



# Article High SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence among Healthcare Workers in Cochabamba, Bolivia

Paola Mariela Saba Villarroel<sup>1,\*</sup>, María del Rosario Castro Soto<sup>2</sup>, Verónica Undurraga<sup>3</sup>, Heydi Sanz<sup>4</sup>, Ana María Jaldín<sup>5</sup>, Laetitia Ninove<sup>1</sup>, Elif Nurtop<sup>1</sup>, Laura Pezzi<sup>1</sup>, Souand Mohamed Ali<sup>1</sup>, Abdennour Amroun<sup>1</sup>, Morgan Seston<sup>1</sup> and Xavier de Lamballerie<sup>1</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Aix-Marseille Univ, IRD 190, Inserm 1207, Unité des Virus Émergents (UVE), 27 Boulevard Jean Moulin, 13005 Marseille, France; Laetitia.NINOVE@ap-hm.fr (L.N.); enurtop@gmail.com (E.N.); laura.pezzi3@studio.unibo.it (L.P.); souand.mohamedal@gmail.com (S.M.A.);
- abdennour.amroun@inserm.fr (A.A.); morgan.seston@ird.fr (M.S.); xavier.de-lamballerie@univ-amu.fr (X.d.L.)
- <sup>2</sup> Infectology Department, Viedma Hospital, Cochabamba 4780, Bolivia; rossycastrosoto@hotmail.com
   <sup>3</sup> María da las Ángelas Clinia, Cashabamba 4780, Bolivia, davaganiagun durra se@eal.com
- <sup>3</sup> María de los Ángeles Clinic, Cochabamba 4780, Bolivia; draveronicaundurraga@aol.com
   <sup>4</sup> Marual Assancia Villamol Hamital Coshabamba 4780, Bolivia; haudi sanz@amail.com
- Manuel Ascencio Villarroel Hospital, Cochabamba 4780, Bolivia; heydi.sanz@gmail.com
   Clínica Conacabana, Cochabamba 4780, Bolivia; namaialdin@hotmail.com
- <sup>5</sup> Clínica Copacabana, Cochabamba 4780, Bolivia; anamajaldin@hotmail.com
- Correspondence: marielasaba@gmail.com



Citation: Saba Villarroel, P.M.; Castro Soto, M.d.R.; Undurraga, V.; Sanz, H.; Jaldín, A.M.; Ninove, L.; Nurtop, E.; Pezzi, L.; Mohamed Ali, S.; Amroun, A.; et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence among Healthcare Workers in Cochabamba, Bolivia. *Viruses* 2022, *14*, 232. https:// doi.org/10.3390/v14020232

Academic Editors: Eurico Arruda, Helena Lage Ferreira, José Luiz Proença Módena and William Marciel de Souza

Received: 1 December 2021 Accepted: 21 January 2022 Published: 25 January 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). **Abstract:** Healthcare workers (HCWs) are at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. The aim of the study was to estimate the SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among HCWs in Cochabamba, Bolivia and to determine the potential risk factors. In January 2021, a cross-sectional SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence study was conducted in 783 volunteer clinical and non-clinical HCWs in tertiary care facilities. It was based on IgG detection using ELISA, chemiluminiscence, and seroneutralisation tests from dried blood spots. Analysis revealed a high seroprevalence (43.4%) of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. The combination of anosmia and ageusia (OR: 68.11; 95%-CI 24.83–186.80) was predictive of seropositivity. Belonging to the cleaning staff (OR: 1.94; 95%-CI 1.09–3.45), having more than two children in the same house (OR: 1.74; 95%-CI 1.12–2.71), and having been in contact with a close relative with COVID-19 (OR: 3.53; 95%-CI 2.24–5.58) were identified as risk factors for seropositivity in a multivariate analysis. A total of 47.5% of participants had received medication for COVID-19 treatment or prevention, and only ~50% of symptomatic subjects accessed PCR or antigenic testing. This study confirms a massive SARS-CoV-2 attack rate among HCWs in Cochabamba by the end of January 2021. The main risk factors identified are having a low-skilled job, living with children, and having been in contact with an infected relative in the household.

Keywords: seroprevalence; SARS-CoV-2; healthcare workers; Bolivia

# 1. Introduction

Since December 2019, the COVID-19 pandemic has represented a major crisis worldwide. Particularly in developing countries, the health system is on the verge of collapse, and the shortage of oxygen supply and healthcare workers (HCWs) [1] makes management particularly challenging. In addition, transmission is exacerbated by the shortage of personal protective equipment and diagnostic tests.

In Bolivia, the first confirmed case of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was reported on 10 March 2020 [2], followed by a nationwide lockdown that began on 22 March and ended on 10 May [3]. In total, national authorities reported 160,124 confirmed positive cases, with 9165 deaths by the end of 2020 [4]. To date, three epidemic waves have been reported in Bolivia: the first epidemic peak occurred in July and August 2020, the second peak occurred in January and early February 2021, and a third peak occurred in May and June 2021 [5].Vaccination campaigns for COVID-19 began on 29 January 2021, with doses reserved for HCWs [6].

Cochabamba is the fourth largest city in Bolivia, with ~826,316 inhabitants in 2020 [7]. It is located in a valley in the Andes mountain range. Cochabamba has been one of the most affected cities in Bolivia during the COVID-19 pandemic, with frequent cases among HCWs in June 2020, leading to the closure of some hospitals.

In this context, we conducted a seroprevalence study among HCWs in Cochabamba, Bolivia to estimate exposure and the risk factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection.

#### 2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.1. Study Design and Participants

In January 2021, during the second epidemic wave and before the start of vaccination campaigns, 783 clinical and non-clinical HCWs from different healthcare facilities in Cochabamba, Bolivia agreed to participate in this cross-sectional study.

Participants were included from: (i) the main and largest public tertiary-care hospitals admitting COVID-19 patients: Viedma adult hospital (360 of 826 employees; participation rate 43.6%) and Manuel Ascencio Villarroel children's hospital (206/410; 50.2%); (ii) two private tertiary care clinics: Copacabana Clinic (81/97; 83.5%) and María de los Ángeles Clinic (71/75; 94.7%), both of which also admit COVID-19 patients; (iii) sixty-five additional HCWs were included from Central Diagnostic Laboratory, Germán Urquidi Maternity Hospital, and Cochabamba Clinic.

All participants were included, irrespective of whether they had had COVID-19 symptoms or not. All consenting subjects were asked to answer a questionnaire and to provide a fingerstick capillary blood sample on blood cards.

The questionnaire allowed for collection of information concerning demographics, occupation, hospital department, working time since the beginning of the pandemic (including lockdown), household size and composition, blood type, tobacco smoking, types of face mask used (surgical, FFP2/KN95, cloth), contacts with confirmed COVID-19 cases (patients, family, friends, and/or colleagues), symptoms since the beginning of the pandemic (ageusia, anosmia, or at least two of the followings: fever, cough, tiredness, rhinitis, sore throat, headache, conjunctivitis, or diarrhea), comorbidities, previous COVID-19 diagnosis (PCR, antigen, and serology tests), hospitalization, treatment, and chlorine-dioxide ingestion.

### 2.2. Ethical Approval

The ethics committee of the Dr. Mario Ortíz Suárez hospital in Bolivia (No. 09/2020) approved this study. HCWs agreed to participate in the study by providing written informed consent prior to enrollment. Blood samples, personal data, and biological results were irreversibly anonymized.

#### 2.3. Serological Testing

Sera were recovered from dried blood spots (DBS) using a standardized quantitative elution protocol. Briefly, four 4.7 mm discs were punched and stored in 0.5 mL 2D FluidX 96-format tubes (Brooks life sciences, Chelmsford, MA, USA) [8]. Elution was performed with 380 µL of PBS, shaken at 1050 rpm for one hour and left for 18 h at room temperature before analysis. The sample eluates were tested with three different SARS-CoV-2 serological tests: (i) a semi-quantitative chemiluminescent immunoassay (CLIA) detecting IgG against the receptor binding domain (RBD) (Access SARS-CoV-2 IgG II, Beckman, CA, USA), run on the DXI instrument; (ii) a commercial semi-quantitative ELISA detecting IgG against the S1 domain of the spike protein (Anti-SARS-CoV-2, EUROIMMUN, Lübeck, Germany; sensitivity 87%, specificity 97.5% [8]), run on the EUROLabWorkstation instrument; (iii) a highly specific in-house virus-neutralization test (VNT) cytopathic effect (CPE)-based, 100 TCID50 of the SARS-CoV-2 BavPat1 strain, with serum dilutions from 1:20 to 1:160, as previously described [9]. The two commercial assays were performed according to the manufacturer's instruction. However, for the EUROIMMUN S1 ELISA assay, the cut-off ratio to define equivocal results was decreased to 0.7 (instead of 0.8). CPE-based VNT was

performed for all samples with either a positive or equivocal ELISA result or a positive CLIA result.

## 2.4. Diagnostic Interpretation

Samples were considered positive when at least two tests were positive among the S1 ELISA (Ratio  $\geq$  1.1), the CLIA RBD assay (titre > 10 AU/mL), and the VNT test (titre  $\geq$  40).

## 2.5. Statistical Analysis

For analysis, participants were assigned to four age groups (18–30 years old (yo); 31–40 yo; 41–60 yo; >60 yo) and to clinical or non-clinical occupational groups. Clinical HCWs (532/780, 68.2% of the study population) included physicians (n = 96, 12.3%), nurses (n = 91, 11.7%), assisting nurses (n = 83, 10.6%), laboratory staff (n = 82, 10.5%), medical students (n = 80, 10.3%), resident physicians (n = 56, 7.2%), physiotherapists and kinesiologists (n = 20, 2.6%), radiologists (n = 12, 1.5%), and nutritionists (n = 12, 1.5%). Non-clinical HCWs (248/780, 31.8%) included administrative staff (n = 109, 14.0%), cleaning (n = 88, 11.3%), kitchen (n = 11, 1.4%), and maintenance (n = 10, 1.3%) staff, security guards (n = 10, 1.3%), psychologists (n = 6, 0.8%), and others (n = 14, 1.8%). For test accuracy, equivocal ELISA results were excluded from analysis and were analyzed according to our stablished criteria for seropositivity. Cohen's Kappa test was used to calculate the degree of accuracy between commercial assays.

Continuous variables are presented as means with standard deviations (SD), and categorical variables as numbers and percentages with odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) when relevant. Variables were compared using the Pearson's chi-square test to identify those associated with the presence or absence of IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. Variables used to evaluate risk factors for seropositivity were age, sex, hospital, occupation, clinical or non-clinical occupational group, working during lockdown, household and composition, blood type, tobacco smoking, face-mask types used, and COVID-19 contact. Variables with *p*-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant (Bonferroni-adjusted p < 0.05) and were included in multivariate logistic-regression analysis to determine whether each variable was an independent factor for seropositivity. Analyses were performed using IBM-SPSS Statistics v 24.0.0.0 (Chicago, IL, USA) and GraphPad Prism 7.00 (San Diego, CA, USA) software.

#### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Characteristics of the Study Population

The mean age of participants was 39.29 (SD 12.3) years, and participants were predominantly female (579/783, 73.9%). The O blood type was the most common, followed by the A blood type (76.7% and 16.7%, respectively, in 708 participants, who provided the information). An underlying disease was reported by 23.1% of participants (including diabetes 32/783, 4.1%; hypothyroidism 30/783, 3.83%; hypertension 27/783, 3.4%; and Chagas disease 23/783, 2.9%). Sixty-seven of 760 (8.8%) participants were tobacco smokers.

The mean household size was 3.1 (SD 1.64), with the following composition: children < 11 years, mean 2.74 (SD 1.39); persons  $\geq$  11 years old, 3.42 (SD 1.75). The mean number of bedrooms was 3.97 (SD 1.65).

A proportion of HCWs wore surgical masks exclusively (311/783, 39.7%), FFP2/KN95 masks exclusively (103/783, 13.2%), or a combination of surgical and FFP2/KN95 masks (303/783, 38.7%). Among clinical HCWs, 412/532 (77.4%) reported contact with COVID-19 patients, in contrast to 115/248 (46.4%) among non-clinical HCWs, with higher proportions in nurses and assisting nurses (~83%), as well as physicians (82%). Household contact with a COVID-19 case was declared by 158/783 (20.2%) participants.

Most of the study population (656/769, 85.3%) worked during the lockdown, and 24/763 (3.1%) were hospitalized due to COVID-19. Details of demographics, occupational exposure, symptoms, and tobacco smoking are presented in Tables 1, S1 and S2. Of note, prior to sample collection, among the health care facilities involved in the study,

ten deaths were reported, and six HCWs did not return to work permanently due to COVID-19 sequelae.

**Table 1.** SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity by demographics, occupational exposure, symptoms, and tobacco smoking in healthcare workers. Cochabamba (Bolivia), January 2021.

Age         Age (years), mean (SD) $39.29 (12.3)$ $39.18 (11.5)$ Sex $31-40, n (\%)$ $220$ $85 (38.64)$ $0.09$ $31-40, n (\%)$ $241$ $117 (48.55)$ $0.05$ $56n, n (\%)$ $263$ $121 (46.01)$ $0.30$ $>60, n (\%)$ $59$ $17 (28.81)$ $0.02$ Healthcare facility         Female, $n (\%)$ $579$ $259 (44.73)$ $0.21$ Wiedma Adult Hospital, $n (\%)$ $204$ $81 (39.71)$ $0.21$ Viedma Adult Hospital, $n (\%)$ $360$ $150 (41.67)$ $0.36$ Maria de los Ángeles Clinic, $n (\%)$ $81$ $31 (38.27)$ $0.32$ Occupation         Clinical HCWs, $n (\%)$ $532$ $222 (41.73)$ $0.15$ Household composition $\gamma (\%)$ $248$ $117 (47.20)$ $0.15$ Tobacco smoking         Active tobacco smokers, $n (\%)$ $67$ $77 (25.37)$ $0.02$ COVID-19 contact         Patient, $n (\%)$ $663$ $310 (44.73)$ $0.02$ Relative inot living in the same house, $n (\%)$ $67$	Variables		Total	Seropositive	<i>p</i> -Value
$\begin{array}{c c} & Age (years), mean (SD) & 39.29 (12.3) & 39.18 (11.5) \\ 18-30, n (\%) & 220 & 85 (38.64) & 0.09 \\ 31-40, n (\%) & 241 & 117 (48.55) & 0.05 \\ 41-60, n (\%) & 59 & 17 (28.81) & 0.21 \\ \hline \\ Sex & Female, n (\%) & 59 & 17 (28.81) & 0.21 \\ \hline \\ Healthcare facility & Viedma Adult Hospital, n (\%) & 360 & 150 (41.67) & 0.36 \\ Manuel Ascencio Villarroel & 206 & 93 (45.15) & 0.32 \\ Hough ad clos Angeles Clinic, n (\%) & 81 & 31 (38.27) & 0.56 \\ María de los Ángeles Clinic, n (\%) & 71 & 36 (50.70) & 0.19 \\ Occupation & Cipacabana Clinic, n (\%) & 71 & 36 (50.70) & 0.19 \\ Occupation & Clinical HCWs, n (\%) & 532 & 222 (41.73) \\ Household composition & view children, n (\%) & 3 & 1 \\ Household composition & view children, n (\%) & 33 & 1 \\ Household composition & the same house, n (\%) & 248 & 117 (47.20) \\ COVID-19 contact & Active tobacco smokers, n (\%) & 260 & 115 \\ Tobacco smoking & Active tobacco smokers, n (\%) & 233 & 10 (44.73) \\ Active tobacco smokers, n (\%) & 233 & 10 (44.73) \\ Relative living in the same house, n (529 & 228 (43.10) \\ Relative living in the same house, n (529 & 228 (43.10) \\ Relative living in the same house, n (76) & 348 & 76 (21.84) \\ Symptoms & No symptoms, n (\%) & 29 & 8 \\ Working activity & Working during lockdown, n (\%) & 29 & 8 \\ Working activity & Working during lockdown, n (\%) & 113 & 39 (34.51) \\ Working activity & Working during lockdown, n (\%) & 14 & 8 \\ \end{array}$	Age				
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} & 18-30, n (\%) & 220 & 85 (38.64) & 0.09 \\ 31-40, n (\%) & 241 & 117 (48.55) & 0.05 \\ 41-60, n (\%) & 59 & 17 (28.81) & 0.02 \\ \hline \\ & & & & \\ Female, n (\%) & 59 & 17 (28.81) & 0.02 \\ \hline \\ & & & & \\ Female, n (\%) & 204 & 81 (39.71) & 0.21 \\ \hline \\ & & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & \\ & & & \\ Healthcare facility & & \\ Household &$	0	Age (years), mean (SD)	39.29 (12.3)	39.18 (11.5)	0.00
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} & \begin{array}{c} 31 \pm 0, n \ (\%) \\ 41 \pm 6, n \ (\%) \\ > 60, n \ (\%) \\ > 204 \ 81 \ (39.71) \\ 0.21 \\ \hline \\ 81 \ 31 \ (39.71) \\ 0.32 \\ Copacabana \ (1nc, n \ (\%) \\ C$		18-30, n (%)	220	85 (38.64) 117 (48 EE)	0.09
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 100, 11(0) \\ >60, $		51-40, n (%) 41-60, n (%)	241	117 (40.55) 121 (46.01)	0.05
Sex         Female, $n$ (%)         579 Male, $n$ (%)         259 (44.73) 204         0.21           Healthcare facility         Viedma Adult Hospital, $n$ (%) Male, $n$ (%)         360         150 (41.67)         0.36           Viedma Adult Hospital, $n$ (%) Manuel Ascencio Villarroel Hospital, $n$ (%)         206         93 (45.15)         0.32           Copacabana Clinic, $n$ (%)         81         31 (38.27)         0.56           María de los Ángeles Clinic, $n$ (%)         71         36 (50.70)         0.19           Others, $n$ (%)         65         30 (46.15)         0.65           Occupation         Clinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)         532         222 (41.73) 117 (47.20)         0.15           Household composition         Stwo children, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)         260         116         62 (53.45) (40.05)         0.01           Tobacco smoking         Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)         23         13         0.02           COVID-19 contact         Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158         103 (65.19)         NA           Symptoms         No symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms $^1$ , $n$ (%)         29         8         0.001           Working activity         Working during lockdown, $n$ (%) Symptoms $^1$ , $n$ (%)         29         266		$\geq 60. n$ (%)	59	17 (28.81)	0.02
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Healthcare facility} & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Sex			()	
Healthcare facility       Male, $n$ (%)       204       81 (39.71)       0.21         Healthcare facility       Viedma Adult Hospital, $n$ (%)       360       150 (41.67)       0.36         Manuel Ascencio Villarroel       206       93 (45.15)       0.32         Hospital, $n$ (%)       81       31 (38.27)       0.56         Maria de los Ángeles Clinic, $n$ (%)       71       36 (50.70)       0.19         Others, $n$ (%)       532       222 (41.73)       0.65         Occupation       Clinical HCWs, $n$ (%)       532       222 (41.73)       0.15         Household       Missing, $n$ (%)       532       222 (41.73)       0.15         Household       Missing, $n$ (%)       532       222 (41.73)       0.15         Household       Missing, $n$ (%)       3       1       0.16         Covincentric       -       -       -       0.01       0.02         Missing, $n$ (%)       260       115       0.01       0.02         CoVID-19 contact       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%)       67       17 (25.37)       0.02         Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         (%)       Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158 </td <td></td> <td>Female, <i>n</i> (%)</td> <td>579</td> <td>259 (44.73)</td> <td>0.21</td>		Female, <i>n</i> (%)	579	259 (44.73)	0.21
Healthcare facility       Viedma Adult Hospital, $n$ (%) Manuel Ascencio Villarroel Hospital, $n$ (%) Copacabana Clinic, $n$ (%) María de los Ángeles Clinic, $n$ (%) Occupation       360       150 (41.67)       0.36         Occupation       Capacabana Clinic, $n$ (%) Others, $n$ (%)       81       31 (38.27)       0.56         Occupation       Clinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Non-clinical HCWs, $n$ (%)       532       222 (41.73)       0.15         Household composition       Clinical HCWs, $n$ (%)       248       117 (47.20)       0.15         Household composition       >two children, $n$ (%)       248       117 (47.20)       0.15         Missing, $n$ (%)       260       115       0.01         Missing, $n$ (%)       260       115       0.01         Missing, $n$ (%)       260       115       0.02         Vivo children, $n$ (%)       67       17 (25.37)       0.02         No smoking, $n$ (%)       23       13       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%)       529       228 (43.10)       NA         Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         (%)       Relative not living in the same house, $n$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         (%)       No symptoms, $n$ (%)       29	TT 1/1 ( 11%	Male, <i>n</i> (%)	204	81 (39.71)	0.21
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Manuel Ascencio Villaria n(\%) \\ \text{Hospital, } n(\%) \\ \text{Maria de los Ángeles Clinic, } n(\%) \\ \text{Others, } n(\%) \\ \text{Others, } n(\%) \\ \text{Others, } n(\%) \\ \text{Others, } n(\%) \\ \text{Missing, } n(\%) \\ M$	Healthcare facility	Viedma Adult Hernital 4 (%)	360	150 (41 67)	0.36
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Hospital, } n (\%) & 206 & 93 (45.15) & 0.32 \\ \text{Copacabana Clinic, } n (\%) & 81 & 31 (38.27) & 0.56 \\ \text{Maria de los Ángeles Clinic, } n (\%) & 65 & 30 (46.15) & 0.65 \\ \text{Occupation} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Clinical HCWs, } n (\%) & 532 & 222 (41.73) \\ \text{Non-clinical HCWs, } n (\%) & 3 & 1 \\ \text{Household} & \hline \\ \text{composition} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Household} & \hline \\ \text{composition} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Tobacco smoking} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Active tobacco smokers, } n (\%) & 67 & 17 (25.37) \\ \text{No smoking, } n (\%) & 23 & 13 \\ \hline \\ \text{Tobacco smoking} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Active tobacco smokers, } n (\%) & 67 & 17 (25.37) \\ \text{No smoking, } n (\%) & 23 & 13 \\ \hline \\ \text{COVID-19 contact} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Patient, } n (\%) & \text{Relative not living in the same house, } n \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Symptoms} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{No symptoms, } n (\%) & 29 & 8 \\ \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Working activity} & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Working during lockdown, } n (\%) & 29 & 8 \\ \hline \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Working during lockdown, } n (\%) & 113 & 39 (34.51) \\ \hline \\ & \hline \\ \text{Working n (\%) & 14 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$		Manuel Ascencio Villarroel	500	130 (41.07)	0.50
$ \begin{array}{c} & \mbox{Copacabana} Clinic, n (\%) & 81 & 31 (38.27) & 0.56 \\ María de los Ángeles Clinic, n (\%) & 71 & 36 (50.70) & 0.19 \\ Others, n (\%) & 65 & 30 (46.15) & 0.65 \end{array} \\ \hline \\ Occupation & & \\ \hline \\ Clinical HCWs, n (\%) & 532 & 222 (41.73) \\ Non-clinical HCWs, n (\%) & 3 & 1 \end{array} \\ \hline \\ Household \\ composition & & \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Tobacco smoking & & \\ \hline \\ Tobacco smoking & & \\ \hline \\ COVID-19 contact & & \\ Patient, n (\%) & 67 & 17 (25.37) \\ No smoking, n (\%) & 67 & 17 (25.37) \\ No smoking, n (\%) & 693 & 310 (44.73) \\ Missing, n (\%) & 23 & 13 \end{array} \\ \hline \\ COVID-19 contact & & \\ Patient, n (\%) & 693 & 310 (44.73) \\ Patient, n (\%) & 693 & 310 (44.73) \\ Relative living in the same house, n & 158 & 103 (65.19) \\ Relative not living in the same house, n & 158 & 103 (65.19) \\ No symptoms & & \\ No symptoms, n (\%) & 348 & 76 (21.84) \\ Symptoms & & No symptoms, n (\%) & 406 & 256 (63.05) \\ Working activity & & \\ Working during lockdown, n (\%) & 406 & 256 (63.05) \\ Working during lockdown, n (\%) & 113 & 39 (34.51) \\ \hline \\ Working n (\%) & & 14 & 8 \end{array}$		Hospital, n (%)	206	93 (45.15)	0.32
$\begin{array}{c} & \operatorname{Maria} de \log \operatorname{Angeles} \operatorname{Clinic}, n (\%) & 71 & 36 (50.70) & 0.19 \\ \operatorname{Others}, n (\%) & 65 & 30 (46.15) & 0.65 \\ \end{array} \\ & \operatorname{Clinical} \operatorname{HCWs}, n (\%) & 532 & 222 (41.73) \\ \operatorname{Non-clinical} \operatorname{HCWs}, n (\%) & 248 & 117 (47.20) \\ \operatorname{Missing}, n (\%) & 3 & 1 \\ \end{array} \\ & \operatorname{Household} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \\ & \operatorname{Cupotion} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & \operatorname{Household} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ \operatorname{Cupotion} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		Copacabana Ćlinic, n (%)	81	31 (38.27)	0.56
OccupationOthers, $n$ (%)6530 (46.15)0.65OccupationClinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Non-clinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)532 248222 (41.73) 117 (47.20)0.15Household composition $116$ 62 (53.45) 4070.01Household composition $116$ 62 (53.45) 4070.01Tobacco smoking No smoking, $n$ (%)260115Tobacco smoking No smoking, $n$ (%)67 40717 (25.37) 310 (44.73)0.02COVID-19 contactPatient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%)529 158228 (43.10) 158NASymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)348 256 (63.05)76 (21.84) 290.001Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)348 11376 (21.84) 39 (34.51)0.041 0.041		María de los Ángeles Clinic, n (%)	71	36 (50.70)	0.19
Occupation       Clinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Non-clinical HCWs, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       532 248 117 (47.20) 3       222 (41.73) 117 (47.20) 3       0.15         Household composition       >two children, $n$ (%) $\leq two children, n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       116 407 260       62 (53.45) 115       0.01         Tobacco smoking       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       67 693       17 (25.37) 310 (44.73)       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%) Relative rot living in the same house, $n$ 529       228 (43.10) 158       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       348       76 (21.84) 256 (63.05) 8       <0.001		Others, $n$ (%)	65	30 (46.15)	0.65
Control HCWS, $n$ (%)352222 (41.73)0.15Non-clinical HCWS, $n$ (%)248117 (47.20)0.15Missing, $n$ (%)311Household>two children, $n$ (%)407163 (40.05)0.01Stwo children, $n$ (%)407163 (40.05)0.01Tobacco smokingActive tobacco smokers, $n$ (%)6717 (25.37)0.02Missing, $n$ (%)23130.02COVID-19 contactPatient, $n$ (%)529228 (43.10)NARelative living in the same house, $n$ (%)158103 (65.19)NASymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%)34876 (21.84)0.001SymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%)2980.001Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n$ (%) Not working during lockdown, $n$ (%)11339 (34.51)0.041	Occupation	Clinical HCMa $\mu$ (%)	E22	222 (41 72)	
Household compositionHousehold (%) </td <td></td> <td>Non-clinical HCWs, <math>n</math> (%)</td> <td>248</td> <td>222 (41.75) 117 (47.20)</td> <td>0.15</td>		Non-clinical HCWs, $n$ (%)	248	222 (41.75) 117 (47.20)	0.15
Household composition       >two children, $n$ (%) $\leq$ two children, $n$ (%) Missing, n (%)       116 407       62 (53.45) 163 (40.05)       0.01         Tobacco smoking       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) No smoking, n (%)       67 23       17 (25.37) 310 (44.73)       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%) Relative not living in the same house, $n$ 529 158       228 (43.10) 109       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms $1, n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       348 29       76 (21.84) 256 (63.05)       <0.001		Missing, n (%)	3	1 1	
composition       >two children, $n$ (%)       116       62 (53.45)       0.01         Stwo children, $n$ (%)       163 (40.05)       115       0.01         Tobacco smoking       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%)       67       17 (25.37)       0.02         No smoking, $n$ (%)       23       13       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%)       529       228 (43.10)       NA         Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         (%)       Relative not living in the same house, $n$ 109       37 (33.94)         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%)       348       76 (21.84)       <0.001	Household		-		
>two children, $n$ (%) $\leq$ two children, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       116 407       62 (53.45) 407       0.01         Tobacco smoking       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) No smoking, $n$ (%)       67 23       17 (25.37) 310 (44.73)       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%)       529 (%)       228 (43.10) 158       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms $n$ (%)       348 76 (21.84) 29       76 (21.84) 29       <0.001	composition				
Symptoms $407$ $163(40.05)$ $407$ No smoking, n (%) $260$ $115$ $0.02$ COVID-19 contact       Active tobacco smokers, n (%) $67$ $17(25.37)$ $0.02$ Patient, n (%) $23$ $310(44.73)$ $0.02$ Relative tobacco smokers, n (%) $67$ $17(25.37)$ $0.02$ Symptoms       Patient, n (%) $23$ $13$ $0.02$ No symptoms, n (%) $23$ $13$ $0.02$ Symptoms       No symptoms, n (%) $529$ $228(43.10)$ $NA$ Working activity       No symptoms, n (%) $348$ $76(21.84)$ $0.001$ Working activity       Working during lockdown, n (%) $29$ $8$ $0.041$ Working activity       Working during lockdown, n (%) $656$ $294(44.82)$ $0.041$ (%)       Missing, n (%) $113$ $39(34.51)$ $0.041$		>two children, n (%)	116	62 (53.45)	0.01
Tobacco smokingActive tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) No smoking, $n$ (%)67 693 23175COVID-19 contactActive tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)67 2317 (25.37) 310 (44.73)0.02Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%)529 158228 (43.10) 103 (65.19)NASymptomsRelative not living in the same house, $n$ (%)109 24037 (33.94)NASymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms $^1, n$ (%)348 406 2976 (21.84) 8<0.001		$\leq$ two children, n (%)	407	163 (40.05)	0101
Notice of Moding       Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%) No smoking, $n$ (%)       67 (693 23       17 (25.37) 310 (44.73) 13       0.02         COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%) Relative not living in the same house, $n$ (%)       529 158       228 (43.10) 103 (65.19)       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms <sup>1</sup> , $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       348 29       76 (21.84) 29       <0.001	Tobacco smoking	wissing, <i>n</i> (78)	200	115	
COVID-19 contact       No smoking, $n$ (%)       693       310 (44.73)       0.02         Patient, $n$ (%)       23       13       13         Patient, $n$ (%)       23       13       NA         Relative living in the same house, $n$ 529       228 (43.10)       NA         (%)       Relative not living in the same house, $n$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n$ (%)       348       76 (21.84)          Symptoms <sup>1</sup> , $n$ (%)       29       8           Working activity       Working during lockdown, $n$ (%)       656       294 (44.82)       0.041         (%)       113       39 (34.51)        0.041	iobucco billoking	Active tobacco smokers, $n$ (%)	67	17 (25.37)	
COVID-19 contact       Missing, $n (\%)$ 23       13         Patient, $n (\%)$ Fatient, $n (\%)$ 529       228 (43.10)         Relative living in the same house, $n (\%)$ 158       103 (65.19)       NA         Symptoms       No symptoms, $n (\%)$ 348       76 (21.84)       <0.001		No smoking, <i>n</i> (%)	693	310 (44.73)	0.02
COVID-19 contact       Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house, $n$ (%) Symptoms       529       228 (43.10) 158       NA         Symptoms       Relative not living in the same house, $n$ (%) Symptoms, $n$ (%) Symptoms <sup>1</sup> , $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       348       76 (21.84) 29       <0.001		Missing, n (%)	23	13	
Patient, $n$ (%)529228 (43.10)Relative living in the same house, $n$ 158103 (65.19)NA(%)Relative not living in the same house, $n$ (%)10937 (33.94)SymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%)34876 (21.84) 256 (63.05)<0.001	COVID-19 contact	$\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{r}}$	E20	229 (42 10)	
No symptomsNo symptoms, $n (\%)$ 348 406 2976 (21.84) 29<0.001Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n (\%)$ Missing, $n (\%)$ 656 406 29294 (44.82) 1130.041		Patient, $n$ (%) Relative living in the same house $n$	529	228 (43.10)	NIA
No symptoms $109$ $37 (33.94)$ SymptomsNo symptoms, $n (\%)$ $348$ $76 (21.84)$ No symptoms, $n (\%)$ $348$ $76 (21.84)$ $256 (63.05)$ Symptoms $1, n (\%)$ $406$ $256 (63.05)$ $400$ Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n (\%)$ $656$ $294 (44.82)$ $0.041$ Not working during lockdown, $n (\%)$ $113$ $39 (34.51)$ $0.041$ Missing, $n (\%)$ $14$ $8$ $8$		$\binom{0}{2}$	158	103 (65.19)	INA
Symptoms109 $37(33.94)$ SymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%) $348$ $76$ (21.84)Symptoms $^1$ , $n$ (%) $406$ $256$ (63.05) $<0.001$ Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n$ (%) $656$ $294$ (44.82) $0.041$ Not working during lockdown, $n$ (%) $113$ $39$ (34.51) $<0.041$ Missing, $n$ (%)14 $8$ $<0.041$		Relative not living in the same			
SymptomsNo symptoms, $n$ (%)348 Symptoms, $n$ (%)76 (21.84) 256 (63.05)<0.001Working activityWorking during lockdown, $n$ (%) Not working during lockdown, $n$ (%)656 8294 (44.82) 1130.041Working n (%)11339 (34.51)0.041		house, <i>n</i> (%)	109	37 (33.94)	
Working activityNo symptoms, $n$ (%)348 Symptoms 1, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)76 (21.84) 20 <b>&lt;0.001</b> Working activitySymptoms 1, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)298 <b>&lt;0.001</b> Working during lockdown, $n$ (%) Not working during lockdown, $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)656294 (44.82) 113 <b>0.041</b>	Symptoms	, , ,			
Working activity       Symptoms $^{1}$ , $n$ (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       406       256 (63.05)       C001         Working activity       Missing, $n$ (%)       29       8       0.041         Working during lockdown, $n$ (%) Not working during lockdown, $n$ 656       294 (44.82)       0.041         (%) Missing, $n$ (%)       113       39 (34.51)         Missing, $n$ (%)       14       8		No symptoms, n (%)	348	76 (21.84)	<0.001
Working activityMissing, $n$ (%)298Working during lockdown, $n$ (%)656294 (44.82)0.041Not working during lockdown, $n$ 11339 (34.51)(%)Missing, $n$ (%)148		Symptoms $1, n$ (%)	406	256 (63.05)	(0.001
Working activity         Working during lockdown, n (%)         656         294 (44.82)         0.041           Not working during lockdown, n         113         39 (34.51)         (%)         113         39 (34.51)           Missing, n (%)         14         8         8	Working activity	Missing, $n$ (%)	29	8	
Not working during lockdown, n         0.041           (%)         113         39 (34.51)           Missing, n (%)         14         8	working activity	Working during lockdown $n$ (%)	656	294 (44 82)	
$\begin{array}{c} (\%) \\ \text{Missing, } n (\%) \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 113 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 8 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 39 (34.51) \\ 8 \\ \end{array}$		Not working during lockdown, n	000		0.041
Missing, n (%) 14 8		(%)	113	39 (34.51)	
		Missing, n (%)	14	8	

<sup>1</sup> Ageusia, anosmia, or at least two of the followings: fever, cough, tiredness, rhinitis, sore throat, headache, conjunctivitis, or diarrhea. Abbreviations: *n*: number; NA: Not applicable; SD: Standard Deviation. Significant values are in bold (after Bonferroni correction for variables for more than 2 categories).

# 3.2. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence

Overall, 340/783 (43.4%; 95% CI 38.8–48.0) participants were seropositive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. There was no significant difference in sex, blood type, healthcare facility, or type of protective masks used.

In univariate model, according to occupation, cleaning workers were associated to a higher seroprevalence (58%, OR: 1.94; 95% CI 1.24–3.03). Seropositivity was associated with having more than two children living in the same house (53.4%, OR: 1.71; 95% CI 1.13–2.60), having been in contact with a close relative with COVID-19 (65.2%, OR: 3.07; 95% CI 2.13–4.42), and working during lockdown (44.8%, OR: 1.54; 95% CI 1.02–2.34). Of note, tobacco smoking was negatively associated with seropositivity (25.4%, OR: 0.420; 95% CI 0.24–0.74) (Figure 1). According to multivariate analysis, belonging to the cleaning staff, having more than two children living in the same house, and being in contact with a close relative with COVID-19 were significantly associated with SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity, and smoking was significantly associated with seronegativity (Table S3 and Figure 2).



Odds ratio

**Figure 1.** Odds ratio (CI 95%) of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity in healthcare workers. Cochabamba (Bolivia), January 2021.



**Figure 2.** Multivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence (significant *p*-values) -associated factors in healthcare workers. Cochabamba, Bolivia. January 2021. Data are presented as odds ratio with CI 95%.

Among seropositive participants, 22.9% (76/332) did not report any of the symptoms mentioned in the questionnaire. Anosmia (OR: 30.42; 95% CI 16.09–57.50) and the combination of anosmia and ageusia (OR: 68.11; 95% CI 24.83–186.80) were highly predictive of SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity (Figure 1). Of participants who reported symptoms or were seropositive for IgG, ~50% had a history of previous PCR and/or antigen testing. Participants who reported an underlying disease were 4.14 times more likely to be hospitalized (OR: 4.14; 95% CI 1.82–9.42).

#### 3.3. Diagnostic Tests

Three hundred nineteen out of 340 (93.8%) seropositive participants had positive results for all three assays (ELISA, CLIA, and VNT). For ELISA and CLIA tests, the sensitivity was 98.2% and 97.0%, the specificity was 97.3% and 99.0%, the positive predictive value was 97.0% and 98.8%, and the negative predictive value was 98.4% and 96.5%, respectively, with almost perfect agreement between both tests (Cohen's k: 0.91). In VNT, only positive or equivocal ELISA and CLIA results were tested, showing a VNT sensitivity and specificity of 100%.

## 3.4. Treatment

A total of 47.5% (315/663) of HCWs had received at least one type of medication, mainly ivermectin (224/663, 33.8%), azithromycin (179/663, 27.0%), and corticosteroids (53/663, 7.9%), and more frequently in symptomatic (225/350, 64.3%) than in asymptomatic participants (85/296, 28.7%).

Oral chlorine dioxide was used by 83/735 (11.3%) HCWs, more often in non-clinical HCWs (39/222, 17.6%) than clinical HCWs (44/510, 8.6%), and more often in symptomatic (53/386, 13.7%) than asymptomatic participants (29/327, 8.7%).

## 4. Discussion

We found that the SARS-CoV-2 attack rate was massive among clinical and nonclinical HCWs from Cochabamba, Bolivia by the end of January 2021, with a seroprevalence of 43.4% documented by a combination of IgG detection tests with high sensitivity and specificity. This is, as far as we know, the highest rate reported from seroprevalence studies performed among HCWs in Latin America in 2020: 0.75–0.9% in Argentina [10,11], 5.5–21.4% in Brazil [12–15], 2.0–24% in Chile [16,17], 8.3% [18] in Colombia, 6–20% in Mexico [19,20], 11.6% in Panama [21]. A single study reported a very high seroprevalence (58.3%) in Peru [22], but it relied on rapid tests.

Consistent with previous reports in the international literature, anosmia and the combination of anosmia and ageusia were the most specific predictive symptoms associated with evidence for previous SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity [23,24]. A total of 22.9% of seropositive participants did not mention any symptoms [23,25]. The number of asymptomatic cases and the lack of diagnosis in almost 50% of symptomatic HCWs could have contributed to a substantial number of secondary infections and to the high seroprevalence rates observed.

In univariate analysis, seropositivity did not differ by sex, health facility, age, or the type of protective mask used. In multivariate analysis, whilst clinical HCWs were more exposed to COVID-19 patients than non-clinical HCWs (77.4% vs. 46.4%), cleaning workers were associated with the highest seroprevalence (57.9%), as previously described [26,27]. This excess risk in low-income occupational groups may be related to their frequent use of public transportation, less adherence to social distancing and the use of face masks, living in overcrowded housing (50% lived with more than five persons in our study), and limited access to diagnostic tests. Being in contact with a close relative with COVID-19 and living with more than two children were also significantly associated with seropositivity. As previously reported [8], children may play an important role in household transmission, reinforced by the frequent occurrence of asymptomatic infections [28].

Active tobacco smokers exhibited lower IgG seroprevalence compared with nonsmokers [8,29–31]. This should not be taken as a false message to promote smoking to avoid infection [32]. On the one hand, tobacco smoking is independently associated with a clear excess risk of severe disease (e.g., cancer, respiratory and cardiovascular diseases), and, on the other hand, it is possible that tobacco smokers infected with SARS-CoV-2 are prone to develop severe disease [33]. Previous studies identified a lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection among people with blood type O [9,34–37]. We did not find this trend in our study, but the overwhelming proportion of blood group O in Bolivia [38] (76.7% in our study) makes this type of assessment difficult and suggests that larger studies are needed to precisely assess this association.

In Bolivia, the spread of COVID-19 was accompanied by great concern among the general population, misinformation, and common self-medication [39]. The antiparasitic ivermectin and the antibiotic azithromycin, alone or combined with the anti-malarial hydroxychloroquine, grabbed attention [40,41] and were widely used as treatment or prophylaxis for SARS-CoV-2 infection after having shown some antiviral activity in vitro [42,43]

and sometimes recommended by the health authorities [44]. We found that ivermectin (33.8%) and azithromycin (26.9%) were frequent used (also occurred among HCWs) amid the fear of contracting the disease (28.7% in asymptomatic participants) or to treat it (64.3% in symptomatic participants). In addition, chlorine dioxide, a derivate of bleach, which is potentially toxic and can cause serious and potentially life-threating side effects, falsely marketed as "Miracle Mineral Solution" for prevention and treatment of COVID-19 [45], has been commonly used by the Bolivian population (11.3% in our study) and even promoted by health authorities [1].

Our study has some limitations. It was carried out among volunteer healthcare workers, which may have resulted in a bias towards those who have already been infected with SARS-CoV-2, either presumed or confirmed. Therefore, the prevalence figures provided should be considered as order-of-magnitude indications. On the other hand, the strength of this research program lies in the consistency of the information collected (with reference to other international studies and to what is known about the dynamics of the epidemic in Bolivia and the behavior of the population) and in the possibility of collecting seroprevalence data prior to the implementation of vaccination campaigns.

#### 5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study shows high seroprevalence rates among HCWs in Cochabamba, Bolivia, suggesting that the first wave of COVID-19 had a considerable impact on this occupational group. Better information and protective measures, continuous awareness and sensibilization, and a greater access to diagnostic tests are needed to reduce the risk of infection.

**Supplementary Materials:** The following are available online at https://www.mdpi.com/article/ 10.3390/v14020232/s1, Table S1: Demographics, occupational exposure, symptoms, and tobacco smoking in healthcare workers according to SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence. Cochabamba (Bolivia), January 2021. Table S2: Diagnostic tests performed and medication used before sample collection by healthcare workers. Cochabamba (Bolivia), January 2021. Table S3: Multivariate analysis of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence-associated factors in healthcare workers (including significant variables). Cochabamba (Bolivia), January 2021.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, X.d.L. and P.M.S.V.; methodology, A.A., S.M.A., E.N. and P.M.S.V.; software, M.S.; validation, X.d.L., P.M.S.V. and L.N.; formal analysis, P.M.S.V. and X.d.L.; investigation, P.M.S.V.; resources, X.d.L. and L.N.; data curation, P.M.S.V.; writing—original draft preparation, P.M.S.V. and X.d.L.; writing—review and editing, L.P. and X.d.L.; project administration, M.d.R.C.S., V.U., H.S. and A.M.J.; funding acquisition, X.d.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This work was partially funded by the Institute of Research for Development (IRD) and the French agency for emerging infectious diseases (ANRS-MIE).

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Mario Ortíz Suárez Hospital (No. 09/2020).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data that support the findings of the study are available within the article. Additional data are available upon request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank all the medical, laboratory, and administration staff from all healthcare facilities, especially to Fanny Condori, Daniela Nina, and John Brito from Viedma Hospital; Iris Galindo and Miguel Saez from Manuel Ascencio Villarroel Hospital; and Elizabeth Villarroel from Central Diagnostic Laboratory for their contribution in enrolling participants.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

# References

- Saavedra, V.V.; López, M.A.; Dauby, N. The Heavy Toll of COVID-19 in Bolivia: A Tale of Distrust, Despair, and Health Inequalities. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* 2021, 104, 1607–1608. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 2. COVID-19 Daily Update—Region of the Americas—PAHO/WHO|Pan American Health Organization. Available online: https://www.paho.org/en/covid-19-global-and-regional-daily-update (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- Ministerio de Salud y Deportes de Bolivia—Gobierno Insta a Cumplir la Cuarentena Domiciliaria Para Evitar la Propagación del COVID-19: Bolivia Registra 24 Casos. Available online: https://www.minsalud.gob.bo/3995-gobierno-insta-a-cumplir-lacuarentena-domiciliaria-para-evitar-la-propagacion-del-covid-19-bolivia-registra-24-casos (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- 4. PAHO COVID-19 Daily Update: 1 January 2021—PAHO/WHO | Pan American Health Organization. Available online: https://www.paho.org/en/documents/paho-covid-19-daily-update-1-january-2021 (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- 5. Bolivia (Plurinational State of): WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard with Vaccination Data. Available online: https://covid19.who.int (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- Ministerio de Salud y Deportes de Bolivia—Inicia El Proceso de Vacunación Al Personal de Salud Que Lucha en Primera Línea Contra la Pandemia. Available online: https://www.minsalud.gob.bo/5230-inicia-proceso-vacunacion (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- 7. Instituto Nacional de Estadística. Available online: https://www.ine.gob.bo/ (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- Carrat, F.; de Lamballerie, X.; Rahib, D.; Blanché, H.; Lapidus, N.; Artaud, F.; Kab, S.; Renuy, A.; de Edelenyi, F.S.; Meyer, L.; et al. Antibody Status and Cumulative Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Adults in Three Regions of France Following the First Lockdown and Associated Risk Factors: A Multicohort Study. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 2021, *50*, 1458–1472. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 9. Gallian, P.; Pastorino, B.; Morel, P.; Chiaroni, J.; Ninove, L.; de Lamballerie, X. Lower Prevalence of Antibodies Neutralizing SARS-CoV-2 in Group O French Blood Donors. *Antivir. Res.* 2020, *181*, 104880. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 10. Silva, A.P.; Aguirre, M.F.; Ballejo, C.; Marro, M.J.; Gamarnik, A.; Vargas, G.; Pifano, M.; Varela, T.; García, E.; Lawrynowicz, A.; et al. Seroprevalencia de infección por SARS-CoV-2 en personal de salud de la region sanitaria VIII, provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Rev. Argent. Salud Publica* **2020**, *12*, 14.
- 11. Insúa, C.; Stedile, G.; Figueroa, V.; Hernández, C.; Svartz, A.; Ferrero, F.; Ossorio, M.F.; Brunetto, O. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies among Physicians from a Children's Hospital. *Arch. Argent. Pediatr.* **2020**, *118*, 381–385. [CrossRef]
- 12. De Oliveira, M.S.; Lobo, R.D.; Detta, F.P.; Vieira-Junior, J.M.; de Souza Castro, T.L.; Zambelli, D.B.; Cardoso, L.F.; Borges, I.C.; Tozetto-Mendoza, T.R.; Costa, S.F.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Risk Factors among Health Care Workers: Estimating the Risk of COVID-19 Dedicated Units. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **2021**, *49*, 1197–1199. [CrossRef]
- Dubiela, A.L.F.; Lana, D.F.D.; Aerts, A.P.K.; de Marques, C.G.; Cassol, R.; Dalarosa, M.G.; Schultz, V.; Ramos, F.; Guasso, I.; Filho, F.F.D.; et al. Prevalence of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) among Healthcare Professionals Working in Hospital Emergencies during the First-Wave Peak in 2020 in Porto Alegre, Brazil. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* 2021, 29, 1–2. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Costa, S.F.; Giavina-Bianchi, P.; Buss, L.; Mesquita Peres, C.H.; Rafael, M.M.; dos Santos, L.G.N.; Bedin, A.A.; Francisco, M.C.P.B.; Satakie, F.M.; Jesus Menezes, M.A.; et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Seroprevalence and Risk Factors among Oligo/Asymptomatic Healthcare Workers: Estimating the Impact of Community Transmission. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 2021, 73, e1214–e1218. [CrossRef]
- de Melo, M.S.; Borges, L.P.; de Souza, D.R.V.; Martins, A.F.; Neto, J.M.d.R.; Ribeiro, A.A.; Santos, A.A.; da Invenção, G.B.; Matos, I.L.S.; dos Santos, K.A.; et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG Antibodies in Health Workers in Sergipe, Brazil. *medRxiv* 2020. [CrossRef]
- Zuñiga, M.; O'Ryan, M.; Bertoglia, M.P.; Bravo, P.; Lagomarcino, A.J.; Muñoz, S.; Peña Alonso, A.; Rodriguez, M.A.; Vial, P.A. SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Prevalence Among 85,529 Healthcare Workers Following the First Wave of COVID-19 in Chile; Social Science Research Network: Rochester, NY, USA, 2021.
- 17. Iruretagoyena, M.; Vial, M.R.; Spencer-Sandino, M.; Gaete, P.; Peters, A.; Delgado, I.; Perez, I.; Calderon, C.; Porte, L.; Legarraga, P.; et al. Longitudinal Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 IgG Seroconversionamong Front-Line Healthcare Workers during the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic at a Tertiary-Care Hospital in Chile. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2021**, *21*, 478. [CrossRef]
- Ariza, B.; Torres, X.; Salgado, D.; Cepeda, M.; Restrepo, C.G.; Castellanos, J.C.; Suárez-Obando, F.; Cuellar, A.; Cardozo, C.; Ángel, J.; et al. Seroprevalence and Seroconversion Rates to SARS-CoV-2 in Interns, Residents, and Medical Doctors in a University Hospital in Bogotá, Colombia. *Infectio* 2021, 25, 145–152. [CrossRef]
- Orozco, M.A.; Aguilera, J.M.R.; Hernández, B.A.B.; Baeza, G.B.G.; del Rosario Sánchez Navarro, M. Seroprevalencia y seguimiento de anticuerpos IgG contra SARS-CoV-2 en personal del Laboratorio Estatal de Salud Pública de Guanajuato LaESaP. *Nova Sci.* 2021, 13, 1. [CrossRef]
- Cruz-Arenas, E.; Cabrera-Ruiz, E.; Laguna-Barcenas, S.; Colin-Castro, C.A.; Chavez, T.; Franco-Cendejas, R.; Ibarra, C.; Perez-Orive, J. Serological Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Associated Factors in Healthcare Workers in a "Non-COVID" Hospital in Mexico City. *PLoS ONE* 2021, *16*, e0255916. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 21. Villarreal, A.; Rangel, G.; Zhang, X.; Wong, D.; Britton, G.; Fernandez, P.L.; Pérez, A.; Oviedo, D.; Restrepo, C.; Carreirra, M.B.; et al. Performance of a Point of Care Test for Detecting IgM and IgG Antibodies Against SARS-CoV-2 and Seroprevalence in Blood Donors and Health Care Workers in Panama. *Front. Med.* 2021, *8*, 616106. [CrossRef]

- Chafloque-Vásquez, R.A.; Pampa-Espinoza, L.; Celis Salinas, J.C.; Chafloque-Vásquez, R.A.; Pampa-Espinoza, L.; Celis Salinas, J.C. Seroprevalencia de COVID-19 En Trabajadores de Un Hospital de La Amazonía Peruana. Acta Médica Peru. 2020, 37, 390–392. [CrossRef]
- Garcia-Basteiro, A.L.; Moncunill, G.; Tortajada, M.; Vidal, M.; Guinovart, C.; Jiménez, A.; Santano, R.; Sanz, S.; Méndez, S.; Llupià, A.; et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among Health Care Workers in a Large Spanish Reference Hospital. *Nat. Commun.* 2020, *11*, 3500. [CrossRef]
- Menni, C.; Valdes, A.M.; Freidin, M.B.; Sudre, C.H.; Nguyen, L.H.; Drew, D.A.; Ganesh, S.; Varsavsky, T.; Cardoso, M.J.; El-Sayed Moustafa, J.S.; et al. Real-Time Tracking of Self-Reported Symptoms to Predict Potential COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* 2020, 26, 1037–1040. [CrossRef]
- 25. Kim, G.-U.; Kim, M.-J.; Ra, S.H.; Lee, J.; Bae, S.; Jung, J.; Kim, S.-H. Clinical Characteristics of Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Patients with Mild COVID-19. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **2020**, *26*, 948.e1–948.e3. [CrossRef]
- Shields, A.; Faustini, S.E.; Perez-Toledo, M.; Jossi, S.; Aldera, E.; Allen, J.D.; Al-Taei, S.; Backhouse, C.; Bosworth, A.; Dunbar, L.A.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Asymptomatic Viral Carriage in Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Thorax* 2020, 75, 1089–1094. [CrossRef]
- 27. Lan, F.-Y.; Wei, C.-F.; Hsu, Y.-T.; Christiani, D.C.; Kales, S.N. Work-Related COVID-19 Transmission in Six Asian Countries/Areas: A Follow-up Study. *PLoS ONE* **2020**, *15*, e0233588. [CrossRef]
- Ludvigsson, J.F. Systematic Review of COVID-19 in Children Shows Milder Cases and a Better Prognosis than Adults. Acta Paediatr. 2020, 109, 1088–1095. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 29. Meini, S.; Fortini, A.; Andreini, R.; Sechi, L.A.; Tascini, C. The Paradox of the Low Prevalence of Current Smokers Among COVID-19 Patients Hospitalized in Nonintensive Care Wards: Results From an Italian Multicenter Case–Control Study. *Nicotine Tob. Res.* **2021**, *23*, 1436–1440. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Farsalinos, K.; Bagos, P.G.; Giannouchos, T.; Niaura, R.; Barbouni, A.; Poulas, K. Smoking Prevalence among Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients and Its Association with Disease Severity and Mortality: An Expanded Re-Analysis of a Recent Publication. *Harm Reduct. J.* 2021, 18, 9. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Simons, D.; Shahab, L.; Brown, J.; Perski, O. The Association of Smoking Status with SARS-CoV-2 Infection, Hospitalization and Mortality from COVID-19: A Living Rapid Evidence Review with Bayesian Meta-Analyses (Version 7). *Addiction* 2021, 116, 1319–1368. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 32. van Westen-Lagerweij, N.A.; Meijer, E.; Meeuwsen, E.G.; Chavannes, N.H.; Willemsen, M.C.; Croes, E.A. Are Smokers Protected against SARS-CoV-2 Infection (COVID-19)? The Origins of the Myth. *npj Prim. Care Respir. Med.* **2021**, *31*, 10. [CrossRef]
- 33. Smoking and COVID-19. Available online: https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/smoking-and-covid-19 (accessed on 8 November 2021).
- Li, J.; Wang, X.; Chen, J.; Cai, Y.; Deng, A.; Yang, M. Association between ABO Blood Groups and Risk of SARS-CoV-2 Pneumonia. Br. J. Haematol. 2020, 190, 24–27. [CrossRef]
- Barnkob, M.B.; Pottegård, A.; Støvring, H.; Haunstrup, T.M.; Homburg, K.; Larsen, R.; Hansen, M.B.; Titlestad, K.; Aagaard, B.; Møller, B.K.; et al. Reduced Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in ABO Blood Group O. *Blood Adv.* 2020, 4, 4990–4993. [CrossRef]
- Göker, H.; Aladağ Karakulak, E.; Demiroğlu, H.; Ayaz Ceylan, Ç.M.; Büyükaşik, Y.; Inkaya, A.Ç.; Aksu, S.; Sayinalp, N.; Haznedaroğlu, I.C.; Uzun, Ö.; et al. The Effects of Blood Group Types on the Risk of COVID-19 Infection and Its Clinical Outcome. *Turk. J. Med. Sci.* 2020, 50, 679–683. [CrossRef]
- 37. Wu, Y.; Feng, Z.; Li, P.; Yu, Q. Relationship between ABO Blood Group Distribution and Clinical Characteristics in Patients with COVID-19. *Clin. Chim. Acta* 2020, *509*, 220–223. [CrossRef]
- Ministerio de Salud y Deportes de Bolivia—Ministerio De Salud Recuerda Existen 4 Grupos Sanguíneos "La Sangre Nos Conecta A Todos, Extiende Tu Brazo A La Vida Dona Sangre. Available online: https://www.minsalud.gob.bo/1219-ministeriode-salud-recuerda-existen-4-grupos-sanguineos-la-sangre-nos-conecta-a-todos-extiende-tu-brazo-a-la-vida-dona-sangre (accessed on 29 November 2021).
- Quispe-Cañari, J.F.; Fidel-Rosales, E.; Manrique, D.; Mascaró-Zan, J.; Huamán-Castillón, K.M.; Chamorro–Espinoza, S.E.; Garayar–Peceros, H.; Ponce–López, V.L.; Sifuentes-Rosales, J.; Alvarez-Risco, A.; et al. Self-Medication Practices during the COVID-19 Pandemic among the Adult Population in Peru: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Saudi Pharm. J.* 2021, 29, 1–11. [CrossRef]
- Román, B.R.; Moscoso, S.; Chung, S.A.; Terceros, B.L.; Álvarez-Risco, A.; Yáñez, J.A. Tratamiento de la COVID-19 en Perú y Bolivia y los riesgos de la automedicación. *Rev. Cuba. Farm.* 2020, 53, 1–20.
- Heimfarth, L.; Santos, V.S.; Araújo, A.A.d.S.; Quintans-Júnior, L.J.; Martins-Filho, P.R. Ivermectin: Panacea or True Promise for COVID-19. EXCLI J. 2020, 19, 1517–1519. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 42. Caly, L.; Druce, J.D.; Catton, M.G.; Jans, D.A.; Wagstaff, K.M. The FDA-Approved Drug Ivermectin Inhibits the Replication of SARS-CoV-2 In Vitro. *Antivir. Res.* 2020, 178, 104787. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Gautret, P.; Lagier, J.-C.; Parola, P.; Hoang, V.T.; Meddeb, L.; Mailhe, M.; Doudier, B.; Courjon, J.; Giordanengo, V.; Vieira, V.E.; et al. Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin as a Treatment of COVID-19: Results of an Open-Label Non-Randomized Clinical Trial. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 2020, *56*, 105949. [CrossRef]

- 44. Mega, E.R. Latin America's Embrace of an Unproven COVID Treatment Is Hindering Drug Trials. *Nature* **2020**, *586*, 481–482. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 45. Commissioner, O. Of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Warns Seller Marketing Dangerous Chlorine Dioxide Products that Claim to Treat or Prevent COVID-19. Available online: https://www.fda.gov/news-events/pressannouncements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-warns-seller-marketing-dangerous-chlorine-dioxide-products-claim (accessed on 29 November 2021).