COVID_19's lost puzzle piece: the power of domestic animal reservoir

Nazli Saeedi [1], Seyed Abbas Rafat[2*]

1 Research Center for Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology, Biomedicine Institute, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran Email : saeedi@hotmail.fr, 2 Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran, Email; abbasrafat@hotmail.com *Corresponding Author

Abstract

In recent months, despite being aware of the COVID-19 pandemic, many countries faced increasing epidemic of this disease. Nearly all countries tried to decrease human-to-human contact as the principal mode of transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Other modes of transmission also need to be clarified in more depth, especially, the foodborne transmission. We assessed the effect of animal origin foods (AOF) consumption on the pandemic of COVID-19. For this purpose, we studied the relationship among 20 food supply as independent variables, and the parameter of Total Cases dependent variable. Here we show a relationship between a group of AOF and total cases. Stepwise Regression, Bayes, and Lasso results showed that eggs and fresh fish have positive coefficient. So, among the transmission ways of COVID_19, the role of foodborne transmission should be more significant than previously thought. The possibility of animal origin foodborne transmission should be taken into more consideration. There is need to invent a pasteurization-like-processes to implicate immediately before ingestion of food. Of course, there will be challenges along the way of the revolution in the food preparation culture. The perspective is to expand the surveillance of SARS-Cov-2 during the food production chain.

Author summary

At the time of writing this manuscript, the number of TC of COVID-19 past seven-million mark. During the pandemic, most countries around the world minimized human-to-human contact and travels. However, the prevalence of COVID-19 continued. Despite the awareness of many countries about the principal mode of person-to-person transmission, the rapid outbreak shows the necessity of research on other transmission routes. We suppose the role of FBT of COVID-19 should be more significant than previously thought. The effect of a group of AOF including eggs and fresh fish on total cases was significant in our analysis. At present, we are not able to interpret all significant effects and their coefficients. Interpretation of the factors could be the subject of future researches. In food science technology, it is necessary to expand the detection of viruses to all AOF. WHO's recommendations state that COVID_19 have not FBT, and suitable food safety practices could prevent the probability of FBT. However, the realization of proper food safety practices for all foods is questionable.

Introduction

At the time of writing this manuscript, the number of TC of COVID-19 past seven-million mark. During the pandemic, most countries around the world minimized human-to-human contact and travels[1]. However, the prevalence of COVID-19 continued. Despite the awareness of many countries about the principal mode of person-to-person transmission, the rapid outbreak shows the necessity of research on other transmission routes. In Italy and the USA, for example, the chances of being surprised were low, but both countries faced epidemic dramatically. Among the various routes of transmission, FBT is most likely. We suppose the role of FBT of COVID-19 should be more significant than previously thought. Transmission of MERS, a similar pathogenic virus to SARS-Cov-2, through food has strengthened our hypothesis.

Furthermore, some researchers cited the possibility of FBT for SARS-Cov-2[2–6]. Also, FAO/WHO experts mentioned the data gap in the relationship between viruses and FB disease [7] . The motivation for the present study is to find the relationship between COVID_19 and human food consumption patterns.

Finding the relevance of TC with food

Material and methods are included in supplementary materials.

We assessed a relationship between the consumption of some foods and TC. Accordingly, we studied TC as a dependent variable and 20 food supply data as independent variables. The statistical methods included correlation, stepwise and LASSO regression, Principal Component Analysis (PCA), and Bayes analysis. Food supply (kg/capita/yr.) was quantity in each country. The primary purpose of the study was to find effect of AOF on TC, however, we considered six plant origin foods for comparison. Histogram of the variables, and their logarithmic transformation are presented in Figs S1 and S2. Diagnostics panels and selection criteria of regression models are presented in Figs S3-S5. The scree plot of PCA is shown in Fig S6. Visual examination of the trace plot in Bayesian analysis is shown in Fig S8. Adjusted R-square and Geweke diagnostics of fitted models are presented in S1 and S2 Tables, respectively.

Furthermore, the relationship between TC and animal production in each country was estimated using the same statistical methods.

Results and Discussion

Food consumption

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of studied variables. Results of PCA show that AOF and TC are mostly grouped (Fig 1 and S7 Fig). The highest positive Pearson correlation with TC belongs to eggs. Stepwise Regression, Bayes, and Lasso results showed that eggs and fresh fish have positive coefficient. With our results in Table 2, implying the need for tracing of SARS-COV-2 in some AOF. Bayes results, e.g., show there is a 0.99 probability of a positive correlation between eggs and TC, adjusted for the other covariates. The number of AOF and their role in our results varies depending on the type of statistical method used, but all results are consistent.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of studied foods (n=20) besides total cases.

#	**Variable** (kg/capita/yr)	**Abbreviation**	**N**	**Mean**	**Std Dev**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
1	**Pig meat**	pig	169	14.66	15.52	0.00	71.48
2	**Bovine Meat**	bov	174	11.20	9.00	0.78	55.48
3	**Cheese**	che	173	4.97	6.55	0.00	30.82
4	**Cream**	cre	159	1.21	2.76	0.00	18.45
5	**Eggs**	Egg	174	7.08	5.09	0.16	19.15
6	**Fresh water Fish**	freshf	174	3.38	4.54	0.00	34.00
7	**Honey**	hon	168	0.36	0.46	0.00	3.51
8	**Milk, Whole**	milk	174	59.17	48.93	0.96	258.44
9	**Poultry Meat**	poul	174	20.56	16.46	0.42	72.87
10	**Demersal Fish**	demer	173	3.40	4.93	0.00	33.45
11	**Cephalopods**	ceph	171	0.44	0.96	0.00	6.70
12	**Butter, Ghee**	butg	174	1.25	1.64	0.00	9.25
13	**Marine Fish, Other**	marf	172	2.74	4.87	0.00	28.19
14	**Aquatic Plants**	aqp	162	0.20	1.91	0.00	22.41
15	**Beverages, Alcoholic**	bev	171	3.20	3.87	0.00	26.90
16	**Rice(Milled Equivalent)**	rice	174	30.95	36.20	0.95	171.73
17	**Potatoes and products**	potato	174	34.89	33.65	0.05	183.16
18	**Maize and products**	maiz	170	21.71	28.52	0.00	158.40
19	**Wheat and products**	wheat	174	70.92	46.85	1.89	222.40
20	**wine**	wine	169	6.27	9.49	0.00	51.41
	Total Cases (Per Country)	TC	215	29247.33	138459.41	1	1837578

Table 2. The results of Pearson correlation and multivariate analyses. All variables are logarithmic transformed data. For abbreviations, see Table 1.

	r, P Value, n	Stepwise	lasso	Bayes
pig	0.17, 0.03, 156	-0.52	-0.28	0.19
bov	0.26, 0.008, 161			0.63
Che	0.28, 0.0004, 161			0.29
cre	0.18, 0.03, 150			0.47
egg	0.43, <.0001, 161	1.84	**1.16**	**0.99**
freshf	0.31, <.0001, 161	1	**0.90**	**0.99**
hon	0.23, 0.004, 158			0.20
milk	0.21, 0.006, 161			0.48
poul	ns			0.31
demer	0.25, <.0001, 160		0.22	0.79
ceph	ns			0.51
Butg	0.34, <.0001, 161		0.08	0.80
marf	-0.45, <.0001, 159	-1.36	-1.29	-1.00
aqp	ns			0.50
bev	ns			0.16
rice	ns		0.30	0.98
potato	0.36, <.0001,161		0.22	0.88
maiz	ns		0.13	0.92
wheat	0.29, 0.0002, 161		0.32	0.90
wine	0.19, 0.02, 157			0.75

The effect of a group of AOF on TC was significant in our analysis. So, we suppose a noticeable effect of AOF in FBT. At present, we are not able to interpret all significant effects and their coefficients. Interpretation of the factors could be the subject of future researches. Potential transmission ways of COVID-19 based on the results of our analysis and bibliography is summarized as Fig 2. The transmission of coronaviruses through food has been reported[6]. Lake and Kingsbury (2020) provided a review about potential for FBT of COVID-19, but they could not guarantee the application of the data found on other coronaviruses to SARS-CoV-2[6]**.** The persistence of viruses by refrigeration temperature[7] might be an explanation of the relationship between COVID-19 and AOF. The viral persistence of coronavirus in soft cheese [8] and raw milk[9] has been reported. We don't know what's going on from “Farm to Fork” about AOF. For example, SARS-CoV-2 may be more resistant to heat when cooking, as it is observed for poliovirus in beef[10]. It is recommended not to consume raw or undercooked animal products[11]. Kitchen utensils can transmit the virus among foods[12], accordingly, AOF may be a suitable vehicle, and the virus inside them will survive better and longer. The human pathogenic virus, such as Enterovirus, can survive in honey, so it is imaginable similarly for SARS-CoV-2. Honey bees deposit viruses on flowers[13]. Maori showed horizontal RNA flow among honey bees by the ingestion of royal jelly[14]. Trade in raw honey bee products could pose pandemic risks for pathogen viruses of honey bees[15]. The pessimist hypothesis would be the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by raw honey.

Furthermore, the methods of diagnosing the virus in food are not complete, and there are many limitations[16]. In food science technology, the primary attention paid to bivalve moullouses. Nowadays, it is necessary to expand the detection of viruses to all AOF.

WHO's recommendations state that COVID_19 have not FBT, and suitable food safety practices could prevent the probability of FBT. However, the realization of proper food safety practices for all AOF is questionable.

Animal production

The highest pair-wise Pearson correlations between the number of livestock and TC belong to poultry (0.71), turkeys (0.68), pigs (0.62), horses (0.59), and beehives (0.57) with P-value of (<0.0001) for all of them. The chosen variables in Bayesian analysis were the number of chicken, turkeys, pigs, and goats, and in Lasso analysis they were the number of chickens, pigs, and turkeys. The observed positive correlation between the number of beehives and TC should be explained by circulating viruses between animal and human. As, some zoonotic viruses first circulate in animals, and sometimes they infect humans. After that, they adapt to humans. A recent zoonotic transmission event of SARS-CoV-2 is reported[17]. It is crucial to characterize circulating viruses in the human working environment, especially where an interface with wildlife[18]. Spread of influenza virus during commercial movement of eggs is reported by Pillai[19]. Poultry production in the extensive system increases the chance of SARS-CoV-2 transmission among other species[20]. Feathers detached from domestic ducks reported as a source of environmental contamination to pathogenic avian influenza virus[21]. Qiu et al.(2020) identified pigs, cows, goats, and sheep among the most likely intermediate animal hosts for SARS-CoV-2 [22]. The outbreak of COVID-19 highlights viral spillover from animals[23]. There is the potential for the emergence of new coronavirus diseases in domestic birds, from both avian and mammalian sources. For example, a novel species of coronaviridae family has been identified recently[24]. *Coronaviridae*'s family viruses are likely can cross the species barrier of viruses and infect other species, fishes, cattle, pigs, and humans [25].

Conclusion

Despite the awareness and readiness of many countries for COVID-19 during early 2020, why did it spread so quickly? It seems FBT has received less attention relative to other routes. There is need to invent a pasteurization-like-processes to implicate immediately before ingestion of food. Of course, there will be challenges along the way of the revolution in the food preparation culture. The perspective is to expand the surveillance of SARS-Cov-2 during the food production chain.

Fig. 1 PCA results: the interrelationships between all variables. Some of AOF are closer to TC. For abbreviations, see Table 1.

Fig. 2 Potential transmission ways of COVID-19 based on the results of our analysis and bibliography. It is necessary to study the exchange of human pathogen viruses in wildlife and livestock. Where and how suspicious foods become contaminated must be investigated. The potential spillover of pathogenic viruses from arthropods hosts to humans should be investigated[23]. The cross-species transmission is reported[26].There may be a type of contact among flowers, bees, and bats. Infected humans could also have transmitted MERS to the camels [27]. SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-Co are among the most notable examples of spillover into humans[28]. References for arrows:

1 [11,14,18,20,29,30]

2: [11,26]

3: [24,26]

4:[23,31]

5: [5,8,32]

6 : [4,32,33]

Material and Methods

Food consumption

We estimated the relationship between 20 food supply and Total Cases of covid19. The methods include pair-wise correlation with Proc Corr, Stepwise Regression with Proc Reg, LASSO regression with GLMSELECT Proc, Principal Component Analysis with Proc Princomp, and Bayes analysis with Proc Genmod (SAS). Food supply was quantity (kg/capita/yr.). Fourteen foods of animal origin and six foods of plant origin were selected. The primary purpose of the study was to find animal origin foods relationship with TC, but some plant origin foods were chosen to compare.

We started our analyses first time on March 2020. Then we repeated it several times with updated COVID_19 data on April, May, and June. Finally we presented the results of June' data.

Data

COVID_19 https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ 1 June 2020

Live Animal production data: http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QA

Food Supply - Crops Primary Equivalent:

http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CC

Food Supply - Livestock and Fish Primary Equivalent:

http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CL

We used base-*e* logs, also known as natural logs (LOG in SAS) for the transformation of TC and independent variables. In all analyses, the accuracy of the model with non-transformed data was very low. So, all variables has been transformed to normalize the distributions. With transformation of data, the accuracy of the model increased to an acceptable level. In PCA, as a nonparametric method, we utilized non-transformed data, in which the variables are treated equally, i.e., that is, there are no dependent variables.

In comparison of models, Lasso's results are more reliable than stepwise regression and Bayes, because it’s AIC was smaller and had higher accuracy as R-square (S1 Table).

S1 Table. Adjusted R-square and AIC of fitted models for food consumption.

	Stepwise	LASSO	BAYES
R-Square	0.48	0.52	-
Adj-R_Square	0.47	0.48	-
AIC	-	301	551
n	131	131	131

Bayesian Analysis: Visual examination of the trace plot displays proper mixing, for one independent variable in presented in S8 Fig. The P-value in the Geweke Diagnostics (S2 Table) showed that the mean estimate of the Markov chain is stable over time. The positive probability that B1 greater than 0 is estimated.

S2 Table Geweke diagnostics from Genmode analysis. Pr > z shows convergence for all variables. For abbreviations, see Table 1

Parameter*	z	Pr > |z|
Intercept	0.2734	0.7845
pig	0.6475	0.5173
bov	-0.2165	0.8286
che	-0.7437	0.4571
cre	-0.9484	0.3429
egg	-1.5173	0.1292
freshf	0.4354	0.6633
hon	0.7984	0.4246
milk	-0.0434	0.9654
poul	0.9524	0.3409
demer	-0.9509	0.3416
ceph	0.7935	0.4275
butg	1.898	0.0577
marf	-0.4608	0.6449
aqp	0.58	0.5619
bev	-1.1802	0.2379
rice	-0.9809	0.3266
potato	-1.0137	0.3107
maiz	-0.3024	0.7624
wheat	0.5066	0.6124
wine	-0.0076	0.994
Scale	0.0274	0.9781

* Logarithmic transformation for all parameters

Although the probability of transmitting the virus through wine is zero, we deliberately kept it in the initial model of our analysis. Results showed wine is eliminated among significant variables of the suited model (Table 2). So we concluded that just the energy content of food should not keep a variable in the fitted model. So, in addition to energy content, there must be something else in food-related COVID-19. The high-fat tissue in the body affects on the pathogenesis of COVID-19[34]. We concentrate FB transmission of COVID-19 rather than the immunity response.

Animal and crop production

We utilized the GLMSLECT procedure of SAS 9.2 with the method of least absolute shrinkage and selector operator (LASSO). The dependent variable was TC, and independent variables were beehives, cattle, chicken, pigs, goats, turkeys, horse, rabbit, maize, barley, and apples. Maize, Barley, apples were deliberately kept in a multi-variable model, to test whether plant material production remains in the model compared to livestock production. We used the GENMOD procedure of the SAS using the *BAYES* statement to obtain *Bayesian* analysis. Spearman and Pearson correlation between stocks and TC calculated. Analyzes were performed with log-transformed data. Due to the higher accuracy of the transformed data, their results were used.

There are references[33] that guide us to construct our hypothesis about the essential relationship between COVID-19 and AOF include.

We provide the SAS code for an application of the used statistical methods [35].

We note that this work was posted as preprint on medrxiv[36] .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Author contributions: Conceptualization and Visualisation: N. S. K., Methodology: S. A. R. Writing: Both authors.

The authors have declared no competing interest.

Data and materials availability: All data are available in the manuscript or the supplementary materials.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Histogram of variables of Total cases before (left) and after (right) logarithmic transformation.

S2 Fig. Histogram of some independent variables before and after logarithmic transformation. First row, from Left to right: cream, log cream, pigs, logpigs. Second row: Bovine meat, log bovin meat, eggs, log of eggs.

S3 Fig. Diagnostics panel. Fit diagnostics and residual by regressors, in multivariate regression with stepwise selection of variables.

S4 Fig. Other Criteria Suggest Stopping the Selection (GLMSELECT proc of SAS). Progression of squared errors (left) and Fit criteria of LASSO analysis.

S5 Fig. Results of the GLMSELECT Proc of SAS. The standardized coefficients of all the effects that are selected at some step of the elastic net method, plotted as a function of the step number of LASSO analysis.

S6 Fig. Scree plot and percentage of variance explained by principal componentsofPCA analysis.

S7 Fig. Results of PROC PRINCOMP, includes 1 by 3 (left)and 2 by 3(right) component pattern plots. Principal component analysis results showed that AOF are generally closer to TC in the comparison with other studied foods.

S8 Fig. Bayesian Analysis: Visual examination of the trace plot displays proper mixing for Eggs.

References

1. Merler S, Pastore A, Mu K, Rossi L, Sun K. The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak. 2020;400: 395–400.

2. Panel E, Biohaz H. Scientific Opinion on an update on the present knowledge on the occurrence and control of foodborne viruses 1. 2011;9: 1–96. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2190.

3. Todd ECD, Greig JD, Todd E, Llc C. Viruses of foodborne origin□: a review. 2020; 25–46.

4. Hi ZS. REVIEW ARTICLE A brief review of foodborne zoonoses in China. 2020; 1497–1504. doi:10.1017/S0950268811000872

5. Newell DG, Koopmans M, Verhoef L, Duizer E, Aidara-kane A, Sprong H, et al. International Journal of Food Microbiology Food-borne diseases — The challenges of 20 years ago still persist while new ones continue to emerge. International Journal of Food Microbiology. 2010;139: S3–S15. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.01.021

6. Kingsbury J, Lake R, Hewitt J, Smit E, King N. POTENTIAL FOR FOODBORNE TRANSMISSION OF COVID-19□: 2020; 1–51.

7. FAO/WHO. [Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Health Organization]. Microbiological Risk Assessment Series. 2008;14: 151.

8. Panon G, Tache S, Labie C. Respective stability of rotavirus and coronavirus in bovine milk. 1988;68: 49–64.

9. Hamdi A. Mohamed, Adham M. Abdou , Ekbal M. Adel, Sayed Ahmed H. Salem MIME-H. DETECTION OF ROTA AND CORONA VIRUSES IN RAW MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS. Benha veterinary medical journal. 2013;24: 79–85. Available: http://www.bvmj.bu.edu.eg/abstract.php?ee=156

10. Pirtle EC. Virus survival in the environment. 1991;10: 733–748.

11. Moy GG. IUFoST / CIFST hold an Extraordinary Scienti fi c Roundtable on COVID-19 and Food Safety. npj Science of Food. 2020; 1–2. doi:10.1038/s41538-020-0068-2

12. Sarah C. P. Williams. Kitchen Utensils Transfer Viruses. Available: https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2012/12/kitchen-utensils-transfer-viruses

13. Id SAA, Burnham PA, Boncristiani HF, Brody K. RNA virus spillover from managed honeybees (Apis mellifera) to wild bumblebees (Bombus spp .). 2019; 1–13.

14. Maori E, Trust W, Reports C. Discovery of RNA transfer through royal jelly could aid development of honey bee vaccines. 2019; 3–5. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2019.04.073

15. Mutinelli F. The spread of pathogens through trade in honey bees and their products (including queen bees and semen): overview and recent developments Honey bees. 2011;30: 257–271.

16. Bosch A, Gkogka E, Le FS, Loisy-hamon F, Lee A, Lieshout L Van, et al. International Journal of Food Microbiology Foodborne viruses□: Detection , risk assessment , and control options in food processing. International Journal of Food Microbiology. 2018;285: 110–128. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2018.06.001

17. Kujawski SA, Wong KK, Collins JP, Epstein L, Killerby ME, Midgley CM, et al. Clinical and virologic characteristics of the first 12 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. Nature Medicine. 2020;26: 861–868. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0877-5

18. Bourgarel M, Pfukenyi D, Becquart P, Morand S. Next-Generation Sequencing on Insectivorous Bat Guano□: An Accurate Tool to Identify Arthropod Viruses of Potential Agricultural Concern. 2019. doi:10.3390/v11121102

19. Pillai SPS, Saif YM, Lee CW. Detection of influenza A viruses in eggs laid by infected

turkeys. Avian diseases. 2010;54: 830–833. doi:10.1637/9102-101209-Reg.1

20. Cavanagh D, Cavanagh D. Coronaviruses in poultry and other birds Coronaviruses in poultry and other birds. 2007;9457. doi:10.1080/03079450500367682

21. Yamamoto Y, Nakamura K, Yamada M, Mase M. Persistence of Avian Influenza Virus (H5N1) in Feathers Detached from Bodies of Infected Domestic Ducks . 2010;76: 5496–5499. doi:10.1128/AEM.00563-10

22. Qiu Y, Zhao Y, Wang Q, Li J, Zhou Z, Liao C, et al. Predicting the angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) utilizing capability as the receptor of SARS-CoV-2. Microbes and Infection. 2020;2. doi:10.1016/j.micinf.2020.03.003

23. Tao Z, Tian J, Pei Y, Yuan M, Zhang Y, Dai F. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. 2020;579. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2008-3

24. Papineau A, Berhane Y, Wylie TN, Wylie KM, Sharpe S, Lung O. Genome Organization of Canada Goose Coronavirus , A Novel Species Identified in a Mass Die-off of Canada Geese. Scientific Reports. 2019; 1–8. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-42355-y

25. Leong JC. Fish Viruses. Encyclopedia of Virology. 2008; 227—234. doi:10.1016/b978-012374410-4.00400-3

26. Miller RS, Sweeney SJ, Slootmaker C, Grear DA, Salvo PA Di, Kiser D, et al. Cross-species transmission potential between wild pigs , livestock , poultry , wildlife , and humans : implications for disease risk management in North America. Scientific Reports. 2017; 1–14. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-07336-z

27. Kai Kupferschmidt. New Middle Eastern Virus Found in Camels. 2013. Available:

https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2013/11/new-middle-eastern-virus-found-camels

28. Guan Y, Zheng BJ, He YQ, Liu XL, Zhuang ZX, Cheung CL, et al. Isolation and characterization of viruses related to the SARS coronavirus from animals in southern China. Science (New York, NY). 2003;302: 276–278. doi:10.1126/science.1087139

29. Rizzo F, Edenborough KM, Toffoli R, Culasso P, Zoppi S, Dondo A, et al. Coronavirus and paramyxovirus in bats from Northwest Italy. 2017; 1–11. doi:10.1186/s12917-017-1307-x

30. Mcmahon DP, Wilfert L, Paxton R, Brown M, Holloway R. Emerging Viruses in Bees□: From. 2018. doi:10.1016/bs.aivir.2018.02.008

31. Geisbert TW, Mire CE, Geisbert JB, Chan Y-P, Agans KN, Feldmann F, et al. Therapeutic treatment of Nipah virus infection in nonhuman primates with a neutralizing human monoclonal antibody. Science translational medicine. 2014;6: 242ra82-242ra82. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3008929

32. Gibbins JD, Hale C, Silver M, Fischer M, Steinberg J, Basler CA, et al. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities —. 2020;69: 557–561.

33. Katy Askew. 2020 German slaughterhouses under fire over “insufficient precautionary measures” to block COVID-19 spread. 2020.

34. Maffetone PB, Laursen PB. The Perfect Storm□: Coronavirus (Covid-19) Pandemic Meets Overfat Pandemic. 2020;8: 1–6. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00135

35. Rafat SA. DATA of Preprint: Human food consumption patterns concerning COVID-19 pandemic. 2020. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.30851.12321

36. Rafat, S.A. saeedi N. Human food consumption patterns concerning COVID-19 pandemic. Available: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132464v1

Fig1


Component Pattern
Component 2 (11.94%)
Component 1 (35.14%)
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.6
-0.8
-1.0
-1.0
-0.8
-0.6
-0.4
-0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
freshf
rice
demer
pig
cre
butg
che
Egg
Totalcases
poul
hon
bov
potato
maiz
wheat
milk

379 Fig 2

380



381

Fig s1


Distribution of Totalcases
Percent
100
80
60
40
20
0
0
200000
400000
600000
800000
1000000
1200000
1400000
1600000
1800000
Totalcases


Distribution of logtot
Percent
25
20
15
10
5
0
0.75
2.25
3.75
5.25
6.75
8.25
9.75
11.25
12.75
14.25
logtot

Fig s2


Distribution of cre
Percent
cre
Distribution of logcre
Percent
logcre
Distribution of pig
Percent
pig
Distribution of logpig
Percent
logpig
Distribution of bov
Percent
bov
Distribution of logbov
Percent
logbov
Distribution of Egg
Percent
Egg
Distribution of logegg
Percent
logegg

Fig s3


Residual by Regressors for logtot
Residual
logpig
logegg
logfreshf
logmarf


Fit Diagnostics for logtot
Residual
Predicted Value
RStudent
Leverage
Quantile
logtot
Cook's D
Observation
Percent
Fit–Mean
Proportion Less
Observations 131
Parameters 5
Error DF 126
MSE 3.425
R-Square 0.4784
Adj R-Square 0.4618

Fig s4


Progression of Average Squared Errors for logtot
Selected Step
Average Squared Error
6
5
4
3
Intercept
1+logmarf
2+logegg
3+logfresht
4+logpotato
5+logdemer
6+logwheat
7+logrice
8+logpig
9+logmaiz
10+logbutg
11+logbov
12+logpoul
13+logche
14+loghon
15+logaqp
16+logceph
17+logcre
18+logmilk
Effect Sequence


Fit Criteria for logtot
AIC
AICC
SBC
Adj R-Sq
C(p)
0
5
10
15
Step
Best Criterion Value
Step Selected by C(p)

Fig s5


Coefficient Progression for logtot
Standardized Coefficient
0.4
0.2
0.0
-0.2
-0.4
logegg
logfreshf
logrice
logmaiz
logbutg
logbov
logaqp
logpoul
logpig
logmarf
Selected Step
CP
100
80
60
40
20
Intercept
1+logmarf
2+logegg
3+logfreshf
4+logpotato
5+logdemer
6+logwheat
7+logrice
8+logpig
9+logmaiz
10+logbutg
11+logbov
12+logpoul
13+logche
14+loghon
15+logaqp
16+logceph
17+logcre
18+logmilk
Effect Sequence

Fig s6


Scree Plot
Eigenvalue
5
4
3
2
1
1
2
3
4
5
6
Principal Component
Variance Explained
Proportion
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
1
2
3
4
5
6
Principal Component
Cumulative
Proportion

Fig s7


Component Pattern
Component 3 (8.537%)
Component 1 (35.14%)
Totalcases
poul
bov
rice
milk
Egg
demer
freshf
wheat
pig
che
maiz
butg
potato
hon
cre
Component Pattern
Component 3 (8.537%)
Component 2 (11.94%)
Totalcases
poul
bov
milk
Egg
demer
rice
freshf
wheat
maiz
potato
che
pig
butg
hon
cre

Fig s8


Diagnostics for logegg
logegg
3
2
1
0
2000
4000
6000
8000
10000
12000
Iteration
Autocorrelation
1.0
0.5
0.0
-0.5
-1.0
0
10
20
30
40
50
Lag
Posterior Density
0
1
2
3
logegg