

1 **Full Title: Factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 among persons living with HIV in Zambia:**
2 **Analysis of three concurrent SARS-CoV-2 prevalence surveys conducted in July 2020 in six**
3 **districts of Zambia**

4 **Short Title: SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence and Associated Factors Among Persons Living with HIV**
5 **in Zambia: July 2020**

6

7 Stephen Longa Chanda^{1,2}, Cephas Sialubanje², Mukumbuta Nawa², Nyambe Sinyange¹, Warren
8 Malambo³, James Zulu¹, Dabwitso Banda¹, Paul Zulu¹, Jonas Hines³

9

- 10 1. Zambia National Public Health Institute, Surveillance and Disease Intelligence Cluster,
11 Lusaka Zambia
- 12 2. School of Public Health, Department of Environmental and Public Health, Levy
13 Mwanawasa Medical University, Lusaka, Zambia
- 14 3. United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Lusaka, Zambia
- 15 4. Ministry of Health, Lusaka, Zambia

16

17 Corresponding Author

18 Stephen Longa Chanda

19 Physical address: Zambia National Public Health Institute, Corner of Chaholi and Addis
20 Ababa Road, Rhodespark, Lusaka

21 Phone number: +260973721052

22 email address- longachandadoc88@gmail.com

23

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 **Author contributions**

25 Stephan Longa Chanda was the principal investigator.

26 Stephen Longa Chanda, Cephas Sialubanje, Mukumbuta Nawa, Nyambe Sinyange, Warren
27 Malambo, James Zulu, Dabwitso Banda¹, Paul Zulu¹, Lloyd B. Mulenga and Jonas Hines designed
28 the study.

29 Warren Malambo, Nyambe Sinyange, James Zulu, Dabwitso Banda, and Jonas Hines collected the
30 data.

31 Stephan Chanda, and Jonas Z Hines analysed the data.

32 Stephen Longa Chanda, Cephas Sialubanje, Mukumbuta Nawa, Nyambe Sinyange, Warren
33 Malambo, James Zulu, Dabwitso Banda, Paul Zulu, Lloyd B. Mulenga, Jonas Hines wrote the
34 manuscript.

35

36

37 **Keywords**

38 HIV infections, SARS-CoV-2, prevalence, reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction, enzyme-
39 linked immunosorbent assay, Zambia, COVID-19 vaccines

40

41

42

43 Abstract

44 People living with HIV (PLHIV) are a unique population because of their altered immune systems
45 and taking antiretroviral therapy (ART) that may modify risk of SARS-CoV-2. Evidence from sub-
46 Saharan African countries suggests that, despite not having higher SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence
47 than HIV-negative persons, PLHIV suffer worse COVID-19 outcomes. We assessed the prevalence
48 of SARS-COV-2 infection by HIV status in Zambia in July 2020.

49 We analyzed data from three different concurrent SARS-CoV-2 prevalence surveys (household,
50 outpatient-department, and health-worker) conducted in six districts of Zambia in July 2020.
51 Information on demographics and medical history was collected. Nasopharyngeal swabs were used
52 to screen for SARS-CoV-2 RNA using polymerase-chain-reaction (PCR) and blood specimens were
53 screened for SARS-CoV-2 virus-specific antibodies using an enzyme-linked-immunosorbent-assay
54 (ELISA). Test-specific SARS-CoV-2 prevalence was calculated. Multilevel logistic regression
55 models were used to measure test-specific adjusted odd ratios (aORs) of SARS-CoV-2 positivity by
56 HIV status, controlling for demographic and medical history.

57 We analysed the outcomes of the two different tests separately. Among 7,092 participants, 4,717
58 (66.5%) consented to blood-draw and 4,642 (65.5%) consented to nasopharyngeal swab. Overall
59 SARS-CoV-2 positivity was 9.4% by PCR and 3.8% by ELISA. SARS-CoV-2 prevalence detected
60 by PCR was higher among PLHIV than HIV-negative respondents (12.4% vs 9.1%, respectively, OR:
61 1.4, 95% confidence intervals [CI]: 1.0-1.9) and lower by ELISA (1.9% vs 3.9%, respectively, OR:
62 0.5, 95%CI: 0.2-0.9). Among PLHIV, not being on ART was an independent predictor of SARS-
63 CoV-2 PCR positivity (aOR: 5.24,95% CI: 1.19-22.22) but did not have a significant effect on ELISA
64 results.

65 During the first COVID-19 wave in Zambia, PLHIV were more likely to be acutely infected with
66 SARS-CoV-2 but less likely to be seropositive than participants without HIV. Intervention programs
67 could focus on early access to COVID-19 vaccinations, testing and ART might reduce COVID-19
68 morbidity among PLHIV.

69 **Word count: 294**

70 Introduction

71 From March 2020 through January 2023, over 339,000 laboratory-confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2
72 infections and over 4,000 deaths were reported in Zambia (1). Lusaka, the national capital, reported
73 the highest number of cases (77%), with 61% of cases reported among men and more than one-third
74 (32%) of cases involving adults aged 30-44 years (2). Elderly patients (aged >60 years) and those
75 with comorbidities (e.g., HIV, chronic lung disease, hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease,
76 and chronic kidney disease) are at high risk of severe infection and mortality (3,4).
77 Immunosuppression has also been associated with more severe outcomes (5).

78 HIV remains one of the biggest public health problems globally, with approximately 38.4 million
79 people living with HIV (PLHIV) globally in 2021 and over 650 000 deaths from AIDS-related
80 illnesses in 2021 (6). The HIV epidemic continues to impact a large portion of Zambian adults, with
81 an HIV prevalence of 9.9 (95% CI: 9.1-10.7) among adults aged 15-59 years in 2021 [4].

82 Current evidence shows that due to aberrant humoral and T-cell-mediated immune responses, PLWH
83 have a higher susceptibility to other infections, such as respiratory infections (7). As more PLHIV
84 age (8), the prevalence of age-related comorbidities among them increases along with the associated
85 risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes. PLHIV with COVID-19 may have more severe clinical
86 presentations and outcomes. The increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection or severe disease among
87 PLHIV may be due to immune dysregulation because of CD8-T lymphocyte cell exhaustion (9). T-
88 cell exhaustion occurs secondary to persistently high levels of HIV viral antigen, which leads to strong
89 proinflammatory immune activation and compromised T-cell homeostasis (7). In addition to this HIV-
90 induced immune dysregulation, coronaviruses have been shown to cause transient immune
91 deficiencies that could further weaken the immune system in an already immunocompromised host
92 (10–12). On the other hand, HIV-associated immunosuppression could help temper the cytokine
93 storm of COVID-19 and thus protect against severe forms of COVID-19 (13). In addition, PLHIV on

94 combined antiretroviral treatment (cART) might have a modified risk of infection and a different
95 clinical course of COVID-19 than those not on treatment, as some antiretrovirals may have theoretical
96 activity against SARS-CoV-2 (14–16).

97 Studies conducted early in the pandemic in the United States of America and Europe showed no
98 difference in the clinical presentation, hospital course and outcomes of COVID-19 between PLHIV
99 and HIV-negative adults (17–20). However, newer evidence from a systematic review and meta-
100 analysis (21), several cohort studies (22–24) and case series (25–27) have shown that PLHIV have a
101 higher risk of severe COVID-19 (hospitalisation, admission to the intensive care unit (ICU),
102 intubation or mechanical ventilation, or death). These studies included PLHIV with suppressed viral
103 loads and different demographic characteristics and comorbidities compared to PLHIV in Africa
104 (9,28,29). The systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Ssentongo et al in 2021 comprising
105 22 studies that included over 20 million participants across North America, Africa, Europe, and Asia
106 established that PLHIV had a 24% greater risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection (1.24, 95% [CI 1.05-1.46])
107 than HIV-negative individuals (21). However, the only African country included in this review was
108 South Africa, one of the most developed economies on the continent. In this meta-analysis, ART
109 (tenofovir and protease inhibitors) did not reduce the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection or death from
110 COVID-19 among PLHIV (21). In this meta-analysis, most respondents had controlled HIV infection
111 (median CD4 count was 538 cells/ μ L, and 80% of the PLHIV patients were virally suppressed [than
112 50 copies of HIV/mL]), and over 96% of PLHIV were on ART(21). In South Africa, a seroprevalence
113 survey among both PLHIV and HIV-negative antenatal women showed that PLHIV had a higher
114 SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence than antenatal HIV-negative women (30). A prospective cohort study
115 conducted in South Africa showed that PLHIV who were not virally suppressed were more likely to
116 develop symptomatic illness when infected with SAR-CoV-2 (OR 3.3 [95% CI 1.3–8.4]) and shed
117 SARS-CoV-2 for longer (hazard ratio 0.4 [95% CI 0.3–0.6]) compared with HIV-uninfected
118 individuals (31).

119 Several seroprevalence surveys of SARS-CoV-2 antibody and HIV testing in the general population
120 have shown that PLHIV are less likely to be seropositive than HIV-uninfected individuals (32–35).
121 In these surveys, poor HIV control (evidenced by either high viral load, low CD4 count or not yet on
122 ART) was associated with a poorer antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection (32–35). A cross-
123 sectional SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence survey conducted in Zambia found no association between
124 SARS-CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence and HIV status (36). As this study was limited to only Kabwe
125 District, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to the rest of the country. The lower
126 seroprevalence rates among PLHIV could be due to HIV-induced impaired humoral response, as HIV
127 targets CD4⁺ T lymphocytes. CD4⁺ T cells are pivotal in orchestrating both the humoral and cellular
128 immune responses to vaccination and prior infections and have an important role in antibody
129 production (37).

130 In sub-Saharan Africa, including Zambia, there is a growing body of evidence on coinfection between
131 HIV and COVID-19 with regional differences. Moreover, Zambia has a large population of PLHIV,
132 whose demographic composition and comorbidity profile are different from most of the populations
133 on which the current literature on COVID-19 in PLHIV is based. The aim of this study was to compare
134 the SARS-CoV-2 test positivity, clinical presentation, and predictors of test-specific SARS-CoV-2
135 positivity between PLHIV and people who are HIV negative in six districts of Zambia. Information
136 is needed to inform policy and interventions focusing on reducing COVID-19 morbidity among
137 PLHIV.

138

139 Materials and Methods

140 Study design

141 We used secondary de-identified data from three different SARS-CoV-2 prevalence surveys
142 conducted in six districts during the upswing of Zambia's first COVID-19 wave in July 2020. These
143 datasets were made available upon request from the MOH on the 21st of December 2021.

144 Study setting

145 The study was conducted in six out of the 116 districts of Zambia (Lusaka, Ndola, Livingstone,
146 Kabwe, Nakonde and Solwezi) across six provinces (Lusaka, Copperbelt, Southern, Central,
147 Muchinga and North-western) of Zambia. These districts were purposively selected due to high
148 SARS-CoV-2 prevalence, being major gateways or transport hubs and to ensure adequate urban rural
149 disaggregation.

150 Study participants

151 Participants in the three surveys included community members from the selected districts, who were
152 drawn from a cross-sectional cluster-sample survey of households in the six districts of Zambia.
153 Within each district, 16 standardised enumeration areas were randomly selected as primary sampling
154 units using probability proportional to size. All households within each standardised enumeration area
155 were listed, and 20 households from each standardised enumeration area were selected using simple
156 random sampling: people seeking care at outpatient departments (OPDs) in the selected health
157 facilities within these districts and healthcare workers (HCWs) in these same facilities.

158 Inclusion criteria

159 Only individuals (of any age) who had slept in the house the night before the survey was done were
160 eligible to participate in the household survey. In the outpatient survey, participants were randomly
161 selected from all the patients attending 20 conveniently selected outpatient clinics at hospitals and
162 health centres in the six districts. HCWs were selected from the same 20 health facilities (HFs)

163 conveniently selected in the outpatient survey in the six districts. A convenience sample of HCWs at
164 the selected HFs who were present during the survey dates were recruited. For smaller HFs (e.g.,
165 health centres), all HCWs were included; for larger HFs (e.g., hospitals), 50 HCWs were invited to
166 participate.

167 Sampling technique and sample size estimation

168 As our study used secondary data, there was no a priori sample size calculation. Participants could
169 accept either PCR or ELISA or both, and we analysed the outcomes of the two different tests
170 separately. For the analysis of overall SARS-CoV-2 PCR test positivity and seropositivity, we used
171 all respondents who took the respective test modality. For the comparison of symptoms reported at
172 enrolment (during survey administration?) Once infected with SARS-CoV-2, we only used the subset
173 of respondents who had a positive PCR test. For the determination of factors associated with SARS-
174 CoV-2 positivity among PLHIV, we used all the PLHIV who accepted either test modality (Figure
175 1).

176 To determine if the sample used in our analysis for predictors of SARS-CoV-2 positivity had enough
177 statistical power to make an inference, the sample size by test type was calculated using the following
178 formula.

$$179 \quad n = p * Z^2 * (1-p) / E^2$$

180 where

181 n is the required sample size

182 P is the percentage occurrence of a state or condition

183 E is the percentage maximum error required

184 Z is the value corresponding to the level of confidence required

185

186 With 4642 respondents who were tested by PCR only, the minimum sample size needed for the study
187 to have 80% power is 259; the study therefore has enough power to make statistically significant
188 inferences.

189 With 4717 respondents who were tested by ELISA only, the minimum sample size needed for the
190 study to have 80% power is 76; the study therefore has enough power to make statistically significant
191 inferences.

192 Variables

193 Outcome variable

194 The outcome variable was SARS-CoV-2 positivity. Participants could be tested by PCR, ELISA, or
195 both. We analysed the two different outcomes separately (PCR and ELISA). PCR and ELISA results
196 were used to determine test-specific positivity and factors associated with being SARS-CoV-2
197 positive. For the analysis of symptomology, we only used the subset of respondents who had a positive
198 PCR test.

199 Independent variables

200 The independent variables were demographic characteristics (age, sex) and self-reported medical
201 history (tuberculosis, malaria, diabetes, cardiac disease, hypertension, asthma, chronic obstructive
202 pulmonary disease, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, cancer, any other past medical history).
203 SARS-CoV-2 exposure was defined as any history in the one month prior to testing of household
204 contact with a confirmed case of COVID-19, social contact with a confirmed case of COVID-19,
205 domestic or international travel, in-person attendance to workplace/school/daycare, visit to a health
206 care facility, number of visits to market/grocer and usual means of transportation.

207 Data collection procedures

208 Data on independent variables were collected through administration of a standardised questionnaire
209 by trained personnel that included information about demographics, self-reported medical history
210 including symptomatology prior to testing, and SARS-CoV-2 exposure history. Next, the specimen
211 for the PCR test was collected by using nasopharyngeal swabs (1 per participant) collected into a
212 cryovial with viral transport medium for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using real-time reverse
213 transcription PCR (38). Additionally, blood samples were collected by finger prick using the BD
214 microtainer EDTA cryovial tube system for detection of anti-spike protein IgG SARS-CoV-2
215 antibodies using Euroimmun ELISA (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA, USA) in single replicate according
216 to the manufacturer's instructions (39).

217 Data management and analysis

218 All statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software (40). Data from the three surveys
219 were merged for analysis. We then assessed for completeness and missingness by running frequency
220 tables and cross-tabulations of all variables. Due attention was given to skip patterns before using
221 multiple imputations using chained equations using the MICE package in R statistical software to
222 impute values for variables with equal to or less than five percent missing values. Variables with
223 greater than five percent missingness were dropped from subsequent analysis. We then performed
224 diagnostic analyses to identify sample distribution and outliers to guide subsequent statistical tests.
225 The continuous variable age was recoded into a categorical variable age group. A logical variable
226 “any symptom” was recoded from the variable symptom, with two levels, “true or false”. If true, the
227 respondent presented with at least one symptom. Similarly, another logical variable, “any comorbid”,
228 was recoded from those respondents who had reported at least one comorbid medical condition
229 excluding HIV, which was analysed separately.

230 SARS-CoV-2 positivity was calculated as the number of positive results divided by the total number
231 of tests performed (for a given test modality). PCR and ELISA positivity estimates were reported
232 separately. Descriptive statistics were used to summarise participant characteristics. Stratified
233 analysis was used to compare self-reported HIV status-specific positivity rates. The Shapiro–Wilk
234 test was used to determine the distribution of continuous variables. Pearson chi-square and Fisher’s
235 exact tests were used to determine associations between the independent and outcome variables.
236 Wilcoxon rank sum tests were used to determine the difference in the medians for continuous
237 variables between PLHIV and HIV-negative participants.

238 Multilevel logistic regression was used to determine the factors associated with SARS-CoV-2
239 positivity among PLWH by PCR and ELISA as well as the strength of association. To account for the
240 spatial clustering of participants in each of the six districts, we assumed a random intercept; that is,
241 each of the 6 districts had its unique intercept. In contrast, we assumed fixed effects for all other
242 covariates (that is, an estimated mean effect for the 6 districts). Variables controlled for included age,
243 ART use, sex, visit to a health facility, in-person attendance at a workplace, school or day care and
244 the presence of any comorbid medical condition. Investigator-led stepwise elimination was used to
245 derive the final model using the AIC and BIC values for each test modality until all predictors had a
246 p value of 0.5 or less. Adjusted odds ratios and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) ($p < 0.05$) were
247 computed.

248 [Ethical considerations](#)

249 The study was conducted under the public health response authority from the Ministry of Health;
250 therefore, permission from the Permanent Secretary, Technical Services at the Ministry of Health was
251 obtained to access the data currently held at the MOH. The study used secondary data and did not
252 involve any interaction with human subjects. The data were deidentified and kept secure. No names
253 of participants were obtained. The data set was handled with confidentiality and only used for the
254 purposes of this study. The data were not subject to undue prejudice. Ethical approval to conduct the

255 study was obtained from the ERES converge ethical review board (**Ref. No 2021-November-010**),
256 and research authority was obtained from the National Health Research Authority (**NHRA-**
257 **316/06/10/2022**).

258 Results

259 Participants

260 A summary of the recruitment algorithm of study participants from the different primary studies is
261 shown in Figure 1A. A total of 7,328 respondents were approached in all three studies, with most
262 respondents from the household survey (64%) (Figure 1A). A total of 7,092 (96.6%) participants
263 agreed to participate in the respective surveys: 4469 (95.3%) completed the household survey, 1,952
264 (98.3%) completed the OPD survey and 660 (99.5%) completed the HCW survey (Figure 1A). A total
265 of 5938 (83.7%) of the participants approached consented to SARS-CoV-2 testing. With 4717
266 (79.4%) tested by ELISA, 4642 (78.2%) tested by PCR, and 3421 (57.6%) tested by both test
267 modalities (Figure 1B), we did not analyse those tested by both test modalities separately.

268 **Figure 1A:** Summary of the study participant recruitment algorithm by study type

269 **Figure 1B:** Outline of the algorithm of the selection of study participants into the different arms of
270 the study

271

272 Demographic characteristics of study participants

273 The median age among all participants who consented to take part in the study was 28.0 years (IQR:
274 19.0-41.0). More female participants (61.6%) were enrolled, and most participants had attended
275 secondary education (37.9%) and did not have any comorbid medical conditions (82.0%). In the entire
276 sample, the HIV prevalence was 8.8 percent, and among those who were HIV positive, only 2.4
277 percent were not on ART (Table 1). Most respondents came from Lusaka district (23.8%), followed
278 by Solwezi district (18.2%), with the least number of respondents from Nakonde district (10.6%)
279 (Table 1). The demographic characteristics of respondents who were tested by either PCR or ELISA
280 were similar to those from the overall sample (Table 1). The demographic characteristics of those

281 tested by PCR or ELISA were similar (Table 1). Compared to HIV-negative study participants,
 282 PLHIV were older (median ages: 42 years versus 27 years, p value < 0.001), and a greater proportion
 283 had at least one comorbidity other than HIV (44.5% versus 16.7%, p value < 0.001) (Table 2).

284 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of study participants tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection, 6
 285 districts, Zambia, July 2020

Variable	Overall (N= 7092) n (%)	Tested by ELISA¹ (N=4717), n (%)	Tested by PCR (N=4642), n (%)
Sex			
Male	2716 (38.4)	1786 (37.9)	1854 (39.9)
Female	4352 (61.6)	2931 (62.1)	2788 (60.1)
Missing	24		
Age, years			
median (IQR ³)	28.0 [19.0;41.0]	29.0 [21.0;42.0]	28.0 [19.0;41.0]
Age group, years			
<19	1842 (26.1)	1009 (21.4)	1231 (26.5)
20-29	1926 (27.3)	1378 (29.2)	1224 (26.4)
30-39	1395 (19.8)	984 (20.9)	919 (19.8)
40-49	847 (12.0)	593 (12.6)	549 (11.8)
50-59	548 (7.8)	397 (8.4)	374 (8.1)
>60	495 (7.0)	356 (7.5)	345 (7.4)
Missing	39		
Education			
Primary	2221 (32.0)	1393 (29.5)	1399 (30.1)
Secondary	2632 (37.9)	1863 (39.5)	1816 (39.1)
Higher	1608 (23.2)	1231 (26.1)	1111 (23.9)
None	485 (7.0)	230 (4.9)	316 (6.8)
Missing	146		
Any Comorbidity			
No	5815 (82.0)	3806 (80.7)	3751 (80.8)
Yes	1277 (18.0)	911 (19.3)	891 (19.2)
HIV			
No	5853 (91.2)	4243 (90.0)	4222 (91.0)
Yes	565 (8.8)	474 (10.0)	420 (9.0)
Missing	674		
On ART			

Yes	537 (97.6)	407 (97.8)	365 (97.9)
No	13 (2.4)	9 (2.2)	8 (2.1)
NA	6542	4301	4269
Survey			
Outpatient	1952 (27.6)	1576 (33.4)	1395 (30.1)
Household	4469 (63.1)	2616 (55.5)	2823 (60.8)
Healthcare worker	660 (9.3)	525 (11.1)	424 (9.1)
Missing	11		
District			
Lusaka	1690 (23.8)	1152 (24.4)	977 (21.0)
Livingstone	1134 (16.0)	836 (17.7)	781 (16.8)
Nakonde	753 (10.6)	499 (10.6)	308 (6.6)
Ndola	1234 (17.4)	979 (20.8)	975 (21.0)
Kabwe	987 (13.9)	582 (12.3)	657 (14.2)
Solwezi	1294 (18.2)	669 (14.2)	944 (20.3)
1 PCR: polymerase chain reaction, 2 ELISA: -enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay, 3 Combination of either ELISA and PCR positive and ELISA or PCR negative, 4 HCW: healthcare worker.			

286

287 **Table 2.** Demographic characteristics of respondents stratified by HIV status and SARS-CoV-2 test
288 type.

	Tested by PCR			Tested by ELISA		
	HIV status			HIV status		
	Negative (N=4222) n (%)	Positive (N=420) n (%)	p value	Negative (N=4254) n (%)	Positive (N=463) n (%)	p value
Sex¹			0.0004			0.0004
Male	1720 (40.7)	134 (31.9)		1646 (38.7)	140 (30.2)	
Female	2502 (59.3)	286 (68.1)		2608 (61.3)	323 (69.8)	
Age²			<0.0001			<0.0001
Median (IQR)	27.0 [18.0;39.0]	42.0 [34.0;51.0]		28.0 [20.0;40.0]	42.0 [35.0;50.0]	
Age group¹			<0.0001			<0.0001
<19	1221 (28.9)	10 (2.4)		1001 (23.5)	8 (1.7)	
20-29	1166 (27.6)	58 (13.8)		1319 (31.0)	59 (12.7)	
30-39	812 (19.2)	107 (25.5)		859 (20.2)	125 (27.0)	
40-49	422 (10.0)	127 (30.2)		448 (10.5)	145 (31.3)	
50-59	305 (7.2)	69 (16.4)		321 (7.5)	76 (16.4)	
>60	296 (7.0)	49 (11.7)		306 (7.2)	50 (10.8)	

Education completed¹			0.0021			0.0003
Primary	1281 (30.3)	118 (28.1)		1245 (29.3)	148 (32.0)	
Secondary	1620 (38.4)	196 (46.7)		1652 (38.8)	211 (45.6)	
Higher	1021 (24.2)	90 (21.4)		1147 (27.0)	84 (18.1)	
None	300 (7.1)	16 (3.8)		210 (4.9)	20 (4.3)	
Any comorbidities¹			<0.0001			<0.0001
No	3518 (83.3)	233 (55.5)		3529 (83.0)	277 (59.8)	
Yes	704 (16.7)	187 (44.5)		725 (17.0)	186 (40.2)	
PCR result¹			0.0277			0.0311
Negative	3838 (90.9)	368 (87.6)		4086 (96.1)	454 (98.1)	
Positive	384 (9.1)	52 (12.4)		168 (3.9)	9 (1.9)	
On ART			NA			NA
Yes		365 (97.9)			407 (97.8)	
No		8 (2.1)			9 (2.2)	
Missing		47			47	
Survey¹			<0.0001			<0.0001
Outpatient	1202 (28.5)	193 (46.0)		1354 (31.8)	222 (47.9)	
Household	2621 (62.1)	202 (48.1)		2405 (56.5)	211 (45.6)	
Healthcare worker	399 (9.5)	25 (6.0)		495 (11.6)	30 (6.5)	
District¹			<0.0001			<0.0001
Lusaka	903 (21.4)	74 (17.6)		1040 (24.4)	112 (24.2)	
Livingstone	699 (16.6)	82 (19.5)		745 (17.5)	91 (19.7)	
Nakonde	289 (6.8)	19 (4.5)		471 (11.1)	28 (6.0)	
Ndola	868 (20.6)	107 (25.5)		872 (20.5)	107 (23.1)	
Kabwe	552 (13.1)	105 (25.0)		490 (11.5)	92 (19.9)	
Solwezi	911 (21.6)	33 (7.9)		636 (15.0)	33 (7.1)	
¹ Pearson-Chi-square, ² Wilcoxon rank sum test						

290 SARS-CoV-2 positivity

291 Among all participants, SARS-CoV-2 positivity was 9.4% and 3.8% by PCR and ELISA,
 292 respectively. SARS-CoV-2 positivity by PCR was 6.6%, 13.4% and 7.8% in the HCW survey,
 293 outpatient survey and household survey, respectively. SARS-CoV-2 positivity by ELISA was 2.3%,
 294 5.4% and 3.1% in the HCW survey, outpatient survey and household survey, respectively (Table 2).
 295 There was no difference in positivity by sex of the respondent (OR 1.2, [PCR], OR 1.1, [ELISA])
 296 (Table 2). Among those for whom PCR testing was completed, positivity differed significantly by
 297 age: compared to respondents aged ≤ 19 years, respondents within the age groups 20 to 29 and 30 to
 298 39 years had higher odds (OR 1.2, 95% CI: 1.12-1.96 and OR 1.4, 95% CI: 1.06-1.93, respectively)
 299 of testing SARS-CoV-2 positive by PCR (Table 2).

300 **Table 3.** Prevalence and bivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 positivity by test modality in six
 301 districts of Zambia, July 2020

	Tested by PCR (N=4642) *		Tested by ELISA (N=4717) *	
	Prevalence n (%)	OR (95%CI)	Prevalence n (%)	OR (95%CI)
Overall	436 (9.4)		177(3.8)	
Sex				
Female	247(8.9)	Ref	105(3.6)	Ref
Male	189(10.2)	1.2(0.96-1.42)	72(4.0)	1.1(0.83-1.53)
Age group				
<19	93(7.6)	Ref	34(3.4)	Ref
20-29	132(10.8)	1.5(1.12-1.96)	46(3.3)	1.0(0.63-1.56)
30-39	96(10.4)	1.4(1.06-1.93)	41(4.2)	1.3(0.79-1.99)
40-49	55(10.0)	1.4(0.96-1.93)	24(4.0)	1.2(0.70-2.05)
50-59	28(7.5)	1.0(0.63-1.52)	16(4.0)	1.2(0.64-2.17)
>60	32(9.3)	1.3(0.81-1.89)	16(4.5)	1.4(0.72-2.44)
Education completed				
None	114(8.1)	Ref	7(3.0)	Ref
Primary	188(10.4)	1.5(0.9-2.53)	50(3.6)	1.2(0.57-2.90)
Secondary	116(10.4)	1.9(1.19-3.26)	83(4.5)	1.5(0.73-3.57)
Higher	18(5.7)	1.9(1.18-3.33)	37(3.0)	1.0(0.46-2.44)

Survey				
Healthcare worker	28(6.6)	Ref	12(2.3)	Ref
Outpatient	187(13.4)	2.2(1.47-3.37)	85(5.4)	2.4(1.37-4.73)
Household	221(7.8)	1.2(0.81-1.84)	80(3.1)	1.4(0.76-2.62)
District				
Kabwe	30(4.6)	Ref	14(2.4)	Ref
Lusaka	106(10.8)	2.5(1.70-3.93)	53(4.6)	2.0(1.11-3.69)
Livingstone	108(13.8)	3.4(2.24-5.18)	20(2.4)	1.0(0.50-2.03)
Nakonde	17(5.5)	1.2(0.65-2.22)	48(9.6)	4.3(2.41-8.22)
Ndola	106(10.9)	2.6(1.70-3.93)	26(2.7)	1.1(0.58-2.19)
Solwezi	69(7.3)	1.7(1.07-2.59)	16(2.4)	1.0(0.48-2.08)
Comorbid medical condition				
No	354(9.4)	Ref	133(3.5)	Ref
Yes	82(9.2)	0.9(0.71-1.20)	44(4.8)	1.4(0.98-1.97)
HIV Status				
Negative	384(9.1)	Ref	168(3.9)	Ref
Positive	52(12.4)	1.4(1.03-1.91)	9(1.9)	0.5(0.23-0.90)
On ART				
Yes	43(11.8)	Ref	9(2.2)	Ref
No	4(50.0)	7.5(1.72-32.7)	0(0)	0.0
Missing	359		168	
Household contact COVID				
No	432(9.4)	Ref	176(3.8)	Ref
Yes	4(12.5)	1.4(0.41-3.54)	1(3.2)	0.9(0.05-4.02)
Travel				
None	348(9.1)	Ref	152(3.9)	Ref
International	5(16.7)	2.0(0.68-4.87)	2(6.9)	1.8(0.29-6.20)
Domestic	83(10.8)	1.2(0.94-1.56)	23(3.0)	0.8(0.48-1.17)
Visit Health Facility				
No	375(10.2)	Ref	143(3.9)	Ref
Yes	61(6.3)	0.6(0.44-0.78)	34(3.3)	0.8(0.57-1.22)
In-person¹				
No	313(9.0)	Ref	127(3.6)	Ref
Yes	123(10.6)	1.2(0.96-1.48)	50(4.1)	1.2(0.82-1.60)
Transport				

Walking	251(9.3)	Ref	97(3.6)	Ref
Personal car	45(10.7)	1.2(0.83-1.62)	18(4.0)	1.1(0.64-1.80)
Taxi	45(11.1)	1.2(0.86-1.68)	13(3.5)	1.0(0.51-1.67)
Bike	9(6.6)	0.7(0.32-1.29)	7(5.6)	1.6(0.65-3.24)
Minibus	86(8.8)	0.9(0.73-1.22)	42(4.0)	1.1(0.76-1.58)

302

303 PLHIV had increased odds of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR (OR 1.4, CI: 1.03-1.91) but
304 had reduced odds of an ELISA-positive test (OR 0.5, 95% CI: 0.23-0.90). Among PLHIV, those not
305 on ART had increased odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection by PCR (OR: 7.5, 95% CI: 1.72-32.7)) (Table
306 2).

307 There was district-by-district variation in SARS-CoV-2 test positivity. Livingstone had the highest
308 test positivity (13.8%) by PCR, while Nakonde had the highest test positivity by ELISA (9.6%) (Table
309 2). Compared to people who had not received any education, people who had completed secondary
310 and higher education had higher odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection (OR 1.9, 95% CI: 1.19-3.26, OR 1.9,
311 95% CI: 1.18-3.33, respectively). Excluding HIV as a comorbidity, there was no difference in SARS-
312 CoV-2 test positivity between people who had comorbid medical conditions and those who did not
313 (OR 0.9, 95% CI: 0.71,1.20) (Table 2).

314 Predictors of SAR-CoV-2 positivity among PLHIV

315 In the multilevel logistic regression model, PLHIV not receiving ART was an independent predictor
316 of SARS-CoV-2 positivity by PCR (aOR 5.78, 95% CI: 1.35-24.76). All the other covariates were
317 insignificant, and none of the covariates were significant in the ELISA analysis (Table 3). There was
318 a similar finding in the ordinary logistic regression model (Table 4).

319

320 **Table 4.** Multilevel multivariate analysis of predictors of SARS-CoV-2 positivity among PLHIV by
321 test modality in six districts of Zambia, July 2020

Predictors	PCR Positivity (420) aOR (95%CI)	ELISA positivity (474) aOR (95%CI)
Sex		
Male	1.32(0.70-2.52)	1.62(0.41-6.47)
Any comorbid		
Yes	1.34(0.72-2.49)	3.72(0.94-14.68)
On ART		
No	5.78(1.35-24.76)	5.35(0.54-53.42)
HH contact COVID		
Yes	6.39(0.29-142.79)	NA
In person		
Yes	1.32(0.66-2.62)	0.71(0.13-3.84)
Visit Health facility		
Yes	NA	1.92(0.54-6.85)
Age	NA	0.97(0.92-1.03)

PCR: polymerase chain reaction

ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay

aOR: adjusted odds ratio

95%CI: 95%: confidence interval

ART: antiretroviral therapy

In-person attendance at workplace, school or day-care

HH household contact

NA Variables not included in the final model of the respective analysis.

We assumed a random intercept for district and survey type; that is, each of the 6 districts and survey had its unique intercept. In contrast, we assumed fixed effects for all other covariates (that is, an estimated mean effect for the 6 districts). Variables controlled for included age, ART use, sex, visit to a health facility, in-person attendance to a workplace, school, or day care and for the presence of any comorbid medical condition).

Table 5: Predictors of SARS-CoV-2 test positivity by test type, multivariate logistic regression.

	PCR Positivity (420) aOR(95%CI)	ELISA positivity (474) aOR(95%CI)
Sex		
Male	1.24(0.65-2.34)	1.58(0.36-6.40)
Age		0.97(0.91-1.02)
Any Comorbid		
Yes	1.32(0.71-2.48)	4.5(1.14-20.37)
On ART		
No	5.24(1.19-22.22)	4.89(0.23-37.94)
HH Contact COVID		
Yes	9.79(0.28-371.89)	NA
In Person		
Yes	1.33(0.66-2.59)	0.87(0.18-3.17)
District		
Kabwe	Ref	
Lusaka	6.49(1.85-31.05)	5.41(0.70-112.35)
Livingstone	9.11(2.86-41.36)	NA
Nakonde	2.3(0.11-19.77)	5.98(0.22-162.36)
Ndola	7.2(2.25-32.89)	5.36(0.77-107.99)
Solwezi	2.55(0.32-16.72)	NA
Visit HF		
Yes	NA	2.08(0.55-7.52)

PCR: polymerase chain reaction

ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay

adjusted odds ratio

95%: confidence interval

ART: antiretroviral therapy

In-person attendance at workplace, school or day-care

HH household contact

NA Variables not included in the final model of the respective analysis.

Variables controlled for included age, ART use, sex, visit to a health facility, in-person attendance to a workplace, school, or day care and for the presence of any comorbid medical condition.

327 Clinical features of SAR-CoV-2-positive cases

328 Among participants who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR, most were asymptomatic at the
 329 time of testing (74.6% among the HIV negative and 56.0% among PLHIV). However, PLHIV had
 330 increased odds of being symptomatic compared to HIV-negative participants (OR 2.3, 95% CI 1.3-
 331 4.2). PLHIV also more frequently presented with cough, shortness of breath, anorexia, rhinorrhea,
 332 and abdominal pain compared to HIV-negative SARS-CoV-2 respondents (Table 4).

333 **Table 6:** Comparison of symptoms reported by SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive respondents at
 334 enrolment by self-reported HIV status in six districts of Zambia, July 2020

335

Symptom	PCR ¹ positive (N=436)		
	Prevalence, n (%)	OR ²	95% CI ³
Any symptom			
HIV-negative	98(25.4)	Ref	—
PLHIV ⁴	22(44.0)	2.31	1.25, 4.21
Fever			
HIV-negative	21(5.4)	Ref	—
PLHIV	3(6.0)	1.11	0.26, 3.38
Chills			
HIV-negative	13(3.4)	Ref	—
PLHIV	3(6.0)	1.83	0.41, 5.94
Cough			
HIV-negative	19(4.9)	Ref	—
PLHIV	8(16.0)	3.68	1.44, 8.67
SOB⁵			
HIV-negative	1(0.3)	Ref	—
PLHIV	2(4.0)	16	1.51, 349
Fatigue			
HIV-negative	11(2.8)	Ref	—
PLHIV	2(4.0)	1.42	0.22, 5.50
Anorexia			
HIV-negative	2(0.5)	Ref	—
PLHIV	4(8.0)	16.7	3.17, 123
Myalgia			
HIV-negative	9(2.3)	Ref	—

PLHIV	1(2.0)	0.85	0.05, 4.69
Arthralgias			
HIV-negative	8(2.1)	Ref	—
PLHIV	1(2.0)	0.96	0.05, 5.42
Rhinorrea			
HIV-negative	19(4.9)	Ref	—
PLHIV	7(14.0)	3.14	1.17, 7.62
Wheezing			
HIV-negative	1(0.3)	Ref	—
PLHIV	1(2.0)	7.86	0.31, 201
Altered taste			
HIV-negative	3(0.8)	Ref	—
PLHIV	1(2.0)	2.61	0.13, 20.8
Abdominal pain			
HIV-negative	10(2.6)	Ref	—
PLHIV	5(10.0)	4.18	1.26, 12.3
Diarrhoea			
HIV-negative	3(0.8)	Ref	—
PLHIV	2(4.0)	5.32	0.69, 32.9
Chest pain			
HIV-negative	9(2.3)	Ref	—
PLHIV	2(4.0)	1.75	0.26, 7.02
Headache			
HIV-negative	44(11.4)	Ref	—
PLHIV	5(10.0)	0.86	0.29, 2.11
Any other⁶			
HIV-negative	15(3.9)	Ref	—
PLHIV	5(10.0)	2.75	0.86, 7.48

¹PCR: polymerase chain reaction

² OR: odds ratio

³95% confidence interval

⁴PLHIV: people living with HIV.

⁵ SOB: shortness of breath.

⁶Any other symptom not listed

336

337

338 Discussion

339 The aim of this study was to compare the SARS-CoV-2 test positivity, clinical presentation, and
340 predictors of SARS-CoV-2 positivity between PLHIV and people who are HIV negative in six
341 districts of Zambia. Our findings showed that among respondents to surveys administered during the
342 early COVID-19 pandemic, PLHIV had higher odds of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR
343 than HIV-negative respondents, and at the time of testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection, PLHIV who
344 tested PCR-positive were more frequently symptomatic than participants who were HIV negative.
345 Among PLHIV, not being on ART was an independent predictor of SARS-CoV-2 PCR positivity.

346 PLHIV had higher odds of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR than HIV-negative respondents.
347 In this study, PLHIV were older and had more comorbidities than the HIV-negative participants; this
348 could have affected our findings, as both increasing age and a greater number of comorbidities have
349 been shown to increase the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection (3–5). Additionally, early in the first wave,
350 PLHIV may have had an additional risk of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 due to more frequent hospital
351 visits for medical review and drug collection. This finding is consistent with findings from a large,
352 pooled analysis of 22 studies from across the world from early 2020 through 2021 that showed that
353 PLHIV had 24% higher odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection than their HIV-negative counterparts
354 (30,41,42). Underlying socioeconomic disparities in PLHIV have been shown to increase exposure to
355 SARS-CoV-2 (43). Among PLHIV, not being on ART was an independent predictor of SARS-CoV-2
356 PCR positivity. Most studies performed on HIV and SARS-CoV-2 coinfection were inconclusive
357 about the effect of ART, as most PLHIV in these studies were on suppressive ART (42). PLHIV who
358 have not achieved viral suppression through ART may have a compromised immune system that
359 leaves them vulnerable to opportunistic infections (44).

360 In the bivariate analysis, there were reduced odds of a positive ELISA test among PLHIV compared
361 to the HIV-negative respondents. As ELISA detects the body's humoral response to SARS-CoV-2

infection, factors that affect the body's immune system may affect the reliability of this test. HIV affects CD4+ T cells, which play a key role in orchestrating the immune system (9). As such, PLHIV may have a delayed or decreased response in producing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 after a natural infection. Several seroprevalence surveys of SARS-CoV-2 antibody and HIV testing have shown that PLHIV are less likely to be seropositive than HIV-uninfected individuals (45–47). In these surveys, high HIV viral load, low host CD4 count or not yet on ART was associated with poorer antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection (44,46,47). Further research may be required to verify this finding among PLHIV in Zambia.

Overall, PLHIV were more likely to present with a symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection at the time of testing. Additionally, cough, shortness of breath, anorexia, rhinorrhea, and abdominal pain were more likely in PLHIV. These findings suggest that at the time of enrolment, PLHIV were more likely to have a symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection than HIV-negative people. Our findings are consistent with a review of 22 studies that included over 20 million participants across North America, Africa, Europe, and Asia that showed an increased risk of severe outcomes in PLHIV (31,48), although most PLHIV in these studies had been on suppressive ART. A study by the WHO showed that PLHIV were at increased risk of severe or critical disease at hospital admission (aOR 1.1, 95% CI 1.0–1.1) compared to HIV-negative individuals (48).

Our study had several limitations. The timing of the study at the beginning of the first wave in Zambia could have biased positive results to those respondents more linked to international or domestic travel. A past medical history of underlying conditions such as HIV was self-reported. As we merged data from three surveys, some study-specific variables had much missingness in the combined data set and therefore could not be analysed further. This resulted in fewer explanatory variables in our analysis. Additionally, PCR positivity can be long-lasting, especially among people who are immunocompromised. As such, people who are PCR positive may be weeks away from the initial infection.

387 Despite these limitations, we believe that our findings are valid due to the large sample size, inclusion
388 of study participants across different sociodemographic characteristics, and geographic settings and
389 due to consistency in the findings of this study with other local and international studies.

390 Conclusion

391 These findings suggest that at the time of enrolment in the study, during the first COVID-19 wave in
392 Zambia, PLHIV were at an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, as evidenced by PCR, but were
393 less likely to have had a prior infection, as evidenced by ELISA. Among the infected individuals,
394 PLHIV were more likely to be symptomatic. Among PLHIV, not being on ART was independently
395 associated with an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Interventions focusing on ensuring early
396 access to COVID-19 vaccinations, testing and ART might reduce COVID-19 morbidity among
397 PLHIV.

398

399 Acknowledgements

400 We thank the Ministry of Health, Zambia, for providing SARS-CoV-2 prevalence data in Zambia.

401

References

1. ZNPHI – A Centre of Excellence in Public Health Security for a Healthy Zambia [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 23]. Available from: <http://znphi.co.zm/>
2. Chipimo PJ, Barradas DT, Kayeyi N, Zulu PM, Muzala K, Mazaba ML, et al. First 100 Persons with COVID-19 — Zambia, March 18–April 28, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(42):1547–8.
3. Guan W jie, Ni Z yi, Hu Y, Liang W hua, Ou C quan, He J xing, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New England Journal of Medicine* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 30 [cited 2021 Jan 18];382(18):1708–20. Available from: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2002032>
4. Sachs JD, Horton R, Bagenal J, Ben Amor Y, Karadag Caman O, Lafortune G. The Lancet COVID-19 Commission. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2020 Aug 15 [cited 2023 Jan 23];396(10249):454–5. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32653081/>
5. Zhang L, Zhu F, Xie L, Wang C, Wang J, Chen R, et al. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19-infected cancer patients: a retrospective case study in three hospitals within Wuhan, China. *Annals of Oncology* [Internet]. 2020 Jul 1 [cited 2021 Feb 16];31(7):894–901. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32653081/>
6. Zambia | UNAIDS [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 20]. Available from: <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/zambia>
7. Nomah DK, Reyes-Urueña J, Llibre JM, Ambrosioni J, Ganem FS, Miró JM, et al. HIV and SARS-CoV-2 Coinfection: Epidemiological, Clinical Features, and Future Implications for Clinical Care and Public Health for People Living with HIV (PLWH) and HIV Most-at-Risk Groups. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Jul 29];18(6):518. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32653081/>
8. Chang CC, Crane M, Zhou J, Mina M, Post JJ, Cameron BA, et al. HIV and coinfections. *Immunol Rev* [Internet]. 2013 Jul [cited 2023 Jan 23];254(1):114–42. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23772618/>

- 427 9. Fenwick C, Joo V, Jacquier P, Noto A, Banga R, Perreau M, et al. T-cell exhaustion in HIV infection
428 [Internet]. Vol. 292, Immunological Reviews. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2019 [cited 2021 Feb 16]. p.
429 149–63. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC7003858/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31003858/)
- 430 10. He Z, Zhao C, Dong Q, Zhuang H, Song S, Peng G, et al. Effects of severe acute respiratory
431 syndrome (SARS) coronavirus infection on peripheral blood lymphocytes and their subsets.
432 International Journal of Infectious Diseases [Internet]. 2005 Nov [cited 2021 Feb 16];9(6):323–30.
433 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16095942/>
- 434 11. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, Cao Y, Huang D, Wang H, et al. Clinical and immunological features of
435 severe and moderate coronavirus disease 2019. Journal of Clinical Investigation [Internet]. 2020 May
436 1 [cited 2021 Feb 16];130(5):2620–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI137244>.
- 437 12. Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, et al. Dysregulation of immune response in patients
438 with coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China. Clinical Infectious Diseases [Internet]. 2020
439 Aug 1 [cited 2021 Feb 16];71(15):762–8. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32161940/>
- 440 13. SeyedAlinaghi SA, Karimi A, MohsseniPour M, Barzegary A, Mirghaderi SP, Fakhfour A, et al. The
441 clinical outcomes of COVID-19 in HIV-positive patients: A systematic review of current evidence.
442 Immun Inflamm Dis [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Aug 31];9(4):1160. Available
443 from: [/pmc/articles/PMC8426924/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3426924/)
- 444 14. Elfiky AA. Ribavirin, Remdesivir, Sofosbuvir, Galidesivir, and Tenofovir against SARS-CoV-2 RNA
445 dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp): A molecular docking study. Life Sci [Internet]. 2020 Jul 15
446 [cited 2021 Feb 16];253:117592. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC7102646/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32102646/)
- 447 15. Amo J del, Polo R, Moreno S, Díaz A, Martínez E, Arribas JR, et al. Incidence and Severity of
448 COVID-19 in HIV-Positive Persons Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy. [https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-](https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-3689)
449 3689 [Internet]. 2020 Jun 26 [cited 2021 Oct 26];173(7):536–41. Available from:
450 <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/abs/10.7326/M20-3689>

16. George S, McGrath N, Oni T. The association between a detectable HIV viral load and noncommunicable diseases comorbidity in HIV positive adults on antiretroviral therapy in Western Cape, South Africa. *BMC Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2019 Apr 27 [cited 2021 Apr 23];19(1). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31029087/>
17. Byrd KM, Beckwith CG, Garland JM, Johnson JE, Aung S, Cu-Uvin S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 and HIV coinfection: clinical experience from Rhode Island, United States. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 8]; Available from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jia2.25573/full>
18. Karmen-Tuohy S, Carlucci PM, Zervou FN, Zacharioudakis IM, Rebick G, Klein E, et al. Outcomes Among HIV-Positive Patients Hospitalised With COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 8]. Available from: <http://links.lww.com/QAI/B494>
19. Calza L, Bon I, Tadolini M, Borderi M, Colangeli V, Badia L, et al. COVID-19 in patients with HIV-1 infection: a single-centre experience in northern Italy. *Infection* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 8];1:1. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33737527/>
20. Härter G, Spinner CD, Roeder J, Bickel M, Krznaric I, Grunwald S, et al. COVID-19 in people living with human immunodeficiency virus: a case series of 33 patients. *Infection* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 1 [cited 2021 Feb 8];48(5):681–6. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33737527/>
21. Ssentongo P, Heilbrunn ES, Ssentongo AE, Advani S, Chinchilli VM, Nunez JJ, et al. Epidemiology and outcomes of COVID-19 in HIV-infected individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Jul 5];11(1). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33737527/>
22. Bhaskaran K, Rentsch CT, MacKenna B, Schultze A, Mehrkar A, Bates CJ, et al. HIV infection and COVID-19 death: a population-based cohort analysis of UK primary care data and linked national death registrations within the OpenSAFELY platform. *Lancet HIV*. 2021 Jan 1;8(1):e24–32.
23. Hadi YB, Naqvi SFZ, Kupec JT, Sarwari AR. Characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 in patients with HIV: A multicentre research network study. *AIDS*. 2020 Nov 1;34(13):F3–8.

- 476 24. Miyashita H, Kuno T. Prognosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in patients with HIV
477 infection in New York City. *HIV Med.* 2021 Jan 1;22(1):e1–2.
- 478 25. Härter G, Spinner CD, Roeder J, Bickel M, Krznaric I, Grunwald S, et al. COVID-19 in people living
479 with human immunodeficiency virus: a case series of 33 patients. *Infection.* 2020 Oct 1;48(5):681–6.
- 480 26. Altuntas Aydin O, Kumbasar Karaosmanoglu H, Kart Yasar K. HIV/SARS-CoV-2 coinfecting patients
481 in Istanbul, Turkey. *J Med Virol.* 2020 Nov 1;92(11):2288–90.
- 482 27. Ho HE, Peluso MJ, Margus C, Matias Lopes JP, He C, Gaisa MM, et al. Clinical outcomes and
483 immunologic characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in people with human immunodeficiency
484 virus. *Journal of Infectious Diseases.* 2021 Feb 1;223(3):403–8.
- 485 28. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019
486 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases from the Chinese Center for
487 Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Vol. 323, *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical*
488 *Association.* American Medical Association; 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 23]. p. 1239–42. Available from:
489 <https://jamanetwork.com/>
- 490 29. Fung M, Babik JM. COVID-19 in Immunocompromised Hosts: What We Know So Far. *Clinical*
491 *Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 27 [cited 2021 Feb 16];72(2):340–50. Available
492 from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/337668/>
- 493 30. Hsiao M, Davies MA, Kalk E, Hardie D, Naidoo M, Centner C, et al. SARS-CoV-2
494 SEROPREVALENCE IN THE CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN SUB-DISTRICTS AFTER THE
495 PEAK OF INFECTIONS [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 8]. Available from: www.nicd.ac.za
- 496 31. Cohen C, Kleynhans J, von Gottberg A, McMorow ML, Wolter N, Bhiman JN, et al. SARS-CoV-2
497 incidence, transmission, and reinfection in a rural and an urban setting: results of the PHIRST-C
498 cohort study, South Africa, 2020–21. *Lancet Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 1 [cited 2023 Jan
499 23];22(6):821–34. Available from: <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S147330992200069X/fulltext>

32. Chanda D. COVID-19 Severity and COVID-19–Associated Deaths Among Hospitalised Patients with HIV Infection — Zambia, March–December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 4 [cited 2021 Jul 12];70(22):807–10. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7022a2.htm>
33. Bertagnolio S, Thwin SS, Silva R, Nagarajan S, Jassat W, Fowler R, et al. Clinical features of, and risk factors for, severe or fatal COVID-19 among people living with HIV admitted to hospital: analysis of data from the WHO Global Clinical Platform of COVID-19. *Lancet HIV*. 2022 Jul 1;9(7):e486–95.
34. Nault L, Marchitto L, Goyette G, Tremblay-Sher D, Fortin C, Martel-Laferrrière V, et al. Covid-19 vaccine immunogenicity in people living with HIV-1. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 6 [cited 2023 Jan 23];40(26):3633. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC9069249/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39069249/)
35. Wolter N, Tempia S, von Gottberg A, Bhiman JN, Walaza S, Kleynhans J, et al. Seroprevalence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 After the Second Wave in South Africa in Human Immunodeficiency Virus–Infected and Uninfected Persons: A Cross-Sectional Household Survey. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 24 [cited 2023 Jan 23];75(1):e57–68. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/75/1/e57/6546682>
36. Shanaube K, Schaap A, Klinkenberg E, Floyd S, Bwalya J, Cheeba M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and associated risk factors in periurban Zambia: a population-based study. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2022 May 1 [cited 2023 Jan 23];118:256. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC8925090/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38925090/)
37. Nault L, Marchitto L, Goyette G, Tremblay-Sher D, Fortin C, Martel-Laferrrière V, et al. Covid-19 vaccine immunogenicity in people living with HIV-1. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 6 [cited 2023 Jan 23];40(26):3633. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC9069249/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39069249/)
38. SARS-CoV-2 Fluorescent PCR Kit For Use under the Emergency Use Authorisation Only For In vitro Diagnostic (IVD) Use RX Only Instructions for Use, Revision 3.1 SARS-CoV-2 Fluorescent PCR Kit P/N: BUSGN7101109 32 tests SARS-CoV-2 Fluorescent PCR Kit P/N: BUSGN7102109 64

526 tests SARS-CoV-2 Fluorescent PCR Kit P/N: BUSGN7103109 96 tests Nucleic Acid Extraction Kit,
527 Manual Version P/N: GN7102903 48 tests Nucleic Acid Extraction Kit, Fast. 2020;

528 39. Sample to Insight - QIAGEN [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 15]. Available from:
529 <https://www.qiagen.com/us>

530 40. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for
531 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2018;

532 41. Gervasoni C, Meraviglia P, Riva A, Giacomelli A, Oreni L, Minisci D, et al. Clinical Features and
533 Outcomes of Patients With Human Immunodeficiency Virus With COVID-19. Clinical Infectious
534 Diseases [Internet]. 2020 Nov 19 [cited 2023 Jan 24];71(16):2276–8. Available from:
535 <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/71/16/2276/5837155>

536 42. Ssentongo P, Heilbrunn ES, Ssentongo AE, Advani S, Chinchilli VM, Nunez JJ, et al. Epidemiology
537 and outcomes of COVID-19 in HIV-infected individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sci
538 Rep [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Jan 23];11(1). Available from:
539 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33737527/>

540 43. Bhaskaran K, Rentsch CT, MacKenna B, Schultze A, Mehrkar A, Bates CJ, et al. HIV infection and
541 COVID-19 death: a population-based cohort analysis of UK primary care data and linked national
542 death registrations within the OpenSAFELY platform. Lancet HIV [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2023
543 Jan 23];8(1):e24–32. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33316211/>

544 44. Bertagnolio S, Thwin SS, Silva R, Nagarajan S, Jassat W, Fowler R, et al. Clinical features of, and
545 risk factors for, severe or fatal COVID-19 among people living with HIV admitted to hospital:
546 analysis of data from the WHO Global Clinical Platform of COVID-19. Lancet HIV. 2022 Jul
547 1;9(7):e486–95.

548 45. Bertagnolio S, Thwin SS, Silva R, Nagarajan S, Jassat W, Fowler R, et al. Clinical features of, and
549 risk factors for, severe or fatal COVID-19 among people living with HIV admitted to hospital:

550 analysis of data from the WHO Global Clinical Platform of COVID-19. *Lancet HIV*. 2022 Jul
551 1;9(7):e486–95.

552 46. Wolter N, Tempia S, von Gottberg A, Bhiman JN, Walaza S, Kleynhans J, et al. Seroprevalence of
553 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 After the Second Wave in South Africa in Human
554 Immunodeficiency Virus-Infected and Uninfected Persons: A Cross-Sectional Household Survey.
555 *Clin Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2022 Jul 1 [cited 2023 Jan 24];75(1):e57–68. Available from:
556 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35271693/>

557 47. Nault L, Marchitto L, Goyette G, Tremblay-Sher D, Fortin C, Martel-Laferrière V, et al. Covid-19
558 vaccine immunogenicity in people living with HIV-1. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 6 [cited 2023 Jan
559 24];40(26):3633. Available from:/pmc/articles/PMC9069249/

560 48. Clinical features and prognostic factors of COVID-19 in people living with HIV hospitalised with
561 suspected or confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 24]. Available from:
562 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Clinical-HIV-2021.1>

563

564

565 Tables and Figures

566 **Figure 1A:** Summary of the study participant recruitment algorithm by study type

567 **Figure 1B:** Outline of the algorithm of the selection of study participants into the different arms of
568 the study

569 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics of study participants tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection, 6
570 districts, Zambia, July 2020

571 **Table 2:** Demographic characteristics of respondents stratified by HIV status and SARS-CoV-2 test
572 type.


573 **Table 3:** Prevalence and bivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 positivity by test modality in six
574 districts of Zambia, July 2020

575 **Table 4:** Multilevel multivariate analysis of predictors of SARS-CoV-2 positivity among PLHIV by
576 test modality in six districts of Zambia, July 2020

577 **Table 5:** Predictors of SARS-CoV-2 test positivity by test type, multivariate logistic regression


578 **Table 6:** Comparison of symptoms reported by SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive respondents at
579 enrolment by self-reported HIV status in six districts of Zambia, July 2020

580



*11 Entries in the data set had a missing survey-type variable

Figure1A



**** PCR: polymerase chain reaction, *PLHIV: people living with HIV, * ELISA: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay**