

1 Original Research Article

2 **Distinguishing non severe cases of dengue from COVID-19 in the context of co-**
3 **epidemics: a cohort study in a SARS-CoV-2 testing center on Reunion island**

4

5 Antoine Joubert,^{1†} Fanny Andry,^{1,2,3†} Antoine Bertolotti,^{1,2,4} Frédéric Accot,¹ Yatrika
6 Koumar,^{1,2,3} Florian Legrand,^{1,3} Patrice Poubeau,^{1,2,3} Rodolphe Manaquin,^{1,2,3} Patrick
7 Gérardin,^{4**} Cécile Levin,^{1,2,3**}

8

9 ¹ COVID-19 testing centre, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de la Réunion, Saint Pierre, Reunion,
10 France

11 ² Department of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de la
12 Réunion, Saint Pierre, Reunion, France

13 ³ City to Hospital Outpatient Clinic for the care of COVID-19, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de la
14 Réunion, Saint Pierre, Reunion, France

15 ⁴ Centre for Clinical Investigation – Clinical Epidemiology (CIC 1410), Institut National de la Santé et
16 de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM), Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de la Réunion, Saint Pierre,
17 Reunion, France

18

19 Short running head title: **Dengue and COVID-19 in co-epidemics**

20 †† Contributed equally

21 * Correspondence: P. Gérardin, Center for Clinical Investigation (CIC1410), CHU Réunion, BP
22 350, 97448 Saint-Pierre Cedex – Reunion, France (patrick.gerardin@chu-reunion.fr); C. Levin,

23 Department of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, CHU Réunion, BP 350, 97448

24 Saint-Pierre Cedex – Reunion, France (cecile.levin@chu-reunion.fr)

25

26 **40-word summary of the article's main point**

27 In the COVID-19 dengue co-epidemic setting of Reunion island, dengue was found more
28 symptomatic than COVID-19 and associated with body ache, headache and retro-orbital
29 pain, while COVID-19 was found associated with contact, anosmia, delayed presentation and
30 absence of active smoking.

31 **Abstract**

32 **Background.** As coronavirus (COVID-19) is spreading globally, several countries are handling
33 dengue epidemics. As both infections are deemed to share similarities at presentation, it
34 would be useful to distinguish COVID-19 from dengue in the context of co-epidemics. In this
35 aim, we performed a cohort study to identify predictors of both infections.

36 **Methods.** All the subjects suspected of COVID-19 between March 23 and May 10, 2020,
37 were screened for COVID-19 within the testing center of the University hospital of Saint-
38 Pierre, Reunion island. The screening consisted in a questionnaire surveyed in face-to-face, a
39 nasopharyngeal swab specimen for the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2
40 (SARS-CoV-2) reverse transcription polymerase chain-reaction and a rapid diagnostic
41 orientation test for dengue. Factors independently associated with COVID-19 or with dengue
42 were sought using multinomial logistic regression models, taking other febrile illnesses (OFIs)
43 as controls.

44 **Results.** Over a two-month study period, we identified among 80 COVID-19, 60 non-severe
45 dengue and 872 OFIs cases, delayed presentation (>3 days) since symptom onset (Odds ratio
46 1.89, 95% confidence interval 1.4-3.40), contact with a COVID-19 positive case (OR 3.81,
47 95%CI 2.12-6.82) and anosmia (OR 8.27, 95%CI 4.39-15.54) as independent predictors of
48 COVID-19, body ache (OR 6.83, 95%CI 2.84-16.41), headache (OR 5.38, 95%CI 1.81-15.94)
49 and retro-orbital pain (OR 7.45, 95%CI 3.17-17.50) as independent predictors of dengue,
50 while smoking was less likely observed with COVID-19 (OR 0.27, 95%CI 0.10-0.74).

51 **Conclusions.** Although prone to potential biases, these data suggest that non-severe dengue
52 may be more symptomatic than COVID-19 in a co-epidemic setting with higher dengue
53 attack rates.

54 **Keywords** : coronavirus, COVID-19, dengue, risk factors, cohort study

55 **Background**

56 During the past decades, there have been growing concerns about the risks of overlapping
57 epidemics and co-infections with emergent viruses, especially with arboviruses that can
58 share the same *Aedes* mosquito vector [1,2]. Yet, surprisingly, since the 2009 flu pandemic,
59 the differential diagnosis between influenza and dengue has been scarcely investigated [3].

60 As Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is spreading
61 globally, several countries are handling dengue epidemics, with fear for their healthcare
62 systems and most vulnerable populations [4]. Thus, differentiate between the two diagnoses
63 may be challenging and lead to misdiagnosis, which may occasion both delays in treatment
64 and preventable deaths, but also inadequate isolation measures with the potential to trigger
65 outbreaks, especially in the healthcare setting [4].

66 On Reunion island, a French overseas department located in the Indian ocean, best
67 known to have host one of the largest chikungunya outbreaks and harbor a highly comorbid
68 population [5,6], dengue virus (DENV) is circulating since 2004 under an endemo-epidemic
69 pattern with outbreaks usually peaking between March and May, and increases with yearly
70 upsurges since 2015 [7]. In 2020, the first cases of coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) were
71 detected on the island by March 11, six days before the French authorities decree the
72 lockdown.

73 In this context, a new case of COVID-19 and dengue co-infection was reported [8].
74 Anticipating that the differential diagnosis between the two infections would be challenging,
75 we designated a retrospective cohort study aimed at identifying the clinical and
76 epidemiological profiles of SARS-CoV-2 and DENV infections to guide their management and
77 mitigate the impact of COVID-19 pandemic surge on the island.

78 **Methods**

79 The full details of the methods can be found in the [Supplementary Methodological appendix](#).

80 **Study design and setting**

81 We conducted a retrospective cohort study between March 23 and May 10, 2020, on all
82 subjects screened for the CO-VID-19 within the UDACS (*Unité de Dépistage Ambulatoire du*
83 *COVID-19 Sud*) of Saint-Pierre, one of the two SARS-CoV-2 testing centers of the *Centre*
84 *Hospitalier Universitaire Réunion* (CHU). When SARS-CoV-2 emerged on the island, the
85 dengue epidemic was already burgeoning, the UDACS was placed in the second line of the
86 reception system for COVID-19 patients, the frontline being the emergency units and the
87 dedicated hospital for COVID-19 patients, the CHU Félix Guyon, located in Saint-Denis,
88 whereby are the prefecture and the international airport.

89 **Ethics statement**

90 Outpatients presenting consecutively at the SARS-CoV-2 testing center were informed of the
91 study orally and by means of an information sheet. People who expressed no opposition
92 were asked to answer a questionnaire and surveyed in face-to-face by a nurse, in accordance
93 to the French legislation on bioethics for retrospective researches. Patient's medical records
94 were retrospectively reviewed, and de-identified data were collected in standardized forms
95 according the MR-004 procedure of the *Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des*
96 *Libertés* (the French information protection commission). The ethical character of this study
97 on previously collected data was approved by the Scientific Committee for COVID-19
98 research of the CHU Réunion and de-identified data were registered on the Health Data Hub.

99 **Data collection**

100 The items of the questionnaire included information on demographics, occupation, risk
101 factors, comorbidities, intra-household and individual exposure to SARS-CoV-2, individual

102 symptoms and treatment. Temperature, pulse rate, respiratory rate and oxygen saturation
103 (SpO₂) were measured upon the consultation, as well as the presence of cough and anxiety.

104 **Diagnostic procedures**

105 All the attendees were screened for SARS-CoV-2 using a nasopharyngeal swab inserted and
106 held in one nostril for about twenty seconds [9]. The sample was processed for a SARS-CoV-2
107 reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) using the Allplex 2019-nCov™
108 assay (Seegene, Seoul, Republic of Korea) or an in-house kit (CNR Pasteur), targeting N, RdRP
109 and E genes, or N and IP2/IP4 targets of RdRP, respectively. In addition, each patient
110 suspected of dengue was tested for NS1 antigen using an OnSite™ Duo dengue Ag-IgG-IgM
111 rapid diagnostic test (CTK Biotech, San Diego, CA, USA) and if negative further explored with
112 a DENV RT-PCR or a dengue serology according to the timing of symptoms. People without
113 symptoms were excluded from the study. Patients requiring hospitalization were transferred
114 promptly from the UDACS to the COVID-19 units.

115 **Statistical analysis**

116 Given the research purpose, co-infections at clinical presentation were excluded from the
117 analysis. Proportions between non COVID-19 and non-dengue other febrile illnesses (OFIs),
118 COVID-19 and dengue subjects were compared using Chi square or Fisher exact tests, as
119 appropriate. Univariable and multivariable multinomial logistic regression models were
120 fitted within Stata14® (College Station, Texas, USA) to identify independent predictors of
121 COVID-19 and dengue, taking OFIs as controls. For all these analyses, observations with
122 missing data were ruled out and a *P*-value less than 0.05 was considered as statistically
123 significant.

124 **Results**

125 Between March 23 and May 10, 2020, 1,715 subjects presented at the UDACS for screening
126 or diagnosis purposes. Of these, 370 incoming patients were screened opportunistically for
127 COVID-19 as part of an expanded screening week targeting admissions to our hospital (75%
128 asymptomatic, all tested negative), and 332 were fully asymptomatic subjects (46% with the
129 notion of a COVID-19 contact, 23% health care workers, all tested negative). Both of these
130 populations were excluded from the study, leaving 1,013 outpatients eligible to the analysis.
131 The study population is shown in [Figure 1](#).

132 The hospitalization rates for the COVID-19 and dengue patients were higher than those
133 observed for the patients affected by OFIs (16.7% and 13.1%, respectively *versus* 1.8%, P
134 <0.001). Among 40 inpatients, 2 patients out of 22 met the criteria for COVID-19 pneumonia
135 and 6 out of 8 had dengue warning signs but none severe dengue at clinical presentation. No
136 COVID-19 dengue co-infection was observed at clinical presentation.

137 COVID-19 patients presented later in their evolution compared to the subjects affected
138 by dengue or OFIs (time elapsed since symptom onset, 7.5 days *versus* 4.2 days or 6.3 days,
139 $P<0.001$). The average levels of temperature, pulse rate, respiratory rate and spO2 did not
140 differ between the three groups of patients.

141 Univariable analysis proposed contact with a COVID-19+ case, recent return from
142 travel abroad (<15 d), fever, ageusia, anosmia (loss of smell) and delayed presentation (>3 d)
143 since symptom onset as candidate predictors for COVID-19, active smoking as candidate
144 protective factor against COVID-19, previous episode of dengue, fever, body ache (*i.e.*,
145 muscle pain, backache with tightness/stiffness), ageusia, gut symptoms (*i.e.*, nausea,
146 vomiting, dyspepsia, eructation or abdominal pain), metallic taste, fatigue, headache and
147 retro-orbital pain as candidate predictors for dengue, and upper respiratory tract infection

148 (URTI) symptoms (*i.e.*, sore throat, runny nose, nasal congestion or sneezing) as a candidate
149 protective factor for both diagnoses referring to another cause of febrile illness
150 ([Supplementary Table 1](#)).

151 Multivariable analysis identified delayed presentation (>3 d) since symptoms onset,
152 contact with a COVID-19 positive case and anosmia as independent predictors of COVID-19,
153 body ache, headache and retro-orbital pain as independent predictors of dengue, while
154 active smoking was less likely observed with COVID-19 and URTI symptoms were indicative
155 of OFIs ([Table 1](#)).

156 A sensitivity analysis restricted to the patients with COVID-19 or with dengue
157 confirmed anosmia, URTI symptoms and delayed presentation (>3 d) on the one hand, body
158 ache, fatigue, headache, retro-orbital pain and rapid presentation (≤ 3 d) on the other hand,
159 as discriminating factors between the two infections ([Supplementary Table 2](#)).

160 Discussion

161 COVID-19 and dengue are two clinically similar entities, especially within the first 24 to 48
162 hours from symptom onset [10]. In a context of co-epidemics, our cohort study, conducted
163 within a SARS-CoV-2 testing center upon mild to moderate cases of COVID-19 and non-
164 severe cases of dengue identified several key distinctive features for both infections. Thus,
165 among the clinically discriminant variables at presentation, retro-orbital pain, body ache and
166 headache were strong predictors of dengue while anosmia was the only predictor of COVID-
167 19 and URTI symptoms were indicative of OFIs. To a lesser extent, gut symptoms other than
168 diarrhea, dysgeusia and fatigue were suggestive of dengue whereas cough referred to
169 another diagnosis (OFIs or COVID-19), albeit found in nearly a third of dengue. Thus, among
170 the epidemiological variables, the contact with a COVID+ case and a delayed presentation
171 beyond three days of symptom onset were predictive of COVID-19, a rapid presentation
172 within three days was suggestive of dengue, while active smoking was less likely observed
173 with COVID-19 or associated with OFIs. These elements are summarized in the [Supplemental](#)
174 [Figure 1](#).

175 Our findings reveal several unexpected differences at the presentation to hospital
176 between COVID-19 or dengue as compared to OFIs, and between COVID-19 and dengue,
177 dengue appearing at first glance more symptomatic and with a more abrupt onset than
178 COVID-19 or OFIs in the setting of a SARS-CoV-2 testing center.

179 These discrepancies might reflect first a selection bias, the more symptomatic cases
180 of both infections having been referred primarily to the emergency units, these redirecting
181 the COVID-19 cases towards the Saint-Denis referral hospital for quarantine purpose. This
182 could be arguably deduced from weighing on the inverse probability of hospitalization,
183 which was on average 2.5-fold higher than from the UDACS, all through the study period.

184 Doing so abrogates, for instances, the effects of a delayed presentation and the protection
185 of active smoking for the prediction of COVID-19 (data not shown). Together with the fact
186 that the dengue epidemic was more active in the south, this fuels the idea that time to
187 presentation in our study partly stemmed from differences in recruitment driven both by the
188 organization and access to care. Importantly, weighing the analysis strengthened also the
189 odds ratios of a contact with a COVID-19+ case for the same, as well as those of headache
190 and retro-orbital pain for the prediction of dengue. These elements suggest that this
191 putative selection bias was more pronounced on epidemiological than on clinical variables.

192 Second, our results might also be affected by a misclassification bias, which may arise
193 from the poor sensitivity of both rapid NS1 antigen and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR. Consistent with
194 this, are the high percentages of cough and URTI symptoms in dengue cases, for instances.

195 This being said, our findings are also in agreement with the literature.

196 First, the fact that dengue was more symptomatic than COVID-19 fulfills both the
197 concept of "force infection" and the trade-off model according to which, the time spent in
198 the susceptible group of an infectious disease is inversely correlated to its incidence [11],
199 and the virulence (*e.g.*, ability to cause illness, lethality) grows with the transmission rate
200 until it reaches a plateau [12]. Consistent with these assumptions, according to *Santé*
201 *Publique France* reports, the attack rate observed over the study period was 22-fold higher
202 for dengue (≈ 905 per 100.000 inhabitants) than for COVID-19 (≈ 41 per 100.000 inhabitants).
203 This was explained by the recent introduction of DENV-1 serotype (March 2019)
204 complicating five years of DENV-2 circulation [7], cases of secondary dengue, the
205 effectiveness of the lockdown to slow the progression of COVID-19 and the fact that SARS-
206 CoV-2 impacted at that time mainly "healthy" individuals (travelers and their relatives). In
207 this framework, the relevance of body ache, headache and retro-orbital pain at presentation

208 for the differential diagnosis between COVID-19 and dengue accounts for the involvement of
209 dengue in the general and digestive spheres, as proposed by Nacher et *al.* in a recent
210 opinion paper, COVID-19 being more pronounced in the respiratory sphere [10].
211 Interestingly, we also found one COVID-19+ case who was tested negative for dengue
212 suffering retro-orbital pain, as previously reported in Taiwan [13].

213 Second, our cohort study supports the high positive predictive values and specificities
214 of the contact with a COVID-19+ case and anosmia for the diagnostic of COVID-19, which is
215 congruent with risk prediction models developed for healthcare workers in Italy [14] and
216 findings from the *Coranosmia* cohort study in France [15], respectively.

217 Together with the abovementioned putative selection bias, the delayed presentation
218 to hospital of COVID-19 cases, as compared to dengue, might also illustrate the mild (“pauci-
219 symptomatic”) character of COVID-19 illness during the first pandemic surge on Reunion
220 island, as well as some consecutive lags in contact tracing. Overall, individuals who did not
221 feel or only slightly sick with COVID-19 might have not feel the need to be tested. However,
222 this hypothesis does not stand the absence of clear association between the proportions of
223 asymptomatic infections and time to presentation (*i.e.*, with 3-fold more asymptomatic
224 cases, OFIs cases presented faster than COVID-19 cases; data not shown).

225 Interestingly, active smoking was less likely observed with COVID-19 as compared to
226 OFIs or dengue, but this effect was not robust as suggested above. Moreover, it was not
227 replicated for asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections, nor it was among COVID-19+ cases for
228 the protection against illness (data not shown). Notwithstanding, this result fuels the
229 smoker's paradox according to which active smokers were underreported among the
230 patients hospitalized for COVID-19 in several countries [16].

231 In conclusion, our cohort study identified several factors distinguishing non severe
232 dengue from COVID-19 at clinical presentation in a context of recent dengue endemicity and
233 first introduction of SARS-CoV-2. Although prone to potential biases, these data suggest that
234 non severe dengue may be more symptomatic than COVID-19 in a co-epidemic setting with
235 higher dengue attack rates. Whether the findings could serve other regions facing co-
236 epidemics requires more investigations and development of more accurate diagnostic tools.

237

238 **Acknowledgments**

239 The authors are indebted to the staffs of the department of Infectious Disease and Tropical
240 Medicine and the SARS-CoV-2 testing center, especially the nurses who performed the
241 survey. They thank the biologists of the CHU for timely diagnosis and the attendees for kind
242 interest in research.

243

244 **Supplementary data**

245 Supplementary materials are available at *Clinical Infectious Diseases* online. While the
246 supplementary tables have been copyedited, the Methodological appendix and the Venn
247 diagram have not been copyedited and are the sole responsibility of the authors. Questions
248 and comments about these should be addressed to the corresponding author.

249 **Notes**

250

251 **Author's contributions.** *F.A and CL conceived and designed the study. A.J, F.A, A.B, F.A, Y.K,*
252 *F.L, P.P, R.M contributed to the data acquisition. P.G designed and performed the statistical*
253 *analyses and is the data curator. F.A, C.L., A.B., and PG interpreted the data. A.J. and C.L*
254 *drafted the paper with the help of P.G. All authors contributed to critical examination of the*
255 *paper for intellectual content and approved the final manuscript.*

256

257 **List of abbreviations.** *CIR: cumulative incidence rate (= attack rate); CNR: centre national de*
258 *reference; COVID-19: coronavirus 2019; DENV: dengue virus; OFIs: other febrile illnesses;*
259 *aOR: adjusted odds ratio; RT-PCR: reverse transcription – polymerase chain reaction ; SARS-*
260 *CoV-2: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2; spO₂: partial saturation of oxygen;*
261 *UDACS: unite de dépistage ambulatoire du coronavirus sud; URTI : upper respiratory tract*
262 *infection; 95% CI: 95% confidence intervals.*

263

264 **Funding.** *None*

265

266 **Potential conflicts of interest.** *All the authors: No reported conflicts. All authors have signed*
267 *the ICMJE form disclosure of potential conflicts of interest.*

268 **References**

- 269 1. Caron M, Paupy C, Grard G, Becquart P, Mombo I, Nso BB, et al. Recent introduction and
270 rapid dissemination of Chikungunya virus and Dengue virus serotype 2 associated with
271 human and mosquito coinfections in Gabon, central Africa. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012; 55: e45-
272 53. [http://dx.doi:10.1093/cid/cis530](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis530). Epub 2012 Jun 5.
- 273 2. Waggoner JJ, Gresh L, Vargas MJ, Ballesteros G, Tellez Y, Soda J, et al. Viremia and clinical
274 presentation in Nicaraguan patients infected with Zika virus, Chikungunya virus and
275 Dengue virus. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016; 63:1584-90. [http://dx.doi:10.1093/cid/ciw589](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw589).
- 276 3. Huang SY, Lee IK, Wang L, Liu JW, Hung SC, Chen CC, et al. Use of simple clinical and
277 laboratory predictors to differentiate influenza from dengue and other febrile illnesses in
278 the emergency room. *BMC Infect Dis* 2014; 14: 623 . [http://dx.doi:10.1186/s12879-014-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12879-014-0623-z)
279 0623-z.
- 280 4. Wilder-Smith A, Tissera H, Ooi EE, Coloma J, Scott TW, Gubler DJ. Preventing dengue
281 epidemics during COVID-19 pandemic. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2020; 103: 570-1.
282 [http://dx.doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0480](http://dx.doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0480).
- 283 5. Gérardin P, Guernier V, Perrau J, Fianu A, Le Roux K, Grivard P, et al. Estimating
284 Chikungunya prevalence in La Réunion island outbreak by serosurveys: two methods for
285 two critical times of the epidemic *BMC Infect Dis* 2008; 8: 99. [http://dx.doi:10.1186/1471-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-8-99)
286 2334-8-99.
- 287 6. Cournot M, Lenclume M, Le Moullec N, Debussche C, Doussiet E, Fagot-Campagna A, et
288 al. Prevalence, treatment and control of hypertension in La Réunion: the REDIA
289 population-based cohort study. *Blood Press* 2017; 26(1):39-47. [http://dx.doi:](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08037051.2016.1182854)
290 10.1080/08037051.2016.1182854. Epub 2016 May 19.

- 291 7. Vincent M, Larrieu S, Vilain P, Etienne A, Solet JL, François C, et al. From the threat to the
292 large outbreak: dengue on Reunion island. *Euro Surveill* 2019; 24: 1900346. [http://dx.doi:](http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.47.1900346)
293 [10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.47.1900346](http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.47.1900346).
- 294 8. Verduyn M, Allou N, Gazaille V, Andre M, Desroche T, Jaffar M-C, et al. Co-infection of
295 dengue and COVID-19: A case report. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2020; 14: e0008476.
296 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008476>.
- 297 9. Marty FM, Chen K, Verrill KA. How to obtain a nasopharyngeal swab specimen. *New Engl*
298 *J Med* 2020; 382; e76. [https://dx.doi/10.1056/NEJMvcm2010260](https://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMvcm2010260).
- 299 10. Nacher M, Douine M, Gaillet M, Flamand C, Rousset D, Rousseau C, et al. Simultaneous
300 dengue and COVID-19 epidemics: difficult days ahead? *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2020; 14:
301 e0008426. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008426>.
- 302 11. Katzelnick LC, Ben-Shachar R, Mercado JC, Rodriguez-Barraquer I, Elizondo D, Arguello S,
303 et al. Dynamics and determinants of the force of infection of dengue virus from 1994 to
304 2015 in Managua, Nicaragua. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018; 115: 10762-7.
305 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1809253115>.
- 306 12. Ebert D, Bull JJ. Challenging the trade-off model for the evolution of virulence: is
307 virulence management feasible? *Trends Microbiol* 2013; 11: 15-20.
308 [https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0966-842x\(02\)00003-3](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0966-842x(02)00003-3).
- 309 13. Ruy W, Hsu SY, Tsai HL, CT Chen. COVID-19 mimicking dengue fever with the initial
310 manifestation of retro-orbital pain – a rare case. *J Formos Med Assoc* 2020 Jun 4; S0929-
311 6646(20)30229-1. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2020.05.039>. Online ahead of print.
- 312 14. Ng MY, Wan EYF, Wong HYF, Leung ST, Lee JCY, Chin TW, et al. Development and
313 validation of risk prediction models for COVID-19 positivity in a hospital setting. *Int J*

- 314 Infect Dis 2020 Sep 15; S1201-9712(20)30738-4.
315 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.022>. Online ahead of print.
- 316 15. Salmeron Ceron D, Bartier S, Hautefort C, Nguyen Y, Nevoux J, Hamel AL, et al. Self-
317 reported loss of smell with nasal obstruction to identify COVID-19. The multicenter
318 Coranosmia cohort study. J Infect 2020; 81: 614-20.
319 <https://dx.doi.org/20.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.005>.
- 320 16. Usman MS, Siddiqi TJ, Khan MS, Patel UK, Shahid I, Ahmed J, et al. Is there a smoker's
321 paradox in COVID-19? BMJ Evid Based Med. 2020 Aug 11:bmjebm-2020-111492.
322 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2020-111492>. Online ahead of print.

Table 1. Independent predictors in multivariate analysis distinguishing COVID-19 and dengue from other febrile illnesses among 972 subjects consulting a COVID-19 screening center during the COVID-19 dengue co-epidemics, Reunion island, Saint-Pierre, March 23-May 10, 2020

Outcomes (versus other febrile illnesses as controls*)	COVID-19 (n = 74)					Dengue (n = 60)					
	Predictors	n	CIR, %	aOR	95% CI	P value	n	CIR, %	aOR	95% CI	P value
Age, years											
0-30 (Q1)	24	8.63	0.90	0.41 - 1.93	0.782	8	2.88	0.21	0.06 - 0.68	0.009	
31-41 (Q2)	10	3.68	0.41	0.17 - 1.00	0.050	25	9.19	1.03	0.43 - 2.44	0.947	
42-54 (Q3)	26	10.20	1.24	0.60 - 2.53	0.554	13	5.10	0.38	0.14 - 0.99	0.048	
55-94 (Q4)	14	8.38	1			14	8.38	1			
Contact with a COVID-19 positive case	40	15.33	3.81	2.12 - 6.82	< 0.001	6	2.30	0.88	0.34 - 2.24	0.778	
Active smoking †	4	2.53	0.27	0.10 - 0.74	0.011	12	7.59	1.72	0.34 - 2.24	0.182	
Cough	32	6.82	0.81	0.45 - 1.44	0.471	17	3.62	0.38	0.20 - 0.74	0.004	
Body ache ‡	29	7.09	1.12	0.62 - 2.01	0.705	52	12.71	6.83	2.84 - 16.41	< 0.001	
Anosmia	26	27.96	8.27	4.39 - 15.54	< 0.001	3	3.23	0.43	0.09 - 2.07	0.296	
Headache	28	5.69	0.84	0.50 - 1.41	0.508	55	11.18	5.38	1.81 - 15.94	0.002	
Retro-orbital pain	1	2.27	0.39	0.03 - 4.19	0.437	17	38.64	7.45	3.17 - 17.50	< 0.001	
URTI symptoms #	28	5.63	0.53	0.31 - 0.89	0.017	20	4.02	0.46	0.23 - 0.91	0.027	
Presentation > 3 days after symptom onset	54	9.69	1.89	1.04 - 3.40	0.035	24	4.31	0.76	0.40 - 1.44	0.402	

Multinomial logistic regression model with other non COVID-19 non dengue febrile illnesses*, taken as controls. Data are numbers, cumulative incidence rates (CIR) expressed as percentages, adjusted odd ratios (aOR), 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) and P values for Wald tests. † Current smokers, as compared to never smokers and past smokers ‡ muscle pain or backache with tightness and/or stiffness; # sore throat, runny nose, nasal congestion, or sneezing. The indicators of performance of the model

are as follows: Bayesian information criterion -5696, Goodness of fit chi-2 test's probability 0.605, areas under the receiver operating curves 0.795 and 0.892, respectively.

23 **Figures**

24 **Figure 1. Study population**

