

1 **Context matters: Contrasting behavioral and residential risk factors for Lyme disease**  
2 **between two high-incidence regions in the Northeastern and Midwestern U.S.**

3

4 **Authors:** Bron <sup>a,b,†</sup>, Gebbiena M., Fernandez <sup>c,d,e</sup> †, Maria del P., Larson <sup>a,b,1</sup>, Scott R., Maus  
5 <sup>f</sup>, Adam, Gustafson <sup>f</sup>, Dave, Tsao <sup>b,g</sup>, Jean I., Diuk-Wasser <sup>d,e</sup>, Maria A., Bartholomay <sup>b,h</sup>,  
6 Lyric C., Paskewitz\* <sup>a,b</sup>, Susan, M.

7 <sup>a</sup>Department of Entomology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1630 Linden Drive,  
8 Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA. [gbron@wisc.edu](mailto:gbron@wisc.edu), [adam.maus@wisc.edu](mailto:adam.maus@wisc.edu),  
9 [dgustafson@wisc.edu](mailto:dgustafson@wisc.edu), [lyric.bartholomay@wisc.edu](mailto:lyric.bartholomay@wisc.edu), [smpaskew@wisc.edu](mailto:smpaskew@wisc.edu)

10 <sup>b</sup>Midwest Center of Excellence for Vector-Borne Diseases, 1656 Linden Drive, Madison,  
11 WI, USA.

12 <sup>c</sup>Earth Institute, Columbia University, New York, USA. [Mpf2131@columbia.edu](mailto:Mpf2131@columbia.edu)

13 <sup>d</sup>Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, Columbia University, New  
14 York, USA. [Mad2256@columbia.edu](mailto:Mad2256@columbia.edu)

15 <sup>e</sup>Northeast Regional Center for Excellence for Vector-Borne Diseases, USA.

16 <sup>f</sup>Center for Health Enhancement System Studies (CHESS), Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

17 <sup>g</sup>Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan,  
18 USA. [tsao@msu.edu](mailto:tsao@msu.edu)

19 <sup>h</sup>Department of Pathobiological Sciences, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1656 Linden  
20 Drive, Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA.

21 <sup>1</sup>Present address: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, 2099 University Avenue West,  
22 Saint Paul, Minnesota, 55104, USA. [Slarson@mmcd.org](mailto:Slarson@mmcd.org)

23

24 \* Corresponding author: [smpaskew@wisc.edu](mailto:smpaskew@wisc.edu)

25 † Both authors contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 **Highlights**

27 - Use of personal tick prevention was associated with more frequent outdoor activity

28 - Personal protective measure use was higher in the Midwest than Northeast

29 - Interventions reducing peridomestic deer and ticks more common in the Northeast

30

31 **Abstract.** The dynamics of zoonotic vector-borne diseases are determined by a complex set  
32 of parameters including human behavior that may vary with socio-ecological contexts. Lyme  
33 disease is the most common vector-borne disease in the United States and the Northeast and  
34 upper Midwest are the regions most affected - two areas with differing levels of urbanization  
35 and sociocultural settings. The probability of being diagnosed with Lyme disease is related to  
36 the risk of encounters with an infected blacklegged tick, which reflects both the  
37 environmental tick hazard and human behaviors. Herein, we compare behavioral and  
38 peridomestic risk factors associated with human-tick encounters between high-incidence  
39 states in the Northeast (New York and New Jersey) and Midwest (Wisconsin) of the United  
40 States. We used a smartphone application, The Tick App, as a novel survey tool, during  
41 spring and summer of 2018. Adaptive human behavior was identified in the relationship  
42 between outdoor activities and the use of preventive methods. More frequent recreational  
43 outdoor activities and gardening (a peridomestic activity) were associated with an increased  
44 likelihood of using personal protective measures. Weekly participation in non-seasonal  
45 recreational and peridomestic outdoor activities in spring and summer was associated with an  
46 increased likelihood of finding a tick in the fall or winter. Most outdoor activities were more  
47 frequently reported by participants from the Midwest than the Northeast. Participants in the  
48 Northeast reported less use of personal protective measures, but they reported more  
49 interventions to reduce the presence of peridomestic deer and ticks (i.e. pesticide applications  
50 on their property) than participants in the Midwest. Participants from the Midwest were more  
51 likely to kill rodents on their property. Context mattered, and our study illustrates the need for  
52 the assessment of personal behavior and tick exposure in these two Lyme disease-endemic  
53 regions to aid in targeted public health messaging to reduce tick-borne diseases.  
54 **Keywords:** *Borrelia burgdorferi*, mHealth, self-efficacy, prevention, ticks, Lyme disease

## 55 **Introduction**

56 Lyme disease is the most common vector-borne disease in the United States and represents  
57 over 80% of reported tick-borne disease cases (Rosenberg et al., 2018). The causative agent,  
58 *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu stricto (Burgdorfer et al., 1982), is transmitted by two tick  
59 species, *Ixodes scapularis* (Say) and *I. pacificus* (Cooley and Kohls) in the United States. The  
60 geographic range of *I. scapularis* has been expanding (Eisen et al., 2016) with predicted  
61 establishment of the enzootic transmission of the pathogen and Lyme disease cases  
62 approximately three to five years later (Ogden et al., 2013). Humans are incidental hosts of *B.*  
63 *burgdorferi*, and infection occurs after exposure to an infectious tick (typically a nymph  
64 which are small and active in late spring and early summer), normally encountered outdoors,  
65 in proximity to wooded environments and during recreational, work-related or peridomestic  
66 activities (Porter et al., 2019; Stafford and Magnarelli, 1993).

67 Spatial patterns of Lyme disease risk (i.e. the likelihood of acquiring the disease) in  
68 the United States are geographically clustered and dynamic, with high incidence states  
69 located in the Northeast and Midwest (Kugeler et al., 2015). These high-risk clusters correlate  
70 with increased hazard ('the source of harm'), measured as the density of host-seeking *I.*  
71 *scapularis* nymphs (Diuk-Wasser et al., 2006; Eisen et al., 2016). However, while tick  
72 density is a predictor of disease risk at a national scale, this relationship varies in strength at  
73 the county level (Pepin et al., 2012). These variations have been, in part, attributed to  
74 potential differences in human behaviors that play a critical role in determining human  
75 exposure to the hazard, or in mitigating its negative effects by engaging in risk reduction  
76 practices (Eisen and Eisen, 2016). Studies assessing human behavioral risk factors have  
77 mostly been local (among others: Connally et al., 2009; Orloski et al., 1998; Smith et al.,  
78 2001; Vázquez et al., 2008), precluding regional comparisons. To overcome this limitation,  
79 we developed a smartphone application, The Tick App, to conduct standardized surveys on

80 human exposure and behavior across regions in a cost-efficient manner (Fernandez et al.,  
81 2019). Study participants self-administered a survey on the behavioral and environmental risk  
82 factors of contracting tick-borne diseases, thus providing new insights into drivers of human  
83 risk that are superimposed on or interact with the hazard.

84 Without a human vaccine or community-based interventions, Lyme disease  
85 prevention relies on personal protective behaviors during outdoor activities and interventions  
86 in peridomestic settings targeting the enzootic cycle to reduce ticks or pathogen transmission  
87 (Schiffman et al., 2016). Personal protective behaviors include preventive practices that  
88 reduce tick exposure (e.g., avoiding risky habitats and using repellents), and practices that  
89 reduce the risk of Lyme disease after tick exposure (e.g., checking for ticks and showering  
90 after being outdoors) (Connally et al., 2009; Eisen and Dolan, 2016; Gould et al., 2008; Jones  
91 et al., 2018). Peridomestic interventions aiming at reducing the tick hazard include the  
92 applying area-wide acaricides, treating wild animal (rodents) host to kill attached ticks, and  
93 performing landscape modifications to reduce deer visitations (e.g. by using tall fencing and  
94 limit resource provisioning) and limit rodent habitat (Connally et al., 2009; Hinckley et al.,  
95 2016; Orloski et al., 1998).

96 According to the health belief model (Rosenstock, 1974), actions to prevent Lyme  
97 disease would be taken when individuals are knowledgeable, perceive the risk and its  
98 severity, understand the benefits of and have the self-efficacy to carry out interventions, and  
99 receive external cues to act. Thus, the ecological (e.g. landscape structure, tick hazard) and  
100 social context (e.g. experiences of friends and family, public health messaging) can influence  
101 the uptake of risk reduction practices, as humans adapt their behavior in response to tick  
102 densities and perceived risk (Berry et al., 2018). For example, implementation of personal  
103 protective behaviors by park visitors varied across an urban-to-rural gradient in Missouri  
104 (Bayles et al., 2013). Visitors to rural and exurban parks (beyond the urban fringe) were more

105 likely to implement tick checks and utilize tick repellent compared to visitors to suburban  
106 parks while the latter were more likely to avoid tick habitat; this variation was linked to  
107 differences in the intended recreational activity of park visitors (Bayles et al., 2013). Regional  
108 differences in the socio-ecological context, such as the higher urbanization levels, population  
109 densities and median household income in the Northeast compared to the Midwest (U.S.  
110 Census Bureau 2013) may simultaneously affect residential (i.e., peridomestic features  
111 associated with tick hazard) and behavioral risk factors for Lyme disease (i.e. activity  
112 patterns, the use of personal protective behaviors and the implementation of peridomestic  
113 interventions).

114 In this study, we used information derived from self-administered surveys completed  
115 by users of The Tick App to compare the use of personal protection measures, the frequency  
116 of different types of outdoor activities, the implementation of peridomestic interventions, and  
117 residential risk factors associated with peridomestic tick hazard between two high-incidence  
118 regions for Lyme disease in the United States: Wisconsin (Midwest), and New Jersey and  
119 southern New York (Northeast). Additionally, to better understand the drivers behind the use  
120 of personal protective behaviors, we evaluated the association between the adoption of these  
121 behaviors and the frequency of outdoor activities, considering both recreational and  
122 peridomestic exposure scenarios and adjusting for regional differences, demographic factors,  
123 and previous Lyme disease diagnoses (e.g. previous personal experience). In the peridomestic  
124 exposure scenario, we also assessed whether hazard reduction practices (i.e., the  
125 implementation of peridomestic interventions) affected the use of personal protective  
126 behaviors.

127

## 128 **Material and methods**

### 129 *The Tick App project*

130           The Tick App was developed by the Midwest and Northeast Centers of Excellence  
131 for Vector-borne Diseases in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin – Madison  
132 Center for Health Enhancement System Studies (CHESS) to serve as a research tool to better  
133 understand human behaviors affecting tick exposure and engage the general public in active  
134 tick prevention across the United States (Fernandez et al., 2019). As a research tool, it  
135 includes epidemiological surveys and allows for real-time assessment of people’s locations  
136 and activities (Fernandez et al., 2019). The Tick App included a one-time enrollment survey  
137 which was designed to take less than 10 min to fill out, and aimed to retrospectively  
138 document the users’ demographic data, past experiences with ticks and tick-borne diseases,  
139 and residential and behavioral risk factors (Fernandez et al., 2019). This app was freely  
140 available through Google Play and the App Store. Participants also had the options of  
141 enrolling and completing the survey online through The Tick App website  
142 ([www.thetickapp.org](http://www.thetickapp.org)), completing the survey in person, or downloading the survey from the  
143 website and mailing . The enrollment survey was accessed by users upon completion of the  
144 consent form in The Tick App, online (UW-Madison Qualtrics Survey Hosting Service,  
145 Qualtrics XM, Provo, UT) or on paper. This work was conducted in accordance with  
146 Institutional Review Board approved protocols (2018-84 University of Wisconsin – Madison  
147 and AAA3750-M00Y01 Columbia University) and HIPAA regulations.

#### 148 Participants

149           Participants in the Northeast and upper Midwest of the United States were recruited  
150 using passive recruitment efforts through social media (Facebook, Twitter), by posting flyers  
151 and posters in public spaces, and through newspaper, television and radio interviews. Efforts  
152 were focused particularly in Wisconsin and southern New York. Active recruitment was also  
153 conducted during house visits coupled with ongoing field research involving tick sampling in  
154 yards at selected study sites (Eau Claire, WI and Staten Island, NY). During these visits, the

155 researchers explained the objective of the app and invited residents to participate as users.  
156 Any adult over 18 years old residing in the selected regions was eligible to participate in the  
157 study. The app was available in Google Play on May 8<sup>th</sup> and in App Store on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018,  
158 respectively. The Tick App promotional activities were launched during Memorial Day  
159 weekend (May 25<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup>), and recruitment of participants continued throughout the duration  
160 of the spring and summer of 2018 (Fernandez et al 2019).

### 161 Survey

162 The enrollment survey consisted of five sections: 1) User profile, 2) Tick exposure, 3)  
163 Outdoor activities, 4) Property features, and 5) Pets. The sections captured the following  
164 information: 1) The user profile queried demographic information including gender, age, and  
165 address (Supp. Text A, questions 1-4). 2) The tick exposure section assessed the use of  
166 personal protective behaviors (wear permethrin-treated clothing, shower or bathe to remove  
167 ticks, adjust clothing or wear light-colored clothing, use tick repellent, check for ticks, or  
168 other to-be-specified measures), tick exposure during the previous fall and winter, and  
169 previous diagnosis with Lyme disease or another tick-borne disease by a physician (Supp.  
170 Text A, questions 5-7). 3) This section captured occupational, peridomestic, and recreational  
171 outdoor activities. Questions were designed to identify whether people worked or volunteered  
172 outdoors and for what duration, and to document the frequency of recreational activities  
173 (hunting, fishing, bird watching, hiking/walking/biking/running on nature trails, camping, and  
174 visiting the beach of an ocean, lake or river) and peridomestic outdoor activities (mowing the  
175 lawn and gardening) (Supp. Text A, question 8 and 9). The frequency of recreational and  
176 peridomestic outdoor activity was reported as never, about once in the summer, at least once  
177 a month, or at least once a week. 4) This section captured property features: including  
178 residential risk factors for Lyme disease, ranging from property characteristics to the  
179 presence of deer, as well as interventions to modify deer or rodent activity, and interventions



180 to reduce tick hazard by host-targeted or environmental pesticide applications (Supp. Text A,  
181 questions 10-15). 5) The final section pets, identified the number of cats and dogs and use of  
182 pet-related tick protection (Supp. Text A, questions 16-25).

183 Responses were formatted as binary (Yes or No), five-point frequency scales, select  
184 the applicable answer (i.e. drop-down menu), check all that apply, or free answer forms when  
185 appropriate (name, address, text detail for an “other” response). A few exceptions were made  
186 to reduce the complexity of choice tables and to make frequencies appropriate to the  
187 question; most notably, a 4-point scale (never, about once a summer, at least once a month, at  
188 least once a week) was used to assess outdoor activity options. This study followed the  
189 recommended guidelines for reporting results of internet e-surveys (Eysenbach, 2004), the  
190 checklist for reporting results of internet e-surveys (CHERRIES) is available in Supp. Text B.

#### 191 Data analysis

192 We included enrollment surveys submitted between May 8<sup>th</sup> and <sup>rd</sup>, 2018 in our  
193 analyses (Fernandez et al., 2019). This period captured three major holiday weekends in the  
194 United States, included our peak enrollment period and high risk season for acquiring  
195 pathogens that cause Lyme disease in the US. We compared southern New York, New  
196 Jersey, and Wisconsin as the majority of Tick App participants lived in these areas  
197 (Fernandez et al., 2019): within the Midwest, 82.3% of participants lived in Wisconsin,  
198 whereas within the Northeast 76.9% of participants lived in southern New York and New  
199 Jersey, consistent with the area of influence of our study and recruitment efforts. When  
200 comparing both areas, we kept the regional reference (Midwest and Northeast) for simplicity  
201 throughout the text but we do not intend to extrapolate to the entire region. Survey responses  
202 that did not include state or residence, use of personal protective measures, outdoor activity,  
203 and property related questions were removed. In addition, those who reported an age between  
204 7 and 18 years old were removed. A reported age of 6 or younger was assumed to be

205 incorrect; these surveys were retained but we manually replaced the age with 'not answered'.  
206 We checked for congruence between state and reported zipcodes (and address, if needed) to  
207 confirm that the selected state was the actual state of residence. Personal identifiable  
208 information was removed and working files for data analysis were created to preserve  
209 confidentiality of the dataset. Peridomestic host-targeted interventions were re-coded to  
210 binary variables; a 'yes' was assigned if any intervention method was used and 'no' if all  
211 responses to the intervention methods were not used (Supp. Text A question 13 and 15).

212 Data analysis was completed in R Statistical Computing Software (R Core Team,  
213 2018). Responses were summarized, and a comparison between the regions of interest was  
214 made using Pearson's Chi-squared tests without continuity correction after missing values  
215 were removed. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated for the likelihood of  
216 having found a tick in the prior fall or winter for each outdoor activity frequency with 'never'  
217 as the reference level using *oddsratio.wald* from package *Epitools* (Aragon, 2017).

#### 218 Modeling personal protective behaviors

219 Multinomial logistic models were used to assess the likelihood of reporting each of  
220 the four most commonly reported personal protective behaviors against not using personal  
221 protective behaviors ('None') as the reference level, depending on the frequency of a given  
222 recreational activity, the region (Midwest and Northeast), previous self-reported Lyme  
223 diagnosis (Yes or No), gender, age category, and the interaction between region and activity.  
224 The ordinal indices for frequency of each outdoor activity were transformed into numeric  
225 variables (never = 0, at least once a week = 3) for use in the multinomial logistic models  
226 allowing us to assess direct proportional association between the use of prevention strategies  
227 and the frequency of activities. We conducted a separate model for each of the recreational  
228 activities.

229 For those participants living in houses with yards, we also assessed the likelihood of  
230 using personal protective behaviors depending on the frequency of peridomestic outdoor  
231 activities, peridomestic tick interventions (insecticide use, interventions reducing deer  
232 activity and interventions reducing rodent activity), and accounting for frequent recreational  
233 outdoor activities with the outdoor index (Fernandez et al. 2019), the region (Midwest and  
234 Northeast), self-reported Lyme diagnosis (Yes or No), gender, and age category. Participants  
235 who worked and/or volunteered outdoors also reported frequent (monthly and weekly)  
236 outdoor activities (Fernandez et al., 2019); because these parameters were highly correlated  
237 working / volunteering outdoors was not included in the models. Tick exposure in fall and  
238 winter was not included as a co-variate as this was strongly correlated with participation in  
239 outdoor activities (see results).

240 For these analyses, we used the function *multinom* from R package *nnet* (Venables &  
241 Ripley, 2002). Multi-model selection was used to assess all possible model combinations and  
242 account for model selection uncertainty, by using the function *dredge* from package *MuMIn*  
243 (Barton, 2018). The odds ratios for each explanatory variable were calculated by averaging  
244 model estimates weighted by AICc using function *model.avg* from package *MuMIn*.

245

## 246 **Results**

### 247 Participants

248 A total of 1,093 enrollment surveys were included in the analysis, including 396 from  
249 New York and New Jersey and 697 from Wisconsin (Table 1). The Tick App was most  
250 commonly used to complete the survey (n=999). The gender distribution was similar in the  
251 Midwest and Northeast, and male and females were nearly equally represented (Table 1). The  
252 age distribution was bimodal (Fernandez et al. 2019), and the representation in age categories  
253 varied between the two study populations: 35-44 year-olds were most represented in the

254 Northeast (28%) whereas older than 55-64 year-olds were most represented in Wisconsin  
255 (24.3%, Table 1). Although in both regions most of the participants lived in a house with yard  
256 (n=899), the proportion of participants living in an apartment was higher in the Northeast  
257 than in the Midwest (Table 1). By contrast, participants from the Midwest were more likely  
258 to have an outdoor occupation and own at least one dog (Table 1). For those who worked  
259 outdoors, the time committed to outdoor work was similar between the two regions (Table 1).

260 The proportion of participants who reported a previous diagnosis of tick-borne disease  
261 was 13.6% (148 of 1089) and this was similar between participants from the Midwest (12.2%  
262 of 696) and the Northeast (16.0% of 393) ( $\chi^2$  test,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=3.119$ ,  $p=0.08$ ). Lyme disease was  
263 most frequently reported (12.0% of 1,086, Table 1) and both babesiosis (1.8% of 1,052  
264 respondents) and anaplasmosis (0.95% of 1,050) were rarely reported. Other diseases  
265 reported (2.0% of 1,026) included ehrlichiosis (n=6), Rocky Mountain spotted fever (n=2)  
266 and Colorado tick fever (n=1). About a third of participants (31.7%, n=1,089) found a tick on  
267 themselves during the previous fall or winter and this was significantly higher in the Midwest  
268 than the Northeast (37.3% versus 21.8%, respectively;  $\chi^2$  test,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=27.164$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

### 269 Personal protective measures

270 The four most commonly reported personal protective behaviors were ‘Check myself  
271 for ticks’ (the most common behavior), ‘Tick repellent (e.g. DEET, picaridin)’, ‘Wear  
272 protective clothing (e.g. light colored, long-sleeved, tucking pants in socks, boots, not  
273 including permethrin-treated clothing)’, and ‘Shower or bathe to remove ticks’ (Figure 1).  
274 Midwest respondents were more likely to report that they checked for ticks, used repellent, or  
275 showered and bathed (Figure 1). Less than 15% of the study participants reported use of  
276 permethrin-treated clothing, and 4.1% reported other strategies to protect against tick bites  
277 including the use of essential oils (n=10) or staying away from grass, trees, and woods  
278 (n=10).

279 Recreational outdoor activities

280 Nearly all participants engaged in at least one of the recreational outdoor activities  
281 during the spring and summer (98.4%); only 16 of 1,060 participants responded “never” to all  
282 six recreational activities. Participation in recreational outdoor activities was greater in  
283 participants from the Midwest than the Northeast, except for visiting the beach on a lake,  
284 river, or ocean (Table 2). The odds of self-reported tick encounter during the previous fall or  
285 winter were higher if any of the recreational outdoor activities were reported to be done at  
286 least monthly or weekly in the spring and summer compared to never or once (Table 3).

287 Peridomestic risk factors

288 Of all houses with a yard, nearly all had a manicured lawn and outdoor seating, and  
289 approximately 25% had children’s play equipment (Figure 2A). Properties in Wisconsin had  
290 more birdfeeders ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=892$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=524.46$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and log or brush piles ( $\chi^2$  test,  
291  $n=891$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=36.106$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), whereas fences were more common in the Northeast ( $\chi^2$   
292 test,  $n=890$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=42.368$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure 2A). Self-reported deer sightings (never or  
293 rarely versus more frequent sightings) on properties with a yard were not significantly  
294 different between respondents from the Midwest and the Northeast ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=893$ ,  $df=1$ ,  
295  $\chi^2=0.159$ ,  $p=0.69$ ). Daily sightings happened at 16.3% (100 of 615 Midwest participants) and  
296 14.0% of homes (39 of 278 Northeast participants), while deer were never or rarely observed  
297 at 47.5% (Midwest) and 48.9% (Northeast) of homes. Deer proof fences ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=892$ ,  
298  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=30.593$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and deer resistant plants ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=888$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=17.867$ ,  
299  $p<0.001$ ) were more commonly used among participants from the Northeast. By contrast,  
300 baiting to attract deer to yards was more common among participants from the Midwest ( $\chi^2$   
301 test,  $n=890$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=8.140$ ,  $p=0.004$ ) although still infrequent (5.7% of 615 versus 1.5% of  
302 275, Figure 2B).

303 Rodent-targeted interventions to control ticks were rarely used; less than 5% of  
304 participants used tick tubes or bait boxes (Figure 2B). Killing rodents (i.e. chipmunks and  
305 mice) on the property was much more common among respondents from the Midwest ( $\chi^2$   
306 test,  $n=889$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=21.772$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (Figure 2B); of the Midwesterners who killed  
307 nuisance rodents, 18.9% reported doing this at least weekly ( $n=32$ ). Use of pesticides  
308 targeting ticks, mosquitoes, or other insects on the property was more common among  
309 Northeasterners ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=895$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $\chi^2=15.205$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (Figure 2B). However, among  
310 those who applied pesticides, the frequency of application did not differ between the two  
311 study areas ( $\chi^2$  test,  $n=228$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $\chi^2=2.185$ ,  $p=0.3$ ). Seasonal (45.2%) and monthly (48.2%)  
312 applications were most commonly reported and weekly application was rare (6.6%).

313 Participation in peridomestic activities was common among participants residing on  
314 properties with a yard; 49.9% of 888 participants reported mowing the lawn weekly and  
315 61.7% of 888 gardened at least weekly. The frequency of mowing the lawn and gardening  
316 was higher among respondents from the Midwest than the Northeast (Table 2). Participants  
317 who reported weekly gardening or lawn mowing in spring and summer were at least twice as  
318 likely to report that they had found a tick on themselves the previous fall and winter  
319 compared to participants who never gardened or mowed the lawn (Table 3).

### 320 Modeling personal protective behaviors

321 For each of the recreational outdoor activities, the likelihood of using the four most  
322 common personal protective behaviors (check themselves for ticks, adjust their clothing, use  
323 repellent, or shower and bathe to remove ticks) increased with the reported frequency of the  
324 activity during the spring and summer, after adjusting for the region, gender, age category,  
325 and previous Lyme disease diagnosis (Figure 3A). There was strong evidence for the  
326 relationship between personal protective behaviors and going to the beach, birding, camping,  
327 fishing, and hiking (Figure 3A,  $p<0.001$ , Supp. Table 1) and moderate evidence for the

328 relationship with hunting (Figure 3A, p-value range: 0.01 – 0.02, Supp. Table 1). Participants  
329 who reported doing more frequent peridomestic outdoor activities were more likely to use  
330 any of the four common prevention strategies if they gardened (Figure 3B, p-value range:  
331 0.015-0.026, Supp. Table 2), after accounting for region, previous Lyme disease diagnosis,  
332 age, gender, frequent participation in recreational outdoor activities (outdoor index), and the  
333 use of deer, rodent, and/or environmental control measures. However, mowing the lawn was  
334 not associated with use of personal protective behaviors (Figure 3B, p-value range: 0.74-0.98,  
335 Supp. Table 2). In this peridomestic scenario, participants who reported any type of deer  
336 control, also reported using three of the four most common personal protective behaviors  
337 (check for ticks, adjust clothing, and shower and bathe to remove ticks) more frequently  
338 (Supp. Table 2). The use of rodent and environmental control measures was not associated  
339 with use of personal protective behaviors.

340         The likelihood of use of personal protective behaviors among respondents from the  
341 Northeast was about half compared to Midwesterners for those who went birding (cOR  
342 range: 0.51-0.57, p-range: 0.003-0.01, Supp. Table 1), visited the beach (cOR range: 0.43-  
343 0.51, p-range: <0.001-0.007, Supp. Table 1), went hunting (cOR range: 0.49-0.56, p-range:  
344 0.002-0.012, Supp. Table 1), or went camping (cOR range: 0.54-0.62, p-range: 0.01-0.05,  
345 Supp. Table 1) after accounting for region, previous Lyme disease diagnosis, age and gender.  
346 That is, people with the same risk of exposure reported using fewer personal protective  
347 behaviors in the Northeast except for those that fished, hiked, gardened or mowed the lawn.  
348 In the outdoor activity models, there is marginal evidence of increased reporting of personal  
349 protective behaviors with a previous Lyme disease diagnosis after we accounted for the  
350 aforementioned covariates (cOR 1.296-2.475, p-range: 0.054-0.492, Supp. Table 1 and 2).

351

## 352 **Discussion**

353 Behavioral and residential risk factors for exposure to ticks and tick-borne diseases  
354 were different for study participants from the Northeast and Midwest. Midwesterners  
355 participated at a greater rate and more frequently in recreational outdoor activities (81.9% vs  
356 63.1%). Similarly, Midwesterners were more likely to engage in the peridomestic activities of  
357 weekly lawn mowing (60.5% vs 26.4%) and gardening (65.8% vs 52.7%) compared to  
358 Northeasterners. These observations suggest that exposure to ticks and tick-borne diseases  
359 could be higher for Midwestern study participants compared to Northeastern participants.  
360 Indeed, the frequency of tick encounters in the prior fall and winter was higher for  
361 Midwestern participants (37.3%) than Northeastern participants (22.0%). Midwesterners also  
362 utilized personal protective behaviors more frequently (Figure 1), perhaps as an adaptive  
363 behavior in response to higher risk of encountering a tick or other biting insects due to more  
364 frequent outdoor activities. In contrast, Northeasterners were more likely to use peridomestic  
365 interventions that could reduce tick and deer activity in their yards.

366 Overall, the use of personal protective behaviors was associated with more frequent  
367 participation in outdoor activities. Nonetheless, Northeasterners were less likely to use  
368 personal protective behaviors even when they were engaged in similar outdoor activities.  
369 This difference is opposite to the trend observed in the national HealthStyles survey, where  
370 participants from the Mid-Atlantic region, including New York, New Jersey and  
371 Pennsylvania, reported slightly higher use of personal prevention measures than respondents  
372 from East-North Central US, including Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio  
373 (Hook et al., 2015). Although the two regions in the HealthStyles survey had similar reports  
374 of tick exposure (24% in Mid Atlantic to 22.8% in East-North Central), the East-North  
375 Central region included four states-Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio-where Lyme disease  
376 incidence rates are much lower and blacklegged ticks less common than in Wisconsin (Eisen  
377 et al., 2016). This lower risk of Lyme disease in most of the region may have resulted in the



378 slightly reduced use of personal protective behaviors observed in the East North Central US  
379 survey responses.

380 Use of prevention measures generally increases if they are perceived as effective and  
381 not burdensome (Butler et al., 2016). The proportion of participants that reported checking  
382 themselves for ticks (74.3 and 86.7%) was high compared to reports from other high-  
383 incidence states, for example 30.7% in the Mid Atlantic (Hook et al., 2015) and 57-67% in  
384 Connecticut, (Connally et al., 2009; Niesobecki et al., 2019). The high percentage of  
385 checking for ticks in our study could be due to the profile of our study participants, who were  
386 more likely to be active outdoors and to have been diagnosed with tick-borne disease  
387 compared to the general public (Fernandez et al., 2019). Alternatively, this high percentage  
388 may have been an artifact of the structure of the survey question, because checking for ticks  
389 was the first option in the response list. While “checking for ticks” was reported more  
390 frequently than expected based on prior studies, the use of adjusting clothing (50 and 57.6%),  
391 wearing repellent (50.4 and 62.4%), or showering to remove ticks (38.8 and 52%) in our two  
392 study areas fell within the wide range of reported use percentages in high Lyme disease  
393 incidence states (Connally et al., 2009; Herrington, 2004; Niesobecki et al., 2019). Similar to  
394 Connally et al. (2009) and Niesobecki et al. (2019), the use of permethrin-treated clothing  
395 was least reported. However, there appears to be an increasing trend in the sales of  
396 permethrin-treated clothing (Online access Market Research Engine), which aligns with the  
397 increase in positive responses seen in surveys asking about the use of permethrin-treated  
398 clothing, from 0.7% in 2005-2007 (Connally et al., 2009), to 7% in 2015 (Niesobecki et al.,  
399 2019) and 14% in our study. Greater awareness and increased belief in the effectiveness  
400 together with increased availability of these products could explain this increase.

401 The observed differences in peridomestic risk factors and intervention strategies  
402 between the Northeastern and Midwestern participants might be due to differences in socio-

403 ecological contexts and possibly influenced by differing urbanization levels between the  
404 regions compared. Southern New York and New Jersey are metropolitan areas whereas  
405 nearly two-third of Wisconsin counties (46 of 72) are nonmetropolitan (less than 50,000  
406 inhabitants per urban cluster, (Ingram and Franco, 2014). Midwest participants represented a  
407 social group that is more active outdoors and also actively recruited wildlife like birds and  
408 deer into their yards. Birdfeeders, known to attract deer, squirrels, and other rodents, and log  
409 and brush piles, known to provide nesting space for rodents, were more common in the  
410 Midwest. These features might increase rodent activity on the property, which could explain  
411 why killing of rodents on properties was also more common in the Midwest than in the  
412 Northeast. In addition, while Midwest participants were more likely to provide forage for  
413 deer, deer proof fencing and deer resistant plants were more common in the Northeast.  
414 Despite the difference in the use of deer-targeted interventions, deer sightings on the  
415 properties were not significantly different between study regions.

416         Interestingly, the largest difference in outdoor activity frequency was related to  
417 mowing the lawn. Only 26.4% of Northeasterners with a yard did this weekly compared to  
418 60.5% of Midwesterners. We posit that the difference in weekly lawn mowing participation is  
419 because lawn care companies do the work in the Northeast (unpublished data Fernandez &  
420 Diuk-Wasser). The use of a lawn care company could also explain the higher proportion of  
421 study participants who reported pesticide use on Northeastern properties compared to  
422 Midwestern properties. Taken together, the higher use of peridomestic interventions of  
423 Northeastern participants (i.e. reducing adult blacklegged tick hosts, deer, in the yard and  
424 using pesticides to kill ticks to reduce the environmental hazard) might suggest that they are  
425 more prone to invest in protecting their landscaping or have greater awareness of Lyme  
426 disease ecology compared to Midwestern participants. Further studies are needed to dissect

427 these associations and their relationship to the socio-ecological contexts (e.g., risk perception,  
428 income).

429 Our study was a retrospective survey, with voluntary participation and mostly passive  
430 recruitment. This strategy resulted in a biased study population with participants who likely  
431 had an above average interest in preventing tick-borne diseases. In this study, we did not  
432 explicitly address differences in urbanization levels that could be driving the observed  
433 differences in behavioral and residential risk factors. This uneven representation of the  
434 population living in more urban areas in the Northeast *versus* the Midwest, warrants further  
435 exploration as more data becomes available from exurban and rural areas in the Northeast. In  
436 addition, any retrospective survey is subject to recall bias (Groves et al., 2011); increasing the  
437 frequency of reporting can reduce this bias with information recalled for a shorter period of  
438 time (Clarke et al., 2008). In The Tick App, participants can share their daily outdoor  
439 activities, personal prevention methods used, and tick encounters in less than a minute using  
440 the Daily Log functionality. This feature, called Tick diary in 2018, was sparingly used by  
441 Tick App users (Fernandez et al. 2019), but we anticipate that these daily assessments can  
442 provide more accurate estimates of prevention method use in relation to outdoor activities  
443 when a more robust sample is acquired. Lastly, although we tried to avoid “check all that  
444 apply” question structures where participants are more likely to select the first options  
445 (Rasinski et al., 1994), the personal preventative behavior question was structured this way.  
446 Possible over reporting of the first option (i.e. checking for ticks) and under reporting of later  
447 options could have been reduced by a forced reply structure (yes/no) or randomizing the  
448 order of responses, but randomizing was not possible in our smartphone application. In the  
449 2019 Tick App enrollment survey, the “check all that apply” structure was replaced with a  
450 yes/no response structure.

451 Human behavior converts enzootic hazard into Lyme disease risk. The results of this  
452 study illustrate how personal prevention measures were more likely to be employed by  
453 participants in different socio-ecological contexts. To be able to include the human  
454 behavioral component into predictions of Lyme disease risk, researchers will need to  
455 determine how specific behaviors (activities and prevention strategies) relate to tick  
456 encounters and disease risk, across regions. The use of a smartphone application to deliver  
457 standardized surveys proved to be a cost-efficient tool to collect data regarding risk factors  
458 for Lyme disease and offers the opportunity of expanding the geographic scope of these  
459 studies. Ultimately, this information will be valuable to adapt risk reduction interventions and  
460 for generating tailored public health messages for different populations across regions in the  
461 United States.

462

#### 463 **Acknowledgements:**

464 We thank all participants for taking time to share their experiences and we thank everybody  
465 who promoted The Tick App. We extend our gratitude to our colleagues, beta-testers, UW-  
466 Madison Survey Center, Becky Eisen and Alison Hinckley for constructive feedback on the  
467 survey. Funding: This work was Supported by Center for Disease Control and Prevention  
468 [Cooperative Agreements #U01 CK000505 and #U01 CK000509-01]. Its contents are solely  
469 the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of CDC or  
470 the Department of Health and Human Services.

471

472

## 473 References

- 474 Aragon T.J., 2017. Epitools: Epidemiology Tools. R package version 0.5-10.  
475 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=epitools>
- 476 Bartoń, K., 2018. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.42.1.  
477 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- 478 Bayles, B.R., Evans, G., Allan, B.F., 2013. Knowledge and prevention of tick-borne diseases  
479 vary across an urban-to-rural human land-use gradient. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*  
480 4, 352–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2013.01.001>
- 481 Berry, K., Bayham, J., Meyer, S.R., Fenichel, E.P., 2018. The Allocation of Time and Risk of  
482 Lyme: A Case of Ecosystem Service Income and Substitution Effects. *Environ*  
483 *Resource Econ* 70, 631–650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0142-7>
- 484 Burgdorfer, W., Barbour, A.G., Hayes, S.F., Benach, J.L., Grunwaldt, E., Davis, J.P., 1982.  
485 Lyme Disease--A Tick-Borne Spirochetosis? *Science, New Series* 216, 1317–1319.
- 486 Butler, A.D., Sedghi, T., Petrini, J.R., Ahmadi, R., 2016. Tick-borne disease preventive  
487 practices and perceptions in an endemic area. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases* 7, 331–  
488 337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.12.003>
- 489 Clarke, P.M., Fiebig, D.G., Gerdtham, U.-G., 2008. Optimal recall length in survey design.  
490 *Journal of Health Economics* 27, 1275–1284.  
491 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2008.05.012>
- 492 Connally, N.P., Durante, A.J., Yousey-Hindes, K.M., Meek, J.I., Nelson, R.S., Heimer, R.,  
493 2009. Peridomestic Lyme Disease Prevention: results of a population-based case-  
494 control study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 37, 201–206.  
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.04.026>
- 496 Diuk-Wasser, M.A., Gatewood, A.G., Cortinas, M.R., Yaremych-Hamer, S., Tsao, J., Kitron,  
497 U., Hickling, G., Brownstein, J.S., Walker, E., Piesman, J., Fish, D., 2006.  
498 Spatiotemporal Patterns of Host-Seeking *Ixodes scapularis* Nymphs (Acari: Ixodidae)  
499 in the United States. *J. Med. Entomol* 43, 166–176. [https://doi.org/10.1603/0022-  
500 2585\(2006\)043](https://doi.org/10.1603/0022-2585(2006)043)
- 501 Eisen, L., Dolan, M.C., 2016. Evidence for Personal Protective Measures to Reduce Human  
502 Contact with Blacklegged Ticks and for Environmentally Based Control Methods to  
503 Suppress Host-Seeking Blacklegged Ticks and Reduce Infection with Lyme Disease  
504 Spirochetes in Tick Vectors and Rodent. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 53, 1063–  
505 1092. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjw103>
- 506 Eisen, L., Eisen, R.J., 2016. Critical Evaluation of the Linkage Between Tick-Based Risk  
507 Measures and the Occurrence of Lyme Disease Cases: Table 1. *Journal of Medical*  
508 *Entomology* 53, 1050–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjw092>
- 509 Eisen, R.J., Eisen, L., Beard, C.B., 2016. County-Scale Distribution of *Ixodes scapularis* and  
510 *Ixodes pacificus* (Acari: Ixodidae) in the Continental United States. *J Med Entomol*  
511 53, 349–386. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjv237>
- 512 Eysenbach, G., 2004. Improving the Quality of Web Surveys: The Checklist for Reporting  
513 Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *J Med Internet Res* 6.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34>
- 515 Fernandez, M.P., Bron, G.M., Kache, P.A., Larson, S.R., Maus, A., Gustafson Jr, D., Tsao,  
516 J.I., Bartholomay, L.C., Paskewitz, S.M., Diuk-Wasser, M.A., 2019. Usability and  
517 Feasibility of a Smartphone App to Assess Human Behavioral Factors Associated  
518 with Tick Exposure (The Tick App): Quantitative and Qualitative Study. *JMIR*  
519 *Mhealth Uhealth* 7, e14769. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14769>
- 520 Gould, L.H., Nelson, R.S., Griffith, K.S., Hayes, E.B., Piesman, J., Mead, P.S., Cartter, M.L.,  
521 2008. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviors Regarding Lyme Disease Prevention

- 522 Among Connecticut Residents, 1999–2004. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases* 8,  
523 769–776. <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2007.0221>
- 524 Groves, R.M., Fowler, F.J., Couper, M.P., Lepkowski, J.M., Singer, E., Tourangeau, R.,  
525 2011. Survey methodology. John Wiley & Sons.
- 526 Herrington, J.E., 2004. Risk perceptions regarding ticks and Lyme disease. *American Journal*  
527 *of Preventive Medicine* 26, 135–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2003.10.010>
- 528 Hinckley, A.F., Meek, J.I., Ray, J.A.E., Niesobecki, S.A., Connally, N.P., Feldman, K.A.,  
529 Jones, E.H., Backenson, P.B., White, J.L., Lukacik, G., Kay, A.B., Miranda, W.P.,  
530 Mead, P.S., 2016. Effectiveness of Residential Acaricides to Prevent Lyme and Other  
531 Tick-borne Diseases in Humans. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 214, 182–188.  
532 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv775>
- 533 Hook, S.A., Nelson, C.A., Mead, P.S., 2015. U.S. public’s experience with ticks and tick-  
534 borne diseases: Results from national HealthStyles surveys. *Ticks and Tick-borne*  
535 *Diseases* 6, 483–488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.03.017>
- 536 Ingram, D., Franco, S., 2014. 2013 NCHS Urban-Rural Classification Scheme for Counties.  
537 *Vital Health Stat, National Center for Health Statistics* 2, 81.
- 538 Jones, E.H., Hinckley, A.F., Hook, S.A., Meek, J.I., Backenson, B., Kugeler, K.J., Feldman,  
539 K.A., 2018. Pet ownership increases human risk of encountering ticks. *Zoonoses*  
540 *Public Health* 65, 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12369>
- 541 Kugeler, K.J., Farley, G.M., Forrester, J.D., Mead, P.S., 2015. Geographic Distribution and  
542 Expansion of Human Lyme Disease, United States. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 21,  
543 1455–1457. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2108.141878>
- 544 Niesobecki, S., Hansen, A., Rutz, H., Mehta, S., Feldman, K., Meek, J., Niccolai, L., Hook,  
545 S., Hinckley, A., 2019. Knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding tick-borne  
546 disease prevention in endemic areas. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases* 10, 101264.  
547 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2019.07.008>
- 548 Ogden, N.H., Lindsay, L.R., Leighton, P.A., 2013. Predicting the rate of invasion of the agent  
549 of Lyme disease *Borrelia burgdorferi*. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50, 510–518.  
550 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12050>
- 551 Orloski, K.A., Campbell, G.L., Genese, C.A., Beckley, J.W., Schriefer, M.E., Spitalny, K.C.,  
552 Dennis, D.T., 1998. Emergence of Lyme Disease in Hunterdon County, New Jersey,  
553 1993: A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors and Evaluation of Reporting Patterns.  
554 *American Journal of Epidemiology* 147, 391–397.  
555 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009462>
- 556 Pepin, K.M., Eisen, R.J., Mead, P.S., Piesman, J., Fish, D., Hoen, A.G., Barbour, A.G.,  
557 Hamer, S., Diuk-Wasser, M.A., 2012. Geographic variation in the relationship  
558 between human Lyme disease incidence and density of infected host-seeking *Ixodes*  
559 *scapularis* nymphs in the Eastern United States. *American Journal of Tropical*  
560 *Medicine and Hygiene* 86, 1062–1071. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2012.11-0630>
- 561 Porter, W.T., Motyka, P.J., Wachara, J., Barrand, Z.A., Hmood, Z., McLaughlin, M.,  
562 Pemberton, K., Nieto, N.C., 2019. Citizen science informs human-tick exposure in the  
563 Northeastern United States. *Int J Health Geogr* 18, 9. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-019-0173-0)  
564 [019-0173-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-019-0173-0)
- 565 R Core Team, 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation  
566 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 567 Rasinski, K.A., Mingay, D., Bradburn, N.M., 1994. Do Respondents Really “Mark All That  
568 Apply” On Self-Administered Questions? *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58, 400.  
569 <https://doi.org/10.1086/269434>
- 570 Rosenberg, R., Lindsey, N.P., Fischer, M., Gregory, C.J., Hinckley, A.F., Mead, P.S., Paz-  
571 Bailey, G., Waterman, S.H., Drexler, N.A., Kersh, G.J., Hooks, H., Partridge, S.K.,

- 572 Visser, S.N., Beard, C.B., Petersen, L.R., 2018. Vital Signs: Trends in Reported  
573 Vectorborne Disease Cases — United States and Territories, 2004–2016. *MMWR*  
574 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 67, 496–501. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6717e1>  
575 Rosenstock, I.M., 1974. Historical Origins of the Health Belief Model. *Health Education*  
576 *Monographs* 2, 328–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019817400200403>  
577 Schiffman, E.K., Neitzel, D.F., Lynfield, R., 2016. Tick-borne Disease Prevention: Still No  
578 Silver Bullet. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 214, 171–172.  
579 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv776>  
580 Smith, G., Wileyto, E.P., Hopkins, R.B., Cherry, B.R., Maher, J.P., 2001. Risk factors for  
581 lyme disease in Chester County, Pennsylvania. *Public Health Rep* 116, 146–156.  
582 Stafford, K.C., Magnarelli, L.A., 1993. Spatial and Temporal Patterns of *Ixodes scapularis*  
583 (Acari: Ixodidae) in Southeastern Connecticut. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 30,  
584 762–771. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmedent/30.4.762>  
585 Vázquez, M., Muehlenbein, C., Cartter, M., Hayes, E.B., Ertel, S., Shapiro, E.D., 2008.  
586 Effectiveness of Personal Protective Measures to Prevent Lyme Disease. *Emerging*  
587 *Infectious Diseases* 14, 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1402.070725>  
588 Venables, W.N., Ripley, B.D., 2002. *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Fourth Edition.  
589 Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0  
590

		<b>Midwest</b>		<b>Northeast</b>		$\chi^2$	
		<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>p-value</b>	
<b>Device</b>	"The Tick App"	663	(95.1)	366	(92.4)	0.068	
	Not App	34	(4.9)	30	(7.6)		
<b>Age (years)</b>	18-24	40	(5.8)	11	(2.8)	0.001	
	25-34	111	(16.0)	70	(17.8)		
	35-44	137	(19.7)	109	(27.7)		
	45-54	120	(17.3)	83	(21.1)		
	55-64	169	(24.3)	73	(18.5)		
	65 or older	118	(17.0)	48	(12.2)		
<b>Gender</b>	Female	340	(48.8)	211	(53.3)	0.258	
	Male	348	(49.9)	178	(45.0)		
	Other	9	(1.3)	7	(1.8)		
<b>Previous Lyme diagnosis</b>	No	618	(89.2)	338	(86.0)	0.122	
	Yes	75	(10.8)	55	(14.0)		
<b>Property</b>	Apartment	79	(11.3)	112	(28.5)	<0.001	
	House with yard	618	(88.7)	281	(71.5)		
<b>Outdoor recreation</b>	Infrequent	126	(18.1)	146	(36.9)	<0.001	
	Frequent	571	(81.9)	250	(63.1)		
<b>Work / volunteer outdoors</b>	No	363	(52.4)	266	(67.5)	<0.001	
	Yes	330	(47.6)	128	(32.5)		
	<8 hr	209	(63.7)	86	(67.2)		0.486
	>8 hr	119	(36.3)	42	(32.8)		
<b>Tick previous fall / winter</b>	No	435	(62.7)	308	(78.0)	<0.001	
	Yes	259	(37.3)	87	(22.0)		
<b>Dog</b>	No	306	(44.2)	212	(54.5)	0.001	
	Yes	386	(55.8)	177	(45.5)		

**Table 1: Summary of study participants.** The Midwest represents participants from Wisconsin and the Northeast represents participants from New Jersey and New York.



Activity	Frequency	Midwest		Northeast		$\chi^2$
		n	(%)	n	(%)	p-value
<b>Recreational</b>						
<b>Bird watching</b>	Never	363	(53.0)	254	(65.5)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	82	(12.0)	51	(13.1)	
	At least once a month	91	(13.3)	40	(10.3)	
	At least once a week	149	(21.8)	43	(11.1)	
<b>Camping</b>	Never	262	(38.2)	233	(59.9)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	217	(31.7)	115	(29.6)	
	At least once a month	176	(25.7)	34	(8.7)	
	At least once a week	30	(4.4)	7	(1.8)	
<b>Fishing</b>	Never	296	(43.0)	299	(76.7)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	149	(21.6)	47	(12.1)	
	At least once a month	173	(25.1)	30	(7.7)	
	At least once a week	71	(10.3)	14	(3.6)	
<b>Hiking</b>	Never	37	(5.4)	45	(11.4)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	62	(9.0)	71	(18.0)	
	At least once a month	230	(33.4)	119	(30.1)	
	At least once a week	360	(52.2)	160	(40.5)	
<b>Hunting</b>	Never	539	(79.1)	373	(95.4)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	43	(6.3)	5	(1.3)	
	At least once a month	63	(9.3)	8	(2.0)	
	At least once a week	36	(5.3)	5	(1.3)	
<b>Visiting the beach</b>	Never	49	(7.1)	24	(6.2)	0.911
	About once in the summer	156	(22.7)	90	(23.1)	
	At least once a month	293	(42.6)	163	(41.9)	
	At least once a week	189	(27.5)	112	(28.8)	


<i>Peridomestic</i>						
<b>Gardening</b>	Never	72	(11.8)	60	(21.5)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	38	(6.2)	20	(7.2)	
	At least once a month	98	(16.1)	52	(18.6)	
	At least once a week	401	(65.8)	147	(52.7)	
<b>Mowing the lawn</b>	Never	120	(19.6)	147	(53.3)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	23	(3.8)	11	(4.0)	
	At least once a month	99	(16.2)	45	(16.3)	
	At least once a week	370	(60.5)	73	(26.4)	

**Table 2.** Midwesterners do more frequent recreational and peridomestic activity than Northeasterners. The number of respondents (n) and percentage (%) in each frequency per recreational and peridomestic outdoor activity. A comparison between the Midwest and Northeast was made for the participants in each activity frequency, the p-value of the Chi-squared test ( $\chi^2$ ) is included.


Activity	Frequency	Midwest		OR (95% CI)	Northeast		OR (95% CI)	$\chi^2$ p-value
		n / N	(%)		n / N	(%)		
<b>Recreational</b>								
<b>Bird watching</b>	Never	112 / 363	(30.9)	1	38 / 254	(15.0)	1	0.877
	About once in the summer	33 / 82	(40.2)	1.51 (0.92, 2.47)	13 / 51	(25.5)	1.95 (0.95, 3.99)	
	At least once a month	44 / 91	(48.4)	2.10 (1.31, 3.35)	15 / 40	(37.5)	3.41 (1.65, 7.06)	
	At least once a week	64 / 149	(43.0)	1.69 (1.14, 2.50)	18 / 43	(41.9)	4.09 (2.04, 8.29)	
<b>Camping</b>	Never	79 / 262	(30.2)	1	34 / 233	(14.6)	1	0.024
	About once in the summer	81 / 217	(37.3)	1.38 (0.94, 2.02)	34 / 115	(29.6)	2.46 (1.43, 4.22)	
	At least once a month	81 / 176	(46.0)	1.98 (1.33, 2.94)	13 / 34	(38.2)	3.62 (1.66, 7.92)	
	At least once a week	13 / 30	(43.3)	1.77 (0.82, 3.82)	3 / 7	(42.9)	4.39 (0.94, 20.49)	
<b>Fishing</b>	Never	86 / 296	(29.1)	1	57 / 299	(19.1)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	61 / 149	(40.9)	1.69 (1.12, 2.56)	10 / 47	(21.3)	1.15 (0.54, 2.44)	
	At least once a month	76 / 173	(43.9)	1.91 (1.29, 2.83)	13 / 30	(43.3)	3.25 (1.49, 7.07)	
	At least once a week	33 / 71	(46.5)	2.12 (1.25, 3.60)	3 / 14	(35.7)	2.36 (0.76, 7.31)	
<b>Hiking</b>	Never	8 / 37	(21.6)	1	3 / 45	(6.7)	1	0.032
	About once in the summer	9 / 62	(14.5)	0.62 (0.21, 1.77)	10 / 71	(14.1)	2.30 (0.60, 8.84)	
	At least once a month	69 / 230	(30.0)	1.55 (0.68, 3.57)	25 / 119	(21.0)	3.72 (1.07, 13.02)	
	At least once a week	172 / 360	(47.8)	3.32 (1.48, 7.45)	49 / 160	(30.6)	6.18 (1.83, 20.90)	
<b>Hunting</b>	Never	170 / 539	(31.5)	1	79 / 373	(21.2)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	19 / 43	(44.2)	1.72 (0.92, 3.22)	0 / 5	(0)	NA	
	At least once a month	38 / 63	(60.3)	3.30 (1.93, 5.64)	4 / 8	(50.0)	3.72 (0.91, 15.21)	
	At least once a week	25 / 36	(69.4)	4.93 (2.37, 10.26)	2 / 5	(40.0)	2.48 (0.41, 15.11)	
<b>Visiting the beach</b>	Never	20 / 49	(40.8)	1	2 / 24	(8.3)	1	0.059

	About once in the summer	42 / 156	(26.9)	0.53 (0.27, 1.06)	20 / 90	(22.2)	3.14 (0.68, 14.52)	
	At least once a month	106 / 293	(36.2)	0.82 (0.44, 1.52)	26 / 163	(16.0)	2.09 (0.46, 9.42)	
	At least once a week	89 / 189	(47.1)	1.29 (0.68, 2.44)	35 / 112	(31.2)	5.00 (1.11, 22.45)	
<b><i>Peridomestic</i></b>								
<b>Gardening</b>	Never	17 / 72	(23.6)	1	7 / 60	(11.7)	1	0.681
	About once in the summer	10 / 38	(26.3)	1.16 (0.47, 2.85)	3 / 20	(15.0)	1.34 (0.31, 5.75)	
	At least once a month	30 / 98	(30.6)	1.43 (0.71, 2.85)	11 / 52	(21.2)	2.03 (0.72, 5.70)	
	At least once a week	177 / 401	(44.1)	2.56 (1.43, 4.56)	46 / 147	(31.3)	3.45 (1.46, 8.16)	
<b>Mowing the lawn</b>	Never	27 / 120	(22.5)	1	27 / 147	(18.4)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	8 / 23	(34.8)	1.84 (0.70, 4.79)	3 / 11	(27.3)	1.67 (0.42, 6.70)	
	At least once a month	34 / 99	(34.3)	1.80 (0.99, 3.27)	12 / 45	(26.7)	1.62 (0.74, 3.53)	
	At least once a week	168 / 370	(45.4)	2.87 (1.78, 4.61)	23 / 73	(31.5)	2.04 (1.07, 3.90)	

**Table 3** Participants who reported more frequent outdoor activity in spring and summer were more likely to have found a tick in the previous fall and winter. The number of respondents that found a tick (n) and the total in each frequency per recreational outdoor activity are included (N), followed by the percentage (%). The odds of finding a tick when doing an activity about once a summer, monthly or weekly compared to never doing the activity was calculated, the odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) are included. A comparison between the Midwest and Northeast was made for participants that reported finding a tick versus those who did not, the p-value of the Chi-squared test ( $\chi^2$ ) is included.




**Figure 1: Use of personal protective measures vary between the Midwest and the Northeast.** The proportion of participants who used personal protective measures the previous spring and summer. Personal protective measures included: Check one-self for ticks, use of tick repellent use (e.g. DEET, picaridin), wear protective clothing (e.g. light colored, long-sleeved, tucking pants in socks, boots), shower or bathe to remove ticks, permethrin-treated clothing, no personal protective measures and other methods. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



**Figure 2: Peridomestic risk factors for tick exposure were more prevalent in the Midwest and peridomestic tick interventions were more common in the Northeast. A)**

The proportion of homes (excluding apartments or condominiums) from participants from the Midwest (grey) and Northeast (black) with each property characteristic. B) Peridomestic interventions employed in the Midwest and Northeast targeting deer, rodents and the environment. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



**Figure 3: More frequent recreational and peri-domestic activities, except mowing the lawn, were associated with the use of personal protective measures.** The conditional odds ratios represent the conditional estimate for increased outdoor activity and the likelihood of use of a preventative measure. A) Estimates for recreational outdoor activities, after accounting for age category, gender, the interaction between activity frequency and region, and previous Lyme diagnosis. B) Estimates for peridomestic activities. In addition to the previously mentioned model parameters, the model also accounted for peridomestic

interventions for deer, rodents and insecticide treatment, and if participants did frequent recreational outdoor activities. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval.