

1 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the Colombo

2 Municipality region, Sri Lanka

3 Chandima Jeewandara ^{1#}, Dinuka Guruge^{2#}, Inoka Sepali Abyrathna¹ Saubhagya Danasekara¹
4 Banuri Gunasekera¹, Pradeep Darshana Pushpakumara¹, Deshan Madhusanka¹, Deshni
5 Jayathilaka¹, Thushali Ranasinghe¹, Gayasha Somathilaka¹, Shyrar Tanussiya¹, Tibutius Tanesh
6 Jayadas¹, Heshan Kuruppu¹, Nimasha Thashmi¹, Michael Harvie¹, Ruwan Wijayamuni², Lisa
7 Schimanski^{3,4}, T.K. Tan^{3,4}, Pramila Rijal^{3,4}, Julie Xiao^{3,4}, Graham S. Ogg³, Alain Townsend^{3,4},
8 Gathsaurie Neelika Malavige^{1,3*}

9
10 ¹Allergy Immunology and Cell Biology Unit, Department of Immunology and Molecular
11 Medicine, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka; ²Colombo Municipal
12 Council, Colombo, Sri Lanka; ³MRC Human Immunology Unit, MRC Weatherall Institute of
13 Molecular Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom; ⁴Centre for Translational
14 Immunology, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences Oxford Institute, University of Oxford,
15 Oxford, United Kingdom

16 # contributed equally

17 Correspondence should be addressed to:

18 Prof. Neelika Malavige DPhil (Oxon), FRCP (Lond), FRCPath (UK)

19 AICBU, Department of Immunology and Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Medical Sciences,

20 University of Sri Jayawardanapura, Sri Lanka

21 Tel +94 (0) 772443193; Fax: +94 (0) 112802026, Email: gathsaurie.malavige@ndm.ox.ac.uk

22 **Abstract**

23 **Background**

24 As the Municipality Council area in Colombo (CMC) experienced the highest number of cases
25 until end of January 2021, in Sri Lanka, we carried out a serosurvey prior to initiation of the
26 vaccination program to understand the extent of the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak.

27 **Methods**

28 SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity was determined in 2547 individuals between the ages of 10 to 86
29 years, by the Wantai total antibody ELISA. We also compared to seroprevalence using the
30 haemagglutination test (HAT) to evaluate its usefulness in carrying out serosurveys.

31 **Results**

32 The overall seropositivity rate was 24.46%, while seropositivity by HAT was 18.9%. Although
33 the SARS-CoV-2 infection detection rates by PCR were highest in the population between the
34 ages of 20 to 60 years of age, the seropositivity rates were equal among all age groups. The
35 seropositivity rate was highest in the 10 to 20 age group (34.03%), whereas the PCR positivity
36 rates was 9.8%. Differences in the PCR positivity rates and seropositivity rates were also seen in
37 60- to 70-year-olds (8.9% vs 30.4%) and in individuals >70 year (4.1% vs 1.2%). The
38 seropositivity rates of the females was 29.7% (290/976), which was significantly higher
39 ($p < 0.002$) than in males 21.2% (333/1571).

40 **Conclusions**

41 A high seroprevalence rate (24.5%) was seen in all age groups in the CMC suggesting that a high
42 level of transmission was seen during this area. The PCR positivity rates, appear to
43 underestimate the true extent of the outbreak and the age groups which were infected.

44

45 **Keywords:** serosurveillance; SARS-CoV-2; Sri Lanka; Colombo; antibodies; PCR

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58 **Introduction**

59 Eighteen months following the reporting of the first person infected by the SARS-CoV-2 virus,
60 many countries are currently experiencing the third wave with higher caseloads and mortality
61 rates. The steepest increase in the number of cases globally is seen now, as the outbreak is
62 affecting many countries in South and South East Asia and Latin America [1], which have scarce
63 resources to deal with such large numbers. Similar to the situation in many other South Asian
64 countries, the number of COVID-19 cases is rapidly rising in Sri Lanka. The first patient was
65 detected on the 27th of January 2020, who was a foreign national from China and the first Sri
66 Lankan patient was reported on the 10th of March [2]. Since the detection of the first patient, Sri
67 Lanka went for a strict and extensive lockdown after 10 days (on the 20th of March), which
68 enabled limiting the initial outbreak to certain areas of the Colombo Municipal Council (CMC)
69 area. Although Sri Lanka successfully contained the epidemic until the end of September, with
70 no locally detected cases from August to September 2020, a large outbreak emerged during early
71 October, which rapidly spread island wide. However, as the CMC is the business capital of the
72 country, and also due to extremely overcrowded living conditions, 32,346/89,817 (36.01%)
73 locally detected cases seen by the end of March 2021, were detected within the Colombo district
74 [3]. Of the cases in the Colombo district 14,416 (44.6%) were identified within the CMC.

75

76 The CMC has a population of 561,314 individuals living in an area of 37.3 km². The CMC is
77 divided into 6 districts: namely D1, D2A, D2B, D3, D4 and D5 (Figure 1). The overall
78 population density in the whole CMC is 20,187.8 individuals/km², although certain areas have a
79 higher density due to poor-housing conditions and overcrowding. During the second wave in Sri

80 Lanka, which occurred from October 2020 to March 2021, a rapid rise in the number of cases
81 and intense transmission was seen within this area. However, the number of cases were seen to
82 gradually decline from mid-February to end of March 2021, with less than 10 cases per day
83 detected in early April. Administration of the COVID-19 vaccines (Covishield) started on the
84 29th of January 2021 in Sri Lanka, by initially immunizing health care workers. Immunizing the
85 general public began after the first week of February and due to the high number of cases, the
86 CMC area was prioritized. By mid-March, 20% of the CMC population were vaccinated.
87 Although vaccination itself may have led to a decline in the number of cases in the CMC, it
88 could have also been due to high past infection rates resulting in many individuals being immune
89 to the virus.

90

91 In many countries, the reported number of cases do not necessarily reflect the extent of the
92 outbreak, age groups infected and groups at risk, as the majority of infections are asymptomatic
93 and limitations in carrying out quantitative real-time PCR for SARS-CoV2 (qRT-PCR)[4; 5]. It
94 has been estimated that surveillance of SARS-CoV2 with qRT-PCR alone may underestimate the
95 true prevalence by tenfold [6]. For instance, the overall seroprevalence of COVID-19 in India
96 was found to be 7.1% by end of September 2020, which gives infection rates several folds higher
97 than the actually reported number of cases [7]. It is important to carry out serosurveillance studies
98 to understand the true extent of an outbreak in order to understand the future outbreaks that may
99 occur in a particular area and to further understand transmission dynamics and duration of
100 immunity. Therefore, we carried out a serosurveillance study in the CMC at end of January 2021,
101 before the initiation of the COVID-19 vaccination campaign for the general public.

102

103 **Methods**

104 Study population

105 2547 individuals between the ages of 10 to 86 years were recruited following informed written
106 consent during January 2021 (before administration of COVID-19 vaccines). The population in
107 each of the six districts and the number of individuals from each district recruited for the study is
108 shown in table 1. Blood samples were obtained from the participants at the same time when
109 samples were taken from them for routine PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2. None of the
110 participants had any symptoms at the time of obtaining blood samples and were not previously
111 diagnosed as been infected with the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Basic demographic details such as the
112 age, gender and prior COVID-19 illness were recorded, and blood samples were obtained to
113 determine the seropositivity status. Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics Review
114 Committee of the University of Sri Jayewardenepura.

115

116 Detection of total antibodies to SARS-CoV-2

117 SARS-COV-2 specific total antibody (IgM, IgG and IgA) responses were assessed using
118 WANTAI SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA (Beijing Wantai Biological Pharmacy Enterprise, China).
119 This assay is specific for the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) and was shown to have a
120 sensitivity of 98% [8] and was found to be 100% specific based also on control serum samples
121 obtained in 2018, in Sri Lankan individuals. The assay was carried out and results were
122 interpreted according to manufacturers' instructions.

123

124 Haemagglutination test (HAT) to detect antibodies to the receptor binding domain (RBD)

125 The HAT assay is very cheap tool, that does not require any specific equipment that detects
126 antibodies to the RBD. In order to compare the usefulness of the HAT assay in comparison to the
127 commercially available Wantai total antibody assay in determining serosurveys, we used the
128 HAT assay in a subset of individuals (n=1413). The HAT was carried out in a subset of these
129 individuals (n=1413) as previously described [9] using method (1). The HAT assay detects
130 haemagglutination of red cells labelled with the IH4-RBD reagent. IH4-RBD is a nanobody
131 against a conserved glycoprotein A epitope on red cells, linked to the RBD of SARS-CoV-2. Any
132 antibody in the test serum specific for the RBD that can cross-link and agglutinate the red cells
133 will be detected. The HAT was shown to have a sensitivity ~90% and specificity >99% several
134 weeks after a PCR diagnosed symptomatic infection⁹. Briefly, red blood cells from an O
135 negative donor diluted in PBS 1:20 (~2% Red Cells) were mixed with 50ul of the IH4-RBD
136 reagent (2ug/ml stock) and 50ul of 1:20 Serum (2.5ul serum in the reaction well) and incubated
137 for one hour at room temperature to give a dilution of 1:40. Phosphate buffered saline was used
138 as a negative control in place of the diluted serum. At the end of the incubation the plate was
139 tilted for 20 seconds and then photographed. The photograph of the plate was read by two
140 independent readers to examine the “teardrop” formation indicative of a negative result. A
141 complete absence of “teardrop” formation was scored as positive, and any flow of “teardrop”
142 was scored as negative. We have confirmed that this assay is negative in >99% of individuals
143 prior to infection with SARS-CoV-2 (manuscript under review).

144

145

146

147 **Results**

148 The mean age of the study population was 43.6 (SD±16.07) and 1571 (61.7%) were males. The
149 overall seropositivity as measured by the Wantai total antibody assay was 24.46% (623/2547).
150 The seropositivity rates of the females was 29.7% (290/976), which was significantly higher
151 ($p < 0.002$) than in males 21.2% (333/1571). We also used the haemagglutination test (HAT) to
152 measure antibodies to the RBD where the RBD of the virus is linked to a nanobody IH4, specific
153 for a conserved epitope within glycoprotein A on red blood cells (RBCs)[9]. A HAT titre of 1:40
154 was considered as positive for the presence of RBD-specific antibodies. The overall
155 seropositivity rate by the HAT was 18.9% (267/1413). The age stratified seroprevalence for the
156 total SARS-CoV2 specific antibodies and the HAT assay is shown in table 2. There was no
157 significant correlation of the total antibody positivity and HAT positivity (Spearman's $R = 0.35$,
158 $p = 0.44$).

159

160 There was no significant difference between age and seropositivity for either assay, with the
161 seropositivity rates been similar in all age groups (Figure 2A). However, the seropositivity rates
162 were slightly higher in the 10 to 20 age group from both the Wantai total antibody assay
163 (34.03%) and HAT (28.57%), compared to other age groups, although this was not statistically
164 significant.

165

166 The Wantai total antibody assay measures the presence of SARS-CoV2 specific IgM, IgG and
167 IgA antibodies to the RBD, while the HAT assay measures any antibodies to the RBD that can
168 cross-link and agglutinate red cells. The total level of antibody to RBD detected in ELISA is

169 known to correlate with viral neutralising titre[10], and we have confirmed this for the titre
170 detected in the HAT assay (manuscript in preparation). Although a higher number of individuals
171 were positive to the Wantai assay in individuals <70 years of age, in those who were >70 years,
172 the HAT positivity rates were higher (23.48%) compared to the Wantai assay, although this was
173 not significant ($p=0.27$). In those who were <30 years of age and between the ages of 30 to 60,
174 0.53% and 0.76% were seropositive by HAT, but negative by Wantai. In the >60-year-old age
175 group, 1.65% who were negative by Wantai were positive by HAT, which was significantly
176 higher ($p=0.002$) when compared to younger age groups. The HAT assay has been shown to
177 have a higher sensitivity early after infection [9], so these differences may reflect the timing of
178 infection prior to recruitment to the study.

179

180 The Wantai and HAT seropositivity rates differed between females and males. While 24.95% of
181 females were positive for SARS-CoV-2 by both the Wantai and HAT assays, the positivity rate
182 of males was 13.76%, which was significantly lower ($p < 0.002$). 1.1% of females were only
183 positive by HAT (negative by Wantai), whereas 0.69% of men were only positive by HAT.

184

185 qPCR positivity in different age groups vs seropositivity

186 As a large number of cases have been detected in the CMC during this time period, qRT-PCRs
187 were carried out on all primary contacts and most of the secondary contacts. Of the total PCR
188 positives ($n=14,416$), 11,108 (77.1%) were between the ages of 20 to 60 years. While the PCR
189 positivity rates (infection detection rates) were between 17.7% to 20.05% in the age groups from
190 20 to 60 years, it was 9.8% in 10- to 20-year-old individuals and 8.9% in 60- to 70-year-olds

191 (Figure 2B). Although infection detection rates were less in those <20 years and those >60 years,
192 the seropositivity rates were higher in the 10- to 20-year-old age group (Figure 2B).

193 Seropositivity rates in different districts of the CMC

194 As shown in table 1, the prevalence rates varied in different districts, with district D2B and D3
195 reporting a very high number of cases/100,000 population identified through PCR compared to
196 other districts. In order to determine if the qRT-PCR positivity rates indicate the true extent of
197 the outbreaks in these different districts, we assessed the differences in the seropositivity rates in
198 these six districts. Interestingly, although the infection rates were highest in D1 (25.4%), the
199 seropositivity rates were lowest in D1 (4%). In contrast, D2A which had a PCR+ rate of 22.8%
200 had a seropositivity of 31% and D3, which had a PCR+ rate of 17.8% had a seropositivity rate of
201 29.5% (table 3).

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212 **Discussion**

213 In this study, we have carried out a serosurveillance for COVID-19 in the CMC area, which
214 experienced the highest number of cases (16.1%) in the whole country. Our data showed that the
215 overall seropositivity rate was 24.46% in this area, until the end of January 2021. This is several
216 fold higher than the prevalence of COVID-19 based on PCR positivity, which is 2,568/100,000
217 population. Based on the seropositivity rates of 24.46%, 138,276 individuals are likely to have
218 been infected with the SARS-CoV-2 virus compared to the reported PCR positive cases of
219 14,416. Therefore, infection detection rates by PCR, appeared to have underestimated the actual
220 number of infections by 9.59-fold. This is comparable to studies carried out elsewhere, which
221 have shown that the serologically detected cases out number the virologically confirmed SARS-
222 CoV-2 infection by 10-fold [6]. In this study we evaluated the usefulness of the HAT to
223 determine seroprevalence, which showed a seropositivity rate of 18.9%. Although the
224 seropositivity rates from HAT were slightly lower than with the Wantai total antibody assay, our
225 data show that the HAT assay appears to be a sensitive tool, that can be used to carry out
226 serosurveys in resource poor settings as it is a cheap assay that does not require any equipment.

227

228 Although the overall seroprevalence was 24.46%, certain districts in the CMC (D2A, D2B and
229 D3) had higher seroprevalence rates (26.2% to 39%) compared to D4 which only had a
230 seroprevalence rate of 3.33%. In D1, although the seroprevalence was 14.76%, certain areas in
231 this district had a very high infection rate and were isolated very early, and therefore, it would
232 have curtailed the spread to the rest of the D1 district. These overall differences between the

233 districts reflect the population density and the housing conditions in these districts, with the
234 districts with high seroprevalence having more overcrowded areas, with poor housing conditions.
235 Such similar differences have been observed in many states in India, where the slum areas
236 reported seroprevalence rates between 52.6% to 58.7% compared to 12 to 17.9% in non-slum
237 areas [11]. Although the overall seroprevalence rates in the CMC was less than urban areas in
238 India, it was higher than many areas in Europe (Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Germany),
239 which reported a seroprevalence between 5% to 13.6% and Iran (22.16%), which reported higher
240 infection rates [12; 13; 14; 15]. Although these seroprevalence studies in other countries were
241 carried out during 2020, Sri Lanka did not experience any large-scale outbreaks of COVID-19
242 until October 2020, and a serosurvey carried out in May 2020, in an area in the CMC where the
243 first outbreak was seen, showed a seroprevalence rates of 1.5% in individuals living in that area
244 (manuscript under review). Therefore, the large outbreak that was seen mainly in the CMC area,
245 which began in early October 2020, appeared to have rapidly spread, resulting in 24.46% of
246 individuals being infected within four months.

247

248 Although the SARS-CoV-2 infection detection rates were highest in the population between the
249 ages of 20 to 60 years of age (working population), the seropositivity rates were equal among all
250 age groups. For instance, although the PCR positivity rates were 9.8% in 10- to 20-year-old 8.9%
251 in 60- to 70-year-olds, and 4.1% in individuals >70 years, their seropositivity rates were 36.8%,
252 32.1% and 26.6% respectively. Therefore, it is likely that individuals of all age groups were
253 equally infected by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, although the infections were only detected by PCR
254 in working age groups, possibly because more PCRs were carried out in the working population.
255 However, interestingly, the seroprevalence rates were significantly higher in females (29.7%)

256 when compared to males (21.1%). Although the reasons for these differences are not clear, it is
257 possible that more females were exposed to other infected individuals, while carrying out their
258 daily activities using common water and washroom facilities, available in these overcrowded
259 housing settings. Interestingly, significantly more females (24.9%) were positive for SARS-
260 CoV-2 by both the Wantai and HAT assays, while positivity rates of males were only 13.76%.
261 The HAT assay detected any agglutinating antibodies to the RBD of the spike protein while the
262 Wantai total antibody assay detect IgG, IgM and IgA antibodies to the RBD.

263
264 In summary, we assessed the seroprevalence in the CMC area in Colombo, which experienced
265 the highest number of cases from October 2020 to January 2021. Our data show that the
266 serologically detected infections outnumbered the PCR detected cases by almost 10-fold, which
267 demonstrates the importance of seroprevalence studies in identifying the true extent of an
268 outbreak.

269
270 **Funding**
271 We are grateful to the World Health Organization, UK Medical Research Council and the
272 Foreign and Commonwealth Office for support. T.K.T. is funded by the Townsend-Jeantet
273 Charitable Trust (charity number 1011770) and the EPA Cephalosporin Early Career Researcher
274 Fund. A.T. are funded by the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences (CAMS) Innovation Fund
275 for Medical Science (CIFMS), China (grant no. 2018-I2M-2-002).

276
277

278

279 **References**

280 [1] Worldometer, COVID-19 CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK, Dadax, 2020.

281 [2] M.o.H. Epidemiology unit, Sri Lanka, COVID-19, National Epidemiological Report, Sri
282 Lanka, Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka, 2020.

283 [3] M.o.H. Epidemiology unit, Sri Lanka, COVID-19, National Epidemiological Report,
284 Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka, 2021.

285 [4] R.W. Peeling, and P.L. Olliaro, The time to do serosurveys for COVID-19 is now. *Lancet*
286 *Respir Med* 8 (2020) 836-838.

287 [5] M.V. Murhekar, and H. Clapham, COVID-19 serosurveys for public health decision making.
288 *Lancet Glob Health* 9 (2021) e559-e560.

289 [6] X. Chen, Z. Chen, A.S. Azman, X. Deng, R. Sun, Z. Zhao, N. Zheng, X. Chen, W. Lu, T.
290 Zhuang, J. Yang, C. Viboud, M. Ajelli, D.T. Leung, and H. Yu, Serological evidence of
291 human infection with SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob*
292 *Health* 9 (2021) e598-e609.

293 [7] M.V. Murhekar, T. Bhatnagar, S. Selvaraju, V. Saravanakumar, J.W.V. Thangaraj, N. Shah,
294 M.S. Kumar, K. Rade, R. Sabarinathan, S. Asthana, R. Balachandar, S.D. Bangar, A.K.
295 Bansal, J. Bhat, V. Chopra, D. Das, A.K. Deb, K.R. Devi, G.R. Dwivedi, S.M.S. Khan,
296 C.P.G. Kumar, M.S. Kumar, A. Laxmaiah, M. Madhukar, A. Mahapatra, S.S. Mohanty,
297 C. Rangaraju, A. Turuk, D.K. Baradwaj, A.S. Chahal, F. Debnath, I. Haq, A. Kalliath, S.
298 Kanungo, J.S. Kshatri, G. Lakshmi, A. Mitra, A.R. Nirmala, G.V. Prasad, M.A. Qurieshi,
299 S. Sahay, R.K. Sangwan, K. Sekar, V.K. Shukla, P.K. Singh, P. Singh, R. Singh, D.S.
300 Varma, A. Viramgami, S. Panda, D.C.S. Reddy, B. Bhargava, and I.S. Group, SARS-

301 CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence in India, August-September, 2020: findings from the
302 second nationwide household serosurvey. *Lancet Glob Health* 9 (2021) e257-e266.

303 [8] L. Weidner, S. Gansdorfer, S. Unterweger, L. Weseslindtner, C. Drexler, M. Farcet, V. Witt,
304 E. Schistal, P. Schlenke, T.R. Kreil, and C. Jungbauer, Quantification of SARS-CoV-2
305 antibodies with eight commercially available immunoassays. *J Clin Virol* 129 (2020)
306 104540.

307 [9] A. Townsend, P. Rijal, J. Xiao, T.K. Tan, K.-Y.A. Huang, L. Schimanski, J. Huo, N. Gupta,
308 R. Rahikainen, P.C. Matthews, D. Crook, S. Hoosdally, T. Street, J. Rudkin, N. Stoesser,
309 F. Karpe, M. Neville, R. Ploeg, M. Oliveira, D.J. Roberts, A.A. Lamikanra, H.P. Tsang,
310 A. Bown, R. Vipond, A.J. Mentzer, J.C. Knight, A. Kwok, G. Screaton, J.
311 Mongkolsapaya, W. Dejnirattisai, P. Supasa, P. Klenerman, C. Dold, K. Baillie, S.C.
312 Moore, P.J. Openshaw, M.G. Semple, L.C. Turtle, M. Ainsworth, A. Allcock, S. Beer, S.
313 Bibi, E. Clutterbuck, A. Espinosa, M. Mendoza, D. Georgiou, T. Lockett, J. Martinez, E.
314 Perez, V. Sanchez, G. Scozzafava, A. Sobrinodiaz, H. Thraves, and E. Joly, A
315 haemagglutination test for rapid detection of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*
316 *Communications* (2020) 2020.10.02.20205831.

317 [10] F. Amanat, D. Stadlbauer, S. Strohmeier, T.H.O. Nguyen, V. Chromikova, M. McMahon,
318 K. Jiang, G.A. Arunkumar, D. Jurczynszak, J. Polanco, M. Bermudez-Gonzalez, G.
319 Kleiner, T. Aydilillo, L. Miorin, D.S. Fierer, L.A. Lugo, E.M. Kojic, J. Stoeber, S.T.H.
320 Liu, C. Cunningham-Rundles, P.L. Felgner, T. Moran, A. Garcia-Sastre, D. Caplivski,
321 A.C. Cheng, K. Kedzierska, O. Vapalahti, J.M. Hepojoki, V. Simon, and F. Krammer, A
322 serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med* 26 (2020)
323 1033-1036.

- 324 [11] A. Malani, D. Shah, G. Kang, G.N. Lobo, J. Shastri, M. Mohanan, R. Jain, S. Agrawal, S.
325 Juneja, S. Imad, and U. Kolthur-Seetharam, Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in slums
326 versus non-slums in Mumbai, India. *Lancet Glob Health* 9 (2021) e110-e111.
- 327 [12] M. Pollan, B. Perez-Gomez, R. Pastor-Barriuso, J. Oteo, M.A. Hernan, M. Perez-Olmeda,
328 J.L. Sanmartin, A. Fernandez-Garcia, I. Cruz, N. Fernandez de Larrea, M. Molina, F.
329 Rodriguez-Cabrera, M. Martin, P. Merino-Amador, J. Leon Paniagua, J.F. Munoz-
330 Montalvo, F. Blanco, R. Yotti, and E.-C.S. Group, Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
331 (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *Lancet* 396
332 (2020) 535-544.
- 333 [13] H. Streeck, B. Schulte, B.M. Kummerer, E. Richter, T. Holler, C. Fuhrmann, E. Bartok, R.
334 Dolscheid-Pommerich, M. Berger, L. Wessendorf, M. Eschbach-Bludau, A. Kellings, A.
335 Schwaiger, M. Coenen, P. Hoffmann, B. Stoffel-Wagner, M.M. Nothen, A.M. Eis-
336 Hubinger, M. Exner, R.M. Schmithausen, M. Schmid, and G. Hartmann, Infection
337 fatality rate of SARS-CoV2 in a super-spreading event in Germany. *Nat Commun* 11
338 (2020) 5829.
- 339 [14] S. Stringhini, A. Wisniak, G. Piumatti, A.S. Azman, S.A. Lauer, H. Baysson, D. De Ridder,
340 D. Petrovic, S. Schrempft, K. Marcus, S. Yerly, I. Arm Vernez, O. Keiser, S. Hurst, K.M.
341 Posfay-Barbe, D. Trono, D. Pittet, L. Getaz, F. Chappuis, I. Eckerle, N. Vuilleumier, B.
342 Meyer, A. Flahault, L. Kaiser, and I. Guessous, Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
343 antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *Lancet*
344 396 (2020) 313-319.

345 [15] O. Byambasuren, C.C. Dobler, K. Bell, D.P. Rojas, J. Clark, M.L. McLaws, and P.
346 Glasziou, Comparison of seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections with cumulative and
347 imputed COVID-19 cases: Systematic review. PloS one 16 (2021) e0248946.

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364 **Tables**

| District number | Total population of the district | Number recruited to the study (%) | PCR positivity (%) | No of PCR+ cases/100,000 population |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| D1 | 131012 | 170 (0.13%) | 3663 (2.79%) | 2795.92 |
| D2A | 137644 | 710 (0.52%) | 3290 (2.39%) | 2390.22 |
| D2B | 61312 | 477 (0.78%) | 2676 (4.36%) | 4364.56 |
| D3 | 89855 | 466 (0.52%) | 2571 (2.86%) | 2861.28 |
| D4 | 80839 | 210 (0.26%) | 1282 (1.59%) | 1585.87 |
| D5 | 60652 | 514 (0.85%) | 934 (1.54%) | 1539.93 |
| Total | 561314 | 2547 (0.45%) | 14416 | 2568.26 |

365

366 **Table 1: The number of individuals in each of the CMC districts and the proportion samples from**
 367 **each district**

368

369

370

| Age group | Seropositive rates by | Seropositive rates by | PCR positivity rates |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | Wantai N=2547 | HAT N=1413 | |
| 10 – 20 | 65/191 (34.03%) | 36/126 (28.57%) | 1418 (9.84%) |
| 21 - 30 | 83/448 (18.53%) | 31/253 (12.25%) | 2864 (19.87%) |
| 31 - 40 | 104/461 (22.56%) | 47/253 (18.58%) | 2893 (20.07%) |
| 41 - 50 | 125/484 (25.83%) | 45/265 (16.98%) | 2801 (19.43%) |
| 51 - 60 | 129/507 (25.44%) | 54/273 (19.78%) | 2556 (17.73%) |
| 61 - 70 | 89/293 (30.38%) | 39/179 (21.79%) | 1294 (8.98%) |
| Over 70 | 28/163 (17.18%) | 15/64 (23.48%) | 590 (4.09%) |
| Total | 623/2547 | 267/1413 | 14416 |

371

372 **Table 2: Age stratified seroprevalence rates for SARS-CoV2 in different age groups**

373

374 **Figure legends**

375 **Figure 1: The six districts in the Colombo Municipality Council (CMC) and the locations of**
376 **cases (identified by qRT-PCR).** Each dot denotes an individual person.

377

378 **Figure 2: Seropositivity rates and infection rates in different age groups.** The seropositivity
379 rates were assessed in each age group by the Wantai total antibody assay (Wantai Ab+) and the
380 HAT assay (HAT+), and the positivity rates of each assay was correlated with the age (A). The
381 PCR positivity rates in each age group and the Wantai (Ab+) and HAT (HAT+) positivity rates
382 were compared in each age group (B).

383

REPORTED COVID-19 CASES 2020



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.18.21259143>; this version posted June 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Legend

- COVID_19_D1
- COVID_19_D2A
- COVID_19_D2B
- COVID_19_D3
- COVID_19_D4
- COVID_19_D5



