

1 **A population-based seroprevalence survey of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2**
2 **infection in Beijing, China**

3

4 Xiaoli Wang¹, Wenjing Gao², Shujuan Cui¹, Yi Zhang¹, Ke Zheng², Ji Ke², Jun Lv², Canqing Yu²,
5 Dianjianyi Sun², Quanyi Wang¹, Liming Li²

6

7 1. Beijing Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing Research Center for Preventive Medicine,
8 Beijing, 100013, China

9 2. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Peking University, Beijing
10 100191, China

11

12 Drs. Xiaoli Wang and Wenjing Gao contributed equally to this article.

13 Correspondence to: Liming Li, lmleeph@vip.163.com; Quanyi Wang, bjcdcxm@126.com

14

15 Word count:

16 Abstract: 97

17 Text: 1939

18

19

20

21

22 **ABSTRACT**

23

24 **BACKGROUND**

25 The spread of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) had been controlled in China. The seroprevalence of
26 COVID-19 in Beijing has not been evaluated.

27 **METHODS**

28 In April, residents in Beijing were randomly enrolled. Blood samples were collected and antibodies to SARS-
29 CoV-2 were tested by two colloidal gold kits. All colloidal gold positive serums were then tested by Micro-
30 neutralization assay.

31 **RESULTS**

32 None of 2,184 residents participated was tested positive by micro-neutralization assay. The seroprevalence
33 of COVID-19 in Beijing was estimated $< 0.17\%$.

34 **CONCLUSIONS**

35 The seroprevalence of COVID-19 was low in April suggesting that community-wide spread was prevented
36 in Beijing.

37 **KEYWORDS:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; asymptomatic case; serological survey

38

39 **Introduction**

40 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) has rapidly spread throughout the world. Reported cases only
41 represented a small fraction of the real number of cases, since most of asymptomatic cases were hardly
42 detected. According to a few early studies from Iceland, US and Iran, the seropositivity at community level
43 ranged from 0.6%-22%, much higher than the level of reported incidence rate [1-4]. The rate of undetected
44 infections also varied in different countries. Investigating seroprevalence in different locations around the
45 world enables further understanding the infection spectrum, the incidence and case-fatality rate, and most
46 importantly, population immunity level of syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Seroprevalence is also
47 a key factor to optimize strategies for disease prevention and control. Serological surveys enable the
48 determination of infection susceptibility, past acute infection and recovery group that has potentiality
49 immune to re-infection. Thus, it is essential to conduct a large-scale serological survey to SARS-CoV-2.

50 COVID-19 was first reported in Wuhan, China. With the rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 all around the world,
51 Beijing - the political, cultural and international exchange center of China- faced an extraordinary challenge
52 both at home and abroad. The first COVID-19 case in Beijing was confirmed on January 19th, 2020. The
53 authority in Beijing implemented a series control measures to prevent further spread during the past several
54 months. As of April 15, a total of 594 COVID-19 cases including 9 deaths were officially confirmed and
55 reported in Beijing, with an incidence rate of 2.75/100,000 and a case-fatality rate of 1.5%.

56 To evaluate the effectiveness of control strategies and the risk of future epidemic in Beijing, a community-
57 based serological survey was performed.

58

59 **Method**

60 **Study design**

61 A community-based, age stratified, onetime cross-sectional serological survey in 2,184 adults and children
62 from 25 communities were conducted in Beijing. The participants were investigated during April 15 to 18.
63 This study had been approved by the IRB at Peking University Health Science Center prior to participant
64 enrollment (IRB00001052-20021). Written informed consents were acquired from all participants in the
65 investigation. For child <18 yrs, consent had been obtained from his/her legal guardian.

66 **Study population**

67 Residents who aged > 1-year-old, lived in Beijing for at least 14 days in between of January and March 2020
68 were eligible for participation.

69 **Sampling strategies**

70 This survey was performed by a multi-stage cluster random sampling technique. The highest four incidence
71 districts (Xicheng, Shijingshan, Daxing and Fengtai) and the lowest incidence district (Pinggu with no
72 confirmed case reported) out of 16 districts in Beijing were selected according to the protocol by World
73 Health Organization [5]. Five communities in each district and certain households in each community were
74 randomly selected based on Probability Proportionate to Size (PPS) at two stages respectively. A household
75 was defined as a group of people (1 or more) living in the same residence. All persons living in the household
76 had been invited to participate in the study, including children. If the age structure of samples were not
77 consistent with that of general population in targeted communities due to refusal or contraindication to
78 venipuncture, additional households were randomly selected to ensure the representativeness of samples.

79 **Data collection**

80 We recruited participants organized by community residential committee. Each participant enrolled in
81 survey was asked to fulfill a concise questionnaire which covers demographic information and COVID-19
82 relevant exposure information.

83 **Specimen collection**

84 A certain amount of whole blood sample was drew into vacutainer without anticoagulant from each
85 participant (5ml for 5+ years old, 3ml for the rest) and transported to the local Center for Disease Control
86 and Prevention (CDC) laboratory. The serum was separated and apportioned into two aliquots A and B. The
87 serum in tube A was transported to Beijing CDC laboratory for SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing within two
88 days, while tube B was stored at -40 °C for backup. All the procedures were according to COVID-19
89 laboratory guidelines in China.

90 **Serological testing**

91 Serum samples were screened for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies using two different
92 antibody test (Colloidal Gold) kits, Wondfo (Guangzhou, Batch W19500315, testing total antibody) and
93 Innovita (Tangshan, Batch 20200402, testing IgM/IgG), which had been approved by China Food and Drug
94 Administration (CFDA). Test kits were read in 15 minutes. According to the manufacturer, test performance
95 characteristics showed a sensitivity of 86.4% (95% CI 82.5-89.6%) and a specificity of 99.6% (95% CI 97.6-
96 99.9%) for Wondfo and a sensitivity of 87.3% (95% CI 80.4-92.0%) and a specificity of 100% (95% CI
97 94.2-100%) for Innovita. Both test performance also verified on a sample of 20 PCR-confirmed COVID-19
98 positive patients and 10 gold-standard negative serum specimens collected before COVID epidemic. The

99 sensitivity and specificity were 100% for both test kits. The testing procedures were carried out in Beijing
100 CDC laboratory with biosafety level 2 (BSL-2) capacity.

101 If a serum sample was positive when using either test kit, the serum in tube B (backup serum) would be
102 couriered to China CDC for a micro-neutralization assay to measure and confirm the SARS-CoV-2 -specific
103 neutralizing antibody. For seronegativity in colloidal gold tests, 20 random samples were confirmed using
104 the same micro-neutralization assay. Serum samples were inactivated at 56 °C for 30 minutes and serially
105 diluted with cell culture medium in two-fold steps. The diluted serums were mixed with a virus suspension
106 of 100 TCID₅₀ (50 tissue culture infective dose) in 96-well plates at a ratio of 1:1, followed by 2 hours
107 incubation at 36.5 °C in a 5% CO₂ incubator. 1-2×10⁴ Vero cells were then added to the serum-virus mixture,
108 and the plates were incubated for 5 days at 36.5 °C in a 5% CO₂ incubator. Cytopathic effect (CPE) of each
109 well was recorded under microscopes, and the neutralizing titer was calculated by the dilution number of
110 50% protective condition. A titer of 1:4 or higher indicated seropositivity.

111 **Statistical analyses**

112 Age-specific cumulative incidence was the proportion of participants per age strata who tested seropositive
113 for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Proportion were adjusted for difference in the age structure of the participants
114 and the overall population. Population weighting estimation and more details were shown in the Statistical
115 Appendix.

116 We used a likelihood ratio test to calculate 95% confidence intervals of fractions with the Clopper-Pearson
117 exact method (when the estimated fraction was 0), as implemented in the R package binom [3].

118

119 **Results**

120 From 39,769 households in 5 districts of Beijing, 578 households, including 1,510 subjects in the sampling
 121 protocol participated in this study. Considering the age structure of 1,510 subjects were not consistent with
 122 that of the local populations, additional subjects were randomly selected in certain age groups. Between
 123 April 15 and 18, 2020, a total of 1,247 households including 2,184 participants were enrolled in this research.
 124 Table 1 provided demographic characteristic of unadjusted sample and population-weight adjusted of the
 125 sample and Beijing estimates. The sample distribution was not significantly deviated from that of Beijing.

126 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of 2,184 study participants

Characteristics	N (%)	Adjusted proportion (%)*
Sex		
Men	997(45.7)	51.6 (45.7)
Women	1187(54.3)	48.4
Age group		
1-9	172(7.9)	6.1
10-19	164(7.5)	8.0
20-39	643(29.4)	43.6
40-59	714(32.7)	29.8
≥60	491(22.5)	12.5
Occupation		
Child/Student	355(16.3)	15.2
Farmer	211(9.7)	3.9
Worker	182(8.3)	9.5
Officer	136(6.2)	6.1
Doctor/Nurse	42(1.9)	2.3
Teacher	19(0.9)	1.1
Retiree	518(23.7)	16.1
Service Worker	172(7.9)	13.1
Deliver	5(0.2)	0.6
Policeman/Security	20(0.9)	1.5
Taxi driver	15(0.7)	0.7
Housekeeper	24(1.1)	1.2
Community staff	145(6.6)	9.4
Other	340(15.6)	19.3

128 **SARS-CoV-2 infection**

129 Thirteen of the 2,184 serum samples were tested seropositive by Colloidal Gold tests, among which 8 were

130 IgM positive, 3 were IgG positive, 1 was total antibody positive, 1 was both IgM and total antibody positive.

131 None of the 13 colloidal gold positive individuals reported any possible exposure (Table 2).

132 Table 2. Serological results in 2,184 study participants.

Variable	Total (N=2184)	Colloidal gold test Positive (N=13)	Micro- neutralization assay Positive (N=0)
Male sex - no. (%)	997(45.7)	7(53.9)	-
Mean age - yr	42.3±19.5	45.6±18.3	-
Patients with chronic Diseases - no. (%)	541(24.8)	1(7.7)	
Pregnant Women - no. (%)	4(0.2)	0(0)	
Any travel – no. (%)	63(2.9)	0(0)	-
Specific travel – no. (%)			
Wuhan	3(0.1)	0(0)	-
Hubei Province* (Wuhan excluded)	46(2.1)	0(0)	-
International travel	15(0.7)	0(0)	-
Contact of patients with symptom(s)** -no. (%)	29(1.3)	0(0)	-
Contact with infected cases – no. (%)	3(0.1)	0(0)	-
Reported symptom(s)** – no. (%)	75(3.4)	0(0)	-
Reported any clinic visit history – no. (%)	53(2.4)	0(0)	-
Reported being diagnosed of COVID-19	0(0)	0(0)	-

133 * Wuhan is the capital city of Hubei province.

134 ** All-caused respiratory symptoms including fever, cough, shortness of breath, or pneumonia, do not
135 limit to COVID-19.

136

137 Among 13 seropositive samples and 50 randomly selected seronegative samples, none was positive in

138 neutralization assay.

139 Considering no positive result in neutralization assay, we did not estimate the age-specific cumulative
140 incidence and the adjusted seroprevalence.

141 Using a likelihood ratio method to calculate 95% confidence intervals of fractions with the Clopper-Pearson
142 exact method, we estimated that the seroprevalence of COVID-19 was, with 95% confidence, not higher
143 than 0.17% in Beijing.

144

145 **Discussion**

146

147 In this study, we utilized three independent testing methods to investigate the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-
148 2 antibody in a multi-stage cluster random sample including 2,184 participants in five districts of Beijing
149 during April 15 to 18. No positive neutralizing antibodies case was detected by micro-neutralization assay.

150

151 We estimated that the percentage of participants that tested positive in population screening were not higher
152 than 0.17% with 95% confidence during April 15-18, which indicates Beijing's control effort had curtailed
153 morbidity from COVID-19 and stopped community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 substantially. Meanwhile,
154 these results also showed that the majority of populations in Beijing remained susceptible to SARS-CoV-2.
155 Indeed, Beijing experienced a COVID-19 rebound in June. On June 11, a new COVID-19 case was reported
156 in Beijing after no new confirmed infection for 56 consecutive days.

157

158 To date, micro-neutralization assay, as the gold-standard is the most specific and sensitive serological assay
159 for evaluating and detecting functional neutralizing antibodies [6]. The updated seroepidemiological

160 investigation protocol of WHO (Version 2.0 released on 26 May) recommended that if a sample was positive
161 or equivocal for either IgM, IgA or IgG using Rapid Diagnostic Tests (RDT), a neutralizing assay should
162 ideally be performed [7]. Additionally, some studies showed that asymptomatic individuals had weaker
163 immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection comparing with symptomatic patients. The neutralizing
164 antibodies of asymptomatic cases decreased within 2-3 months after infection [8]. Therefore, the
165 seroprevalence might be underestimated if: (1) the serum sample was not collected within the window of
166 neutralizing antibody production; (2) the immune response of asymptomatic infection was not strong enough
167 to be detected.

168

169 Several research teams worldwide had started testing samples for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Among high risk
170 populations, the average seroprevalence in healthcare a tertiary hospital in Germany in employees of a
171 university hospital emergency department in USA was 1.6 % [9] and 5.9% [10] respectively. Among blood
172 donors, 4.4-10.8% in Milan of Italy [11] and 5/500 in Scotland of UK [12] were positive for anti- SARS-
173 CoV-2. Among general populations, 0.6% [3], 1.5% [2] , 4.1% [4] and 22% [1] were antibody positive in
174 random community participants in four surveys conducted in Iceland, Santa Clara and Los Angeles County
175 of USA and Guilan of Iran respectively. One systematic review showed that the pooled percentage of
176 asymptomatic infection was 46% (95% CI, 18.5-73.6%) [13]. The varying rates of COVID-19 antibody
177 seropositivity in above studies emphasized the importance of serological survey in different populations. A
178 study from the city of Wuhan, the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic in China, showed that the
179 seropositivity here varied between 3.2% and 3.8% in non-random sampling of high risk populations
180 including health workers, hotel staff members and family members of the healthcare workers [14]. More

181 studies were needed to determine the seroprevalence in community residents in both high and low COVID-
182 19 epidemic regions of China.

183

184 Our study has several limitations. One of the main limitations is the performance of test kits. According to
185 the manufacturer, the two test kits were both used for the additional testing for suspected case with negative
186 PCR, which indicated that they are unsuitable for general population screening. Although none was positive
187 in neutralization assay among these 13 seropositive samples and 20 randomly selected seronegative samples,
188 we could not preclude the possibility of false negativity since the neutralization assay was conducted only
189 in targeted part of residents. Despite the acceptable sensitivity of the two colloidal gold methods provided
190 by the manufacturers, Džhla et al. found that antibody-based rapid test showed low sensitivity (36.4%) in
191 high-prevalence community setting. They recommended not to rely on an antibody-based rapid test for
192 public health measures such as community screenings [15]. Considering that the sample sizes of patients and
193 controls in our validation were limited, we used test performance data in manufacturer instructions to
194 establish the test's sensitivity and specificity [2]. Additional validation of the assays especially in general
195 populations used could improve further our estimates. The availability of other high-quality serological
196 testing kits suitable for general population screening was expected. Inadequate sample size and one-time
197 cross-sectional study performed were also needed to be considered. Given the low seroprevalence in Beijing,
198 larger sample size is expected to be further investigated in order to achieve dynamic and more accurate
199 seroprevalence estimation.

200

201 **Conclusions**

202 The seroprevalence of COVID-19 was low in Beijing by April, which suggests that the comprehensive
203 control measures effectively prevent and contain further spread in Beijing. However, the majority of the
204 residents in Beijing were susceptible to infection and the risk of rebound should be noted due to the low
205 population-level immunity.

206

207 **Funding/Support**

208 This publication was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82041027), Special
209 Research Fund of PKU for Prevention and Control of COVID-19 and the Fundamental Research Funds for
210 the Central Universities.

211

212 **Acknowledgement**

213 We thank China CDC for assistance with study design and laboratory support. The authors would like to
214 thank all the investigators from Xicheng, Shijingshan, Daxing, Fengtai, and Pinggu CDC for field
215 investigation and data collection and all participants for their contribution in this study.

216 **Conflict of interest**

217 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

218

219

220

221 **References**

- 222 1. Shakiba M, Nazari S S H, Mehrabian F, et al. **Seroprevalence of COVID-19 virus infection in Guilan**
223 **province, Iran.** medRxiv20079244v1 [Preprint]. May 1, 2020 [cited 20 September 2020]. Available from:
224 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.26.20079244v1>.
- 225 2. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, et al. **COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County,**
226 **California.** medRxiv 20062463v2 [Preprint]. April 30, 2020 [cited 20 September 2020]. Available
227 from:<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.14.20062463v2>.
- 228 3. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, et al. **Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population.**
229 *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:2302-15
- 230 4. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, et al. **Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibodies Among**
231 **Adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10-11, 2020.** *JAMA* 2020; 323(23):2425-7.
- 232 5. World Health Organization. **Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation**
233 **protocol for COVID-19 virus infection.** [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Seroepidemiology-2020.2)
234 *Seroepidemiology-2020.2* Accessed 14 September 2020.
- 235 6. Manenti A, Maggetti M, Casa E, et al. **Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies using of**
236 **a CPE-based Colorimetric live virus micro-neutralization assay in human serum samples** [published
237 online ahead of print 8 May 2020]. *J Med Virol.* doi:10.1002/jmv.25986.
- 238 7. World Health Organization. **Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation**
239 **protocol for coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19 infection) Version 2.0.**
240 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332188>. Accessed 14 September 2020.

- 241 8. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, *et al.* **Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-**
242 **CoV-2 infections.** *NAT MED* 2020; 26: 1200-4.
- 243 9. Korth J, Wilde B, Dolff S, *et al.* **SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection in healthcare workers in**
244 **Germany with direct contact to COVID-19 patients** [published online ahead of print 13 May 2020]. *J*
245 *CLIN VIROL* 2020:104437. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104437.
- 246 10. Madsen T, Levin N, Niehus K. **Prevalence of IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 among emergency**
247 **department employees.** *AM J EMERG MED* 2020;S0735-6757(20)30306-5.
- 248 11. Valenti L, Bergna A, Pelusi S, *et al.* **SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence trends in healthy blood donors**
249 **during the COVID-19 Milan outbreak.** medRxiv 20098442v2 [Preprint]. May 31, 2020 [cited 20
250 September 2020]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.11.20098442v2>.
- 251 12. **Neutralising antibodies to SARS coronavirus 2 in Scottish blood donors - a pilot study of the value**
252 **of serology to determine population exposure.** medRxiv 20060467v2 [Preprint]. July 29, 2020 [cited 20
253 September 2020]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.13.20060467v2>.
- 254 13. He J, Guo Y, Mao R, Zhang J. **Proportion of asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019: A systematic**
255 **review and meta-analysis** [published online ahead of print 21 Jul 2020]. *J MED VIROL*
256 2020;10.1002/jmv.26326. doi:10.1002/jmv.26326
- 257 14. Xu X, Sun J, Nie S, *et al.* Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M and G antibodies against SARS-CoV-
258 2 in China. *NAT MED* 2020; 26(8):1193-5.
- 259 15. Dohla M, Boesecke C, Schulte B, *et al.* **Rapid point-of-care testing for SARS-CoV-2 in a community**
260 **screening setting shows low sensitivity.** *PUBLIC HEALTH* 2020, **182**:170-2.