medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Title page

Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and associated factors in health care workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Running title: Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies

Petros Galanis[a], Irene Vraka[b], Despoina Fragkou[a], Angeliki Bilali[c], Daphne Kaitelidou[a]

[a] Faculty of Nursing, Center for Health Services Management and Evaluation, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

[b] Department of Radiology, P & A Kyriakou Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece

[c] Hospital Waste Management Unit, P & A Kyriakou Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Petros Galanis, PhD, Faculty of Nursing, Center for Health Services Management and Evaluation, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 123 Papadiamantopoulou street, GR-11527, Athens, Greece, e-mail: pegalan@nurs.uoa.gr

Author contributions

P.G, I.V. and D.K. were responsible for the conception and design of the study. P.G, I.V., D.F., A.B. were responsible for the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data. All the authors drafted the article or revised it critically for important intellectual content, and provided final approval of the version to be submitted

Word count: 3901

Conflicts of interest: none

Funding: None

Declarations of interest: None

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Summary

Background: Health care workers (HCWs) represent a high risk population for the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection.

Aim: To determine the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs, and to find out the factors that are associated with this seroprevalence.

Methods: The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines were applied for this systematic review and meta-analysis. Databases including PubMed/MEDLINE and pre-print services (medRχiv and bioRχiv) were searched from inception up to August 24, 2020.

Findings: Forty-nine studies, including 127,480 HCWs met the inclusion criteria. The estimated overall seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs was 8.7% (95% CI: 6.7-10.9%). Seroprevalence was higher in studies that were conducted in North America (12.7%) compared to those in Europe (8.5%), Africa (8.2), and Asia (4%). Meta-regression showed that increased sensitivity of antibodies test was associated with increased seroprevalence. The following factors were associated with seropositivity: male gender, Black, Asian, and Hispanic HCWs, work in a coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) unit, patient-related work, frontline health care workers, health care assistants, personal protective equipment shortage, self-reported belief for previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, previous positive polymerase chain reaction test, and household contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients.

Conclusion: The seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs is high. Excellent adherence to infection prevention and control measures, sufficient and adequate personal protective equipment, and early recognition, identification and isolation of HCWs that are infected with SARS-CoV-2 are imperative to decrease the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, seroprevalence, antibodies, health care workers

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) emerged from the Wuhan, Hubei province, China during December 2019 and the World Health Organization (WHO) declared a world pandemic on 11th March 2020 [1]. As of October 2, 2020, the WHO reported 34,079,542 cases globally and 1,015,963 deaths due to COVID-19 [2].

Health care workers (HCWs) are a high risk group for infection and a recent meta-analysis with 11 studies found that the proportion of HCWs who were SARS-CoV-2 positive among all COVID-19 patients was 10.1% but the severity and mortality among HCWs were lower than COVID-19 patients [3]. This proportion varied substantially among countries i.e. China; 4.2%, Italy; 9% and USA; 17.8% [3]. Lower proportion in China is probably due to implementation of immediate and strong public health interventions e.g. lockdown measures, home isolation, quarantine measures, wearing masks and social (physical) distancing [4].

SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 present significant diagnostic issues i.e. serology tests aim to identify previous SARS-CoV-2 infection detecting the presence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Until now, it is known that SARS-CoV-2 antibodies tests are accurate to detect previous SARS-CoV-2 infection if used >14 days after the onset of symptoms and they have very low sensitivity in the first week since symptoms onset [5]. Also, rapid diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies show a low pooled sensitivity (64.8) and a high pooled specificity (98%) but this meta-analysis suffers from low power and other significant limitations [6].

Knowing seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs is important to understand COVID-19 spread among health care facilities and to assess the success of public health interventions. To our knowledge, the overall seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs and the associated factors are unknown. Thus, the primary objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to determine the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs, while the secondary objective was to find out the factors that are associated with this seroprevalence.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Data sources and strategy

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines were applied for this systematic review and meta-analysis [7]. PRISMA checklist is presented in Web Table 1. We searched PubMed/MEDLINE and pre-print services (medRχiv and bioRχiv) from inception up to August 24, 2020. Also, we examined reference lists of all relevant articles and we removed duplicates. We used the following search strategy: ("sars-cov-2 antibodies" OR "COVID-19 antibodies" OR "sars-cov-2" OR "COVID-19" OR antibodies) AND ("health care personnel" OR "healthcare personnel" OR "health-care personnel" OR "health care workers" OR "health-care workers" OR "healthcare workers" OR "healthcare staff" OR "health care staff" OR "health-care staff" OR "medical staff").

Selection and eligibility criteria

Two independent review authors performed study selection and a third, senior author resolved the discrepancies. We included all studies that were written in English, except case reports. Also, we included studies that reported the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs and the associated factors. We searched for any serology test (e.g. ELISA, CLIA, etc.) detects SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (IgA, IgG, and IgM) in all HCWs. Moreover, we included studies that were performed under screening settings and HCWs were neither selected for participation based on previous exposure to SARS-CoV-2 nor symptoms.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Data collected included study characteristics such as authors, location, data collection time, sample size, setting, study design, antibodies test, sensitivity and specificity for the antibodies test, number of HCWs with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, factors associated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

with the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, and the level of analysis (univariate or multivariable).

The quality of the studies was assessed with the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools where a 9-point scale is used for prevalence studies, an 8-point scale for cross-sectional studies and an 11-point scale for cohort studies [8]. In prevalence studies, a score of 8-9 points indicates good quality, a score of 5-7 points indicates moderate quality and a score ≤4 indicates poor quality. In cross-sectional studies, a score of 7-8 points indicates good quality, a score of 4-6 points indicates moderate quality and a score ≤3 indicates poor quality. In cohort studies, a score of 9-11 points indicates good quality, a score of 5-8 points indicates moderate quality and a score ≤4 indicates poor quality.

Statistical analysis

For each study we extracted the total number of HCWs and the number of HCWs that were positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. The seroprevalence and the 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated for each included study. We transformed seroprevalences with the Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine method before pooling [9]. Between-studies heterogeneity was assessed by the Hedges Q statistic and I^2 statistics. Statistical significance for the Hedges Q statistic is set at p-value < 0.1, while I^2 values higher than 75% indicates high heterogeneity [10]. We applied a random effect model to estimate pooled seroprevalence since the heterogeneity between results was very high [10-11]. We considered studies quality, sample size, sensitivity and specificity for the antibodies tests, publication type (journal or pre-print service) and the continent that studies were conducted as pre-specified sources of heterogeneity and we explored them with subgroup analysis and meta-regression analysis. Also, we performed a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis by removing one study at a time to determine the influence of each study on the overall prevalence. We used a funnel plot and the Egger's test to assess the publication bias. P-value < 0.05 for the Egger's test indicates publication bias [12]. We did not perform meta-analysis for the factors that are associated with the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies since the data were very scarce. Statistical analysis was performed with OpenMeta[Analyst] [13].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Identification and selection of studies

Flowchart of the literature search is summarized in PRISMA format (Figure 1). Initially, we identified 3632 potential records through PubMed and 103 records through preprint servers for health sciences i.e. medRχiv and bioRχiv removing duplicates. After the screening of the titles and abstracts, we removed 3684 records and we added 12 more records found by the reference lists scanning. Finally, we included 49 studies in this meta-analysis that met our inclusion criteria.

Characteristics of the studies

Main characteristics of the 49 studies included in our systematic review and meta-analysis are shown in Table 1. A total of 127,480 HCWs were included in this systematic review and meta-analysis. Forty-nine studies [14-62] reported data regarding the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs and 27 studies [14, 15, 18, 19, 21-25, 27-32, 34-37, 39, 44, 47, 52, 54, 58, 60, 61] investigated factors for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity.

The majority of studies was conducted in Europe (n=31), and then in North America (n=9), Asia (n=6), and Africa (n=3). In particular, nine studies was conducted in USA [14, 15, 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 40], eight studies in Italy [23, 28, 30, 36, 44, 45, 56, 57], seven studies in United Kingdom [16, 17, 20, 25, 33, 59, 61], five studies in Germany [21, 35, 42, 43, 46], four studies in Spain [31, 38, 49, 52], and three studies in and Japan [53, 58, 62], Belgium [18, 19, 22] and China [47, 48, 51]. Twenty-nine studies did not report the response rate [15-17, 20, 24, 26-30, 32-34, 38, 40-43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 55-59, 62], nine studies did not report HCWs' age [17, 18, 21, 23, 32, 33, 36, 41, 48], eight studies did not report sex distribution [16, 18, 21, 25, 32, 33, 41, 48] and five studies did not report data collection time [17, 36, 43, 48, 56]. Females' percentage ranged from 35% [62] to 88.5% [51] and was higher in 41 studies, while in three studies males' percentage was higher. Mean age of HCWs ranged from 31.2 [51] years to 47.9 years [57], while sample size ranged from 25 [40] to 40,329 HCWs

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

[14]. Regarding the study design, 26 studies were cross-sectional studies [14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23-25, 27-32, 34-37, 39, 44, 47, 52, 54, 58, 60, 61], 20 studies were prevalence studies [17, 26, 33, 38, 40-43, 45, 46, 48-51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 62], and three studies were cohort studies [16, 20, 22]. All studies except one [31] used a convenience sample, while response rate ranged from 47.7% [19] to 100% [36, 60]. Forty-two studies were conducted in hospitals [15-24, 26, 27, 29-48, 50-62], four studies in primary care facilities and hospitals [14, 25, 28, 49], two studies in primary care facilities [35, 62] and one study in cancer centers [59]. Thirty-five studies were published in journals [14-48], while 14 studies in pre-print services [49-62].

Validity assessment (sensitivity and specificity) for the antibodies tests used in the included studies according to the manufacturers data are presented in Web Table 2. Sensitivity ranged from 50% to 100%, while specificity from 80.5% to 100%.

Quality assessment

Quality assessment of prevalence studies, cross-sectional studies and cohort studies are shown in Web Tables 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Quality was moderate in 37 studies, good in 10 studies, and poor in two studies. Regarding prevalence studies, 16 were at moderate risk of bias, three were at low risk and one was at high risk. Moreover, 20 cross-sectional studies were at moderate risk of bias, five were at low risk and one was at high risk. Two cohort studies were at low risk of bias and one was at moderate risk.

Meta-analysis of the seroprevalence

We applied a random effect model to estimate pooled prevalence since the heterogeneity between results was very high (I^2=99.34, p-value for the Hedges Q statistic < 0.001). The estimated overall seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs was 8.7% (95% CI: 6.7-10.9%) (Figure 2). Seroprevalence among studies ranged from 0% to 45.3%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Subgroup and meta-regression analysis

According to subgroup analysis, seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was higher for the studies with poor quality (11.6% [95% CI: 0.7-32.7%]) compared to those with moderate quality (8.8% [95% CI: 6.0-12%]) and good quality (7.9% [95% CI: 4.1-12.8%]). Moreover, seroprevalence was higher for the studies that were published in journals (9% [95% CI: 6.7-11.6%]) compared to those in pre-print services (7.7% [95% CI: 3.4-13.4%]). Seroprevalence was higher in studies that were conducted in North America (12.7% [95% CI: 8.6-17.5%]) compared to those in Europe (8.5% [95% CI: 5.8-11.6%]), Africa (8.2% [95% CI: 0.8-22.3%]), and Asia (4% [95% CI: 1.8-7.1%]). Meta-regression showed that increased sensitivity of antibodies test was associated with increased seroprevalence (coefficient = 0.004 [95% CI: 0.0001-0.009], p=0.038). Moreover, seroprevalence was independent of the sample size (p=0.65) and the specificity (p=0.20).

Sensitivity analysis

A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis showed that no single study had a disproportional effect on the overall seroprevalence, which varied between 8.2% (95% CI: 6.2-10.3%), with Hoolihan et al. [16] excluded, and 9.0% (95% CI: 6.9-11.2%), with Nakamura et al. [53] excluded (Web Figure 1).

Publication bias

Egger's test (p=0.0001) and the asymmetrical shape of the funnel plot (Web Figure 2) implied potential publication bias.

Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity

Twenty-seven studies [14, 15, 18, 19, 21-25, 27-32, 34-37, 39, 44, 47, 52, 54, 58, 60, 61] investigated factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity and 13 studies found associations [14, 18, 23-25, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 47, 60] (Table 2). Twenty-four studies [15, 19, 21-25, 27-32, 34-37, 44, 47, 52, 54, 58, 60, 61] used

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

univariate analysis, while three studies [14, 18, 39] used multivariable regression analysis.

Three studies found [24, 30, 39] that males have more frequently detectable SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with odds ratios (OR) ranging from 1.39 to 3.21. Results regarding age were controversial since SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity was associated with HWCs aged <30 years (OR=1.40, 95% CI=1.22-1.60) [39], HWCs aged ≥40 years (OR=1.36, 95% CI=1.09-1.60) [28], and HWCs aged ≥65 years (p<0.001) [47]. A significantly higher percentage of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies found among African American HCWs (p<0.05) [32] and Black, Asian, and Hispanic HCWs compared to White participants (OR=2.30, 95% CI=1.71-3.10, p<0.001) [24].

Three studies [25, 39, 60] found a significantly higher probability of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs working in a COVID-19 unit with ORs ranging from 1.4 to 1.67. Similar results found for HCWs with patient-related work (ORs range from 1.22 to 2.9) [25, 39, 60] and frontline health care workers (OR=1.38, 95% CI=1.22-1.56) [39]. Moreover, Self et al. [24] found that HCWs in surgery department (OR=6.47, 95% CI=2.37-17.63) and pediatric intensive care unit (OR=3.77, 95% CI=1.44-9.89, p=0.007) had a significantly higher percentage of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Two studies [28, 60] found that SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity was higher among health care assistants (OR=1.39, 95% CI=1.05-1.84 and OR=3.8, 95% CI=2.3-6.1). Self et al. [24] found that no use of a face covering for all clinical encounters (p=0.012) and personal protective equipment shortage (p=0.009) increase the probability of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs.

Three studies [14, 24, 34] found that HCWs self-reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19 (ORs range from 1.23 to 5.67) is associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity. Similar results found for HCWs with a previous positive Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) test (OR=1.52, 95% CI=1.44-1.60 in one study [14] and p<0.001 in another study [34]). Also, two studies [18, 36] found that household contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients increases the probability of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs (OR=3.15, 95% CI=2.33-4.25 in one study [18] and p=0.008 in another study [36]).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis that estimates the overall seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs in screening settings. We found that the overall seroprevalence was 8.7% with a wide range among studies from 0% to 45.3%. Population-based and community-based studies in USA showed a great variability in seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies from 1.1% to 14.4% [63-67]. Similar studies in Europe [68-70] and China [71] found very different seroprevalence in general population ranging from 0.23% to 10.9%. These differences in seroprevalence among studies may be attributable to several reasons, e.g. different study populations, different antibodies tests with variation in sensitivity and specificity, different study designs, different lockdown and quarantine measures, different data collection time period etc. Moreover, according to our subgroup analysis, seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was higher for the studies with poor quality (11.6%) compared to those with moderate quality (8.8%) and good quality (7.9%) indicating that difference in studies quality could be also a significant reason for difference in seroprevalence.

Our subgroup analysis identified that seroprevalence was higher in studies that were conducted in North America (12.7%) compared to those in Europe (8.5%), Africa (8.2%), and Asia (4%). This finding is in accordance with a meta-analysis [3] that found that the overall proportion of HCWs who are SARS-CoV-2 positive among all COVID-19 patients is lower in China (4.2%) than in USA (17.8%) and Europe (9%). This might be explained due to the good adherence to infection prevention and control measures and the appropriate use of personal protective equipment among HCWs in China. Also, USA and Europe seem to be unprepared to handle the surge of patients that led to the severe shortage in the personal protective equipment, while USA and most of the countries in Europe (with significant exceptions such as Germany and Greece) took action too late [72]. For example, according to reports in United Kingdom and Italy, HCWs experienced extreme situations during COVID-19 pandemic wearing paper face masks and plastic aprons instead of appropriate masks, visors, and gowns [73, 74]. In our meta-analysis, seroprevalence in studies in United Kingdom (n=7) and Italy (n=8) was higher (10.3%) than the overall seroprevalence (8.4%), while seroprevalence in studies in Germany (n=5) and Greece (n=2) was quite

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

lower (2.2%) than the overall seroprevalence. On the other hand, China has already controlled rapidly and efficiently the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic that broke out in 2003 [75, 76]. Thus, China immediately adopts the lessons from handling the SARS epidemic in the case of COVID-19 pandemic applying effective measures, e.g. early case identification and isolation, active large-scale surveillance of individuals even with smartphone application, tracing and quarantining of COVID-19 contacts, temperature screening in public places, physical distancing, travelers screening, street camera system for identification of individuals without a mask or showing symptoms etc. [71, 77, 78]. Moreover, some hospitals in China implemented a tactical training protocol for all aspects of COVID-19 that result in very low infection rate among HCWs even among frontline HCWs in Wuhan [79].

We found that seropositivity was higher for HCWs with patient-related work [25, 39, 60], and frontline health care workers [39]. Grant et al. [25] and Rudberg et al. [60] found that seropositivity of HCWs is much higher than this of general population of London and Stockholm respectively, indicating an occupational health risk among HCWs. Several studies emphasize the risk of occupational transmission of SARS-CoV-2 among HCWs since the HCWs are at the frontline response to the COVID-19 and would be more prone to viral transmission [73, 80-84]. Increased HCWs exposure to SARS-CoV-2 may be attributable mainly to patient-to-HCW transmission and HCW-to-HCW transmission due to the personal protective equipment shortage, poor adherence to infection prevention and control measures, and space constraints in hospitals. Additionally, we found that SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity was higher among health care assistants [28, 60] a finding that further reinforces a patient-related transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to HCWs since this occupation involves the most patient near contact.

In our systematic review, the seroprevalence was higher among HCWs working in a COVID-19 unit [25, 39, 60]. It is clear that HCWs with COVID-19 patient contact have represented a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection especially during the first months of COVID-19 pandemic where the knowledge, the control measures and the personal protective equipment were limited. Also, Self et al. [24] found that no use of a face covering for all clinical encounters and personal protective equipment shortage increase the probability of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs. Thus, personal protective equipment supplies for HCWs at hospitals are a necessary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

tool against COVID-19, while universal masking is of utmost importance since decreases rate of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCWs [85]. Optimal personal protective equipment is still unknown but rigorous application of personal protective equipment measures and absolute adherence to all infection prevention and control measures are crucial to reduce SARS-CoV-2 nosocomial transmissions [86-89]. Interestingly, Grant et al. [25] found that seropositivity was lower among intensive care unit HCWs. Several reasons could explain this finding such as the enhanced personal protective equipment for intensive care unit HCWs, the fact that the intubated patients are ventilated on a closed circuit, and the fact that COVID-19 patients who require admission on an intensive care unit are often admitted around day 10 of the natural history of their illness [90], by which point viral loads of patients tend to decrease [91].

According to our review, household contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients is associated with positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs [18, 36]. Also, HCWs self-reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19 is associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity [14, 24, 34]. HCWs are exposed to SARS-CoV-2 not only in clinical settings but also in their house or in social meetings, joint meals, and office spaces with friends or colleagues. In fact, as community transmission increases, the risk of SARS-CoV-2 exposure for HCWs is higher outside of the clinical settings through household contacts with infected COVID-19 patients or interaction with others in areas with active, unmitigated transmission [92-94].

We found that a previous positive PCR test increases the probability of a positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies test in HCWs [14, 34]. SARS-CoV-2 antibodies tests identify previous SARS-CoV-2 infection but many issues are still controversial. For example, the sensitivity of these tests is too low in the first week since symptom onset but increases ≥15 days after the onset of symptoms [5]. Also, the duration of antibody rises is unknown since the data >35 days after the onset of symptoms are very scarce [5]. Moreover, it is currently unknown whether antibody titers correlate with protective immunity against reinfection and if antibody responses differ significantly in asymptomatic individuals and individuals with mild or severe COVID-19 [95, 96]. Variation in the validity of commercial SARS-CoV-2 antibodies tests, cross-reactivity between SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses, and confusion regarding the possible role of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies as biomarkers of protective immunity or past

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

infection increase the uncertainty about the utility of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies tests in clinical practice [5, 97, 98]. In any case, SARS-CoV-2 antibodies tests seem to be an additional tool against COVID-19 and their utility will be expanded as additional data give us a better understanding of the pros and cons of these tests. Also, universal screening for SARS-CoV-2 in high-risk units in hospitals could help to identify asymptomatic HCWs resulting on self-isolation for the appropriate time [22].

We identified that seropositivity was higher among African American HCWs [32] and Black, Asian, and Hispanic HCWs compared to White participants [24]. This finding is confirmed by studies in general populations where a higher percentage of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies found among Blacks [67, 99] and Hispanics [67]. According to a preliminary analysis of Cook et al. [100], until 12 April, 106 HCWs died in the United Kingdom with COVID-19 and 64.2% (n=68) of them were from the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic community. Moreover, Gould and Wilson [101] found that Black workers experience higher SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence than Whites. This disparity may be attributable to several reasons, e.g. work conditions, economic inequality, high population density, limited access to health care services, health insurance etc. There is a need for strategies tailored to the culture of minority groups and organized by local minority leaders, who can mobilize individuals to participate in screening tests, and tracing and quarantining of COVID-19 contacts to avoid additional SARS-CoV-2 infections in minority groups [102].

Our study has several limitations. First, 14 out of 49 included studies were published in pre-print services which do not apply peer-review process. Nevertheless, we assessed studies quality and we performed subgroup analysis according to publication type (journal or pre-print service) and studies quality. Second, the heterogeneity between results was very high. We performed random effects model and subgroups analysis to overcome this limitation. Third, seroprevalence reported in studies could be underestimated or overestimated depending on the applied antibody test. Validity (sensitivity and specificity) of the antibodies tests have not been reported in most of the included studies. We performed meta-regression analysis with sensitivity and specificity of the antibodies tests according to the manufacturers' data as the moderator variables in order to overcome this limitation. Fourth, time between exposure and antibody testing in studies is unknown and seropositivity may have been missed if testing was too early. This systematic bias could result in an underestimation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

of the seroprevalence. Last, the data regarding the factors that are associated with the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were very scarce and we cannot perform meta-analysis; thus a qualitative approach was applied to assess these factors.

Conclusion

Sseroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among HCWs is high indicating that HCWs represent a population with considerable risk contracting SARS-CoV-2 infection. Absolute adherence to infection prevention and control measures, sufficient and adequate personal protective equipment, and early recognition, identification and isolation of HCWs that are infected with SARS-CoV-2 are imperative to decrease the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Moreover, seroprevalence studies among HCWs could add significant information regarding the level of exposure among HCWs, the identification of high-risk departments in hospitals, the measurement of COVID-19 spread, the success of interventions, and the understanding of asymptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical settings. Given the limitations both of our review and the studies that were included, and that the COVID-19 pandemic is still evolving, there is a need for further high-quality studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Flowchart of the literature search according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

Figure 2. Forest plot of the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The size of the black boxes is positively proportional to the weight assigned to studies, and horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence intervals according to random effects analysis.

Web Figure 1. A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with corresponding 95% confidence intervals.

Web Figure 2. Funnel plot of the meta-analysis.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis.

Table 2. Studies that investigated factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity among health care workers.

Web Table 1. PRISMA Checklist**.**

Web Table 2. Validity assessment (sensitivity and specificity) for the antibodies tests used in the included studies according to the manufacturers data.

Web Table 3. Quality of prevalence studies.

Web Table 4. Quality of cross-sectional studies.

Web Table 5. Quality of cohort studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. NEJM 2020;382:1199-207.

2. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard; 2020. https://covid19.who.int/ [last accessed 2 October 2020]

3. Sahu AK, Amrithanand VT, Mathew R, Aggarwal P, Nayer J, Bhoi S. COVID-19 in health care workers-A systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Emerg Med 2020;38:1727-31.

4. Xiang B, Li P, Yang X, Zhong S, Manyande A, Feng M. The impact of novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 among healthcare workers in hospitals: An aerial overview. Am J Infect Control 2020;48:915-7.

5. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Spijker R, Taylor-Phillips S, Cochrane COVID-19 Diagnostic Test Accuracy Group. Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-CoV-2. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2020;6:CD013652.

6. Riccò M, Ferraro P, Gualerzi G, Ranzieri S, Henry BM, Said YB, et al. Point-of-care diagnostic tests for detecting SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: A systematic review and meta-analysis of real-world data. J Clin Med 2020;9:1515.

7. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzla J, Altman DG, Altman D, Antes, G, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 2009;6:e1000097.

8. Santos W, Secoli SR, Püschel V. The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews. Rev Lat Am Enfermagem. 2018;26:e3074.

9. Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. J Epidemiol Community Health, 2013;67:974-8. doi:10.1136/jech-2013-203104

10. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557-60.

11. Ioannidis JP, Patsopoulos NA, Evangelou E. Heterogeneity in meta-analyses of genome-wide association investigations. PLoS ONE 2007;2:e841.

12. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 1997;315:629-34.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

13. Wallace BC, Schmid CH, Lau J, Trikalinos TA. Meta-Analyst: software for meta-analysis of binary, continuous and diagnostic data. BMC Med Res Methodol 2009;9:80.

14. Moscola J, Sembajwe G, Jarrett M, Farber B, Chang T, McGinn T, et al. Northwell Health COVID-19 Research Consortium. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in health care personnel in the New York City area. JAMA 2020;324:893-5.

15. Jeremias A, Nguyen J, Levine J, Pollack S, Engellenner W, Thakore A, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among health care workers in a tertiary community hospital. JAMA Intern Med 2020; In press.

16. Houlihan CF, Vora N, Byrne T, Lewer D, Kelly G, Heaney J, et al. Pandemic peak SARS-CoV-2 infection and seroconversion rates in London frontline health-care workers. Lancet 2020;396:e6-e7.

17. Poulikakos D, Sinha S, Kalra PA. SARS-CoV-2 antibody screening in healthcare workers in a tertiary centre in North West England. J Clin Virol 2020;129:104545.

18. Steensels D, Oris E, Coninx L, Nuyens D, Delforge ML, Vermeersch P, et al. Hospital-wide SARS-CoV-2 antibody screening in 3056 staff in a tertiary center in Belgium. JAMA 2020;324:195-7.

19. Blairon L, Mokrane S, Wilmet A, Dessilly G, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Beukinga I, et al. Large-scale, molecular and serological SARS-CoV-2 screening of healthcare workers in a 4-site public hospital in Belgium after COVID-19 outbreak. J Infect 2020;4453:30514-4. Advance online publication.

20. Pallett S, Rayment M, Patel A, Fitzgerald-Smith S, Denny SJ, Charani E, et al. Point-of-care serological assays for delayed SARS-CoV-2 case identification among health-care workers in the UK: a prospective multicentre cohort study. Lancet Respir Med 2020;8:885-94.

21. Korth J, Wilde B, Dolff S, Anastasiou OE, Krawczyk A, Jahn M, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection in healthcare workers in Germany with direct contact to COVID-19 patients. J Clin Virol 2020; 128:104437.

22. Martin C, Montesinos I, Dauby N, Gilles C, Dahma H, Van Den Wijngaert S, et al. Dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positivity and seroprevalence among high-risk healthcare workers and hospital staff. J Hosp Infect 2020;106:102-6.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

23. Amendola A, Tanzi E, Folgori L, Barcellini L, Bianchi S, Gori M, et al. (2020). Low seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers of the largest children hospital in Milan during the pandemic wave. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020; In press.

24. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Stubblefield WB, Feldstein LR, Steingrub JS, Shapiro NI, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among frontline health care personnel in a multistate hospital network-13 academic medical centers, April–June 2020. MMWR 2020;69:1221-6.

25. Grant JJ, Wilmore S, McCann NS, Donnelly O, Lai R, Kinsella MJ, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in healthcare workers at a London NHS Trust. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020; In press.

26. Mughal MS, Kaur IP, Patton CD, Mikhail NH, Vareechon C, Granet KM. (2020). The prevalence of severe acute respiratory coronavirus virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) IgG antibodies in intensive care unit (ICU) healthcare personnel (HCP) and its implications-a single-center, prospective, pilot study. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020; In press.

27. Hunter E, Price DA, Murphy E, van der Loeff IS, Baker KF, Lendrem D, et al. First experience of COVID-19 screening of health-care workers in England. Lancet 2020;395:e77-8.

28. Plebani M, Padoan A, Fedeli U, Schievano E, Vecchiato E, Lippi G, et al. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 serosurvey in health care workers of the Veneto Region. CCLM 2020; In press.

29. Mansour M, Leven E, Muellers K, Stone K, Mendu DR, Wajnberg, A. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among healthcare workers at a tertiary academic hospital in New York City. J Gen Intern Med 2020;35:2485-6.

30. Sotgiu G, Barassi A, Miozzo M, Saderi L, Piana A, Orfeo N, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific serological pattern in healthcare workers of an Italian COVID-19 forefront hospital. BMC Pulm Med 2020;20:203.

31. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Moncunill G, Tortajada M, Vidal M, Guinovart C, Jiménez A, et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital. Nat Commun 2020;11:3500.

32. Sydney E, Kishore P, Laniado I, Rucker L, Bajaj K, Zinaman M. Antibody evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers in the Bronx. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020;1-2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

33. Khalil A, Hill R, Wright A, Ladhani S, O'Brien P. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection in healthcare workers in a UK maternity Hospital: Correlation with SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results. Clin Infect Dis 2020;ciaa893.

34. Stubblefield WB, Talbot HK, Feldstein L, Tenforde MW, Rasheed M, Mills L, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among frontline healthcare personnel during the first month of caring for COVID-19 patients - Nashville, Tennessee. Clin Infect Dis 2020;ciaa936.

35. Lackermair K, William F, Grzanna N, Lehmann E, Fichtner S, Kucher HB, et al. Infection with SARS-CoV-2 in primary care health care workers assessed by antibody testing, Fam Pract 2020;cmaa078. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmaa078

36. Paderno A, Fior M, Berretti G, Schreiber A, Grammatica A, Mattavelli D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in health care workers: cross-sectional analysis of an otolaryngology unit. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2020;163:671-2.

37. Kassem AM, Talaat H, Shawky S, Fouad R, Amer K, Elnagdy T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers of a gastroenterological service in a tertiary care facility. Arab J Gastroenterol 2020;21:151-5.

38. Olalla J, Correa AM, Martín-Escalante MD, Hortas ML, Martin-Sendarrubias MJ, Fuentes V, et al. Search for asymptomatic carriers of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare workers during the pandemic: a Spanish experience. QJM 2020;hcaa238.

39. Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje M, et al. (2020). Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020; In press.

40. Hains DS, Schwaderer AL, Carroll AE, Starr MC, Wilson AC, Amanat F, et al. Asymptomatic seroconversion of immunoglobulins to SARS-CoV-2 in a pediatric dialysis unit. JAMA 2020;323:2424-5. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8438

41. Solodky ML, Galvez C, Russias B, Detourbet P, N'Guyen-Bonin V, Herr AL, et al. Lower detection rates of SARS-COV2 antibodies in cancer patients versus health care workers after symptomatic COVID-19. Ann Oncol 2020;31:1087-8.

42. Behrens G, Cossmann A, Stankov MV, Witte T, Ernst D, Happle C, et al. Perceived versus proven SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses in health-care professionals. Infection 2020;48:631-4.

43. Brandstetter S, Roth S, Harner S, Buntrock-Döpke H, Toncheva AA, Borchers N, et al. Symptoms and immunoglobulin development in hospital staff exposed to a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2020; In press.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

44. Fusco FM, Pisaturo M, Iodice V, Bellopede R, Tambaro O, Parrella G, et al. COVID-19 among healthcare workers in a specialist infectious diseases setting in Naples, Southern Italy: results of a cross-sectional surveillance study. J Hosp Infect 2020;105:596-600.

45. Lahner E, Dilaghi E, Prestigiacomo C, Alessio G, Marcellini L, Simmaco M, et al. Prevalence of Sars-Cov-2 Infection in Health Workers (HWs) and diagnostic test performance: the experience of a teaching hospital in central Italy. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2020;17:4417.

46. Schmidt SB, Grüter L, Boltzmann M, Rollnik JD. Prevalence of serum IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among clinic staff. PloS One 2020;15:e0235417.

47. Xu X, Sun J, Nie S, Li H, Kong Y, Liang M, et al. Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M and G antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in China. Nat Med 2020;26:1193-5.

48. Zhao R, Li M, Song H, Chen J, Ren W, Feng Y, et al. (2020). Early detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in COVID-19 patients as a serologic marker of infection. Clin Infect Dis 2020;ciaa523.

49. Fernández-Rivas G, Quirant-Sánchez B, González V, Doladé M, Martinez-Caceres E, Piña M, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG specific antibodies among healthcare workers in the Northern Metropolitan Area of Barcelona, Spain, after the first pandemic wave. medRxiv 2020;06.24.20135673.

50. Kammon AM, El-Arabi AA, Erhouma EA, Mehemed TM, Mohamed OA. Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among public community and health-care workers in Alzintan City of Libya. medRxiv 2020;05.25.20109470.

51. Xiong S, Guo C, Dittmer U, Zheng X, Wang B. The prevalence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic healthcare workers with intensive exposure to COVID-19. medRxiv 2020;05.28.20110767.

52. Galán I, Velasco M, Casas ML, Goyanes MJ, Rodriguez-Caravaca G, Losa JE, et al. SARS CoV-2 seroprevalence among all workers in a teaching hospital in Spain: Unmasking the risk. medRxiv 2020;05.29.20116731. doi:

53. Nakamura A, Sato R, Ando S, Oana N, Nozaki E, Endo H, et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare workers in non-epidemic region: a hospital report in Iwate Prefecture, Japan. medRxiv 2020;06.15.20132316.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

54. Psichogiou M, Karabinis A, Pavlopoulou I, Basoulis D, Petsios K, Roussos S, et al. Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a country with low burden of COVID-19.

55. Chibwana MG, Jere KC, Kamngona R, Mandolo J, Katunga-Phiri V, Tembo D, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in health care workers but relatively low numbers of deaths in urban Malawi. medRxiv 2020;07.30.20164970.

56. Tosato F, Pelloso M, Gallo N, Giraudo C, Llanaj G, Cosma C, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 serology in asymptomatic healthcare professionals: preliminary experience of a tertiary Italian academic center. medRxiv 2020;04.27.20073858.

57. Paradiso AV, De Summa S, Silvestris N, Tommasi S, Tufaro A, De Palma G, et al. COVID-19 screening and monitoring of asymptomatic health workers with a rapid serological test. medRxiv 2020;05.05.20086017.

58. Fujita K, Kada S, Kanai O, Hata H, Odagaki T, Satoh-Asahara N, et al. Quantitative SARS-CoV-2 antibody screening of healthcare workers in the southern part of Kyoto city during the COVID-19 peri-pandemic period. medRxiv 2020;05.12.20098962.

59. Sikora K, Barwick I, Hamilton C. Serological prevalence of antibodies to SARS CoV-2 amongst cancer centre staff. medRxiv 2020;05.16.20099408.

60. Rudberg AS, Havervall S, Manberg A, Falk AJ, Aguilera K, Ng H, et al. SARS-CoV-2 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in health care workers. medRxiv 2020;06.22.20137646.

61. Shields AM, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M, Jossi S, Aldera EL, Allen JD, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in health care workers. medRxiv 2020;05.18.20105197.

62. Takita M, Matsumura T, Yamamoto K, Yamashita E, Hosoda K, Hamaki T, et al. Preliminary results of Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 at community clinics in Tokyo. medRxiv 2020;04.29.20085449.

63. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, Shah S, Ling E, Bromley-Dulfano R, et al.COVID-19 antibody seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. medRxiv 2020;04.14.20062463.

64. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, Eichner D, Reynolds J, Bendavid E, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies among adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10-11, 2020. JAMA 2020;323:2425-7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

65. Rosenberg ES, Tesoriero JM, Rosenthal EM, Chung R, Barranco M, Styer LM, et al. Cumulative incidence and diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in New York. Ann Epidemiol 2020; 48:23-9.

66. Biggs HM, Harris JB, Breakwell L, Dahlgren FS, Abedi GR, Szablewski CM, et al. Estimated community seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies - Two Georgia Counties, April 28-May 3, 2020. MMWR 2020;69:965-70.

67. Menachemi N, Yiannoutsos CT, Dixon BE, Duszynski TJ, Fadel WF, Wools-Kaloustian KK, et al. Population point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on a statewide random sample - Indiana, April 25-29, 2020. MMWR 2020;69:960-4.

68. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet 2020;396:313-9.

69. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. Lancet 2020;396:535-44.

70. Bogogiannidou Z, Vontas A, Dadouli K, Kyritsi MA, Soteriades S, Nikoulis DJ, et al. Repeated leftover serosurvey of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, Greece, March and April 2020. Euro Surveill 2020;25:2001369.

71. Xu T, Ao M, Zhou X, Zhu WF, Nie HN, Fang JH, et al. China's practice to prevent and control COVID-19 in the context of large population movement. Infect Dis Poverty 2020;9:115.

72. Pearce N, Lawlor DA, Brickley EB. Comparisons between countries are essential for the control of COVID-19. Int J Eepidemiol 2020;dyaa108.

73. Hunter DJ. Covid-19 and the stiff upper lip-the pandemic response in the United Kingdom. N Engl J Med 2020;16:382.

74. Rosenbaum L. Facing Covid-19 in Italy-ethics, logistics, and therapeutics on the epidemic's front line. N Engl J Med. 2020;14:382.

75. Ahmad A, Krumkamp R, Reintjes R. Controlling SARS: a review on China's response compared with other SARS-affected countries. Trop Med Int Health 2009;14:36-45.

76. Pang X, Zhu Z, Xu F, Guo J, Gong X, Liu D, et al. Evaluation of control measures implemented in the severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak in Beijing, 2003. JAMA 2003;290:3215-221.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

77. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ., Eggo RM, Davies N, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. Lancet Public Health 2020;5:e261-70.

78. Cyranoski D. What China's coronavirus response can teach the rest of the world. Nature 2020;579:479-80.

79. Yang DY, Cheng SY, Wang SZ, Wang JS, Kuang M, Wang TH, et al. Preparedness of medical education in China: Lessons from the COVID-19 outbreak. Medical teacher, 2020;42:787-90.

80. Canova V, Lederer Schlapfer H, Piso RJ, Droll A, Fenner L, Hoffmann T, et al. Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 to healthcare workers -observational results of a primary care hospital contact tracing. Swiss Med Wkly 2020;150:w20257.

81. Banik RK, Ulrich AK. (2020). Evidence of short-range aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and call for universal airborne precautions for anesthesiologists during the COVID-19 pandemic. Anesth Analg 2020; In press.

82. Wilson NM, Norton A, Young FP, Collins DW. Airborne transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 to healthcare workers: a narrative review. Anaesthesia 2020;75:1086-95.

83. McMichael TM, Currie DW, Clark S, Pogosjans S, Kay M, Schwartz NG, et al. Epidemiology of Covid-19 in a long-term care facility in King County, Washington. N Engl J Med 2020;21:382.

84. Godderis L, Boone A, Bakusic J. COVID-19: a new work-related disease threatening healthcare workers. Occup Med 2020;70:315-6.

85. Wang X, Ferro EG, Zhou G, Hashimoto D, Bhatt DL. Association between universal masking in a health care system and SARS-CoV-2 positivity among health care workers. JAMA 2020;324:703-4.

86. Schwartz J, King CC, Yen MY. Protecting health care workers during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak: lessons from Taiwan's severe acute respiratory syndrome response. Clin Infect Dis 2020;71:858-60.

87. Verbeek JH, Ijaz S, Mischke C, Ruotsalainen JH, Mäkelä E, Neuvonen K, et al. Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016;4:CD011621.

88. Chang D, Xu H, Rebaza A, Sharma L, Dela Cruz CS. Protecting health-care workers from subclinical coronavirus infection. Lancet Respir Med 2020;8:e13.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

89. Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. J Hosp Infect 2020;105:100-1.

90. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020;395:1054-62.

91. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. Clin Infect Dis 2020;ciaa638.

92. Belingheri M, Paladino ME, Riva MA. Beyond the assistance: additional exposure situations to COVID-19 for healthcare workers. J Hosp Infect 2020;105:353.

93. Muhi S, Irving LB, Buising KI. COVID-19 in Australian healthcare workers: early experience of the Royal Melbourne Hospital emphasises the importance of community acquisition. Med J Aust 2020;213:44.

94. Liu J, Ouyang L, Guo P, Wu H, Fu P, Chen Y, et al. Epidemiological, clinical characteristics and outcome of medical staff infected with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective case series analysis. medRxiv 2020;03.09.20033118.

95. Zohar T, Alter G. Dissecting antibody-mediated protection against SARS-CoV-2. Nat Rev Immunol 2020;20:392-4.

96. Döhla M, Boesecke C, Schulte B, Diegmann C, Sib E, Richter E, et al. Rapid point-of-care testing for SARS-CoV-2 in a community screening setting shows low sensitivity. Public Health 2020;182:170-2.

97. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, Kelly M, Becker M, Slater D, et al. Dynamics and significance of the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv 2020;07.18.20155374.

98. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. The role of antibody testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is there one? J Clin Microbiol 2020;58:e00797-20.

99. Stokes EK, Zambrano LD, Anderson KN, Marder EP, Raz KM, Felix S, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 case surveillance-United States, January 22-May 30, 2020. MMWR 2020;69:759-65.

100. Cook T, Kursumovic E, Lennane S. Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from COVID-19 analysed. 2020. https://www.hsj.co.uk/exclusive-deaths-of-nhs-staff-from-covid-19-analysed/7027471.article. [last accessed 2 October 2020].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

101. Gould E, Wilson V. Black workers face two of the most lethal preexisting conditions for coronavirus-racism and economic inequality. 2020. https://www.epi.org/publication/black-workers-covid. [last accessed 2 October 2020].

102. Novacek DM, Hampton-Anderson JN, Ebor MT, Loeb TB, Wyatt GE. Mental health ramifications of the COVID-19 pandemic for black Americans: clinical and research recommendations. 2020. https://psycnet.apa.org/ fulltext/2020-41730-001.html. [last accessed 2 October 2020].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis.

Reference	City or state/country	Females (%)	Age, mean (SD)	Sample size (n)	Study design	Sampling method	Response rate (%)	Data collection time	Setting	Publication in
Moscola et al. 2020 [14]	New York/USA	73.7	42.7 (17.1)	40,329	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	65.1	April 20 to June 23	Primary care facilities and hospitals	Journal
Jeremias et al. 2020 [15]	New York/USA	70.2	42.8 (13.8)	1699	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	March 1 to April 30	Hospitals	Journal
Houlihan et al. 2020 [16]	London/United Kingdom	NR	35.8 (11.2)	181	Cohort	Convenience sampling	NR	March 26 to April 8	Hospitals	Journal
Poulikakos et al. 2020 [17]	North West England/United Kingdom	73	NR	281	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	NR	Hospitals	Journal
Steensels et al. 2020 [18]	Genk/Belgium	NR	NR	3056	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	74	April 22-30	Hospitals	Journal
Blairon et al. 2020 [19]	Brussels/Belgium	72.4	43.9 (1.7)[a] 47.4 (2.1)[b]	1485	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	47.7	May 25 to June 19	Hospitals	Journal
Pallett et al. 2020 [20]	London/United Kingdom	72.7	39.1 (12.1)	6440	Cohort	Convenience sampling	NR	April 8 to June 12	Hospitals	Journal
Korth et al. 2020 [21]	Essen/Germany	NR	NR	316	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	65	March 25 to April 21	Hospitals	Journal
Martin et al. 2020 [22]	Brussels/Belgium	73	37 (11.3)	326	Cohort	Convenience sampling	87.3	April 15 to May 18	Hospitals	Journal

Amendola et al. 2020 [23]	Milan/Italy	83.7	NR	547	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	89.4	April 15	Hospitals	Journal
Self et al. 2020 [24]	Washington, Oregon, California, Minnesota, Tennessee, Ohio, North Carolina, New York, Massachusetts, Utah, Colorado, Maryland/USA	65.6	38.5 (12.6)	3248	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 3 to May 19	Hospitals	Journal
Grant et al. 2020 [25]	London/United Kingdom	NR	40.3 (11.1)	2004	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	54.2	May 15 to June 5	Primary care facilities and hospitals	Journal
Mughal et al. 2020 [26]	New Jersey/USA	75	38.5 (15.4)	121	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 1 to April 30	Hospitals	Journal
Hunter et al. 2020 [27]	Indiana/USA	70.1	43 (NR)	690	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 29 to May 8	Hospitals	Journal
Plebani et al. 2020 [28]	Veneto Region/Italy	71.6	43.2 (11.6)	8285	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	February 22 to May 29	Primary care facilities and hospitals	Journal
Mansour et al. 2020 [29]	New York/USA	46	38.4 (10.8)	285	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	March 24 to April 4	Hospitals	Journal
Sotgiu et al. 2020 [30]	Milan/Italy	65.3	44.6 (14.2)	202	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 2-16	Hospitals	Journal
Garcia-Basteiro et	Barcelona/Spain	72.1	42.1 (11.6)	578	Cross-	Random	74.3	March 9	Hospitals	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

al. 2020 [31]					sectional	sampling				
Sydney et al. 2020 [32]	New York/USA	NR	NR	1700	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 28 to May 4	Hospitals	Journal
Khalil et al. 2020 [33]	London/United Kingdom	NR	NR	190	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	May 15-28	Hospitals	Journal
Stubblefield et al. 2020 [34]	Tennessee/USA	65.5	33.7 (8.7)	249	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 3-13	Hospitals	Journal
Lackermair et al. 2020 [35]	Bavaria/Germany	83	37.9 (4)	151	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	63.7	April 2-6	Primary care facilities	Journal
Paderno et al. 2020 [36]	Brescia/Italy	65.5	41 (NR)	58	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	100	NR	Hospitals	Journal
Kassem et al. 2020 [37]	Cairo/Egypt	59.5	32.5 (5.2)	74	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	58.7	June 1-14	Hospitals	Journal
Olalla et al. 2020 [38]	Marbella/Spain	80	41.5 (8.9)	498	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	April 15-25	Hospitals	Journal
Iversen et al. 2020 [39]	Capital Region of Denmark/Denmark	78.9	44.4 (12.6)	28,792	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	96.3	April 17-22	Hospitals	Journal
Hains et al. 2020 [40]	Indiana/USA	88	41.2 (9.2)	25	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 25 to April 11	Hospitals	Journal
Solodky et al. 2020 [41]	Lyon/France	NR	NR	244	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 1 to April 16	Hospitals	Journal
Behrens et al. 2020 [42]	Hannover, Germany	65	36.5 (11.3)	217	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 23 to April 17	Hospitals	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Brandstetter et al. 2020 [43]	Regensburg/Germany	85.1	18-35 years, 35.8%; 36-50 years, 35.8%; 51-65 years, 28.4%	201	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	NR	Hospitals	Journal
Fusco et al. 2020 [44]	Naples/Italy	49	42.1 (14.6)	115	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	95.8	March 23 to April 2	Hospitals	Journal
Lahner et al. 2020 [45]	Rome/Italy	63.8	45.2 (11.1)	2115	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 18 to April 27	Hospitals	Journal
Schmidt et al. 2020 [46]	Hessisch Oldendorf/Germany	80	18-29 years, 14.3%; 30-49 years, 40%; 50-64 years, 44.2%; >64 years, 1.5%	406	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	77.3	April 20-30	Hospitals	Journal
Xu et al. 2020 [47]	Hubei Province, Chongqing, Guangzhou, Guangdong/China	75.2	37.1 (13.3)	4384	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	March 9 to April 10	Hospitals	Journal
Zhao et al. 2020 [48]	Beijing, Zhejiang province/China	NR	NR	276	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	NR	Hospitals	Journal
Fernández-Rivas et al. 2020 [49]	Barcelona/Spain	76	43.8 (12.4)	7563	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	81.2	May 4-22	Primary care facilities and hospitals	Pre-print service
Kammon et al. 2020	Alzintan/Libya	53	>40 years,	77	Prevalence	Convenience	NR	April 2 to May	Hospitals	Pre-print

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

[50]			37.4%			sampling		18		service
Xiong et al. 2020 [51]	Wuhan/China	88.5	31.2 (4.7)	797	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	February 12 to March 17	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Galán et al. 2020 [52]	Madrid/Spain	73.9	43.8 (11.1)	2590	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	90.5	April 14-27	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Nakamura et al. 2020 [53]	Iwate/Japan	73.6	40 (11)	1000	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	76.8	May 18-29	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Psichogiou et al. 2020 [54]	Athens/Greece	69.7	46.4 (10.3)	1495	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	77	April 13 to May 15	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Chibwana et al. 2020 [55]	Blantyre/Malawi	53	31.4 (7.3)	500	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	May 22 to June 19	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Tosato et al. 2020 [56]	Padova/Italy	88	47 (10)	133	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	NR	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Paradiso et al. 2020 [57]	Bari/Italy	60.6	47.9 (8.6)	606	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	March 26 to April 17	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Fujita et al. 2020 [58]	Kyoto/Japan	64.1	20-29 years, 32.6%; 30-39 years, 31.5%; 40-49 years, 22.8%; >49 years, 13%	92	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	NR	April 10-20	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Sikora et al. 2020 [59]	Reading, Newport, Liverpool, Bedlington/United Kingdom	50.3	43 (NR)	161	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	April 14-24	Cancer centers	Pre-print service

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Rudberg et al. 2020 [60]	Stockholm/Sweden	85	44 (12)	410	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	100	April 14 to May 8	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Shields et al. 2020 [61]	Birmingham/United Kingdom	75.2	40.9 (15.6)	516	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	93.1	April 25	Hospitals	Pre-print service
Takita et al. 2020 [62]	Tokyo/Japan	35	20-29 years, 0%; 30-39 years, 9%; 40-49 years, 36%; 50-59 years, 16%; 60-69, 31%; 70-80 years, 7%	55	Prevalence	Convenience sampling	NR	April 21 to 28	Primary care facilities	Pre-print service

NR: not reported

SD: standard deviation

[a] for females

[b] for males

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 2. Studies that investigated factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity among health care workers.

Reference	Factors investigated for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity	Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies positivity	Level of analysis
Moscola et al. 2020 [14]	Age, sex, race/ethnicity, borough/county of residence, type of occupation, previously diagnosed with COVID-19 by PCR test, self-reported high suspicion of SARS-CoV-2 exposure, primary location of clinical work, direct patient care, working in a COVID-19 unit	- Previous positive PCR test (OR=1.52, 95% CI=1.44-1.60, p<0.001) - Self-reported high suspicion of SARS-CoV-2 exposure (OR=1.23, 95% CI=1.18-1.23, p<0.001)	Multivariable
Jeremias et al. 2020 [15]	Sex, ethnicity, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work	None	Univariate
Steensels et al. 2020 [18]	Age, sex, involvement in clinical care, work during the lockdown phase, involvement in care for COVID-19 patients, exposure to COVID-19 positive coworkers and household contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients	- Household contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients (OR=3.15, 95% CI=2.33-4.25, p<0.001)	Multivariable
Blairon et al. 2020 [19]	Age, sex, type of occupation, level of exposure to COVID-19 patients	None	Univariate
Korth et al. 2020 [21]	Age, sex, type of occupation, level of exposure to COVID-19 patients	None	Univariate
Martin et al. 2020 [22]	Age, sex, type of occupation, level of exposure to COVID-19 patients	None	Univariate
Amendola et al. 2020 [23]	Age, sex, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work	- Surgery department (OR=6.47, 95% CI=2.37-17.63, p=0.0003) and pediatric intensive care unit (OR=3.77, 95% CI=1.44-9.89, p=0.007)	Univariate
Self et al. 2020 [24]	Age, sex, race/ethnicity, chronic medical conditions, substance use, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work, participants' reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19, face covering for all clinical encounters and	- Males (OR=1.39, 95% CI=1.03-1.86, p=0.029) - Other participants (Black, Asian, Hispanic etc.) compared to White	Univariate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

	participants who reported a personal protective equipment shortage	participants (OR=2.30, 95% CI=1.71-3.10, p<0.001) - Participants' reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19 (OR=5.67, 95% CI=4.21-7.63, p<0.001) - No use of a face covering for all clinical encounters (p=0.012)[a] - Participants who reported a personal protective equipment shortage (p=0.009)[a]	
Grant et al. 2020 [25]	Prolonged direct contact with patients, working in a COVID-19 unit	- Prolonged direct contact with patients (OR=1.57, 95% CI=1.27-1.93, p<0.005) - Working in a COVID-19 unit (OR=1.67, 95% CI=1.40-1.99, p<0.001)	Univariate
Hunter et al. 2020 [27]	Age, sex, type of occupation, level of exposure to COVID-19 patients	None	Univariate
Plebani et al. 2020 [28]	Age, sex, type of occupation	- Aged ≥40 years (OR=1.36, 95% CI=1.09-1.60, p=0.006) - Health care assistants (OR=1.39, 95% CI=1.05-1.84, p=0.02)	Univariate
Mansour et al. 2020 [29]	Age, sex	None	Univariate
Sotgiu et al. 2020 [30]	Age, sex, type of occupation, contact with COVID-19 patients	- Males (OR=3.21, 95% CI=1.43-7.19, p=0.003)	Univariate
Garcia-Basteiro et al. 2020 [31]	Age, sex, type of occupation, daily contact with patients, working in a COVID-19 unit, close contact with COVID-19 confirmed or suspected cases, previously diagnosed with COVID-19 by PCR test, comorbidity, household size, flu vaccine	None	Univariate
Sydney et al. 2020 [32]	Age, sex, race/ethnicity, primary location of clinical work	- African American participants compared to other racial groups (p<0.05)[a]	Univariate
Stubblefield et	Age, sex, race/ethnicity, comorbidity, smoking, primary location of clinical work,	- Participants' reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19	Univariate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

al. 2020 [34]	type of occupation, previously diagnosed with COVID-19 by PCR test, face covering for all clinical encounters, participants' reported belief that (s)he previously had COVID-19	(p=0.02)[a] - Previous positive PCR test (p<0.001)[a]	
Lackermair et al. 2020 [35]	Age, sex, contact with COVID-19 patients, temporary residence in a high-risk SARS-CoV-2 region	None	Univariate
Paderno et al. 2020 [36]	Age, sex, type of occupation, hospital and household contacts without personal protective equipment	- Household contacts without personal protective equipment (p=0.008)[a]	Univariate
Kassem et al. 2020 [37]	Age, sex, type of occupation	None	Univariate
Iversen et al. 2020 [39]	Age, sex, comorbidity, smoking, alcohol consumption, type of occupation, working in a COVID-19 unit, patient contact	- Males (OR=1.49, 95% CI=1.31-1.68, p<0.001) - Aged <30 years (OR=1.40, 95% CI=1.22-1.60, p<0.001) - Working in a COVID-19 unit (OR=1.65, 95% CI=1.34-2.03, p<0.001) - Frontline health care workers (OR=1.38, 95% CI=1.22-1.56, p<0.001) - Regular patient contact (OR=1.22, 95% CI=1.03-1.45, p=0.02)	Multivariable
Fusco et al. 2020 [44]	Age, sex, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work, working in a COVID-19 unit, participation in training event on personal protective equipment	None	Univariate
Xu et al. 2020 [47]	Age, sex, type of occupation	- Aged ≥65 years (p<0.001)[a]	Univariate
Galán et al. 2020 [52]	Age, sex, comorbidity, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work	None	Univariate
Psichogiou et al. 2020 [54]	Sex, country of birth, education, household size, front-line or second line HCWs, personal protective equipment	None	Univariate
Fujita et al.	Age, sex, type of occupation, primary location of clinical work, history of	None	Univariate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

2020 [58]	seasonal common cold symptoms, history of regular contact with children, history of exposure to a viral infection		
Rudberg et al. 2020 [60]	Age, sex, type of occupation, patient-related work, COVID-19 patient contact	- Patient-related work (OR=2.9, 95% CI=1.9-4.5, p<0.001) - COVID-19 patient contact (OR=1.4, 95% CI=1.1-1.8, p=0.003) - Assistant nurses (OR=3.8, 95% CI=2.3-6.1, p<0.001)	Univariate
Shields et al. 2020 [61]	Age, sex, ethnicity	None	Univariate

CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio

[a] Not available data to calculate OR and CI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.23.20218289; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.


Identification
Records identified through PubMed searching (n = 3632)
Additional records identified through medRxiv and bioRxiv searching (n = 103)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 3742)
Screening
Records screened (n = 3742)
Records excluded at first screening (title/abstract) (n = 3684)
Eligibility
Additional records through reference lists scanning (n = 12)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 58)
Full-text articles excluded, for not meeting inclusion criteria (n = 9):
-Not health care workers
-Case reports
Included
Studies included in the qualitative analysis (n = 49)
Studies included in the quantitative analysis (n = 49)

Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)	positive cases/sample size
Moscola et al. 2020	0.137 (0.134, 0.140)	5523/40329
Jeremias et al. 2020	0.098 (0.085, 0.113)	167/1699
Houlihan et al. 2020	0.453 (0.381, 0.526)	82/181
Poulikakos et al. 2020	0.060 (0.036, 0.091)	17/281
Steensels et al. 2020	0.064 (0.056, 0.073)	197/3056
Blairon et al. 2020	0.146 (0.129, 0.165)	217/1485
Pallett et al. 2020	0.180 (0.170, 0.189)	1157/6440
Korth et al. 2020	0.016 (0.005, 0.032)	5/316
Martin et al. 2020	0.110 (0.079, 0.147)	36/326
Amendola et al. 2020	0.051 (0.034, 0.071)	28/547
Self et al. 2020	0.060 (0.052, 0.068)	194/3248
Grant et al. 2020	0.316 (0.296, 0.337)	634/2004
Mughal et al. 2020	0.083 (0.040, 0.138)	10/121
Hunter et al. 2020	0.014 (0.007, 0.025)	10/690
Plebani et al. 2020	0.046 (0.041, 0.050)	378/8285
Mansour et al. 2020	0.358 (0.303, 0.414)	102/285
Sotgiu et al. 2020	0.144 (0.099, 0.195)	29/202
Garcia-Basteiro et al. 2020	0.093 (0.071, 0.118)	54/578
Sydney et al. 2020	0.192 (0.174, 0.211)	327/1700
Khalil et al. 2020	0.216 (0.160, 0.277)	41/190
Stubblefield et al. 2020	0.076 (0.047, 0.112)	19/249
Lackermair et al. 2020	0.026 (0.007, 0.068)	4/151
Paderno et al. 2020	0.086 (0.028, 0.171)	5/58
Kassem et al. 2020	0.122 (0.058, 0.205)	9/74
Olalla et al. 2020	0.018 (0.008, 0.032)	9/498
Iversen et al. 2020	0.040 (0.038, 0.043)	1163/28792
Fernondez-Rivas et al. 2020	0.103 (0.096, 0.110)	779/7563
Kammon et al. 2020	0.006 (0.000, 0.036)	0/77
Xiong et al. 2020	0.044 (0.031, 0.059)	35/797
Galon et al. 2020	0.316 (0.298, 0.334)	818/2590
Nakamura et al. 2020	0.004 (0.001, 0.009)	4/1000
Psichogiou et al. 2020	0.010 (0.006, 0.016)	15/1495
Chibwana et al. 2020	0.168 (0.137, 0.202)	84/500
Tosato et al. 2020	0.045 (0.017, 0.087)	6/133
Paradiso et al. 2020	0.012 (0.005, 0.022)	7/606
Fujita et al. 2020	0.054 (0.018, 0.110)	5/92
Sikora et al. 2020	0.075 (0.039, 0.120)	12/161
Rudberg et al. 2020	0.191 (0.174, 0.208)	410/2149
Shields et al. 2020	0.240 (0.204, 0.277)	126/526
Hains et al. 2020	0.440 (0.255, 0.634)	11/25
Solodky et al. 2020	0.053 (0.029, 0.085)	13/244
Behrens et al. 2020	0.014 (0.003, 0.034)	3/217
Brandstetter et al. 2020	0.109 (0.070, 0.156)	22/201
Fusco et al. 2020	0.009 (0.000, 0.034)	1/115
Lahner et al. 2020	0.004 (0.002, 0.007)	8/2115
Schmidt et al. 2020	0.029 (0.015, 0.049)	11/374
Xu et al. 2020	0.018 (0.015, 0.023)	81/4384
Zhao et al. 2020	0.101 (0.069, 0.140)	28/276
Takita et al. 2020	0.091 (0.030, 0.180)	5/55
Overall (I^2=99.34 %, P< 0.001)	**0.087 (0.067, 0.109)**	**12901/127480**



Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)
Overall	0.087 (0.067, 0.109)
- Moscola et al.	0.086 (0.064, 0.110)
- Jeremias et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.109)
- Houlihan et al.	0.082 (0.062, 0.103)
- Poulikakos et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Steensels et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Blairon et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.108)
- Pallett et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.107)
- Korth et al.	0.089 (0.068, 0.111)
- Martin et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.109)
- Amendola et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Self et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Grant et al.	0.083 (0.064, 0.104)
- Mughal et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.109)
- Hunter et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.111)
- Plebani et al.	0.088 (0.067, 0.111)
- Mansour et al.	0.083 (0.063, 0.104)
- Sotgiu et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.108)
- Garcia-Basteiro et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.109)
- Sydney et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.107)
- Khalil et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.107)
- Stubblefield et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.109)
- Lackermair et al.	0.088 (0.068, 0.111)
- Paderno et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.109)
- Kassem et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.108)
- Olalla et al.	0.089 (0.068, 0.111)
- Iversen et al.	0.088 (0.067, 0.111)
- Fernandez-Rivas et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.110)
- Kammon et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.112)
- Xiong et al.	0.088 (0.067, 0.110)
- Galon et al.	0.083 (0.064, 0.104)
- Nakamura et al.	0.090 (0.069, 0.112)
- Psichogiou et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.112)
- Chibwana et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.107)
- Tosato et al.	0.088 (0.067, 0.110)
- Paradiso et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.112)
- Fujita et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Sikora et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.109)
- Rudberg et al.	0.085 (0.065, 0.107)
- Shields et al.	0.084 (0.064, 0.106)
- Hains et al.	0.083 (0.064, 0.105)
- Solodky et al.	0.087 (0.067, 0.110)
- Behrens et al.	0.089 (0.068, 0.111)
- Brandstetter et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.109)
- Fusco et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.112)
- Lahner et al.	0.090 (0.070, 0.112)
- Schmidt et al.	0.088 (0.068, 0.111)
- Xu et al.	0.089 (0.069, 0.111)
- Zhao et al.	0.086 (0.066, 0.109)
- Takita et al.	0.087 (0.066, 0.109)




0,00
0,02
0,04
0,06
0,08
0,10
Standard error
-0,1
0,0
0,1
0,2
0,3
0,4
0,5
Proportion