

Supplemental File 1: Protocol for a “living” rapid systematic review on the results of SARS-CoV-2 sero-surveys

1. Objective

To provide up-to-date synthesis of the results of SARS-CoV-2 sero-surveys globally.

2. Methods

a. Approach for the “living rapid review”

To conduct this “living” rapid review, we will use abbreviated systematic review methods informed by Cochrane guidance.¹ Pairs of reviewers will pilot screen 50 articles and extract 5 articles in duplicate. All subsequent screening and data extraction will be completed by one reviewer and verified by a second. Risk of bias assessments will be completed by two authors independently and in duplicate. Discrepancies will be resolved by discussion.

b. Criteria for including evidence

Characteristics	Criteria for inclusion ^a
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Humans - any age
Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection (a.k.a. novel coronavirus, COVID-19)
Types of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposed or ongoing sero-surveys – defined as the collection and testing of serum (or proxy such as oral fluid) specimens from a sample of a defined population over a specified period of time to estimate the prevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 as an indicator of immunity² ● Cross-sectional and cohort study designs, with serum measurements at single time points or repeated at multiple time points ● Published or unpublished academic literature, grey literature, media reports, or press releases
Outcome measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Report or provide data to calculate seroprevalence estimates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seropositive prevalence (proportion with detectable antibodies) ○ Seronegative prevalence (proportion without detectable antibodies) ○ Seroprotected prevalence (proportion above protective antibody threshold) ○ Non-seroprotected prevalence (proportion with no detectable antibodies or below the protective antibody threshold) ○ Count/proportion of a population screened/unscreened
Languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Any

^aEvidence must meet all the criteria to be included.

¹Cochrane guidance on rapid reviews <https://methods.cochrane.org/rapidreviews/cochrane-rr-methods>

²https://www.who.int/immunization/monitoring_surveillance/burden/laboratory/Serosurvey_Manual_chapter_1.pdf

c. Criteria for excluding evidence

Characteristics	Criteria for exclusion
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-human (e.g., <i>in silico</i>, animal, <i>in vitro</i>)
Condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active SARS-CoV-2 infection (a.k.a. novel coronavirus, COVID-19) • Presence of SARS-CoV-2 antigen
Types of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on COVID-19, but unrelated to serosurveillance (e.g., viral properties, general information about COVID-19) • Study designs other than cross-sectional or cohort design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Case reports, case-control studies, evaluations of serological tests, reviews of serological studies • Serological studies that only include patients with previously confirmed COVID-19 infection • Serological study protocols without an implementation plan that includes a proposed region, sample size, and approximate start date
Outcome measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only reports incidence or prevalence of serum SARS-CoV-2 antigen
Languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

d. Search methods

We will search electronic data sources from December 1, 2019 to April 18, 2020 using search terms related to SARS-CoV-2 and sero-surveillance. See Appendix 1 for the complete search strategy. We will search for published and unpublished academic studies in databases (PubMed, MedRXIV and BioRXIV) and high-impact medical journals (BMJ, JAMA, NEJM, The Lancet, Annals of Internal Medicine); reports by governments, NGOs, and health systems; and media reports via Google News. The search strategy will be pilot-tested and validated using a key set of sero-surveillance studies, reports, and news releases from multiple countries.

e. Strategy for updating evidence

We will subscribe to daily automatic email alerts for the electronic databases, journals, and media resources. These will be directed to a common Gmail account. Each author will be assigned to an incoming source of evidence for updated screening and extraction.

f. Data extraction

We will extract the data elements listed in the table below from included articles.

Variable	Description
Study/article level	
Source of publication	Categorical: published academic study, preprint*, media report / news release*, government / NGO / health system report*
Organization conducting survey	Free text
Country in which study was carried out	Free text
State in which study was carried out	Free text
Municipality in which study was carried out	Free text
Type of study	Categorical: cross-sectional, repeated cross-sectional, cohort studies
Status of study	Categorical: proposed, ongoing, finished
Start date for testing	Date
End date for testing	Date
Prevalence estimate level	
Population of interest	Free text
Description of study sampling approach	Free text
Isotype reported	Categorical: IgG, IgA, IgM, IgD, IgE
Test type	Categorical: immunochromatographic, ELISA, LFIA, S-FLOW, RDT
Test manufacturer	Free text
Description of how test was validated	Free text
Approving regulator	Free text

Test sensitivity %	Numeric
Test sensitivity, 95% confidence interval upper	Numeric
Test sensitivity, 95% confidence interval lower	Numeric
Test specificity %	Numeric
Test specificity, 95% confidence interval upper	Numeric
Test specificity, 95% confidence interval lower	Numeric
Serum positive prevalence, %	Numeric
Serum positive prevalence, 95% confidence interval upper	Numeric
Serum positive prevalence, 95% confidence interval lower	Numeric
Numerator value (number positive)	Free text
Numerator definition, indicating how a test is defined as positive	Free text
Denominator value (n), indicating total sample size	Numeric
Infection fatality rate, %	Numeric
Infection fatality rate, 95% confidence interval upper	Numeric
Infection fatality rate, 95% confidence interval lower	Numeric
JBI rank indicating overall risk of bias**	Categorical: low, moderate, high

* Additional categories not listed here will be used to allow labeling of preprints as “now published” and of grey literature and media articles as secondary findings.

** See Appendix 2 for additional notes on how a JBI rank will be obtained.

g. Duplicate news articles and data

If news articles report duplicate information, we will include the article that provides the most complete information and exclude the duplicates. If multiple news stories report on a study and each provide unique data the article with the most information will be presented as the primary record, and additional articles will be included but flagged as supporting articles. Details from these partially overlapping articles will be extracted to create the most complete record of information for each prevalence estimate. Any conflicting information will be noted and all sets of information will be presented.

h. Data analysis

Data will be summarized using counts and proportions.

i. Critical appraisal

Estimates of prevalence will be critically appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Tool for Prevalence Studies.³ Two authors will apply the criteria independently and in duplicate. Based on these criteria an overall risk of bias assessment will be provided (i.e., low, moderate, high, unclear). The criteria will be used to assess the extent to which systematic bias may have been introduced, the nature of the potential bias, and the magnitude of the potential bias. See Appendix 2 for additional notes of how the checklist was adapted for use in this rapid review.

j. Data presentation

All data will be presented on a publicly accessible online platform (i.e., AirTable). We will design built-in filters that allow users to sort prevalence estimates by region (i.e., states, provinces) and population (i.e., age, sex, health care workers, long term care residents, people aged 65+, people with chronic diseases/multi-morbidity). To contextualize each prevalence estimate we will extract the number of total confirmed cases per one million population for the country from the World O Meter COVID-19 tracker.⁴ We will extract the number of confirmed cases on the start date for the prevalence study.

k. Limitations

This review may have some limitations. Firstly, it is possible that articles will be missed by only searching one academic database of peer-review articles. That said, the supplemental search will include the five high-impact journals and two pre-print databases. Secondly, we will not be conducting article screening or extraction using two independent authors. However, we will pilot test screening and extraction in duplicate to ensure reliability. Furthermore, a second author will verify screening decisions and extracted data.

3) Summary

This “living” rapid systematic review utilises a novel approach to provide up-to-date synthesis of the results of SARS-CoV-2 sero-surveys from around the world. We hope the results will deepen our scientific understanding of global seroprevalence, and thereby contribute to the design and conduct of scientific studies and public health strategies.

³Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13(3):147–153.

⁴ <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>

Appendix 1. Search strategies

Terms used to build search strategies:

Covid synonyms: novel coronavirus; coronavirus; COVID-19; SARS Cov-2; severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; wuhan virus

Serosurveillance synonyms: antibody; antibodies; serological; serology; serum; plasma; blood; RDT; ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; immune; immunity; surveillance; screening; prevalence; seroprevalence; serosurvey

Type of evidence: published academic work* December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020			
Source	Search strategy		Hits
Pubmed	1	((("Immunoglobulins"[Mesh] OR antibody OR "anti-body" OR "antibodies" OR "anti-bodies" OR "Serologic Tests"[Mesh] OR "Immunoassay"[Mesh] OR "Serology"[Mesh] OR serosurvey OR "sero-survey"))))	
	2	((coronavirus OR corona-virus OR covid 19 OR covid-19 OR covid19 OR covid 2019 OR covid-2019 OR covid 2019 OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2" OR SARS-CoV-2 OR sars cov-2 OR sars-cov 2 OR sar cov 2 OR wuhan virus))**	
	3	("2019/12"[Date - Publication] : "3000"[Date - Publication])	
	4	1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4	288
BMJ	1	Coronavirus Date: after 2020-12-01 Category: research	9
JAMA	1	Section: coronavirus Terms: antibod* OR sero* Category: research articles	6
NEJM	1	(Covid* OR coronavirus)	
	2	(immun* OR sero* OR antibod*)	
	3	Category: research Date: past 6 months	
	4	1 AND 2 AND 3	6

Lancet	1	(antibody OR Serologic tests)	
	2	Category: Covid-19 and Coronavirus	
	3	Date: past 6 months	3
Annals of Internal Medicine	1	(Covid OR coronavirus)	
	2	(serologic testing OR antibodies OR antibody)	
	3	1 AND 2	1

*Updates for pubmed via RSS; updates for journals via RSS and VisualPing

**Covid search filter adapted from the CDCs

Type of evidence: unpublished academic work*			
December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020			
Source	Search strategy		Hits
Pre-prints: BioRxiv and MedRXIV	1	(Coronavirus OR COVID-19 OR SARS Cov-2)	
	2	(antibod* OR sero* OR screen* OR diagnostic* OR immun* OR Ig*)	
	3	(test*)	
	4	Date filter: December 1, 2019 to present	
	5	1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4	787
Pre-prints: BioRxiv and MedRXIV	1	(Coronavirus OR COVID-19 OR SARS Cov-2)	
	2	(enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay OR neutralization assay OR rapid diagnostic test)	
	3	Date filter: December 1, 2019 to present	
	4	1 AND 2 AND 3	39

*Updates via email using keyword alerts with the search terms

Notes: Search terms max 128 characters

5 <https://www.cdc.gov/library/researchguides/2019novelcoronavirus/pubmedsearchalert.html>

Type of evidence: grey literature academic work*			
December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020			
Source	Search strategy		Hits
WHO Situation Reports	1	“antibod”, “sero”, “immun”, “ELISA”	7
WHO	1	(Coronavirus OR COVID-19 OR SARS Cov-2)	
	2	(antibodies OR serosurveillance OR serological OR ELISA)	
	3	Domain: who.int Sort: Sort by date Find results with all of the words: 1 AND 2	58
NIH	1	("COVID" OR "SARS-CoV-2")	
	2	("sero*" OR "antibod*" OR "immun*" OR "RDT" OR "ELISA " OR "LFIA ")	
	3	allintext:(1 AND 2) site:nih.gov -site:ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	
	4	Date Filter: December 1, 2019 to April 18, 2020	
	5	3 AND 4	8
CDC	1	("COVID" OR "SARS-CoV-2")	
	2	("sero*" OR "antibod*" OR "immun*" OR "RDT" OR "ELISA " OR "LFIA ")	
	3	allintext:(1 AND 2) site:cdc.gov	
	4	Date Filter: December 1, 2019 to April 18, 2020	
	5	3 AND 4	42
ECDC	1	("COVID" OR "SARS-CoV-2")	
	2	("sero*" OR "antibod*" OR "immun*" OR "RDT" OR "ELISA " OR "LFIA ")	

	3	allintext:(1 AND 2) site:ecdc.europa.eu	
	4	Date Filter: December 1, 2019 to April 18, 2020	
	5	3 AND 4	4

*Updates via email subscription to relevant newsletters for NIH and CDC and via VisualPing for WHO Situation Reports and ECDC

Notes: WHO Situation Reports are PDF documents and will be individually searched using the Ctrl+F functionality for each term listed above

Type of evidence: Clinical research registry December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020			
Source	Search strategy		Hits
World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP)	1	Covid-19 records downloaded from WHO ICTRP https://www.who.int/ictrp/en/	1,829
	2	Keyword: antibody OR sero* OR immun*	
	3	NOT: patient, plasma, vaccin*, treatment	
	4	1 AND 2 AND 3	49

Notes: The WHO ICTRP receives records from 17 national and multinational clinical trials registers, including Clinicaltrials.gov, EU Clinical Trials Register (EU-CTR), Chinese Clinical Trials Register (CHiCTR) and the Iranian Clinical Trials Register (ICTR).

Type of evidence: news reports December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020			
Source	Search strategy		Hits
Google news	1	(coronavirus OR covid-19 OR sars cov-2 OR SARS-CoV-2 OR wuhan virus)	
	2	(antibody OR antibodies OR surveillance OR screen OR serology OR serological OR serosurvey OR ELISA OR LFIA OR assay OR blood OR serum OR immune OR immunity OR herd immunity OR random test)	
	3	Date filter: December 1, 2019 to May 1, 2020	
	4	1 AND 2 AND 3	290

Google alerts	1	(coronavirus OR covid-19 OR sars cov-2 OR SARS-CoV-2 OR wuhan virus) and	
	2	(antibody OR antibodies OR surveillance OR screen OR serology OR serological OR serosurvey OR ELISA OR LFIA OR assay OR blood OR serum OR immune OR immunity OR herd immunity OR random test)	
	3	Category: News; All results	
	4	Date filter: Daily	
	5	1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4	249

Notes: Will search for English language articles.

Appendix 2. Modified critical appraisal tool for studies reporting prevalence data

Items

1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?
2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?
3. Was the sample size adequate?
4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?
5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?
6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?
7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?
8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?
9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?
10. Overall risk of bias

Risk of Bias	Definition
High	Limited certainty in the prevalence: the true prevalence may be substantially different from the estimated prevalence.
Moderate	Moderate certainty in the prevalence: the true prevalence is likely to be close to the estimate, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.
Low	High certainty in the prevalence estimate: true prevalence is likely close to the estimate.
Unclear	There was insufficient information to assess risk of bias.

Response options

Response options for Questions 1 to 9: Yes/No/Unclear/Not Applicable

Response option for overall risk of bias: Low/Moderate/High/Unclear Risk of Bias

Special considerations for COVID-19 seroprevalence studies

We applied JBI criteria as described, incorporating the below additional considerations specific to COVID-19 seroprevalence studies:

- Item 2
 - Snowball/close contact recruitment were classified as an inappropriate sampling method (due to the transmission of COVID-19)
 - Blood donors were not considered representative of the general population
- Item 3
 - Was the sample size used to determine antibody test characteristics (sensitivity, specificity) sufficient to precisely determine these characteristics?
 - To calculate the required sample size we used an assumed prevalence of 2.5%, which is the global average estimated by the WHO in April, 2020.⁶ Based on

⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/apr/20/studies-suggest-very-few-have-had-covid-19-without-symptoms>

guidance by the Joanna Briggs Institute and published medical statistical recommendations we selected a precision value that was half the assumed prevalence (1.25%)^{7,8}

- Sample size calculation: $n = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{d^2}$
 - Where n = sample size;
 - Z = Z statistic for level of confidence (95%);
 - P = expected prevalence (2.5% WHO global estimate);
 - d = precision (1.25%)
- Item 6
 - Did the antibody test used have sufficient sensitivity and specificity? We used cut-offs selected by the FDA for Emergency Use Authorizations for COVID-19 serological tests: sensitivity minimum 90%, specificity minimum 95%.⁹
 - Independently validated antibody test?
 - Was the antibody test's sensitivity and specificity comparable between manufacturer evaluation and independent evaluation?
 - Did the antibody test used in the study have regulatory approval?
- Item 8
 - Were confidence intervals provided?
 - Robust method for calculation of confidence intervals
 - Did calculation of confidence intervals account for potential non-normality with small sample size?
 - If $n > 50$, $np < 5$, appropriate to approximate binomial with Poisson - Devore's rule of thumb
 - If $np > 5$ and $n(1-p) > 5$, might be appropriate to approximate binomial with normal
 - Exact vs. bootstrap vs. approximate calculation (first two preferable)
 - Was uncertainty in test sensitivity and specificity accounted for in calculating confidence intervals?
 - Are false positives accounted for appropriately?
- Item 10
 - Based on these criteria an overall risk of bias assessment was provided (i.e., low, moderate, high, unclear). The criteria were used to assess the extent to which systematic bias may have been introduced, the nature of the potential bias, and the magnitude of the potential bias. The overall risk of bias reflects the extent to which the estimated prevalence approximates the true prevalence value.

⁷Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc.* 2015;13(3):147–153.

⁸Naing L, Winn T, Ruslil BN. Practical issues in calculating the sample size for prevalence studies. *Archives of Orofacial Sciences* 2006; 1: 9-14

⁹<https://www.fda.gov/media/137470/download>