medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Comparison of COVID-19 outcomes among shielded and non-shielded populations: A general population cohort study of 1.3 million

Bhautesh D Jani,* Frederick K Ho,* David J Lowe, Jamie P Traynor, Sean MacBride-Stewart, Patrick B Mark, Frances S Mair, Jill P Pell

*Joint-first author

Bhautesh D Jani PhD
Clinical Senior Lecturer in General Practice and Primary Care
Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow
Glasgow G12 9LX, UK
Bhautesh.jani@glasgow.ac.uk

Frederick K Ho PhD
Research Associate
Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow
Glasgow, G12 8RZ, UK
Frederick.Ho@glasgow.ac.uk

David J Lowe MSc
Consultant in Emergency Medicine
Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
Glasgow, G52 4TF, UK
David.lowe@nhs.net

Jamie P Traynor MD
Consultant Nephrologist
Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde
Glasgow, G52 4TF, UK
Jamie.traynor@ggc.scot.nhs.uk

Sean MacBride-Stewart PhD
Lead Pharmacist (Medicines Management Resources)
Pharmacy Services
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, G76 7AT, UK
Sean.MacBride-Stewart@ggc.scot.nhs.uk

Patrick B Mark PhD
Professor of Nephrology
Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences
Glasgow, G12 8TA, UK
Patrick.Mark@glasgow.ac.uk

Frances S Mair MD
Norie Miller Professor of General Practice
Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow
Glasgow G12 9LX, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Frances.mair@glasgow.ac.uk

Jill P Pell MD
Henry Mechan Professor of Public Health
Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow
Glasgow, G12 8RZ, UK
Jill.pell@glasgow.ac.uk

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Address for correspondence:
Professor Jill Pell
Director of the Institute of Health and Wellbeing
University of Glasgow
1 Lilybank Gardens
Glasgow G12 8RZ
United Kingdom
Jill.pell@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract word count	306
Main text word count	2,975
Tables	5
Supplementary Tables	2
Supplementary Figures	1
Number of references	34

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Key Points

Question: Did shielding protecting individuals?

Findings: The shielded group experienced higher COVID-19 mortality.

Meaning: Shielding individuals has not been as successful as hoped.

Question: Has shielding protected the population?

Findings: Three-quarters of deaths were due to moderate-risk criteria for which shielding was not recommended.

Meaning: Effective population-level prevention would require considerable expansion of shielding criteria.

Question: Was shielding effective at protecting health services.

Findings: The shielded group were less likely to be admitted to ICU following hospitalisation for COVID-19.

Meaning: ICU demand was successfully managed by systematic exclusion of those with highest risk, rather than protecting them from infection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Importance: Shielding (extended self-isolation) of people judged, a priori, to be at high-risk from COVID-19 has been used by some countries to protect the individuals and reduce demand on health services. It is unclear how well this strategy works in either regard.

Objective: To compare COVID-19 outcomes among shielded and non-shielded populations.

Design: A general population study was conducted using linked primary care, prescribing, laboratory, hospital and death records up to end of May 2020. Poisson regression models and population attributable fractions were used to compare COVID-19 outcomes.

Setting: Population-based cohort study.

Participants: 1.3 million residents in Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Scotland.

Exposures: Overall risk category, and individual risk criteria.

Main Outcomes and Measures: COVID-19 confirmed infection, hospitalisation, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, population mortality and case-fatality.

Results: Of the 1.3 million population, 27,747 (2.03%) had been advised to shield, a further 353,085 (26.85%) were classified a priori as moderate risk. Testing for COVID-19 was more common in the shielded (7.01%) and moderate (2.03%) than low (0.73%) risk categories. Referent to low-risk, the shielded group had higher risk of confirmed infection (RR 8.45, 95% 7.44-9.59), case-fatality (RR 5.62, 95% CI 4.47-7.07) and population mortality (RR 57.56, 95% 44.06-75.19). The moderate-risk had intermediate risk of confirmed infection (RR 4.11, 95% CI 3.82-4.42) and population mortality (RR 25.41, 95% CI 20.36-31.71), but had comparable case-fatality (RR 5.01, 95% CI 4.14-6.06) to the shielded, and accounted for a higher proportion of deaths (PAF 75.30% vs 13.22%). Age ≥70 years made the largest contribution to deaths (49.55%) and was associated with an 8-fold risk of infection, 7-fold case-fatality and 73-fold mortality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions and Relevance: Shielding has not been effective at preventing deaths in those with highest risk. To be effective as a population strategy, shielding criteria would need to be widely expanded to include other criteria, such as the elderly.

Keywords (Mesh terms):

Cohort studies; COVID-19; epidemiology; vulnerable populations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Background

Early in the COVID-19 pandemic, a major concerns was that the demand on health services would exceed capacity in terms of hospitalisations, intensive care unit (ICU) admissions, and ventilation [1]. It was assumed that sub-groups of the population would have worse prognosis and, therefore, contribute disproportionately to adverse outcomes and healthcare demands.

Asian countries have generally relied on population-wide strategies [2]. Early, widespread 'test, trace, isolate' strategies were made possible by higher testing capacity and greater willingness to monitor and enforce compliance. In contrast, Europe and the USA have adopted a two-pronged approach; [2] general population interventions, such as physical distancing and hand hygiene, designed to reduce transmission in the population as a whole, supplemented by shielding of those assumed to be at higher risk. Notably, Sweden, an outlier in not applying lock-down, nonetheless mandated shielding[3]. Studies suggest that the strict isolation over a protracted period that shielding requires can have negative physical and psychological impact.[4,5]

In the UK, a Vulnerable Patient List (Supplementary Table 1)[6] was produced comprising two categories labelled high risk, highest risk or clinically extremely vulnerable and moderate risk, at risk or clinically vulnerable by various UK organisations. In this manuscript, they are referred to as shielded and moderate risk, with the remaining population labelled low-risk. In the UK, the shielded group received individual letters strongly recommending they self-isolate over a protracted period - not leaving their homes and avoiding non-essential contact with household members - and were provided with support at home such as delivery of food

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

packages. The moderate risk category was simply advised to be vigilant in adhering to general advice.

The category definitions were based largely on expert opinion informed by our understanding of previous viruses and the need for better definitions has been highlighted [7]. Studies are emerging of the risk factors associated with COVID-19 outcomes. Among two million UK community-based app users self-reported heart disease, kidney disease, lung disease, diabetes and obesity were associated with self-reported hospital admission and respiratory support for COVID-19 [8]. Similarly, linkage of family practitioner records of 17 million people in England reported a wide range of long-term conditions associated with in-hospital death from COVID-19 including: respiratory, heart, liver and kidney disease, diabetes, cancers, stroke and organ transplantation [9]. Unfortunately, the investigators did not have access to deaths in the community. COVID-19 risk scores are being developed in an attempt to improve identification of high risk individuals who could be advised to shield [10] but attempts to investigate the potential contribution of a shielding strategy to population-level outcomes and healthcare demands have so far been limited to mathematical modelling[11–19].

The aims of this study were to compare those classified, a priori, as high risk (and therefore advised to shield) and those classified as moderate and low-risk, in terms of their individual risk of COVID-19 infection and outcomes and the extent to which they accounted for COVID-19 related outcomes at a population level.

Methods

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We conducted a general population cohort study of all 1.3 million residents of NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde (NHS GGC) in Scotland. The Community Health Index (CHI), a unique identifier attached to all Scottish health records, enabled individual-level record linkage of nine databases: Community Health Index (CHI) register, NHS GGC Shielding List, Egton Medical Information Systems (EMIS) and Vision, Electronic Communication of Surveillance in Scotland (ECOSS), Prescribing Information System (PIS), Strathclyde Electronic Renal Patient Record (SERPR), Rapid Preliminary Inpatient Data (RAPID), and death certificates.

The CHI register provided sociodemographic information (age, sex, area socioeconomic deprivation). Deprivation was measured using the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), derived from seven domains - income, education, health, employment, crime, housing, and access to services – and categorised into general population quintiles. ECOSS collects laboratory data on infectious diseases, including test date and result. Albasoft software extract data from the family practitioner electronic health record systems EMIS and Vision, and PIS collects data on medications prescribed by family practitioners. SERPR records data on renal replacement therapy and transplantation. RAPID collects real-time data on hospitalisation, including dates of admission and discharge, and type of ward, and the Scottish Morbidity Record 01 (SMR01) subsequently records the relevant disease codes. Death certificates provide the date and cause of all deaths, whether in-hospital or in the community. Follow-up data were available until the end of May 2020, before the shielding recommendation was lifted.

Supplementary Table 1 lists the criteria for the shielded and medium risk categories applied at the time of data extraction. All remaining patients are categorised as low-risk. The Scottish list of high-risk individuals is compiled centrally, and regularly updated, using family

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

practitioner, hospital admission, disease registry and medication data. Family practitioners check the completeness and accuracy of the list before letters, recommending shielding, are sent to patients. The NHS GGC Shielding List we used contains the validated data including the criterion satisfied. We ascertained moderate risk individuals using Albasoft extraction of EMIS and Vision data, and PIS data.

Separate models were conducted by overall risk category (low-risk, moderate-risk or shielded) and by the individual criteria for the moderate-risk and shielded categories. The four general population outcomes investigated were: confirmed COVID-19 infection; COVID-19 related hospitalisation; COVID-19 related ICU admission; COVID-19 related mortality. The three outcomes investigated among those with confirmed infection were: COVID-19 related hospitalisation; COVID-19 related ICU admission; and COVID-19 related case fatality.

Laboratory-confirmed cases were defined as positive PCR test. Clinically-confirmed cases were defined as either positive PCR test or death from COVID-19 without testing. COVID-19 related deaths were defined as International Classification of Diseases 10th revision (ICD-10) code U07.1 or U07.2 recorded on the death certificate. COVID-related hospitalisation was defined as an SMR01 hospitalisation record with an ICD code U07.1 or U07.2 or, for more recent admissions, a RAPID hospitalisation record plus positive PCR test taken between two weeks before and two days after hospitalisation. ICU admission during such hospitalisations was assumed to be COVID-related.

Sociodemographic characteristics were compared by risk category using chi-square tests. Poisson regression models with robust standard errors were used to compare risk ratios (RR)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

for the shielded and moderate-risk categories referent to the low-risk category. The models were run univariately; then adjusted for sex and SIMD quintile as potential confounders. Age was not included as a covariate because it was a moderate-risk criterion. The models were re-run using the individual criteria for the shielded and moderate-risk categories as the exposure variables, referent to the low-risk category.

Population attributable fractions (PAFs) were calculated, from prevalence and adjusted RR, to determine the proportion of each outcome that could be attributed to being shielded and moderate-risk, as well as the proportion due to each individual criterion. The PAFs of individual criteria were proportionally calibrated so that their sum equated to the overall PAF of the relevant risk category. PAF confidence intervals were estimated using bootstrapping (x 1000).

Ethical approvals

The study was approved by the NHS GGC Primary Care Information Sharing Group and the NHS GGC Local Privacy Advisory Committee (Reference GSH/20RM005) and was covered by the generic Safe Haven Research Ethics Committee approval (GSH20RM005_COVID_Community).

Results

Of the 1,315,071 people registered with family practitioners in NHS GGC, 26,747 (2.03%) were on the shielding list and 353,085 (26.85%) were classified, a priori, as moderate-risk. Of the 26,747 people in the shielded group, 18,147 (55.78%) had severe respiratory disease,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5,349 (16.44%) were on immunosuppressive therapies, 2,491 (7.66%) had specific cancers, 1,245 (3.83%) had received organ transplants, 475 (1.78%) were on renal dialysis, and less than five were pregnant and had severe heart disease. Of the 353,085 classified as moderate-risk, 160,215 (45.38%) had hypertension, 151,865 (43.01%) had chronic lung disease, 139,568 (39.53%) were at least 70 years of age, 64,358 (18.23%) had diabetes, 48,571 (13.81%) had heart disease, and 1,195 (0.34%) had a weakened immune system.

Shielded and moderate-risk categories

Overall, 15,865 (1.21%) people had been tested for COVID-19. The likelihood of being tested increased with age, was higher in women and in the moderate-risk category and highest in the shielded group (Table 1). Overall, 3,348 (0.25%) people had confirmed COVID-19 infection. The likelihood of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infection followed similar patterns as testing. It increased with age, was higher in women; was highest in the shielded group and lowest in the low-risk category (Table 2). After adjustment for sex and deprivation quintile, the risk of laboratory-confirmed infection remained higher in the moderate-risk category and highest in the shielded group (Table 3).

Overall, 1,661 people were hospitalised for COVID-19. Within the general population, hospitalisations increased with age but were comparable between men and women (Table 2). Hospitalisations were more common in the moderate-risk category and most common in the shielded group (Table 2), remaining so after adjustment for sex and deprivation (Table 3). Overall, 122 people were admitted to ICU wards for COVID-19. ICU admissions were significantly more common among people aged 45-64 years of age than among older people (Table 2). Compared with the low-risk category, the shielded group were 18 times more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

likely to be hospitalised but only 4 times more likely to be admitted to ICU (Table 3). Overall, 1,027 (0.08%) people died from COVID-19. Within the general population, mortality increased with age but was similar in men and women (Table 2). Population mortality was higher in the moderate-risk category and highest in the shielded group (Table 2) and remained so after adjustment for sex and deprivation (Table 3).

Among the sub-group with laboratory-confirmed (test-positive) COVID-19 infection, 1,661 (49.6%) were hospitalised. Hospitalisations increased with age but were comparable between men and women (Table 4). The moderate-risk category was more likely to be hospitalised and the shielded group most likely (Table 4), remaining so after adjustment for age and deprivation (Table 5). Among those with laboratory-confirmed infection, ICU admissions were more common in men and more common in people aged 45-64 years than those older (Table 4). Low-risk cases were more likely to be admitted to ICU than the moderate-risk and shielded groups (Tables 4 & 5). Among the sub-group with clinically-confirmed (test-positive or COVID-19 related death) COVID-19 infection, 1,027 (26.70%) died (Table 4). Case-fatality increased by age and was higher in men than women. It was lowest in the low-risk category but not significantly different between the moderate-risk and shielded groups ($RR_{shielded/moderate}$ [95% CI] 1.12 [0.96-1.31], p=0.14) (Table 5).

The shielded group accounted for 7.62% of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infections, 12.70% of COVID-19 hospitalisations, 2.69% of ICU admissions and 13.22% of COVID-19 related deaths (Supplementary Table 2). The corresponding figures for the moderate-risk category were 42.06%, 53.28%, 22.96% and 75.30%. To prevent at least 80% of deaths, 28.8% of the population would have had to receive the current level of shielding including those with five criteria currently classified as moderate- risk (Supplementary Figure 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Individual risk criteria

Due to insufficient numbers, the individual risk criteria models could not be run for pregnant women with severe heart disease or for COVID-19 related ICU admission in the shielded category. All the remaining individual risk criteria were associated with higher likelihood of being tested for COVID-19 (Table 1), laboratory-confirmed infection (Table 2), hospitalisation, population mortality (Table 3) and case-fatality (Table 5) independent of sex and deprivation. Among the moderate-risk category criteria, age ≥70 years and weakened immune system had risks of population mortality (Table 3) and case-fatality (Table 5) at least as high as the overall shielded group. Apart from the 0.13% of people with relevant rare diseases or inborn errors of metabolism and 1.78% on renal dialysis, the strongest associations were observed for those aged ≥70 years who were eight times as likely to have confirmed infection (Table 3); seven times as likely to die following confirmed infection (Table 5); and 74 times as likely to die overall (Table 3) compared with the low-risk category. Being ≥70 years of age accounted for 17.81% of confirmed COVID-19 infections, 22.19% of COVID-19 related hospitalisations, and 49.55% of COVID-19 related deaths (Supplementary Table 2). Among those hospitalised for COVID-19, the likelihood of ICU admission was significantly lower for all individual risk criteria in the moderate-risk category, other than diabetes (Table 5). In particular, hospitalised patients ≥70 years of age were 14 times less likely to be admitted to ICU than low-risk hospitalised patients (Table 5).

Discussion

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The 2.03% of people advised to shield were, nonetheless, eight times more likely to have confirmed infections than the low-risk category, five times more likely to die following confirmed infection and 49 times more likely to die from COVID-19 overall. Whilst selective testing might explain the first outcome, it does not explain higher overall mortality which suggests that the shielding strategy has not been as effective as was hoped.

One quarter of the population were classified as moderate-risk and not advised to shield. Nonetheless, they were four times more likely to have confirmed infections than the low-risk category, five times more likely to die following confirmed infection and 25 times more likely to die overall, suggesting that shielding criteria should be expanded. In particular, older age needs to be considered since the elderly are both at high individual risk and contribute significantly to population burden due to their relatively high numbers.

Paradoxically, people in the shielded and moderate-risk categories were less likely to be admitted to ICU following hospitalisation for COVID-19 in spite of their poor prognosis, especially patients ≥70 years. This likely reflects selective admission policies applied to avoid demand exceeding supply, as experienced by some other countries. This finding reinforces the importance of prevention in those with the worst prognosis.

<u>Comparison with existing literature</u>

Our finding that 26.85% of people satisfy moderate-risk criteria is consistent with limited existing evidence. A study linking English primary and secondary care records on 3.9 million people reported that 20% of population satisfied similar criteria[20]. Similarly, analysis of the Global Burden of Diseases Study estimated that 22% of the global population are at increased

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

risk of severe COVID-19 disease[21]. A USA study using data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System reported that 45.4% of 444,649 adults had one or more of a longer list of morbidities that may be associated with higher risk from COVID-19[22]. Another USA study estimated that 14.2% of participants in the National Health Interview Survey had more than two-fold risk and 1.6% had more than 10-fold risk[23].

The evidence on COVID-19 related complications among those classified as high risk, and therefore advised to shield, has mainly come from case series and expert opinion. Case series found higher COVID-19 related complications among organ transplant recipients[24,25], patients receiving chemotherapy, radiotherapy or immunotherapy for cancer[26,27], and patients with haematological cancers[28]. Systematic review suggests higher COVID-19 complication risk among COPD patients, but the effect of COPD severity was not investigated[29]. Patients with cystic fibrosis and sickle cell disease were classified as high risk based on expert opinion[30,31]. While pregnant women with COVID-19 were found to have higher risk of poor maternal and perinatal outcomes[32,33], outcomes were not investigated specifically for pregnant women with heart disease. There was no evidence of worse COVID-19 related complications among patients on immunosuppressants [34]. A large community study in England found strong association between severe asthma (hazard ratio 1.25) and COVID-19 related mortality but did not investigate the risk of COVID-19 infection or hospitalisation[9].

In common with previous studies, we demonstrated that age was a major individual-level risk factor for death. Additionally, we showed it is important at the population level with 49.55% of deaths attributable to age ≥70 years. The higher mortality in the elderly was mediated in part by higher case-fatality but they also had a higher incidence of infection, possibly due to transmission within care homes. Lower ICU admissions following hospitalisation for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 may have contributed to their higher case-fatality. Previous studies have reported that men are at higher risk of COVID-19.[7] Our study demonstrated they are less likely to be tested for COVID-19, have confirmed infection and be hospitalised. They have comparable overall mortality from COVID-19, due to their lower incidence, but their case-fatality is higher.

Strengths and Limitations

This study adds to the existing evidence of the possible effectiveness of a shielding strategy which is currently limited to mathematical modelling of population effects based on assumptions [11–19]. Ours was a large-scale, unselected general population study. The data cover a period when shielding was in place. Linkage of family practitioner, laboratory, hospital and death data enabled us to examine a range of COVID-19 outcomes and study a range of exposure variables including the overall risk categories and their individual criteria. The datasets were linked using exact, rather than probabilistic, matching. We were able to adjust for potential sociodemographic confounders. The exposure data were collected prior to the outcomes occurring avoiding potential reverse causation and recall or recording bias. Our analysis of potential risk factors was restricted to those used as criteria for shielding and moderate-risk at the time of the study. The shielding and moderate-risk criteria were correct at the time of extracting data but may be revised over time.

Implications of findings

Our findings suggest that our attempts to shield those at highest risk have not been as successful as hoped, with those advised to shield experiencing higher rates of infection and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

death. ICU provision has been successfully protected but via systematic exclusion of those with worse prognosis, rather than prevention of infection in those highest at risk. For shielding to be effective as a population level strategy, the current criteria would need to be expanded since three-quarters of deaths were associated with moderate-risk criteria for which shielding has not hitherto been recommended. In our study, more than one-quarter of the general population would have needed to be effectively shielded to prevent over 80% of deaths. Since this is unlikely to be acceptable at a time when governments are under pressure to ease lock-down restrictions, shielding is probably best viewed as an individual-level intervention to be used alongside other population-wide interventions such as physical distancing, face coverings and hand hygiene.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Availability of data and materials

The dataset supporting the conclusions of this article is available in the Glasgow Safe Haven (https://www.nhsggc.org.uk/about-us/professional-support-sites/safe-haven/services/).

Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to the following for their support and hard work in extracting and linking the datasets and providing access to them: Charlie Mayor (Data Safe Haven Manager), Alison Hamilton (Safe Haven Project Manager), Jonathan Todd (Head of Information Management), Imran Sadat (Data Manager) and Neil Hillen (Data Analyst).

Funding

No external funding sources.

Conflicts of interest

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Contributors

FH and BJ contributed equally and are joint-first authors. BJ and JP conceptualised the study, interpreted the data, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. FH analysed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All other authors interpreted the data and critically revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final submitted version of the manuscript.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

BJ, FH, and JP serve as the guarantor of the manuscript and accepts full responsibility for the work and/or the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Willan J, King AJ, Jeffery K, Bienz N. Challenges for NHS hospitals during covid-19 epidemic. *BMJ*. 2020;368. doi:10.1136/BMJ.M1117
2. ACAPS. #COVID19 A global joint response.
3. Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB). National ban on visiting elderly homes.
4. Radtke T, Haile SR, Dressel H, Benden C. Recommended shielding against COVID-19 impacts physical activity levels in adults with cystic fibrosis. *J Cyst Fibros*. Published online 2020.
5. Kemp O, Horne GA, Soutar R. The psychological impact of COVID19 on a shielding high-risk cohort. *Scott Med J*. Published online 2020:0036933020951900.
6. Public Health England. Guidance on shielding and protecting people who are clinically extremely vulnerable from COVID-19.
7. Lipsitch M, Swerdlow DL, Finelli L. Defining the Epidemiology of Covid-19 — Studies Needed. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(13):1194-1196. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2002125
8. Lochlainn MN, Lee KA, Sudre CH, et al. Key predictors of attending hospital with COVID19: An association study from the COVID Symptom Tracker App in 2,618,948 individuals. *medRxiv*. Published online April 2020:2020.04.25.20079251. doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079251
9. The OpenSAFELY, Williamson E, Walker AJ, et al. OpenSAFELY: factors associated with COVID-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic health records of 17 million adult NHS patients. *medRxiv*. Published online May 2020:2020.05.06.20092999. doi:10.1101/2020.05.06.20092999
10. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Bonten MMJ, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1328. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1328
11. Vlas SJ de, Coffeng LE. A phased lift of control: a practical strategy to achieve herd immunity against Covid-19 at the country level. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.29.20046011
12. Keeling MJ, Hill E, Gorsich E, et al. Predictions of COVID-19 dynamics in the UK: short-term forecasting and analysis of potential exit strategies. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.10.20083683
13. McKeigue PM, Colhoun HM. Evaluation of “stratify and shield” as a policy option for ending the COVID-19 lockdown in the UK. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079913
14. Bunnik B Van, Woolhouse M, van Bunnik BAD. Segmentation and shielding of the most vulnerable members of the population as elements of an exit strategy from COVID-19 lockdown. *medrxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.04.20090597
15. Weitz JS, Beckett SJ, Coenen AR, et al. Intervention Serology and Interaction Substitution: Modeling the Role of “Shield Immunity” in Reducing COVID-19 Epidemic Spread. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.01.20049767
16. Neufeld Z, Khataee H. Targeted adaptive isolation strategy for Covid-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.23.20041897
17. Acemoglu D, Chernozhukov V, Werning I, Whinston M. *Optimal Targeted Lockdowns in a Multi-Group SIR Model*.; 2020. doi:10.3386/w27102
18. Clark A, Jit M, Warren-Gash C, et al. Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. *Lancet Glob Heal*. Published online 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30264-3

19. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, et al. Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Heal*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30133-X
20. Banerjee A, Pasea L, Harris S, et al. Estimating excess 1-year mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic according to underlying conditions and age: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30854-0
21. Clark A, Jit M, Warren-Gash C, et al. How many are at increased risk of severe COVID-19 disease? Rapid global, regional and national estimates for 2020. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.18.20064774
22. Adams ML, Katz DL, Grandpre J. Population based estimates of comorbidities affecting risk for complications from COVID-19 in the US. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20043919
23. Jin J, Agarwala N, Kundu P, Chatterjee N. Estimating the Size of High-risk Populations for COVID-19 Mortality across 442 US Cities. Published online May 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.27.20115170
24. Pereira M, Mohan S, Cohen D, et al. COVID-19 in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients: Initial Report From the US Epicenter. *Am J Transplant*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1111/AJT.15941
25. Fernández-Ruiz M, Andrés A, Loinaz C, et al. COVID-19 in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients: A Single-Center Case Series From Spain. *Am J Transplant*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1111/AJT.15929
26. Zhang L, Zhu F, Xie L, et al. Clinical Characteristics of COVID-19-infected Cancer Patients: A Retrospective Case Study in Three Hospitals Within Wuhan, China. *Ann Oncol Off J Eur Soc Med Oncol*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1016/J.ANNONC.2020.03.296
27. Dai M, Liu D, Liu M, et al. Patients with cancer appear more vulnerable to SARS-COV-2: a multi-center study during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Cancer Discov*. Published online April 2020. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-20-0422
28. He W, Chen L, Chen L, et al. COVID-19 in persons with haematological cancers. *Leukemia*. Published online April 2020:1-9. doi:10.1038/s41375-020-0836-7
29. Yang J, Zheng Y, Gou X, et al. Prevalence of Comorbidities and Its Effects in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;94. doi:10.1016/J.IJID.2020.03.017
30. Colombo C, Burgel P-R, Gartner S, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on people with cystic fibrosis. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020;8(5):e35-e36. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30177-6
31. Rodriguez-Morales A, Cardona-Ospina J, Gutiérrez-Ocampo E, et al. Clinical, Laboratory and Imaging Features of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1016/J.TMAID.2020.101623
32. Di Mascio D, Khalil A, Saccone G, et al. Outcome of Coronavirus Spectrum Infections (SARS, MERS, COVID 1 -19) During Pregnancy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1016/J.AJOGMF.2020.100107
33. Elshafeey F, Magdi R, Hindi N, et al. A Systematic Scoping Review of COVID-19 During Pregnancy and Childbirth. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1002/IJGO.13182
34. Minotti C, Tirelli F, Barbieri E, Giaquinto C, D D. How Is Immunosuppressive Status

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Affecting Children and Adults in SARS-CoV-2 Infection? A Systematic Review. *J Infect*. 2020;S0163-4453. doi:10.1016/J.JINF.2020.04.026

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. COVID-19 testing status by sociodemographic characteristics, risk category and risk criteria

	COVID-19 testing status		
	Not tested N=1,299,206 n (%)	**Tested N=15,865 n (%)**	**P value**
Age group (years)			<0.0001
0-24	355,238 (99.49)	1,822 (0.51)	
25-44	410,408 (99.22)	3,247 (0.78)	
45-64	340,268 (98.65)	4,660 (1.35)	
≥65	193,292 (96.92)	6,136 (3.08)	
Sex			<0.0001
Male	654,041 (99.01)	6,569 (0.99)	
Female	645,165 (98.58)	9,296 (1.42)	
Deprivation quintile			<0.0001
1 (most deprived)	461,672 (98.67)	6,211 (1.33)	
2	230,402 (98.75)	2,921 (1.25)	
3	194,702 (98.90)	2,175 (1.10)	
4	173,456 (98.93)	1,883 (1.07)	
5 (most affluent)	238,974 (98.89)	2,675 (1.11)	
Risk category			<0.0001
Low	928,420 (99.27)	6,819 (0.73)	
Moderate	345,913 (97.97)	7,172 (2.03)	
Shielded	24,873 (92.99)	1,874 (7.01)	
Moderate risk criteria			
Chronic respiratory disease	149,325 (98.33)	2,540 (1.67)	<0.0001
Heart disease	46,728 (96.21)	1,843 (3.79)	<0.0001
Hypertension	156,286 (97.55)	3,929 (2.45)	<0.0001
Diabetes	62,482 (97.09)	1,876 (2.91)	<0.0001
Weakened immune system	1,140 (95.40)	55 (4.60)	<0.0001
≥70 years of age	134,305 (96.23)	5,263 (3.77)	<0.0001
Shielded criteria			
Severe respiratory disease	17,146 (94.48)	1,001 (5.52)	<0.0001
Specific cancers	2,075 (83.30)	416 (16.70)	<0.0001
Pregnant with severe heart disease	<5	0	-
Immunosuppressive therapy	5,028 (94.00)	321 (6.00)	<0.0001
Solid organ transplant	1,149 (92.29)	96 (7.71)	<0.0001
Rare diseases and inborn errors of metabolism	1,623 (91.95)	142 (8.05)	<0.0001
Renal dialysis	305 (64.21)	170 (35.79)	<0.0001

N number

Table 2. Crude, population-level COVID-19 outcomes by sociodemographic characteristics, risk category and risk criteria

	Confirmed COVID-19 infection			COVID-19 hospitalisation			COVID-19 ICU admission			COVID-19 mortality		
	Negative test/ Not tested	**Positive test**	**P-value**	**Not admitted**	**Admitted**	**P-value**	**Not admitted**	**Admitted**	**P-value**	**Alive**	**Dead**	**P-value**
	N=1,311,723 n (%)	**N=3,348 n (%)**		**N=1,313,410 n (%)**	**N=1,661 n (%)**		**N=1,314,949 n (%)**	**N=122 n (%)**		**N=1,314,044 n (%)**	**N=1,027 n (%)**	
Age group (years)			<0.0001			<0.0001			0.0005			<0.0001
0-24	356,944 (99.97)	116 (0.03)		357,041 (99.99)	19 (0.01)		357,060 (100.00)	0		357,060 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	
25-44	413,123 (99.87)	532 (0.13)		413,532 (99.97)	123 (0.03)		413,643 (100.00)	12 (0.00)		413,647 (100.00)	8 (0.00)	
45-64	343,856 (99.69)	1,072 (0.31)		344,409 (99.85)	519 (0.15)		344,846 (99.98)	82 (0.02)		344,838 (99.97)	90 (0.03)	
≥65	197,800 (99.18)	1,628 (0.82)		198,428 (99.50)	1,000 (0.50)		199,400 (99.99)	28 (0.01)		198,499 (99.53)	929 (0.47)	
Sex												
Male	659,203 (99.79)	1,407 (0.21)	<0.0001	659,781 (99.87)	829 (0.13)	0.81	660,525 (99.99)	85 (0.01)	<0.0001	660,092 (99.92)	518 (0.08)	0.92
Female	652,250 (99.70)	1,941 (0.30)		659,369 (99.87)	832 (0.13)		660,908 (99.99)	37 (0.01)		653,952 (99.92)	509 (0.08)	
Deprivation quintile			0.0002			<0.0001			0.18			<0.0001
1 (most deprived)	466,582 (99.72)	1,301 (0.28)		467,146 (99.84)	737 (0.16)		467,832 (99.99)	51 (0.01)		467,442 (99.91)	441 (0.09)	
2	232,710 (99.74)	613 (0.26)		233,041 (99.88)	282 (0.12)		233,302 (99.99)	21 (0.01)		233,181 (99.94)	142 (0.06)	
3	196,416 (99.77)	461 (0.23)		196,651 (99.89)	226 (0.11)		196,854 (99.99)	23 (0.01)		196,724 (99.92)	153 (0.08)	
4	174,939 (99.77)	400 (0.23)		175,143 (99.89)	196 (0.11)		175,329 (99.99)	10 (0.01)		175,209 (99.93)	130 (0.07)	
5 (most affluent)	241,076 (99.76)	573 (0.24)		241,429 (99.91)	220 (0.09)		241,632 (99.99)	17 (0.01)		241,488 (99.93)	161 (0.07)	
Risk category			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001
Low	934,049 (99.87)	1,190 (0.13)		93,4839 (99.96)	400 (0.04)		935,174 (99.99)	65 (0.01)		935,155 (99.99)	84 (0.01)	
Moderate	351,226 (99.47)	1,859 (0.53)		35,2054 (99.71)	1,031 (0.29)		353,033 (99.99)	52 (0.01)		352,282 (99.77)	803 (0.23)	
Shielded	26,448 (98.88)	299 (1.12)		26,517 (99.14)	230 (0.86)		26,742 (99.98)	5 (0.02)		26,607 (99.48)	140 (0.52)	
Moderate risk criteria												
Chronic respiratory disease	151,414 (99.70)	451 (0.30)	0.0005	151,618 (99.84)	247 (0.16)	<0.0001	151,853 (99.99)	12 (0.01)	0.65	151,812 (99.97)	53 (0.03)	<0.0001
Heart disease	48,176 (99.19)	395 (0.81)	<0.0001	48,325 (99.49)	246 (0.51)	<0.0001	48,564 (99.99)	7 (0.01)	0.34	48,456 (99.76)	115 (0.24)	<0.0001
Hypertension	159,267 (99.41)	948 (0.59)	<0.0001	159,670 (99.66)	545 (0.34)	<0.0001	160,189 (99.98)	26 (0.02)	0.003	159,991 (99.86)	224 (0.14)	<0.0001
Diabetes	63,903 (99.29)	455 (0.71)	<0.0001	64,063 (99.54)	295 (0.46)	<0.0001	64,335 (99.96)	23 (0.04)	<0.0001	64,263 (99.85)	95 (0.15)	<0.0001
Weakened immune system	1,183 (99.00)	12 (1.00)	<0.0001	1,185 (99.16)	10 (0.84)	<0.0001	1,195 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	-	1,189 (99.50)	6 (0.50)	<0.0001
≥70 years of age	138,115 (98.96)	1,453 (1.04)	<0.0001	138,701 (99.38)	867 (0.62)	<0.0001	139,560 (99.99)	8 (0.01)	0.19	138,690 (99.37)	878 (0.63)	<0.0001
Shielded group												
Severe respiratory disease	17,981 (99.09)	166 (0.91)	<0.0001	18,012 (99.26)	135 (0.74)	<0.0001	18,146 (99.99)	<5	-	18,059 (99.52)	88 (0.48)	<0.0001
Specific cancers	2,452 (98.43)	39 (1.57)	<0.0001	2,462 (98.84)	29 (1.16)	<0.0001	2,491 (100.00)	0	-	2,475 (99.36)	16 (0.64)	<0.0001
Pregnant, severe heart disease	<5	0	-	<5	0	-	<5	0	-	<5	0(0.00)	-
Immunosuppressive therapy	5,285 (98.80)	64 (1.20)	<0.0001	5,299 (99.07)	50 (0.93)	<0.0001	5,346 (99.94)	<5	-	5,324 (99.53)	25 (0.47)	<0.0001
Solid organ transplant	1,228 (98.63)	17 (1.37)	<0.0001	1,230 (98.80)	15 (1.20)	<0.0001	1,244 (99.92)	<5	-	1,238 (99.44)	7 (0.56)	<0.0001
Rare diseases and IEM	1,729 (97.96)	36 (2.04)	<0.0001	1,741 (98.64)	24 (1.36)	<0.0001	1,764 (99.94)	<5	-	1,744 (98.81)	21 (1.19)	<0.0001
Renal dialysis	445 (93.68)	30 (6.32)	<0.0001	457 (96.21)	18 (3.79)	<0.0001	475 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	-	468 (98.53)	7 (1.47)	<0.0001

N number; IEM inborn errors of metabolism

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 3. Associations* between risk categories and risk criteria and population-level COVID-19 outcomes

	Confirmed COVID-19 infection		COVID-19 hospitalisation		COVID-19 ICU admission		COVID-19 mortality	
	RR (95% CI)	**P-value**	**RR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**RR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**RR (95% CI)**	**P-value**
Low	1 (Reference)		1 (Reference)		1 (Reference)		1 (Reference)	
Moderate								
Overall	4.11 (3.83-4.42)	<0.0001	6.83 (6.09-7.67)	<0.0001	2.15 (1.49-3.10)	<0.0001	25.41 (20.36-31.71)	<0.0001
Chronic respiratory disease	2.30 (2.07-2.56)	<0.0001	3.76 (3.21-4.41)	<0.0001	1.15 (0.62-2.14)	0.65	3.88 (2.77-5.44)	<0.0001
Heart disease	6.53 (5.83-7.31)	<0.0001	11.63 (9.93-13.63)	<0.0001	1.92 (0.88-4.20)	0.1	26.00 (19.71-34.31)	<0.0001
Hypertension	4.60 (4.22-5.01)	<0.0001	8.01 (7.04-9.11)	<0.0001	2.44 (1.55-3.85)	0.0001	15.68 (12.24-20.09)	<0.0001
Diabetes	5.59 (5.02-6.23)	<0.0001	10.49 (9.03-12.19)	<0.0001	4.89 (3.03-7.89)	<0.0001	16.23 (12.16-21.66)	<0.0001
Weakened immune system	7.79 (4.43-13.72)	<0.0001	19.62 (10.50-36.69)	<0.0001	-	-	56.19 (24.85-127.02)	<0.0001
≥70 years of age	8.08 (7.48-8.72)	<0.0001	14.96 (13.29-16.85)	<0.0001	0.90 (0.43-1.86)	0.77	72.98 (58.81-90.55)	<0.0001
Shielded								
Overall	8.45 (7.44-9.59)	<0.0001	19.35 (16.45-22.77)	<0.0001	2.78 (1.12-6.91)	0.03	57.56 (44.06-75.19)	<0.0001
Severe respiratory disease	6.79 (5.78-7.99)	<0.0001	16.40 (13.48-19.95)	<0.0001	0.82 (0.11-5.89)	0.84	52.85 (39.31-71.05)	<0.0001
Specific cancers	12.13 (8.83-16.65)	<0.0001	27.21 (18.69-39.63)	<0.0001	-	-	71.72 (42.36-121.42)	<0.0001
Immunosuppressive therapy	9.25 (7.21-11.88)	<0.0001	21.85 (16.30-29.29)	<0.0001	8.40 (2.64-26.72)	0.0003	52.23 (33.64-81.08)	<0.0001
Solid organ transplant	10.90 (6.77-17.55)	<0.0001	27.77 (16.61-46.44)	<0.0001	10.84 (1.50-78.16)	0.02	62.03 (29.03-132.56)	<0.0001
Rare diseases and IEM	15.91 (11.44-22.12)	<0.0001	31.45 (20.86-47.42)	<0.0001	8.18 (1.13-58.93)	0.04	132.29 (82.60-211.86)	<0.0001
Renal dialysis	50.29 (35.06-72.12)	<0.0001	84.41 (52.70-135.20)	<0.0001	-	-	158.41 (74.11-338.62)	<0.0001

*adjusted for sex and deprivation quintile
RR relative risk; CI confidence interval; IEM inborn errors of metabolism

s

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Crude COVID-19 outcomes among confirmed cases by sociodemographic characteristics, risk category and risk criteria

	COVID-19 hospitalisation N=3,348†			COVID-19 ICU admission N=3,348†			COVID-19 case-fatality N=3,846‡		
	Not admitted N=1,687 n (%)	Admitted N=1,661 n (%)	P-value	Not admitted N=3,226 n (%)	Admitted N=122 n (%)	P-value	Alive N=2,819 n (%)	Dead N=1,027 n (%)	P-value
Age group (years)			<0.0001			<0.0001			<0.0001
0-24	97 (83.62)	19 (16.38)		116 (100.00)	0		116 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	
25-44	410 (76.92)	123 (23.08)		520 (97.74)	12 (2.26)		526 (98.50)	8 (1.50)	
45-64	553 (51.59)	519 (48.41)		990 (92.35)	82 (7.65)		1,003 (91.77)	90 (8.23)	
≥65	630 (38.65)	1,000 (61.35)		1,600 (98.28)	28 (1.72)		1,174 (55.83)	929 (44.17)	
Sex									<0.0001
Male	579 (41.12)	829 (58.88)	<0.0001	1,322 (93.96)	85 (6.04)	<0.0001	1,105 (68.08)	518 (31.92)	
Female	1,108 (57.11)	832 (42.89)		1,904 (98.09)	37 (1.91)		1,717 (77.10)	509 (22.90)	
Deprivation Quintile			<0.0001			0.29			0.0004
1 (most deprived)	566 (43.44)	737 (56.56)		1,250 (96.08)	51 (3.92)		1,046 (70.34)	441 (29.66)	
2	332 (54.07)	282 (45.93)		592 (96.57)	21 (3.43)		531 (78.90)	142 (21.10)	
3	235 (50.98)	226 (49.02)		438 (95.01)	23 (4.99)		394 (72.03)	153 (27.97)	
4	204 (51.00)	196 (49.00)		390 (97.50)	10 (2.50)		341 (72.40)	130 (27.60)	
5 (most affluent)	353 (61.61)	220 (38.39)		556 (97.03)	17 (2.97)		507 (75.90)	161 (24.10)	
Risk category			<0.0001			0.0001			<0.0001
Low	791 (66.41)	400 (33.59)		1125 (94.54)	65 (5.46)		1130 (93.08)	84 (6.92)	
Moderate	828 (44.54)	1031 (55.46)		1807 (97.20)	52 (2.80)		1485 (64.90)	803 (35.10)	
Shielded	71 (23.59)	230 (76.41)		294 (98.33)	5 (1.67)		204 (59.30)	140 (40.70)	
Moderate risk criteria									
Chronic respiratory disease	205 (45.35)	247 (54.65)	0.02	439 (97.34)	12 (2.66)	0.29	420 (88.79)	53 (11.21)	<0.0001
Heart disease	149 (37.72)	246 (62.28)	<0.0001	388 (98.23)	7 (1.77)	0.049	330 (74.16)	115 (25.84)	0.7
Hypertension	404 (42.57)	545 (57.43)	<0.0001	922 (97.26)	26 (2.74)	0.10	836 (78.87)	224 (21.13)	<0.0001
Diabetes	161 (35.31)	295 (64.69)	<0.0001	432 (94.95)	23 (5.05)	0.11	398 (80.73)	95 (19.27)	<0.0001
Weakened immune system	2 (16.67)	10 (83.33)	0.04	12 (100.00)	0	-	6 (50.00)	6 (50.00)	0.13
≥70 years of age	587 (40.37)	867 (59.63)	<0.0001	1,445 (99.45)	8 (0.55)	<0.0001	1,035 (54.10)	878 (45.90)	<0.0001
Shielding criteria									
Severe respiratory disease	33 (19.64)	135 (80.36)	<0.0001	165 (99.40)	<5	-	111 (55.78)	88 (44.22)	<0.0001
Specific cancers	10 (25.64)	29 (74.36)	0.003	39 (100.00)	0	-	27 (62.79)	16 (37.21)	0.16
Pregnant, severe heart disease	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Immunosuppressive therapy	14 (21.88)	50 (78.12)	<0.0001	61 (95.31)	<5	-	42 (62.69)	25 (37.31)	0.07
Solid organ transplant	2 (11.76)	15 (88.24)	0.003	16 (94.12)	<5	-	11 (61.11)	7 (38.89)	0.37
Rare diseases and IEM	12 (33.33)	24 (66.67)	0.06	35 (97.22)	<5	-	23 (52.27)	21 (47.73)	0.003
Renal dialysis	12 (40.00)	18 (60.00)	0.33	30 (100.00)	0	-	23 (76.67)	7 (23.33)	0.83

†laboratory-confirmed (test-positive) COVID-19 cases
‡clinically-confirmed (test-positive or COVID-19 on death certificate) COVID-19 cases
N number; IEM inborn errors of metabolism

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 5. Associations* between risk categories and risk criteria and COVID-19 outcomes among confirmed cases

	COVID-19 hospitalisation N=3,348†		**COVID-19 ICU admission N=3,348†**		**COVID-19 case-fatality N=3,846‡**	
	RR (95% CI)	**P-value**	**RR (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**RR (95% CI)**	**P-value**
Low	1 (Reference)		1 (Reference)		1 (Reference)	
Moderate						
Overall	1.34 (1.23-1.46)	<0.0001	0.40 (0.28-0.58)	<0.0001	5.01 (4.14-6.06)	<0.0001
Chronic respiratory disease	1.55 (1.38-1.75)	<0.0001	0.46 (0.25-0.86)	0.02	1.61 (1.21-2.16)	0.001
Heart disease	1.59 (1.41-1.79)	<0.0001	0.24 (0.11-0.53)	0.0004	3.55 (2.79-4.50)	<0.0001
Hypertension	1.53 (1.39-1.69)	<0.0001	0.44 (0.28-0.70)	0.0004	3.04 (2.45-3.76)	<0.0001
Diabetes	1.69 (1.51-1.90)	<0.0001	0.72 (0.45-1.17)	0.19	2.62 (2.05-3.36)	<0.0001
Weakened immune system	2.41 (1.50-3.86)	0.0003	-	-	7.09 (3.52-14.28)	<0.0001
≥70 years of age	1.36 (1.24-1.48)	<0.0001	0.07 (0.04-0.15)	<0.0001	6.53 (5.42-7.88)	<0.0001
Shielded						
Overall	1.89 (1.67-2.13)	<0.0001	0.23 (0.09-0.56)	0.001	5.62 (4.47-7.07)	<0.0001
Severe respiratory disease	1.92 (1.66-2.23)	<0.0001	-	-	6.16 (4.78-7.93)	<0.0001
Specific cancers	1.88 (1.41-2.49)	<0.0001	-	-	5.00 (3.18-7.87)	<0.0001
Immunosuppressive therapy	2.15 (1.73-2.69)	<0.0001	-	-	5.15 (3.53-7.51)	<0.0001
Solid organ transplant	2.31 (1.57-3.41)	<0.0001	-	-	5.20 (2.71-9.99)	<0.0001
Rare diseases and IEM	1.49 (1.09-2.03)	0.01	-	-	6.59 (4.39-9.89)	<0.0001
Renal dialysis	1.61 (1.13-2.30)	0.009	-	-	3.10 (1.61-5.96)	0.0007

*adjusted for sex and deprivation quintile
†laboratory-confirmed (test-positive) COVID-19 cases
‡clinically-confirmed (test-positive or COVID-19 on death certificate) COVID-19 cases
N number; RR relative risk; CI confidence interval; IEM inborn errors of metabolism

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.17.20196436; this version posted October 22, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.