medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Omicron-associated changes in SARS-CoV-2 symptoms in the United Kingdom

Authors

Karina-Doris Vihta1,2,3*, Koen B. Pouwels2,4, Tim EA Peto1,2,5,6, Emma Pritchard1,2, Thomas House7,8, Ruth Studley9, Emma Rourke9, Duncan Cook9, Ian Diamond9, Derrick Crook1,2,5,6, Philippa C. Matthews1,10,11,12, Nicole Stoesser1,2,5,6, David W. Eyre2,5,13#, Ann Sarah Walker1,2,5#, and the COVID-19 Infection Survey team

contribution considered equal

Affiliations

1 Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

2 The National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance at the University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

3 Department of Engineering, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

4 Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

5 The National Institute for Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

6 Department of Infectious Diseases and Microbiology, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK

7 Department of Mathematics, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

8 IBM Research, Hartree Centre, Sci-Tech Daresbury, UK

9 Office for National Statistics, Newport, UK

10 Francis Crick Institute, London, UK

11 Division of Infection and Immunity, University College London, London UK

12 Department of Infection, University College London Hospitals, London, 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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

13 Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Key words: SARS-CoV-2, Omicron, symptoms

Running head: Omicron-associated changes in symptoms

Corresponding author: Karina-Doris Vihta, Institute of Biomedical Engineering, Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, OX1 2JD, Oxford, U.K. Email karina-doris.vihta@eng.ox.ac.uk. Tel: +44 7707931091.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT (WORDS 50, WORD LIMIT 50)

In a nationally representative UK community study, SARS-CoV-2 Omicron infections were associated with fewer lower, and more upper, respiratory tract symptoms. Increases in sore throat (also common in PCR-negative participants), and a marked reduction in loss of taste/smell (previously highly specific), make Omicron harder to detect with symptom-based testing algorithms.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Introduction

As the highly-transmissible SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant increases in incidence, coincident with other winter respiratory viruses circulating in the Northern hemisphere, changes in symptomatology may influence clinical and testing policy. Experimental and clinical data suggest Omicron has less impact on the lower respiratory tract, leading to less severe disease[1–7], with the variant-defining mutations potentially also affecting other symptoms.

We used the UK Covid-19 Infection Survey, a nationally representative longitudinal household study[8], to investigate if SARS-CoV-2 infection symptoms have changed with the Omicron variant. We compared symptoms reported in SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive infection episodes and at PCR-negative visits from December 2021 onwards, when Omicron emerged and rapidly became dominant across the UK[9], with those reported between October 2020 and November 2021 (described previously to August 2021[10]).

Methods

This analysis included all SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests of nose and throat swabs from 1 October 2020 to 15 January 2022 in the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Covid Infection Survey (CIS) (ISRCTN21086382, https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-survey/protocol-and-information-sheets). The survey randomly selects private households on a continuous basis from address lists and previous surveys to provide a representative UK sample. Following verbal agreement to participate, a study worker visited each household to take written informed consent, which was obtained from parents/carers for those 2-15 years; those aged 10-15 years provided written assent. Those <2 years were not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

eligible. Ethical approval was provided by the South Central Berkshire B Research Ethics Committee (20/SC/0195).

Individuals were asked about demographics, symptoms, contacts and relevant behaviours (https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-survey/case-record-forms). To reduce transmission risks, participants ≥12 years self-collected nose and throat swabs following study worker instructions. Parents/carers took swabs from children <12 years. At the first visit, participants were asked for consent for optional follow-up visits every week for the next month, then monthly from enrolment.

Swabs were analysed at the UK's national Lighthouse Laboratories at Milton Keynes and Glasgow using identical methodology. PCR for three SARS-CoV-2 genes (N protein, S protein and ORF1ab) was performed using the Thermo Fisher TaqPath RT-PCR COVID-19 kit, and analysed using UgenTec FastFinder 3.300.5, with an assay-specific algorithm and decision mechanism that allows conversion of amplification assay raw data from the ABI 7500 Fast into test results with minimal manual intervention. Samples are called positive if at least the N gene and/or ORF1ab are detected. Although S gene cycle threshold (Ct) values are determined, S gene detection alone is not considered sufficient to call a sample positive.

The presence of 12 specific symptoms in the previous seven days was elicited at each visit from the start of the survey (cough, fever, myalgia, fatigue, sore throat, shortness of breath, headache, nausea, abdominal pain, diarrhoea, loss of taste, loss of smell), as was whether participants thought they had (unspecified) symptoms compatible with COVID-19. Positive response to any of these questions defined "symptomatic" cases. Four additional symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

(runny nose, trouble sleeping, loss of appetite, wheezing) were added from 29 September 2021; as these were not elicited throughout the survey, they were considered separately and not used to define symptomatic cases.

We included the first positive study test in each PCR-positive infection "episode", defining re-infections (arbitrarily) as occurring ≥120 days after an index positive with a preceding negative test, or after 4 consecutive negative tests[11]. Each positive episode was characterised as wild-type/Delta if the S-gene was ever detected (by definition, with N/ORF1ab/both), or as Alpha-compatible or Omicron-compatible if positive at least once for ORF1ab+N, otherwise "other" (N-only/ORF1ab-only) depending on calendar period (**Fig.1A**). Symptom presence was defined as reported symptoms at any visit within [0,+35] days of the first PCR-positive in each infection episode to allow for the random sampling leading to pre-symptomatic identification of some individuals, who only report symptoms subsequently.

As a comparator, we initially included all visits with negative PCR tests, and then, following a previous analysis to August 2021[10], excluded visits where symptoms could plausibly be related to ongoing effects of COVID-19 or long COVID, where there was a high pre-test probability of a new COVID-19 infection that had not been detected in the study, or where symptoms were likely driven by recent vaccination (details in Supplementary Methods).

Generalised additive models (binomial distribution with complementary log-log link, R mgcv (v.1.8-31) package) were fitted to estimate the percentage of PCR-positive infection episodes and PCR-negative visits that were symptomatic, and the percentage of symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes and PCR-negative visits reporting each

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

symptom separately. Models adjusted simultaneously for calendar time (smoothing spline), age (smoothing spline), sex and ethnicity (white vs non-white).

Results

Between October 2020 and January 2022, 63,013 PCR-positive episodes occurred in 61,901 participants (median 41 years, IQR 18-57), with 34,383 (55%) reporting symptoms. 1169/63,013 (2%) were re-infections (**Fig.S1**), 516 (44%) reporting symptoms. The comparator comprised 4,314,474 PCR-negative study visits (482,888 participants, median 54 years, IQR 34-67); 179,555 (4%) reporting symptoms.

As Omicron infections started to increase, the percentage of PCR-positive infection episodes with reported symptoms, and the mean number of symptoms reported in PCR-positive infection episodes, declined slightly before rising again slightly, only to decline further from 4 January 2022 (**Fig.1B/C**). The slight decrease followed by a small rise may be due to the large numbers of early Omicron cases[12] being pre-symptomatic when tested; however, the subsequent decline as Omicron came to dominate (**Fig.1A**) supports this being a true decrease with Omicron. There was no change in the percentage of PCR-negative visits reporting any symptoms, or the mean number of symptoms reported in PCR-negative visits during this time.

For specific symptoms, amongst symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes, there was a marked decline in reported loss of taste/smell, from high levels during the period when Delta dominated, e.g. 44%/44% on 1 December 2021, to 16%/13% on 31 December 2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

with only very small changes thereafter. Loss of taste/smell was also more uncommon with Omicron than Alpha (which also exhibits S gene target failure) (**Fig.1D**). Loss of taste/smell remained extremely uncommon in symptomatic PCR-negative visits throughout (**Fig.1F**).

There were concurrent smaller, but significant declines in symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes reporting cough, fever, fatigue/weakness, myalgia, headache and shortness of breath during December 2021. The percentage of symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes reporting headache and shortness of breath stabilised at around 60% and 20%, respectively, for shortness of breath at a similarly low level to October 2020 (**Fig.1D/E**). There was little change in the percentages of symptomatic PCR-negative visits reporting these symptoms, until a small increase in fatigue/weakness, myalgia, headache and shortness of breath at the start of January 2022 (**Fig.1F/G**).

Trends were similar for most other symptoms (**Fig.1D/G**, **Fig.S2**). The key exception was sore throat, which increased from 45% to 57% in symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes during December 2021, decreasing slightly to 54% by 15 January 2022. However, concurrently, sore throat also increased from 40% to 43% in symptomatic PCR-negative visits during December 2021 and then decreased to 35% by 15 January 2022, with a similar decrease in cough in symptomatic PCR-negative visits. There was a concurrent trend towards increasing percentages of symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes reporting runny nose (**Fig.S2**, 56% 1 December 2021 to 60% 15 January 2022), but this decreased in PCR-negative visits from 44% to 37%, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Differential symptom reporting between variants from December 2021, particularly fewer cases with loss of taste/smell and more with sore throat, was unaffected by vaccination status (**Fig.S3**). The probability of reporting any symptoms in PCR-positives/PCR-negatives and the mean number of reported symptoms was lower at most ages after Omicron emerged (15 Jan 2022) vs. before (1 December 2021) (**Fig.S4**), with no evidence of differences at the oldest ages. Lower percentages of symptomatic PCR-positives reported loss of taste/smell post Omicron for those under 70 years; the percentages of symptomatic participants reporting most other symptoms was broadly similar across ages pre vs post Omicron emergence, with the only other substantial difference being higher percentages of those over 60 years reporting fatigue/weakness in those post Omicron.

Discussion

Overall, in this study of predominantly mild community-based infection, Omicron was associated with fewer lower, and more upper, respiratory tract symptoms.

In PCR/lateral flow antigen-positive cases, the ZOE study, which relies on volunteers reporting symptoms daily using an app, found runny nose, headache, fatigue, sore throat and sneezing to be the top five symptoms during periods when both Delta and Omicron were dominant[13], with less loss of taste/smell being reported with Omicron, as in our study. The major strength of our study is that regular PCR testing is undertaken in all participants at all visits irrespective of symptoms. This provides a representative sample of PCR-negative visits without SARS-CoV-2 infection for comparison with symptom rates in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

PCR-positives. This is crucial in the context of other winter respiratory viruses that are normally circulating in the Northern hemisphere. Limitations include the fact that we used a relatively crude definition of reinfections given the data available with which to determine these; however, estimated reinfections were infrequent (2%) and results were very similar excluding these (not shown).

Overall, increases in sore throat (also common in symptomatic PCR-negative visits), and the marked reduction in the previously highest specificity symptoms, namely loss of taste/smell, make Omicron harder to detect with symptom-based testing algorithms.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Symptoms in those testing positive and negative for SARS-CoV-2 prior to and following the emergence and dominance of Omicron in December 2021 in the UK. Panel A shows the number of PCR-positive infection episodes that were S-gene negative (Alpha-compatible November 2020 to May 2021; Omicron-compatible from December 2021) and S-gene positive (Delta-compatible from June 2021 onwards). Vertical lines indicate periods when new variants came to dominate: wild type before 17 November 2020, then Alpha before 17 May 2021, then Delta; the first Omicron cases were detected from 29 November 2021. Panels B and C show the probability of reporting symptoms and the number of symptoms (out of the 12 elicited throughout the study period) of all PCR-positive infection episodes and all PCR-negative comparator visits. Panels D-G show the probability of specific symptoms in symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes (panels D and E) and in symptomatic PCR-negative comparator study visits (panels F and G), after adjustment for age, sex, ethnicity (presented at the reference category age 45, male, white).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

1. Kozlov M. Omicron's feeble attack on the lungs could make it less dangerous. 2022. Available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-00007-8. Accessed 10 January 2022.

2. Diamond M, Halfmann P, Maemura T, et al. The SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 Omicron virus causes attenuated infection and disease in mice and hamsters. Rev **2021**; :1–27.

3. Willett BJ, Grove J, Maclean OA, et al. The hyper-transmissible SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant exhibits significant antigenic change, vaccine escape and a switch in cell entry mechanism Brian. medRxiv **2022**; :1–59. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.01.03.21268111v1.full.pdf .

4. Meng B, A.T.M FI, Abdullahi A, Goonawardane N. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron spike mediated immune escape and tropism shift. bioRxiv **2022**; Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.01.03.21268111v1.full.pdf .

5. Bentley EG, Kirby A, Sharma P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-B.1.1.529 Variant leads to less severe disease than Pango B and Delta variants strains in a mouse model of severe COVID-19. bioRxiv **2021**; :1–16.

6. McMahan K, Giffin V, Tostanoski LH, Chung B. Reduced Pathogenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant in Hamsters. bioRxiv **2022**;

7. Peacock TP, Brown JC, Zhou J, et al. The SARS-CoV-2 variant , Omicron , shows rapid replication in human primary nasal epithelial cultures and efficiently uses the endosomal route of entry . bioRxiv **2022**;

8. Pouwels KB, House T, Pritchard E, et al. Community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in England from April to November, 2020: results from the ONS Coronavirus Infection Survey. Lancet Public Heal **2021**; 6:e30–e38.

9. UK Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey, UK: 7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

January 2022. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tfc-children-and-transmission-update-paper-17-december-2020. Accessed 9 January 2022.

10. Vihta K-D, Pouwels KB, Peto T, et al. Symptoms and SARS-CoV-2 positivity in the general population in the UK. Clin Infect Dis **2021**; :ciab945. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab945.

11. Pritchard E, Matthews PC, Stoesser N, et al. Impact of vaccination on new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the United Kingdom. Nat Med **2021**; Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01410-w.

12. UK Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey, UK: 23 December 2021. 2021. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/23december2021. Accessed 24 January 2022.

13. ZOE Editorial Staff. What are the symptoms of Omicron? 2022. Available at: https://joinzoe.com/learn/omicron-symptoms. Accessed 24 January 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Declarations

Contributors: This specific analysis was designed by ASW, K-DV, KBP, PCM, NS, DWE, TH, DC, TEAP. K-DV conducted the statistical analysis of the survey data. K-DV, NS, PCM, ASW drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to interpretation of the study results, and revised and approved the manuscript for intellectual content. K-DV is the guarantor and accepts full responsibility for the work and conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish. The corresponding author (K-DV) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Funding: This study is funded by the Department of Health and Social Care with in-kind support from the Welsh Government, the Department of Health on behalf of the Northern Ireland Government and the Scottish Government. K-DV, KBP, ASW, TEAP, NS, DE are supported by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance at the University of Oxford in partnership with Public Health England (PHE) (NIHR200915). ASW and TEAP are also supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre. KBP is also supported by the Huo Family Foundation. ASW is also supported by core support from the Medical Research Council UK to the MRC Clinical Trials Unit [MC_UU_12023/22] and is an NIHR Senior Investigator. PCM is funded by Wellcome (intermediate fellowship, grant ref 110110/Z/15/Z) and holds an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellowship award. DWE is supported by a Robertson Fellowship and an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellowship. NS is an Oxford Martin Fellow and an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellow. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, NIHR, Department of Health, or PHE. The funder/sponsor did not have any role in the design and conduct of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors had full access to all data analysis outputs (reports and tables) and take responsibility for their integrity and accuracy.

For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Competing interests: DWE declares lecture fees from Gilead outside the submitted work. No other author has a conflict of interest to declare.

Ethical approval: The study received ethical approval from the South Central Berkshire B Research Ethics Committee (20/SC/0195).

Data sharing: Data are still being collected for the COVID-19 Infection Survey. De-identified study data are available for access by accredited researchers in the ONS Secure Research Service (SRS) for accredited research purposes under part 5, chapter 5 of the Digital Economy Act 2017. For further information about accreditation, contact Research.Support@ons.gov.uk or visit the SRS website.

Transparency: The lead authors affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study design being reported, no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any discrepancies from the study as originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained. Dissemination to participants and related patient

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

and public communities: Results of individual tests were communicated to the participants. Overall study results were disseminated through the preprint of the study. Findings were disseminated in lay language in the national and local press.

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful for the support of all COVID-19 Infection Survey participants and the COVID-19 Infection Survey team:

Office for National Statistics: Sir Ian Diamond, Emma Rourke, Ruth Studley, Tina Thomas, Duncan Cook.

Office for National Statistics COVID Infection Survey Analysis and Operations teams, in particular Daniel Ayoubkhani, Russell Black, Antonio Felton, Megan Crees, Joel Jones, Lina Lloyd, Esther Sutherland.

University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Medicine: Ann Sarah Walker, Derrick Crook, Philippa C Matthews, Tim Peto, Emma Pritchard, Nicole Stoesser, Karina-Doris Vihta, Jia Wei, Alison Howarth, George Doherty, James Kavanagh, Kevin K Chau, Stephanie B Hatch, Daniel Ebner, Lucas Martins Ferreira, Thomas Christott, Brian D Marsden, Wanwisa Dejnirattisai, Juthathip Mongkolsapaya, Sarah Cameron, Phoebe Tamblin-Hopper, Magda Wolna, Rachael Brown, Sarah Hoosdally, Richard Cornall, Yvonne Jones, David I Stuart, Gavin Screaton.

University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health: Koen Pouwels.

University of Oxford, Big Data Institute: David W Eyre, Katrina Lythgoe, David Bonsall, Tanya Golubchik, Helen Fryer.

University of Oxford, Radcliffe Department of Medicine: John Bell.

Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust: Stuart Cox, Kevin Paddon, Tim James.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

University of Manchester: Thomas House.

Public Health England: John Newton, Julie Robotham, Paul Birrell.

IQVIA: Helena Jordan, Tim Sheppard, Graham Athey, Dan Moody, Leigh Curry, Pamela Brereton.

National Biocentre: Ian Jarvis, Anna Godsmark, George Morris, Bobby Mallick, Phil Eeles.

Glasgow Lighthouse Laboratory: Jodie Hay, Harper VanSteenhouse.

Department of Health and Social Care: Jessica Lee.

Welsh Government: Sean White, Tim Evans, Lisa Bloemberg.

Scottish Government: Katie Allison, Anouska Pandya, Sophie Davis.

Public Health Scotland: David I Conway, Margaret MacLeod, Chris Cunningham.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

OMICRON-ASSOCIATED CHANGES IN SARS-COV-2 SYMPTOMS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

OMICRON-ASSOCIATED CHANGES IN SARS-COV-2 SYMPTOMS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 19

Supplementary Methods *20*

Choice of negative visits in the comparator group 20

Choice of timeframe to include symptoms in the PCR-positive group 21

Generalised additive models 21

Differences in reported symptoms between Delta and Omicron by vaccination status 22

References 23

Supplementary Figures *24*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Supplementary Methods

Choice of negative visits in the comparator group

We excluded all negative visits:

1. **From -90 days before** the first S-antibody positive blood test in the study prior to vaccination, where such antibody results are likely to represent previous undetected infection (these results were available only in a random subset of the population);
2. **From -35 days before** the first swab positive onwards from individuals who ever tested PCR positive in the study or positive on either PCR or LFD in the linked English testing programme (to avoid ongoing long COVID symptoms,[1] and COVID-related symptoms occurring shortly before the positive test);
3. **From -35 days before** any self-reported positive swab test result onwards (for the same reason; reflecting the fact that individuals may have obtained tests elsewhere)
4. From a small number of individuals who reported either loss of taste or loss of smell at their first study visit and had no national testing programme result within [-21,+21] days (all before 1 July 2020), given the high specificity of this symptom for COVID-19 infection, the fact that it would have been impossible for these individuals to get an external test at the time and the potential for subsequent symptoms to represent long COVID;
5. Where participants reported self-isolating OR contact with **definite** positives in the preceding 28 days (since these individuals have much higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection which may not have been detected) and the **previous and the next visit** (because of higher risk of unidentified positivity, and because they may have been contact traced through the national training programme they may be more likely to report symptoms through recall bias, regardless of status);
6. Occurring within [-7,+14 days] of either first, second or third vaccination date[2], to avoid the inclusion of common symptoms caused by vaccination in the test-negative comparator group and to reflect the possibility of small inaccuracies in reported date of vaccination for some participants.

Time windows were arbitrary but aligned with other analyses or windows for considering symptoms associated with PCR-positive episodes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Choice of timeframe to include symptoms in the PCR-positive group

Tests are conducted in the survey independently of symptoms, and therefore infection episodes may be identified either early (pre-symptomatic) or late (post-symptomatic). Symptom questions relate to the previous 7 days, so to ensure that subsequently reported symptoms in pre-symptomatic cases were counted we included all symptoms reported at any visit (PCR-positive/PCR-negative/failed) up to 35 days after the index positive test in each infection episode, reflecting the monthly visit schedule.

Generalised additive models

In regression models for reporting any evidence of symptoms and specific symptoms in those with evidence of symptoms in PCR-positives and PCR-negatives, we truncated age at 85y to avoid undue influence of outliers. Age was modelled as smoothing spline.

```
bam(cbind(n_withsymptom, n_withoutsymptom) ~
s(study_day, bs="bs",  k=50, by=Sars_COV_2_positivity) +
s(age_at_visit, bs="bs",  k=15, by=Sars_COV_2_positivity)  +
sex:Sars_COV_2_positivity + ethnicity_wo:Sars_COV_2_positivity + sex + ethnicity_wo +
Sars_COV_2_positivity, family=binomial(link="cloglog"), method = "fREML", data = data,
discrete=TRUE, nthreads =12)
```

```
bam(cbind(n_withsymptom, n_withoutsymptom) ~
s(study_day, bs="bs",  k=50, by=Sars_COV_2_positivity) +
s(age_at_visit, bs="bs",  k=15, by=Sars_COV_2_positivity)  +
sex:Sars_COV_2_positivity + ethnicity_wo:Sars_COV_2_positivity + sex + ethnicity_wo +
Sars_COV_2_positivity, family=binomial(link="cloglog"), method = "fREML", data = data,
discrete=TRUE, nthreads =12)
```

Between 1 December 2021-15 January 2022, including an interaction between study day and age:

```
bam(symptom_count ~
te(study_day, age_at_visit, bs="bs", k=c(5,15), by=region) +
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

sex:Sars_COV_2_positivity +ethnicity_wo:Sars_COV_2_positivity + sex + ethnicity_wo + Sars_COV_2_positivity, family=gaussian, method = "fREML", data = data, discrete=TRUE, nthreads =12)

Differences in reported symptoms between Delta and Omicron by vaccination status

To explore the differences between Delta and Omicron by vaccination status we restricted our PCR-positives to those occurring after 1 December 2021 and classified S gene positives and S gene negatives by their vaccination status at the time of the index positive test: before first vaccination (unvaccinated), from 21 days after first vaccination to 13 days inclusive after second vaccination (first vaccine), from 14 days after second vaccination to 13 days inclusive after third vaccination (second vaccine), more than 14 days after the third vaccination (third vaccine).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

References

1. Ayoubkhani D. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in the UK : 1 April 2021. **2021**; :1–16.

2. Menni C, Klaser K, May A, et al. Vaccine side-effects and SARS-CoV-2 infection after vaccination in users of the COVID Symptom Study app in the UK: a prospective observational study. Lancet Infect Dis **2021**; 3099:1–11. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00224-3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Supplementary Figures



Figure S1. Number of PCR-positive infection episodes by first/second/third episode.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .



Figure S2. Symptoms in those testing positive and negative for SARS-CoV-2 before and following the emergence and dominance of Omicron in December 2021 in the UK. Note: vertical lines indicate periods when new variants came to dominate: wild type before 17 November 2020, then Alpha before 17 May 2021, then Delta; first Omicron cases detected 29 November 2021. Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity (presented at the reference category age 45, male, white).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .



Figure S3. Percentage of S-gene-negative (Omicron-compatible) and S-gene-positive (Delta-compatible) symptomatic PCR-positives from December 2021 onwards reporting different symptoms by vaccination status.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269082; this version posted February 4, 2022. 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 4.0 International license .

Figure S4. By age, symptoms in those testing positive and negative for SARS-CoV-2 before (1 December 2021) and after (15 January 2022) the emergence of Omicron. The panels in the first show the probability of reporting symptoms and the number of symptoms (out of the 12 elicited throughout the study period) of all PCR-positive infection episodes and all PCR-negative comparator visits at two reference categories, 1 December 2021 and 15 January 2022. All the rest show the probability of specific symptoms in symptomatic PCR-positive infection episodes and in symptomatic PCR-negative comparator study visits at these two reference categories, after adjustment for calendar date, age (allowing for effect modification by calendar date by including an interaction between calendar date and age), sex, ethnicity (modelled from 1 December 2021 and presented at two reference categories, 1 December 2021 and 15 January 2022, male, white).