

24 ⁸ Department of Statistics, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre,
25 RS, Brazil

26 ⁹ Department of Exact and Social Applied Sciences, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde
27 de Porto Alegre (UFCSPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

28 ¹⁰ Department of Diagnostic Methods, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto
29 Alegre

30 ¹¹ Department of Pharmacosciences, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto
31 Alegre (UFCSPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

32 * **Corresponding author**

33

34 **Address for correspondence:**

35 Claudia Elizabeth Thompson

36 Department of Pharmacosciences, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre
37 (UFCSPA), 245/200C Sarmiento Leite St, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

38 ZIP code: 90050-170.

39 Phone: +55 (51) 3303 8889.

40 E-mail: cthompson@ufcspa.edu.br, thompson.ufcspa@gmail.com

41 **Abstract**

42 Population-based prevalence surveys of COVID-19 contribute to establish the burden and
43 epidemiology of infection, the role of asymptomatic and mild infections in transmission, and
44 allow more precise decisions about reopen policies. We performed a systematic review to
45 evaluate qualitative aspects of these studies, their reliability, and biases. The available data
46 described 37 surveys from 19 countries, mostly from Europe and America and using antibody
47 testing. They reached highly heterogeneous sample sizes and prevalence estimates.
48 Disproportional prevalence was observed in minority communities. Important risk of bias was
49 detected in four domains: sample size, data analysis with sufficient coverage, measurements in
50 standard way, and response rate. The correspondence analysis showed few consistent patterns
51 for high risk of bias. Intermediate risk of bias was related to American and European studies,
52 blood samples and prevalence >1%. Low risk of bias was related to Asian studies, RT-PCR
53 tests and prevalence <1%.

54

55 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, Cross-Sectional
56 Studies, Prevalence, Epidemiology, Infectious Diseases

57

58 **One sentence summary:** Population-based prevalence surveys of COVID-19 until September
59 2020 were mostly conducted in Europe and Americas, used antibody testing, and had important
60 risks of bias.

61 **Introduction**

62 In December 2019, the third most important coronavirus in the twenty-first century
63 (SARS-CoV-2) was identified as the causative agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome
64 outbreak in Wuhan, Hubei province, China (1,2). The illness named COVID-19 spread rapidly
65 around the world, acquiring pandemic status on March 11, 2020 (3). As of 14 October, 2020,
66 there are ~38 million confirmed cases and ~1.1 million reported deaths in 216 countries, areas
67 or territories. More than 50% of these cases were reported in the USA, India and Brazil, the
68 worst-hit countries (4,5).

69 According to the current evidence, the main form of SARS-CoV-2 spreading is through
70 human-to-human transmission via respiratory droplets and contact routes (6). The standard
71 diagnostic testing method is the Real-Time reverse transcription-PCR (RT-PCR) test (7,8),
72 which is able to detect current infections and it is recommended for people with COVID-19
73 symptoms and for all close contacts of the confirmed cases. A complementary approach is to
74 use antibody tests (e. g. point-of-care test or enzyme linked immunosorbent assay) to detect a
75 past infection and the production of antibodies (IgM and/or IgG) against SARS-CoV-2 (8).

76 COVID-19 causes diverse degrees of illness, ranging from asymptomatic infection to
77 severe pneumonia (9). However, surveillance is only based on the confirmed cases, which can
78 represent an underestimation of total cases due to non-testing in mildly affected or
79 asymptomatic individuals. Population-based prevalence surveys can help to establish the
80 disease epidemiology, the burden of infection, the role that asymptomatic and mild infections
81 play in the transmission and to enable precise evidence-based decisions about control and
82 reopen policies while no pharmacological intervention is available (10). Moreover, accurate
83 estimates of the basic reproduction number, of exposed and susceptible populations, and the
84 fatality rates can be obtained (11,12).

85 Statistical extrapolations will only be reliable for the population if (i) the sample of
86 individuals is sufficient, random, and representative of the general population, (ii) if the
87 measurements are standardized, and (iii) if the tests used have adequate sensitivity and
88 specificity, among other factors (13). For example, a recent systematic review and meta-
89 analysis evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of serological tests in 40 studies. The conclusion
90 indicated that the use of existing point-of-care serological tests is not supported by available
91 evidence due to low performance (14). Thus, a critical evaluation of these parameters is
92 necessary to verify the reliability of the population-based surveys of COVID-19.

93 We performed a systematic review to evaluate and summarize the main results regarding
94 the COVID-19 prevalence obtained through population-based surveys, their reliability and
95 biases. Our main aims were to evaluate the qualitative aspects of these studies and to compile
96 methodology practices that can influence positively or negatively the prevalence estimates.

97 **Methods**

98 **Registration and Reporting**

99 The protocol for this systematic review was registered on PROSPERO
100 ([CRD42020202186](#)) and it is available in full on Appendix 1. Reporting was conducted
101 according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
102 (Appendix 2, Checklist).

103 **Search Strategy**

104 Systematic literature searches for published and unpublished (preprint) articles were
105 conducted from 15 July to 05 September, 2020. MEDLINE (accessed via PubMed), Excerpta
106 Medica dataBASE (EMBASE), bioRxiv, and medRxiv databases were searched using the
107 following controlled vocabulary heading and terms: “seroprevalence”, “prevalence”,
108 “serology”, “immunoassay”, “enzyme linked immunosorbent assay”, “real time polymerase

109 chain reaction”, “cross-sectional study”, “population screening”, “severe acute respiratory
110 syndrome coronavirus 2”, “COVID-19”. These terms and their synonyms were combined using
111 logical operators and adapted according to the searched database. Only articles published in
112 English were retrieved. The complete search strategy for each database is on Appendix 2, Table
113 1.

114 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

115 The review included cross-sectional or repeated cross-sectional studies using molecular
116 or serological tests to estimate the prevalence of COVID-19 in municipalities, regions, states or
117 countries around the world. Studies were excluded based on the following criteria: (i) non-
118 cross-sectional studies, (ii) studies with correlation between COVID-19 and other diseases or
119 health determinants, (iii) non-random selection of participants (e. g. convenience sampling),
120 (iv) inclusion of a specific group of participants only (e. g., with comorbidities, pregnant,
121 elderly, healthcare workers, pediatric patients), and (v) non-human samples.

122 **Article Screening and Data Extraction**

123 Four pairs of authors (AMM and CLML, ABG and JGK, ASS and VBF, GDC and JCP)
124 independently reviewed the titles and abstracts, in parallel, and included publications identified
125 by either author for full-text review. These authors also reviewed full texts to determine which
126 publications met the inclusion criteria and then re-analyzed the texts and supplemental materials
127 to extract the following relevant information, when available: (i) authors, (ii) study location,
128 (iii) coverage, (iv) study type, (v) random sampling method, (vi) period of testing, (vii) number
129 of tests, (viii) biological samples, (ix) type of test used, (x) if test validation was performed, (xi)
130 the test sensitivity and specificity, (xii) prevalence, and (xiii) statistical methods (Table).
131 Disagreements in the screening and data extraction were discussed among the reviewers and, if
132 consensus cannot be reached, a third reviewer (ATW) made the ultimate decision.

133 **Survey Quality**

134 We assessed each survey quality by using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical
135 Appraisal Checklist for Prevalence Studies (13). This tool evaluates nine domains: (D1) sample
136 frame adequacy, (D2) recruitment method, (D3) sample size, (D4) study subjects and the
137 setting, (D5) coverage, (D6) diagnostic methods, (D7) the reliability and standardization of
138 measurements, (D8) statistical analysis, and (D9) the response rate. For each study, “yes”,
139 “no” and “unclear” options were selected, meaning "low", "high" and "unclear" risk of bias,
140 respectively. The number of “yes” answers to these nine domains was counted, with a higher
141 number of yes representing less risk of bias. Graphs considering each risk of bias domain across
142 all studies were prepared using the robvis R package v. 0.3.0.900 (15).

143 **Definitions**

144 Additional objective criteria were adopted for the survey quality assessment. For D4,
145 the prevalence estimates should be stratified by conventional sex and age classes minimally.
146 For D5, “no” was chosen when there was a lack of a subgroup representativity. If the response
147 rate $>70\%$ or $<70\%$ with adequate sample size, “yes” was chosen. The option "unclear" was
148 selected only if there was no information about the response rate in the article. For D6, a method
149 was considered valid if the sensitivity $>70\%$. For D7, self-sampling was considered as a practice
150 of high risk of bias. In the case of a collection described by health professionals or trained
151 individuals and using standardized methods, we assumed a low risk of bias. For D8, a minimum
152 description of statistical methods was sufficient to classify the study as low risk of bias. For D9,
153 if the response rate $<70\%$ without stratification or statistical management, the study was
154 considered to have a high risk of bias. Response rate $>70\%$ or appropriate management of low
155 response rate were related to a low risk of bias, while missing information about the proportion
156 of tested in relation to the recruited individuals was associated with unclear.

157 **Data analysis**

158 A correspondence analysis was performed to visualize in a low-dimensional graphic the
159 relationships among categories of the row and column variables. The row variables (respective
160 categories) were: (i) study continent (Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and South
161 America); (ii) coverage (country, region, and municipality); (iii) biological samples
162 (uninformed, blood only, both swab and blood, serum/plasma, and swab only), (iv) test
163 validation (external, uninformed, yes [internal], and RT-PCR [N/A: gold-standard]), (v) test
164 sensitivity (<80%, 80-90%, 90-100%, unavailable, and RT-PCR [N/A: gold-standard]). The
165 column variables (respective categories) were: (vi) prevalence (<1%, 1-3%, 3-5%, 5-20%, and
166 >20%), and (vii) risk of bias (low [≤ 1 high risk], intermediate [$1 < \text{high risk} \leq 3$], and high [$>$
167 3 high risk]) (see Survey Quality). Two studies (18,34) were split due to widely divergent
168 prevalences reported in each part of the municipalities investigated. Therefore, despite the 37
169 studies included, 39 records were considered in this analysis. The PROC CORRESP from SAS
170 Studio (Release 3.8, Enterprise Edition) available on the SAS OnDemand for Academics
171 platform was used to perform the correspondence analysis.

172 **Results**

173 Of 49 full-text articles screened, we excluded 12 (Appendix 2, Table 2), and identified
174 37 eligible for extensive review (Figure 1, Table). Of these, 23 (62.2%) were preprint, while 14
175 (37.8%) were peer-reviewed and published. Fifteen articles (40.5%) were from Europe, 8
176 (21.6%) from North America, 8 (21.6%) from South America, 5 (13.5%) from Asia, and 1
177 (2.7%) from Africa. The countries with the vast majority of population-based prevalence study
178 initiatives were the United States (n=8; 21.6%), Brazil (n=7; 18.9%), and the United Kingdom
179 (n=3; 8.1%). Importantly, 15 of the 16 studies in the Americas were conducted in the United
180 States or Brazil, which are included in the TOP 3 of confirmed cases and deaths worldwide. In

181 total, 19 countries had studies included in this analysis (Figure 2). Considering the coverage of
182 these studies, 16 (43.2%) had regional (state / province / county) scope, 13 (35.1%) were
183 restricted to municipalities, and 8 (21.6%) were nationwide studies.

184 The vast majority of studies (n=25; 67.6%) reported only antibody testing, while the
185 exclusive use of RT-PCR were presented in 5 (13.5%), and both tests were conducted in 7
186 (18.9%) studies. The authors of 15 (46.9%) of the 32 studies that used serological tests reported
187 their own validation test performance, while in 13 (40.6%) the validation performed by other
188 studies or by the manufacturer were described. Excluding Wuhan's (China) screening program
189 that tested 9,899,828, at least 394,090 individuals were tested in the other 36 studies that
190 reported the number of tests. However, this number was highly variable among studies (mean:
191 10,946.94, median: 1,990, standard deviation (SD): 27,382.34). Considering the periods of
192 these surveys, most of them were conducted between April and July, 2020 (Figure 3).

193 Most studies (n=35; 94.6%) presented low risk of bias overall, but only one had low
194 risk of bias in all nine domains (32). Two studies showed overall unclear risk of bias (34,49).
195 Apart from these, another three studies had a sum of high and unclear risk of bias higher than
196 the low risk of bias (16,20,27) (Appendix 2, Figure). Considering the nine domains established
197 and three possible answers (low, unclear, and high), on average 6.35, 1.43 and 1.19 of each
198 option was chosen, respectively. The median values were 6.0, 1.0 and 1.0 while the SDs were
199 1.44, 1.26 and 1.08. Considering the sum of results with some risk of bias (unclear and high),
200 the mean, median and SD were 2.62, 3.0 and 1.46, respectively. Considering each domain in
201 all studies, >75% low risk of bias across the studies were observed in five domains. On the
202 other hand, three criteria (data analysis with sufficient coverage, measurements in standard way,
203 and response rate adequacy) were adequate in <50% of the studies. The remaining domain
204 (sample size) was adequate in ~70% of the studies (Figure 4).

205 Considering the analysis of correspondence performed (Figure 5) among seven main
206 variables (continent, coverage, biological samples, test validation, sensitivity, prevalence, and
207 risk of bias), we found some important correlations. European, North- and South-American
208 studies presented, in general, an intermediate risk of bias, while Asian studies tended to a low
209 risk of bias. Regarding the coverage of the studies, both regional, nationwide and municipal
210 studies presented an association with intermediate risk of bias.

211 Studies that performed molecular tests on naso- and oropharyngeal swabs (NPS) tended
212 to have a low risk of bias, while those with blood samples were related to intermediate risk.
213 Regarding prevalence, the majority of the studies with swab samples (RT-PCR) showed
214 prevalence (P) <1%, while studies using only blood, or swab and blood, exhibited P>1%.
215 Validation in serological tests had no significant impact on the quality of studies, since both
216 external and internal validation were related to intermediate risk of bias. On the other hand, the
217 use of the gold standard (RT-PCR) was associated with low risk of bias. P<1% was more
218 frequent in studies with low risk of bias, while P>1% was associated with intermediate risk of
219 bias.

220 **Discussion**

221 We observed that important limitations of the studies were the low sample size and the
222 low response rate (Figure 4). These factors influence heavily on reliable prevalence estimates
223 (53). Moreover, the recruitment by letter, by mail or online may play a significant role in
224 reducing the response rate and inadequately address the target population (54,55).

225 For example, in the Icelandic study (27), the authors discussed the small variation in the
226 prevalence estimates between open invitation and random selection recruitments. However, the
227 random selection methods were not detailed and the sample size to detect the estimated
228 prevalence was not adequate (<2,529 individuals) (56). In the Slovenian study (31), despite

229 being considered nationwide, the sample size was 1,366, which represented ~7x less than
230 necessary (10,179) (56) and there was no management of the low response rate (<50%). Some
231 authors seem to have not been concerned with managing this issue because even though the
232 response rate was low, there was still an adequate sample (23,35,36,40,42). Repeated cross-
233 sectional studies featured a widely distinct prevalence estimate on each round (29,36,49,50).
234 This trend might be caused by the ascending curve of infected people, following the epidemic's
235 natural course. Therefore, there was a need for different sample sizes for each period.
236 Unfortunately, some studies did not yield adequate sample size in all rounds (49, 50).

237 The same proportion of studies validated their methods internally to report accuracy
238 (16,21,23,24,30,32,34-39,45,50,52) or used sensitivity and specificity given by manufacturers
239 or other external studies (18-20,22,36,40-42,44-51). We also noticed that it is quite unclear if
240 the field teams followed standardized protocols for the data collection and testing. The absence
241 of complete information resulted in a loss of quality in the methodological analysis (13), and
242 we speculate that one rationale would be the editing process of these articles, which were
243 published as letters or comments. In some studies (23,24,35), the samples were collected by the
244 participants themselves, which causes an increase in the number of discarded samples and can
245 reduce the sensitivity, especially of RT-PCR, highly influenced by a well done sample
246 collection procedure (57).

247 However, the studies presented several strengths to highlight. Valid methods
248 consistently stated the identification of the condition and the manufacturer indicated this
249 accuracy. The majority of the sampling methods was conducted appropriately regarding
250 randomness, and the participants were well described and stratified, thus mitigating possible
251 selection bias (18,19,24,26,28,30,33,37,39,43,44,46,48-51). A strong trend was observed in
252 relation to the sampling procedures used in Brazil. All studies used a standardized household
253 sampling method based on census tracts (46-48,50-52) or healthcare units (49).

254 An interesting method of sample selection was the use of social networks ads targeting
255 individuals by demographic and geographic characteristics and stratification, which despite
256 being convenient inserts the biases of technology usage and the participation of people most
257 likely to be infected. However, in these cases, statistical management seems to have been
258 adequate to accommodate the sampling issues in the prevalence estimates (38,43). Biases were
259 also introduced when volunteers were recruited, but data analysis was conducted properly in
260 these cases (41,43). Nevertheless, these practices cover up important methodological issues
261 despite minimizing the biases of studies and they should be avoided.

262 COVID-19 has an extensive spectrum of manifestation, including asymptomatic
263 infection, mild disease, severe pneumonia, and death (2,9). Asymptomatic individuals may play
264 an important role in disease transmission (10). The prevalence of asymptomatic infection in the
265 community is still unclear, but essential to estimate the real COVID-19 prevalence. Infection
266 rates rely on testing of symptomatic persons and may underestimate infection rates (10,11,12),
267 which can be circumvented by surveying randomly recruited populations (11).

268 In fact, the asymptomatic rate of infection is quite hard to estimate. Nevertheless, we
269 can consider some relevant observations. The proportion of symptom-free SARS-CoV-2
270 infection in most studies is higher than Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) (58) and
271 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) (59) coronaviruses epidemics, which was reported
272 to lay between 0% and 7.5%. However, in the case of COVID-19, these rates were widely
273 variable among PCR-positive and/or seropositive, ranging from 19.6% (47) to 69% (23). Older
274 age groups were correlated with SARS-CoV-2 infection among symptomatic participants
275 (28,29), and there was no statistical difference in the viral load of symptomatic versus
276 asymptomatic (29). On the other hand, PCR- and antibody-negative participants also reported
277 symptoms (25,27), raising the possibility of infection by other respiratory etiological agents
278 (27). However, the comparability of asymptomatic rate estimates is hindered by different

279 approaches applied, since the period of symptoms screening before the sampling ranged from
280 one week (23) to several months (26).

281 Some studies demonstrated a disproportionate seroprevalence in black communities
282 (24,40,42-44,46,47,51), multiracial, hispanic, indigenous, and asian persons
283 (24,38,39,43,44,46), as well as in public-facing workers (17,24,43), and slums population
284 (18,45). These data show the disparities that minority communities face to access healthcare
285 systems, arisen from a complex relationship of social, environmental, economic, and structural
286 inequities (60,61). Therefore, a priori knowledge of these trends in seroprevalence is essential
287 for the sample design and for the instruction of field teams regarding protective measures in
288 these surveys.

289 In the study from Stockholm (34), it was observed a significant difference in
290 seroprevalence between the two areas (4.1% in middle-high income and 30% in lower income
291 suburb). The authors related this high prevalence with cramped accommodation, which
292 enhances cluster transmission, and with a majority of public-facing workers in the suburb. In
293 Mumbai (18), the authors found a higher seroprevalence in the slums (54.1%) compared with
294 non-slums (16.1%). Thus, it is discussed that the epidemic may be in advanced stages in slums
295 due to higher population density.

296 The data from Brazilian studies (46-52) suggest that pandemic were highly
297 heterogeneous in the country, with rapid growth in North and Northeast regions, and slow
298 progression in the South and Center-West regions. These data demonstrate the impact of
299 differences in demographics, urban infrastructure and income on the infection spreading and
300 seroprevalence, emphasizing health inequality (62,63).

301 It is important to note that the data presented here are based on the articles until
302 September 5, 2020. Therefore, more recent articles are not included in the analysis. In addition,
303 previous pre-print articles can be currently published. In general, we believe that the peer review

304 process should contribute to increase the quality of these currently unpublished articles with a
305 higher risk of bias.

306 We have decided not to conduct a meta-analysis because of the prevalence heterogeneity
307 among studies and the different stages of pandemic faced in the countries and continents at the
308 time of each survey. Thus, a summary measure of meta-analysis would not be able to generalize
309 overall findings sufficiently. In contrast, we found that a correspondence analysis was more
310 able to detect the correlation among variables.

311 In this analysis, few consistent patterns were observed for studies with a high risk of
312 bias, indicating that particular methodological choices of each study may affect its quality, not
313 choices that are being made in many studies worldwide. The high number of "unclear" reported
314 (n=53; 15.9%) may be related to the accelerated speed of publication, the forgetfulness of these
315 items in the writing process of the manuscript or the lack of knowledge of checklists like the
316 one used in this work (13). Therefore, we recommend the use of standardized checklists for the
317 planning, execution and reporting of prevalence studies. Intermediate risk of bias was
318 associated with: American and European studies, blood samples, $P > 1\%$, and internal/external
319 validation. Low risk of bias was associated with: Asian studies, $P < 1\%$, NPS samples and RT-
320 PCR tests. Although the number of studies were low and the correspondence analysis presents
321 some outliers due to the low representativeness of some categories, these conclusions were
322 highly consistent and showed some important aspects of population-based COVID-19
323 prevalence studies associated with the methodological quality.

324 **Acknowledgements**

325 The authors would like to thank the included studies for the data provided and for important
326 contributions in facing the pandemic in their countries.

327 **Disclaimers**

328 The authors declare no competing interests.

329 **Funding**

330 This work was supported by grants from Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível
331 Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento
332 Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do RS
333 (FAPERGS) (Brazilian Government Agencies). The funders had no role in the study design,
334 data generation and analysis, decision to publish or the preparation of the manuscript.

335 **References**

- 336 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected
337 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet*. 2020; 395(10223):497-506.
338 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
- 339 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients
340 with pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(8):727-33.
341 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>
- 342 3. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19-11 March
343 2020. World Health Organization [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
344 [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
345 [media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
- 346 4. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. World Health Organization [Internet].
347 2020. Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 348 5. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. Johns Hopkins University & Medicine
349 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>
- 350 6. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan,
351 China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(13): 1199-207.
352 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001316>
- 353 7. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019
354 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill*. 2020; 25(3):2000045.
355 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045>
- 356 8. COVID-19 Testing Overview. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. 2020.
357 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/testing.html>
- 358 9. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical characteristics of
359 coronavirus disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(18):1708-20.
360 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2002032>
- 361 10. Lipsitch M, Swerdlow DL, Finelli L. Defining the epidemiology of Covid-19—studies
362 needed. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(13):1194-96. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2002125>
- 363 11. Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation protocol for coronavirus
364 2019 (COVID-19) infection, 26 May 2020 (No. WHO/2019-nCoV/Seroepidemiology/2020.2).

- 365 World Health Organization [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
366 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331656>
- 367 12. Tang YW, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. Laboratory diagnosis of COVID-19:
368 current issues and challenges. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020; 58(6): e00512-20.
369 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00512-20>
- 370 13. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic
371 reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative
372 incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc.* 2020; 13(3):147-53.
373 <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000054>
- 374 14. Bastos ML, Tavaziva G, Abidi SK, Campbell JR, Haraoui LP, Johnston JC, et al. Diagnostic
375 accuracy of serological tests for covid-19: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2020;
376 370:m2516. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2516>
- 377 15. McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and
378 Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Syn Meth.* 2020; 1-7.
379 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1411>
- 380 16. Majiya H, Aliyu-Paiko M, Balogu VT, Musa DA, Salihu IM, Kawu AA, et al.
381 Seroprevalence of COVID-19 in Niger State. *MedRxiv* 20168112 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020
382 Oct 01]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.04.20168112v1>
- 383 17. Cao S, Gan Y, Wang C, Bachmann M, Huang Y, Wang T, et al. Citywide Nucleic Acid
384 Screening of SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Post-lockdown Wuhan, China: Results and
385 Implications. *MedRxiv* 20142554 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
386 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.29.20142554v1>
- 387 18. Malani A, Shah D, Kang G, Lobo GN, Shastri J, Mohanan M, et al. Seroprevalence of
388 SARS-CoV-2 in slums and non-slums of Mumbai, India, during June 29-July 19, 2020.
389 *MedRxiv* 20182741 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
390 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.27.20182741v1>
- 391 19. Shakiba M, Nazari SSH, Mehrabian F, Rezvani SM, Ghasempour Z, et al. Seroprevalence
392 of COVID-19 virus infection in Guilan province, Iran. *MedRxiv* 20079244 [Preprint]. 2020
393 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
394 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.26.20079244v1>

- 395 20. Nawa N, Kuramochi J, Sonoda S, Yamaoka Y, Nukui Y, Miyazaki Y, Fujiwara T.
396 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies in Utsunomiya City, Greater Tokyo, after first
397 pandemic in 2020 (U-CORONA): a household-and population-based study. MedRxiv
398 20155945 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
399 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.20.20155945v1?rss=1%22>
- 400 21. Qutob N, Awartani F, Salah Z, Asia M, Khader IA, Herzallah K, et al. Seroprevalence of
401 SARS-CoV-2 in Palestine: a cross-sectional seroepidemiological study. MedRxiv 20180083
402 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
403 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.28.20180083v3>
- 404 22. Petersen MS, Strøm M, Christiansen DH, Fjallsbak JP, Eliassen EH, Johansen M, et al. Early
405 Release-Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibodies, Faroe Islands. Emerg Infect
406 Dis. 2020; 26(11). <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2611.202736>
- 407 23. Riley S, Ainslie KE, Eales O, Jeffrey B, Walters CE, Atchison CJ, et al. Community
408 prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 virus in England during may 2020: REACT study. MedRxiv
409 20150524 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
410 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150524v1>
- 411 24. Ward H, Atchison CJ, Whitaker M, Ainslie KE, Elliot J, Okell LC, et al. Antibody
412 prevalence for SARS-CoV-2 in England following first peak of the pandemic: REACT2 study
413 in 100,000 adults. MedRxiv 20173690 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
414 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.12.20173690v2>
- 415 25. Weis S, Scherag A, Baier M, Kiehntopf M, Kamradt T, Kolanos S, et al. Seroprevalence of
416 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in an entirely PCR-sampled and quarantined community after a
417 COVID-19 outbreak-the CoNAN study. MedRxiv 20154112 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct
418 01]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.15.20154112v1>
- 419 26. Merkely B, Szabó AJ, Kosztin A, Berényi E, Sebestyén A, Lengyel C, et al. Novel
420 coronavirus epidemic in the Hungarian population, a cross-sectional nationwide survey to
421 support the exit policy in Hungary. GeroScience. 2020; 42(4):1063-1074.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-020-00226-9>
- 423 27. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, Magnusson OT, Melsted P, Norddahl GL, et al.
424 Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic population. N Engl J Med. 2020; 382(24):2302-15.
425 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2006100>

- 426 28. Pagani G, Conti F, Giacomelli A, Bernacchia D, Rondanin R, Prina A, et al. Seroprevalence
427 of SARS-CoV-2 IgG significantly varies with age: results from a mass population screening
428 (SARS-2-SCREEN-CdA). MedRxiv 20138875 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available
429 from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.24.20138875v2>
- 430 29. Lavezzo E, Franchin E, Ciavarella C, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Barzon L, Del Vecchio C, et
431 al. Suppression of a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in the Italian municipality of Vo'. Nature. 2020;
432 584(7821), 425-429. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2488-1>
- 433 30. Snoeck CJ, Vaillant M, Abdelrahman T, Satagopam VP, Turner JD, Beaumont K, et al.
434 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the Luxembourgish population: the CON-VINCE
435 study. MedRxiv 20092916 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
436 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.11.20092916v1>
- 437 31. Vodičar PM, Valenčak AO, Zupan B, Županc TA, Kurdija S, Korva M, et al. Low
438 prevalence of active COVID-19 in Slovenia: a nationwide population study of a probability-
439 based sample. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.07.013>
- 440 32. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al.
441 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based
442 seroepidemiological study. Lancet. 2020; 396(10250):535-44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-
443 6736\(20\)31483-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5)
- 444 33. Brotons C, Serrano J, Fernandez D, Garcia-Ramos C, Ichazo B, Lemaire J, et al.
445 Seroprevalence against COVID-19 and follow-up of suspected cases in primary health care in
446 Spain. MedRxiv 20130575 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
447 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.13.20130575v1>
- 448 34. Lundkvist Å, Hanson S, Olsen B. Pronounced difference in Covid-19 antibody prevalence
449 indicates cluster transmission in Stockholm, Sweden. Infect Ecol Epidemiology. 2020; 10(1):
450 1806505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008686.2020.1806505>
- 451 35. Roxhed N, Bendes A, Dale M, Mattsson C, Hanke L, Dodig-Crnkovic T, et al. A
452 translational multiplex serology approach to profile the prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
453 antibodies in home-sampled blood. MedRxiv 20143966 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01].
454 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.01.20143966v1>
- 455 36. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al.
456 Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-

- 457 POP): a population-based study. *Lancet*. 2020; 396:313-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140->
458 [6736\(20\)31304-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0)
- 459 37. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, Eichner D, Reynolds J, Bendavid E, Bhattacharya J.
460 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2–Specific Antibodies Among Adults in Los Angeles County,
461 California, on April 10-11, 2020. *JAMA*. 2020; 323(23):2425-27.
462 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.8279>
- 463 38. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, Shah S, Ling E, Bromley-Dulfano R, et al. COVID-19
464 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. *MedRxiv* 20062463 [Preprint].
465 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
466 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.14.20062463v2>
- 467 39. Mahajan S, Srinivasan R, Redlich CA, Huston SK, Anastasio KM, Cashman L, et al.
468 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-Specific IgG Antibodies Among Adults Living in Connecticut
469 Between March 1 and June 1, 2020: Post-Infection Prevalence (PIP) Study. *MedRxiv* 20168203
470 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
471 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.04.20168203v2>
- 472 40. Biggs HM, Harris JB, Breakwell L, Dahlgren FS, Abedi GR, Szablewski CM, et al.
473 Estimated community seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies—two Georgia counties,
474 April 28–May 3, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020; 69(29), 965-70.
475 <http://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6929e2>
- 476 41. McLaughlin CC, Doll MK, Morrison KT, McLaughlin WL, O’Connor T, Sholukh AM, et
477 al. High Community SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Seroprevalence in a Ski Resort Community,
478 Blaine County, Idaho, US. Preliminary Results. *Medrxiv* 20157198 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020
479 Oct 01]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.19.20157198v1>
- 480 42. Menachemi N, Yiannoutsos CT, Dixon BE, Duszynski TJ, Fadel WF, Wools-Kaloustian,
481 KK, et al. Population point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on a statewide random
482 sample—Indiana, April 25–29, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020; 69(29): 960-4.
483 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6929e1>
- 484 43. Feehan AK, Velasco C, Fort D, Burton JH, Price-Haywood E, Katzmarzyk PT, et al. Racial
485 and workplace disparities in seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, July
486 15-31, 2020. *MedRxiv* 20180968 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
487 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.26.20180968v1>

- 488 44. Feehan AK, Fort D, Garcia-Diaz J, Price-Haywood E, Velasco C, Sapp E, et al. Early
489 Release-Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and Infection Fatality Ratio, Orleans and Jefferson
490 Parishes, Louisiana, USA, May 2020. *Emerging Infect Dis.* 2020; 26(11).
491 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2611.203029>
- 492 45. Figar S, Pagotto V, Luna L, Salto J, Manslau MW, Mistchenko A, et al. Community-level
493 SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Survey in urban slum dwellers of Buenos Aires City, Argentina:
494 a participatory research. *MedRxiv* 20153858 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available
495 from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.14.20153858v2>
- 496 46. Hallal P, Hartwig F, Horta B, Victora GD, Silveira M, Struchiner C, et al. Remarkable
497 variability in SARS-CoV-2 antibodies across Brazilian regions: nationwide serological
498 household survey in 27 states. *MedRxiv* 20117531 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01].
499 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.30.20117531v1>
- 500 47. Gomes CC, Cerutti C, Zandonade E, Maciel ELN, de Alencar FEC, Almada GL, et al. A
501 population-based study of the prevalence of COVID-19 infection in Espirito Santo, Brazil:
502 methodology and results of the first stage. *MedRxiv* 20130559 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct
503 01]. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.13.20130559v1>
- 504 48. da Silva AAM, Neto LGL, de Maria Pedrozo C, de Azevedo S, da Costa LMM, Bragança
505 MLBM, et al. Population-based seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 is more than halfway through
506 the herd immunity threshold in the State of Maranhao, Brazil. *MedRxiv* 20180463 [Preprint].
507 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
508 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.28.20180463v1>
- 509 49. Vieira CPDB, Borba ADS, Melo MCDC, Oliveira MDS, Melo RM, Nunes VV, et al.
510 Sequential serological surveys in the early stages of the coronavirus disease epidemic:
511 limitations and perspectives. *Rev Soc Bras Med Trop.* 2020; 53:e20200351.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1590/0037-8682-0351-2020>
- 513 50. Silveira MF, Barros AJ, Horta BL, Pellanda LC, Victora GD, Dellagostin OA, et al.
514 Population-based surveys of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Brazil. *Nat Med.*
515 2020; 26(8):1196-99. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0992-3>
- 516 51. Tess BH, Granato CF, Alves MC, Pintao MC, Rizzatti E, Nunes MC, Reinach FC. SARS-
517 CoV-2 seroprevalence in the municipality of Sao Paulo, Brazil, ten weeks after the first reported
518 case. *MedRxiv* 20142331 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
519 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.29.20142331v1>

- 520 52. Calife K, Caseiro MM, dos Santos Barros CR, Martins LC, Chioro A, Estanislau E, et al.
521 COVID-19 Seroprevalence in Baixada Santista Metropolitan Area, Sao Paulo, Brazil. MedRxiv
522 20184010 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 01]. Available from:
523 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.28.20184010v1>
- 524 53. Draugalis JR, Coons SJ, Plaza, CM. Best practices for survey research reports: a synopsis
525 for authors and reviewers. Am J Pharm Educ. 2008; 72(1):11. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj720111>
- 526 54. So R, Shinohara K, Aoki T, Tsujimoto Y, Suganuma AM, Furukawa TA. Effect of
527 recruitment methods on response rate in a web-based study for primary care physicians:
528 factorial randomized controlled trial. J Medical Internet Res. 2018; 20(2):e28.
529 <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8561>
- 530 55. Cook C, Heath F, Thompson RL. A meta-analysis of response rates in web-or internet-based
531 surveys. Educ Psychol Meas. 2000; 60(6):821-36.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970934>
- 533 56. Naing L, Winn T, Rusli BN. Practical issues in calculating the sample size for prevalence
534 studies. Arch Orofac Sci. 2006; 1:9-14.
- 535 57. Tahamtan A, Ardebili A. Real-time RT-PCR in COVID-19 detection: issues affecting the
536 results. Expert Rev Mol Diagn. 2020; 20(5):1-2.
537 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2020.1757437>
- 538 58. Leung GM, Lim WW, Ho LM, Lam TH, Ghani AC, Donnelly CA, et al. Seroprevalence of
539 IgG antibodies to SARS-coronavirus in asymptomatic or subclinical population groups.
540 Epidemiol Infect. 2006; 134(2):211-21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268805004826>
- 541 59. Degnah AA, Al-Amri SS, Hassan AM, Almasoud AS, Mousa M, Almahboub SA, et al.
542 Seroprevalence of MERS-CoV in healthy adults in western Saudi Arabia, 2011–2016. J Infect
543 Public Health. 2020; 23(5):697-703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.01.001>
- 544 60. Abuelgasim E, Saw LJ, Shirke M, Zeinah M, Harky A. COVID-19: Unique public health
545 issues facing Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities. Curr Probl Cardiol. 2020;
546 45(8):100621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2020.100621>
- 547 61. Millett GA, Jones AT, Benkeser D, Baral S, Mercer L, Beyrer C et al. Assessing differential
548 impacts of COVID-19 on Black communities. Ann Epidemiol. 2020; 47: 37-44.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.05.003>

550 62. Baqui P, Bica I, Marra V, Ercole A, van Der Schaar M. Ethnic and regional variations in
551 hospital mortality from COVID-19 in Brazil: a cross-sectional observational study. *Lancet Glob*
552 *Health*. 2020; 8(8):e1018-26. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(20\)30285-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30285-0)

553 63. Pinto AS, Rodrigues CA, Sobrinho CL, Santos EG, Cruz LA, Nunes PC, et al. Covid-19
554 epidemic curve in Brazil: A sum of multiple epidemics, whose income inequality and
555 population density in the states are correlated with growth rate and daily acceleration. *MedRxiv*
556 20191353 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 04]. Available from:
557 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.09.20191353v2>

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572


573

574

575

576

577




578

579 **Figure 1.** PRISMA Flowchart of the literature search.




580

581 **Figure 2.** Map of countries and specific regions with prevalence surveys. Red dots represent
582 regions and cities where the initiatives were performed. In nationwide studies, the point was
583 placed in the center of the country.



584

585 **Figure 3.** Timeline of population-based COVID-19 prevalence surveys conducted worldwide,
 586 with the duration of each survey and an overview of the most represented periods. Black dots
 587 on the left represent the date of the first confirmed case in the country of each survey.



588

589 **Figure 4.** Risk of bias assessment summary table across all studies.

590 *No weights were applied for different studies.

591 †Not applicable was selected in “sample size adequate” because the study had zero prevalence

592 (impossible to calculate the sample size required).

- 601 **Table.** Characteristics of 37 population-based prevalence surveys during the COVID-19
602 pandemic until September.
- 603 **Appendix 1.** PROSPERO protocol.
- 604 **Appendix 2, Checklist.** PRISMA Checklist
- 605 **Appendix 2, Table 1.** Search strategies for different databases.
- 606 **Appendix 2, Table 2.** Articles and reasons for exclusion after full-text review.
- 607 **Appendix 2, Figure.** Traffic light plot of the domain-level judgements for each individual
608 study.