medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Seroprevalence and epidemiological characteristics of immunoglobulin M and G antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people in Wuhan, China

Ruijie Ling*, Yihan Yu*, Jiayu He, Jixian Zhang, Sha Xu, Renrong Sun, Tao Li, Honglong Ji, Huanqiang Wang

*Contributed equally

Department of respiratory medicine, Hubei Provincial Hospital of Integrated Chinese & Western Medicine, Wuhan, Hubei, China（Ruijie Ling MPH, Yihan Yu MD, Jixian Zhang MD, Sha Xu MD, Renrong Sun MD）

Department of Cellular and Molecular Biology, University of Texas Health Science Centre at Tyler, Tyler, Texas, USA（Honglong Ji PhD）

National Institute of Occupational Health and Poison Control, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing, China（Jiayu He MPH, Tao Li MD, Huanqiang Wang PhD）

Correspondence to:

Dr Huan-Qiang Wang, National Institute of Occupational Health and Poison Control, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing, China. wanghq@niohp.chinacdc.cn

Prof Hong-Long Ji, Department of Cellular and Molecular Biology, University of Texas Health Science Centre at Tyler, Tyler, Texas, USA. James.ji@uthct.edu

Prof Tao Li, National Institute of Occupational Health and Poison Control, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Beijing, China. litao@niohp.chinacdc.cn

Summary

Background The seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M (IgM) and immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) may be a more reliable approach to detect true infected population, particularly in asymptomatic persons. Few studies focus on the diagnosis of COVID-19 patients using serological tests. To detect and assess asymptomatic infections of COVID-19 among people in Wuhan, the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic in China, and provide evidence for planning adequate public health measures, we collected and analyzed the clinical data in the Wuhan General Hospital mandatory for 16- to 64-year-old asymptomatic people. This retrospective study estimated the seroprevalence of IgM and IgG and compared the epidemiological characteristics of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2-infected population.

Methods Demographical and radiological data were collected from the Wuhan General Hospital between March 26 and April 28, 2020. Serological tests for IgM and IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 were conducted with a colloidal gold method. Nucleic acid sequences of viruses were detected with RT-PCR. Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS 20.0 software.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Findings Between March 26 and April 28, 2020, 18,391 asymptomatic back-to-work participants were enrolled. Among them, 89 had positivity for IgM (0·48%, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0·38–0·58%); 620 cases had IgG positivity (3·37%, 95% CI: 3·11–3·64%), and 650 cases had either IgG positivity or IgM positivity (3·53%, 95% CI: 3·26–3·80%). After standardizing for the genders and ages in the population of Wuhan, the overall standardized seroprevalence of IgG was 3·33% (95% CI: 3·07–3·59%) and the standardized seroprevalence of IgG was 3·01% (95% CI: 2·69–3·33%) among males and 3·66% (95 % CI: 3·23–4·09%) among females. The standardized seroprevalence of IgG was higher in women than in men with a significant difference (χ^2 = 2,060·3, p < 0·01). By a detection method adjustment, the seroprevalence of IgG was 1·57% (95% CI: 1·39–1·75%) in all medical records, of which males were 1·96% (95% CI: 1·64–2·28%), and females were 1·19% (95% CI: 0·99–1·39%). The assay-adjusted seroprevalence of IgG was higher in women than in men, and the difference was significant (χ^2 = 5,871·0, p < 0·01). The differences were significant for the seroprevalence of IgG among people who went back to work in different categories of workplace (χ^2 = 198·44, p < 0·01). The differences in seroprevalence for IgG positivity or IgM positivity among people who went back to work in different urban and rural areas was also significant (χ^2 = 45·110, p < 0·01). Calculated as IgG and/or IgM antibody positivity, the number of new infections was reduced by 64 ·8% from March 26 to April 28, 2020. Based on the census population aged 16–64 years in Wuhan in 2017, we estimated that 172,340 (95% CI: 157,568–187,112) asymptomatic people aged 16–64 years were infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan between March 25 and April 28, 2020. This estimate was 3·4-times higher than the officially reported 50,333 infections on April 28.

Interpretation The seropositivity rate in Wuhan indicated that RT-PCR-confirmed patients only represented a small part of the total number of cases. Seropositivity progressively decreased in the Wuhan population from March 26 to April 28, 2020, comparable to Japan and Denmark, but well below the level reported in New York, Iran, Italy, and Germany. The prevalence of asymptomatic infection was higher in women than in men among people who went back to work in Wuhan. The low seroprevalence suggests that most of the population remains susceptible to COVID-19.

Funding The Emergency Management Project of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81842035) and Advisory Research Project of the Chinese Academy of Engineering in 2019 (2019-XZ-70).

Keywords: COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; serological testing; IgG; IgM; seroprevalence

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The first case of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), which is caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), was reported on December 8, 2019, in Wuhan, Hubei Province.[1,2] The Chinese public health, clinical, and scientific communities promptly responded in timely recognition of the new virus and shared the viral gene sequence to the world.[3,4] The World Health Organization (WHO) termed the disease COVID-19 in January 2020.[2] The pandemic is the third coronavirus outbreak in the last 20 years, with severe acute respiratory syndrome caused by SARS-CoV and the Middle East respiratory syndrome by MERS-CoV.[5] As of May 17, 2020, COVID-19 infections occurred globally at more than 4,657,000 human cases and resulted in more than 312,000 human deaths according to the Johns Hopkins University.[6] The clinical symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection vary from mild to the onset of severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. Many patients can be asymptomatic, greatly increasing the uncertainty of diagnosis.[7] A timely and accurate diagnosis of COVID-19 is crucial for limiting further spread of the virus, particularly in people who are asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic, who can be responsible for community transmissions.[8] As Wuhan accepted the timely prevention strategies of lockdown and curbing population flow, it controlled the spread of the pandemic effectively. Nonetheless, there is still a risk of a second outbreak. Therefore, knowing the situation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the general population is necessary. This knowledge has a meaning for the control and prevention of COVID-19 and epidemiological investigations, the determination of post-disease immunity and the use of future vaccine strategies.

Quantitative reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) analysis for SARS-CoV-2 is the gold standard for COVID-19 diagnosis.[9–10] It is time-consuming and requires special equipment with skilled laboratory technicians and has the weakness that easily leads to false negatives for SARS-CoV-2.[9-11] We know SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies appear around 3–10 days after infection, with IgM appearing first and IgG following around 14 days after infection.[12] Even after the symptoms of infection disappear, IgG can still show seropositivity.[13] Therefore, SARS-CoV-2 serological assays are a good supplementary method for nucleic acid detection.[14] Additionally, serological assays allow studying the immune response(s) to SARS-CoV-2 in a dynamic qualitative and quantitative manner. In addition, serological antibody assays can determine the precise rate of infection in an affected area or a certain population, estimate the cumulative incidence and infection fatality rate, and provide parameters for epidemiological models to assess the possible impact of specific interventions, thus guiding public health decision-making. Furthermore, serological assays can be used to elucidate the geographic spread of the virus and identify subgroups of individuals who are more vulnerable to infection. Last, the degree of protection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 infection or reinfection can be determined by serological assays.[15,16] Therefore, testing for antibodies specific to SARS-CoV-2 protein could be an alternative method for rapid laboratory diagnosis with high sensitivity.[12] WHO recommends monitoring changes of seroprevalence over time, which is crucial at the beginning of an epidemic to anticipate and plan an adequate public health response.[9]

At present, relatively few domestic and foreign reports exist on the diagnosis of patients with COVID-19 using serological tests. Thus, we conducted a retrospective study analyzing 18,391 medical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

examination records at a general hospital in Wuhan, Hubei province including IgM and IgG tests for SARS-CoV-2 antibody, nucleic acid tests from March 26 to April 28, 2020 among people aged 16-64 years who went back to work.

Current methods for measuring serum IgM and IgG mainly include enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays, chemiluminescence enzyme immunoassays, lateral flow immunoassays (LFIAs), and fluorescence immunoassays. LFIA specificity can reach about 99% with sensitivity from 80% to 86%. Combined IgG and IgM tests seem to be better choices for sensitivity than measuring either antibody type alone.[17] In our study, the LFIA method had a similar sensitivity and specificity for detecting SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. This study provides a reference for estimating the number of asymptomatic examples of COVID-19, the transmission patterns of the virus, and pandemic prevention strategies.

Materials and methods

This was a cross-sectional, retrospective study to investigate seroprevalence in asymptomatic COVID-19 among people aged 16 to 64 years, who visited a designated hospital for COVID-19 in Wuhan for medical examinations before going back to work. All people lived in Wuhan since the city went into lockdown starting January 22, 2020. Most worked in Wuhan before the lockdown.

Patient selection criteria: Age 16 to 64 years with no fever, headache, or other symptoms of COVID-19 and specific IgG and IgM antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 were detected. Exclusion criteria: No specific test for SARS-CoV-2 antibody or clinical data incomplete. From March 26 to April 28, 2020, 20,929 people visited the hospital for 21,526 medical examinations, of which 2,637 were excluded without antibody testing. There were 18,889 medical examinations that were tested for antibodies with 498 reexaminations. A total of 17,608 people received nucleic acid tests, with one suspected as nucleic acid-positive, and positive for IgG antibodies and negative for IgM antibodies. Among the 783 people without nucleic acid tests, 10 (1·28%) were positive by antibody tests and the rest were negative (98·7%).

A total of 18,391 people met the inclusion criteria with a median age of 40·0 years with 11,177 (60·8%) males with median age 42·0 years and 7,214 (39·2%) females with median age 37·0 years. Clinical data were collected from March 26 to April 28, 2020, including serum IgG positivity and IgM positivity or negative results for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, nucleic acid testing, clinical symptoms, previous medical history, and chest CT. SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection kits (colloidal gold method) were provided by INNOVITA (Tangshan, registration certificate for the medical devices of Peoples Republic of China: 20203400177).[18] All enrolled medical examiners collected 2 ml peripheral venous blood. After centrifugation, serum was taken for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody IgG and IgM detection within 2 hours. Nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swabs used for SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid testing were collected by trained and qualified medical staff for performing nucleic acid tests within 2 hours. The automatic nucleic acid extraction instrument was provided by the Hangzhou Allsheng Instruments Co. Ltd. (Allsheng). The ABI-7500 fluorescence PCR instrument was from Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. All operations were carried out according to kit instructions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Before starting screening for antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, we validated the serological assay[19] with serum samples from 105 patients with COVID-19 confirmed by a SARS-CoV-2 fluorescent PCR kit with nasopharyngeal swabs collected between January 18 and February 22, 2020. The SARS-CoV-2 fluorescent PCR kits were provided by the DAAN Gene Co., Ltd. of Sun Yat-sen University (Registration certificate for medical device of Peoples Republic of China: 20203400060). In the validation test, the serological test showed a sensitivity of 86·7% (91 of 105) for IgG and 76·2% (80 of 105) for IgM antibodies. The detection sensitivity was 89·5% (94 of 105) for IgG and/or IgM antibodies. Second, we conducted the assay using serum samples collected from 138 health workers and 64 people with respiratory symptoms, without SARS-CoV-2. The serological test showed a specificity of 98·0% (198 of 202) for IgG and 99·0% (200 of 202) for IgM antibodies. The detection specificity was 99·0% (200 of 202) for IgG and/or IgM antibodies.

Statistical analysis

SPSS 20·0 statistical software was used for processing data. Proportions for categorical variables were compared either by Pearson Chi-square test or by Fisher's Exact Test. This study estimated the seroprevalence of IgM and IgG with 95% confidence interval (CI). Median with quartile (25th, 75th percentile) was used for non-normal distribution data. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

To correct for the effects of gender and age structure, the seroprevalence of IgM positivity, IgG positivity, and IgM and/or IgG positivity were standardized according to the gender and age-specific population of Wuhan in 2017 (Attachment 2).[19] To correct for effects from accuracy of the serum antibody test, seroprevalence was corrected according to the sensitivity and specificity of the colloidal gold test in previous studies[13] following the Rogan Gladen methods.[20]

Ethics

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Hubei Provincial Hospital of Integrated Chinese & Western Medicine. This was a retrospective and observational study and informed consent was obtained.

Results

Table 1 shows the unadjusted and adjusted seroprevalence for IgG and IgM against SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people aged 16 to 64 by gender. The unadjusted seroprevalence of IgG in females was higher than in males and was significantly different ($x^2 = 6·218$, $p < 0·05$). The unadjusted seroprevalence of IgM in females was slightly higher than in males, but was not significantly different ($x^2 = 0·207$, $p > 0·05$). When IgG and IgM positivity were analyzed together, the unadjusted seroprevalence of IgG positivity and /or IgM positivity in females was higher than in males and was significantly different ($x^2 = 6·865$, $p < 0·01$).

After standardization according to the numbers of people of different ages and genders in the population of Wuhan from the national census of 2017, the age- and gender-adjusted seroprevalence of IgG was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

higher in females than in males and the differences were significant (x^2 = 2,060·3, p < 0·01). After adjusting for ages and genders, and assay sensitivity and specificity, including CI, the overall adjusted seroprevalence of IgG was higher in females than in males. The difference between genders was significant (x^2 = 5,871·0, p < 0·01).

The age- and gender-adjusted seroprevalence of IgG positivity and /or IgM positivity was higher in females than in males, and the difference was significant (x^2 = 979·26, p < 0·01).

After adjusting for ages and genders, and assay type, the overall adjusted serum rate for IgG and /or IgM antibodies was 2·80 (95% CI: 2·56–3·04%) with 2·40 (95% CI: 2·11–2·68) for males and 3·23 (95% CI: 2·82–3·64) for females. Numbers were higher for females than males, and the difference was significant (x^2 = 3,885·7, p < 0·01). The census indicated that the Wuhan population aged 16–64 years in 2017 was 6,155,003. Based on this number, asymptomatic COVID-19-positive individuals aged 16–64 years, using IgG and/or IgM seroprevalence tests, was estimated at 172,340 (95% CI: 157,568–187,112) in Wuhan from March 25 to April 28 2020.

The distributions of seroprevalence of IgG and IgM in the genders and across age groups are in **Figures 1 and 2**. No significant correlation was observed between the seroprevalences of IgG and the different age groups (x^2 = 11·628, p > 0·05). No IgG positivity was detected in the 16- to 19-year age group. The seroprevalences of IgM in different age groups was correlated with age (x^2 = 17·899, p < 0·05), which showed a higher seroprevalence of IgM in the middle-aged group for men and an increased seroprevalence with age for women. No IgM positivity was detected in males or females under 24 years old. The positivity for IgM antibodies for males over 55 years was significantly lower than for females.

The time distribution for the unadjusted seroprevalence of IgM and IgG antibodies is shown in **Figure 3**. The seroprevalences of IgG or IgM in different time periods for medical examinations were correlated with the time period (x^2 = 146·644, p < 0·01; x^2 = 16·846, p < 0·01), with progressively decreased seroprevalence between March 26 to April 28, 2020. The positivity for IgG gradually increased from 3·85% (95% CI: 2·16–5 54%) on March 25-29 when the tests started, to a high of 8·36% (95% CI: 6·72–10·00%) on April 4-8, then dropped steadily to 1·46 (95% CI: 0·93–1·98%) on April 24-28. The positivity for IgM declined slightly and remained at a low level with the highest rate of 1·35% (95% CI: 0·35–2·35%) on March 25-29, and dropped to a low of 0·28% (95% CI: 0·07–0·49%) on April 19-23. Calculated with IgG and/or IgM antibody positivity, the number of new infections was reduced by 64·8% from March 26 to April 28, 2020.

The unadjusted seroprevalence from different types of workplaces and different urban and rural areas is shown in **Table 2**. A significant difference was seen in seroprevalence of IgG among people from different units (x^2 = 198·44, p < 0·01), with no significant difference for IgM (x^2=28·124, p>0·05), and a significant difference for IgG positivity and /or IgM positivity (x^2 = 200·21, p < 0·01). Among the tested individuals, the seroprevalence of IgG was highest for those who voluntarily came for examinations, followed by those reinforced by their work units, including real estate property companies, urban construction companies, telecommunications companies, banks, securities and insurance companies, law firms, and procuratorates. A significant difference was seen in seroprevalence of IgG by urban area (x^2 =

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

43·660, p < 0 01), with no significant difference for IgM (x^2 = 14·783, p > 0·05), and a significant difference for IgG and/or IgM (x^2 = 45·110, p < 0·01). The Wuchang and Jianghan districts had higher seroprevalences of IgG than other urban areas.

Discussion

Detection of asymptomatic or subclinical novel human coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 infections is critical for understanding the overall prevalence and infection potential of COVID-19[21]. However, the seroprevalence data of large population are lacking. Our aim was to estimate the seroprevalence from SARS-CoV-2 infections in China. We evaluated the host serologic response, measured by seroprevalence of IgG and IgM in 18,391 individuals aged 16-64 years. Measurements were for the city of Wuhan, the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic in China, and geographic urban and rural areas in the city during the period from 26 March, 2020 to 28 April, 2020.

According to a study in Denmark, 9,496 blood donors (17-69 years old) who gave blood during April 6–17, 2020 were tested for SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies using a commercial lateral flow test. The seroprevalence adjusted for assay sensitivity and specificity was 1·7% (CI: 0·9–2·3%), and differed by region.[22] A similar cross-sectional study conducted in Japan had an IgG seroprevalence of 3·3% (95% CI: 2·3–4·6%) using 1,000 samples from patients at outpatient settings. After adjusting for ages and genders, the IgG seroprevalence was 2·7% (95% CI: 1·8–3·9%), and the estimated number of infections was 396 to 858 times the number of confirmed cases at the time.[23]

The seroprevalence estimated in our study was adjusted by age and gender, and then for assay sensitivity and specificity, which was comparable to the studies in Japan and Denmark, but lower than preliminary findings for Iran of 22%, New York City of around 14%, Italy of 10%, and Germany of 14%.[24-27] All these studies indicated that the number of asymptomatic infections was much higher than the number of confirmed cases reported based on PCR results.

Our study found that the number of new infections was reduced by 64 8% to a relatively lower level of 1·46 (95% CI: 0·93–1·98%) of the IgG seroprevalence among the urban population aged 16-64 years on April 24-28 in Wuhan compared to the earlier COVID-19 stage. Based on the census population aged 16–64 years in Wuhan in 2017, we estimated that 172,340 (95% CI: 157,568–187,112) asymptomatic people aged 16–64 years were infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan between March 25 and April 28, 2020. This number was 3.4 times higher than the officially reported infections of 50,333 on April 28 (Attachment 2). Of note, the officially reported number included people under age 16 and over age 64, yet was lower than the calculated number in this study, implicating underestimation due to omitted detection of asymptomatic infections. Data from a detailed surveillance study from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention indicates that 80% of confirmed cases were mild, and a number of patients can remain asymptomatic with very low symptomatology.[28] Thus, epidemiological studies of asymptomatic infections should receive sufficient attention.

Some studies find an average level of IgG antibodies that is higher in females than in males.[29] In our

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

study, the IgG seroprevalence was higher in females than in males, indicating that women were more likely to have asymptomatic infections.

People living or working in the Wuchang and Jianghan districts had a higher IgG seroprevalence of 4·60 (95% CI:3·21–5·99) and 4·18 (95% CI:3·80–4·56) respectively than people from other districts of Wuhan in our study. Based on the cumulative number of reported cases of COVID-19 and the number of residents in each district in Wuhan on March 25 and April 28, we estimated an average incidence rate per 100,000 people of 2·98 (95% CI: 2·97–2·99) during this period. Incidence rates were higher in the Jianghan and Wuchang districts, at 8·09 (95% CI: 8·02–8·15) and 7·25 (95% CI: 7·20–7·29) per 100,000 people, respectively, which were the same as our regional distribution analyses (Attachment 2).

Our study found significant differences in IgG seroprevalence among people going back to work by types of jobs, with the highest seroprevalence in volunteer medical examinees who came for tests without a mandate from their job supervisors. These self-motivated individuals had close contacts with COVID-19 patients, and therefore, had a higher risk of infection. Other individuals with high IgG seroprevalence were easy to identify due to the nature of their jobs. They undertook substantial voluntary work in response to government calls during the COVID-19 pandemic, to assist in, for instance, administering in the local residential communities, transporting COVID-19 patients, and screening the general population for epidemic incidence. Thus, they faced a greater chance of contacting infected people during their work, and were more likely to be infected, even with personal protection.

This study had a few limitations. First, this study had selection bias since the analyzed medical records were based on examinees directed by their work units. Most of the examinees came from government-owned institutions and agencies instead of private businesses. Therefore, the sample was incompletely randomized and insufficiently representative, compromising the assessment accuracy of the prevalence of asymptomatic infections in Wuhan. Second, as the examinees were only from the back-to-work population, people under age 16 and over age 64 were not covered in analyses. Therefore, we could not estimate COVID-19 in these two groups. Our study provides information to herd immunity investigation to help design targeted strategies for prevention. Research on serological antibodies has great value for COVID-19 prevention.

Contributors Mr. Ruijie Ling, Mr. Yihan Yu, Dr. Huanqiang Wang and Professor Tao Li were responsible for study design. Mr. Ruijie Ling, Dr. Huanqiang Wang and Miss Jiayu He were responsible for the literature search. Mr. Yihan Yu, Ms. Jixian Zhang, Ms. Sha Xu, Mr. Renrong Sun and Dr. Huanqiang Wang were responsible for data collection. Dr. Huanqiang Wang was responsible for data analysis and figures. Dr. Huanqiang Wang, Professor Hong-Long Ji and Professor Tao Li were responsible for data interpretation. Dr. Huanqiang Wang, Professor Hong-Long Ji and Ms. Jiayu He were responsible for writing the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the final draft.

Acknowledgments We acknowledge the work and contribution of all the health providers from the Hubei Provincial Hospital of Integrated Chinese & Western Medicine. This study was supported with funding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

from the Emergency Management Project of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81842035) and Advisory Research Project of the Chinese Academy of Engineering in 2019 (2019-XZ-70).

Conflicts of interest All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Table 1: Unadjusted and adjusted seroprevalence of IgG, IgM and IgG/IgM of individuals by gender (%, 95% CI)

	N	n_1	IgG^+			n_2	IgM^+		n_3	IgG^+ or IgM^+		
			Unadjusted	Ages and genders adjusted	Assay adjusted		Unadjusted	Ages and genders adjusted		Unadjusted	Ages and genders adjusted	Assay adjusted
Male	11177	347	3·10(2·78,3·42)	3·01(2 69,3·33)	1·19(0·99,1·39)	52	0·47(0·34,0·60)	0·40(0·28,0·52)	363	3·25(2·92,3·58)	3·12(2·80,3·44)	2·40(2·11,2·68)
Female	7214	273	3·78(3·34,4·22)	3·66(3·23,4·09)	1·96(1·64,2·28)	37	0·51(0·35,0·67)	0·57(0·40,0·74)	287	3·98(3·53,4·43)	3·86(3·42,4·30)	3·23(2·82,3·64)
Average	18391	620	3·37(3·11,3·63)	3·33(3·07,3·59)	1·57(1·39,1·75)	89	0·48(0·38,0·58)	0·48(0·38,0·58)	650	3·53(3·26,3·80)	3·48(3·22,3·74)	2·80 (2·56,3·04)

N is the total number of individuals, n_1 is the number of IgG-positive individuals, n_2 is the number of IgM-positive individuals, n_3 is the number of IgG-positive or IgM-positive. IgG^+ is IgG antibody positivity, IgM^+ is IgM antibody positivity, IgG^+ or Ig^+ is IgG antibody positivity or IgM antibody positivity.

Assay adjusted is the adjusted rate of IgG antibody positivity, IgM antibody positivity, IgG antibody positivity or IgM antibody positivity, corrected for sensitivity and specificity of the colloidal gold test in previous studies following the Rogan Gladen methods, to correct for effects from accuracy of the serum antibody test. According to the Rogan Gladen methods, $P=(t+\beta-1)/(\alpha+\beta-1)$, in which P is adjusted seroprevalence, α is sensitivity of the antibody test (colloidal gold method), β is specificity of the antibody test by colloidal gold method, t is age- and gender-adjusted seroprevalence or positive test frequency.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1: Numbers and seroprevalences of IgG positive of 16-64 years old asymptomatic returning workers in Wuhan, China,2020



Figure 2: Numbers and seroprevalences of IgM positive of 16-64 years old asymptomatic returning workers in Wuhan, China,2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3: Time distribution of number and unadjusted seroprevalence of IgG and IgM of 16-64 years old asymptomatic returning workers in Wuhan, China,2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Unadjusted seroprevalence of IgG, IgM and IgG/IgM in different study populations

Types of work units	N	Male ,%	Median age, year (25th, 75th percentile)	IgG+		IgM+		IgG+/IgM+	
				n_1	% (95%CI)	n_2	% (95%CI)	n_3	% (95%CI)
Tap water and natural gas	4788	65·7	42 (35,50)	95	1·98(1·59,2·37)	21	0·44(0·25,0·63)	100	2·09(1·68,2·50)
Real estate	2427	66·8	41 (32,52)	144	5·93(4·99,6·87)	17	0·70(0·37,1·03)	150	6·18(5·22,7·14)
Government institutions	2370	66·2	43 (35,52)	57	2·41(1·79,3·03)	10	0·42(0·16,0·68)	63	2·66(2·01,3·31)
The airport	1800	53·5	31 (26,36)	36	2·00(1·35,2·65)	3	0·17(0·00,0·36)	37	2·06(1·40,2·72)
Banks, securities and insurance companies	1779	46·7	35 (30,45)	89	5·00(3·99,6·01)	17	0·96(0·1,1·41)	96	5·40(4·35,6·45)
Highway management and auto repair	939	76·5	47 (35,54)	40	4·26(2·97,5·55)	8	0·85(0·26,1·44)	43	4·58(3·24,5·92)
Telecommunications companies	750	45·2	35 (31,40)	45	6·00(4·30,7·70)	1	0·13(0·00,0·39)	46	6·13(4·41,7·85)
Law firms, procuratorates	703	51·2	39 (31,50)	40	5·69(3·98,7·40)	2	0·28(0·00,0·67)	40	5·69(3·98,7·40)
Rehab	700	72·7	45 (36,51)	15	2·14(1·07,3·21)	5	0·71(0·09,1·33)	16	2·29(1·18,3·40)
Primary medical care	605	32·7	43 (33,49)	15	2·48(1·24,3·72)	3	0·50(0·00,1·06)	15	2·48(1·24,3·72)
Other service industries	1477	60·4	39 (31,49)	33	2·23(1·48,2·98)	1	0·07(0·00,0·20)	33	2·23(1·48,2·98)
Personal	53	60·4	42 (32,50)	11	20·8(9·83,31·7)	1	1·89(0·00,5·56)	11	20·8(9·83,31·7)
Urban and rural areas									
Jianghan	10420	60·0	41 (33,51)	417	4·00(3·62,4·38)	58	0·56(0·42,0·70)	436	4·18(3·80,4·56)
Huangpi	1808	53·7	31 (26,36)	39	2·16(1·49,2·83)	3	0·17(0·00,0·36)	40	2·21(1·53,2·89)
Hanyang	1506	75·7	46 (34,53)	38	2·52(1·73,3·31)	9	0·6(0·21,0·99)	41	2·72(1·90,3·54)
Jiangan	1455	55·9	43 (33,51)	40	2·75(1·91,3·59)	3	0·21(0·00,0·45)	41	2·82(1·97,3·67)
Qiaokou	961	78·0	36 (30,44)	13	1·35(0·62,2·08)	2	0·21(0·00,0·50)	15	1·56(0·78,2·34)
Wuchang	870	62·2	42 (32,50)	37	4·25(2·91,5·59)	7	0·80(0·21,1·39)	40	4·60(3·21,5·99)
Hongshan	563	45·8	39 (30,49)	14	2·49(1·20,3·78)	4	0·71(0·02,1·40)	15	2·66(1·33,3·99)
Dongxihu	171	80·1	46 (34,52)	4	2·34(0·07,4·61)	2	1·17(0·00,2·78)	4	2·34(0·07,4·61)
Caidian and the others	84	71·4	38 (32,46)	4	4·76(0·21,9·31)	0	0	4	4·76(0·21,9·31)
Outside	553	45·9	41 (32,48)	14	2·53(1·22,3·84)	1	0·18(0·00,0·53)	14	2·53(1·22,3·84)
Total	18391	60·8	40 (32,50)	620	3·37(3·11,3·63)	89	0·48(0·38,0·58)	650	3·53(3·26,3·80)

N is the total number of individuals, n_1 is the number of IgG-positive individuals, n_2 is the number of IgM-positive individuals, n_3 is the number of IgG-positive or IgM-positive. Real estate includes real estate agencies, residential property management firms, and urban construction corporations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020; **395**(10223): 507-13.

2. Purcell LN, Charles AG. An Invited Commentary on "World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel Coronavirus (COVID-19)": Emergency or new reality? *International journal of surgery (London, England)* 2020; **76**: 111.

3. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *The New England journal of medicine* 2020; **382**(8): 727-33.

4. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature* 2020; **579**(7798): 265-9.

5. Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. *Journal of autoimmunity* 2020; **109**: 102433.

6. University JH. COVID-19 Case Tracker. 2020. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/ (accessed 2 June 2020 2020).

7. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Annals of internal medicine* 2020; **172**(9): 577-82.

8. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* 2020; **25**(10).

9. Organization WH. Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation protocol for COVID-19 virus infection, 17 March 2020. 2020. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331656 (accessed 2 June 2020 2020).

10. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerging microbes & infections* 2020; **9**(1): 386-9.

11. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* 2020; **20**(5): 565-74.

12. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2020.

13. Tan W, Lu Y, Zhang J, et al. Viral Kinetics and Antibody Responses in Patients with COVID-19. 2020: 2020.03.24.20042382.

14. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, et al. Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG combined antibody test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis. *Journal of medical virology* 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Ou X, Liu Y, Lei X, et al. Characterization of spike glycoprotein of SARS-CoV-2 on virus entry and its immune cross-reactivity with SARS-CoV. *Nature communications* 2020; **11**(1): 1620.

16. Crawford KHD, Eguia R, Dingens AS, et al. Protocol and Reagents for Pseudotyping Lentiviral Particles with SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein for Neutralization Assays. *Viruses* 2020; **12**(5).

17-21. Kontou PI, Braliou GG, Dimou NL, Nikolopoulos G, Bagos PG. Antibody Tests in Detecting SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Meta-Analysis. *Diagnostics (Basel, Switzerland)* 2020; **10**(5).

18. Zhang W, Lu X, Huang C, et al. Clinical Evaluation and Application of Detection for SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG Antibodies with Colloidal Gold Immunochromatography Assay. *Chinese Journal of Virology* 2020; **36(03):348-354**.

19. House CAJEP. Population grouped by age(2017). . Wuhan Statistical Yearbook-2018; 2020.

20. Rogan WJ, Gladen B. Estimating prevalence from the results of a screening test. *American journal of epidemiology* 1978; **107**(1): 71-6.

21. Xin X, Jian S, Sheng N,et al.Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M and G antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in China.*Nature Medicine* 2020;https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41591-020-0949-6.

22. Erikstrup C, Hother CE, Pedersen OBV, et al. Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality rate by real-time antibody screening of blood donors. 2020: 2020.04.24.20075291.

23. Doi A, Iwata K, Kuroda H, et al. Estimation of seroprevalence of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using preserved serum at an outpatient setting in Kobe, Japan: A cross-sectional study. 2020: 2020.04.26.20079822.

24. Shakiba M, Hashemi Nazari SS, Mehrabian F, Rezvani SM, Ghasempour Z, Heidarzadeh A. Seroprevalence of COVID-19 virus infection in Guilan province, Iran. 2020: 2020.04.26.20079244.

25. What the first data of Robbio reveal, the only Italian country to take immunity tests on all citizens. 2020. https://it.businessinsider.com/esclusiva-cosa-rivelano-i-primi-test-di-robbioprimo-paese-italiano-afare-i-test-sullimmunita-a-tutti-i-cittadini/ (accessed 23 April 2020 2020).

26. Regalado A. Blood tests show 14% of people are now immune to covid-19 in one town in Germany. 2020. https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/04/09/999015/blood-tests-show-15-of-people-are-now-immune-to-covid-19-in-one-town-in-germany/ (accessed 23 April 2020 2020).

27. Higgins-Dunn N, Breuninger K, Kim J. New York antibody study estimates 13.9% of residents have had the coronavirus, Gov. Cuomo says. 2020. https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/23/new-york-antibody-study-estimates-13point9percent-of-residents-have-had-the-coronavirus-cuomo-says.html (accessed 24 April 2020 2020).

28. Response EWGfNE. [The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) in China]. *Zhonghua liu xing bing xue za zhi = Zhonghua liuxingbingxue zazhi* 2020; **41**(2): 145-51.

29. Zeng F, Dai C, Cai P, et al. A comparison study of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody between male and female COVID-19 patients: a possible reason underlying different outcome between gender.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132423; this version posted June 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

2020: 2020.03.26.20040709.