

1

2 **High prevalence of symptoms among Brazilian subjects with antibodies against**
3 **SARS-CoV-2: a nationwide household survey.**

4

5 Ana M B Menezes anamene.epi@gmail.com 0000-0002-2996-9427

6 Cesar G Victora cvictora@gmail.com 0000-0002-2465-2180

7 Fernando P Hartwig fernandophratwig@gmail.com 0000-0003-3729-0710

8 Mariângela F Silveira mariangelafreitassilveira@gmail.com 0000-0002-2861-7139

9 Bernardo L Horta blhorta@gmail.com 0000-0001-9843-412X

10 Aluísio J D Barros abarros.epi@gmail.com 0000-0002-2022-8729

11 Marília A Mesenburg mariliaepi@gmail.com 0000-0001-9598-4193

12 Fernando C Wehrmeister fcwehrmeister@gmail.com 0000-0001-7137-1747

13 Lúcia C Pellanda pellanda@ufcspa.edu.br 0000-0002-4593-3416

14 Odir A Dellagostin odirad@gmail.com 0000-0003-2803-4088

15 Cláudio José Struchiner claustru@gmail.com 0000-0003-2114-847X

16 Marcelo N Burattini mnburatt@gmail.com 0000-0002-5407-6890

17 Fernando C Barros fbarros.epi@gmail.com 0000-0001-5973-1746

18 Pedro C Hallal prchallal@gmail.com 0000-0003-1470-6461

19

20 **Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Brazil** (Prof. Ana M B Menezes, Prof. Bernardo L
21 Horta, Dr. Fernando P Hartwig, Dr. Fernando C Wehrmeister, Prof. Mariângela F
22 Silveira, Dr. Marília A Mesenburg, Prof. Aluísio J D Barros, Prof. Odir A Dellagostin,
23 Prof. Fernando C Barros, Prof. Cesar G Victora, Dr. Pedro C Hallal), **Fundação**
24 **Universidade Federal de Ciências de Saúde de Porto Alegre, Brazil** (Dr. Marília A

25 Mesenburg, Prof. Lúcia C Pellanda), **Fundação Getúlio Vargas , Brazil** (Prof. Claudio
26 J Struchiner), **Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil** (Prof. Marcelo N Burattini)

27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29

30 Since the beginning of the pandemic of COVID-19, there has been a widespread
31 assumption that most infected persons are asymptomatic. A frequently-cited early study
32 from China suggested that 86% of all infections were undocumented, which was used as
33 indirect evidence that patients were asymptomatic.

34 Using data from the most recent wave of the EPICOVID19 study, a nationwide
35 household-based survey including 133 cities from all states of Brazil, we estimated the
36 proportion of people with and without antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 who were
37 asymptomatic, which symptoms were most frequently reported, the number of
38 symptoms reported and the association between symptomatology and socio-
39 demographic characteristics. We were able to test 33,205 subjects using a rapid
40 antibody test that was previously validated. Information on symptoms was collected
41 before participants received the test result. Out of 849 (2.7%) participants who tested
42 positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, only 12.1% (95%CI 10.1-14.5) reported no
43 symptoms since the start of the pandemic, compared to 42.2% (95%CI 41.7-42.8)
44 among those who tested negative. The largest difference between the two groups was
45 observed for changes in smell or taste (56.5% versus 9.1%, a 6.2-fold difference).
46 Symptoms change in smell or taste, fever and myalgia were most likely to predict
47 positive test results as suggested by recursive partitioning tree analysis.
48 Among individuals without any of these three symptoms (74.2% of the sample), only
49 0.8% tested positive, compared to 18.3% of those with both fever and changes in smell

50 or taste. Most subjects with antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in Brazil are symptomatic,

51 even though most present only mild symptoms.

52

53 INTRODUCTION

54 Since the beginning of the pandemic of COVID-19, there is a widespread notion that
55 most people infected by SARS-CoV-2 are asymptomatic, following an early article
56 from China stating that 86% of those infected did not report any symptoms.¹ More
57 recently, several clinical studies became available, showing that the prevalence of
58 asymptomatic infected individuals ranges from 4% to 75%.²⁻⁶ These discrepancies
59 might be explained by the use of different lists of symptoms, different recall periods, as
60 well as different populations. Population-based studies are particularly relevant for
61 studying SARS-CoV-2 symptoms, because asymptomatic patients or those with mild
62 symptoms may be identified at home, rather than in health service-based studies.

63

64 Using data from the most recent wave of the EPICOVID19 study, a nationwide
65 household-based survey including 133 cities from all states of Brazil,⁷ we estimate the
66 proportion of people with and without antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 who were
67 asymptomatic. We investigated which symptoms were most frequently reported, how
68 many symptoms were reported by each subject, and the associations between
69 symptoms and sociodemographic characteristics. We also performed conditional
70 inference tree analyses using binary recursive partitioning to identify which
71 combinations of symptoms were most likely to predict positive test results.

72

73 METHODS

74 EPICOVID19 is a nationwide seroprevalence survey conducted in sentinel cities in 26
75 Brazilian states and the Federal District. The Brazilian Institute of Geography and
76 Statistics (IBGE) divides the country into 133 intermediate regions, and the most
77 populous municipality in each region was included in the sample. So far, the study has

78 entailed three waves of data collection (May 14-21, June 4-7, and June 21-24). Here we
79 report on findings from the third wave of data collection which included a detailed
80 investigation of symptoms.

81

82 A multi-stage probabilistic sample was adopted, with 25 census tracts selected in each
83 one of the 133 sentinel cities, with probability proportionate to size. In each sampled
84 tract, 10 households were systematically selected, totaling 250 households per
85 municipality. All household residents were listed, and age and sex recorded on a list.
86 One individual was then randomly selected as the respondent for that household. Then,
87 a finger prick blood sample was obtained and a questionnaire applied. If the selected
88 subject did not accept to participate, a second resident was randomly chosen. In case of
89 another refusal, the interviewers moved to the next household to the right of the one
90 that had been originally selected. The total planned sample size was 33,250 individuals.

91

92 The WONDFO SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Test (Wondfo Biotech Co., Guangzhou, China)
93 was used for the detection of antibodies for SARS-CoV-2
94 ([https://en.wondfo.com.cn/product/wondfo-sars-cov-2-antibody-test-lateral-flow-](https://en.wondfo.com.cn/product/wondfo-sars-cov-2-antibody-test-lateral-flow-method-2/)
95 [method-2/](https://en.wondfo.com.cn/product/wondfo-sars-cov-2-antibody-test-lateral-flow-method-2/)); this rapid point-of-care test is based on the principle of immune assay of
96 lateral flow and detects IgG/IgM antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. The presence of
97 antibodies is detected by two drops of blood from a pinprick sample; after the
98 introduction of the blood sample, valid tests are identified by a positive control line in
99 the kit's window; if this control line is not visible, the test is considered inconclusive. A
100 second line also appears in the window if SARS-CoV-2-reactive antibodies are present;
101 in the absence of antibodies, this line is not visible. This rapid test underwent
102 independent validation studies; by pooling the results from the four validation studies,

103 weighted by sample sizes, sensitivity was estimated at 84.8% (95% CI 81.4%;87.8%)
104 and specificity at 99.95% (95% CI 97.8%;99.7%).⁸⁻¹⁰

105

106 Field workers used tablets to record the full interviews, registered all answers, and
107 photographed the test results. All positive or inconclusive tests were read by a second
108 observer, as well as 20% of the negative tests. Subjects were asked about presence
109 (yes/no) of 11 symptoms since March 2020, when the first cases were reported in
110 Brazil: fever, sore throat, cough, difficulty breathing, palpitation, change in smell or
111 taste, diarrhea, vomiting, myalgia, shivering and headache. Subjects were classified as
112 “asymptomatic” if they answered “no” for all symptoms.

113

114 Sociodemographic variables were also investigated: sex, age in years, schooling (last
115 year completed/grade; recoded as primary or less; secondary; university or higher), self-
116 reported skin color, and household assets. The official Brazilian classification of
117 ethnicity recognizes five groups, based on the question: “What is your race or color?”
118 The five response options are “white”, “brown” (“pardo” in Portuguese), “black”,
119 “yellow” and “indigenous”. Interviewers were instructed to check the “yellow” option
120 when the respondent mentions being of Asian descent, and “indigenous” when any of
121 the multiple first nations were mentioned.¹¹

122

123 The wealth index was created based on a list of assets and goods (computer or laptop,
124 internet access, color television, air conditioning equipment, number of vehicles, cable
125 TV, number of bathrooms and number of bedrooms), through a principal component
126 analysis. The first component was extracted and the total sample divided into quintiles
127 weighted by municipality urban population; the first quintile represent the 20% poorest

128 individuals, and the fifth quintile represents the wealthiest 20% in the sample.¹² For the
129 schooling analysis, subjects under 5 years were excluded as they could still be attending
130 school.

131

132 Interviewers were tested prior to the field work and only those found to be negative for
133 the virus could participate in the study. Biological safety measures were taken to protect
134 the health of the field workers and individual protection equipment was discarded after
135 visiting each household. Ethical approval was provided by the Brazilian's National
136 Ethics Committee (process number: 30721520.7.1001.5313). Study participants were
137 informed about the objectives of the study, possible risks and advantages. Blood
138 collection took place after obtaining written informed consent from participants or their
139 legal guardians. Individuals testing positive were referred to the statewide COVID-19
140 surveillance system. In case of a positive rapid test by the respondent, all other residents
141 of the household were also tested for antibodies.

142

143 The prevalence of each of the 11 symptoms was calculated separately for individuals
144 who tested positive and those with negative results. Means and standard errors (SE)
145 were estimated for the variable on number of symptoms. Prevalence ratio and 95%
146 confidence interval (95% CI) were calculated for each symptom, by dividing the
147 frequency of each symptom in positive and negative subjects. Chi-squared test for
148 heterogeneity or linear trend were calculated, according to the type of variable studied,
149 and interactions with the test result were also tested. Subjects with previous diagnosis of
150 COVID-19 (n=242) and missing information on symptoms (n=1,104) were excluded
151 from the analysis.

152

153 We also performed conditional inference tree analyses using binary recursive
154 partitioning, accounting for multiple testing¹³. The objective of these analyses was to
155 identify which combinations of the 11 symptoms were most likely to predict positive
156 test results.

157

158 Analyses were performed using the software Stata version 14.1 (StataCorp, College
159 Station, TX, USA) and conditional inference tree analyses were performed using R
160 3.6.1 (<https://www.r-project.org/>). Data will become publicly available 30 days after
161 completion of the fieldwork at <http://www.epicovid19brasil.org/>.

162

163 **RESULTS**

164 Of the target sample size comprising 33,250 individuals, we were able to include 33,205
165 (99.9%) participants in the study (missing information for 45 subjects). To achieve this
166 number, a total of 59,724 houses were contacted, with 19.8% of refusals and 24.6% of
167 houses being empty at the time of the visit. Of the 31,869 participants included (after
168 excluding for missing on symptoms and previous COVI-19 diagnosis), 849 subjects
169 (2.7%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Test results were only disclosed
170 after the interview on symptoms had been completed. Table 1 shows the distribution of
171 the sample according to sociodemographic characteristics.

172

173 Each of the 11 symptoms investigated were significantly ($P < 0.01$) more likely to be
174 reported by those testing positive as compared to those testing negative (Table 2). The
175 most frequently reported symptoms among positive cases were headaches (58.0%),
176 change in smell or taste (56.5%), fever (52.1%), cough (47.7%) and myalgia (44.1%).
177 Table 2 also presents the prevalence ratios for each symptom and the 95% CI according

178 to SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. The largest ratios between positive and negative subjects
179 were observed for change in smell or taste (6.2-fold), fever (4.3-fold), shivering (3.3-
180 fold) and myalgia (2.8-fold). The sensitivity and specificity for positive test results, for
181 each symptom, are presented in Supplementary Table. The two symptoms with
182 sensitivity above 50% and specificity above 85% were change in smell or taste,
183 followed by fever.

184

185 Of the 849 participants who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, only 12.1%
186 (95%CI 10.1-14.5) reported none of the 11 symptoms and were therefore classified as
187 asymptomatic, against 42.2% (95%CI 41.7-42.8) among those who tested negative
188 (Figure 1). The mean (SE) number of symptoms for those who tested positive or
189 negative were 3.91 (0.10) and 1.53 (0.01), respectively. Among those who tested
190 positive, 63.5% had three or more symptoms, compared to 23.0% among those who
191 tested negative.

192

193 In Figure 2 we present the mean number of symptoms among those who tested positive
194 for SARS-CoV-2 as well as the prevalence of asymptomatic subjects, according to
195 sociodemographic characteristics. The associations with ethnicity and household wealth
196 were not significant. Symptoms were more frequent among women than men, and less
197 frequent among individuals with primary or less schooling compared to those with
198 secondary or higher education. The age distribution for the number of symptoms
199 showed in inverse U-shaped pattern, with highest value at ages 30-39 years and the
200 lowest means in children and adolescents. The corresponding figure for individuals
201 without antibodies is included in the supplementary materials (Supplementary Figure
202 1).

203

204 Figure 3 displays the results of the conditional inference tree analysis. Out of the 11
205 symptoms, this analysis selected three: change in smell or taste, fever and myalgia.
206 Given the low overall seroprevalence, in all terminal nodes the prevalence was lower
207 than 20%. Notably, the two thirds of the total sample who reported none of the three
208 symptoms presented a markedly low seroprevalence of 0.8%, compared to 18.3%
209 among those presenting fever, myalgia and change in smell or taste.

210

211 When an individual tested positive, we also tested other family members. Of the 90
212 positive subjects with at least one positive family member, 6.7% were asymptomatic,
213 compared to 13.0% asymptomatic among 747 positive subjects without any positive
214 family members (chi-squared = 2.97; P = 0.085). Lastly, we verified whether antibody
215 prevalence levels in cities were associated with the frequency of symptoms among
216 positive subjects, and found no such association (Supplementary Figure 2).

217

218 **DISCUSSION**

219 In the first two waves of the EPICOVID19 nationwide survey, we identified that,
220 contrary to what is often reported, most subjects with antibodies were symptomatic.
221 However, symptoms had only been assessed for those with positive tests, and the
222 information was collected after the individual had learned about the test result. We
223 addressed the possibility of bias by asking all participants, regardless of the test result,
224 in the third wave. The question on symptoms covered the four-month period since the
225 first COVID-19 cases were reported in the country. The questionnaire was applied
226 before the test result was known, so that respondents were blind to their serological
227 status, and this allowed us to compare symptoms among those testing positive and those

228 testing negative. Subjects with a previous diagnosis of COVID-19 and missing
229 information for symptoms (0.73% of the whole sample) were excluded from the
230 analyses in order to ensure that the respondents were not aware of their condition.

231

232 The above results from the third wave of the study confirmed a high prevalence of
233 symptoms using a 4-month recall period; only 12.1% positive subjects were
234 asymptomatic, compared to 42.2% of those without antibodies. Inclusion in our
235 analyses of individuals who tested negative was useful for identifying which symptoms
236 were most strongly associated with the presence of antibodies. For example, headaches
237 were the most common symptom affecting 58.0% of those positive, but were also
238 reported by 35.5% of those who tested negative, a prevalence ratio of only 1.6. In
239 contrast, changes in smell or taste affected 56.5% among those who tested positive and
240 9.1% in the negative ones, respectively. This symptom provided the best discrimination,
241 with a prevalence ratio of 6.2. Recent studies have shown that when SARS-CoV-2
242 enters the nasal and oral epithelium through the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2
243 (ACE2) and transmembrane serine protease 2 (TMPRSS2), it may cause damages to
244 olfactory and gustatory receptor cells resulting in anosmia or ageusia^{14, 15} .

245

246 Overall, symptoms were more frequent among females than males, in subjects aged 30-
247 29 years and in those with higher education. Children and adolescents were
248 substantially less likely to report symptoms than adults, which is compatible with the
249 lower infection-fatality rates observed in these age groups¹⁶. In contrast, prevalence of
250 symptoms fell with age from 30 to over 70 years, which does not reflect the age pattern
251 in infection-fatality and case-fatality¹⁷. The difference in reported symptoms between
252 women and men is also at odds with the higher case-fatality among males¹⁸.

253 Comparison of our findings on the prevalence of symptoms with the literature are
254 affected by the settings in which studies were done, by the phase of infection, the
255 duration of recall, and by the ways in which symptoms were recorded, as well as
256 whether or not the subjects were aware or suspicious of being infected. The prevalence
257 for asymptomatic subjects in the literature ranges from 4% to 75%^{2-6, 19, 20}, whereas in
258 our study it was 12.1%. We identified five published reviews that provided pooled
259 prevalence estimates for symptoms^{4, 5, 21-23} among individuals who tested positive in
260 health facilities. We found lower prevalence (52.1%) for fever (pooled prevalence
261 ranging from 78.4% to 92.8%) and cough (47.7% versus pooled prevalence ranging
262 from 58.3% to 72.2%). Our estimates for myalgia (44.1%) and difficulty breathing
263 (23.1%) were within the ranges reported in the studies (29.4% to 51.0%, and 20.6% to
264 45.6%, respectively). Lastly, prevalence of headache in our study (58%) was
265 considerably higher than in the reviews (8.0% to 14.0%). One may assume the
266 prevalence ranges of symptoms based on individuals who sought care in medical
267 facilities would tend to be higher than in our population-based survey, but this was not
268 the case, except for fever or cough.

269
270 Notably, change in smell or taste was not investigated in these review papers. We
271 searched the literature and change in smell or taste or anosmia/ ageusia was identified in
272 a multicenter European study with prevalence of 85.6% (anosmia) and 88.0%
273 (ageusia)²⁴ and a very low prevalence in a retrospective study in China (5.1% for
274 hyposmia and 5.6% for hypogeusia)²⁵, whereas we found 56.5%.

275
276 Besides the aforementioned symptoms, some studies have hypothesized that the
277 angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 receptor (ACE2) is also expressed in the mucosa of

278 the gastrointestinal (GI) tract and play lead to GI manifestations²⁶. The pooled
279 prevalence of GI symptoms has ranged in the literature from 7.4 to 12.5% for diarrhea
280 (against 25.6% in our study), and 4.6% to 10.2% for nausea and/or vomiting (compared
281 to 9.5% in our study)²⁶⁻²⁸.

282

283 It is likely that the information on symptoms from population-based studies, such as the
284 one from Spain²⁹, would be comparable to our study; however, the recall time in that
285 study was two weeks, compared to up to four months in our survey. In this study, the
286 only symptom specifically reported was anosmia, that was present around 27% of
287 positive subjects, in the three waves.

288

289 The decision tree analyses were useful for identifying a subgroup of individuals who
290 presented both fever and change in smell or taste, among whom seroprevalence was
291 18.3%, compared to only 0.8% among subjects that did not present these two
292 symptoms, nor presented body aches.

293

294 It is clear from the literature that no single symptom correlates perfectly with SARS-
295 CoV-2 infection, thus raising the possibility that the use of multiple symptoms might be
296 appropriate for screening purposes. However, the literature on this topic is still scarce.

297 A study using app-based self-reported data in the United States and in the United
298 Kingdom identified that change in smell or taste is the single symptom most strongly
299 correlated with infection and, using stepwise logistic regression, identified a prediction
300 model that also includes fatigue, persistent cough and loss of appetite³⁰. We also
301 identified change in smell or taste as the single most predictive symptom, but the two
302 additional symptoms prioritized in the conditional inference tree analysis were fever and

303 myalgia. Given that the symptoms are partially correlated to one another, it is possible
304 that models including different symptoms yield similar predictions, and would therefore
305 be of similar practical use. Another app-based study including mostly individuals in the
306 United Kingdom identified that, collectively, symptoms improve predicting prognosis³¹.
307 This indicates that symptoms may be used not only for screening, but also for patient
308 monitoring and planning health service needs.

309

310 Our study has limitations. Differentiation recall bias is a concern, particularly by using a
311 4-month recall period, but the alternative – as in the Spanish survey – was to ask for
312 symptoms in a shorter, more recent period and potentially misclassifying individuals
313 who had the disease in the past, and for whom antibodies remained detectable. In order
314 to evaluate the likelihood of differential recall bias, we excluded the 242 participants
315 who had a diagnosis of COVID-19 prior to the interview. Another limitation is the
316 growing evidence that antibody levels decrease rapidly over time, for example by 14%
317 in the same subjects in the Spanish study²⁹, and in our own (unpublished) analyses
318 comparing the first and third waves of the survey in cities with high initial prevalence.
319 This would lead some individuals who had the disease to test negative, and yet report
320 symptoms that occurred at the time of the episode. This type of bias would reduce the
321 difference in reported symptoms among subjects who tested positive and negative. An
322 additional limitation is the growing evidence that antibody levels decrease rapidly over
323 time, for example by 14% in the same subjects in the Spanish study²⁸, and in our own
324 (unpublished) analyses comparing the first and third waves of the survey in cities with
325 high initial prevalence. This would lead some individuals who had the disease to test
326 negative, and yet report symptoms that occurred at the time of the episode. This

327 characteristic of the dynamics of the infection would reduce the difference in reported
328 symptoms among subjects who tested positive and negative.

329

330 Positive aspects of our study, on the other hand, included the population basis over an
331 area of 8.5 million square km, the large sample size, collection of symptoms in positive
332 and negative cases, and blinding of respondents as test results were only disclosed after
333 the clinical history was collected.

334 In summary, our analyses show that most individuals with antibodies against SARS-
335 CoV-2 report having presented symptoms, even though in most cases these were mild.
336 Our findings can be used to implement surveillance systems in Brazil, which would
337 help identify cases early and guide testing procedures.

338

339

340 **Acknowledgments**

341

342 We acknowledge the support from Instituto Serrapilheira, Pastoral da Criança, the
343 Brazilian Collective Health Association (ABRASCO) and JBS's initiative 'Fazer o Bem
344 Faz Bem'.

345

346 Ana M B Menezes, Cesar G Victora, Fernando P Hartwig, Mariângela F Silveira,
347 Bernardo L Horta, Aluisio J D Barros, Lúcia C Pellanda, Odir A Dellagostin, Claudio J
348 Struchiner, Marcelo Burattini, Fernando C Barros and Pedro C Hallal contributed to the
349 conception and design of the work, to the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of
350 data and the draft of the manuscript. Marilia A Mesenburg and Fernando C
351 Whermeister contributed to the analysis of data. All authors have approved the
352 submitted version and have agreed to be personally accountable for the author's own

353 contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part
354 of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are
355 appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.

356

357 **Competing interests**

358 None declared

359

360 **REFERENCES**

- 361 1. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the
362 rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science*.
363 2020;368(6490):489-93.
- 364 2. Zhou X, Li Y, Li T, Zhang W. Follow-up of asymptomatic patients with SARS-
365 CoV-2 infection. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020;26(7):957-9.
- 366 3. Day M. Covid-19: identifying and isolating asymptomatic people helped
367 eliminate virus in Italian village. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m1165.
- 368 4. Zhu J, Zhong Z, Ji P, et al. Clinicopathological characteristics of 8697 patients
369 with COVID-19 in China: a meta-analysis. *Fam Med Community Health*. 2020;8(2).
- 370 5. Fu L, Wang B, Yuan T, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease
371 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect*.
372 2020;80(6):656-65.
- 373 6. Kronbichler A, Kresse D, Yoon S, et al. Asymptomatic patients as a source of
374 COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 375 7. Hallal P, Barros F, Silveira M, et al. EPICOVID19 protocol: repeated
376 serological surveys on SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Brazil. 2020 [2020/07/27];

- 377 Available from: [http://www.cienciaesaudecoletiva.com.br/artigos/epicovid19-protocol-](http://www.cienciaesaudecoletiva.com.br/artigos/epicovid19-protocol-repeated-serological-surveys-on-sars-cov2-antibodies-in-brazil/17691)
378 [repeated-serological-surveys-on-sars-cov2-antibodies-in-brazil/17691](http://www.cienciaesaudecoletiva.com.br/artigos/epicovid19-protocol-repeated-serological-surveys-on-sars-cov2-antibodies-in-brazil/17691).
- 379 8. Whitman JD, Hiatt J, Mowery CT, et al. Test performance evaluation of SARS-
380 CoV-2 serological assays. MedRxiv. 2020.
- 381 9. Horta BL, Gigante DP, Goncalves H, et al. Cohort Profile Update: The 1982
382 Pelotas (Brazil) Birth Cohort Study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015;44(2):441, a-e.
- 383 10. Pellanda LC, Wendland EM, McBride AJ, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of a
384 rapid test for assessment of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in a community-based setting in
385 Brazil. MedRxiv. 2020.
- 386 11. Petruccelli JL, Saboia AL. Características étnico-raciais da população:
387 classificações e identidades: Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística--IBGE; 2013.
- 388 12. Rutstein SO. The DHS wealth index: approaches for rural and urban areas:
389 Macro International Incorporated; 2008.
- 390 13. Hothorn T, Hornik K, Zeileis A. Unbiased Recursive Partitioning: A Conditional
391 Inference Framework. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*.
392 2006;15(3):651-74.
- 393 14. Hoang MP, Kanjanaumporn J, Aeumjaturapat S, et al. Olfactory and gustatory
394 dysfunctions in COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Asian Pac*
395 *J Allergy Immunol*. 2020.
- 396 15. Butowt R, Bilinska K. SARS-CoV-2: Olfaction, Brain Infection, and the Urgent
397 Need for Clinical Samples Allowing Earlier Virus Detection. *ACS Chem Neurosci*.
398 2020;11(9):1200-3.
- 399 16. Yang W, Kandula S, Huynh M, et al. Estimating the infection fatality risk of
400 COVID-19 in New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. MedRxiv.
401 2020:2020.06.27.20141689.

- 402 17. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus
403 disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(6):669-77.
- 404 18. Green MS, Swartz N, Nitzan D, Peer V. The male excess in case-fatality rates
405 for COVID-19. A meta-analytic study of the age-related differences and consistency
406 over six countries. *MedRxiv.* 2020:2020.06.11.20128439.
- 407 19. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Asymptomatic SARS-
408 CoV-2 infections: a living systematic review and meta-analysis. *MedRxiv.*
409 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
- 410 20. Gao Z, Xu Y, Sun C, et al. A Systematic Review of Asymptomatic Infections
411 with COVID-19. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.* 2020.
- 412 21. Yang J, Zheng Y, Gou X, et al. Prevalence of comorbidities and its effects in
413 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect*
414 *Dis.* 2020;94:91-5.
- 415 22. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutierrez-Ocampo E, et al.
416 Clinical, laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-
417 analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2020;34:101623.
- 418 23. Sun P, Qie S, Liu Z, et al. Clinical characteristics of hospitalized patients with
419 SARS-CoV-2 infection: A single arm meta-analysis. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92(6):612-7.
- 420 24. Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, De Siaty DR, et al. Olfactory and gustatory
421 dysfunctions as a clinical presentation of mild-to-moderate forms of the coronavirus
422 disease (COVID-19): a multicenter European study. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.*
423 2020;277(8):2251-61.
- 424 25. Mao L, Wang M, Chen S, et al. Neurological Manifestations of Hospitalized
425 Patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective case series study. *MedRxiv.*
426 2020:2020.02.22.20026500.

- 427 26. Suresh Kumar VC, Mukherjee S, Harne PS, et al. Novelty in the gut: a
428 systematic review and meta-analysis of the gastrointestinal manifestations of COVID-
429 19. *BMJ Open Gastroenterol.* 2020;7(1).
- 430 27. Parasa S, Desai M, Thoguluva Chandrasekar V, et al. Prevalence of
431 Gastrointestinal Symptoms and Fecal Viral Shedding in Patients With Coronavirus
432 Disease 2019: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.*
433 2020;3(6):e2011335.
- 434 28. Cheung KS, Hung IFN, Chan PPY, et al. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of
435 SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort:
436 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology.* 2020;159(1):81-95.
- 437 29. Ministerio de Sanidad – Consejo Interterritorial del Sistema Nacional de Salud –
438 Instituto de Salud Carlos III. Estudio ENE-COVID: informe final. Estudio nacional de
439 sero-epidemiología de la infección por SARS-CoV-2 en España. Madrid 2020 [cited
440 2020 07/26]; Available from: [https://www.mscbs.gob.es/ciudadanos/ene-](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/ciudadanos/ene-covid/docs/ESTUDIO_ENE-COVID19_INFORME_FINAL.pdf)
441 [covid/docs/ESTUDIO_ENE-COVID19_INFORME_FINAL.pdf](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/ciudadanos/ene-covid/docs/ESTUDIO_ENE-COVID19_INFORME_FINAL.pdf).
- 442 30. Menni C, Valdes AM, Freidin MB, et al. Real-time tracking of self-reported
443 symptoms to predict potential COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(7):1037-40.
- 444 31. Sudre CH, Lee K, Ni Lochlainn M, et al. Symptom clusters in Covid19: A
445 potential clinical prediction tool from the COVID Symptom study app. *MedRxiv.*
446 2020:2020.06.12.20129056.
- 447
448

449 Table 1. Distribution of the study sample according to sociodemographic characteristics
 450 and region. The EPICOV19 study, third wave.
 451

	Sample distribution	
	Number	%
Region		
Northeast	9982	31.3%
North	5180	16.3%
Central-West	3603	11.3%
Southeast	8021	25.1%
South	5083	16.0%
Sex		
Female	18646	58.5%
Male	13223	41.5%
Age (years)		
0-4	637	2.0%
5-9	862	2.7%
10-19	2789	8.8%
20-29	4965	15.6%
30-39	4999	15.7%
40-49	5078	15.9%
50-59	5032	15.8%
60-69	4234	13.3%
70+	3273	10.3%
Color/ethnicity		
White	11442	36.7%
Brown	14131	45.4%
Black	4264	13.7%
Asian	897	2.9%
Indigenous	429	1.4%
Schooling		
Primary or less	11417	39.3%
Secondary	11363	39.1%
University or higher	6275	21.6%
Wealth quintiles		
Poorest	7668	24.1%
2nd	5809	18.2%
3rd	6334	19.9%
4th	6214	19.5%
Richest	5844	18.3%

452

453


454 Table 2. Prevalence of symptoms among subjects with positive and negative antibody
455 tests for SARS-CoV-2, and prevalence ratios. The EPICOVID19 study, third wave.
456

Symptom	Prevalence		Prevalence ratio	95% CI	
	Positive	Negative		Lower bound	Upper bound
Headaches	58.0	35.5	1.6	1.5	1.8
Change in smell or taste	56.5	9.1	6.2	5.6	6.8
Fever	52.1	12.2	4.3	3.9	4.7
Cough	47.7	22.2	2.1	1.9	2.4
Myalgia	44.1	15.7	2.8	2.5	3.1
Sore throat	33.8	16.6	2.0	1.8	2.3
Diarrhea	25.6	11.7	2.2	1.9	2.5
Difficulty breathing	23.1	9.4	2.5	2.1	2.8
Shivering	20.5	6.1	3.3	2.9	3.9
Palpitation	20.0	10.5	1.9	1.6	2.2
Vomiting	9.5	4.0	2.4	1.9	3.0

457

458

459 Figure 1. Distribution of the number of symptoms in individuals positive and negative
460 for antibodies for SARS-CoV-2. The EPICOV19 study, third wave.
461




462

463


464

465 Figure 2. Mean number of symptoms and percent asymptomatic in subjects positive for
 466 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, according to sociodemographic characteristics. The
 467 EPICOVID19 study, third wave.

468
 469 Notes: diamonds represent the main Y axis for the mean number of symptoms (with
 470 their respective 95% CI). The bars represent the secondary Y axis for the prevalence of
 471 asymptomatic subjects.



474 Figure 3 – Conditional inference tree of the association between symptoms (predictors)
 475 and seroprevalence for SARS-CoV-2. The EPICOV19 study, third wave.
 476
 477 The area of the rectangles corresponds to the proportion of the population contained in
 478 each node.
 479



480

481

482