

1 Title: Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and
2 retrospective mortality in a refugee camp, Dagahaley, Kenya

3 Authors

4 Etienne GIGNOUX^{1*}

5 Frida ATHANASSIADIS²

6 Ahmed GARAT YARROW²

7 Abdullahi JIMALE²

8 Nicole MUBUTO²

9 Carole DÉGLISE²

10 Denis ONSONGO MOSOTI⁵

11 Andrew S AZMAN^{2,3,4}

12 Matilu MWAU⁶

13 Francisco LUQUERO¹

14 Iza CIGLENECKI²

15 Institutions

16 ¹ Epicentre , Paris, France

17 ² Médecins Sans Frontières, Geneva, Switzerland

18 ³ Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

19 ⁴ Institute for Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva

20 ⁵ Ministry of Health- Republic of Kenya

21 ⁶ Kenya Medical Research Institute

22 * Corresponding author:

23 E-mail: etienne.gignoux@geneva.msf.org

24 Abstract

25 Background:

26 Camps of forcibly displaced populations are considered to be at risk of large COVID-19 outbreaks.
27 Low screening rates and limited surveillance led us to conduct a study in Dagahaley camp, located in
28 the Dadaab refugee complex in Kenya to estimate SARS-COV-2 seroprevalence and, mortality and to
29 identify changes in access to care during the pandemic.

30 Methods:

31 To estimate seroprevalence, we conducted a cross-sectional survey among a sample of individuals
32 (n=587) seeking care at the two main health centres and among all household members (n=619) of
33 community health workers and traditional birth attendants working in the camp. We used a rapid
34 immunologic assay (BIOSYNEX® COVID-19 BSS [IgG/IgM]) and adjusted for test performance and
35 mismatch between the sampled population and that of the general camp population. To estimate
36 mortality, we exhaustively interviewed all households (n=12860) in the camp about deaths occurring
37 from January 2019 through March 2021.

38 Results:

39 We included 1206 participants in the seroprevalence study. In total, 8% (95% CI: 6.6%-9.7%) had a
40 positive serologic test. After adjusting for test performance and standardizing on age, we estimated
41 a seroprevalence of 5.8% (95% CI: 1.6%-8.4%). The mortality rate for 10,000 persons per day was
42 0.05 (95% CI 0.05-0.06) prior to the pandemic and 0.07 (95% CI 0.06-0.08) during the pandemic,
43 representing a significant 42% increase ($p < 0.001$). MSF health centre consultations and hospital
44 admissions decreased by 38% and 37% respectively.

45 Conclusion:

46 We estimated that the number of infected people was 67 times higher than the number of reported
47 cases. Participants aged 50 years or more were among the most affected. The mortality survey
48 shows an increase in the mortality rate during the pandemic compared to before the pandemic. A
49 decline in attendance at health facilities was observed and sustained despite the easing of
50 restrictions.

51 Summary Box

52 What is already known?

- 53 • At the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, models predicted the risk of a large-scale
54 COVID-19 outbreaks in camps of forcibly displaced populations that would have created
55 excess mortality caused directly by the disease and indirectly by reduced access to care
56 and/or congestion in health facilities.
- 57 • To date, this prediction has not materialized in most camps, the lower than expected
58 number of cases and deaths could be attributed to a population characteristics and early
59 implementation of confinement; alternatively, it could be an underestimate caused by
60 limited screening and testing capacity and lack of morbidity and mortality surveillance.
- 61 • The actual impact of COVID-19 on these populations therefore remains an open question.

62 What are the new findings?

- 63 • In Dagahaley camps in Kenya, we estimated that the number of infected people was 67
64 times higher than the number of reported cases.
- 65 • Participants aged 50 years and over, who are most at risk of severe illness, were among the
66 most affected.

67 • We observed an increase in mortality rates during the pandemic, and a decrease in the use
68 of health facilities, which continued despite the easing of restrictions, but access for severe
69 cases was less impacted.

70 What do the new findings imply?

- 71 • To our knowledge, this is the first combined survey of COVID-19 seroprevalence and
72 retrospective mortality in a forcibly displaced population living in a camp.
- 73 • Despite mitigation measures, the virus has circulated, which should prompt rapid
74 vaccination as most of the population remains susceptible; the collateral effects of the
75 pandemic on access to care must be addressed and public confidence restored in order to
76 limit the risk of excess mortality.
- 77 • The varying situations of forcibly displaced populations living in camps around the world
78 support the need for further research at other sites.

79 Keywords

80 COVID-19, SAR-COV-2, mortality, seroprevalence,

81 Background

82 Many predicted that resource-limited settings would be particularly hard hit by the COVID-19
83 epidemic given the difficulty of imposing confinement measures as well as the reduced access to
84 diagnostics and health care in these contexts (1) . Overcrowded places such as urban slums and
85 camps of forcibly displaced populations were of particular concern. In these settings, in addition to
86 population density, higher transmissibility could occur due to larger household sizes, intense social
87 mixing between the young and elderly, inadequate water and sanitation, and specific cultural and
88 faith practices (2).

89 This has not materialized in most camps of forcibly displaced people, where the number of reported
90 cases and deaths has been much lower than feared (1). The low numbers have been attributed to
91 limited testing capacity, differences in the population structure with a small proportion of elderly at
92 high risk of severe disease and death, a predominance of asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic
93 infections, and early implementation of confinement(3). However, the actual impact of COVID-19 on
94 these populations remains an open question.

95 Accordingly, we sought to ascertain a more accurate picture of the extent of the epidemic by
96 estimating SARS-COV-2 seroprevalence through a cross-sectional survey. In addition, through a
97 retrospective survey and programmatic data, we assessed its impact on mortality and on access to
98 healthcare before and during the COVID-19 epidemic. The Dagahaley camp is part of the Dadaab
99 refugee complex in Kenya, where Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) has been working since 2009, was
100 a relevant location for the study. MSF provides in-patient and out-patient health services in the
101 hospital and two health centres located in the camp and works with a network of 110 community
102 health workers (CHW) and 45 traditional birth attendants (TBA). The population of Dagahaley camp
103 was estimated at 72,635 inhabitants, during a survey conducted in September 2018 (personal
104 communication Etienne Gignoux).

105 As of the start of the study on 3 March 2021, 106,470 confirmed cases of COVID-19 had been
106 reported in Kenya including 1,863 deaths (source WHO). The first confirmed case of COVID-19 in
107 Dagahaley camp was identified on 16 May 2020. Few cases were reported in Dagahaley camp in May
108 and June 2020; then a first peak occurred in September and a second increase started in February
109 2021. As of 3 March 2021, 940 PCR tests had been performed in Dagahaley camp, confirming 47
110 positive cases, including 3 deaths.

111 **Methods**

112 **Design and setting**

113 The study entailed a cross-sectional survey using convenience sampling to estimate seroprevalence.
114 A population based survey was not deemed feasible in this setting due to limited access by MSF staff
115 to the camp and expectedly low participation rates in the camp. To estimate seroprevalence, we
116 included two cohorts accessible to trained MSF staff: a) All CHWs and TBAs working in Dagahaley
117 camp and their household members, as well as b) Patients and caretakers presenting at MSF-
118 supported health centres in Dagahaley camp.

119 In order to introduce the study and seek participants, trained study staff organized a meeting with
120 all CHWs and TBAs collaborating with MSF. They highlighted the volunteer nature of participation in
121 the study. When he/she agreed, he/she informed his/her family members of the possibility to
122 participate in the study and gave them an appointment time to present to MSF health facilities. For
123 patients and caretakers, we conducted systematic time sampling of patients and caretakers
124 presenting to health centres stratified by age.

125 For practical reasons in a context where access is limited, we choose to use a rapid antibody test.
126 Antibody test haven't shown important discordances with the ELISA, based on the correlations
127 observed in the published literature (3). The test used in our study (BIOSYNEX® COVID-19 BSS
128 [IgG/IgM]) offers good performance (sensitivity: 95.8 % (95% CI: 90.2–100.0), specificity: 98.1 %
129 (95% CI : 94.3- 100.0)) (4) and has been approved by the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Kenya
130 and the WHO.

131

132 To assess mortality, we exhaustively sampled the Dagahaley population. CHWs were asked to visit all
133 households in the camp and to collect data on the total number of household members and every
134 death from the start of the recall period. To calculate age-specific mortality, we used the estimated
135 age distribution from a population size estimate conducted in 2018 by MSF (supplementary
136 material). The recall period for the mortality survey was from 1 January 2019 until the start of the
137 study, and was divided into 2 periods: pre-pandemic (prior to COVID-19 detection) from 1 January
138 2019 to 30 April 2020; and pandemic (presumed active COVID-19 transmission) from 1 May 2020
139 until the start of the study. Data on the number of consultations, hospitalizations, and deaths at the
140 hospital were extracted from routinely collected MSF data.

141 [Data analysis](#)

142 Data analysis was conducted using R (R Core Team, 2020). All indicators (i.e., sex and age) were
143 calculated as proportions with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Where appropriate, differences in
144 proportions were measured using Pearson χ^2 tests with p-values (p) presented.

145 Logistic regression was performed and risk-ratios (overall and by subpopulations) calculated. To
146 estimate the risk associated with exposure to another infected person in the household we had to
147 determine the first infected person in the household and then identify other exposed persons. This
148 was not possible based on symptom onset, given the long recall period, and given the fact that not
149 all participants reported symptoms. Therefore, we randomly selected one of the seropositive
150 persons in the household as the first infected; then we repeated this 1000 times to obtain the
151 relative risk, its confidence interval, and its p-value.

152 We first standardized seroprevalence results by age group with an age distribution identified in a
153 survey conducted in 2018 by MSF (see supplementary material). We estimated the proportion of
154 inhabitants for each five-year age group, then weighted the results for each individual tested with
155 the inverse of this proportion using the R Survey package (Version 4.0). In addition, we adjusted the
156 results taking the estimate, found in the literature, of specificity and sensitivity for identifying
157 previously infected individuals (sensitivity: 95.8 % (95% CI: 90.2–100.0), specificity: 98.1 % (95% CI :
158 94.3- 100.0))(4). We performed a Bayesian estimation of true prevalence from apparent prevalence
159 obtained from individuals tested in our sample using the R Prevalence Package (Version 0.4.0).
160 The Crude Mortality Rate (CMR) (expressed as deaths/10,000 people/day) was calculated, with 95%
161 CI provided. Mortality was calculated during two periods: 486 days pre-pandemic (1 January 2019 to
162 31 April 2020) and 326 days from the start of the pandemic (1 May 2020, to 22 March 2021, which
163 corresponds to the median date of the survey implementation).

164 Use of services was assessed and compared over time based on routinely collected monitoring data.
165 The number of consultations and admissions per individual per year were estimated.

166 Patient and Public Involvement

167 Although there was no specific public involvement in the development of the protocol, discussions
168 were held with Dagahaley camp community leaders and representatives about the purpose of the
169 study. The network of community health workers in the Dagahaley camp was included in the
170 research team, they were involved in adjusting the questionnaires after the pilot phase and then
171 conducted the retrospective mortality data collection. We are currently working with the local
172 health authorities on how best to communicate the study results to the community.

173 Results

174 Seroprevalence

175 In total, we included 1206 participants in the seroprevalence study. We approached 662 patients
 176 and caretakers, of whom 6.5% (43/662) declined participation. Among the 155 TBAs and CHWs
 177 recorded by MSF, 145(94%) participated and were all included. They declared having 818 other
 178 family members among whom 442 participated (54%) and were all included. Patients and caretakers
 179 represented 51 % (619/1206) of the inclusions. The overall proportion of females was 54%. The
 180 proportion of participants under 20 years of age was 42% (510/1206), and 17% (204/1206) were 50
 181 years old and above.

182 The overall proportion with a positive test (either IgG or IgM positive) was 8% (95% CI: 6.6%-9.7%).
 183 After adjustment for test specificity and standardization of the seroprevalence results by age group
 184 with the age distribution of the camp, we estimated the adjusted seroprevalence at 5.8% (95% CI:
 185 1.6%-8.4%).

186 The proportion of participants testing positive was lowest among those under 5 years of age and
 187 highest among those aged 20 to 34 years and 50 years and above (Table 1).

188 **Table 1. Results of Rapid Diagnostic Test by age group, by sex, and overall, Dagahaley refugee camp, Garisa**
 189 **County, Kenya, May 2021**

Age group	Patients and caretakers		CHW & TBA and their family members		All					
	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	95% CI	IgG +	IgM+	IgG+ & IgM+
0-19 Y	151 (96.8%)	5 (3.2%)	333 (94.1%)	21 (5.9%)	484 (94.9%)	26 (5.1%)	3.5%-7.4%	13 (2.5%)	9 (1.8%)	4 (0.8%)
0-4 Y	30 (100%)	0 (0%)	83 (97.6%)	2 (2.4%)	113 (98.3%)	2 (1.7%)	0.5%-6.1%	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)
5-9 Y	43 (97.7%)	1 (2.3%)	112 (94.1%)	7 (5.9%)	155 (95.1%)	8 (4.9%)	2.5%-9.4%	6 (3.7%)	2 (1.2%)	0 (0%)
10-19 Y	78 (95.1%)	4 (4.9%)	138 (92%)	12 (8%)	216 (93.1%)	16 (6.9%)	4.3%-10.9%	6 (2.6%)	6 (2.6%)	4 (1.7%)
20-34 Y	115 (92.7%)	9 (7.3%)	115 (83.9%)	22 (16.1%)	230 (88.1%)	31 (11.9%)	8.5%-16.4%	14 (5.4%)	10 (3.8%)	7 (2.7%)
35-49 Y	166 (94.9%)	9 (5.1%)	48 (85.7%)	8 (14.3%)	214 (92.6%)	17 (7.4%)	4.6%-11.5%	10 (4.3%)	4 (1.7%)	3 (1.3%)
>=50 Y	144 (87.8%)	20 (12.2%)	37 (92.5%)	3 (7.5%)	181 (88.7%)	23 (11.3%)	7.6%-16.3%	13 (6.4%)	5 (2.5%)	5 (2.5%)
Female	214 (92.2%)	18 (7.8%)	533 (90.8%)	26 (9.1%)	621 (92.4%)	51 (7.6%)	5.8%-9.8%	24 (3.6%)	15 (2.2%)	12 (1.8%)
Male	362 (93.5%)	25 (6.5%)	274 (90.7%)	28 (9.3%)	488 (91.4%)	46 (8.6%)	6.5%-11.3%	26 (4.9%)	13 (2.4%)	7 (1.3%)
Overall	576 (93.1%)	43 (6.9%)	533 (90.8%)	54 (9.2%)	1109 (92%)	97 (8%)	6.6%-9.7%	50 (4.1%)	28 (2.3%)	19 (1.6%)

190 In multivariate analysis, being 20 years of age and above was associated with an increased risk of
191 seropositivity compared to being less than 20 years old, RR=2.7 (95% CI= 1.6-4.9, p value= <0.001),
192 while, being female was not associated with significant risk of seropositivity, RR=0.8 (95% CI= 0.5-
193 1.3, p value=0.322). Compared to patients and caretakers, being a family member of a CHW or a TBA
194 almost doubled the risk of seropositivity , RR=1.9 (95% CI= 1.1-3.2, p value=0.015), being a CHW or a
195 TBA was also associated with increased risk though this was not statistically significant, RR=1.5 (95%
196 CI= 0.9-2.6, p value=0.116).

197 The recruitment of family members of CHWs and TBAs allowed an exploration of the risk associated
198 with exposure to another seropositive person in the household. Not all households were complete
199 (39% (57/147)), and we included only households where at least 2 members participated in the
200 survey in our analysis. Being exposed to another seropositive person in the household was
201 significantly associated with more than two folds higher risk of seropositivity, RR=2.7 (95% CI= 1.4-
202 5.2, p value=0.002). In contrast, the size of the household did not seem to increase the risk, RR=1.0
203 (95% CI= 0.9-1.2).

204 Seropositive participants reported at least one COVID-consistent symptom from January 2020 more
205 frequently compared to seronegative participants (81% versus 45%, p value <0.001) (Table 2).

206 Seropositive participants with at least one COVID-consistent symptom experienced a longer duration
207 of symptoms and a median number of symptoms that was twice as high. In contrast, health seeking
208 behaviour was not statistically different based on seroprevalence status. The symptoms most
209 commonly reported by seropositive participants were cough (70%), headache (64%) and fever (63%).

210

211

212 Table 2. Characteristics of symptoms associated with COVID-19 and health seeking behaviour by seropositivity
 213 and results of the Rapid Diagnostic Test BIOSYNEX COVID-19 BSS, Dagahaley refugee camp, Garisa County,
 214 Kenya, May 2021

	Negative	Positive	P value*	IgM +	IgG+ & IgM+	IgG +
At least one symptom	45% (500)	81% (79)	<0.001	86% (24)	84% (16)	78% (39)
Symptoms lasting at least one week	30% (152)	52% (41)	0.016	33% (8)	69% (11)	56% (22)
Median number of symptoms (if at least one)	3	6	0	5	5.5	7
Saw a doctor if at least one symptom	30% (151)	29% (23)	1	33% (8)	44% (7)	21% (8)
Went to hospital	15% (76)	14% (11)	1	21% (5)	12% (2)	10% (4)
Hospitalized	2% (9)	3% (2)	0.653	4% (1)	0% (0)	3% (1)
ICU	0% (2)	3% (2)	0.095	4% (1)	0% (0)	3% (1)

215

216 Mortality

217 During the survey, CHWs recorded the size of all households (n=12,860) living in Dagahaley and
 218 estimated the population of Dagahaley at 88,793 inhabitants. In September 2018, the population
 219 was estimated at 72,635 inhabitants; assuming linear growth, we estimated the population size mid-
 220 pre-pandemic periods at 78,889 inhabitants and at 85,837 inhabitants mid-pandemic period. In
 221 total, we recorded 407 deaths (200 pre-pandemic and 207 during the pandemic).

222 The CMR was low in both periods (Table 3); however, it increased significantly by 42% during the
 223 pandemic. The highest mortality rate was among people aged 50 years and over. The mortality rate
 224 increased statistically significantly among 5- to 19-year-olds and those 50 years and over. We
 225 conducted a sensitivity analysis restricted to the same month of the year for both periods (pre-
 226 pandemic and pandemic) and reached similar results (see supplementary materials).

227 In the pre-pandemic period, 44.5% (89/200) of the deceased were aged 50 years and over, while
 228 43.9% (91/207) were aged 50 years and over during the pandemic period. The detailed analysis by
 229 month does not show a significant pattern (supplementary material).

230 Table 3. Mortality rates by age group and period, Dagahaley refugee camp, Garisa County, Kenya

Age group	Pre-Pandemic (1 January 2019-April 2020)		Pandemic (1 May 2020-22 March 2021)		Rate ratio	95% CI	p value
	Death	Mortality rate	Death	Mortality rate			
0-4 Y	61	0.09	58	0.12	1.30	0.91-1.87	0.148
5-19 Y	10	0.01	22	0.02	3.01	1.43-6.37	0.002
20-34 Y	23	0.03	18	0.03	1.07	0.58-1.99	0.824
35-49 Y	17	0.04	18	0.06	1.45	0.75-2.81	0.269
>=50 Y	89	0.35	91	0.49	1.40	1.05-1.88	0.023
Overall	200	0.05	207	0.07	1.42	1.17-1.72	<0.001

231

232 The main reported cause of death from a known cause was respiratory disease (pre-pandemic=11%,
 233 n=22, pandemic=15%, n=31, p value=0.35). We did not detect any significant difference by cause of
 234 death during the two periods, even when stratified by aged (<50 vs ≥50 years). COVID-19 was
 235 reported as the cause of death for two cases. We did not find any significant difference between the
 236 pre-pandemic and pandemic periods for any symptoms reported prior to death nor for
 237 comorbidities. Most of the deceased had access to the hospital prior to death (pre-pandemic=74%,
 238 (147/199), pandemic=69% (142/207)). The proportion of deaths in the hospital was similar for both
 239 periods (pre-pandemic=42%, n=84, pandemic=36%, n=75). For more details on the characteristics of
 240 the deceased refer to the supplementary material.

241 **Attendance at health facilities**

242 Table 4. Attendance and death at MSF health facilities, Dagahaley refugee camp, Garisa County, Kenya January
 243 2019-March 2021

	Pre-pandemic (January 2019-April 2020)		Pandemic (May 2020-March 2021)		Rate ratio
	N	Rate (day)	N	Rate (day)	
Consultation at health centres	164848	339	82187	245	0.72
Consultation at emergency room*	46105	116	35961	107	0.92
Admission to hospital	12918	26.5	6467	19.3	0.73
Death at hospital	140	0.288	81	0.25	0.87

*Data from emergency room were available only from April 2019

244

245 The number of consultations at health centres decreased by more than a third during the pandemic
246 period; the decrease started in April 2020 and has yet to return to pre-pandemic levels. At the
247 emergency room, the decrease in consultations was much lower(8%) compared to health
248 centres(38%), with a return to previous levels in October 2020. Admission to the hospital showed a
249 similar decrease as consultations at health centres (see monthly data in supplementary material).

250 Discussion

251 Our survey found a SARS-COV-2 antibody seroprevalence of 5.8% (95% CI 1.5-8.5) in Dagahaley
252 Refugee Camp. Comparing the pre-pandemic to the pandemic periods, we observed a 42% (95% CI:
253 17%-72%) increase in the mortality rate as well as a 38% decrease in consultations at health centres,
254 an 8% decrease in emergency room, and a 37% decrease in hospital admissions.

255

256 The seroprevalence found in our survey is lower than another survey conducted in Kenya in
257 November 2020 in the Nairobi population which reported a seroprevalence of 34.7% (95% CI 31.8-
258 37.6) (5) based on ELISA, and lower than a national seroprevalence estimated from tests conducted
259 on blood donors(6). Many factors may have contributed to the lower seroprevalence in our study:
260 first, the isolation of the Dagahaley refugee camp of over 80,000 people and the strict screening of
261 arrivals and visitors in the camp; second, our survey used a rapid test that may not be as sensitive as
262 an ELISA; third, age has been shown to be correlated with transmission (7)—the young age of
263 Dagahaley population could have played a role; fourth, the limited number of meeting places and few
264 large enclosed spaces such as shopping centre in the camp may have limited transmission.

265

266 The estimated seroprevalence in this study applied to the population of Dagahaley, comprised of
267 88,793 inhabitants at the time of the survey, suggesting that 5103 people (95% CI 1332 – 7455) were
268 infected. This figure is 67 times higher than the number of cases reported in the camp until the last
269 day of the survey (76 confirmed COVID-19 cases up to April 26th 2021).

270 As the proportion of asymptomatic cases of COVID-19 decreases with age (8), it is possible that the
271 proportion of asymptomatic cases was high in Dagahaley. However, seropositive participants
272 reported having at least one symptom more frequently than seronegative participants (81% versus
273 45%), with a higher median number of symptoms lasting longer. These results suggest that a
274 substantial proportion of the seropositive were affected by the disease; accordingly, the proportion
275 of asymptomatic cases cannot fully explain the difference between reported cases and estimated
276 infections. Other factors may have been involved, such as the relatively low number of tests
277 performed (less than 1000 for over 80,000 people) and the decrease in access to health care.

278 The survey showed that the risk of infection was correlated with age. People aged 20-35 years and
279 those aged 50 and over were the most affected in contrast to the Nairobi survey which showed a
280 slightly lower seroprevalence in this age group compared to the 20-50 year olds. Probably due to the
281 intense social mixing of young and old in the camp, the 50+ age group was one of the most exposed,
282 which is worrying as they are at greatest risk of mortality. The survey also shows that having an
283 infected person in the household is another factor that more than doubles the risk of infection;
284 which is consistent with the results of other studies (9).

285 CHWs, TBAs, and their family members had a higher seroprevalence than patients and caretakers.
286 This suggest that CHWs and TBAs are more exposed to infection, likely by occupational exposure; by
287 extension, their household members are also more exposed due to intra-household transmission.
288 This calls for improved infection prevention and control measures for this group as well as increased
289 awareness of the importance of early detection of infection to protect the household.

290 The survey estimated a CMR of 0.05 deaths per day per 10,000 people before the pandemic and
291 0.07 deaths per day per 10,000 people during the pandemic. These mortality rates are lower than
292 those estimated from reported mortality in Kenya (expected CMR 0.16, see supplementary
293 material). This may be due, among other things, to good access to basic health care in the camps.
294 The population has free access to a broad spectrum of primary and secondary care and preventive
295 activities.

296 Two deaths from COVID-19 were reported during the survey. (Up to the start of the survey, three
297 COVID-19-related deaths were officially reported). Analysis of the causes of death and co-
298 morbidities of the deceased showed no significant differences between the two periods and did not
299 allow the identification of deaths caused by COVID-19 that had not been identified as such. In
300 addition, the proportion of deaths in those over 50 years of age was relatively constant; this suggests
301 no substantial differential increase in mortality in this age group directly from COVID-19.

302 We estimate that eight COVID-19 related deaths would have been expected if the age-specific
303 Infection Fatality Rate estimated by Driscoll et al.(10) is applied on the infected population by age
304 group derived from the survey (see detailed calculation in supplementary material).

305 Although we cannot exclude that we missed deaths directly related to COVID-19, the increase in
306 mortality detected by the survey during the pandemic may also be indirectly caused by decreased
307 access to care as evidenced by decreased attendance at health facilities and other potential adverse
308 effects of the pandemic.

309 The analysis of data from MSF health facilities showed a significant reduction in attendance during
310 the pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period. The rates of consultations at primary health
311 centres as well as hospital admissions decreased by a third. However, the number of consultations at
312 the emergency room and the number of hospital deaths decreased less during the period,
313 potentially suggesting that access to health care for severe cases only moderately impacted.

314 This study has several limitations. For practical reasons, we were not able to do a population-based
315 sampling to estimate seroprevalence; instead, we targeted the families of TBAs and CHWs as well as
316 patients and caretakers at health centres. This population is potentially different from the camp
317 population, both in terms of exposure to the virus and access to care. However, this population
318 originates from all geographical areas of the camp and includes all ages. The refusal rate was low
319 among patients and caretakers, decreasing the potential risk of selection bias. Among family
320 members of CHW and TBA, none who came to the study site declined to participate, but only 55%
321 participated, which could potentially introduce bias. As the assessment of symptoms was based on
322 participant recall over a one-year period, recall bias may have occurred; however, participants
323 reported symptoms before they knew their test result and a significant difference was detected
324 between seropositive and seronegative individuals.

325 Due to logistical and time constraints, only rapid tests were used. Rapid tests have less accuracy than
326 laboratory tests such as ELISA. Nevertheless, the BIOSYNEX test showed good performance in studies
327 conducted on subjects infected a few weeks before (4). Certain types of antibodies decay over time
328 (11), hence the sensitivity of the test may be affected. Cross-reactivity of the test that was used is
329 possible; however, in a study conducted on a pre-pandemic sample from the Central African
330 Republic using three different rapid tests, BIOSYNEX showed the lowest rate of false positivity
331 (1.36% (4/294)) (12).

332 The increase in mortality may also be due to the long recall period- The number of deaths may have
333 been underreported differentially or misclassified between the pre-pandemic and pandemic periods.
334 Respondents reported to CHWs that 39% of deaths occurred in the hospital (42% in the pre-
335 pandemic period and 36% in the pandemic period). During this period, 221 deaths were recorded in
336 the hospital (140 pre-pandemic deaths and 81 pandemic deaths). Assuming the hospital database is
337 complete and the proportion of in-hospital deaths reported to CHWs is representative, the
338 projection gives 557 deaths (333 pre-pandemic deaths and 224 pandemic deaths), compared to 407
339 deaths reported to CHWs (200 pre-pandemic and 207 pandemic). This calculation suggests that the
340 survey may have underestimated the mortality rate by 37%; moreover, it suggests that the
341 underestimation was more important in the pre-pandemic period than in the pandemic period (66%
342 versus 3%). Lastly, this increase could be an artefact, as households that would have left the camp
343 during the recall period could not be included.

344

345 Conclusion

346 We estimated 67 times more infected cases than the number of cases reported in the camp. This
347 ratio cannot be fully explained by a high proportion of asymptomatic or pauci-symptomatic cases. A
348 significant proportion of the population remains susceptible, and our survey showed that the virus
349 circulates in the camp. The new, more transmissible, and potentially more severe (13)(14) variants
350 could have dramatic consequences in the camp.

351 Our survey showed an increase in the mortality rate during, compared to before, the pandemic. This
352 occurred in tandem with a sustained decline in attendance to health facilities despite the easing of
353 restrictions. Initiatives to restore the population's confidence and access to health care are urgently
354 needed. Furthermore, this study took place in a stable refugee camp with relatively good baseline

355 access to health care as shown by the low CMR. The situation of the more than 80 million forcibly
356 displaced people in the world varies greatly; this merits further research in other sites to assess their
357 situation. Importantly, only large-scale vaccination of the population can limit the risk of excess
358 mortality from COVID-19.

359

360 [List of abbreviations](#)

361 **CHWs** : Community health workers

362 **CI** : Confidence interval

363 **CMR** : Crude mortality rate

364 **MPH** : Ministry of Public Health

365 **MSF** : Médecins Sans Frontières

366 **CHW**: Community health worker

367 **TBA** : Traditional birth attendant

368 [Declarations](#)

369 [Ethics approval and consent to participate](#)

370 This protocol was approved by the MSF Ethics Review Board (V. 1.1, 24.12.2020, ID: 20105) and the
371 KEMRI SERU Scientific and Ethic Review Board (KEMRI/SERU/CIPDR/045/4164). All study procedures
372 involving subject's participation were conducted in compliance with the principles enunciated in the
373 Declaration of Helsinki.

374 Authorities and community leaders in the Dagahaley area were approached to explain the purposes
375 of the mortality and seroprevalence survey.

376 Mortality monitoring is part of the routine tasks of CHWs; our activity consisted of strengthening this
377 aspect. Nevertheless, as the mortality survey was part of our study, we sought verbal informed
378 consent from every household, with the designated head of household answering the questionnaire
379 for all relevant members of the household. For the seroprevalence component, written informed
380 consent was sought from all individuals willing to participate. In the case of minors aged between
381 eight to 17 years, participation was proposed for both the minor and the legal guardian. Both the
382 assent of the minor and the consent of the legal guardian were needed for inclusion. In the case of
383 minors below eight years of age, the decision to participate was made solely by the legal guardian.
384 Participant privacy was respected throughout the study.

385 [Consent for publication](#)

386 Not applicable

387 [Availability of data and material](#)

388 The minimal dataset underlying the findings of this study is available on request, in accordance with
389 the legal framework set forth by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) data sharing policy (Karunakara U,
390 PLoS Med 2013). MSF is committed to share and disseminate health data from its programs and
391 research in an open, timely, and transparent manner in order to promote health benefits for
392 populations while respecting ethical and legal obligations towards patients, research participants,
393 and their communities. The MSF data sharing policy ensures that data will be available upon request
394 to interested researchers while addressing all security, legal, and ethical concerns. All readers may
395 contact the generic address data.sharing@msf.org or Ms. Aminata Ndiaye
396 (aminata.ndiaye@epicentre.msf.org) to request data.

397 [Competing interests](#)

398 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

399 [Funding](#)

400 The study was funded by the Operational Centre of Geneva of Médecins Sans Frontières.

401 [Authors' contributions](#)

402 EG, FA, AA, CD, FL, IC and MM conceptualized and designed the study and collected the
403 data. EG, AGY, AJ, NM, DO oversaw the data collection. EG, AA and AJ analyzed the data, EG wrote
404 the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final copy of the manuscript.

405

406 [Acknowledgements](#)

407 We thank the people and community staff of Dagahaley for their participation in the study, the
408 Ministry of Health staff and Médecins Sans Frontières field and headquarters teams for their support
409 and guidance, and Manuel Albela and Rebecca Coulborn for their invaluable advices on analysis and
410 writing.

411

412 [References](#)

- 413 1. Truelove S, Abraham O, Altare C, Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Azman AS, et al. The potential impact of
414 COVID-19 in refugee camps in Bangladesh and beyond: A modeling study. PLoS Med
415 [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Jun 25];17(6):e1003144. Available from:
416 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003144>
- 417 2. Dahab M, Van Zandvoort K, Flasche S, Warsame A, Ratnayake R, Favas C, et al. COVID-19
418 control in low-income settings and displaced populations: What can realistically be done?
419 [Internet]. Vol. 14, Conflict and Health. BioMed Central Ltd; 2020 [cited 2021 Jun 25]. p. 1–6.
420 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13031-020-00296-8>

- 421 3. Musa HH, Musa TH, Musa IH, Musa IH, Ranciaro A, Campbell MC. Addressing Africa's
422 pandemic puzzle: Perspectives on COVID-19 transmission and mortality in sub-Saharan Africa.
423 Int J Infect Dis [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Jul 9];102:483. Available from:
424 [/pmc/articles/PMC7526606/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3526606/)
- 425 4. Péré H, Mboumba Bouassa RS, Tonen-Wolyec S, Podglajen I, Veyer D, Bélec L. Analytical
426 performances of five SARS-CoV-2 whole-blood finger-stick IgG-IgM combined antibody rapid
427 tests. J Virol Methods. 2021 Apr 1;290:114067.
- 428 5. Ngere I, Dawa J, Hunsperger E, Otiemo N, Masika M, Amoth P, et al. HIGH SEROPREVALENCE
429 OF SARS-COV-2 EIGHT MONTHS AFTER INTRODUCTION IN NAIROBI, KENYA. Preprint
430 [Internet]. 2020; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3844795>
- 431 6. Uyoga S, Adetifa IMO, Otiende M, Gitonga JN, Mugo D, Nyagwange J, et al. Prevalence of
432 SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies from a one-year National Serosurveillance of Kenyan Blood
433 Transfusion Donors. medRxiv [Internet]. 2021 Jul 7 [cited 2021 Jul 14];2021.07.06.21260038.
434 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.07.06.21260038v1>
- 435 7. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Pearson CAB, et al. Age-dependent effects in the
436 transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat Med. 2020;26(8):1205–11.
- 437 8. Nikolai LA, Meyer CG, Kreamsner PG, Velavan TP. Asymptomatic SARS Coronavirus 2 infection:
438 Invisible yet invincible. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;100(January):112–6.
- 439 9. Qifang Bi, Justin Lessler, Isabella Eckerle, Stephen A Lauer, Laurent Kaiser, Nicolas
440 Vuilleumier, Derek AT Cummings, Antoine Flahault D, Petrovic, Idris Guessous, Silvia
441 Stringhini ASA. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Insights from a Population-based
442 Serological Survey. Preprint [Internet]. 2021; Available from:
443 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.04.20225573>

- 444 10. O’Driscoll M, Ribeiro Dos Santos G, Wang L, Cummings DA, Azman AS, Paireau J, et al. Age-
445 specific mortality and immunity patterns of SARS-CoV-2 infection in 45 countries. medRxiv
446 [Internet]. 2020;2020.08.24.20180851. Available from:
447 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.24.20180851>
- 448 11. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, Kelly M, Becker M, Slater D, et al. Persistence and decay of
449 human antibody responses to the receptor binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in
450 COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(52):1–13.
- 451 12. Mboumba Bouassa RS, Péré H, Tonen-Wolyec S, Longo JDD, Moussa S, Mbopi-Keou FX, et al.
452 Unexpected high frequency of unspecific reactivities by testing pre-epidemic blood
453 specimens from Europe and Africa with SARS-CoV-2 IgG–IgM antibody rapid tests points to
454 IgM as the Achilles heel. *J Med Virol* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Jun 7];93(4):2196–203.
455 Available from: <https://covid-19.sante.gouv.fr/tests>
- 456 13. Grint DJ, Wing K, Williamson E, McDonald HI, Bhaskaran K, Evans D, et al. Case fatality risk of
457 the SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern B.1.1.7 in England, 16 November to 5 February.
458 *Eurosurveillance* [Internet]. 2021;26(11):1–6. Available from:
459 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.11.2100256>
- 460 14. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, Munday JD, et al. Estimated
461 transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* (80-) [Internet].
462 2021 Apr 9 [cited 2021 Jul 9];372(6538):eabg3055. Available from:
463 <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/372/6538/eabg3055>
464