
131 (median 2, min 1, max 12). The mean age of those tested was 38.56 years (SD 17.46; min 16, max 111),
132 with 38.76 years (SD 17.25; min 16, max 111) for women and 38.28 years (SD 17.74; min 16, max 92)
133 for men. Approximately 56.40% of participants had never attended school. 41.06% lived in households
134 with 1 to 5 members, and 6.71% had access to piped water (either inside their dwelling or from a

135 neighbor). 66.04% had a normal body mass index (BMI), 15.83% were overweight, and 6.03% were
136 obese (BMI \geq 30). The descriptive statistics of the main variables are shown in Table 1.

137

138 **Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the main sociodemographic variables**

Characteristic	Frequency	Proportion (%)
Town (2143)		
Kombissiri	620	28.93
Manga	622	29.03
Pô	901	42.04
Sex		
Female	1227	57.26
Male	916	42.74
Age (in years)		
16-24	599	27.95
25-54	1123	52.40
≥55	421	19.65
Body Mass Index (BMI)		
Underweight	259	12.10
Normal	1414	66.04
Overweight	339	15.83
Obese	129	6.03
Education attainment (2108)		
No formal education	1189	56.40
Any formal education	919	43.60
Primary	361	17.13
Lower Secondary	336	15.94
Upper Secondary and above	222	10.53
Household size (members)		

1-5	880	41.06
>5	1263	58.94
Access to water^a (2131)		
Yes	143	6.71
No	1988	93.29

139 Household members aged 16 or older whose RDT is valid were considered.

140 ^aAccess to water is an indicator taking value 1 if the household has access to clean water in his house, garden or
141 from a neighbor.

142

143 **COVID-19 Seroprevalence**

144 Across the entire sample, 246 positive tests were observed, resulting in a prevalence of 11.48%.

145 Prevalence was 9.35% (58 cases) in Kombissiri, 12.86% (80 cases) in Manga, and 11.99% (108 cases) in

146 Pô.

147 Among the 246 positive cases, 164 were women (prevalence rate of 13.37%) and 82 were men

148 (8.95%). Consequently, women constituted 66.67% of all subjects testing positive. Among pregnant

149 women, the seroprevalence was 26.32% (10 cases out of 38).

150 The mean age of those testing positive was 41.22 years (SD 18.70; min 16, max 92).

151 Seroprevalence was 10.51% (181 cases) in individuals under 55 years and 15.44% in those aged 55

152 years and older (65 cases).

153 **SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence and sociodemographic indicators**

154 **Univariate Analysis**

155 We compared seropositivity according to city of residence, household size, sex, age group, education

156 level, and access to water (Table 2). Univariate analysis from logistic regression did not show a

157 significant difference between the three cities ($P= 0.050$ and 0.107), household size ($P= 0.779$), or

158 education level (P= 0.790, a variable indicating whether one was educated or not, observed in 2,108
159 respondents). However, a statistically significant difference was noted for sex (P= 0.002), high BMI (P=
160 0.005, a variable indicating whether BMI is equal to 25 or more), age groups (P= 0.005), and gestational
161 status among the 1,227 women (P= 0.021). Additionally, there was a significant difference based on
162 whether a person was a member of a household with water access (private tap or shared tap in the
163 courtyard or with a neighbor) compared to those without water access, with a p-value of 0.006.

164

165

166 **Table 2. Odds ratio from univariate logistic regression**

Variables	% Positive	Univariate OR	95% CI	P-value
City (n=2143)				
Kombissiri	9.35	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
Manga	12.86	1.43	1.00 2.05	0.050
Pô	11.99	1.32	0.94 1.85	0.107
Household size (n=2143)				
1-5	11.26	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
>5	11.65	1.04	0.79 1.36	0.779
Education (n=2108)				
No formal education	11.32	1.04	0.79 1.36	0.790
Any formal education	11.69	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
Sex (n=2143)				
Female	13.37	1.57	1.19 2.08	0.002
Male	8.95	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
BMI group (n=2141)				
BMI >25	10.46	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
BMI larger than 25	15.17	1.53	1.14 2.06	0.005
Age (n=2143)				
16-54	10.51	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
55+	15.44	1.55	1.14 2.11	0.005
Water access (n=2131)				
Yes	18.35	1.82	1.19 2.79	0.006
No	11.00	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	
Currently pregnant (n=1227)				

Yes	26.32	2.40	1.14 5.04	0.021
No	12.95	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Reference</i>	

167 Household members aged 16 or older whose RDT is valid were considered.
168 BMI = body mass index; n = number of individuals; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

169

170 Multivariate Analysis

171 In the multivariate analysis, we included all variables that had a significant association with SARS-CoV-
172 2 infection (those with a critical probability below 0.10), except for gestational status, which was not
173 included to analyze the complete sample of men and women. Logistic regression analysis revealed that
174 female gender, high BMI, age (being under 55 years old), and lack of a household tap (private or shared)
175 were factors associated with seropositivity to SARS-CoV-2 in our study population (see Table 3).

176 **Table 3. Odds ratio from multivariate logistic regression**

Variables	OR	95% CI	P-value
Female	1.48	1.11-1,97.	0.007
BMI equal to 25 and above	1.42	1.04-1,92	0.026
55 years old or older	1.57	1.15-2.14	0.004
Access to water^a	1.73	1.13-2.67	0.013
Constant term (baseline odds)	0.08	0.06-0.10	0.000
n	2,129		

177 Household members aged 16 or older whose RDT is valid were considered.
178 ^aAccess to water is an indicator equal to one if the household has access to clean water within vicinity (house,
179 garden or from a neighbor).
180 BMI = body mass index; n = number of individuals; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval

181

182 Discussion

183 This study demonstrates that the Central-South region of Burkina Faso was not spared by the COVID-
184 19 pandemic. Despite the limited number of officially reported cases (25 confirmed cases from March

185 2020 to July 2021, and an additional 4 cases from August to December 2021)[3], our study reveals that
186 the virus had circulated within the population. Sex, BMI, age, and the availability of a source of clean
187 water within vicinity are factors significantly associated with seropositivity in our study population.

188 The average seroprevalence in the three cities under study (11.48%) is lower than that reported
189 in Bamako, Mali, in September 2020 [6], where crude seroprevalence was 16.5% (225/1367, 95% CI =
190 14.5–18.5%), and in the Niger State (Nigeria), between June 26 and June 30, 2020 [7], with an average
191 prevalence of 25.41%, including 21.43% in rural areas. In Africa, most prevalence studies found in our
192 literature review were conducted on specific population groups, particularly those deemed to be at
193 high risk of infection due to their activities or professions.

194 In Lomé, a study conducted from April 23 to May 8, 2020, on a group of individuals comprising
195 healthcare workers, police officers, and airport personnel, reported a significantly lower prevalence
196 compared to our study (1.6%; 95% CI: 0.9–2.6%) [8]. Similarly, in Kenya, the prevalence of anti-SARS-
197 CoV-2 IgG antibodies among blood donors tested between April and June 2020 was 5.6% (95% CI: 4.8
198 to 6.5%) [9]. A study among blood donors in Quebec suggested that the low prevalence in the study
199 population could be partly explained by self-exclusion bias [10].

200 Most of the seroprevalence estimations reported in the literature were conducted during the
201 year 2020 (5-8), while our serological tests were conducted between June and July 2021. Burkina Faso
202 experienced primarily two major waves of infection, the first between September and October 2020,
203 and the second, which was larger, between late November 2020 and February 2021 (see Figs 1 and 2).
204 A timid third wave was observed around June and September 2021. The COVID-19 vaccination
205 campaign began on June 2, 2021, in the country.

206 **Fig 1. Number of confirmed cases and number of deaths due to COVID-19 infection between March**
207 **2020 and September 2021 in Burkina Faso [11]**

208 Cas confirmés = confirmed cases
209 Décès = deaths

210

211 **Fig 2. Number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 infection between March 2020 and January 2022 in**
212 **the region of Centre Sud in Burkina Faso**

213 *Calculations from Burkina Faso Open Data available on
214 <https://burkinafaso.opendataforafrica.org/jovpdge/burkina-faso-covid-19-rapport-de-situation> [3]

215

216 The differences in prevalence between studies may be attributed, apart from differences in the
217 composition of study populations (socio-demographic characteristics), to various factors such as the
218 study period, the study setting (urban or rural), and the type of diagnostic test used (differences in
219 diagnostic performance). Bobrovitz et al found that seroprevalence was low in general population
220 compared to some specific populations and national studies had also lower seroprevalence than local
221 studies [12].

222 In contrast to our study, Halatoko et al. reported a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity
223 among individuals under 55 years of age compared to those aged 55 and above [8] and Bobrovitz found
224 an higher seroprevalence among people ages 18–64 compared to 65 and over [12]. Similar findings
225 were observed in the French SCOPE study, where the differences in the likelihood of infection were
226 attributed to behaviors such as reduced outings and contacts among older adults [13]. Nevertheless,
227 Nwosu et al. found that seropositivity rates progressively increased with age, ranging from 30.2%
228 among individuals aged 15 to 29 years to 37.5% among subjects over 65 years [14].

229 These results could be explained by certain physiological predispositions that increase
230 susceptibility to infections among older adults [14]. Moreover, a study conducted in France among
231 participants aged 86 on average demonstrated that anti-Spike and neutralizing antibodies persisted
232 for at least 9 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection in this age group [15]. Other researchers also revealed
233 that individuals over 50 years of age or with a body mass index (BMI) greater than 25 had, one month
234 after symptom onset, higher antibody levels compared to others, especially among men [16].

235 Our study indicates higher seroprevalence among females, consistent with findings from the
236 SCOPE and EpiCov studies in France [17]. However, a systematic review of global seroprevalence of

237 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies reported that there was no difference in seroprevalence between sex groups
238 [12]. A study on gender inequalities in COVID-19 conducted in France identified a cross-effect of gender
239 and socio-professional category. Women, due to their employment types, may face higher exposure
240 to SARS-CoV-2 [18]. This prevalence difference between genders could also be attributed to women's
241 roles in certain communities, particularly in rural areas, where women care for the elderly, the sick,
242 and engage in more frequent outings for visits and errands (e.g., water collection, market visits,
243 income-generating activities) [18]. However, other research indicated that the duration of immunity
244 against SARS-CoV-2 was longer in women than in men after infection [16].

245 Lastly, our study shows a relationship between having access to water within households or
246 compounds and the likelihood of testing positive. We initially expected the opposite relationship,
247 assuming that water access would lead to more frequent handwashing among household members.
248 However, access to water was negatively correlated with poverty risk ($p=0.000$) in our data, suggesting
249 that greater access to water is associated with higher socioeconomic status. The observed positive
250 relationship between access to water and prevalence could therefore be explained by the fact that
251 wealthier individuals are more likely to travel to other cities with higher disease prevalence, such as
252 Ouagadougou. Nevertheless, these results should not overshadow the fact that difficulties in accessing
253 clean water have direct health repercussions beyond COVID-19 pandemic, particularly concerning
254 protection against viruses and waterborne diseases. Unfortunately, in some developing countries,
255 water scarcity has been exacerbated due to successive lockdowns, closures, or limited access to public
256 water sources such as fountains and reservoirs. In our sample, only 7% of households had access to
257 piped water at home or from neighbors. Note that the odd ratios of the other risk factors remain
258 unchanged if access to water is excluded from the model (see Appendix Table S1).

259 Study Strengths: The study benefited from a large sample size and a low refusal rate. The
260 population-based sample included individuals without targeting symptomatic or diagnosed at-risk
261 populations.

262 Study Limitations: The main limitations of the study were the period of data collection (too late
263 after the second wave to detect people infected during that peak) and the diagnostic performance of
264 the rapid test used in an African population. One concern of the study is the lack of a clear
265 understanding of the Biosynex COVID-19 BSS and other rapid tests' diagnostic performance. The
266 Biosynex COVID-19 BSS has been shown to have 91.8% (100%) sensitivity and 99.2% (99.5%) specificity
267 for the IgM (IgG) by the reference center of Institut Pasteur when using RT-PCR tests as the reference
268 method for clinical diagnosis in 446 blood samples for the IgG and 456 blood samples for the IgM (the
269 report is available upon request). However, these samples were collected from French patients and
270 diagnostic performances might differ in African populations, in particular due to population-specific
271 cross-reactivity. A study by Ouedraogo et al. estimated the specificity of the Biosynex COVID-19 BSS
272 rapid test at 99.36% and sensitivity at 48.41%, compared to the WANTEI SARS CoV-2 Ab ELISA
273 immunoassay as the reference test, suggesting an underestimation of seroprevalence in our study
274 population [19]. Yet, it has also been shown that ELISA immunoassays can have relatively low
275 specificity in West African populations [20, 21]. This raises concerns that estimating the sensitivity of
276 rapid antibody tests from comparisons with ELISA immunoassays might underestimate the sensitivity
277 of these tests. The extent of the underestimation of seroprevalence rates in our study therefore
278 remains unclear in the absence of a validation of rapid antibody tests with RT-PCR as the reference
279 method in our study population.

280 Conclusions

281 The results of this study indicate that COVID-19 has been circulating more extensively within
282 middle-sized cities in Burkina Faso than officially reported, given the low use of systematic screening.
283 Prevention measures implemented to contain the pandemic must take these areas into consideration.
284 Our findings highlight the vulnerability of women, older adults, and overweight and obese individuals
285 to the epidemic.[4]

286

287 **Acknowledgments**

288 The project received approval from the Burkina Faso Health Research Ethics Committee through
289 deliberation n°2020-7-132.

290 We extend our gratitude to all participants who contributed to this study, dedicating their time
291 to answer our questions, provide capillary blood samples for serological testing, and adhere to
292 anthropometric measurements.

293 We address our acknowledgments to Macoura Doumbia, Muriel De Souza and Yara Mimboire
294 for their contribution to data collection.

295 **Author Contributions**

296 **Conceptualization:** Hermann Badolo, Abdramane Berthé, Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï,
297 Dramane Kania, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

298 **Data curation:** Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï, Thomas Thivillon.

299 **Data analysis:** Elodie Djemaï, Adama Sana.

300 **Funding acquisition:** Hermann Badolo, Abdramane Berthé, Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï,
301 Dramane Kania, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

302 **Investigation:** Hermann Badolo, Abdramane Berthé, Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï, Dramane
303 Kania, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

304 **Methodology:** Hermann Badolo, Abdramane Berthé, Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï, Dramane
305 Kania, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

306 **Project administration:** Hermann Badolo, Abdramane Berthé, Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï,
307 Dramane Kania, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

308 **Software:** Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï, Thomas Thivillon

309 **Supervision:** Philippe De Vreyer, Adama Sana.

310 **Writing – original draft:** Elodie Djemaï, Adama Sana.

311 **Writing – review & editing:** Philippe De Vreyer, Elodie Djemaï, Adama Sana, Thomas Thivillon.

312 All authors agree that the paper is submitted to PLoS ONE.

313

314 **Supplementary material**

315 S1 File. This is the S1 File Title: Table S1: Odds ratio from multivariate logistic regression (not controlling
316 for access to water).

317

318 **References**

319

- 320 1. World Health Organization. Nouveau coronavirus (2019nCoV) [cited 2023 10 January].
321 Available from: <https://www.who.int/fr/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>.
- 322 2. United Nations Population Fund. Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19): Situation Report #01 2020
323 [Available from: [https://burkinafaso.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-
324 pdf/BURKINA%20FASO%20COVID-19%20SitRep%20%2301_0.pdf](https://burkinafaso.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/BURKINA%20FASO%20COVID-19%20SitRep%20%2301_0.pdf).
- 325 3. Anonymous. Rapport de situation de l'évaluation de la COVID-19 au Burkina Faso [cited 2023
326 23 January]. Available from: [https://burkinafaso.opendataforafrica.org/jovpdge/burkina-faso-covid-
327 19-rapport-de-situation](https://burkinafaso.opendataforafrica.org/jovpdge/burkina-faso-covid-19-rapport-de-situation).
- 328 4. World Health Organization. Mise à jour de la stratégie COVID-19 [cited 2023 10 January].
329 Available from: <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/strategy-update-french.pdf>.
- 330 5. Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie. Burkina Faso - Enquête
331 Multisectorielle Continue 2014 2014 [cited 2022 July 26]. Available from:
332 <https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/2538>.
- 333 6. Cissoko M, Landier J, Bendiane M, Sangaré A, Katile A, Berthé I, et al. Séroprévalence SARS-
334 CoV-2 au Mali : résultats d'une enquête transversale. Infectious Diseases Now. 2021;51(5):S71.
- 335 7. Majiya H, Aliyu-Paiko M, Balogu V, Musa D, Salihu I, Kawu A, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-
336 CoV-2 in Niger State: A Pilot Cross Sectional Study. medRxiv. 2020.
- 337 8. Halatoko WA, Konu YR, Gbeasor-Komlanvi FA, Sadio AJ, Tchankoni MK, Komlanvi KS, et al.
338 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among high-risk populations in Lomé (Togo) in 2020. PloS one.
339 2020;15(11):e0242124.
- 340 9. Uyoga S, Adetifa IMO, Karanja HK, Nyagwange J, Tuju J, Wanjiku P, et al. Seroprevalence of
341 anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Kenyan blood donors. Science (New York, NY). 2021;371(6524):79-
342 82.
- 343 10. Héma-Québec. Étude de séroprévalence des anti-SRAS-CoV-2 chez les donneurs de sang
344 d'HEMA-QUEBEC, vers la fin de la première vague de COVID-19 – étude NO. ET-20-004, projet COVID-
345 20-02 [cited 2023 5 June]. Available from: [https://www.hema-
346 quebec.gc.ca/userfiles/file/coronavirus/COVID-20-02-rappot-final-20-02-2021.pdf](https://www.hema-quebec.gc.ca/userfiles/file/coronavirus/COVID-20-02-rappot-final-20-02-2021.pdf).
- 347 11. IMMAP. Analyse de situation COVID-19 : Rapport annuel - analyse contextuelle : mars 2020 à
348 septembre 2021 2021 [Available from: [https://immap.org/wp-
349 content/uploads/2022/01/BFA_SitAn_COVID-19_Annual_Report-1.pdf](https://immap.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/BFA_SitAn_COVID-19_Annual_Report-1.pdf).
- 350 12. Bobrovitz N, Arora RK, Cao C, Boucher E, Liu M, Donnici C, et al. Global seroprevalence of SARS-
351 CoV-2 antibodies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS one. 2021;16(6):e0252617.

- 352 13. Beaumont A, Durand C, Ledrans M, Schwoebel V, Noel H, Strat YL, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-
353 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies after the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in a vulnerable population in
354 France: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(11):e053201.
- 355 14. Nwosu K, Fokam J, Wanda F, Mama L, Orel E, Ray N, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence
356 and associated risk factors in an urban district in Cameroon. *Nature communications*. 2021;12(1):5851.
- 357 15. Collarino R, Vauloup-Fellous C, Allemang-Trivalle A, Mouna L, Duron E, Neiss M, et al.
358 Persistence et protection des anticorps neutralisants 12 mois après l'infection à SARS-COV-2 chez les
359 sujets âgés. *Infectious Diseases Now*. 2021;51(5, Supplement):S15.
- 360 16. Grzelak L, Velay A, Madec Y, Gallais F, Staropoli I, Schmidt-Mutter C, et al. Sex Differences in
361 the Evolution of Neutralizing Antibodies to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *The*
362 *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2021;224(6):983-8.
- 363 17. Direction de la recherche dé, de l'évaluation et des statistiques,. In May 2020, 4.5% of the
364 population of metropolitan France had developed antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 : The first results of
365 the EpiCov national survey. France; October 2020. Report No.: 1167.
- 366 18. Neufcourt L, Joannès C, Maurel M, Redmond N, Delpierre C, Kelly-Irving M. Inégalités entre
367 hommes et femme face au risque d'infection par le virus SARS-CoV-2 durant le confinement du
368 printemps 2020 en France *Bulletin Epidemiologique Hebdomadaire*. 2021;11:185-205.
- 369 19. Ouedraogo HG, Zoure AA, Compaoré TR, Ky H, Zida S, Zingué D, et al. Evaluation of ten (10)
370 SARS-CoV-2 rapid serological tests in comparison with WANTAI SARS-CoV-2 ab ELISA in Burkina Faso,
371 West Africa. *Virology journal*. 2023;20(1):57.
- 372 20. Emmerich P, Murawski C, Ehmen C, von Possel R, Pekarek N, Oestereich L, et al. Limited
373 specificity of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISAs in serum samples of African origin. *Tropical*
374 *medicine & international health : TM & IH*. 2021;26(6):621-31.
- 375 21. Woodford J, Sagara I, Dicko A, Zeguime A, Doucoure M, Kwan J, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory
376 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Seroassay Performance and Optimization in a Population With High
377 Background Reactivity in Mali. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;224(12):2001-9.

378

Cas confirmés

Décès



