

1 **Breakpoint modelling of temporal associations between non-pharmaceutical interventions and**
2 **the incidence of symptomatic COVID-19 in the Republic of Ireland**

3

4 **Boudou M^{1*}, ÓhAiseadha C^{1,2}, Garvey, P^{1,3}, O'Dwyer J^{1,4,5}, Hynds P^{1,5*}**

5

6 ¹ SpatioTemporal Environmental Epidemiology Research (STEER) Group, Environmental
7 Sustainability & Health Institute, Technological University Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

8 ² Health Service Executive, (HSE), Dublin, Ireland

9 ³ Health Protection Surveillance Centre (HPSC), Dublin, Ireland

10 ⁴ School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

11 ⁵ Irish Centre for Research in Applied Geoscience, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.

12

13 *Corresponding Authors; hyndsp@tcd.ie; martin.boudou@gmail.com

14

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background**

17 To constrain propagation and mitigate the burden of COVID-19, most countries initiated and
18 continue to implement several non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), including national and
19 regional lockdowns. In the Republic of Ireland, the first national lockdown was decreed on 23rd of
20 March 2020, followed by a succession of restriction increases and decreases (phases) over the the
21 following year. To date, the effects of these interventions remain unclear, and particularly within
22 differing population subsets. The current study sought to assess the impact of individual NPI phases
23 on COVID-19 transmission patterns within delineated population subgroups in the Republic of
24 Ireland.

25 **Methods and Findings**

26 Confirmed, anonymised COVID-19 cases occurring between the 29th of February 2020 and
27 30th November 2020 (n= 72,654) were obtained. Segmented modelling via breakpoint regression
28 with multiple turning points was employed to identify structural breaks across sub-populations,
29 including primary/secondary infections, age deciles, urban/commuter/rural areas, patients with
30 underlying health conditions, and socio-demographic profiles. These were subsequently compared
31 with initiation dates of eight overarching NPI phases.

32 Five distinct breakpoints were identified. The first breakpoint, associated with a decrease in
33 the daily COVID-19 incidence, was reported within 14 days of the first set of restrictions in mid-
34 March 2020 for most population sub-groups. Results suggest that moderately strict NPIs were more

35 effective than the strictest Phase 5 (National Lockdown). Divergences were observed across
36 population sub-groups; lagged response times were observed among populations >80 years,
37 residents of rural/ commuter regions, and cases associated with a below-median deprivation score.

38 **Conclusions**

39 Study findings suggest that many NPIs have been successful in decreasing COVID-19
40 incidence rates, however the strictest Phase 5 NPI was not. Moreover, NPIs were not equally
41 successful across all sub-populations, with differing response times noted. Mitigation strategies and
42 interventions may need to be increasingly bespoke, based on sub-population profiles and required
43 responses.

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Since its identification in late-2019 in Wuhan China, severe acute respiratory syndrome
47 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the virus associated with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has
48 rapidly spread across the world [1]. The clinical presentation of infection by SARS-CoV-2 ranges
49 between asymptomatic infection, mild symptomatic infection, and critical disease, defined by
50 respiratory and/or multi-organ failure and death [1]. As of late March 2021, almost 127 million cases
51 had been reported, resulting in approximately 2.8 million deaths [2] including 234,000 cases and
52 4,650 deaths in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) [3], representing unprecedented rates of hospitalisation
53 and subsequent pressure on critical care services, both nationally and globally [4,5]. The first
54 laboratory confirmed-case reported in the ROI was reported on 29th February 2020, and within three
55 weeks, cases had been confirmed in all 26 administrative counties [6]. On March 11th 2020, the
56 World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a global pandemic, almost immediately after which a
57 multi-faceted approach was adopted by the Irish government to reduce the impacts of the crisis and
58 “flatten the (epidemic) curve”. As no pharmaceutical intervention was available, this approach
59 comprised an ensemble of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), a majority of which were rolled
60 out nationally, with several regional NPIs (e.g., lockdowns) implemented later in 2020. Measures
61 included 1.) limiting the spread of the virus in the community via school closures, closing the
62 hospitality sector and social distancing 2.) contact tracing, 3.) ensuring adequate healthcare services
63 and equipment available for those most impacted, and 4.) limiting the financial burden on the
64 population, particularly business owners, arising from mitigation and containment measures [7]. A
65 comprehensive overview of the key decisions and responses mandated by the Irish government are
66 presented in Table 1.

67 **Table 1. Time-series of public health responses and non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs)**
 68 **implemented in the Republic of Ireland in response to COVID-19 Pandemic, March – October 2020**

Date	Public Health Response	Restriction Increase/Decrease
9 th March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Patrick's Day Festival Cancelled by Irish Taoiseach (Prime Minister) 	Increase
12 th March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory closure of schools, colleges, universities, childcare facilities, and state-run cultural institutions Suspension of indoor gatherings for >100 people and outdoor gatherings for >500 people Workers urged to work from home, where possible 	Increase
15 th March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of pubs (bars) 	Increase
24 th March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of non-essential businesses All indoor and outdoor sporting activities cancelled All playgrounds/campgrounds closed Citizens not permitted to take unnecessary travel either within Ireland or overseas Physical distancing required when outside and social gatherings of no more than four individuals allowed (except for members of the same household) Citizens required to work from home unless they worked in essential services 	Increase
27 th March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stay at home measures announced for entire population (except essential workers) Confinement radius of 2km from home address implemented No gatherings with anyone outside household People aged over 70 or medically vulnerable advised not to leave own home 	Increase
April 9 th 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irish Police Service granted legal powers to restrict movement, including arrest without warrant, under the Health Act 1947 (Section 31A-Temporary Restrictions) (Covid-19 Regulations). 	Increase
May 18 th 2020	<p>Phase 1 of reopening of economy and society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outdoor work and retail catering for outdoor work resumed Groups of up to four people are allowed to meet outdoors within 5 km of home. Outdoor public amenities, sport and fitness activities are allowed to open. 	Decrease
June 8 th 2020	<p>Phase 2 of reopening of economy and society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel within a county or up to 20 km from home if crossing county borders is allowed. Groups of up to six people are allowed to meet either outdoors or indoors. Organised sporting, cultural or social activities for up to 15 people are allowed. Other retail (except within malls/shopping centres) are allowed to open. Funerals with up to 25 people in attendance are allowed. 	Decrease
June 15 th 2020	Retail facilities in malls/shopping centres are allowed to open	Decrease

June 29 th 2020	<p>Phase 3 of reopening of economy and society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic travel restrictions lifted. • Cafes, restaurants, hotels, hostels, galleries, museums and pubs that serve food are allowed to open but social distancing must be maintained. • Crèches reopen for essential workers and those who need childcare facilities • Behind closed door sporting activities resumed. • Higher risk retail outlets such as hairdressers are allowed to open. • Indoor leisure facilities, festivals and cultural activities reopen. • Indoor gatherings of up to 50 people and outdoor gatherings of up to 200 people allowed as long as public health advice followed. 	Decrease
July 15 th 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face masks made mandatory in shops for customers and staff. • Maximum of 10 people from no more than 4 households allowed to visit other people's homes 	Increase
July 20 th 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Green list" of countries published; travellers from these countries can visit Ireland without having to quarantine. • Advice to people living in Ireland is to avoid all non-essential overseas travel. 	Decrease
August 10 th 2020	<p>Phase 4 of reopening of economy and society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crèches can reopen for the remaining workers. • Weddings are permitted with limited attendance. • Pubs/Nightclubs to remain closed 	Decrease
August 18 th 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors to a home should be limited to not more than 6 from not more than 3 households • Restaurants and Cafes to close by 11:30pm with a maximum of 6 per group (no more than 3 households) 	Decrease
September 1 st 2020	Primary and Secondary Schools reopen	Decrease
October 7 th 2020	<p>Restrictions levels increased to Level 3 (of a 5-point scale), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visits to private homes limited to six people from two different households. • Social family gatherings are suspended. • Organized indoor gatherings are suspended while outdoor gatherings are limited to 15 people. • Residents must remain in their counties of residence unless traveling for work, education, or other essential purposes. • Public transport capacity is limited to 50 percent • Restaurants and cafes allowed to remain open for takeaway and delivery 	Increase
October 21 st 2020	<p>Six-week level 5 (most severe) lockdown, except for specific circumstances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5km containment radius introduced • Schools, early learning and childcare services remain open and are deemed essential • Visits to other people's homes or gardens is banned • Bars, cafes, restaurants and wet pubs may provide take-away and delivery services only. • Public transport will operate at 25% capacity for the purposes of allowing those providing essential services to get to work • Essential retail and services to remain open 	Increase

69

70 In the early phases of the pandemic, a marked age-associated vulnerability in the burden of
71 disease was established, with COVID-19-associated morbidity and mortality rates significantly higher
72 among older sub-populations [8,9]. More recently, studies have examined the impact of geographic
73 location [10], and socioeconomic profile [11] on the likelihood of infection and subsequent
74 outcomes (e.g., hospitalisation, severe infection, intensive care and mortality).

75 However, while there is little doubt as to the overarching efficacy of NPIs “flattening the
76 curve” in the ROI and ensuring that healthcare systems remained intact, to date, it remains unclear
77 how effectively individual measures (intervention phases) reduced viral transmission, and if
78 measures were analogously efficacious among all population subsets and geographical regions.
79 Accurate and reliable analyses of the epidemiology of COVID-19 as it relates to NPIs is essential for
80 informing ongoing healthcare provision and future public health emergency planning. As such, the
81 current study applied breakpoint linear regression analyses with multiple breakpoints to calculated
82 daily incidence time-series for all symptomatic, laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 among the
83 Irish population from February 29th to November 30th 2020. Subsequently, identified structural
84 breaks emanating from delineated sub-populations (primary/secondary infection, age deciles,
85 urban/commuter/rural, deprivation median, and patients with underlying health conditions) were
86 compared with eight time-specific NPIs, accounting for the World Health Organisations (WHO) mean
87 (5-day) and maximum (14-day) estimated COVID-19 incubation periods. We aimed to longitudinally
88 estimate the efficacy, lag-period, and increasing/decreasing slope associated with specific NPIs
89 among delineated sub-populations, with a view to providing governmental and public health
90 authorities with a robust evidence-base for current, ongoing and future public health emergencies.

91

92 **2. Methods**

93 **2.1 Case Data**

94 Anonymised notified COVID-19 case data were obtained from the Computerised Infectious
95 Disease Reporting (CIDR) database (<http://www.hpsc.ie/CIDR/>), an information system used for the
96 collation of notifiable (communicable) infection data in Ireland [12]. Address level data had already
97 been geocoded to Small Areas by the Health Service Executive (HSE)-Health Intelligence Unit. COVID-
98 19 incidence time-series were developed based on the “epidemiological date” (EpiDate) include in
99 the HSE COVID-19 Case Surveillance Form.

100

101 Inclusion criteria

102 Due to the evolving testing policy since the start of the pandemic, only symptomatic cases
103 were included for analyses. Accordingly, all laboratory confirmed cases, occurring between 29th
104 February and 30th November 2020, with symptoms consistent with the Health Protection
105 Surveillance Centre (HPSC) COVID-19 interim case definition (Version 6, January 27th 2021) [13] were
106 included for analyses. Accordingly, cases associated with detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid
107 or antigen in a clinical specimen (Laboratory criteria), and exhibiting at least one of the following:
108 sudden onset of cough or fever or shortness of breath or anosmia, ageusia or dysgeusia (Clinical
109 criteria, i.e. “symptomatic”) were included.

110

111 Ethical considerations

112 Research ethical approval for use of the COVID-19 dataset and associated analyses were
113 granted by the National Research Ethics Committee for COVID-19-related Health Research (NREC
114 COVID-19) (Application number: 20-NREC-COV-061)

115

116 2.2 Data Subsetting

117 Sporadic (i.e., not recorded as associated with a confirmed outbreak or cluster) and
118 outbreak index cases (the first case identified as part of a recognised outbreak/cluster) were defined
119 as primary cases, while all other known outbreak cases were defined as secondary cases.

120 Further, cluster incidence rate (based on CIDR outbreak code, with cluster initiation taken as
121 the epidemiological date (EpiDate) attributable to second case within a defined cluster) per day was
122 also defined and forwarded for analyses. Several metrics were additionally attributed to all
123 individual clusters, including mean case age (years), mean duration (days) and mean size (case
124 number) to investigate the effect of NPIs on cluster composition. All primary symptomatic cases of
125 COVID-19 were discretized into decile-based age-groups for further analyses of age-based sub-
126 populations and their responses to NPIs.

127

128 *Urban/Rural Classification*

129 A categorical SA-specific settlement type variable with three levels of classification was
130 developed using data obtained from the Irish Central Statistics Office (CSO). The CSO settlement
131 type dataset comprises six categories classified along an urban/peri-urban/rural scale ranging from
132 ‘city’ (1) to ‘highly rural/remote areas’ (6). The classification variable was coded such that any
133 classification which included a built-up area (classification 1 to 4) was recoded as ‘urban’,

134 classification 5 (rural areas with high urban influence) was recoded as commuter/peri-urban, with all
135 other areas (classification 6) coded as 'rural'.

136

137 *Deprivation index*

138 The Pobal Haase Pratschke (HP) Deprivation Index is derived from 16 individual components
139 representing the three main dimensions of deprivation: demographic profile, social class
140 composition, and labour market situation [14] (Supplementary Table S1). The relative index score
141 represents a composite measure of deprivation based on these components, calculated for each CSO
142 Small Area (SA) and measured on a single scale across all census periods (Supplementary Table S2),
143 with the score acting as a comparative measure of deprivation between SAs during a census period
144 [14]. Deprivation index data were obtained for 2016 (the most recent Irish census) to correspond
145 with the study period, and binary classification used to delineate SAs based on high (above median
146 relative score) and low (below median relative score) socioeconomic profile.

147 All datasets (urban/rural, deprivation) were spatially integrated using a unique SA identifier
148 via the *match()* function (i.e., input vector), with subset-specific daily incidence rates calculated using
149 the *ts()* function in R version 4.0.3 [15]

150

151 **2.2 Non-pharmaceutical Interventions in the Republic of Ireland, March – November 2020**

152 As shown (Table 1), 16 NPI periods occurred during the study period, however, as several of
153 these were relatively minor and/or regionally specific, 8 primary time points were selected for
154 comparison, based on the 5-phase COVID-19 Plan: Roadmap for Reopening Society and Business,
155 published by the Irish Government in June 2020 (Table 2).

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168 **Table 2. Non-pharmaceutical Intervention (NPI) phases in the Republic of Ireland, March –**
169 **November 2020**

Date	Restrictions	Phase Equivalent
------	--------------	------------------

15/03/2020	Schools (12th) and Bars closed	4
27/03/2020	Stay At Home (SAH) Order – Full P5Lockdown	5
18/05/2020	Easing of COVID-19 P5 – Non-essential shops open – Outdoor sports and mixing with 4 people (max) permitted	4
08/06/2020	Easing of COVID-19 P4 - Indoor and outdoor mixing up to 6 (max) people permitted	3
29/06/2020	Dry pubs/restaurants/barbers/indoor exercise permitted	2
18/08/2020	15/6 people mixing restrictions outdoor/indoor	2
06/10/2020	P3 Restrictions implemented nationwide	3
21/10/2020	P5 Lockdown - Six weeks	5

170

171

172 2.3 Analytical Methods

173 Segmented modelling via breakpoint regression is a useful tool for assessing the effect of a
 174 covariate x on the response y when x changes at a value within the range of the covariate. The
 175 breakpoint regression model has been widely used in medical and related research including
 176 mortality time-series [16], cancer incidence [17], and medication usage [18]. Parameter estimates
 177 and breakpoint estimates were calculated using the "segmented" package [19]. Generic linear
 178 models (seg.Z) were fit to delineated time-series (i.e., sequence of daily COVID-19 incidence through
 179 days 1:276, with the segmented() function employed to fit piecewise regressions based on distance
 180 (i.e., γ divergence/error function), with the model converging when γ is minimized. Stochastically,
 181 breakpoint regression models for sample subsets were defined as $(x_t, y_t, t = 1, 2, \dots, n)$, with:

182

$$183 \quad y_t = \begin{cases} m(x_t, \beta(1)), & a \leq x_t \leq r \\ m(x_t, \beta(2)), & r < x_t \leq b \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

184

185 where β_x represents the slope of the regression line(s), thus determining the increasing or
 186 decreasing trend of the disease for each time interval. In the current study, multiple breakpoints
 187 were identified, with the breakpoint linear regression model defined as:

188

$$189 \quad y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_t + \delta_1 (x_t - \tau_1) + \dots + \delta_k (x_t - \tau_k) + \epsilon, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

190

191 where x_t is "day number", with τ_s 's ($s = 1, 2, \dots, k$) representing the breakpoints. In this case, k
 192 breakpoints divide the time into $(k + 1)$ intervals (or sections), and the interval gradients associated
 193 with these intervals are β_1 (first slope, $x_t < \tau_1$), $\beta_2 = \beta_1 + \delta_1$ (second slope), etc. An iterative
 194 approach was taken to optimise breakpoint number via increasing the npsi parameter from 1, up to
 195 a maximum of 10, using the adjusted R^2 value to balance acceptable model fit with model

196 parsimony, for ease of interpretation, thus providing a number (npsi) of optimised breakpoints with
197 a sequence date (from 1 to 276, i.e., length of the time series), matched to the corresponding date
198 and associated (n + 1) linear intervals and corresponding interval slope. Identified breakpoints and
199 associated sections were subsequently plotted and compared with national level NPI phases (Table
200 2), using the World Health Organisations (WHO) mean (5-day) and maximum (14-day) estimated
201 COVID-19 incubation periods.


202

203 3. Results

204 Overall, 47,928 COVID-19 cases (25,651 female (53.5%); mean age 41.2 years) were included
205 for individual (i.e., case-by-case) breakpoint analyses (65.9% of all notified cases), of which 61.5% (n
206 = 29,459) of cases were classified as primary, and 18,469 (38.5%) classified as secondary cases. The
207 entire dataset (N = 72,311, i.e., both symptomatic and asymptomatic) was included for breakpoint
208 analyses of cluster number per day, based on the first reported epi-date associated with each
209 cluster.

210 Approximately 98.6% of symptomatic cases (n = 47,265) were successfully geocoded to one CSO SA,
211 of which 15.3% (n = 7339), 70.8% (n = 33,950) and 12.5% (n = 5976) of cases were assigned to rural,
212 urban and commuter/peri-urban categories, respectively; 1231 cases (2.6%) were associated with
213 international travel. A median relative deprivation score of 0.870 (Minimum -36.18, Maximum 40.47;
214 25th and 75th percentiles: -6.42, 7.59) was used for case designation.

215



216

217

218 **Figure 1. Age and gender distribution of symptomatic COVID-19 cases in the Republic of Ireland,**
219 **February 29th – November 30th 2020 (crude cases and percentage)**

220

220

221 **Breakpoint Models**

222 Case subsets were modelled to identify the best psi (breakpoint number) for use in
 223 breakpoint analyses (Table 3). A high degree of fit (minimum adjusted $R^2 = 0.833$) was found among
 224 all modelled subsets using psi = 5; while psi = 9 was found to result in higher fit values for several
 225 subsets ($n = 7$), findings of psi = 5 for all subsets are presented to increase comparability and clarity.

226
 227


228 **Table 3. Case subsets, associated sample number and results of breakpoint modelling (based on 5**
 229 **breakpoints), N = 47,928**

Case Subset	Number of cases in subset	Adj. R^2
Primary	29,459	0.925
Secondary	18,469	0.919
Notified Case Clusters	8581	0.923
Underlying Health Conditions	15,079	0.895
0-10 Years	1933	0.883
11-20 Years	5488	0.882
21-30 Years	9380	0.889
31-40 Years	8332	0.916
41-50 Years	7883	0.904
51-60 Years	6714	0.91
61-70 Years	3494	0.87
71-80 Years	2270	0.84
81-90 Years	1907	0.889
>90 Years	518	0.833
Rural	7339	0.921
Urban	33,950	0.933
Mixed/Commuter	5976	0.848
High Deprivation	23,624	0.93
Low Deprivation	23,641	0.923

230


231 As shown (Table 3, Figure 2), while both primary and secondary case time-series achieved
 232 high degrees of fit via breakpoint modelling with psi = 5 (both $R^2 > 0.9$), differing patterns were
 233 identified. The first breakpoint identified within the primary case time-series (29/03) occurred within
 234 5 days of NPI Phase 4 (Figure 2a), while this occurred markedly later within the secondary case time
 235 series (23/04), and not within 14 days of the introduction of any NPI (Figure 2b). The first three
 236 breakpoints associated with secondary cases occurred over a significantly shorter time-period than
 237 observed within primary cases; a marked increase in secondary cases occurred within 14 days
 238 (02/09) of a relaxing of restrictions in mid-August (18/08) 2020, with this increase occurring
 239 approximately 3 weeks earlier among primary cases (07/08) (Figure 3). Both primary and secondary
 240 incidence rates exhibited a marked decrease within 5 days of the move from NPI Phase 2 to Phase 3

241 being implemented nationwide on 6th October; no breakpoint followed by a marked and consistent
242 case decrease was identified within 5 or 14 days of either nationwide Phase 5 lockdowns.



243
244 **Figure 2. Breakpoint models ($\psi = 5$) for a.) primary symptomatic COVID-19 and b.) secondary**
245 **symptomatic COVID-19 in the Republic of Ireland (cases/day), February 29th to November 30th**
246 **2020**

247
248
249
250
251
252




253

254 **Figure 3. Grid synthesis of primary and secondary time-series breakpoint models ($\psi = 5$) in the**
 255 **Republic of Ireland (cases/day), February 29th to November 30th 2020; + and - signs refer to**
 256 **positive and negative interval gradients, respectively**

257

258



259

260 **Figure 4. Breakpoint model ($\psi = 5$) for notified COVID-19 clusters in the Republic of Ireland**
 261 **(based on first reported epi-date), February 29th to November 30th 2020**

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273 **Table 4. Results of breakpoint modelling for COVID-19 clusters per day, with associated median**
274 **within-cluster age and mean cluster size**


Breakpoint Model Section	Start Date	End Date	Cluster Number	Median within-cluster age	Mean Cases/Cluster	Phase Duration (days)
1	29/02/2020	18/03/2020	453	47.33	10.34	18
2	18/03/2020	23/04/2020	1085	45.00	7.07	36
3	23/04/2020	05/08/2020	421	37.33	5.20	104
4	05/08/2020	03/10/2020	2546	34.00	4.18	59
5	03/10/2020	05/10/2020	248	33.83	4.07	2
6	05/10/2020	30/11/2020	3828	32.50	3.57	56

275

276 The breakpoint model associated with cluster number per day (Figure 4) was relatively
277 similar with respect to breakpoint location and interval gradient as that developed for primary cases.
278 For example, the first identified breakpoint (18/03) leading to a consistent decline occurred within 5
279 days of initiation of Phase 4 closures, with another similar breakpoint identified one day before
280 Phase 4 re-entry on October 6th. Again, no breakpoint followed by a decline in cluster occurrence
281 were identified during or within 14 days of Phase 5 lockdowns. As shown (Table 4), no discernible
282 pattern was observed with respect to breakpoint/interval order and cluster number, however, a
283 notable monotonic decline in median within-cluster age (e.g., Interval 1 – Median Age 47.3 years;
284 Interval 6 – Median Age 32.5 years) and cluster size (e.g., Interval 1 – Mean Cases/Cluster 10.3,
285 Interval 6 – Mean Cases/Cluster 3.6).

286 Symptomatic COVID-19 cases among individuals with underlying health conditions based on
287 the HSE COVID-19 Case Surveillance Form (chronic heart disease, hypertension, chronic neurological
288 disease, chronic respiratory disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic liver disease, asthma requiring
289 medication, immunodeficiency (including HIV), diabetes, BMI ≥ 40 , cancer/malignancy) exhibited a
290 distinctive breakpoint pattern (Figure 5). As for primary cases, secondary cases, and cluster number,
291 the first identified breakpoint occurred relatively close to the 15/03 Phase 4 NPI, albeit not within
292 the 5-day median incubation period (23/03). However, “relaxing” of NPIs from Phase 3 to 2 (29/06;
293 18/08) both coincided (within 14-days) with breakpoints followed by increasing daily incidence rates.
294 The second wave peak and overarching pattern associated with this population subset was markedly
295 different from that observed among other sub-populations.

296



297

298 **Figure 5. Breakpoint model ($\psi = 5$) for symptomatic COVID-19 in the Republic of Ireland among**
 299 **persons with underlying health conditions (cases/day), February 29th to November 30th 2020**

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321


All age deciles from 0-10 up to 71-80 years inclusive exhibited a first breakpoint occurring within the NPI Phase 4 (15/03 to 27/03), with an age-ordered pattern observed (i.e., younger deciles exhibited breakpoint before older deciles) (Figure 6a). The two oldest subsets, namely 81-90 years and >90 years, did not adhere to this pattern however, with an approximate 25-days gap between the first identified breakpoint among both these deciles and the 71–80-year decile. Both the 81-90 years and >90 years sub-populations exhibited markedly different breakpoint patterns over the duration of the study period. Conversely, while an age-ordered pattern was also identified for 2nd breakpoints, higher age deciles typically exhibited turning points prior to younger counterparts. For example, among 61–70-year-olds, a second breakpoint was identified 10 days (08/05) before easing of the first Phase 5 lockdown (18/05), while this breakpoint occurred one week after easing among the 31–40-year decile (23/05). All age-based sub-populations exhibited a breakpoint followed by a negative interval gradient (Range -0.18 - -2.8) within 14 days of nationwide Phase 3 restrictions (06/10), with no breakpoints identified during the ensuing Phase 5 lockdown (21/10 onwards).

A similar pattern was observed between identified breakpoints based on urban/rural classification during the first half of the study period (February-August) (Figure 6b), for example, while the second identified breakpoint among urban cases occurred slightly earlier (25/05) than among cases residing in rural (30/05) or commuter areas (29/05), these differences were relatively minor, with all three breakpoints, followed by low positive gradient intervals (Range 0.16 – 0.57), occurring within 14 days of Phase 5 easing (18/05). The most significant divergence from this pattern was represented by the third identified breakpoint, all of which were followed by positive gradient

322 intervals (1.35-5.05), which occurred on 21/08 within the urban case time-series, and approximately
 323 two weeks later in rural (08/09) and commuter areas (07/09).

324 As shown (Figure 6c), breakpoints identified within the sub-population associated with the
 325 “above-median” (i.e., low) deprivation score (> 0.87) typically occurred prior to or in concurrence
 326 with those associated with a deprivation score < 0.87 . For example, the first identified breakpoint
 327 within the low deprivation sub-population occurred on 16/03 (one day after P4 initiation), while the
 328 first high-deprivation breakpoint occurred one week later (23/03). Similarly, the second low-
 329 deprivation breakpoint occurred one day after Phase 5 easing (19/05), while this breakpoint
 330 occurred one week later among those residing in high-deprivation SAs (26/05), thus indicating that
 331 NPI responses occurred more rapidly within low-deprivation areas in the early phases of the
 332 pandemic, with this pattern dissipating over time.

333



334

335 **Figure 6. Grid synthesis of (top) age-related deciles, (middle) urban/commuter/rural classification,**
 336 **and (bottom) above/below median deprivation score time-series breakpoint models ($\psi = 5$) in**
 337 **the Republic of Ireland (cases/day), February 29th to November 30th 2020; + and - signs refer to**
 338 **positive and negative interval gradients, respectively**

339 **4. Discussion**

340 Results may offer valuable insight into the mechanisms of virus suppression and their
341 efficacy across sub-populations, geographic regions and sociodemographic profiles. Five distinct
342 breakpoints were identified and compared across the study period, which consisted of eight varying
343 (increasing/decreasing stringency) stages of non-pharmaceutical intervention. The initial identified
344 breakpoint among a majority of case subsets (excluding secondary infections, and infection among
345 those >80 years) followed by a significantly negative interval gradient, occurred within 14 days of the
346 implementation of the first set of restrictions in mid-March 2020, indicating that there was extensive
347 'voluntary' societal change approaching the implementation of restrictions. This is likely reflective of
348 the socially perceived 'high risk' at the time, due to the unprecedented media exposure and scale of
349 the unfolding event, resulting in high compliance behavioural change (e.g., handwashing, social
350 distancing, staying at home etc.). This effect has been recently reported, whereby restaurant
351 reservations in the United States and movie releases and revenues in Sweden were shown to reduce
352 significantly before any imposition of NPIs, not as a direct response. Thus the largest proportion of
353 decreased mobility in both countries during the initial stages of the pandemic was voluntary, driven
354 by the number of COVID-19 cases and proxying for greater awareness of risk, with the total
355 contribution of NPIs moderate compared to voluntary actions [20].

356 All identified second breakpoints occurred between mid-April and mid-May, after which
357 COVID-19 incidence rates remained low and consistent for 2-3 months, despite eased restrictions
358 (i.e., Phase 2). Previous studies have shown that respiratory viruses, including coronaviruses, exhibit
359 significantly lower incidence rates of infection during summer, and particularly in temperate regions
360 such as Ireland, with colder conditions during winter a major driver for respiratory tract infections
361 due to increased virus stability and transmission and a weakened host immune system [21].
362 Additionally, Merow & Urban (2020) posit that increased UV radiation (viral inactivation) in
363 conjunction with increased vitamin D production (via increased UV radiation) may play a key role,
364 particularly when combined with ongoing voluntary social precautions; models suggest that up to
365 36% of the variation in maximum COVID-19 growth rates in the US is attributed to weather, with UV
366 light the most strongly associated climatic variable with lower COVID-19 growth rates [22].

367 The fourth identified breakpoint within all subsets marked a significant and abrupt increase
368 of infection rates from mid to late September 2020, likely attributable to the reopening of schools
369 (both primary and secondary) and the return of college/university students to campus
370 accommodation. Focusing on primary and secondary education which was reinstated with strict
371 procedural guidance (e.g., 'pods' consisting of 6 children/teens), research from Ireland has
372 concluded that there is no evidence of secondary transmission of COVID-19 from children attending

373 school [23]. However, the reopening of schools likely resulted in increased social interaction
374 between parents/caregivers. Moreover, Santamaria & Hortal (2020) suggest that numerous
375 pandemic waves and consequent NPI phases may lead to lapsing vigilance associated with fatigue or
376 lowered risk perception [24]. In response to the increasing number of notifications in line with
377 breakpoint four, the final breakpoint (significant negative interval gradient across all subsets)
378 occurred simultaneously with the move to Phase four of the national response plan, again indicating
379 a natural reduction in disease prevalence prior to a mandated NPI, perhaps resulting from an
380 increased social perception of risk and reinforced personal protective measures. The re-introduction
381 of increasingly restrictive NPIs immediately after this period was arguably unnecessary; notably no
382 significant reduction breakpoint were identified during either of the ‘high-level’ (i.e, Phase 5) NPI
383 phases, as the ‘voluntary’ reduction of disease was likely already triggered. While several
384 mathematical modelling studies and meta-analyses have reported a marked reduction in COVID-19
385 incidence and mortality [25 - 27], a meta-analysis of 87 regions which include 3741 pairwise
386 comparisons could not explain if COVID-19 mortality is reduced by “stay at home” orders in 98% of
387 the comparisons [28]. Analysis of incidence trends in Germany detected a crucial breakpoint on 8
388 March, coinciding with the cancellation of mass events on the same day, with the authors suggesting
389 that increased awareness and voluntary changes in behaviour, e.g., social distancing, respiratory
390 etiquette and hand hygiene, likely had a significant effect [29]. Similarly, breakpoint analysis of daily
391 incidence and effective reproductive number in Spain indicates reductions in disease growth that
392 preceded mobility restrictions [24], while Post et al. (2021) also report findings from a study of seven
393 European countries that adopted different strategies, which found that, although breakpoints in
394 daily effective contact rates (ECR) aligned with government interventions, ECR after full lockdown
395 was not necessarily lower than that after a ban on gatherings alone [30]. As such, it appears that the
396 efficacy of Phase 5 lockdowns may be regionally- or nationally-specific, and in the case of Ireland,
397 there is no evidence to suggest that Phase 5 NPIs were more effective than Phase 3/4 NPIs during
398 the first two “waves” of infection. Considering the potential impacts of prolonged restrictions on
399 psychological wellbeing [31,32], significant further work and a robust evidence base is required to
400 support future use of these measures.

401 Breakpoints identified among both secondary cases and recognised COVID-19 clusters
402 differed from patterns observed among primary cases (Figures 3 & 4); within the cluster number
403 subset, breakpoints preceded lockdown by a week or more in both first and second wave, while the
404 crucial breakpoint identified for secondary cases during the first wave did not occur until three
405 weeks after the lockdown was imposed. This may indicate that measures required to control
406 outbreaks may differ from those required to control transmission within the general population.

407 Likewise, when cases are assessed based on age profile (Figure 6), notable divergence from an
408 overarching pattern was observed; a notable decrease in “quick” response was noted among
409 individuals >80 years i.e., a reduction in the number of cases occurred significantly more quickly
410 among the population <80 years. This could be attributable to numerous factors including a longer
411 incubation period in older adults [9], comorbidity-related severity of infection and reduced immune
412 response [33], all of which may allow for a lengthened persistence of the disease within elderly
413 populations. The history of the pandemic indicates that nursing homes, or ‘long-term care facilities’
414 (LTCF) for older people, in Ireland as in other countries, were severely impacted during the first wave
415 [3], which required specific outbreak control measures within these facilities to break the chain of
416 transmission. As these infections occurred within the LTCF setting, they were not amenable to the
417 effects of NPI’s implemented in the general population. Similarly, COVID-19 incidence rate
418 breakpoints were significantly staggered based on age decile, with case incidence decreases
419 occurring in younger populations first (approximately 1-3 days per decile), and case increases
420 occurring more quickly among older individuals (approximately 2-5 days per decile).

421 The timing of the third identified breakpoint differed between urban and rural subgroups,
422 occurring in mid-August in the urban subgroup and not until approximately 7th September in the
423 rural subgroup. This may be reflective of differences in social activities, e.g., an earlier seasonal
424 increase in indoor gatherings among urban versus rural residents and/or condensed residences in
425 urban areas expediting SAR-CoV-2 transmission. A recent study from South Carolina reports that
426 relaxing of NPIs was followed by hotspots of infection reappearing in urban areas more quickly than
427 rural areas [34], with the authors recommending locally- or regionally-customised actions to ensure
428 highest levels of efficacy in controlling the infection. The authors feel that it is likely that there are
429 more ‘office’ based jobs in urban areas, thus offering more opportunity for working from home,
430 however data were not available to test this hypothesis. Henning-Smith et al. (2020) suggest that in
431 many high-income countries, rural residents are older, more likely to be associated with underlying
432 health conditions, and less likely to have access to healthcare and/or necessary financial resources
433 [35], and as such, a “one size fits all” approach to NPIs may not be appropriate based upon
434 geographic location, which in Ireland is associated with many potential drivers including occupation,
435 income, car ownership, educational attainment, and level of affluence [36]. It is important to note
436 that, within the symptomatic COVID-19 case dataset for Ireland, a significant association exists
437 between rurality and deprivation; rural cases were associated with a median HP Deprivation Score of
438 -8.25, while urban cases exhibited a median deprivation score of -3.22, and as such, it is difficult to
439 comment on or make recommendations solely based on geographic location. Similarly, an inter-
440 relationship exists between deprivation and underlying health (based on underlying health condition

441 number associated with confirmed cases) in Ireland, further complicating the situation; when people
442 without an underlying health condition were excluded, a significant negative non-parametric
443 correlation existed between deprivation score and health condition number (Spearman Rho = -
444 0.096, $p < 0.001$).

445 The observed earlier first breakpoint among cases associated with a higher deprivation score
446 (i.e., more affluent subset) may indicate a greater awareness and willingness to adopt voluntary
447 measures for self-protection, while working from home (and thus complying with stay-at-home
448 orders) may be more difficult for those in lower paid jobs. Conversely, the earlier timing of second
449 and third breakpoints may point to higher levels of susceptibility among more deprived sub-
450 populations, based on underlying health status, as mentioned above. A recently published
451 retrospective cohort study comprising 3528 patients with laboratory confirmed COVID-19 residing in
452 New York (US) found that patients associated with high poverty areas were significantly younger,
453 had a higher prevalence of comorbidities and were more likely to be female or from a racial minority
454 compared to individuals living in low poverty areas [37].

455 While the presented study is the first of its kind from Ireland, insofar as it the first to employ
456 temporally-specific case data, geo-coded to a very fine resolution, thus allowing delineation of
457 cohorts pertaining to geographical attributes including deprivation and urban/rural classification,
458 there are some inherent limitations the authors feel should be highlighted. The epi-date used to
459 develop sub-population time-series, while complete, included a number of temporal classifications;
460 while a large majority of epi-dates were classified as being “infection onset date”, other case epi-
461 dates were classified as “lab specified collection date”, “event creation date”, and “date of
462 diagnosis”. Accordingly, presented findings should be interpreted with an appropriate level of
463 caution. Similarly, it was not possible to accurately delineate large LTCH or workplace outbreaks,
464 which may influence, and potentially bias, the number of cases attributed to specific population
465 subsets e.g., urban/commuter/rural classification. Lastly, COVID-19 surveillance data may be biased
466 due to geographical distribution of testing locations, and particularly as they pertain to secondary
467 and/or asymptomatic cases. Consequently, it is important to note that cluster number, median
468 within-cluster age and cluster size (i.e, notified cases per cluster) were inherently influenced by the
469 availability of testing for asymptomatic individuals, and particularly during the early phases of the
470 pandemic.

471

472 **References**

- 473 1. World Health Organisation (2020) Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). World Health
474 Organization. Published 12th October 2020. Available at: [https://www.who.int/news-
475 room/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19](https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19) [Accessed 3rd March 2021]

- 476 2. World Health Organisation (2021) Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. World Health
477 Organisation. Available at: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019)
478 [2019](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019) [Accessed 23rd March 2021]
- 479 3. Department of Health (2021) Latest updates on COVID-19. Government of Ireland. Available
480 at: <https://www.gov.ie/en/news/7e0924-latest-updates-on-covid-19-coronavirus/> [Accessed
481 28th March 2021]
- 482 4. Legido-Quigley H, Asgari N, Teo YY, Leung GM, Oshitani H, Fukuda K, et al. Are high-
483 performing health systems resilient against the COVID-19 epidemic? *Lancet*.
484 2020;395(10227):848–50.
- 485 5. Verelst, F., Kuylen, E., & Beutels, P. (2020). Indications for healthcare surge capacity in
486 European countries facing an exponential increase in coronavirus disease (COVID-19) cases,
487 March 2020. *Eurosurveillance*, 25(13), 2000323.
- 488 6. HPSC (2020) Epidemiology of COVID-19 in Ireland. Health Protection Surveillance Centre.
489 Published 22nd March 2020. Available at: [https://www.hpsc.ie/a-](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casesinireland/epidemiologyofcovid-19inireland/march2020/COVID-19%20Epidemiology%20report%20for%20NPHE%2022.03.2020_v1%20web%20version.pdf)
490 [z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casesinireland/epidemiologyofcovid-](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casesinireland/epidemiologyofcovid-19inireland/march2020/COVID-19%20Epidemiology%20report%20for%20NPHE%2022.03.2020_v1%20web%20version.pdf)
491 [19inireland/march2020/COVID-](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casesinireland/epidemiologyofcovid-19inireland/march2020/COVID-19%20Epidemiology%20report%20for%20NPHE%2022.03.2020_v1%20web%20version.pdf)
492 [19%20Epidemiology%20report%20for%20NPHE%2022.03.2020_v1%20web%20version.pdf](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casesinireland/epidemiologyofcovid-19inireland/march2020/COVID-19%20Epidemiology%20report%20for%20NPHE%2022.03.2020_v1%20web%20version.pdf)
493 [Accessed 3rd March 2021]
- 494 7. Kennelly B, O'Callaghan M, Coughlan D, Cullinan J, Doherty E, Glynn L, Moloney E, Queally M.
495 The COVID-19 pandemic in Ireland: An overview of the health service and economic policy
496 response. *Health Policy Technol.* 2020 Dec;9(4):419-429.
- 497 8. Salje, H. et al. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. *Science* **369**, 208–211 (2020)
- 498 9. Kong TK. (2020). Longer incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in older
499 adults. *Aging Medicine*, 3(2), 102-109.
- 500 10. Mueller JT, McConnell K., Berne Burow P., Pofahl K., Merdjanoff AA., Farrell J. (2021).
501 Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on rural America Proceedings of the National Academy
502 of Sciences. Jan 2021, 118 (1)
- 503 11. Clark, A., Jit, M., Warren-Gash, C., Guthrie, B., Wang, H. H., Mercer, S. W., ... & Jarvis, C. I.
504 (2020). Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe
505 COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. *The Lancet Global*
506 *Health*, 8(8), e1003-e1017.
- 507 12. Domegan, L., Garvey, P., McKeown, P., Johnson, H., Hynds, P., O'Dwyer, J., & ÓhAiseadha, C.
508 (2021). Geocoding cryptosporidiosis cases in Ireland (2008–2017)—development of a
509 reliable, reproducible, multiphase geocoding methodology. *Irish Journal of Medical Science*
510 (1971-), 1-11.
- 511 13. HPSC (2021). Covid-19 Case Definitions. Available at: [https://www.hpsc.ie/a-](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casedefinitions/)
512 [z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casedefinitions/](https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/respiratory/coronavirus/novelcoronavirus/casedefinitions/) [Accessed 3rd March 2021]
- 513 14. Haase T., Pratchhke J. (2012). The 2011 Pobal HP Deprivation Index for small areas (SA):
514 Introduction and reference tables. Poabl. Dublin
- 515 15. Kuhn, M., Wing, J., Weston, S., Williams, A., Keefer, C., Engelhardt, A., ... & Benesty, M.
516 (2020). Package 'caret'. *The R Journal*, 223.

- 517 16. Parcha, V., Patel, N., Kalra, R., Suri, S. S., Arora, G., & Arora, P. (2020, December). Mortality
518 due to mitral regurgitation among adults in the United States: 1999-2018. In *Mayo Clinic*
519 *Proceedings* (Vol. 95, No. 12, pp. 2633-2643). Elsevier.
- 520 17. Kim, H. J., Yu, B., & Feuer, E. J. (2008). Inference in segmented line regression: a simulation
521 study. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 78(11), 1087-1103.
- 522 18. Wagner, A. K., Soumerai, S. B., Zhang, F., & Ross-Degnan, D. (2002). Segmented
523 regression analysis of interrupted time series studies in medication use research. *Journal of*
524 *clinical pharmacy and therapeutics*, 27(4), 299-309.
- 525 19. Muggeo, V. M. (2008). Segmented: an R package to fit regression models with broken-line
526 relationships. *R news*, 8(1), 20-25.
- 527 20. Maloney W., Taskin T. (2020). *Determinants of social distancing and economic*
528 *activity during COVID-19: A global view*. The World Bank.
- 529 21. Audi, A., Allbrahim, M., Kaddoura, M., Hijazi, G., Yassine, H. M., & Zaraket, H. (2020).
530 Seasonality of Respiratory Viral Infections: Will COVID-19 Follow Suit? *Frontiers in Public*
531 *Health*, 8, 576.
- 532 22. Merow, C., & Urban, M. C. (2020). Seasonality and uncertainty in global COVID-19 growth
533 rates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(44), 27456-27464.
- 534 23. Heavey, L., Casey, G., Kelly, C., Kelly, D., & McDarby, G. (2020). No evidence of secondary
535 transmission of COVID-19 from children attending school in Ireland, 2020. *Eurosurveillance*,
536 25(21), 2000903.
- 537 24. Santamaría, L., & Hortal, J. (2021). COVID-19 effective reproduction number dropped during
538 Spain's nationwide dropdown, then spiked at lower-incidence regions. *Science of the Total*
539 *Environment*, 751, 142257.
- 540 25. Ibarra-Vega, D. (2020). Lockdown, one, two, none, or smart. Modeling containing covid-19
541 infection. A conceptual model. *Science of the Total Environment*, 730, 138917.
- 542 26. Ambikapathy, B., & Krishnamurthy, K. (2020). Mathematical modelling to assess the impact
543 of lockdown on COVID-19 transmission in India: Model development and validation. *JMIR*
544 *public health and surveillance*, 6(2), e19368.
- 545 27. Kucharski, A. J., Russell, T. W., Diamond, C., Liu, Y., Edmunds, J., Funk, S., ... & Flasche, S.
546 (2020). Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling
547 study. *The lancet infectious diseases*, 20(5), 553-558.
- 548 28. Savaris, R. F., Pumi, G., Dalzochio, J., & Kunst, R. (2021). Stay-at-home policy is a case of
549 exception fallacy: an internet-based ecological study. *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 1-13.
- 550 29. Wieland, T. (2020). A phenomenological approach to assessing the effectiveness of COVID-
551 19 related nonpharmaceutical interventions in Germany. *Safety Science*, 131, 104924.
- 552 30. Post, R. A., Regis, M., Zhan, Z., & van den Heuvel, E. R. (2021). How did governmental
553 interventions affect the spread of COVID-19 in European countries? *BMC public*
554 *health*, 21(1), 1-11.

- 555 31. González-Sanguino, C., Ausín, B., Castellanos, M. Á., Saiz, J., López-Gómez, A., Ugidos, C., &
556 Muñoz, M. (2020). Mental health consequences during the initial stage of the 2020
557 Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) in Spain. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, *87*, 172-176.
- 558 32. Rajkumar, R. P. (2020). COVID-19 and mental health: A review of the existing
559 literature. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, *52*, 102066.
- 560 33. Liu, Y., Yan, L. M., Wan, L., Xiang, T. X., Le, A., Liu, J. M., ... & Zhang, W. (2020). Viral dynamics
561 in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, *20*(6), 656-657.
- 562 34. Huang, Q., Jackson, S., Derakhshan, S., Lee, L., Pham, E., Jackson, A., & Cutter, S. L. (2021).
563 Urban-rural differences in COVID-19 exposures and outcomes in the South: A preliminary
564 analysis of South Carolina. *PLoS one*, *16*(2), e0246548.
- 565 35. Henning-Smith, C. (2020). The unique impact of COVID-19 on older adults in rural
566 areas. *Journal of aging & social policy*, *32*(4-5), 396-402.
- 567 36. Central Statistics Office (2019). Urban and Rural life in Ireland. Available at:
568 [https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-](https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-urli/urbanandrurallifeinireland2019/introduction/)
569 [urli/urbanandrurallifeinireland2019/introduction/](https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-urli/urbanandrurallifeinireland2019/introduction/) [Assessed on March 23rd 2021]
- 570 37. van Gerwen, M., Alsen, M., Little, C., Barlow, J., Genden, E., Naymagon, L., & Tremblay, D.
571 (2021). Risk factors and outcomes of COVID-19 in New York City; a retrospective cohort
572 study. *Journal of medical virology*, *93*(2), 907-915.
- 573
574