

1 **Title of the article: Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Kinetics up to 6 months of follow-up: Result**
2 **from a Nation-wide Population-based, Age Stratified Sero-Epidemiological Prospective**
3 **Cohort Study in India**

4 Puneet Misra¹, Arvind Kumar Singh², Baijayantimala Mishra³, Bijayini Behera², Binod Kumar
5 Patro², Guruprasad R Medigeshe⁴, Hari Shanker Joshi⁵, Mohammad Ahmad⁶, P K Chaturvedi⁷,
6 Palanivel Chinnakali⁸, Partha Haldar¹, Mohan Bairwa¹, Pradeep Kharya⁵, Rahul Dhodapkar⁹,
7 Ramashankar Rath⁵, Randeep Guleria¹⁰, Sanjay K Rai¹, Sitanshu Sekhar Kar⁸, Shashi Kant¹,
8 Sonali Sarkar⁸, Subrata Baidya¹¹, Suneeta Meena¹², Suprakash Mandal¹, Surekha Kishore¹³, Tapan
9 Majumder¹⁴, Vivek Hada¹⁵

10

11 **Contributors*:**

- 12 1. Centre for Community Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi
13 110029, India
- 14 2. Department of Community and Family Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences,
15 Bhubaneshwar, Odisha- 751019, India
- 16 3. Department Microbiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Bhubaneshwar, Odisha-
17 751019, India
- 18 4. Translational Health Science and Technology Institute, Faridabad-121001, India
- 19 5. Department of Community and Family Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences,
20 Gorakhpur- 273008, India
- 21 6. WHO Country Office, World Health Organization
- 22 7. Department of Reproductive Biology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi
23 110029, India
- 24 8. Department of Community Medicine, Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical
25 Education and Research, Puducherry- 605006, India
- 26 9. Department of Microbiology, Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and
27 Research, Puducherry- 605006, India

28 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 29 11. Department of Community Medicine, Agartala Government Medical College, Agartala-
30 799006, India
- 31 12. Department of Laboratory Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi
32 110029, India
- 33 13. Director, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Gorakhpur- 273008, India
- 34 14. Department of Microbiology, Agartala Government Medical College, Agartala- 799006,
35 India
- 36 15. Department of Microbiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Gorakhpur, Uttar
37 Pradesh, India

38 ***After first and corresponding author, all others authors sequence is arranged alphabetically**

39 **Corresponding author and guarantor:**

40 Dr. Puneet Misra,
41 Professor,
42 Centre For Community Medicine
43 Room Number: 30, Old OT Block
44 All India Institute of Medical Sciences,
45 New Delhi- 110029.
46 Telephone: +91 (11) 26593773 (Direct)
47 +91(11) 26593233 (Office)
48 Mobile: +91-9810696386
49 Mail: doctormisra@gmail.com
50 Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2019-1524>

51 **Biographical Sketch of first author:**

52 Dr. Puneet Misra is Professor of Community Medicine at the All India Institute of Medical
53 Sciences having over twenty years of experience as Physician, Researcher, Teacher,
54 Epidemiologist and Public Health professional. His area of specialties are Public Health,
55 Vaccine Trial, Clinical Trials, Epidemiologist, Yoga, chronic disease, life style medicine etc.

56

57

58 **Total number of pages: 12**

59 **Total number of photographs: Nil**

60 **Word count of abstract:** 301

61 **Word count for text (excluding reference, tables, abstract):** 2761

62 **Word count for introduction and discussion:** 893

63 **Conflicts of interest:** Nil.

64 **Source of funding:** This work was supported by a research grant (Ref No: **2020/1085497**,
65 Purchase Order: **202630166**) from the WHO Country Office, New Delhi 110016, India.

66 **Previous presentation/submission:** None

67 **Acknowledgement**

68 We thank the WHO Country Office, India team particularly Mohammad Ahmad (National
69 Professional Officer, WHO) and Anisur Rahman (Health Emergencies and Research Officer,
70 WHO) for continuous support. We are immensely thankful to Meenu Sangral, Research
71 Officer; Shreya Jha, Senior Research Consultant; Priyanka Kardam, Research Officer; Kapil
72 Yadav, Professor; Bratati Pal, Research Officer; Tanushree Roy, Research officer for their
73 support. Special thanks to the participants who allowed us to investigate the extent of infection,
74 as determined by seropositivity in the general population, in which COVID-19 virus infection
75 has been reported.

76 **Author statement:** All co-authors have read and approved this manuscript. The corresponding
77 author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the
78 criteria have been omitted. This manuscript represents the honest work done in this multisite
79 sero-epidemiological study

80

81

Contributor	Concept	Design	Literature search	Data acquisition and analysis	Manuscript preparation	Manuscript editing	Manuscript review
Puneet Misra	√	√	√	-	√	√	√

Arvind Kumar Singh	√	√	-	√	-	-	√
Baijayantimala Mishra	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Bijayini Behera	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Binod Kumar Patro,	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Guruprasad R Medigeshi	√	√	-	√	-	-	√
Hari Shanker Joshi	√	√	-	-	-	-	√
Mohammad Ahmad	√	√	-	-	-	-	√
Mohan Bairwa	-	√	-	-	-	-	√
P K Chaturvedi	√	√	-	√	-	-	√
Palanivel Chinnakali	√	√	-	√	-	-	√
Partha Haldar	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Pradeep Kharya	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Puneet Misra	√	√	√	-	√	√	√
Rahul Dhodapkar	-	-	√	√	-	-	√
Ramashankar Rath	-	-	-	√	-	-	√

Randeep Guleria	√	√	-	-	-	-	√
Sanjay K Rai	√	√	-	-	-	-	√
Shashi Kant	√	√	√	-	√	√	√
Sitanshu Sekhar Kar	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Sonali Sarkar	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Subrata Baidya	√	√	-	√	-	-	√
Suneeta Meena	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Suprakash Mandal	-	-	√	√	√	√	√
Surekha Kishore	√	√	-	-	-	-	√
Tapan Majumder	-	-	-	√	-	-	√
Vivek Hada	-	-	-	√	-	-	√

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89 Title: **Anti SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Kinetics up to 6 months of follow-up: Result from a**
90 **Nation-wide Population-based, Age Stratified Sero-Epidemiological Prospective Cohort**
91 **Study in India**

92
93 **Abstract:**

94 Repeated serological testing tells about the change in the overall infection in a community. This
95 study aimed to evaluate changes in antibody prevalence and kinetics in a closed cohort over six
96 months in different sub-populations in India. The study included 10,000 participants from rural
97 and urban areas in five states and measured SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in serum in three follow-up
98 rounds. The overall seroprevalence increased from 73.9% in round one to 90.7% in round two and
99 92.9% in round three. Among seropositive rural participants in round one, 98.2% remained
100 positive in round two, and this percentage remained stable in urban and tribal areas in round three.
101 The results showed high antibody prevalence that increased over time and was not different based
102 on area, age group, or sex. Vaccinated individuals had higher antibody prevalence, and nearly all
103 participants had antibody positivity for up to six months.

104 **Keywords:** Serology, Antibody, SARS-CoV-2, longitudinal

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116 INTRODUCTION

117 The COVID-19 pandemic remains an important public health issue since 2019. Since its onset,
118 several waves were seen in different countries throughout the world in different time periods.[1,2]
119 In India, the first wave was seen from March to November 2020. The second wave in the form of
120 the delta variant, from March to June 2021, led to a massive surge of symptomatic COVID,
121 hospitalization, and fatality.[3] There was a subsequent third wave of less virulent omicron variant
122 at the end of 2021. For almost 3 years India experienced this series of the pandemic waves, which
123 had impact on population health. India started the COVID-19 vaccination in January 2021;
124 initially for the health care workers, and frontline workers followed by the elderly population, and
125 finally for all adults.[4]
126 India, as well as most parts of the world, has entered the phase of endemicity where a substantial
127 proportion of the population is positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibody.[5] Varying levels of
128 seropositivity were found among the population of different states of India. The seropositivity
129 status of a population indicates the extent of past infection, the indirect protection from subsequent
130 infection, the proportion of the susceptible population, etc. Similarly, repeated serological testing
131 tells about the change in the overall infection in a community. There were very few studies in
132 cohort design assessing the antibody kinetics for a longer duration. Therefore, we aimed to assess
133 the change in antibody prevalence and its kinetics in a closed cohort over six months across the
134 country in different sub-population in India.

135

136 METHODOLOGY

137 **Study Design:** This was a population-based, multi-centric, age-stratified prospective cohort study
138 under WHO (World Health Organisation) Unity protocols for the SARS-CoV-2 sero-surveillance.
139 [6] A total of three rounds of follow-up were done for the same cohort of the study participants
140 viz. at baseline, 3rd months, and 6th months.

141 **Study Setting and Patient Selection:** The study was conducted at five selected study sites in
142 India. The study sites were Delhi, Bhubaneswar, Gorakhpur, Pondicherry, and Agartala situated in
143 the state of Delhi, Odisha, Uttar Pradesh, Pondicherry, and Tripura respectively (**Figure 1**).

144 **Figure 1.** Geographical distribution of the study sites across India

145
146 The study population were from both the rural and urban areas of each site except at the Agartala
147 site where the tribal population was included in place of the urban population. For Delhi site, an
148 urban resettlement colony consisting mostly of a population from low socio-economic strata in the
149 south Delhi district was chosen to represent urban population. The rural population was selected
150 from Ballabgarh block in the Faridabad district of nearby Haryana state. Faridabad district had
151 contiguous border with Delhi state and came under Delhi National Capital Region (Delhi NCR).
152 Ballabgarh block was the rural field practice area of the investigating site spread across 50 square
153 kilometres with 28 villages with a population of 102,000 as per 2021 data. The Bhubaneswar site
154 in south-Eastern India included an urban area under the Bhubaneswar Municipal Corporation
155 (BMC) and a rural area at selected villages of adjacent Khordha districts at a distance of 25-40
156 kilometres from the site institute. Gorakhpur was a city situated in Uttar Pradesh, a state in
157 Northern India. The city was a major transit point of surface transport near the India-Nepal
158 international border. The rural area was in the vicinity of the city with an average distance of 16-
159 72 kilometres from the city centre whereas the urban area was in the centre of the city in a selected
160 municipality block. In north-eastern India, the Agartala site was situated in the state of Tripura.
161 This site included the rural and tribal population from the selected villages situated at a distance of
162 16-30 km from the city centre. In southern India, the Puducherry site was a Union Territory of an
163 area of 20 square kilometres where selected municipality wards and villages were included for the
164 urban and rural population.

165 **Sample Size and Sampling Strategy:** In each of the study sites, population both from an urban
166 and rural area (except Agartala: rural and tribal) were included. Individual villages in the rural

167 area and municipality wards in the urban area were considered as a cluster. From each rural and
168 urban area, 25 clusters were selected purposively. From each cluster, 40 participants were selected
169 to finally achieve 1,000. Therefore, each study site had a sample size of 2,000 and the total sample
170 size for the study was 10,000. The recruitment of the participants started from a meeting point of
171 multiple lanes of a cluster preferably at the centre. The rotating pencil method was used to identify
172 the first starting lane where ≥ 10 consecutive families were approached. From those houses, at
173 least 40 participants having age more than equal to 1 year were recruited. The rule of the left was
174 adopted to move further at the end of any lane.

175 **Outcome Measures:** Our main outcome measure was the presence or absence of antibodies
176 against the SARS-CoV-2 virus in serum. It was assessed by standard Enzyme-linked
177 Immunoassay (ELISA) (Kit: WANTAI SARS-CoV-2 Ab ELISA kit, Wantai SARS-CoV-2
178 Diagnostics) as per the manufacturer's protocol. The kit captured human serum total antibody
179 (IgM + IgG) against the receptor binding domain of spike protein of the SARS-Cov-2 virus and
180 detected the antibody qualitatively. The sensitivity and specificity of the test kit were 94.4% and
181 100% respectively. [7] Those serum specimens having a ratio of observed absorbance to cut-off
182 (O/C) ≥ 1.0 was taken as reactive for the antibody.

183 **Biological Specimen Collection and Handling:** Three to five millilitre of venous blood sample
184 was collected by aseptic venepuncture from each participant. The blood sample was centrifuged
185 (at 3000 rpm for 10 minutes) within two hours of collection. Serum was stored at 2-8 degree
186 Celsius for laboratory analysis within seven days, otherwise at -80 degrees Celsius for long-term
187 storage. The standard operating procedure for handling biological samples was followed.

188 **Other Variable:** We interviewed the adult participants and the guardian of the minor participants
189 to obtain basic socio-demographic details like age, sex, residence, educational status, occupation,
190 any substance use, any clinical symptoms experienced in the past three months, history of SARS-
191 CoV-2 laboratory test, COVID-19 vaccination status, etc.

192 **Data Collection Tool and Data Quality Management:** We used electronic tablet-based Epi-
193 Collect 5 data collection software to enter the data of participants' interviews as well as data of
194 laboratory results. The web portal of Epi-Collect 5 was used to do real-time based monitoring of
195 the progress, identifying any data entry error, incompleteness, and data mismatch simultaneously
196 during the period of data collection. The appropriate prompt action was taken to resolve issues
197 that appeared at any of the study site. Periodic data download and cross-checking were also done
198 to find any discrepancies by a designated data manager. A weekly progress report was obtained
199 and discussed with all the study sites to ensure timely data collection and maintaining quality.
200 Apart from this periodic refresher training and study site review meetings were conducted to
201 address the site-specific issues and ensure timely dissemination of quality data. Standard state-
202 specific COVID-appropriate guideline was followed during the data collection. The uploaded data
203 were exported to Microsoft Excel format and merged with the subsequent round of data with the
204 help of unique identification numbers.

205 **Data Analysis:** Data data analysis was done by STATA Version 12 (STATA Corporation, Texas,
206 USA) statistical software. Data cleaning was done with the help of both Microsoft Excel and
207 STATA by a qualified data manager as well as by the study investigators. Descriptive statistical
208 analysis was done and the result was expressed by frequency and proportion for categorical
209 variables and mean (SD), 95% confidence interval (CI) for the continuous variable. The
210 seroprevalence was presented by percentage and with 95% CI by on the study site, round, urban-
211 rural area, age group, sex, according to symptoms, and vaccination status.

212 **Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate:** Ethical approval was obtained from all five
213 investigating institutes (Letter No. For AIIMS, New Delhi: **IEC-959/04.09.2020**, AIIMS
214 Bhubaneswar: **T/EMF/CM&FM/20/44**, JIPMER Puducherry: **JIP/IEC/2020/248**, AIIMS
215 Gorakhpur: **IHEC/AIIMS-GKP/BMR/01/22**, Agartala: **F.4(5-234)/AGMC/ACADEMIC/IEC**

216 **MEETING**). We obtained informed written consent, assent, and consent from the
 217 parents/guardians of the participants who were under the legal age for giving consent.

218

219 **RESULTS**

220 The data collection period was from March 2021 to August 2021 in round one, from May 2021 to
 221 December 2021 in round two, and from August 2021 to January 2022 in round three.

222 **(Supplementary Table 1.)**

223 **Supplementary Table 1. The period of the data collection according to the study site and area**
 224

Study Site	Area	Round One	Round Two	Round Three
AIIMS, New Delhi	Rural	March 3, 2021 – June 10, 2021	May 27, 2021 – Oct 18, 2021	August 26, 2021 – Dec 31, 2021
	Urban	March 15, 2021 – July 31, 2021	June 18, 2021 – Oct 26, 2021	Sept 28, 2021 – Dec 11, 2021
AIIMS, Bhubaneswar	Rural	March 22, 2021 – May 7, 2021	July 9, 2021 – August 11, 2021	Oct 11, 2021 – Dec 19, 2021
	Urban	June 7, 2021 – June 30, 2021	Sept 6, 2021 – Oct 11, 2021	Oct 12, 2021 – Jan 14, 2022
AIIMS, Gorakhpur	Rural	April 22, 2021 - June 29, 2021	July 24, 2021 – Oct 4, 2021	Oct 12, 2021 – Dec 19, 2021
	Urban	July 1, 2021 – August 18, 2021	Oct 5, 2021 – Nov 27, 2021	Dec 18, 2021 – Jan 10, 2022
Agartala Medical College	Rural	26 March 2021 – June 1, 2021	July 12, 2021 – Dec 10, 2021	Sept 20, 2021 – Dec 31, 2021
	Tribal	17 June 2021 – August 7, 2021	Sept 14, 2021 – Nov 29, 2021	Dec 15, 2021 – Dec 31, 2021
JIPMER, Pondicherry	Rural	June 9, 2021 – July 30, 2021	Sept 1, 2021 – Nov 23, 2021	Oct 12, 2021 – Dec 27, 2021
	Urban	June 10, 2021 – July 23, 2021	Sept 2, 2021 – Nov 27, 2021	Oct 12, 2021 – Dec 28, 2021

225

226 The total number of participants in round one was 10,110 for all sites clubbed together. In the
 227 subsequent rounds, 6,503 (64.3%) remained in round two and 5,564 (55.0%) in round three. The
 228 highest proportion of participants who remained in the cohort till round three was at the

229 Bhubaneswar site (73.6%), whereas the minimum was at the Pondicherry site (33.1%).

230 **(Supplementary Table 2.)**

231 **Supplementary Table 2: Distribution of participants by to the study site, round, and area**

232

Study site	Area	Round One n (%)		Round Two n (%)		Round Three n (%)	
		Total	Area wise*	Total	Area wise	Total	Area wise
Delhi	Urban	2060 (100%)	1001 (47.2%)	1569 (76.2%)	741/1001 (74.0%)	1395 (67.7%)	780/1001 (77.9%)
	Rural		1059 (52.8%)		828/1059 (78.2%)		708/1395 (66.8%)
Bhubaneswar	Urban	2000 (100%)	1000 (50.0%)	1704 (85.2%)	820/1000 (82.0%)	1473 (73.6%)	777/1000 (77.7%)
	Rural		1000 (50.0%)		884/1000 (88.4%)		700/1000 (70.0%)
Gorakhpur	Urban	2010 (100%)	1002 (49.8%)	1151 (57.3%)	553/1002 (55.2%)	937 (46.6%)	509/940 (50.8%)
	Rural		1008 (50.2%)		598/1008 (59.3%)		431/1008 (42.7%)
Agartala	Tribal	2000 (100%)	1339 (66.9%)	856 (42.8%)	489/1339 (36.5%)	1095 (54.7%)	672/1339 (31.7%)
	Rural		661 (33.1%)		368/661 (55.6%)		423/639 (63.9%)
Pondicherry	Urban	2040 (100%)	1020 (50.0%)	1222 (59.9%)	601/1020 (49.2%)	664 (33.1%)	322/1020 (31.6%)
	Rural		1020 (50.0%)		621/1020 (60.1%)		352/1020 (34.5%)
Total	Urban	10110 (100%)	4023 (39.7%)	6503 (64.3%)	2715/4023 (67.5%)	5564 (55.0%)	2164/4023 (53.7%)
	Rural		4748 (46.9%)		3229/4748 (69.5%)		2728/4748 (57.4%)
	Tribal		1339 (13.2%)		489/1339 (36.5%)		672/1339 (50.2%)

233 *Column % is given whereas for all other figures, the denominator is the number of round one

234

235 In round two higher proportion of participants from the rural area remained in the study compared

236 to the urban participants across all sites. In contrast to this, higher attrition rate was seen in the

237 rural area in round three across all sites. **(Supplementary Table 2.)** The overall proportion of

238 males in all three rounds was lower than females. The recruited participants were mostly older

239 than 10 years and younger than 60 years. This age group formed nearly 70% of all the participants

240 and remained stable across the three rounds. **(Supplementary Table 3.)**

241 **Supplementary Table 3. Distribution of total participants in urban and rural area by survey**
 242 **round, sex, and age group**

Variable		Rural n (%)			Urban n (%)			Tribal n (%)		
		Round One (n=4748)	Round Two (n=3299)	Round Three (n=2728)	Round One (n=4023)	Round Two (n=2715)	Round Three (n=2164)	Round One (n=1339)	Round Two (n=489)	Round Three (n=672)
Sex	Male	2060 (43.4)	1349 (40.9)	1057 (38.7)	1906 (47.4)	1240 (45.7)	956 (44.2)	554 (41.4)	178 (36.4)	262 (38.9)
	Female	2688 (56.6)	1950 (59.1)	1671 (61.3)	2117 (52.6)	1475 (54.3)	1208 (55.8)	785 (58.6)	311 (63.6)	410 (61.1)
Age Group	1-4 years	35 (0.7)	25 (0.7)	20 (0.7)	10 (0.3)	5 (0.2)	4 (0.2)	0	0	0
	5-9 years	179 (3.4)	120 (3.6)	101 (3.7)	130 (3.2)	83 (3.1)	64 (2.9)	13 (0.9)	4 (0.8)	6 (0.9)
	10-14 years	386 (8.1)	276 (8.4)	225 (8.3)	283 (7.0)	195 (7.2)	148 (6.8)	50 (3.7)	7 (1.4)	21 (3.1)
	15-19 years	430 (9.1)	291 (8.8)	231 (8.5)	285 (7.1)	180 (6.6)	114 (5.3)	80 (5.9)	13 (2.6)	30 (4.5)
	20-29 years	747 (15.7)	473 (14.3)	389 (14.3)	581 (14.4)	348 (12.8)	247 (11.4)	242 (18.1)	74 (15.1)	92 (13.7)
	30-39 years	795 (16.7)	549 (16.7)	450 (16.5)	638 (15.8)	412 (15.2)	353 (16.3)	290 (21.6)	108 (22.1)	173 (25.7)
	40-49 years	784 (16.5)	550 (16.7)	476 (17.5)	748 (18.6)	502 (18.5)	414 (19.1)	261 (19.5)	99 (20.3)	139 (20.7)
	50-59 years	616 (12.9)	428 (12.9)	357 (13.1)	621 (15.4)	442 (16.3)	353 (16.3)	188 (14.0)	92 (18.8)	96 (14.3)
	60-69 years	475 (10.0)	359 (10.8)	292 (10.7)	492 (12.2)	371 (13.6)	323 (14.9)	129 (9.6)	57 (11.6)	75 (11.9)
	70+ years	301 (6.3)	228 (6.9)	187 (6.8)	235 (5.8)	177 (6.5)	144 (6.7)	86 (6.4)	35 (7.2)	40 (5.9)

243

244 Of those lost to follow-up in urban areas, 655 (50%) participants in round two and 469 (32.3%)
 245 participants in round three were not traceable even after three domiciliary visits. The second most
 246 common reason for attrition was refusal to continue participation in the study (37.2% in urban,
 247 47.3% in rural, and 98.9% in tribal areas). In round three, the proportion who refused to
 248 participate was higher than those who couldn't be traced. (Supplementary Table 4.)

249 **Supplementary Table 4. Distribution of reasons for loss to follow up participants by round**
 250 **area**

251

Reasons for loss to follow up	Urban		Rural		Tribal	
	Round Two n= 1308 (%)	Round Three n= 1859 (%)	Round Two n= 1449 (%)	Round Three n= 2020 (%)	Round Two n= 850 (%)	Round Three n= 667 (%)
Refused	487 (37.2)	873 (46.9)	685 (47.3)	1084 (53.7)	841 (98.9)	665 (99.7)
Deceased	8 (0.6)	13 (0.7)	9 (0.6)	14 (0.7)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)

Sick at the time of visit	158 (12.1)	335 (18.0)	286 (19.7)	379 (18.7)	7 (0.8)	0
Could not be found at home after three visit	655 (50.1)	638 (34.3)	469 (32.3)	543 (26.8)	0	0

252
253 The overall seroprevalence was 73.9% (95% CI: 73.1 – 74.8) in round one which increased to
254 90.7% (95% CI: 89.9 – 91.4) in round two and 92.9% (95% CI: 92.2 – 93.6) in round three. The
255 highest seroprevalence in round one was at the Gorakhpur site (91.7%, 95% CI: 90.5 – 92.9)
256 whereas the lowest was at the Bhubaneswar site (64.1%, 95% CI: 62.0 – 66.3) giving a wide range
257 of seroprevalence across the study sites. The seroprevalence in round two was similar across all
258 the sites ranging from 83.8% (95% CI: 82.0 – 85.6) to 94.9% (95% CI: 93.5 – 96.1). The range of
259 seroprevalence further narrowed down in round three. **(Table 1.)**

260 **Table 1: Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive participants by site and round**
261

Study site	Round One n (%)		Round Two n (%)		Round Three n (%)	
	Sample size	Seropositive n (%) 95% CI	Sample size	Seropositive n (%) 95% CI	Sample size	Seropositive n (%) 95% CI
Delhi	2060	1373 (66.6) (64.6 - 68.7)	1569	1485 (94.7) (93.4 – 95.7)	1395	1336 (95.8) (94.5 – 96.7)
Bhubaneswar	2000	1283 (64.1) (62.0 – 66.3)	1704	1429 (83.8) (82.0 – 85.6)	1473	1284 (87.2) (85.3 – 88.8)
Gorakhpur	2010	1845 (91.7) (90.5 – 92.9)	1151	1093 (94.9) (93.5 – 96.1)	937	903 (96.4) (94.9 – 97.5)
Agartala	2000	1254 (62.7) (60.5 – 64.8)	856	776 (90.7) (88.5 – 92.5)	1095	1020 (93.2) (91.5 – 94.6)
Pondicherry	2040	1719 (84.2) (82.6 – 85.8)	1222	1114 (91.6) (89.4 – 92.6)	664	627 (94.4) (92.4 – 96.1)
Total	10110	7474 (73.9) (73.1 – 74.8)	6503	5897 (90.7) (89.9 – 91.4)	5564	5170 (92.9) (92.2 -93.6)

262
263 In round one the seroprevalence was higher in the urban area across all the sites; the overall
264 seroprevalence in urban area was 81.5% and rural 69.6% and 66.7% in the tribal area. In round

265 two these were 91.1% in urban, 90.4% in rural, and 90.4% in tribal area. Whereas, in round three
 266 it was 91.8%, 94.1%, and 91.6% in urban, rural, and tribal area respectively. **(Supplementary**
 267 **Table 5.)**

268 **Supplementary Table 5. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive of participants by site,**
 269 **round and area**

270

Sites	Area	Round One		Round Two		Round Three	
Delhi	Urban	1373 (66.6)	749 (74.8)	1485 (94.6)	721 (97.3)	1336 (95.8)	679 (98.4)
	Rural		624 (58.9)		764 (92.3)		657 (93.2)
Bhubaneswar	Urban	1283 (64.1)	732 (73.2)	1428 (83.0)	669 (81.6)	1284 (87.2)	566 (80.9)
	Rural		551 (55.1)		759 (85.8)		718 (92.7)
Gorakhpur	Urban	1845 (91.7)	948 (94.6)	1093 (94.9)	537 (97.1)	903 (96.4)	420 (97.7)
	Rural		897 (88.9)		556 (92.9)		483 (95.3)
Agartala	Tribal	1254 (62.7)	893 (66.7)	777 (90.7)	442 (90.4)	1020 (93.2)	615 (91.6)
	Rural		361 (54.6)		335 (91.0)		405 (95.5)
Pondicherry	Urban	1719 (84.2)	849 (83.2)	1114 (91.2)	545 (90.6)	627 (94.4)	323 (93.6)
	Rural		870 (85.3)		569 (91.6)		304 (95.3)
Total	Urban	7474 (73.9)	3278 (81.5)	5897 (90.7)	2472 (91.1)	5170 (92.9)	1988 (91.8)
	Rural		3303 (69.6)		2983 (90.4)		2567 (94.1)
	Tribal		893 (66.7)		442 (90.4)		615 (91.6)

271

272 Sex-wise seroprevalence in round one was 73.8% among males, and 74.0% among females. In
 273 round two it was 89.4% among males, and 91.7% among females. In round three, the
 274 seroprevalence among males was 91% and among females, it was 94.3%. **(Table 2.)**

275

276

277

278 **Table 2: Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive participants by site, round, and sex**
 279

		Agartala		Bhubaneshwar		Delhi		Gorakhpur		Puducherry		Total	
		Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e	Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e	Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e	Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e	Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e	Sampl e size	Sero- positiv e
		n	n (%)	n	n (%)	n	n (%)	n	n (%)	n	n (%)	N	n (%)
Male	Roun d one	803	508	926	596	930	588	1035	955	834	697	4528	3343
			(63.3)		(64.4)		(63.2)		(92.2)		(83.6)		(73.8)
	Roun d Two	300	268	780	642	682	631	558	530	447	402	2767	2473
			(89.3)		(82.3)		(92.5)		(95.0)		(89.9)		(89.4)
	Roun d Three	397	365	656	553	573	538	423	406	226	208	2275	2070
			(91.9)		(84.3)		(93.9)		(96.0)		(92.0)		(91.0)
Femal e	Roun d one	1197	746	1074	687	1130	785	975	890	1206	1022	5582	4131
			(62.3)		(63.9)		(69.5)		(91.4)		(84.7)		(74.0)
	Roun d Two	556	508	924	786	887	854	593	563	775	712	3736	3424
			(91.4)		(85.1)		(96.3)		(94.9)		(91.9)		(91.7)
	Roun d Three	697	655	817	731	822	798	513	497	440	422	3289	3101
			(93.8)		(89.5)		(97.1)		(96.7)		(95.7)		(94.3)

280
 281 The seroprevalence among participants aged less than 18 years was 67.1%, 82.3%, and 85.1% in
 282 rounds one, two, and three, respectively. The seroprevalence among the participants aged 18 years
 283 or older was 75.2%, 92.2%, and 94.2% in the three rounds, respectively. **(Table 3.)**

284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298

299 **Table 3: Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive of participants by site, round and age**
 300 **group (<18 years and ≥18 years)**
 301

Age category		Agartala		Bhubaneshwar		Delhi		Gorakhpur		Puducherry		Total	
		Sample size	Sero-positive	Sample size	Sero-positive	Sample size	Sero-positive	Sample size	Sero-positive	Sample size	Sero-positive	Sample size	Sero-positive
		n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	N	n
			(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)		(%)
< 18 years	Round one	230	108 (47.0)	320	175 (54.7)	281	183 (65.1)	339	282 (83.2)	372	286 (76.9)	1542	1034 (67.1)
	Round Two	75	58 (77.3)	283	218 (77.0)	223	203 (91.0)	193	164 (85.4)	218	173 (79.4)	992	816 (82.3)
	Round Three	111	95 (84.8)	244	198 (81.2)	183	164 (89.1)	165	148 (89.7)	92	73 (79.4)	795	678 (85.1)
≥ 18 years	Round one	1770	1146 (64.8)	1680	1108 (66.0)	1779	1190 (66.9)	1671	1563 (93.5)	1668	1433 (86.0)	8568	6440 (75.2)
	Round Two	781	718 (91.9)	1421	1210 (85.2)	1346	1282 (95.3)	959	929 (96.9)	1004	941 (93.7)	5511	5080 (92.2)
	Round Three	983	925 (94.1)	1229	1086 (88.4)	1210	1172 (96.8)	772	755 (97.8)	575	557 (96.9)	4769	4495 (94.2)

302
 303 The proportion of symptomatic individuals among the seropositive was 26.5% overall in round
 304 one. The proportion of symptomatic declined slightly in round two (25.1%) and further declined
 305 to 20.1% in round three. **(Supplementary Table 6.)**

306 **Supplementary Table 6: Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive of participants by round,**
 307 **symptom status and site**

Round	Symptom status	Agartala		Bhubaneswar		Delhi		Gorakhpur		Puducherry		Total	
		Seropositive	n (%)	Seropositive	n (%)	Seropositive	n (%)	Seropositive	n (%)	Seropositive	n (%)	Seropositive	n (%)
Round one	Symptoms Positive	1254	339 (27.0)	1283	384 (29.9)	1373	443 (32.3)	1845	569 (30.8)	1719	247 (14.4)	7474	1982 (26.5)
	Symptoms Negative		915 (72.9)		899 (70.0)		930 (67.7)		1276 (69.2)		1472 (85.6)		5492 (73.5)
Round Two	Symptoms Positive	776	290 (37.4)	1429	248 (17.4)	1485	255 (17.2)	1093	612 (55.9)	1114	72 (6.5)	5897	1477 (25.1)
	Symptoms Negative		486 (62.6)		1181 (82.6)		1230 (82.8)		481 (44.1)		1042 (93.5)		4420 (74.9)
Round Three	Symptoms Positive	1020	139 (13.6)	1284	136 (10.6)	1336	249 (18.6)	903	459 (50.8)	627	54 (8.6)	5170	1037 (20.1)
	Symptoms Negative		881 (86.4)		1148 (89.4)		1087 (81.4)		444 (49.2)		573 (91.4)		4133 (79.9)

308
 309 The proportion of vaccinated individuals in round one was 31.5% which increased to 58.8% in
 310 round two and 61.0% in round three. The seroprevalence in round one among the vaccinated
 311 individuals was 86.5% whereas among unvaccinated it was 68.1%. In subsequent rounds, the
 312 prevalence reached nearly 95% among vaccinated and around 85% among unvaccinated. (Table
 313 4.)

314 **Table 4: Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive of participants by round, vaccination**
 315 **status and site**

Round	Vaccination status	Agartala		Bhubaneswar		Delhi		Gorakhpur		Puducherry		Total	
		Sample	Seropositive n (%)	Sample	Seropositive n (%)	Sample	Seropositive n (%)	Sample	Seropositive n (%)	Sample	Seropositive n (%)	Sample*	Seropositive n (%)
Round one	Yes	728	621 (85.3)	778	582 (74.8)	214	148 (69.2)	727	706 (97.1)	738	699 (94.7)	3186	2756 (86.5)
	No	1272	633 (49.8)	1222	701 (57.4)	1844	1224 (66.4)	1275	1132 (88.8)	1301	1019 (78.3)	6915	4709 (68.1)
Round Two	Yes	601	570 (94.8)	1072	928 (86.6)	635	614 (96.7)	745	729 (97.9)	769	756 (98.3)	3822	3597 (94.1)
	No	255	206 (80.8)	631	499 (79.1)	933	871 (93.3)	401	359 (89.5)	452	358 (79.0)	2672	2293 (85.8)
Round Three	Yes	763	740 (97.0)	1144	1013 (88.5)	876	856 (97.7)	712	696 (97.7)	505	496 (98.2)	4000	3801 (95.0)
	No	332	280 (84.3)	328	270 (82.3)	510	472 (92.6)	223	205 (91.9)	162	134 (82.7)	1555	1361 (87.5)

316 *9 participants didn't had idea of their vaccination status across all three rounds

317
 318 Among the seropositive rural participants in round one, 98.2% remained positive in round 2. This
 319 percentage remained stable in the urban and tribal areas and in round three also. Among the
 320 seronegative participants, 73.5% in rural, 60.5% in the urban area, and 78.2% in the tribal area
 321 were converted to seropositive in round two. In round three, among seropositive, 45.6% in rural,
 322 25.7% in urban, and 33.3% in tribal area seroconverted to positive. **(Table 5.)**

323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333

334 **Table 5. Distribution of participants by change in SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity status by round**
 335 **and area**

Ba se line	Rural						Urban						Tribal					
	Round Two*			Round Three†			Round Two‡			Round Three			Round Two§			Round Three¶		
	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)	n	Pos n (%)	Ne g n (%)
Se ro +v e	222 2 6 2	40 (1.7)	20 95	207 1 (98.8)	24 (1.2)	21 97	215 7 (98.2)	40 (1.8)	17 15	167 2 (97.5)	43 (2.5)	3 7	308 (97.2)	9 (2.8)	2 3	291 (98.9)	2 (0.6)	
Se ro - ve	1028	756 (73.5)	272 (26.5)	219	100 (45.6)	119 (54.3)	512	310 (60.5)	201 (39.3)	166	43 (25.7)	123 (73.6)	169	133 (78.2)	36 (21.2)	26	9 (33.3)	17 (62.9)

336 *5 borderline in first round got positive in round 2.

337 † 4 borderline in round 2 got positive in round 3

338 ‡ Out of 6 borderline in round 1, 5 were positive and 1 were negative in round 2

339 § Out of the 2 borderline in first round, 1 got positive and 1 got negative in round 2

340 ¶ 1 borderline of round 2 got positive in round 3

341

342 DISCUSSION

343 This nationwide multicentric population-based seroepidemiological cohort study attempted to find
 344 the serum antibody prevalence against SARS-CoV-2 virus among the general population up to 6th
 345 month after the initial serological assessment. The data collection period in round one coincided
 346 with the before and after the second wave of SARS-CoV-2 infection in India. The round two data
 347 were collected during and after the second wave but before the third wave whereas the round three
 348 data collection was done before and after the third wave. At the end of three round more than 50%
 349 participants remained in the study. The rural area participants remained more in the first follow-up
 350 due which may be due to the inherent non-migratory nature and integrity of the area but during the

351 third round lost to follow-up was more compared to the urban area. This may be due to the loss of
352 importance of the pandemic to the rural general population.

353 The overall seroprevalence in round one was 73.9% among which the highest was in the
354 Gorakhpur site. The Gorakhpur site being in a busy international transit point with Nepal and the
355 rapid transmission in the whole state of Uttar Pradesh might be the reason for high seroprevalence.
356 The prevalence was slightly more in an urban area, among the older age (>18 years) group, and
357 among those vaccinated with the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine but was not different between males and
358 females. Our findings were consistent with the fourth nationwide serosurvey where the overall
359 seroprevalence was 67%; and it was not different in urban and rural areas, between male and
360 female but was higher among vaccinated participants.[8] The seroprevalence increased to 90.7%
361 in round two. This time the prevalence in urban areas was closer to the rural area but was slightly
362 higher among the older age group, vaccinated participants. A study done in the similar time
363 period of round two in Delhi reported 89.5% overall seroprevalence among the general population
364 with higher prevalence among the older age group, but little difference between male, female,
365 urban, and rural areas.[9] Another study was done among children and adolescents in Delhi in
366 October 2021, which found 81.8% prevalence among the age group <18 years but no difference
367 between urban and rural areas, male and female participants.[10] In the third round, almost in
368 every category, the seroprevalence was high. However, among the vaccinated individuals still
369 seroprevalence was higher. This indicates that at the time of third wave of SARS-CoV-2 infection
370 in India, almost all individuals had evidence of past infection regardless of age, sex, or area of
371 residence.

372 We also explored the persistence of the immunity up to 6 months after a baseline seropositive
373 result. Our study found that nearly the whole study cohort remained seropositive at the third
374 month and six months in urban, rural, and tribal areas. This indicates the persistence of humoral
375 immunity against SARS-CoV-2 infection for up to six months. A similar seroepidemiological

376 cohort study done in Spain among already diagnosed cases also found that 99% of the participants
377 had persistent antibodies at six months.[11]

378 This was a nationwide multicentric seroepidemiological study involving participants from urban,
379 rural, and tribal areas. The study was done in a close cohort across all the sites. Even after six
380 months of follow-up during the challenging pandemic phase, there was a considerable number of
381 participants remained in the cohort, and at the round, three more than 50% of participants were in
382 the study.

383 Though we could assess total antibody against SRBD the neutralizing antibody couldn't be
384 assessed. Moreover, our follow-up was limited up to six months in this current report. We
385 couldn't assess the adaptive immunity also to have a comprehensive understanding of the total
386 immunity over time. We could not do RTPCR among those who were found negative in previous
387 rounds therefore the follow-up positive antibody could also be due to reinfection or re-exposure.

388

389 **CONCLUSION**

390 This study explored the SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in different sites, groups, and the
391 antibody kinetics up to six months of baseline assessment. The antibody prevalence was high and
392 increased over time. In most of the cases, the seroprevalence was not different based on the area,
393 age group, sex, etc. However the vaccinated individual had a higher antibody prevalence. On the
394 other hand, nearly all the participants had antibody positivity for up to six months. There is a
395 further need for study for longer follow-up and finding actual protection from subsequent
396 infection.

397 **DECLARATION**

398 **Funding:** This work was supported by a research grant (Ref No: **2020/1085497**, Purchase Order:
399 **202630166**) from the WHO Country Office, New Delhi 110016, India.

400 **Availability of data and materials:** The data and materials are not available publicly. It can be
401 obtained upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

402 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

403 **Competing Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest

404 **Acknowledgment:** We thank the WHO Country Office, India team particularly Dr. Mohammad
405 Ahmad (National Professional Officer, WHO) and Dr. Anisur Rahman (Health Emergencies and
406 Research Officer, WHO) for their continuous support. Special thanks to the participants who
407 allowed us to investigate the extent of infection, as determined by seropositivity in the general
408 population, in which COVID-19 virus infection has been reported.

409 **Author statement:** All co-authors have read and approved this manuscript. The corresponding
410 author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria
411 have been omitted. This manuscript represents the honest work done in this multisite
412 seroepidemiological study

413 **Abbreviations**

414 SARS-CoV-2: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2

415 WHO: World Health Organization

416 COVID: Coronavirus Disease

417 ELISA: Enzyme-linked Immunosorbent Assay

418 AIIMS: All India Institute of Medical Sciences

419 NCR: Delhi National Capital Region

420

421 **Reference:**

422 1. Wei Y, Guan J, Ning X, Li Y, Wei L, Shen S, et al. Global COVID-19 Pandemic Waves:

423 limited lessons learned worldwide over the Past Year. Eng Beijing China 2022;13:91–8.

424 2. Mukherjee S, Ray SK. Third Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Prominence of initial public

425 health interference. Infect Disord Drug Targets 2022;22:e080222200919.

- 426 3. Jain VK, Iyengar KarthikeyanP, Vaishya R. Differences between First wave and Second wave
427 of COVID-19 in India. *Diabetes Metab Syndr* 2021;15:1047–8.
- 428 4. Rackimuthu S, Hasan MM, Bardhan M, Essar MY. COVID-19 vaccination strategies and
429 policies in India: The need for further re-evaluation is a pressing priority. *Int J Health Plann*
430 *Manage* 2022;37:1847–50.
- 431 5. Lee ACK, Morling JR. Living with endemic COVID-19. *Public Health* 2022;205:26–7.
- 432 6. Unity Studies: Early Investigation Protocols [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 11]; Available from:
433 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/early-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/early-investigations)
434 [investigations](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/early-investigations)
- 435 7. Wantai : COVID-19 Serology and Molecular Tests [Internet]. Wantai BioPharm [cited 2021
436 Apr 25]; Available from: <http://www.ystwt.cn/covid-19/>
- 437 8. Murhekar MV, Bhatnagar T, Thangaraj JWV, Saravanakumar V, Santhosh KM, Selvaraju S,
438 et al. Seroprevalence of IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among the general population
439 and healthcare workers in India, June–July 2021: A population-based cross-sectional study.
440 *PLoS Med* 2021;18:e1003877.
- 441 9. Sharma P, Basu S, Mishra S, Gupta E, Agarwal R, Kale P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence
442 in Delhi, India, During September-October 2021: A population-based seroepidemiological
443 study. *Cureus* 14:e27428.
- 444 10. Sharma P, Basu S, Mishra S, Singh MM. Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin G antibodies
445 against SARS-CoV-2 in children and adolescents in Delhi, India, from January to October
446 2021: a repeated cross-sectional analysis. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect* 2022;13:184–90.

- 447 11. Domènech-Montoliu S, Puig-Barberà J, Pac-Sa MR, Vidal-Utrillas P, Latorre-Poveda M, Del
448 Rio-González A, et al. Persistence of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies six months after infection
449 in an outbreak with five hundred COVID-19 cases in Borriana (Spain): A prospective cohort
450 study. COVID 2021;1:71–82.

Study Sites Map



Figure 1: Geographical location of the study sites in India

Partnering Institutes

1. All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi 110029, India
2. All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Bhubaneswar, Odisha- 751019, India
3. All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Gorakhpur- 273008, India
4. Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research, Puducherry- 605006, India
5. Agartala Government Medical College, Agartala- 799006, India
6. Translational Health Science and Technology Institute, Faridabad-121001, India

Figure 1. Geographical distribution of the study sites across India