

1 **COVID-19 Antibody in Thai Community Hospitals**

2 Tanawin Nopsopon, M.D.

3 Lecturer, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok,
4 Thailand

5 tnopsopon@gmail.com

6

7 Krit Pongpirul, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

8 Assistant Professor, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn
9 University, Bangkok,

10 Thailand; Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore,

11 MD, USA; Bumrungrad International Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand

12 doctorkrit@gmail.com

13

14 Korn Chotirosniramit

15 Medical Student, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

16 korn.chotiros@gmail.com

17

18 Narin Hiransuthikul, M.D., Ph.D.

19 Professor, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University,
20 Bangkok, Thailand

21 narin.h@chula.ac.th

22

23 Words: 2,381 words (Text), 217 words (Abstract), 5 tables, 1 figure

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Abstract

Background: COVID-19 seroprevalence data has been scarce, especially in less developed countries with a relatively low infection rate.

Methods: A locally developed rapid IgM/IgG test kit was used for screening hospital staff and patients who required procedural treatment or surgery in 52 hospitals in Thailand from April 8 to June 26, 2020. A total of 857 participants were tested—675 were hospital staff and 182 were pre-procedural patients. (Thai Clinical Trials Registry: TCTR20200426002)

Results

Overall, 5.5% of the participants (47 of 857) had positive immunoglobulin M (IgM), 0.2% (2 of 857) had positive immunoglobulin G (IgG) and IgM. Hospitals located in the Central part of Thailand had the highest IgM seroprevalence (11.9%). Preprocedural patients had a higher rate of positive IgM than the hospital staff (12.1% vs. 3.7%). Participants with present upper respiratory tract symptoms had a higher rate of positive IgM than those without (9.6% vs. 4.5%). Three quarters (80.5%, 690 of 857) of the participants were asymptomatic, of which, 31 had positive IgM (4.5%) which consisted of 20 of 566 healthcare workers (3.5%) and 11 of 124 preprocedural patients (8.9%).

Conclusions

COVID-19 antibody test could detect a substantial number of potential silent spreaders in Thai community hospitals. Antibody testing should be encouraged for mass screening, especially in asymptomatic individuals.

MeSH Keywords: COVID-19, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, Seroepidemiologic Studies, Hospitals, Thailand

45 **Introduction**

46 Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was introduced as a diagnostic test of choice for coronavirus disease 2019
47 (COVID-19) infection. However, it might not be readily available or affordable in many facilities and could pose an
48 unnecessary risk to the healthcare providers during the specimen collection. Besides, a recent study raised a concern
49 of false-negative results from the PCR test for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in
50 patients with high pretest probability and encouraged the development of a highly sensitive test [1]. In Thailand, the
51 PCR test was offered in suspected individuals with strict criteria during the initial phase of the COVID-19
52 pandemic. As a more feasible, cheaper, and safer alternative to the PCR, the antibody test is not only useful for an
53 epidemiological investigation [2] but could also be used for mass screening of potential silent spreaders—
54 asymptomatic COVID-19 individuals.

55 Hospital is one of the best venues for getting and spreading pathogens. There are two types of people in the
56 hospital who potentially are silent spreaders and need antibody testing: (1) healthcare workers who have a relatively
57 higher risk of infection than laypersons, and (2) asymptomatic patients who need procedural treatment or operation
58 but do not meet the criteria for PCR testing.

59 **Methods**

60 From April 8 to June 26, 2020, hospital staff and patients who needed procedural treatment or operation but did not
61 meet the national PCR testing criteria in 244 hospitals (215 community hospitals and 29 general hospitals) from all
62 regions of Thailand were offered antibody testing. Of 215 community hospitals, data from 52 hospitals (24.2%) in
63 35 provinces were readily available for the analysis performed on June 29, 2020. Patients with PCR confirmed
64 COVID-19 infection were quarantined and excluded. Baiya Rapid COVID-19 IgG/IgM test kit (Baiya Phytopharm,
65 Thailand) which reports the presence of immunoglobulin M (IgM) and immunoglobulin G (IgG) qualitatively, was
66 used in this study free of charge. The internal validation of the test kit using the serum of 51 PCR confirmed
67 COVID-19 cases and 150 controls showed sensitivity 94.1% (48 of 51) and specificity 98.0% (147 of 150) for IgM
68 or IgG antibody. Participants with positive IgM were encouraged to have a PCR test if available.

69 *Age-adjusted seroprevalence*

70 PCR confirmed COVID-19 cases were obtained from the Thailand government report on June 30, 2020.
71 Seroprevalence data were presented as unadjusted seroprevalence and compared with direct age-adjusted

72 seroprevalence using combined participating population, Thailand population, and world population provided by
73 world health organization (WHO) for 2000-2025 population.

74 *Statistical analysis*

75 Categorical data were presented with counts and percentages while continuous data were provided with median and
76 interquartile range. The 95% confidence interval (CI) of the seroprevalence was calculated by Wilson's method
77 using binomial probabilities. Correlation between seroprevalence and PCR confirmed COVID-19 prevalence was
78 tested using Spearman's correlation. Missing data were excluded. A two-tailed $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically
79 significant. All data were analyzed using Stata 16.1 (College Station, TX).

80 *Ethics Committee Approval*

81 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Chulalongkorn University (IRB No.236/63) and 18
82 general hospitals. Given no ethics committees were available in the participating community hospitals, participation
83 in this study was approved by the hospital directors or representatives. All participants provided written informed
84 consent. (Thai Clinical Trials Registry: TCTR20200426002)

85 **Results**

86 Overall, 52 community hospitals from 46.1% of provinces in Thailand (35 of 76) which consisted of 58.2% of
87 national population (35,416,545 of 60,892,671) participated in this study. Participation rates varied across regions—
88 Northeastern (55%), Central (50.0%), Southern (42.9%), Northern (33.3%), and Eastern (28.6%) [Table 1].

89

90

91 **Table 1.** Geographical Distribution of 52 Participating Community Hospitals


| | Participating Provinces | Total Provinces | Population of Participating Provinces | Population of All Provinces |
|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Thailand* | 35 (46.1%) | 76 | 35,416,545 (58.2%) | 60,892,671 |
| Northern | 3 (33.3%) | 9 | 2,505,118 (39.4%) | 6,350,499 |
| Northeastern | 11 (55.0%) | 20 | 15,064,919 (68.4%) | 22,014,248 |
| Central* | 13 (50.0%) | 26 | 10,053,397 (55.3%) | 18,192,361 |
| Southern | 6 (42.9%) | 14 | 5,697,112 (60.0%) | 9,493,757 |
| Eastern | 2 (28.6%) | 7 | 2,095,999 (43.3%) | 4,841,806 |

92 * Not include Bangkok which has no community hospital.

93 Data were presented in counts and percentages.

94

95 From 52 community hospitals, 857 participants which consisted of 675 hospital staff and 182 pre-
96 procedural patients were included in the study. Their median age was 37 years (interquartile range 27–45), 74.7%
97 were female, 98.8% were Thai, and 80.5% were asymptomatic. The most common symptoms were cough (9.7%),
98 rhinitis (7.5%), sore throat (6.4%), fever (5.7%), and dyspnea (3.5%). History of travel to the high-risk area was
99 6.0%, history of close contact to the confirmed COVID-19 case was 15.4%, and 14.5% had PCR negative. Forty-
100 seven participants (5.5%, 95% CI 4.1–7.2) had IgM antibody against SARS-CoV-2 whereas the IgG antibody was
101 found in two participants (0.2%, 95% CI 0.1–0.8). Participants from the Central region of Thailand had the highest
102 IgM seroprevalence (11.9%, 95% CI 8.4–16.5), while the Northern region had the lowest seroprevalence (1.6%,
103 95% CI 0.3–8.7) [Fig 1].



104

105 **Fig 1.** Unadjusted IgM Seroprevalence in Community Hospitals across Geographical Regions of Thailand.

106

107 Age-adjusted IgM seroprevalence with combined participating population showed almost similar results
108 with unadjusted IgM seroprevalence. However, age-adjusted seroprevalence using Thailand population showed
109 increasing seropositive rate in Thailand from 5.5% to 6.3%, Central region from 11.9% to 15.3%, and Northern
110 region from 1.6% to 1.8%, while decreasing seroprevalence in Northeastern region from 3.0% to 1.6%, Eastern
111 region from 4.0% to 2.8%, and Southern region from 1.8% to 1.5%. Adjusted with the world standard population

112 from the World Health Organization (WHO 2000-2025) showed decreasing trends of seroprevalence both overall
 113 and in most regions [Table 2].

114 **Table 2.** Unadjusted and age-adjusted immunoglobulin M seroprevalence in community hospitals across
 115 geographical regions of Thailand

| | Unadjusted IgM Seroprevalence | Age-adjusted IgM Seroprevalence with Combined Participating Population | Age-adjusted IgM Seroprevalence with Thailand Population | Age-adjusted IgM Seroprevalence with World Standard Population |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Thailand* | 5.5% | NA | 6.3% | 5.1% |
| Northern | 1.6% | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.1% |
| Northeastern | 3.0% | 3.0% | 1.6% | 1.5% |
| Central* | 11.9% | 11.9% | 15.3% | 12.2% |
| Southern | 1.8% | 2.4% | 1.5% | 1.2% |
| Eastern | 4.0% | 3.9% | 2.8% | 2.6% |

116 * Not include Bangkok which has no community hospital.
 117 IgM, immunoglobulin M; NA, not available; WHO, World Health Organization.

118
 119 Pre-procedural patients had an unexpectedly higher proportion of positive IgM than the hospital staff
 120 (12.1% vs. 3.7%), especially patients in the Central region of Thailand (27.9%, 95% CI 18.2–40.2) while patients in
 121 the Northern and Southern regions showed zero seroprevalences. Also, hospital staff in the Central region had the
 122 highest seroprevalence (6.6%, 95% CI 3.8–11.1) while those in the Northern region had the lowest (1.7%, 95% CI
 123 0.3–9.0). Overall, the seropositive prevalence was not different between males and females (5.8% vs. 5.5%).
 124 Paradoxically, the seroprevalences were higher in participants without a history of travel to the high-risk area (5.6%
 125 vs. 3.9%) and those without a history of close contact to confirmed COVID-19 case (5.7% vs. 4.5%) than their
 126 counterparts. The same paradox also applied to pre-procedural patients. Patients without travel history were likely to
 127 have an antibody for SARS-CoV-2 (13.9% vs. 3.2%) and patients without close contact to the case also had more
 128 chance to develop an antibody (12.3% vs. 9.1%). However, healthcare workers with travel history had slightly more
 129 chance to develop IgM (5.0% vs. 3.7%) and with close contact history (4.1% vs. 3.6%). In general, participants with
 130 upper respiratory tract symptoms had a higher chance of being seropositive (9.6% vs. 4.5%), of which dyspnea had
 131 the highest (30.0%, 95% CI 16.7–47.9). Likewise, pre-procedural patient with dyspnea had the most IgM positive
 132 (29.6%, 95% CI 15.9–48.5) and healthcare worker with dyspnea (33.3%, 95% CI 6.1–79.2). Of 690 participants

133 without present upper respiratory tract symptom, 31 had IgM positive for COVID-19 (4.5%, 95% CI 3.2–6.3) which
 134 consisted of 20 of 566 healthcare workers (3.5%, 95% CI 2.3–5.4) and 11 of 124 patients (8.9%, 95% CI 5.0–15.2).
 135 History of negative PCR was associated with a surprisingly higher chance of seropositive than those with no PCR
 136 test result (6.5% vs. 5.3%) [Table 3]. Unfortunately, none of participants with positive IgM had opportunities for
 137 PCR testing.

138 **Table 3.** Demographic Characteristics and Seroprevalence in different groups

| | All Participants | | Hospital Staff | | Pre-procedural Patients | |
|---|------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------|
| | n | IgM+ | n | IgM+ | n | IgM+ |
| Total | 857 | 47 (5.5%) | 675 | 25 (3.7%) | 182 | 22 (12.1%) |
| Median age, years (25th–75th percentile) | 37 (27–45) | | 36.5 (28–45) | | 37 (25–53) | |
| Male, n (%) | 207 (24.1%) | 12 (5.8%) | 145 (21.5%) | 6 (4.1%) | 62 (34.1%) | 6 (9.7%) |
| Female, n (%) | 640 (74.7%) | 35 (5.5%) | 521 (77.2%) | 19 (3.6%) | 119 (65.4%) | 16 (13.4%) |
| Unspecified, n (%) | 10 (1.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 9 (1.3%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.5%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Thai | 847 | 47 (5.5%) | 671 | 25 (3.7%) | 176 | 22 (12.5%) |
| Non-Thai | 10 | 0 (0.0%) | 4 | 0 (0.0%) | 6 | 0 (0.0%) |
| Region | | | | | | |
| North | 61 | 1 (1.6%) | 59 | 1 (1.7%) | 2 | 0 (0.0%) |
| Northeast | 269 | 8 (3.0%) | 220 | 4 (1.8%) | 49 | 4 (8.2%) |
| Central | 244 | 29 (11.9%) | 183 | 12 (6.6%) | 61 | 17 (27.9%) |
| South | 109 | 2 (1.8%) | 88 | 2 (2.3%) | 21 | 0 (0.0%) |
| East | 174 | 7 (4.0%) | 125 | 6 (4.8%) | 49 | 1 (2.0%) |
| History of travel to high risk area | | | | | | |
| Yes | 51 | 2 (3.9%) | 20 | 1 (5.0%) | 31 | 1 (3.2%) |
| No | 806 | 45 (5.6%) | 655 | 24 (3.7%) | 151 | 21 (13.9%) |
| History of close contact confirmed case | | | | | | |
| Yes | 132 | 6 (4.5%) | 121 | 5 (4.1%) | 11 | 1 (9.1%) |
| No | 725 | 41 (5.7%) | 554 | 20 (3.6%) | 171 | 21 (12.3%) |
| Asymptomatic | 690 | 31 (4.5%) | 566 | 20 (3.5%) | 124 | 11 (8.9%) |
| Symptomatic | 167 | 16 (9.6%) | 109 | 5 (4.6%) | 58 | 11 (19.0%) |
| Fever | 49 | 7 (14.3%) | 17 | 0 (0.0%) | 32 | 7 (21.9%) |
| Cough | 83 | 8 (9.6%) | 52 | 1 (1.9%) | 31 | 7 (22.6%) |
| Rhinitis | 64 | 7 (10.9%) | 47 | 2 (4.3%) | 17 | 5 (29.4%) |
| Sore throat | 55 | 8 (14.5%) | 37 | 3 (8.1%) | 18 | 5 (27.8%) |
| Dyspnea | 30 | 9 (30.0%) | 3 | 1 (33.3%) | 27 | 8 (29.6%) |
| Previous PCR status | | | | | | |
| Negative | 124 | 8 (6.5%) | 77 | 1 (1.3%) | 47 | 7 (14.9%) |
| Never tested | 733 | 39 (5.3%) | 598 | 24 (4.0%) | 135 | 15 (11.1%) |

139 Data were presented in counts and percentages unless otherwise specified.
 140 IgM+, immunoglobulin M positive; NA, not available; PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

141
 142 PCR confirmed COVID-19 case data were acquired for participating provinces with population. Overall,
 143 COVID-19 prevalence was 2.44 cases per 100,000. Participating provinces in the Eastern region had the highest
 144 prevalence of COVID-19 (6.54 cases per 100,000) while provinces in northeastern had the lowest prevalence
 145 [Table 4]. There was no correlation between IgM seroprevalence and PCR confirmed COVID-19 prevalence
 146 ($p=0.199$).

148 **Table 4.** Number and prevalence of PCR confirmed COVID-19 cases in participating provinces

| | PCR Confirmed COVID-19 Cases | Population | PCR Confirmed COVID-19 Prevalence per 100,000 Population |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------|--|
| Overall | 864 | 35,416,545 | 2.44 |
| Northern | 47 | 2,505,118 | 1.88 |
| Chiang Mai | 41 | 1,779,254 | 2.30 |
| Mae Hong Son | 5 | 284,138 | 1.76 |
| Phrae | 1 | 441,726 | 0.23 |
| Northeastern | 85 | 15,064,919 | 0.56 |
| Buriram | 13 | 1,595,747 | 0.81 |
| Chaiyaphum | 3 | 1,137,357 | 0.26 |
| Kalasin | 3 | 983,418 | 0.31 |
| Khon Kaen | 6 | 1,802,872 | 0.33 |
| Maha Sarakham | 1 | 962,665 | 0.10 |
| Mukdahan | 4 | 353,174 | 1.13 |
| Nakhon Phanom | 2 | 719,136 | 0.28 |
| Nakhon Ratchasima | 19 | 2,648,927 | 0.72 |
| Surin | 9 | 1,396,831 | 0.64 |
| Ubon Ratchathani | 15 | 1,878,146 | 0.80 |
| Udon Thani | 10 | 1,586,646 | 0.63 |
| Central | 383 | 10,053,397 | 3.81 |
| Ayutthaya | 4 | 820,188 | 0.49 |
| Chainat | 0 | 326,611 | 0.00 |
| Lopburi | 2 | 755,556 | 0.26 |
| Nakhon Pathom | 22 | 920,030 | 2.39 |
| Nonthaburi | 158 | 1,265,387 | 12.49 |
| Pathum Thani | 39 | 1,163,604 | 3.35 |
| Phetchaburi | 2 | 485,191 | 0.41 |
| Phichit | 0 | 536,311 | 0.00 |
| Samut Prakan | 143 | 1,344,875 | 10.63 |
| Sukhothai | 3 | 595,072 | 0.50 |
| Suphanburi | 6 | 846,334 | 0.71 |
| Tak | 3 | 665,620 | 0.45 |
| Uthaithani | 1 | 328,618 | 0.30 |
| Southern | 212 | 5,697,112 | 3.72 |
| Chumphon | 21 | 511,304 | 4.11 |
| Krabi | 20 | 476,739 | 4.20 |
| Nakhon Si Thammarat | 12 | 1,561,927 | 0.77 |
| Songkhla | 134 | 1,435,968 | 9.33 |
| Surat Thani | 18 | 1,068,010 | 1.69 |
| Trang | 7 | 643,164 | 1.09 |
| Eastern | 137 | 2,095,999 | 6.54 |
| Chanthaburi | 3 | 537,698 | 0.56 |
| Chonburi | 134 | 1,558,301 | 8.60 |

149 PCR, polymerase chain reaction.

150

151 IgG was detected in two participants (0.2%, 95% CI 0.1–0.8) who also had a positive IgM antibody. In
 152 other words, we did not find any participants with isolated positive IgG. Participant A was a Thai female healthcare
 153 worker who worked in a community hospital in the Central region of Thailand. She had a sore throat but had no
 154 history of travel to a high-risk area or close contact to confirmed COVID-19 case, and did not have a PCR test
 155 before. Participant B was a Thai female preprocedural patient who visited another community hospital in the Central
 156 region. She had no symptom, no history of travel to a high-risk area, or close contact to confirmed COVID-19 case.
 157 Patient B had a previously negative PCR result [Table 5].

158 **Table 5.** Characteristics of Participants who Developed Immunoglobulin G Antibody

| | Age Range, years | Gender | Ethnicity | Region | Occupation | History of travel to high-risk area | History of contact confirmed case | Symptoms | Previous PCR status |
|---------------|------------------|--------|-----------|---------|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Participant A | 56-60 | Female | Thai | Central | HCW | No | No | Sore throat | Never tested |
| Participant B | 41-45 | Female | Thai | Central | Patient | No | No | No | Negative |

159 HCW, healthcare worker; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; Age range was used for participant's privacy and confidentiality.

160 Discussion

161 COVID-19 seroprevalence in asymptomatic staff and patients in Thai community hospitals was higher than
162 hospitals in China (4.5% vs. 2.5%) [3]. Seroprevalence in asymptomatic hospital staff in Thailand was also higher
163 than hospitals in China (3.5% vs. 1.8%) [3] but less than a tertiary hospital in Belgium (3.5% vs. 6.4%) [4].
164 Asymptomatic patients in Thailand seemed to have higher seroprevalence than China (8.9% vs. 3.5%) [3]. Unlike
165 China and Belgium where the seroprevalences were mostly from positive IgG, our study revealed mostly positive
166 IgM. Comparison with Belgium hospital should be interpreted with caution due to the unknown PCR status of
167 Belgium subjects.

168 Serological testing provides some crucial epidemiological information and would have been more effective
169 when combined with other diagnostic tests such as PCR. While all participants with positive results from the free-of-
170 charge rapid IgM/IgG test provided in this study were encouraged to get PCR testing, a majority of community
171 hospitals still did not have access to the PCR testing because of both financial and non-financial reasons.
172 Recommendation for PCR testing after positive rapid IgM/IgG test had not fully complied so we did not have
173 information about the participants with positive IgM. With immunoglobulin status and PCR results, we can shape
174 the situation more accurately for both individual and regional views. Hopefully, with this and other vigorous and
175 dedicated studies on antibody status around the globe, serology testing would provide useful information for
176 pandemic control.

177 Conclusions

178 COVID-19 antibody test could detect a substantial number of potential silent spreaders in Thai community hospitals.
179 Antibody testing should be encouraged for mass screening, especially in asymptomatic individuals.

180

181

182 **Acknowledgements**

183 We thank Baiya Phytopharm, Thailand for supporting the Baiya Rapid COVID-19 IgG/IgM test kit. The company
184 did not involve in the data analysis, interpretation, and the manuscript preparation.

185 **Author Contributions**

186 **Conceptualization:** TN, KP, NH

187 **Data curation:** TN, KC, KP

188 **Formal analysis:** TN, KP

189 **Investigation:** TN, KC, KP

190 **Methodology:** TN, KP, NH

191 **Project administration:** TN, KP, NH

192 **Resources:** KP, NH

193 **Software:** TN, KP

194 **Supervision:** KP, NH

195 **Validation:** TN, KC, KP

196 **Visualization:** TN

197 **Writing – original draft:** TN, KP

198 **Writing – review & editing:** TN, KP, KC, NH

199 **References**

- 200 1. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim A. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection - Challenges and
201 Implications. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. Epub 2020/06/06. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2015897. PubMed PMID: 32502334.
- 202 2. Yong S, Anderson D, Wei W, Pang J, Chia W, Tan C, et al. Connecting clusters of COVID-19: an
203 epidemiological and serological investigation. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020. Epub 2020/04/25. doi: 10.1016/s1473-
204 3099(20)30273-5. PubMed PMID: 32330439; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7173813.
- 205 3. Xu X, Sun J, Nie S, Li H, Kong Y, Liang M, et al. Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M and G antibodies
206 against SARS-CoV-2 in China. *Nat Med*. 2020. Epub 2020/06/07. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0949-6. PubMed
207 PMID: 32504052.
- 208 4. Steensels D, Oris E, Coninx L, Nuyens D, Delforge M, Vermeersch P, et al. Hospital-Wide SARS-CoV-2
209 Antibody Screening in 3056 Staff in a Tertiary Center in Belgium. *Jama*. 2020. Epub 2020/06/17. doi:
210 10.1001/jama.2020.11160. PubMed PMID: 32539107.

211