SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence and determinants of six ethnic groups living in Amsterdam, the Netherlands: a population-based cross-sectional study, June-October 2020

Running title

SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and ethnicity

Authors

Liza Coyer^{1,2}, Anders Boyd^{1,3}, Janke Schinkel⁴, Charles Agyemang⁵, Henrike Galenkamp⁵, Anitra D M
Koopman⁵, Tjalling Leenstra¹, Eric P Moll van Charante^{5,7}, Bert-Jan H van den Born⁸, Anja Lok⁹,
Arnoud Verhoeff^{10,11}, Aeilko H Zwinderman¹², Suzanne Jurriaans⁴, Lonneke A van Vught^{7,13,14}, Karien
Stronks⁵, Maria Prins^{1,2}

Affiliations

¹ Department of Infectious Diseases, Public Health Service of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the
Netherlands

² Amsterdam UMC, Department of Infectious Diseases, Amsterdam Infection and Immunity (All),
University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

³ Stichting HIV Monitoring, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁴ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Medical Microbiology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam,
the Netherlands

⁵ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Public and Occupational Health, Amsterdam Public Health
Research Institute, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁶ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Amsterdam Public Health
Research Institute, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

⁷ Amsterdam UMC, Department of General Practice, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁸ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Vascular Medicine, Amsterdam Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁹ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Psychiatry, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Center for Urban Mental Health, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹⁰ Department of Epidemiology, Health Promotion & Healthcare Innovation, Public Health Service of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹¹ Department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹² Amsterdam UMC, Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹³ Amsterdam UMC, Center for Experimental Molecular Medicine, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹⁴ Amsterdam UMC, Department of Intensive Care Medicine, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Contact details corresponding author

Liza Coyer

Nieuwe Achtergracht 100

1018 WT Amsterdam

Phone: +31 20 555 3873

Email: lcoyer@ggd.amsterdam.nl

Keywords

HELIUS study; SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; infection, seroprevalence; serology, antibody; ethnicity

46 **Abstract**

47 **Background**

48 Ethnic minorities have higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 diagnoses, but little is known about ethnic
49 differences in past exposure. We aimed to determine whether prevalence and determinants of
50 SARS-CoV-2 exposure varied between six ethnic groups in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

51 **Methods**

52 Participants aged 25-79 years enrolled in a population-based prospective cohort were randomly
53 selected within ethnic groups and invited to test for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies and answer
54 COVID-19 related questions. We estimated prevalence and determinants of SARS-CoV-2 exposure
55 within ethnic groups using survey-weighted logistic regression adjusting for age, sex and calendar
56 time.

57 **Results**

58 Between June 24-October 9, 2020, we included 2497 participants. Adjusted SARS-CoV-2
59 seroprevalence was comparable between ethnic-Dutch (25/498; 5.5%, 95%CI=3.2-7.9), South-Asian
60 Surinamese (22/451; 4.8%, 95%CI=2.1-7.5), African Surinamese (22/400; 8.2%, 95%CI=3.0-13.4),
61 Turkish (30/408; 7.8%, 95%CI=4.3-11.2) and Moroccan (32/391; 7.0%, 95%CI=4.0-9.9) participants,
62 but higher among Ghanaians (95/327; 26.5%, 95%CI=18.7-34.4). 57.1% of SARS-CoV-2-positive
63 participants did not suspect or were unsure of being infected, which was lowest in African
64 Surinamese (18.2%) and highest in Ghanaians (90.5%). Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 exposure
65 varied across ethnic groups, while the most common determinant was having a household member
66 suspected of infection. In Ghanaians, seropositivity was associated with older age, larger household
67 sizes, living with small children, leaving home to work and attending religious services.

68 **Conclusions**

69 No remarkable differences in SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence were observed between the largest
70 ethnic groups in Amsterdam after the first wave of infections. The higher infection seroprevalence
71 observed among Ghanaians, which passed mostly unnoticed, warrants wider prevention efforts and
72 opportunities for non-symptom-based testing.

73 Introduction

74 Data from the United Kingdom (UK) and United States (US) suggest that certain ethnic minority
75 populations have been disproportionately affected by the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19),
76 caused by SARS-CoV-2. In both countries, a relatively higher number of SARS-CoV-2 polymerase
77 chain reaction (PCR)-positive or clinically-diagnosed COVID-19 cases were observed among ethnic
78 minority groups, particularly people of African and Asian descent.[1-3] The underlying causes for
79 these disparities might include work-related exposure, housing conditions, access to healthcare,
80 help-seeking behavior, and language proficiency.[4-6]

81 Little is known about ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infections outside the UK and US. This is of
82 particular concern for larger cities in Europe, including the Dutch capital Amsterdam, where half the
83 population comprises migrants, including people with foreign-born parents.[7] Amsterdam
84 witnessed its first confirmed case of SARS-CoV-2 on February 29, 2020 and by December 31, 2020,
85 there were more than 50,000 confirmed infections, 1300 COVID-19-related hospitalizations and 500
86 COVID-19-related deaths.[8] If SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence is increased in specific ethnic
87 groups, targeted prevention measures could be instated to help minimize the risk of further
88 transmission.

89 Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence could be studied using COVID-19
90 notification registries. However, since the testing policy in the Netherlands has changed several
91 times and until June 1, 2020, testing was largely restricted to symptomatic health care workers or
92 those living or working in long-term care facilities, these data are prone to differential testing
93 uptake. Ethnic differences in testing uptake could be further exacerbated by testing access,
94 willingness to test and disease perceptions. Another limitation of registries is that migration
95 background is often missing. Other data are therefore needed to estimate seroprevalence within
96 specific ethnic groups in Amsterdam.

97 The Healthy life in an Urban Setting (HELIUS) study is a large, population-based cohort study
98 among six different ethnic groups, which was established with the aim to investigate mechanisms
99 underlying the impact of ethnicity on communicable and non-communicable diseases.[9] From
100 individuals actively enrolled in this study, we determined the prevalence and determinants of
101 exposure to SARS-CoV-2 between the largest ethnic groups in Amsterdam.

Methods

Study design and population

The HELIUS study is a multiethnic cohort study conducted in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, which focuses on cardiovascular disease, mental health, and infectious diseases. Detailed procedures have been previously described.[9] Briefly, HELIUS includes persons of Dutch, South-Asian Surinamese, African Surinamese, Ghanaian, Moroccan, and Turkish origin, aged between 18 and 70 years at inclusion. A random sample of persons, stratified by ethnic origin, was taken from the municipality register of Amsterdam and subjects were invited to participate. Between January 2011 and December 2015, a total of 24,789 individuals were included.[9] Participants filled in a self-administered questionnaire and underwent a physical examination during which biological samples were obtained. Ethical approval for the HELIUS study was obtained from the Academic Medical Center Ethical Review Board. All participants provided written informed consent.

Ethnicity was defined according to the country of birth of the participant and their parents.[9] Participants were considered to be of non-Dutch ethnic origin if (i) they were born abroad and had at least one parent born abroad (first generation) or (ii) they were born in Netherlands but both their parents were born abroad (second generation). Participants of Dutch origin were born in the Netherlands with both parents who were born in the Netherlands. Surinamese participants were further classified as African Surinamese, South-Asian Surinamese, and Javanese/other/unknown Surinamese, based on self-reporting.

A cross-sectional, serological substudy was performed in participants of the HELIUS study from 24 June to 9 October 2020. Participants were randomly selected within each ethnic group and asked to participate in the substudy. Serum samples for assessment of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were collected by venipuncture and stored at -20°C. Trained interviewers asked participants questions on uptake of COVID-19-related prevention measures, potential exposure, infection, symptoms and disease.

Outcomes

SARS-CoV-2 exposure was determined by the presence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies were determined using the WANTAI SARS-CoV-2 Ab Elisa (Wantai Biological Pharmacy Enterprise Co., Beijing, China) according to the manufacturer's instructions. This Elisa detects IgA, IgM and IgG against the receptor binding domain of the S-protein of SARS-CoV-2.[10]

Determinants

We defined the following potential determinants: *from the baseline visit of the HELIUS study*– demographics (i.e. age, sex, ethnicity, migration generation, city district), socio-economic factors (i.e. educational level, working status, occupational level, number of people in household), access-to-healthcare indicators (i.e. proficiency with Dutch language, health literacy); *from the COVID-19 substudy visit*–job setting, household members, suspected being infected, thinking household member/steady partner was infected, household member hospitalized for COVID-19, type of people living in household, travelling abroad in 2020 and COVID-19 behaviors in the past week (i.e. number of times leaving the house, type of locations visited, number of visitors, frequency of using public transportation).

Statistical analysis

SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence, along with 95% confidence intervals (CI), was modeled per ethnic group using univariable logistic regression. Seroprevalence was then modeled per ethnic group while correcting for sampling, accounting for the population structure of ethnic groups in Amsterdam (i.e. post-stratification), and adjusting for differences in age, sex and calendar time (before/after 15 August 2020, based on the onset of the second wave of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Netherlands[8]) between ethnic groups. For sampling, the probability of being invited for the COVID-19 substudy (as the proportion of participants invited among those in active follow-up in the parent study) was calculated, as was the conditional probability of participating in the COVID-19 substudy (given the participant's ethnicity, age, educational level, working status and health

literacy). The product of the two probabilities was taken and the inverse of this result, standardized to one, was used as a sampling weight. For post-stratification, a weight was assigned corresponding to the proportion representing the Amsterdam population of each stratum of age (20-44, 45-54, 55-59, 60-79 years), sex (male, female) and ethnicity (Surinamese, Ghanaian, Moroccan, Turkish, Dutch). Sampling and post-stratification weights were placed in a multivariable logistic regression model with covariates ethnicity, age, sex, and calendar time. Given the weighting scheme of this study, variance was calculated with the designed-based Taylor series linearization method using the 'svy' commands in STATA. Differences between ethnic groups were tested in the model using the Wald χ^2 test.

Seroprevalence was regressed on age (in restricted cubic splines with 3 knots) with sample and post-stratification weights, within subpopulations of ethnic groups. The mean and 95%CI of predicted seroprevalence was plotted over age in years.

To identify determinants of past SARS-CoV-2 infection within ethnic groups, univariable associations between potential determinants and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity were evaluated. The odds ratios (OR) comparing the odds of seroprevalence across levels of each determinant, and their 95% confidence intervals (CI), were estimated using logistic regression. P-values were obtained using the Wald χ^2 test. All covariates with a P -value ≤ 0.2 in univariable analyses were then included in a multivariable model and after assessing covariate distributions and collinearity, variables with a P -value ≥ 0.05 above this threshold were removed in backwards-stepwise fashion until only variables with a P -value < 0.05 were retained in a final multivariable model. All models included sampling and post-stratification weights. We forced calendar time in all models.

Statistical significance was defined at a P -value < 0.05 . All analyses were conducted using Stata 15.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

Results

Study population

Of the 16,889 HELIUS participants who were in active follow-up in 2019-2020, 11,080 (65.6%) were invited (Figure 1). Of these, 2497 (22.5%) were included in the COVID-19 substudy. The response rate varied across ethnic groups, from 15.3-17.2% among Ghanaian, Turkish or Moroccan participants to 49.9% among Dutch participants. Detailed information on differences between HELIUS participants who were and were not invited, and between invited participants who were and were not included, are presented in Supplementary Table 1. Briefly, invited individuals who were included had obtained a slightly higher educational level, were more likely to be employed and were more likely to have adequate health literacy level compared to those who were invited but not included.

Number included per month within ethnic groups is presented in Supplementary Figure 1. Of 2497 included participants, 503 (20.1%) were of Dutch origin, 453 (18.1%) South-Asian Surinamese, 407 (16.3%) African Surinamese, 331 (13.3%) Ghanaian, 409 (16.4%) Turkish and 394 (15.8%) Moroccan (Supplementary Table 1, Table 1). The median age of included participants was 54 (interquartile range [IQR]: 44-61) and 56.6% were female. In the 1994 participants of non-Dutch origin, the percentage of first-generation migrants was lowest in the Turkish group (74.8%) and highest in the Ghanaian group (98.2%). Dutch participants were the most likely to have a higher vocational or university degree (67.0%) and be employed (75.5%) compared to other ethnicities.

SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence

Of 2497 included, 2483 (99.4%) participants had a SARS-CoV-2 antibody test result. Of these 2483, 226 were positive, 2249 negative and 8 had an equivocal test result. The distribution of signal-to-cutoff ratios for positive test results is shown per ethnic group in Supplementary Figure 2. The proportion with a positive result did not increase over time in any of the ethnic groups, except for the South-Asian Surinamese group (Supplementary Figure 1).

Unadjusted and adjusted seroprevalence estimates per ethnic group are provided in Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 2. Adjusted seroprevalence was comparable between the Dutch (5.5%, 95%CI=3.2-7.9), South-Asian Surinamese (4.8%, 95%CI=2.1-7.5), African Surinamese (8.2%, 95%CI=3.0-13.4), Turkish (7.8%, 95%CI=4.3-11.2) and Moroccan (7.0%, 95%CI=4.0-9.9) groups, but higher in the Ghanaian group compared to all other groups (26.5%, 95%CI=18.7-34.4, $P<0.001$). Figure 3 shows adjusted seroprevalence estimates as a function of age in years for each ethnic group. In the African Surinamese group, seroprevalence decreased with age. In the Ghanaian group, the highest seroprevalence was observed between the ages of 50-55 years.

COVID-19-related symptoms

Table 2 describes SARS-CoV-2-related characteristics of included participants. Of 2497 participants, 348 (13.9%) suspected being infected with SARS-CoV-2, 2144 (85.9%) did not suspect or were unsure of being infected. 90.5% of Ghanaian participants who tested positive did not suspect or were unsure of being infected, mainly because most of these individuals had not experienced symptoms (58.7%). SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals from other ethnic groups more frequently suspected being infected (range 59.1% to 81.8%).

Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity per ethnic group

Univariable analysis of determinants of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity is presented per ethnic group in Supplementary Tables 2-7. In multivariable analysis (Figure 4), having a household member suspected of infection was associated with SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity in Dutch, South-Asian Surinamese, Turkish and Moroccan participants. Recently traveling abroad was associated with seropositivity in Dutch and South-Asian Surinamese participants. In Ghanaian participants, older age, increasing household size, living with children ≤ 3 years old, and leaving home to work and attending religious services were associated with SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity. Increased odds for SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity were also observed for leaving home to pick up medication or visiting a doctor in the past week (Dutch participants), living with other adults (African Surinamese), having

- 225 had ≥ 2 unique visitors in the past week (African Surinamese), leaving home to walk or exercise
- 226 outside and using public transportation in the past week (Turkish participants) and occupational
- 227 level (Moroccan participants).

Discussion

After the first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic, we observed no evidence of ethnic disparities in past SARS-CoV-2 infection between the six largest ethnic groups residing in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, with the noteworthy exception of individuals of Ghanaian origin. We estimated that 26% of the adult Ghanaian group had developed SARS-COV-2 antibodies, compared to 5-8% of the other adult ethnic groups. Increased risk of past infection was present among individuals who reported a household member suspected of infection in four of the six groups. Amongst other factors, leaving home to work and attending religious services were associated with seropositivity in Ghanaian individuals, while using public transportation was associated with seropositivity in Turkish individuals. Determinants differed between ethnicities, hence demonstrating that broad generalizations of some SARS-CoV-2-related determinants might not be appropriate for individual ethnic groups.

Among the determinants of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity, work and travelling to work, most likely via public transportation, represents a common theme in individuals of non-Dutch origin. Working from home was one of the first preventive measures introduced in the Netherlands to mitigate spread of SARS-CoV-2.[11] However, this was not feasible for individuals with lower professional levels and jobs requiring physical presence, many of whom were of non-Dutch origin. Interestingly, Moroccan individuals in the missing occupation category appeared to be more often seropositive. Previous research suggests that the health of individuals in this category resembles that of individuals with elementary or intermediary professions,[12] implying that working conditions could put these individuals at risk of infection.

Although attending religious services was asked only for the past week and infections may have occurred as early as in March 2020, exposure to SARS-CoV-2 during attendance at religious services might have driven many of the past infections observed in the Ghanaian group. Religious services, along with demonstrations, were allowed to continue without a maximum number of attendees, as

stipulated by Dutch law,[13] which could have fostered further spread of SARS-CoV-2. Many places of worship did, however, implement social distancing measures. A nationwide study demonstrated similar findings in that Orthodox-Reformed Protestants were at increased risk for SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity during the first wave of the pandemic.[14] Increased infection risk for people attending religious services has also been demonstrated in studies from other countries.[15-17]

Strikingly, 90% of Ghanaians with SARS-CoV-2 antibodies did not suspect or were unsure of being infected, many because they did not report experiencing any COVID-19-related symptoms. This is in stark contrast to other ethnic groups in which most SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals had suspected of being infected. If these infections were indeed asymptomatic in Ghanaians, many could have been completely unaware of their infection and as a result, might have carried out their normal routines despite unknowingly continuing transmission. The dense clustering of Ghanaians in the South-East city district of Amsterdam might have also accelerated transmission, as we unknowingly may have sampled a cluster of infections within a specific neighbourhood or religious center. Nevertheless, there were no infection clusters within Ghanaian individuals identified during the first wave by the local Public Health Service (personal communication T. Leenstra, January 27, 2021), when SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing was restricted. Our study clearly indicates that to reduce ongoing and unnoticed transmission of SARS-CoV-2, expanded testing needs to include those groups in which the proportion of asymptomatic individuals might be high, such as the Ghanaian residents of Amsterdam.

Since data from Ghana on SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and proportion of asymptomatic infection are limited, we cannot make any distinction on whether our finding reflects the epidemiology in the country of origin or is specific to Ghanaian individuals in the Netherlands. One modelling study suggests that Ghana is one of the four most affected African countries in terms of cases, but has a relatively low death rate.[18] A study among Kenyan blood donors found a surprisingly high seroprevalence (4.3%) from what can be inferred by the low number of COVID-19-related

hospitalisations and deaths.[19] Further research is needed to clarify the role of symptom burden, earlier exposure to coronaviruses, or differences in genetic vulnerability to symptoms in explaining the seemingly high proportion of asymptomatic cases in Ghanaians.[20,21]

Having a household member suspected of being infected was the most common and consistent determinant of seropositivity. This finding supports observations that during periods of more extensive lock-downs, most transmissions occur in household settings and is related to symptomatic infection, age distribution and social interactions within households.[22-24] Other household determinants of seropositivity were observed in specific ethnic groups and included living with other adults, living with children ≤ 3 years old, and larger household sizes.

In the Netherlands, a series of restrictions was introduced in mid-March, when the spread of SARS-CoV-2 was still limited.[11] The finding that seroprevalence did not differ between ethnic groups, other than Ghanaian, implies that these restrictive measures were able to prevent the spread of infection equally across ethnicities. Furthermore, additional data from individuals participating in the parent HELIUS study showed that non-ethnic Dutch groups in general were as likely as ethnic-Dutch to adhere to prevention measures (personal communication F. Chilunga, January, 27 2021). It should be mentioned that our results also stem from a setting where economic inequalities are not prohibitive to healthcare access.[25]

In comparison to the seroprevalence estimates, people from large ethnic groups (Netherlands Antilles, Morocco, Surinam, Turkey, Ghana) had increased hospitalisation rates compared to ethnic Dutch individuals living in Amsterdam between February and May 2020,[26] as shown in other settings.[2,3] In addition, individuals with a migration background living in the Netherlands had a higher excess mortality during the first six weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic.[27] Our data suggest that, apart from Ghanaians, the increased rates of hospitalisations and deaths in non-Dutch ethnic groups during this period cannot be explained by a higher infection rate. The severity of COVID-19 can be impacted to a large extent by underlying comorbidities,[28] which vary across ethnic

groups[9] and could explain differences in severity.[29] Healthcare inequalities, racism, stigmatisation and discrimination witnessed by ethnic minorities and differences in healthcare seeking-behaviour may provide additional explanations for these disparities.[30-34]

Strengths of our study include population-based sampling, with a large number of participants from the major ethnic groups living in Amsterdam, representing various levels of socioeconomic status; measuring seroprevalence via antibodies in individuals with and without previous COVID-19-related symptoms; and obtaining individual-level determinants of infection. Nonetheless, there are several limitations. First, our study includes a random subsample of HELIUS participants and there may be selection bias. Undocumented people and other ethnic groups living in Amsterdam were not included in the parent study. Second, participants in our substudy may have been more concerned about their health compared to non-participants. Notwithstanding the differential response rate between ethnicities in this substudy, the distribution of characteristics was largely similar between included and non-included HELIUS participants. Our estimates, corrected for sampling and post-stratification, were also close to those from a nationwide study that included mainly people of Dutch origin and revealed a 6% seroprevalence among the Amsterdam population in June 2020.[35] Data were also collected over a span of 4 months, which reflects different points of the epidemic, and thus the timing of testing could bias estimates. We attempted to mitigate this issue by adjusting for calendar time. Furthermore, prevention measures remained mostly the same and nationwide incidence was quite stable during this period, thereby limiting the effect of this bias.[8,36] Third, as this study was cross-sectional and infection occurred in the past, it is difficult to make any causal inference with respect to determinants. Fourth, fear of stigmatization or consequences for work might have led to an underreporting of suspected past infection and symptoms, particularly among Ghanaians. Finally, circulating SARS-CoV-2 antibodies could have disappeared after infection,[37,38] although this was probably limited during the study period,[39,40] and individuals could not participate in this substudy if they were experiencing COVID-19-related symptoms, both of which likely led to underestimated seroprevalence.

329 In conclusion, most ethnic groups displayed comparable seroprevalence after the first SARS-CoV-2
330 wave in Amsterdam, yet the substantially higher prevalence among the smaller Ghanaian
331 population, possibly infections without symptoms, is of concern. Targeted prevention campaigns
332 addressing the needs of specific ethnic groups and expanding testing opportunities are urgently
333 warranted. In addition, prevention measures for those who cannot work from home should be
334 intensified, also by bringing to light the employer's role in reducing COVID-19 transmissions.

Author contributions

MP, KS, JS and CA conceived, designed or oversaw the study. HG, AK and JS were involved in the acquisition of data. LC and AB conducted the statistical analysis. LC, AB and MP drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests related to the project.

Data sharing

The HELIUS data are owned by the Amsterdam UMC, location AMC, in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Any researcher can request the data by submitting a proposal to the HELIUS Executive Board as outlined at <http://www.heliusstudy.nl/en/researchers/collaboration>, by email: heliuscoordinator@amsterdamumc.nl. The HELIUS Executive Board will check proposals for compatibility with the general objectives, ethical approvals and informed consent forms of the HELIUS study. There are no other restrictions to obtaining the data and all data requests will be processed in the same manner.

Funding

This work was supported by ZonMw (10430022010002) and the Public Health Service of Amsterdam. The HELIUS study is conducted by Amsterdam UMC, location Academic Medical Center and the Public Health Service of Amsterdam. Both organizations provided core support for HELIUS. The HELIUS study is also funded by the Dutch Heart Foundation (2010 To84), ZonMw (200500003), the European Union (FP-7) (278901), and the European Fund for the Integration of non-EU immigrants (EIF) (2013EIF013).

Acknowledgements

20210222-HELIUS COVID-19 manuscript seroprevalence-vs6.3_refs_ethics

357 The authors would like to acknowledge the HELIUS COVID-19 study participants for their
358 contribution and the HELIUS team for data collection and management. They would also like to
359 thank Anton Janssen for providing population tables.

References

1. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19, 2020.
2. Sze S, Pan D, Nevill CR, Gray LJ, Martin CA, Nazareth J, et al. Ethnicity and clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;29:100630.
3. Indseth T, Grøslund M, Arnesen T, Skyrud K, Kløvstad H, Lamprini V, et al. COVID-19 among immigrants in Norway, notified infections, related hospitalizations and associated mortality: A register-based study. *Scand J Public Health*. 2021;49(1):48-56.
4. Public Health England. Beyond the data: Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on BAME groups, June 2020.
5. Bhala N, Curry G, Martineau AR, Agyemang C, Bhopal R. Sharpening the global focus on ethnicity and race in the time of COVID-19. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10238):1673-6.
6. Martin CA, Jenkins DR, Minhas JS, Gray LJ, Tang J, Williams C, et al. Socio-demographic heterogeneity in the prevalence of COVID-19 during lockdown is associated with ethnicity and household size: Results from an observational cohort study. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;25:100466.
7. Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Bevolking; leeftijd, migratieachtergrond, geslacht, regio, 1 jan. 1996-2020. Available from: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37713/table?fromstatweb>. Accessed 6 January 2021.
8. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport. Current information about COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) 2020. Available from: <https://www.rivm.nl/en/novel-coronavirus-covid-19/current-information>. Accessed 6 January 2021.
9. Snijder MB, Galenkamp H, Prins M, Derks EM, Peters RJG, Zwinderman AH, et al. Cohort profile: the Healthy Life in an Urban Setting (HELIUS) study in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(12):e017873.

10. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, Bogers S, Embregts CWE, Laksono BM, et al. An evaluation of COVID-19 serological assays informs future diagnostics and exposure assessment. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):3436.
11. Dutch Government. Nieuwe maatregelen tegen verspreiding coronavirus in Nederland, 12 March 2020. Available from: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/03/12/nieuwe-maatregelen-tegen-verspreiding-coronavirus-in-nederland>. Accessed 27 January 2021.
12. Galenkamp H, van Oers H, Stronks K. To what extent do socioeconomic inequalities in SRH reflect inequalities in burden of disease? The HELIUS study. *J Public Health (Oxf).* 2020;42(4):e412-e20.
13. Dutch Government. Dutch measures against coronavirus: Rules that apply indoors and outdoors. Available from: <https://www.government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/tackling-new-coronavirus-in-the-netherlands/public-life>. Accessed 27 January 2021.
14. Vos ERA, den Hartog G, Schepp RM, Kaaijk P, van Vliet J, Helm K, et al. Nationwide seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and identification of risk factors in the general population of the Netherlands during the first epidemic wave. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2020.
15. Liu T, Gong D, Xiao J, Hu J, He G, Rong Z, et al. Cluster infections play important roles in the rapid evolution of COVID-19 transmission: A systematic review. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases.* 2020;99:374-80.
16. James A, Eagle L, Phillips C, Hedges DS, Bodenhamer C, Brown R, et al. High COVID-19 Attack Rate Among Attendees at Events at a Church - Arkansas, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(20):632-5.
17. Yong SEF, Anderson DE, Wei WE, Pang J, Chia WN, Tan CW, et al. Connecting clusters of COVID-19: an epidemiological and serological investigation. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(7):809-15.
18. Lukman AF, Rauf RI, Abiodun O, Oludoun O, Ayinde K, Ogundokun RO. COVID-19 prevalence estimation: Four most affected African countries. *Infect Dis Model.* 2020;5:827-38.

- 410 19. Uyoga S, Adetifa IMO, Karanja HK, Nyagwange J, Tuju J, Wanjiku P, et al. Seroprevalence of
411 anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Kenyan blood donors. *Science*. 2021;371(6524):79-82.
- 412 20. Ng KA-O, Faulkner NA-O, Cornish GA-O, Rosa AA-O, Harvey R, Hussain SA-OX, et al.
413 Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in humans. *Science*.
414 2020;370(6522):1339-43.
- 415 21. Sette A, Crotty SA-O. Pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2: the knowns and unknowns.
416 *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2020;20(8):457-8.
- 417 22. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of
418 SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031756-
419 e.
- 420 23. Shen M, Peng Z, Guo Y, Rong L, Li Y, Xiao Y, et al. Assessing the effects of metropolitan-
421 wide quarantine on the spread of COVID-19 in public space and households. *Int J Infect Dis*.
422 2020;96:503-5.
- 423 24. Sun K, Wang W, Gao L, Wang Y, Luo K, Ren L, et al. Transmission heterogeneities, kinetics,
424 and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. 2021;371(6526):eabe2424.
- 425 25. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Health for Everyone? Social
426 Inequalities in Health and Health Systems. Paris, France: OECD Health Policy Studies; 2019.
- 427 26. Coyer L, Wynberg E, Buster M, Wijffels C, Prins M, Schreijer A, et al. The first wave of
428 COVID-19 in the greater Amsterdam area, the Netherlands. Presented at: ESCMID Conference on
429 Coronavirus Disease (ECCVID), 23-25 September 2020.
- 430 27. Kunst A, de Visser M, Stoeldraijer L, Harmsen C. Oversterfte tijdens de eerste zes weken
431 van de corona-epidemie: Sociaal-demografische en geografische verschillen. Centraal Bureau voor
432 Statistiek; 2020. Available from: [https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2020/20/oversterfte-tijdens-](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2020/20/oversterfte-tijdens-de-eerste-zes-weken-van-de-corona-epidemie)
433 [de-eerste-zes-weken-van-de-corona-epidemie](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2020/20/oversterfte-tijdens-de-eerste-zes-weken-van-de-corona-epidemie).

- 434 28. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology,
435 Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. JAMA.
436 2020;324(8):782-93.
- 437 29. Raharja A, Tamara A, Kok LT. Association Between Ethnicity and Severe COVID-19 Disease:
438 a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J Racial Ethn Health Disparities. 2020:1-10.
- 439 30. Webb Hooper M, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities.
440 JAMA. 2020;323(24):2466-7.
- 441 31. Egede LE, Walker RJ. Structural Racism, Social Risk Factors, and Covid-19 — A Dangerous
442 Convergence for Black Americans. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020;383(12):e77.
- 443 32. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities.
444 Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 2020;74(11):964.
- 445 33. Schmengler H, Ikram UZ, Snijder MB, Kunst AE, Agyemang C. Association of perceived
446 ethnic discrimination with general and abdominal obesity in ethnic minority groups: the HELIUS
447 study. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2017;71(5):453-60.
- 448 34. Suurmond J, Rosenmöller DL, El Mesbahi H, Lamkaddem M, Essink-Bot ML. Barriers in
449 access to home care services among ethnic minority and Dutch elderly--a qualitative study. Int J
450 Nurs Stud. 2016;54:23-35.
- 451 35. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment. PIENTER Corona studie:
452 Resultaten. Available from: <https://www.rivm.nl/pienter-corona-studie/resultaten>. Accessed 22
453 February 2021.
- 454 36. Dutch Government. Vermijd drukte, houd 1,5 meter afstand 2020, 6 May 2020. Available
455 from: [https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/05/06/vermijd-drukke-houd-15-meter-](https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2020/05/06/vermijd-drukke-houd-15-meter-afstand)
456 afstand. Accessed 6 January 2021.
- 457 37. Ibarrondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, Elliott J, Hofmann C, Hausner MA, et al. Rapid
458 Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. N Engl J Med.
459 2020;383(11):1085-7.

460 38. Choe PG, Kim KH, Kang CK, Suh HJ, Kang E, Lee SY, et al. Antibody Responses 8 Months
461 after Asymptomatic or Mild SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;27(3).
462 39. Wajnberg A, Amanat F, Firpo A, Altman DR, Bailey MJ, Mansour M, et al. Robust
463 neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 infection persist for months. *Science.* 2020;370(6521):1227.
464 40. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, Gunnarsdottir K, Holm H, Eythorsson E, et al.
465 Humoral Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 in Iceland. *New England Journal of Medicine.*
466 2020;383(18):1724-34.
467
468

469 **Tables**

470 **Table 1. Characteristics of the HELIUS participants included in the COVID-19 study, by ethnic group (N=2497), Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 24**
 471 **June - 9 October 2020**

Characteristic	Dutch (n=503)	South-Asian Surinamese (n=453)	African Surinamese (n=407)	Ghanaian (n=331)	Turkish (n=409)	Moroccan (n=392)	P-value
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Sex							
Male	237 (47.1%)	179 (39.5%)	165 (40.5%)	145 (43.8%)	184 (45.0%)	173 (43.9%)	0.19
Female	266 (52.9%)	274 (60.5%)	242 (59.5%)	186 (56.2%)	225 (55.0%)	221 (56.1%)	
Age in years on 1 January 2020							
Median [IQR]	57 [45-66]	56[47-63]	59 [50-65]	54 [47-59]	48 [40-56]	49 [39-56]	<0.001
Migration generation							
1 st	N.A.	370 (81.7%)	355 (87.2%)	325 (98.2%)	306 (74.8%)	300 (76.1%)	<0.001
2 nd	N.A.	83 (18.3%)	52 (12.8%)	6 (1.8%)	103 (25.2%)	94 (23.9%)	
City district^a							
Centre	88 (17.5%)	18 (4.0%)	15 (3.7%)	5 (1.5%)	4 (1.0%)	12 (3.0%)	<0.001
East	99 (19.7%)	53 (11.7%)	84 (20.6%)	25 (7.6%)	66 (16.1%)	94 (23.9%)	
West	89 (17.7%)	6 (1.3%)	34 (8.4%)	19 (5.7%)	66 (16.1%)	83 (21.1%)	
South	112 (22.3%)	32 (7.1%)	28 (6.9%)	8 (2.4%)	30 (7.3%)	38 (9.6%)	
New-West	45 (8.9%)	111 (24.5%)	51 (12.5%)	18 (5.4%)	231 (56.5%)	147 (37.3%)	
Southeast	65 (12.9%)	229 (50.6%)	192 (47.2%)	254 (76.7%)	6 (1.5%)	19 (4.8%)	
Other/missing	5 (1.0%)	4 (0.9%)	3 (0.7%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (1.5%)	1 (0.3%)	
Educational level^a							
No school/elementary school	10 (2.0%)	56 (12.4%)	15 (3.7%)	78 (23.6%)	78 (19.1%)	90 (22.8%)	<0.001
Lower vocational/lower secondary school	56 (11.1%)	156 (34.4%)	124 (30.5%)	128 (38.7%)	84 (20.5%)	64 (16.2%)	
Intermediary vocational/intermediary secondary school	99 (19.7%)	137 (30.2%)	142 (34.9%)	73 (22.1%)	124 (30.3%)	125 (31.7%)	
Higher vocational/university	337 (67.0%)	103 (22.7%)	124 (30.5%)	26 (7.9%)	108 (26.4%)	94 (23.9%)	

Missing	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	26 (7.9%)	15 (3.7%)	21 (5.3%)	
Labor participation^b							
Employed	380 (75.5%)	308 (68.0%)	292 (71.7%)	203 (61.3%)	247 (60.4%)	229 (58.1%)	<0.001
Not in workforce	90 (17.9%)	47 (10.4%)	40 (9.8%)	10 (3.0%)	59 (14.4%)	63 (16.0%)	
Unemployed/on benefits	21 (4.2%)	53 (11.7%)	47 (11.5%)	60 (18.1%)	62 (15.2%)	57 (14.5%)	
Disabled	11 (2.2%)	39 (8.6%)	24 (5.9%)	28 (8.5%)	27 (6.6%)	22 (5.6%)	
Unknown/missing	1 (0.2%)	6 (1.3%)	4 (1.0%)	30 (9.0%)	14 (3.4%)	23 (5.8%)	
Occupational level^a							
Elementary occupations	5 (1.0%)	36 (7.9%)	22 (5.4%)	162 (48.9%)	52 (12.7%)	46 (11.7%)	<0.001
Lower occupations	46 (9.1%)	127 (28.0%)	101 (24.8%)	69 (20.8%)	102 (24.9%)	92 (23.4%)	
Intermediary occupations	107 (21.3%)	143 (31.6%)	146 (35.9%)	21 (6.3%)	88 (21.5%)	94 (23.9%)	
Higher occupations	203 (40.4%)	79 (17.4%)	91 (22.4%)	11 (3.3%)	51 (12.5%)	65 (16.5%)	
Scientific occupations	115 (22.9%)	20 (4.4%)	19 (4.7%)	6 (1.8%)	32 (7.8%)	10 (2.5%)	
Missing	27 (5.4%)	48 (10.6%)	28 (6.9%)	62 (18.7%)	84 (22.5%)	87 (22.1%)	
Job setting^b							
No job / caretaker only	117 (23.3%)	144 (31.8%)	120 (29.5%)	90 (27.2%)	138 (33.7%)	132 (33.5%)	<0.001
Job with no contact within 1.5 meter	96 (19.1%)	65 (14.3%)	39 (9.6%)	66 (19.9%)	67 (16.4%)	54 (13.7%)	
Other job with contact within 1.5 meter	145 (28.8%)	154 (34.0%)	131 (32.2%)	115 (34.7%)	130 (31.8%)	114 (28.9%)	
Child care/schools/higher education	62 (12.3%)	27 (6.0%)	43 (10.6%)	10 (3.0%)	25 (6.1%)	48 (12.2%)	
Bar/restaurant	12 (2.4%)	10 (2.2%)	11 (2.7%)	23 (6.9%)	6 (1.5%)	7 (1.8%)	
Hospital/long-term care facility/Health care worker elsewhere	71 (14.1%)	51 (11.3%)	63 (15.5%)	26 (7.9%)	41 (10.0%)	36 (9.1%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)	3 (0.8%)	
Difficulty with Dutch language^a							
No	N.A.	348 (76.8%)	359 (88.2%)	41 (12.4%)	189 (46.2%)	211 (53.6%)	<0.001
Yes	N.A.	104 (23.0%)	46 (11.3%)	264 (79.8%)	206 (50.4%)	162 (41.1%)	
Missing	N.A.	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	26 (7.9%)	14 (3.4%)	21 (5.3%)	
Health literacy (SBSQ)^a							
Adequate	500 (99.4%)	437 (96.5%)	400 (98.3%)	209 (63.1%)	310 (75.8%)	308 (78.2%)	<0.001
Low	3 (0.6%)	16 (3.5%)	7 (1.7%)	97 (29.3%)	87 (21.3%)	64 (16.2%)	

Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	25 (7.6%)	12 (2.9%)	22 (5.6%)	
Diabetes mellitus^c							
No	478 (95.0%)	358 (79.0%)	362 (88.9%)	297 (89.7%)	366 (89.5%)	345 (87.6%)	<0.001
Yes	18 (3.6%)	88 (19.4%)	42 (10.3%)	30 (9.1%)	35 (8.6%)	41 (10.4%)	
Missing	7 (1.4%)	7 (1.5%)	3 (0.7%)	4 (1.2%)	8 (2.0%)	8 (2.0%)	
High blood pressure^d							
No	370 (73.6%)	261 (57.6%)	198 (48.6%)	143 (43.2%)	321 (78.5%)	305 (77.4%)	<0.001
Yes	127 (25.2%)	185 (40.8%)	207 (50.9%)	181 (54.7%)	82 (20.0%)	81 (20.6%)	
Missing	6 (1.2%)	7 (1.5%)	2 (0.5%)	7 (2.1%)	6 (1.5%)	8 (2.0%)	
Body Mass Index (kg/m2), median (IQR)^a	24 [22-27]	25 [23-28]	27 [24-29]	28 [25-31]	27 [24-31]	27 [24-30]	<0.001
Month of study visit^b							
June	86 (17.1%)	44 (9.7%)	31 (7.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	32 (8.1%)	<0.001
July	265 (52.7%)	233 (51.4%)	203 (49.9%)	38 (11.5%)	151 (36.9%)	170 (43.1%)	
August	108 (21.5%)	98 (21.6%)	110 (27.0%)	135 (40.8%)	88 (21.5%)	85 (21.6%)	
September	39 (7.8%)	75 (16.6%)	56 (13.8%)	125 (37.8%)	127 (31.1%)	74 (18.8%)	
October	5 (1.0%)	3 (0.7%)	7 (1.7%)	33 (10.0%)	43 (10.5%)	33 (8.4%)	

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; HELIUS, Healthy Life in an Urban Setting; IQR, interquartile range; N.A., not applicable; SBSQ, Set of Brief Screening Question ^a Presumed higher

exposure categories had priority, i.e. if someone was working in a school and as a health care worker, they were categorized as a health care worker. Caretakers were not included as a

category because many had other jobs.

^a Measured at baseline (2011-2015) ^b Measured at COVID-1 visit (2020) ^c Based on self-report, increased fasting glucose (≥ 7 mmol/l) or use of glucose-lowering medication ^d Based on self-

report, SBP ≥ 140 mmHg, DBP ≥ 90 or blood pressure-lowering medication

477 **Table 2. SARS-CoV-2-related characteristics of the HELIUS participants included in the COVID-19 study, by ethnicity (N=2497), Amsterdam, the**
 478 **Netherlands, 24 June - 9 October 2020**

Characteristic	Dutch (n=503) n (%)	South-Asian Surinamese (n=453) n (%)	African Surinamese (n=407) n (%)	Ghanaian (n=331) n (%)	Turkish (n=409) n (%)	Moroccan (n=392) n (%)	P-value
Do you think you have been infected? (among all respondents)							
Yes, this was confirmed by a PCR test	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.9%)	5 (1.2%)	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.2%)	9 (2.3%)	<0.001
Yes, this was confirmed by a Ab test	6 (1.2%)	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.5%)	
Yes, but this was not confirmed by a test	67 (13.3%)	46 (10.2%)	51 (12.5%)	16 (4.8%)	63 (15.4%)	68 (17.3%)	
No, this was confirmed by a PCR test	28 (5.6%)	22 (4.9%)	22 (5.4%)	14 (4.2%)	26 (6.4%)	17 (4.3%)	
No, this was confirmed by a Ab test	6 (1.2%)	4 (0.9%)	5 (1.2%)	2 (0.6%)	5 (1.2%)	9 (2.3%)	
No, I do not think so, but this was not confirmed by a test	178 (35.4%)	181 (40.0%)	139 (34.2%)	90 (27.2%)	112 (27.4%)	108 (27.4%)	<0.001
No, I know for certain, because I did not have any symptoms	178 (35.4%)	152 (33.6%)	144 (35.4%)	182 (55.0%)	134 (32.8%)	144 (36.5%)	
I do not know	39 (7.8%)	41 (9.1%)	40 (9.8%)	25 (7.6%)	61 (14.9%)	36 (9.1%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)	
Do you think you have been infected? (among SARS-CoV-2 antibody positive individuals)							
No/do not know	6 (24.0%)	9 (40.9%)	4 (18.2%)	86 (90.5%)	11 (36.7%)	13 (40.6%)	<0.001
Yes	19 (76.0%)	13 (59.1%)	18 (81.8%)	9 (9.5%)	19 (63.3%)	19 (59.4%)	
Thinks household member/steady partner was infected							
N.A.	93 (18.5%)	89 (19.6%)	104 (25.6%)	40 (12.1%)	50 (12.2%)	58 (14.7%)	<0.001
No	352 (70.0%)	321 (70.9%)	270 (66.3%)	275 (83.1%)	310 (75.8%)	281 (71.3%)	
Yes	53 (10.5%)	38 (8.4%)	33 (8.1%)	15 (4.5%)	46 (11.2%)	51 (12.9%)	
Missing	5 (1.0%)	5 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	
Household member hospitalized for COVID-19							
N.A.	93 (18.5%)	89 (19.6%)	104 (25.6%)	40 (12.1%)	50 (12.2%)	58 (14.7%)	<0.001
No	401 (79.7%)	356 (78.6%)	302 (74.2%)	290 (87.6%)	352 (86.1%)	329 (83.5%)	

Yes	4 (0.8%)	3 (0.7%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.0%)	3 (0.8%)	
Missing	5 (1.0%)	5 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	
Number of times left home in the past week							<0.001
0-7	59 (11.7%)	144 (31.8%)	145 (35.6%)	122 (36.9%)	106 (25.9%)	101 (25.6%)	
8-11	82 (16.3%)	134 (29.6%)	99 (24.3%)	120 (36.3%)	97 (23.7%)	90 (22.8%)	
12-16	141 (28.0%)	103 (22.7%)	80 (19.7%)	58 (17.5%)	103 (25.2%)	88 (22.3%)	
17+	221 (43.9%)	70 (15.5%)	83 (20.4%)	30 (9.1%)	101 (24.7%)	113 (28.7%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.5%)	
Number of unique visitors at home in the past week							
0	216 (42.9%)	218 (48.1%)	192 (47.2%)	239 (72.2%)	207 (50.6%)	209 (53.0%)	<0.001
1	89 (17.7%)	80 (17.7%)	84 (20.6%)	43 (13.0%)	48 (11.7%)	45 (11.4%)	
2-4	146 (29.0%)	120 (26.5%)	97 (23.8%)	41 (12.4%)	110 (26.9%)	102 (25.9%)	
5+	49 (9.7%)	30 (6.6%)	32 (7.9%)	6 (1.8%)	41 (10.0%)	34 (8.6%)	
Missing	3 (0.6%)	5 (1.1%)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	
479	Abbreviations: HELIUS, Healthy Life in an Urban Setting						

Figures

Figure 1. Flowchart depicting the selection of HELIUS participants in the COVID-19 study, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 24 June - 9 October 2020

Figure 2. Unadjusted and adjusted SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence per ethnic group (N=2475), Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 24 June - 9 October 2020

Footnote: We excluded individuals with an equivocal result (n=8) from the seroprevalence calculation. Boxes represent the seroprevalence estimate, bands the corresponding 95% confidence interval. Adjusted seroprevalence estimates were corrected for sampling, accounted for the population structure of ethnic groups in Amsterdam (i.e. post-stratification), and adjusted for differences in age, sex and calendar time (before/after 15 August 2020) between ethnic groups.

Figure 3. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and age by ethnic group, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 24 June - 9 October 2020

Footnote: Seroprevalence was regressed on age (in restricted cubic splines with 3 knots) with sample and post-stratification weights, within subpopulations of ethnic groups.

499 **Figure 4. Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity by ethnic group, HELIUS COVID-19 study,**
500 **24 June - 9 October 2020 (multivariable analysis)**