

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2

3 **Title: U.S. CDC support to international SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys, May 2020–February 2022**

4 **Short Title: CDC support to international SARS-CoV-2 Serosurveys**

5

6 **Authors:**

7 Amen Ben Hamida^{1,2} ¶*, Myrna Charles^{2,3} ¶, Christopher Murrill^{2,4} ¶, Olga Henao^{1,2} ¶, Kathleen Gallagher^{1,2} ¶.

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹: Division of Global Health Protection, U.S. CDC, Atlanta, GA, USA.

11 ²: COVID-19 International Task Force, U.S. CDC, Atlanta, GA, USA.

12 ³: Influenza Division, U.S. CDC, Atlanta, GA, USA.

13 ⁴: Global Immunization Division, U.S. CDC, Atlanta, GA, USA.

14

15 **Corresponding author:** ABenHamida@cdc.gov (ABH)

16

17 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Pandemic, Seroprevalence, serosurvey, low- and middle-income
18 countries, U.S. CDC

19

20 **Abstract word count:** 300 / 300

21 **Manuscript word count:** 2,898 (no restriction)

22

23 **ABSTRACT**

24
25 *SARS-CoV-2* seroprevalence surveys provide critical information to assess the burden of COVID-19,
26 describe population immunity, and guide public health strategies. Early in the pandemic, most of these
27 surveys were conducted within high-income countries, leaving significant knowledge gaps in low-and
28 middle-income (LMI) countries. To address this gap, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
29 (CDC) is supporting serosurveys internationally.

30
31 We conducted a descriptive analysis of international serosurveys supported by CDC during May 12, 2020–
32 February 28, 2022, using an internal tracker including data on the type of assistance provided, study
33 design, population surveyed, laboratory testing performed, and status of implementation. Since the
34 beginning of the pandemic, CDC has supported 72 serosurveys (77 serosurvey rounds) in 35 LMI countries
35 by providing technical assistance (TA) on epidemiologic, statistical, and laboratory methods, financial
36 assistance (FA), or both. Among these serosurvey rounds, the majority (61%) received both TA and FA
37 from CDC, 30% received TA only, 3% received only FA, and 5% were part of informal reviews. Fifty-four
38 percent of these serosurveys target the general population, 13% sample pregnant women, 7% sample
39 healthcare workers, 7% sample other special populations (internally displaced persons, patients, students,
40 and people living with HIV), and 18% assess multiple or other populations. These studies are in different
41 stages of implementation, ranging from protocol development to dissemination of results. They are
42 conducted under the leadership of local governments, who have ownership over the data, in collaboration
43 with international partners. Thirty-four surveys rounds have completed data collection.

44
45 CDC TA and FA of *SARS-CoV-2* seroprevalence surveys will enhance the knowledge of the COVID-19

46 pandemic in almost three dozen LMI countries. Support for these surveys should account for current
47 limitations with interpreting results, focusing efforts on prospective cohorts, identifying, and forecasting
48 disease patterns over time, and helping understand antibody kinetics and correlates of protection.

49 INTRODUCTION

50

51 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) —the virus responsible for coronavirus
52 disease 2019 (COVID-19)— was first identified in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. After its rapid spread
53 to 20 additional countries in the first six weeks, on January 30, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO)
54 declared COVID-19 a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC, [\[1\]](#)). As of May 2022,
55 virtually all countries have been affected by COVID-19, resulting in more than 520 million COVID-19
56 confirmed cases and more than 6.2 million COVID-19-related deaths reported globally [\[2\]](#).

57

58 Seroprevalence surveys are generally conducted to assess the prevalence of pathogen-specific antibodies
59 in the serum and have been used extensively in the past to serve various public health purposes, including
60 to a) assess the prevalence and incidence of infections (e.g., human immunodeficiency virus [HIV],
61 hepatitis C and B viruses) [\[3-6\]](#); b) identify populations that are susceptible to infections [\[7\]](#); and c) inform
62 and sustain models for disease control, elimination, or eradication (e.g., measles, rubella, diphtheria,
63 poliomyelitis, and neonatal tetanus) [\[8-10\]](#).

64

65 SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys complement case-surveillance data. Case-surveillance generates data
66 that is needed to assess the burden and severity of disease and identify transmission hotspots. However,
67 these case reports are generally incomplete because many infections are not recognized; for example, if
68 a) an individual is asymptomatic and does not seek health care, b) testing is not available and accessible,
69 or c) identified cases are not appropriately reported to the national public health disease surveillance
70 system. It is in this context that SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys —which estimate the prevalence of
71 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies within a specific population and thus provide a useful proxy to assess previous

72 exposure to and/or vaccination against *SARS-CoV-2*— were initiated. Data from these surveys provide
73 critical information for decision-makers to estimate the true burden of disease, describe population
74 immunity over place and time, identify still-at-risk groups, help assess vaccination coverage, and
75 ultimately guide public health strategies [11].

76
77 During the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, most seroprevalence surveys were conducted within
78 high-income countries, leaving a significant knowledge gap in low- and middle-income (LMI) countries.
79 For example, among the 968 studies included in a systematic literature review of *SARS-CoV-2*
80 seroprevalence studies conducted during 2020, only 23% were from LMI countries [11-13]. To address
81 this gap, the U.S. Centers for Disease Prevention and Control (CDC) —along with multiple other
82 international actors, including WHO— started supporting seroprevalence studies in LMI settings in mid-
83 2020. In this paper, we describe CDC’s support of international seroprevalence surveys, define the
84 purpose and characteristics of the supported studies, discuss challenges with implementation and
85 propose possible steps moving forward to use seroprevalence data for public health action.

86

87 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

88

89 On January 20, 2020, CDC activated its Emergency Operations Center in response to the COVID-19
90 pandemic to coordinate efforts to stop the transmission of *SARS-CoV-2* [14]. Consequently, an incident
91 management structure was established, including the development and implementation of an incident
92 action plan. Within the Incident Management System, an International Task Force, mostly consisting of
93 CDC staff, was established to oversee CDC’s role in the global response, including support for the
94 implementation and monitoring of *SARS-CoV-2* international seroprevalence studies. These studies were

95 funded mainly by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, enacted on March 27,
96 2020 [14-16].

97
98 CDC-supported international seroprevalence studies are conducted under the leadership and guidance of
99 local government agencies that request CDC support (e.g., Ministries of Health or national public health
100 institutes) in close coordination with international stakeholders such as the WHO and Africa CDC. The
101 national governmental agencies retain total ownership over generated seroprevalence data. However,
102 limited and temporary access to seroprevalence data may be granted to CDC by the local authorities for
103 a specific task (e.g., data analysis). Technical support is generally provided through CDC offices in country.
104 It includes sharing of templates and guidance documents, assistance in protocol development, advice on
105 sampling methodology and laboratory techniques, staff training, data analysis and interpretation, and
106 dissemination of results.

107
108 To ensure some degree of standardization, whenever possible, CDC staff worked closely with WHO, and
109 encouraged countries to use the WHO UNITY protocol entitled “Population-based age-stratified
110 seroepidemiological investigation protocol for COVID-19 infection.” The WHO UNITY protocol is part of a
111 global seroepidemiological standardization initiative to increase evidence-based knowledge for action
112 [17]. The WHO UNITY criteria include: using an age-stratified sample from the general population;
113 following a cross-sectional, repeated cross-sectional, or a longitudinal survey design, including all
114 individuals regardless of acute or prior SARS-CoV-2 infection; and using a validated SARS-CoV-2 laboratory
115 test kit with sensitivity $\geq 90\%$ and specificity $\geq 97\%$ [17]. Survey designs were modified, as appropriate, to
116 accommodate country-specific needs.

117
118 To support the implementation of these surveys, in December 2020 CDC initiated an international

119 seroprevalence community of practice (a virtual monthly group call) to facilitate communication between
120 CDC headquarters and country office staff engaging in seroprevalence work. This community of practice
121 provided an opportunity to discuss and exchange information on topics including sampling, testing, and
122 survey methods and to share ongoing progress, lessons learned, and available seroprevalence data.

123
124 In addition, we developed an Excel-based tracker for CDC-supported international seroprevalence
125 surveys, where project staff could update status of protocol development and implementation for each
126 survey. We reviewed information from the tracker and conducted a descriptive analysis of international
127 serosurveys supported by CDC during May 12, 2020–February 28, 2022. Variables included in the analysis
128 were: 1) type of assistance provided (e.g., only technical assistance, only financial assistance, both,
129 informal technical review [as defined by a one-time request for technical review or consultation for a
130 seroprevalence protocol that CDC is not actively engaged in]), 2) WHO region, 3) study design and
131 population surveyed, 4) laboratory testing used, 5) status of survey implementation and 6) status of
132 dissemination.

133
134 This activity was reviewed by CDC, deemed not to be research (ID: 0900f3eb81de998d), and was
135 conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy (See e.g., 45 C.F.R. part 46, 21 C.F.R. part
136 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq.). The same applies for all the serosurveys
137 described in this manuscript that have received CDC funding and CDC technical assistance or in which CDC
138 staff are listed as co-authors.

139

140 **RESULTS**

141

142 **Type of CDC Support and geographic distribution**

143 As of February 28, 2022, CDC has supported 72 COVID-19 international seroprevalence surveys,
144 corresponding to 77 survey rounds in 35 LMI countries.

145


146 Among these survey rounds, the majority (61%) receive both technical and financial assistance from CDC,
147 30% receive technical assistance only, and 3% receive only financial assistance. Six percent were part of
148 informal CDC reviews and technical assistance under the request of local authorities or external partners
149 (Figure 1).

150

151 Most surveys (54%) were conducted within the WHO African region, followed by 18% in the Americas
152 region, 13% within the South-East Asian region, 7% in the Western Pacific region, and 4% for each of the
153 European and Eastern Mediterranean regions.

154

155 **Figure 1: CDC Support to SARS-CoV-2 international seroprevalence surveys as of February 28, 2022 (N=**
156 **72 surveys / 77 survey rounds)**



157

158 Note: TA: Technical assistance. Greyed countries did not receive CDC assistance.

159 Map developed using QGIS Software and Natural Earth base layer [[18](#), [19](#)].

160

161 **Study design, population of interest, and WHO UNITY determination**

162 Among the 72 seroprevalence surveys, 69% are based on a cross-sectional design (84% of which are using
163 a single round, while the remaining 16% are using multiple rounds), 19% involve following longitudinal
164 cohorts, and 10% are part of the establishment of COVID-19-specific sentinel surveillance (or being
165 integrated within an already existing surveillance system). The remaining 1% are using a hybrid design
166 customized to the target population (Table 1).

167

168 Forty-seven percent of the surveys involve targeting the general population through household-based
169 surveys, and 7% involve targeting the general population through other means (e.g., recruiting from
170 community venues or using a convenience sample); 13% involve sampling pregnant women; 7% involve
171 following health care worker cohorts; and 7% are conducted among other special populations including
172 people living with HIV, persons who were displaced, and students. The remaining 18% target multiple or
173 other populations (e.g., truck drivers).

174
175 Sixty-three percent of survey rounds have been assessed against WHO UNITY criteria. Among these, 79%
176 involved methods aligned with the WHO UNITY criteria, and 21% did not.

177
178 **Laboratory procedures**
179 Among the 77 serosurvey rounds, 55% involved collecting blood via venipuncture, 25% involved using a
180 finger stick and 5% involved using remnant samples from other studies or ongoing cohorts. Eight percent
181 involved using multiple sample collection types, and 7% are yet to be determined. Seventeen percent
182 involved using dried blood spots to store and transport specimens (Table 1).

183
184 The choice of antibody assays has been determined for 95% of serosurvey rounds. About half (55%)
185 involved using an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in serum,
186 20% involved using a multiplex assay, and 11% involved using a rapid test. The remaining 13% involved
187 using multiple assays.

188
189 **Progress to date**
190 Progress varies across countries. By February 28, 2022, among the 77 survey rounds, 16% are in the stage
191 of protocol development, 16% are in the stage of preparing for data collection, 17% are in the stage of
192 data collection, 18% are in the stage of data analysis, 19% are in the stage of developing their deliverables,
193 and 6% have their dissemination of results completed. The remaining 8% are either interrupted or CDC
194 monitoring was discontinued (e.g., if CDC support was limited to an informal review) (Table 1).

195
196 **Table 1: Summary of CDC-supported international SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys (N= 72 surveys /**
197 **77 survey rounds)**

Variables	N (%)
Type of Support (N=77 survey rounds)	
Technical and financial assistance	47 (61%)
Technical assistance only	23 (30%)
Financial assistance only	2 (3%)
Informal review	5 (6%)
Survey design (N=72 surveys)	
Cross-sectional (one-time survey)	42 (58%)
Repeated cross-sectional	8 (11%)
Longitudinal cohort	14 (19%)
Sentinel surveillance system*	7 (10%)
Hybrid design**	1 (1%)
Population surveyed (N=72 surveys)	
General population — Household survey	34 (47%)
General population — Other	5 (7%)
Healthcare workers	5 (7%)
People living with HIV	3 (4%)
Persons who were displaced	1 (1%)
Patients	1 (1%)
Students	1 (1%)
Pregnant	9 (13%)
Other	3 (4%)
Multiple	10 (14%)
WHO region (N=72 surveys)	
Africa	39 (54%)
Americas	13 (18%)
South-East Asia	9 (13%)
Europea	3 (4%)
Eastern Mediterranean	3 (4%)
Western Pacific	5 (7%)
Serologic testing (N=77 survey rounds)	
ELISA	40 (52%)
Antibody Rapid Test	8 (10%)
Multiplex	15 (19%)
Other/multiple	9 (12%)
To be determined	5 (6%)
Sample collection (N=77 survey rounds)	
Venipuncture	42 (55%)
Finger Stick	19 (25%)
Remnant samples	4 (5%)
Multiple	6 (8%)
Not yet determined	6 (7%)

Progress to date (N= 77 survey rounds)

Protocol preparation and drafting	12 (16%)
Preparing for data collection	12 (16%)
Data collection ongoing	13 (17%)
Data analysis ongoing	14 (18%)
Drafting of deliverables ongoing	15 (19%)
Dissemination of results complete	5 (6%)
Serosurvey interrupted	2 (3%)
CDC monitoring discontinued	4 (5%)

198 Notes: *Setting new sentinel surveillance systems (e.g., each month, recruiting the first 30 pregnant
 199 women who are consulting at an ante-natal care clinic) or integrating seroprevalence within existing ones
 200 (e.g., acute febrile illness sentinel surveillance system). **Customized to the target population. ELISA:
 201 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. Some variable percentages total 99% due to rounding.

202

203 **Dissemination of results**

204 To date, five manuscripts have been published. All five were cross-sectional, population-based surveys
 205 conducted in Africa (Table 2). As of February 2022, at least 15 other manuscripts from 10 countries are
 206 currently being drafted.

207

208 As shown in Table 2, among the published data, SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence estimates obtained mostly
 209 during the first year of pandemic ranged from 2.1% in Zambia (6 districts, July 2020) to 34.7% in Kenya
 210 (Nairobi, November 2020) [20-24]. Infection to reported cases ratios —which is the ratio of the number
 211 of persons with previous infections as detected by seroprevalence studies (seropositive), to the number
 212 of COVID-19 cases detected by the surveillance system during the same period— ranged from 21:1 in
 213 Ethiopia (Addis Ababa, June–July 2020) to 295:1 in Senegal (National, October–November 2020) [20-24].

214

215 **Table 2: Published CDC-supported SARS-CoV-2 international seroprevalence studies by February 28,**
 216 **2022 (N= 5)**

Country	Geographic Scope	Design	Data Collection Period	Seroprevalence estimate	Infections to Cases Ratio	Reference
---------	------------------	--------	------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------

Ethiopia	14 major urban areas	Cross-sectional, population-based	June 24–July 8, 2020	3.5% (95% CI= 3.2%–3.8%)	21:1 (in Addis Ababa)	Tadesse et al. [20]
Kenya	Nairobi	Cross-sectional, population-based	November 2020	34.7% (95% CI= 31.8–37.6)	42:1	Ngere et al. [21]
Senegal	National	Cross-sectional, population-based	October 24–November 26, 2020	28.4% (95% CI= 26.1–30.8)	295:1	Talla et al. [22]
Sierra Leone	National	Cross-sectional, population-based	March 2021	2.6% (95% CI= 1.9%–3.4%)	43:1	Barrie et al. [23]
Zambia	6 districts	Cross-sectional, population-based	July 4–27, 2020	Combined PCR and ELISA: 10.6% (95% CI= 7.3–13.9) ELISA: 2.1% (95% CI= 1.1–3.1)	92:1	Mulenga et al. [24]

217 Notes: Infections to case ratio: Number of possible SARS-CoV-2 infections estimated based on the
 218 seroprevalence survey, divided by the number of COVID-19 cases detected by the national surveillance
 219 system by the mid-point of the data collection period. ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. PCR:
 220 polymerase chain reaction. CI: confidence interval.

221

222 Discussion

223 To supplement ongoing COVID-19 surveillance efforts in countries and ensure a thorough understanding
 224 of disease prevalence in LMI settings, CDC currently supports more than 70 seroprevalence studies in 35

225 countries. These surveys vary significantly in type of CDC support received, study design, the population
226 surveyed, geographic distribution, laboratory method, and progress to date.

227

228 The heterogeneity in seroprevalence studies is expected given the varying situations and populations
229 surveyed both within and between countries and has been observed by others conducting a systematic
230 review to track *SARS-CoV-2* serosurveys globally [12, 13]. In June 2021, a Canadian team published a
231 systematic literature review of seroprevalence studies conducted during 2020, which included 968 unique
232 serosurveys with significant heterogeneity noted [11]. In order to make sense of this diversity in
233 seroprevalence studies and ensure comparability of results, several global initiatives have been launched
234 including the Serotracker website, designed by the same Canadian team, which conducts a systematic live
235 review of published *SARS-CoV-2* seroprevalence studies, and displays results in an automated live
236 dashboard, allowing users to filter seroprevalence studies by several criteria including region, population
237 of interest, date of data collection, and test type [12, 13]. Additional initiatives include the WHO UNITY
238 approach and protocol templates for population-based seroprevalence surveys, which advocate for more
239 standardization and more rigorous methods while conducting serosurveys [17, 25]; and the WHO
240 statement on the reporting of seroprevalence studies, which aims to standardize reporting of
241 seroprevalence studies' results [26].

242

243 Five CDC-supported seroprevalence studies have been published to date; and at least 15 more had their
244 results disseminated with MOH and are currently in the stage of developing their deliverables. All five
245 published serosurveys were cross-sectional, population-based, and from countries in the WHO Africa
246 region, with wide ranges in both *SARS CoV-2* seroprevalence estimates (2.1% to 34.7%) and infection-to-
247 cases ratios (21:1 to 295:1) [20-24]. Of note, the previously mentioned systematic review and meta-
248 analysis, including surveys conducted during 2020, estimated the median corrected *SARS CoV-2*

249 seroprevalence to be 0.6% in Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Oceania; 4.1% in high-income countries; 8.2%
250 in North Africa and the Middle East; 10.6% in Latin America and the Caribbean; 12.2% in Central Europe,
251 Eastern Europe, and Central Asia; 17.1% in South Asia; and 19.5% in Sub-Saharan Africa [11]. The extreme
252 variability in infection-to-case ratios from the CDC-supported surveys conducted in 2020 is consistent with
253 those reported in the literature, from a median of 6:1 in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia
254 to 217:1 in Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Oceania [11, 13]. This variability could be explained by different
255 factors including differences in clinical presentation, availability of testing, and mitigation measures
256 implemented in-countries.

257
258 Seroprevalence results provide critical information for decision makers to guide ongoing public health
259 strategies for the prevention and control of COVID-19. They allow for the assessment of the burden of
260 disease (e.g., cumulative incidence and true case-to-fatality ratio), identification of hidden hotspots,
261 quantification of the infection-to-case ratio, and estimation of vaccination coverage [11, 20-24]. When
262 coupled with other surveillance, clinical, and epidemiologic data, data from these surveys can also help
263 distinguish between a) a well-functioning surveillance system capturing most of the cases; b) a real gap in
264 the ability of public health system to identify, diagnose, and report symptomatic cases; and c) a less severe
265 clinical presentation which may lead to limited healthcare-seeking behavior.

266
267 Supporting the implementation of international seroprevalence surveys has numerous ongoing and
268 emerging challenges. These include the ever-evolving nature of the pandemic, changes in mitigation
269 strategies and shifting data needs to inform the response, limited resources to support these and other
270 epidemiologic endeavors globally, and competing country priorities. Additionally, there is a clear need for
271 serosurveys to adopt more efficient processes that allow for timelier implementation. These could include
272 better integration with other ongoing surveillance or epidemiologic efforts; standardization of processes;

273 and real-time analysis and dissemination of results.

274

275 Several factors have also challenged the interpretation and usefulness of seroprevalence surveys leading
276 to a change over time in the questions these surveys can address. These include concerns about SARS-
277 CoV-2 cross-reactivity with other pathogens, the implementation of COVID-19 vaccination campaigns, the
278 emergence of new variants, reports of waning immunity, and un-defined correlates of protection (CoP).

279

280 Several reports have been shared suggesting possible antigenic cross-reactivity between *SARS-CoV-2* and
281 other pathogens including *Plasmodium* species, Dengue viruses, and other human coronaviruses; possibly
282 leading to a decreased specificity of *SARS-CoV-2* serologic testing and a higher level of false positive
283 results, especially in the African region [27-32]. To help address this, CDC and WHO recommend using
284 serologic tests that have been independently validated and conducting an in-country validation or
285 verification whenever possible [33, 34].

286

287 Early in the pandemic and before the introduction of *SARS-CoV-2* vaccines, most seroprevalence survey
288 objectives focused on assessing the true burden of disease to help identify gaps in national public health
289 surveillance systems and identify at-risk populations [11, 17, 25]. The introduction of vaccines, critical in
290 slowing the spread of the virus and decreasing severity of the disease, has created challenges in the
291 design, implementation, and interpretation of *SARS-CoV-2* serosurveys. Testing algorithms involving the
292 use of antibody assays with different targets (e.g. antibodies anti-nucleocapsid protein and antibodies
293 anti-Spike protein) have been developed to help distinguish between natural and vaccine-induced
294 immunity for vaccines that only target Spike protein-derived antigens (e.g., current mRNA and viral vector
295 vaccines) [35]. However, if the countries are using other vaccines or the survey design does not allow to
296 distinguish between natural and vaccine-induced immunity, the objectives of seroprevalence surveys

297 would be mostly limited to elucidating potentially at-risk populations and allocating scarce resources
298 (vaccines) efficiently [35]. Additionally, mounting evidence of waning antibodies with both natural and
299 vaccine-induced immunities challenges the ability to assess both the true burden of disease and
300 vaccination coverage [36-39]. Of note, infection severity, timing of testing, and the choice of antibody
301 assays all seem to significantly impact antibodies' detection over time [40]. CDC is currently working with
302 international partners to address the statistical, epidemiologic, and laboratory considerations of vaccine
303 introduction and to adapt seroprevalence protocols accordingly, based on WHO interim guidance and in-
304 country specific needs and priorities.

305
306 Finally, the question of correlates of protection (CoP) for SARS-CoV2 is not resolved. Several studies have
307 documented an inverse relationship between neutralizing antibody levels and incidence of infection, and
308 a correlation between these antibody levels and vaccine efficacy suggests a possible relative CoP against
309 infection that is likely defined by quantitative thresholds [35, 41-44]. However, most serosurveys
310 underway are using qualitative assays to assess circulating antibodies. Cellular immunity, which is
311 generally more durable and likely to be integral to CoP, is generally not assessed in these surveys due to
312 technical and cost challenges [35, 41].

313
314 CDC technical assistance and financial support of SARS-CoV-2 international seroprevalence surveys
315 contribute to strengthening local capacity to conduct epidemiologic surveillance and enhance the
316 knowledge of the COVID-19 pandemic in almost three dozen LMI countries. Considering constantly
317 evolving challenges to implementation and interpretation of seroprevalence results two years into the
318 COVID-19 pandemic, there is a need for the global public health community to assess the best strategies
319 for future SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence efforts. These strategies could include developing a better
320 understanding of antibody kinetics, identifying and forecasting epidemic patterns over time, and helping

321 assess CoP. These objectives may be attainable by relying on prospective cohorts, integrating COVID-19
322 sero-surveillance with surveillance of other pathogens, and introducing quantitative testing of binding and
323 neutralizing antibodies. Support for international seroprevalence surveys can help understand patterns
324 of transmission, guide public health interventions, allocate resources strategically, and ultimately control
325 the spread of the pandemic.

326

327 **Disclaimer**

328 The findings and conclusions in this study are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the
329 views of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease
330 Registry.

331

332 **Acknowledgments**

333 U.S. CDC Countries offices involved in seroprevalence work; National Ministries of Public Health, CDCs,
334 Institutes for Public health, and other implementing partners; U.S. CDC Division of Global Health
335 Protection, Global Epidemiology, Laboratory, and Surveillance Branch, Surveillance and Information
336 Systems Team and Laboratory Team; U.S. CDC International Task Force, Epidemiology and Laboratory
337 Teams; WHO Seroprevalence Team; SeroTracker team; and Africa CDC Seroprevalence Team.

338

339

340 **References**

341 1. World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 Public Health Emergency of International Concern
342 (PHEIC) Global research and innovation forum [Internet]. 2020 [updated 2020 February 12; cited 2021
343 November 23]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
344 [emergency-of-international-concern-\(pheic\)-global-research-and-innovation-forum](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum).

- 345 2. World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 Explorer [Internet]. 2020 [updated 2022 May 18;
346 cited 2022 May 18]. Available from: <https://worldhealthorg.shinyapps.io/covid/>.
- 347 3. Khokhar N, Gill ML, Malik GJ. General seroprevalence of hepatitis C and hepatitis B virus infections
348 in population. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak*. 2004;14(9):534-6.
- 349 4. Drain PK, Smith JS, Hughes JP, Halperin DT, Holmes KK. Correlates of National HIV Seroprevalence:
350 An Ecologic Analysis of 122 Developing Countries. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency*
351 *Syndromes*. 2004;35(4).
- 352 5. Abdool Karim Q, Abdool Karim SS, Singh B, Short R, Ngxongo S. Seroprevalence of HIV infection in
353 rural South Africa. *AIDS (London, England)*. 1992;6(12):1535-9.
- 354 6. Ott JJ, Stevens GA, Groeger J, Wiersma ST. Global epidemiology of hepatitis B virus infection: New
355 estimates of age-specific HBsAg seroprevalence and endemicity. *Vaccine*. 2012;30(12):2212-9.
- 356 7. Jacobsen KH, Koopman JS. Declining hepatitis A seroprevalence: a global review and analysis.
357 *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2004;132(6):1005-22.
- 358 8. PachÓN I, Amela C, De Ory F. Age-specific seroprevalence of poliomyelitis, diphtheria and tetanus
359 antibodies in Spain. *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2002;129(3):535-41.
- 360 9. McQuillan GM, Kruszon-Moran D, Hyde TB, Forghani B, Bellini W, Dayan GH. Seroprevalence of
361 Measles Antibody in the US Population, 1999–2004. *The Journal of infectious diseases*.
362 2007;196(10):1459-64.
- 363 10. Winter AK, Martinez ME, Cutts FT, Moss WJ, Ferrari MJ, McKee A, et al. Benefits and Challenges
364 in Using Seroprevalence Data to Inform Models for Measles and Rubella Elimination. *The Journal of*
365 *infectious diseases*. 2018;218(3):355-64.
- 366 11. Bobrovitz N, Arora RK, Cao C, Boucher E, Liu M, Donnici C, et al. Global seroprevalence of SARS-
367 CoV-2 antibodies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2021;16(6):e0252617.
- 368 12. SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence dashboard [Internet]. 2020 [updated 2021
369 November 10; cited 2021 November 24]. Available from: <https://serotracker.com/en/Explore>.

- 370 13. Arora RK, Joseph A, Van Wyk J, Rocco S, Atmaja A, May E, et al. SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2
371 seroprevalence dashboard. *The Lancet Infectious diseases*. 2021;21(4):e75-e6.
- 372 14. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CDC Emergency Operations Center
373 Activations [Internet]. 2020 [updated January 20, 2020; cited November 26, 2021]. Available from:
374 <https://emergency.cdc.gov/recentincidents/>.
- 375 15. Congress.gov. H.R.748 - CARES Act [Internet]. 2019 [updated March 27, 2020; cited November 26,
376 2021]. Available from: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/748>.
- 377 16. Bipartisan Policy Center. U.S. Leadership in the COVID-19 Pandemic Response: Global Health is
378 U.S. Health [Internet]. 2020 [updated April 2020; cited November 26, 2021]. Available from:
379 [https://bipartisanpolicy.org/download/?file=/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/BPC_Health_COVID19-](https://bipartisanpolicy.org/download/?file=/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/BPC_Health_COVID19-Pandemic-Response.pdf)
380 [Pandemic-Response.pdf](https://bipartisanpolicy.org/download/?file=/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/BPC_Health_COVID19-Pandemic-Response.pdf).
- 381 17. World Health Organization (WHO). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) technical guidance: The Unity
382 Studies: Early Investigation Protocols [Internet]. 2020 [updated 2020 May 26; cited 2021 November 24].
383 Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/early-investigations)
384 [guidance/early-investigations](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/early-investigations).
- 385 18. Natural Earth. Public Domain Map Dataset 2022 [cited May 25 2022]. Available from:
386 <https://www.naturalearthdata.com/about/terms-of-use/>.
- 387 19. QGIS. A Free and Open Source Geographic Information System 2022 [cited May 25 2022].
388 Available from: <https://qgis.org/en/site/index.html>.
- 389 20. Tadesse EB, Endris AA, Solomon H, Alayu M, Kebede A, Eshetu K, et al. Seroprevalence and risk
390 factors for SARS-CoV-2 Infection in selected urban areas in Ethiopia: a cross-sectional evaluation during
391 July 2020. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society*
392 *for Infectious Diseases*. 2021;111:179-85.
- 393 21. Ngere I, Dawa J, Hunsperger E, Otieno N, Masika M, Amoth P, et al. High seroprevalence of SARS-
394 CoV-2 but low infection fatality ratio eight months after introduction in Nairobi, Kenya. *International*
395 *journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*.
396 2021;112:25-34.

- 397 22. Talla C, Loucoubar C, Roka JL, Barry A, Ndiay S, Diarra M, et al. Seroprevalence of Anti-SARS-CoV-
398 2 Antibodies in Senegal: A National Population-Based Cross-Sectional Survey, between October and
399 November 2020 [PrePrint]. 2021 [updated September 17, 2021; cited November 29, 2021]. Available
400 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3925475>.
- 401 23. Barrie MB, Lakoh S, Kelly JD, Kanu JS, Squire JS, Koroma Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence
402 in Sierra Leone, March 2021: a cross-sectional, nationally representative, age-stratified serosurvey. *BMJ*
403 *Glob Health*. 2021;6(11).
- 404 24. Mulenga LB, Hines JZ, Fwoloshi S, Chirwa L, Siwingwa M, Yingst S, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-
405 2 in six districts in Zambia in July, 2020: a cross-sectional cluster sample survey. *The Lancet Global health*.
406 2021;9(6):e773-e81.
- 407 25. Bergeri I, Lewis HC, Subissi L, Nardone A, Valenciano M, Cheng B, et al. Early epidemiological
408 investigations: World Health Organization UNITY protocols provide a standardized and timely
409 international investigation framework during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Influenza and other respiratory*
410 *viruses*. 2021;16(1), 7–13.
- 411 26. World Health Organization Seroepidemiology Technical Working G. ROSES-S: Statement from the
412 World Health Organization on the reporting of seroepidemiologic studies for SARS-CoV-2. *Influenza and*
413 *other respiratory viruses*. 2021;15(5):561-8.
- 414 27. Yadouleton A, Sander AL, Moreira-Soto A, Tchibozo C, Hounkanrin G, Badou Y, et al. Limited
415 Specificity of Serologic Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Detection, Benin. *Emerging infectious diseases*.
416 2021;27(1).
- 417 28. Emmerich P, Murawski C, Ehmen C, von Possel R, Pekarek N, Oestereich L, et al. Limited specificity
418 of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISAs in serum samples of African origin. *Trop Med Int Health*.
419 2021;26(6):621-31.
- 420 29. Lustig Y, Keler S, Kolodny R, Ben-Tal N, Atias-Varon D, Shlush E, et al. Potential Antigenic Cross-
421 reactivity Between Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Dengue Viruses.
422 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;73(7):e2444-e9.

- 423 30. Gold JE, Baumgartl WH, Okyay RA, Licht WE, Fidel PL, Jr., Noverr MC, et al. Analysis of Measles-
424 Mumps-Rubella (MMR) Titers of Recovered COVID-19 Patients. *mBio*. 2020;11(6).
- 425 31. Tso FY, Lidenge SJ, Pena PB, Clegg AA, Ngowi JR, Mwaiselage J, et al. High prevalence of pre-
426 existing serological cross-reactivity against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-
427 2) in sub-Saharan Africa. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the*
428 *International Society for Infectious Diseases*. 2021;102:577-83.
- 429 32. Masyeni S, Santoso MS, Widyaningsih PD, Asmara DW, Nainu F, Harapan H, et al. Serological cross-
430 reaction and coinfection of dengue and COVID-19 in Asia: Experience from Indonesia. *International journal*
431 *of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*.
432 2021;102:152-4.
- 433 33. NRL Science of Quality. Independent NRL contracted SARS-CoV-2 IVD assessments [Internet].
434 2021 [updated November 29, 2021; cited November 29, 2021]. Available from:
435 <https://www.nrlquality.org.au/who-covid-evaluations-summary-of-results>.
- 436 34. FIND The Global Alliance for Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Detection Tests
437 [Internet]. 2021 [updated April 30, 2021; cited November 29, 2021]. Available from:
438 <https://www.finddx.org/sarscov2-eval-antibody/>.
- 439 35. Duarte N, Yanes-Lane M, Arora RK, Bobrovitz N, Liu M, Bego MG, et al. Adapting Serosurveys for
440 the SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Era. *Open forum infectious diseases*. 2022;9(2):ofab632.
- 441 36. Kojima N, Klausner JD. Protective immunity after recovery from SARS-CoV-2 infection. *The Lancet*
442 *Infectious diseases*. 2022;22(1):12-4.
- 443 37. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, Hastie KM, Yu ED, Faliti CE, et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2
444 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science*. 2021;371(6529).
- 445 38. Wheatley AK, Juno JA, Wang JJ, Selva KJ, Reynaldi A, Tan HX, et al. Evolution of immune responses
446 to SARS-CoV-2 in mild-moderate COVID-19. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1162.
- 447 39. Stone M, Grebe E, Sulaeman H, Di Germanio C, Dave H, Kelly K, et al. Evaluation of Commercially
448 Available High-Throughput SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Assays for Serosurveillance and Related Applications.
449 *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2022;28(3):672-83.

- 450 40. Peluso MJ, Takahashi S, Hakim J, Kelly JD, Torres L, Iyer NS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody magnitude
451 and detectability are driven by disease severity, timing, and assay. *Science Advances*.
452 2021;7(31):eabh3409.
- 453 41. Perry J, Osman S, Wright J, Richard-Greenblatt M, Buchan SA, Sadarangani M, et al. Does a
454 humoral correlate of protection exist for SARS-CoV-2? A systematic review. *medRxiv*.
455 2022:2022.01.21.22269667.
- 456 42. Earle KA, Ambrosino DM, Fiore-Gartland A, Goldblatt D, Gilbert PB, Siber GR, et al. Evidence for
457 antibody as a protective correlate for COVID-19 vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2021;39(32):4423-8.
- 458 43. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, et al. Neutralizing antibody
459 levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature*
460 *Medicine*. 2021;27(7):1205-11.
- 461 44. Cromer D, Steain M, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, et al. Neutralising antibody
462 titres as predictors of protection against SARS-CoV-2 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis.
463 *The Lancet Microbe*. 2022;3(1):e52-e61.
- 464