Title:

Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal testing in a rural community sample: the CHRIS COVID-19 study.

Authors: Daniele Giardiello[1], Roberto Melotti[1], Giulia Barbieri[1,2], Martin Gögele[1], Christian X. Weichenberger[1], Luisa Foco[1], Daniele Bottigliengo[1], Laura Barin[1], Rebecca Lundin[1], Peter P. Pramstaller[1,3,4], Cristian Pattaro[1]

Affiliations

[1] Institute for Biomedicine (affiliated to the University of Lübeck), Eurac Research, Bolzano, Italy;

[2] Department of Neurosciences, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, University of Verona, Verona, Italy;

[3] Department of Neurology, General Central Hospital, Bolzano, Italy;

[4] Department of Neurology, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany;

Corresponding author

Cristian Pattaro

Eurac Research

Institute for Biomedicine

Via Galvani 31, 39100 Bolzano, Italy

email: cristian.pattaro@eurac.edu

tel. +30 0471 055 527

Abstract

Background

To rapidly characterize COVID-19 epidemiology, numerous population-based studies have been undertaken to model the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Less is known about what may drive the probability to undergo testing. Understanding how much testing is driven by contextual or individual conditions provides the basis for unbiased representation of testing figures and shaping of public health interventions and resource allocation.

Methods

In the Val Venosta/Vinschgau district (South Tyrol, Italy), we conducted a population-representative longitudinal study on 697 individuals who completed 4,512 repeated online questionnaires at four week intervals between September 2020 and May 2021. Mixed-effects logistic regression models were fitted to investigate associations between self-reported SARS-CoV-2 testing and both individual characteristics (social, demographic, and biological) and contextual determinants.

Results

Testing was associated with month of reporting, reflecting the timing of both the pandemic intensity and public health interventions, COVID-19-related symptoms (odds ratio, OR:8.26; 95% confidence interval, CI:6.04–11.31), contacts with infected individuals within home (OR:7.47, 95%CI:3.81–14.62) or outside home (OR:9.87, 95%CI:5.78–16.85), and being retired (OR:0.50, 95%CI:0.34-0.73). Within- and outside-home contacts were the leading determinants in the first and second half of the period, respectively, possibly reflecting later relaxation of social-distancing measures. Testing was not associated with age, sex, education, comorbidities, or lifestyle factors.

Conclusions

In the study area, contextual determinants reflecting the course of the pandemic were predominant compared to individual sociodemographic characteristics in explaining the SARS-CoV-2 probability testing. Decision makers should evaluate whether the intended target groups were correctly prioritized by the testing campaign.

Research in Context box for Lancet Regional Health - Europe

Evidence before this study

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, characterizing the epidemiological landscape of SARS-CoV-2 infections was an urgent need. Numerous population-based studies were undertaken to quantify infection risk. However, while such quantification critically depends on the availability and accessibility of swab tests, studies assessing SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal swab-testing probability at population level are lacking. A PubMed search for “COVID-19” or “SARS-CoV-2” and “testing” and “probability” or “determinants”, conducted on November 30, 2021, identified few, mostly non-European cross-sectional studies revealing that access to COVID-19 testing can be associated with deprivation, ethnicity, and age. A comprehensive assessment of how much testing might be driven by contextual rather than personal conditions is currently missing. This appears to be particularly relevant since, during the pandemic, the personal conduct of citizens, which depends on biological, social and cultural factors, seems to have played a role in various circumstances such as willingness to be tested or to be vaccinated. We addressed this question by investigating data from the CHRIS COVID-19 study, a rural population-based study that collected information on SARS-CoV-2 testing as well as biological, sociodemographic, lifestyle-related, and medical conditions from each participant longitudinally between September 2020 and May 2021.

Added value of this study

In the studied region, which is ethnically and culturally more homogeneous than most other study contexts, contextual determinants reflecting the course of the pandemic and individual sociodemographic characteristics were assessed as determinants for undergoing testing. The only factors suggested to be associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing were the time period, presence of symptoms, and contacts with infected or symptomatic individuals within- and outside-home. The time period reflects the temporal evolution of the pandemic and mitigation policies. Contacts with other individuals reflect the social context, with stronger association found for within-home contact earlier in the period, when infection rates were higher and restrictions on social contact more rigid, and for outside-home contact later. When these factors were accounted for, no personal characteristic was associated with the probability to undergo a swab test, except being retired, which was associated with a lower probability of getting tested, probably because of the greater isolation of this group.

Implications of all the available evidence

The study shows that, in this area, individuals largely followed the general recommendations for undertaking a test when they had symptoms and contacts with infected individuals. The study also implicates that citizens undertook SARS-CoV-2 testing regardless of their personal demographic, economic, cultural and medical condition. This could be reassuring to the healthcare system in terms of social equity. On the other hand, decision makers should evaluate whether the specific target groups, such as individuals with higher risk to develop severe COVID-19 disease, were correctly prioritized by the testing campaign, especially during the acute phase of the pandemic. Further research is needed to investigate additional reasons potentially related to SARS-CoV-2 testing, such as information about testing center accessibility or limited laboratory resources.

Introduction

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) presents an urgent threat to global health, with more than 320 million affected individuals and more than 5 million global deaths as of January 2022(1). Population-based studies are central to assess incidence and identify determinants of infection(2–4), disease severity, and mortality(5–9).

Although many such studies have been conducted, few have had a joint focus on contextual and individual determinants of SARS-CoV-2 testing, despite evidence that personal characteristics can impact health behaviors. For instance, healthcare workers had a higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection compared to the general population, but they were also periodically tested to minimize the spread of infection among hospitalized individuals(10). In some contexts, differential access to SARS-CoV-2 testing by level of education and income has been observed(11,12). Many other individual determinants of testing are currently unexplored. For instance, females exhibit generally more health-prone behaviors than males(13), and evidence from observational studies suggest an association between SARS-CoV-2 infection incidence and sex(2,3,14,15). Whether this association is mainly biological in nature(16) or also driven by behaviours that differ by sex is an open question. Similar reasoning applies to other determinants already associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection, whether biological such as age(17) or sociocultural such as educational level, employment(10), lifestyle, and income(2). Other contextual determinants of testing may include temporal variability of testing capacity and resources availability, which depend not only on healthcare system organisation but also on the pandemic evolution.

We studied the case of the Val Venosta/Vinschgau district in South Tyrol (Italy) between September 2020 and May 2021. During the first pandemic wave and until the end of summer 2020, the district was nearly free of SARS-CoV-2 infections. With the start of the school season and the advent of autumn, there was a rapid increase of infections. By the end of October, a number of municipalities were defined as red zones in which testing was being stepped up to track and contain infections(18). Following an explosive increase in infections, South Tyrol conducted mass testing using rapid antigen tests, involving 70% of the whole population between November, 18th and 25th 2020(19). Meanwhile, the availability of rapid nasal tests in pharmacies and healthcare facilities became widespread, with a substantial increase in the effective testing capacity and easier access to testing for the population. At the beginning of 2021, the vaccination campaign began, starting with the most exposed and vulnerable population groups. In February and March there was a new wave of infections and hospitalisations, with a reduction of infections by late spring.

Understanding to which extent COVID-19 testing probability may be driven by general or personal conditions is key not only to obtain unbiased epidemiological estimates but, most importantly, to evaluate public health interventions and resource allocation. To assess this question we exploited data collected in the context of a longitudinal population-based study on COVID-19 conducted in this rural Alpine region and characterized by repeated surveys to study participants every four weeks for the entire duration of the study(20). Individual determinants comprised biological, health, behavioral, cultural, and socio-economic aspects. The pandemic pattern was captured by the period of participation. Results for the probability of SARS-CoV-2 testing are presented according to the relative contribution of both the epidemic pattern and individual characteristics.

Material and Methods

Study design

The CHRIS COVID-19 study(20), a longitudinal study embedded within the Cooperative Health Research In South Tyrol (CHRIS) study(21), was established on July 13, 2020 to assess the determinants of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease. From all the 13,393 CHRIS participants, 1,812 individuals were randomly selected to represent the general adult population of the Val Venosta/Vinschgau district, based on age and sex distribution(20). By August 28, 2020, all selected individuals were invited to a baseline assessment consisting of a Roche Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay serum antibody (SAb) test, a swab real time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test, and a screening questionnaire. This baseline questionnaire referred to the period from February 1, 2020 until the participation date and included questions on sociodemographic and dwelling information, lifestyle, regular medication, past and current health status, and a section dedicated to SARS-CoV-2 infection: previous diagnosis, symptoms, within- or outside-home contacts with infected or symptomatic individuals, and vaccination.

Follow-up of those with negative baseline tests was conducted by administering a streamlined online questionnaire every 4 weeks for one year, limited to SARS-CoV-2 relevant information and incident events, including symptoms, testing, infection, vaccination, and recent contacts at risk. Participants reporting a positive a naso/oropharyngeal swab test as PCR, antigen test or saliva swab test (hereafter: ‘testing’) or serological test or a contact with a positive individual since the last interview were invited to the study center for PCR and SAb testing. If positive to any of the tests at the study center, the participant was excluded by design

from further follow-up survey questionnaires as they were involved in a separate longitudinal evaluation of antibody response. If negative to both tests, the participant was considered still susceptible to infection and eligible for the follow-up questionnaires every four weeks (**Figure 1**).

Of 845 baseline participants, 9 tested positive at baseline and 138 dropped out of the study by not replying to further questionnaires. One further individual and 21 questionnaire responses overall were also removed to prevent possible overlapping of a reported positive swab test in the questionnaire with the test performed at the study center. This left 697 individuals and 4,512 follow-up questionnaires available for analysis.

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Healthcare System of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano/Bozen (deliberation number 53-2020). All participants provided informed consent.

Primary endpoint

Our primary interest was on the probability to have undergone a nasopharyngeal swab for SARS-CoV-2 testing, based on the question "*Have you had a naso/oropharyngeal swab for the novel coronavirus infection since the date of the last questionnaire?*" included in all follow-up questionnaires.

Study variables

The probability of undergoing a swab test was assessed against characteristics collected in baseline and follow-up questionnaires: a) biological characteristics: age, sex, and body mass index (BMI); b) any pre-existing pathologies (more details in the **Supplementary Material**); c) lifestyle determinants: smoking status; d) socio-demographic characteristics: educational qualification, main occupation, and crowding index (ratio between number of cohabitants and number of rooms in the house as a measure of household living conditions); e) information reflecting individual symptomatology, close contacts with infected or symptomatic individuals defined as permanence within the same indoor environment for at least 15 minutes at a distance of less than 2 meters without protection or direct physical contact with another person, and SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status(20).

The month when each follow-up questionnaire was completed was used as a proxy for the local context, including dynamic policies to address the spread of infection and the progression of the pandemic, among other unmeasured determinants. Details about all

characteristics considered for the analyses are reported in the **Supplementary Material** and elsewhere(20).

Statistical analysis

Mixed-effect logistic regression models were fitted to investigate the association between probability to undergo testing and several determinants. The individual was considered as a random effect to account for variability within and between individuals over repeated measures. Potential selection bias was corrected through relative sample weighting(22). To assess the effect of each determinant, we fitted minimally adjusted models, where each determinant was included in turn while adjusting for month at follow-up, age and sex, and a fully adjusted model, where all determinants were included together. Both models were also fitted stratifying by early and late study periods (September-December 2020; January-May 2021) to account for the introduction of vaccinations on December 27th, 2020, and the potential changes in social and business restrictions(18).

We fitted models to separate the relative contribution of each block of determinants, which sequentially included: 1) the month of participation; 2) individual biological characteristics (age, sex, BMI) and pathologies; 3) lifestyle (smoking) and socio-demographic characteristics (educational qualification, main activity, and crowding index); 4) individual symptomatology; 5) information about close contacts with infected or symptomatic individuals inside and outside home; 6) and vaccination status. The proportion of variance explained by separate blocks was estimated by the marginal R-squared statistic(23).

Marginalized coefficients and the corresponding standard errors were estimated using Monte Carlo iterations over the random effects with 1000 samples repeated 50 times(24). Despite a small amount of missing data overall (maximum 5.6%), missing values were multiply imputed using chained equations (MICE) to avoid loss of information due to case-wise deletion using a two-stage approach (see **Supplementary Material**)(25,26). All analyses were performed using the R software package version 4.0.5(27).

Results

Study participants had a median age of 50 years (range: 19, 93), 48.6% were females, 3.5% were healthcare workers, and 49.9% declared at least one pathology (**Table 1**). The number of self-reported SARS-CoV-2 tests during the study period was 1,136 (median number of test per capita 1, range 0, 7). A number of 128 tests were reported positive by 102 individuals. The percentage of the study sample self-reporting SARS-CoV-2 testing varied

between 6.6% in October and 58.0% in December (**Figure 2**). The percentage of those reporting within-home contacts varied between 0.2% (September) and 6.1% (December), and between 0.4% (September) and 11.0% (November) for outside-home contacts (**Table 2**).

The minimally adjusted models applied to the whole period (September 2020 - May 2021) showed that the determinants most associated with the probability of undergoing a SARS-CoV-2 test were: close contacts with infected individuals within home (odds ratio, OR, 22.71; 95% confidence interval, CI, 13.11–39.12) and outside home (OR:13.47, 95%CI:9.28–19.55); close contacts with symptomatic individuals within home (OR:10.84, 95%CI:7.10–16.97) and outside home (OR:8.56, 95%CI:5.39–13.61); presence of COVID-19-related symptoms (OR:12.41,95%CI:9.42–16.35); month of reporting (e.g., December vs. September OR:7.79, 95%CI:5.87–10.35); and the main occupation (healthcare sector compared to the 'other' category of the tertiary sector: OR:2.47, 95%CI:1.38–4.41; being retired compared to the 'other' category of the tertiary sector: OR:0.63, 95%CI: 0.44-0.90; **Figure 3a**; **Supplementary Table 1**).

The fully adjusted model suggested the following determinants associated with undergoing a SARS-CoV-2 test: within-home (OR:7.47, 95%CI:3.81–14.62), and outside-home (OR:9.87, 95%CI:5.78–16.85) close contacts with infected individuals, self-reported symptoms (OR:8.26, 95%CI:6.04–11.31), month of reporting (e.g. December vs. September OR:7.19, 95%CI:5.35–9.66), main activity (e.g.: retired individuals compared to individuals working in the 'other' category of the tertiary sector, OR:0.50 95%CI:0.34–0.73), and vaccination (OR:1.59, 95%CI:1.08–2.33 for individuals who initiated vaccination compared to non-vaccinated; **Figure 3a; Supplementary Table 1**). Some individual characteristics such as age and educational level were associated with the testing probability in the minimally adjusted model but not in the fully adjusted model, reflecting collinearity across some of the included variables.

When fitting sequential models, the inclusion of just the month of participation gave a marginal R-squared estimate of 0.153 (**Table 3**). The marginal R-squared increased to 0.169 (+0.016) when including individual biological characteristics (age, sex, and BMI) and pre-existing pathologies, and to 0.191 (additional +0.022) when including lifestyle (smoking) and sociodemographic characteristics such as educational qualification, economic activity, and crowding index. When further including the presence of symptoms, the marginal R-squared increased to 0.308 (+0.117 from previous model), and to 0.387 when further adding information on close contacts (+0.079). Final inclusion of vaccination status (marginal R-squared 0.388) did not add substantial information (**Table 3**).

To reflect the vaccination campaign that started on December 27, 2020, models were stratified by period: from September to December 2020 and from January to May 2021. Results of such stratified analyses were consistent with those from the overall analyses both in the minimally and fully adjusted configurations (**Figures 3b** and **3c**; **Supplementary Tables 2** and **3**). However, in the first period (**Figure 3b**; **Supplementary Table 2**), the fully adjusted analysis suggested that the determinant most associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing was within-home close contacts with infected individuals (OR:9.98, 95%CI:3.81–26.13). In the latter period (**Figure 3c**; **Supplementary Table 3**), this changed to having outside-home close contacts with infected individuals (OR:14.65, 95%CI:6.71–32.00), while within-home close contacts with symptomatic individuals was still associated, but to a minor extent (OR:3.98, 95%CI:1.37–11.57). Vaccination was also associated with higher odds of SARS-CoV-2 testing (OR:1.81 with 95%CI:1.25–2.62 for initiated vaccination versus no vaccination; OR:1.62, 95%CI:1.08–2.45 for completed vaccination versus no vaccination).

Discussion

This longitudinal analysis of a population-representative sample showed that the probability to undergo SARS-CoV-2 testing was mostly driven by contextual rather than individual characteristics. The major determinants were the time of the year, which reflects a mixture of the pandemic trend and public health interventions like restrictions or more intense testing activities, and close contacts with infected and symptomatics individuals. Within-home close contacts were most strongly associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing until December 2020, while outside-home close contacts were most strongly associated with testing probability from January 2021 onward, probably reflecting a change in the pandemic mitigation policies between the two periods. Among the broad individual determinants considered here, only retired participants showed evidence of reduced testing probability as compared to other main occupational groups. No established personal characteristic among those previously associated with severe COVID-19 disease, such as age, BMI, smoking status and pre-existing pathologies, were associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing.

An important feature of the study was the population-representative sampling, which enables the generalization of the findings to the whole district and perhaps to the wider rural areas of South Tyrol. Caution is commended for extrapolating the results to other contexts: the characteristics of the rural Alpine district considered here, which has relatively low population density and strong administrative autonomy, can be substantially different from those of urban environments or culturally diverse regions. Of note is that the study was conducted in a COVID-

19 near-naïve population: until the beginning of our assessment, the district had as few as 16 SARS-CoV-2 confirmed cases(28). A major strength of the study was the regular follow-up conducted over nearly a whole year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The frequency of follow-up questionnaires, submitted every four weeks, should have largely limited recall bias and enhanced data quality.

In addition to the limited sample size, which prevented the possibility to study higher order interactions, other limitations should be highlighted. First, most information was self-reported, thus some reporting error could not be excluded. Even if individuals were randomly selected by stratification and the analyses accounted for population-representative weights, some selection bias cannot be excluded, although we counteracted it by applying relative sample weights stratified by the age and sex distribution of the target population(4,20). Second, we did not consider availability of and distance to testing sites, which may affect the chance to undergo a test(29). Distance was only available as an average distance at the municipal level, and testing sites could also have changed overtime, depending on the intensity of the pandemic. Third, our study was not designed to incorporate external events such as public health interventions, which could only be approximated by modeling the month of participation. Last, the widespread availability of cheap, rapid, nasal tests through pharmacies, without the need of a medical prescription, made it unfeasible to evaluate the role of general practitioners or other healthcare providers in mediating access to swab tests.

We identified December as the month with the highest reporting of SARS-CoV-2 testing, likely due to the mass testing implemented in South Tyrol at the end of November 2020(19). The month in which the questionnaire was filled, social contacts with infected individuals and symptoms played a central role in undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing. These findings support that individuals largely followed the general recommendations for undertaking a test when they had symptoms or contact with infected individuals, as suggested by health authorities, following testing prioritization in case of limited resources outlined by the WHO and ECDC(30–32).

The analyses stratified by period, before and after the start of the vaccination campaign, showed consistent results with the overall analysis, indicating a general stability of the identified determinants over the pandemic course. The main determinants associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing were within-home close contacts with infected individuals in the first period and outside-home close contacts with infected individuals in the second period. The effect of tightened measures to mitigate the spread of infection might have confined secondary infections within households from September to December 2020. From January to May 2021, social measures were relaxed: higher order schools and non-essential businesses reopened, and mobility across

Italian regions was gradually possible, therefore contacts with infected individuals outside home were more common(18). Vaccination was also associated with a higher probability to undergo SARS-CoV-2 testing. The elderly, the fragile, the healthcare workers, and the educational employees were the first categories invited for vaccination. These groups were also those with had a higher probability of being tested in our minimally adjusted analyses. Thus, it is plausible that those who decided very early to get vaccinated were those with a more guideline-compliant behavior, so if they saw symptoms, they acted on it by taking a test.

The only personal characteristic associated with testing probability was being retired, which had lower odds of getting tested compared to all other occupational categories. The association was significant in both the minimally and fully adjusted models, with an even larger effect in the latter one. Thus, this association was independent of all other variables included in the model. This effect might have been further enhanced by the retired group lacking individuals living in long-term care facilities (LTCF). While living in a LCTF was associated with very high odds of COVID-19 diagnosis and hospitalization(33), the CHRIS COVID-19 study experienced difficulty to enroll individuals residing in LTCFs due to lack of individual autonomy and legal responsibilities. It is thus likely that the retired group in the CHRIS COVID-19 study was composed of individuals in good health, living in their own houses with limited social interactions.

Perhaps surprising is the finding that healthcare workers did not have higher testing probability, when other studies suggested that healthcare workers should be more likely to undergo SARS-CoV-2 testing because they are more likely to have at-risk contacts and are at higher risk to infect vulnerable people(34–36). However, in minimally adjusted analysis, which did not account for being regularly in contact with infected or symptomatic individuals like patients in healthcare facilities, this effect was apparent.

In conclusion, this study showed that almost no personal characteristic, not even educational level or pre-existing pathologies, had an infuence on the likelihood of undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing in the Val Venosta/Vinschgau district over nine months of the COVID-19 pandemic. The evidence that access to testing was homogeneous across population subgroups may inform decision makers about testing prioritization, when this is guided by individualized COVID-19 risk prediction of positivity and severity based on lifestyle, biological determinants, frailties, and individual exposure, especially during peaks(37,38). Finally, public decision-makers could draw conclusions as to whether the most at-risk groups were correctly prioritized during the most intense phases of the pandemic(39,40).

Funding

The CHRIS COVID-19 study was supported by Eurac Research, the South Tyrolean Health Authority, and the Department of Innovation, Research and University of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano. The present research was conducted within the project 'PACE: Partnership to Accelerate COVID-19 rEsearch in South Tyrol', funded by Department of Innovation, Research and University of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano within the 2019–2021 Research Program (unique project code: D52F20000770003).

Author contribution

CP, PPP, RM, and MG conceived the CHRIS COVID-19 study.

CP and DG conceived the investigation topic object of the present work.

DG, GB, MG, and DB performed the statistical analyses.

DG, GB, MG, DB, LF, CXW, RM and CP interpreted the results.

DG, RM, and CP drafted the manuscript.

LF, LB, RL, DB, RM, MG, CXW, PP contributed to the critical revision and editing of the manuscript.

All authors were involved in data generation or provision, and read and approved the final manuscript.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the questionnaire-based follow-up screening in the CHRIS COVID-19 study.



Figure 2. Proportion of self-reported SARS-CoV-2 testing of participants in the CHRIS COVID-19 study follow-up between September 2020 and May 2021, by month of participation. Denominators for proportions may vary due to exclusions in subsequent months by design or selection.



Figure 3. **Results of the minimally and fully adjusted mixed-effect logistic regression models**. The reference categories for the categorical variables were: 'Male' for Sex; 'September' for month; 'Primary school or no title' for Educational qualification; 'Tertiary sector (other)' for main occupation; 'Never smoker' for smoking status; and 'Not vaccinated' for vaccination status. A diamond shading is used when data are not available. **Panel a**: whole period from September 2020 until May 2021. **Panel b**: first period, September – December 2020. **Panel c**: second period, January – May 2021 ('January' as reference category for month).



Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the 697 participants in the CHRIS Covid-19 study follow-up. Sample size (N) and relative frequency (%) or median (range) are given for categorical and quantitative variables, respectively.

Characteristics	Values	N
Age, *years*		
Median (range)	50 (19-93)	697
Sex, *%* (n=697)		
Female	48.6	339
Male	51.4	358
Educational qualification, *%* (n=684)		
Primary school or no title	22.5	154
Secondary school	59.6	408
University degree	17.8	122
Rooms in the house, *No.*		
Median (range)	3 (1-26)	686
Cohabitants, *No.*		
Median (range)	4 (1-6)	689
Main occupation, *%* (n=658)		
Primary and secondary sector	22.3	147
Tertiary sector – Housekeeper	6.5	43
Tertiary sector – Education	8.8	58
Tertiary sector – Healthcare	3.5	23
Tertiary sector – Social services	2.9	19
Tertiary sector – Others	30.5	201
Student or unemployed	3.0	20
Retired	22.3	147
Smoking status, *%* (n=675)		
Never smoker	56.9	384
Past smoker	28.3	191
Current smoker	14.8	100
Body mass index, kg/m^2		
Median (range)	24.6 (17.7-52.2)	693
Any pathologies, *%* (n=676)		
Yes	49.9	337
No	50.2	339

Table 2. Separate frequencies of study participants and questionnaires in the CHRIS Covid-19 study follow-up, and selected self-reported SARS-CoV-2 related information, by month of participation.

Time *(month)*	Number of individuals	Number of questionnaries	Number of questionnaires (%) reporting specific information						
			COVID-19-related symptoms	Vaccination		Close contacts since last questionnarie			
				Initiated (at least 1 dose)	Completed (1 or 2 doses)	with infected individuals		with symptomatic individuals	
						within home	outside home	within home	outside home
September	481	482	23 (4.8%)	N.A.	N.A.	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)	4 (0.8%)
October	510	512	28 (5.5%)	N.A.	N.A.	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.6%)	7 (1.4%)	5 (1.0%)
November	532	536	66 (12.3%)	N.A.	N.A.	31 (6.0%)	59 (11.0%)	32 (6.1%)	31 (5.9%)
December	519	523	64 (12.3%)	N.A.	N.A.	32 (6.1%)	29 (5.7%)	28 (5.8%)	22 (4.3%)
January	525	529	34 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (1.7%)	15 (2.8%)	23 (4.4%)	10 (2.0%)	13 (2.5%)
February	484	484	62 (12.8%)	4 (0.8%)	27 (5.6%)	19 (4.1%)	32 (6.7%)	22 (4.7%)	17 (3.6%)
March	489	495	73 (14.7%)	35 (7.1%)	48 (9.7%)	22 (4.7%)	15 (3.1%)	15 (3.2%)	5 (1.0%)
April	446	510	32 (6.3%)	67 (13.0%)	75 (15.0%)	10 (2.0%)	15 (3.0%)	12 (2.5%)	11 (2.2%)
May	441	441	30 (6.8%)	112 (25.0%)	73 (17.0%)	6 (1.4%)	6 (1.4%)	4 (0.9%)	2 (0.5%)

Abbreviation: N.A. = not applicable

Table 3. Variance explained by sequential inclusion of groups of determinants in the mixed-effect logistic model. Model 1 included only month. Model 2 additionally included individual biological characteristics (age, sex, and BMI) and pathologies; Model 3 additionally included lifestyle (smoking) and socio-demographic characteristics (educational qualification, main activity, and crowding index). Model 4 additionally included individual symptomatology. Model 5 additionally included information about close contacts with infected and symptomatic individuals within and outside home. Model 6 additionally included vaccination status.

Models	Included variables	R^2
1	[Month]	0.153
2	1 + [individual biological characteristics, pathologies]	0.169
3	2 + [lifestyle, sociodemographic characteristics]	0.191
4	3 + [individual symptomatology]	0.308
5	4 + [close contacts]	0.387
6	5 + [vaccination]	0.388

References

1. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020 May 1;20(5):533–4.

2. Rostami A, Sepidarkish M, Leeflang MMG, Riahi SM, Nourollahpour Shiadeh M, Esfandyari S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence worldwide: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2021 Mar 1;27(3):331–40.

3. Álvarez-Antonio C, Meza-Sánchez G, Calampa C, Casanova W, Carey C, Alava F, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Iquitos, Peru in July and August, 2020: a population-based study. The Lancet Global Health. 2021 Jul 1;9(7):e925–31.

4. Melotti R, Scaggiante F, Falciani M, Weichenberger CX, Foco L, Lombardo S, et al. Prevalence and determinants of serum antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in the general population of the Gardena valley. Epidemiology & Infection. 2021 ed;149.

5. Kim H-J, Hwang H, Hong H, Yim J-J, Lee J. A systematic review and meta-analysis of regional risk factors for critical outcomes of COVID-19 during early phase of the pandemic. Sci Rep. 2021 May 7;11(1):9784.

6. Zheng Z, Peng F, Xu B, Zhao J, Liu H, Peng J, et al. Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. Journal of Infection. 2020 Aug 1;81(2):e16–25.

7. Gesesew HA, Koye DN, Fetene DM, Woldegiorgis M, Kinfu Y, Geleto AB, et al. Risk factors for COVID-19 infection, disease severity and related deaths in Africa: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2021 Feb 1;11(2):e044618.

8. Booth A, Reed AB, Ponzo S, Yassaee A, Aral M, Plans D, et al. Population risk factors for severe disease and mortality in COVID-19: A global systematic review and meta-analysis. PLOS ONE. 2021 Mar 4;16(3):e0247461.

9. ECDC: risk factors and risk groups [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 23]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/latest-evidence/risk-factors-risk-groups

10. Chen X, Chen Z, Azman AS, Deng X, Sun R, Zhao Z, et al. Serological evidence of human infection with SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Global Health. 2021 Mar 8;0(0).

11. Rentsch CT, Kidwai-Khan F, Tate JP, Park LS, Jr JTK, Skanderson M, et al. Patterns of COVID-19 testing and mortality by race and ethnicity among United States veterans: A nationwide cohort study. PLOS Medicine. 2020 Sep 22;17(9):e1003379.

12. Lieberman-Cribbin W, Tuminello S, Flores RM, Taioli E. Disparities in COVID-19 Testing and Positivity in New York City. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2020 Sep 1;59(3):326–32.

13. Ladwig KH, Marten-Mittag B, Formanek B, Dammann G. Gender differences of symptom reporting and medical health care utilization in the German population. Eur J Epidemiol. 2000 Jun;16(6):511–8.

14. Rostami A, Sepidarkish M, Fazlzadeh A, Mokdad AH, Sattarnezhad A, Esfandyari S, et al. Update on SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence: regional and worldwide. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2021 Dec 1;27(12):1762–71.

15. Stefanelli P, Bella A, Fedele G, Pancheri S, Leone P, Vacca P, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in an area of northeastern Italy with a high incidence of COVID-19 cases: a population-based study. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2021 Apr 1;27(4):633.e1-633.e7.

16. Bastard P, Rosen LB, Zhang Q, Michailidis E, Hoffmann H-H, Zhang Y, et al. Autoantibodies against type I IFNs in patients with life-threatening COVID-19. Science. 2020 Oct 23;370(6515):eabd4585.

17. Pagani G, Conti F, Giacomelli A, Bernacchia D, Rondanin R, Prina A, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 significantly varies with age: Preliminary results from a mass population screening. J Infect. 2020 Dec;81(6):e10–2.

18. Pelagatti M, Maranzano P. Assessing the effectiveness of the Italian risk-zones policy during the second wave of COVID-19. Health Policy. 2021 Jul 31;

19. Stillman S, Tonin M. Communities and Testing for Covid-19 [Internet]. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2021 Jan [cited 2021 Nov 23]. Report No.: ID 3762882. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3762882

20. Pattaro C, Barbieri G, Foco L, Weichenberger CX, Biasiotto R, De Grandi A, et al. Prospective epidemiological, molecular, and genetic characterization of a novel coronavirus disease in the Val Venosta/Vinschgau: the CHRIS COVID-19 study protocol. Pathogens and Global Health. 2021 Oct 12;0(0):1–9.

21. Pattaro C, Gögele M, Mascalzoni D, Melotti R, Schwienbacher C, De Grandi A, et al. The Cooperative Health Research in South Tyrol (CHRIS) study: rationale, objectives, and preliminary results. Journal of Translational Medicine. 2015 Nov 5;13(1):348.

22. Fitzmaurice, GM, Laird, N, Ware, JH. Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis. 2nd edition. John Wiley & Sons; 2012. (Wiley series in probability and statistics).

23. Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. A general and simple method for obtaining R2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 2013;4(2):133–42.

24. Hedeker D, du Toit SHC, Demirtas H, Gibbons RD. A note on marginalization of regression parameters from mixed models of binary outcomes. Biometrics. 2018;74(1):354–61.

25. Audigier V, White IR, Jolani S, Debray TPA, Quartagno M, Carpenter J, et al. Multiple Imputation for Multilevel Data with Continuous and Binary Variables. Statistical Science. 2018 May;33(2):160–83.

26. Spratt M, Carpenter J, Sterne JAC, Carlin JB, Heron J, Henderson J, et al. Strategies for Multiple Imputation in Longitudinal Studies. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2010 Aug 15;172(4):478–87.

27. R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Internet]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,Vienna, Austria; Available from: https://www.R-project.org/

28. Barbieri G, Gögele, M, Melotti, R, Weichenberger, CX, Foco, L, Giardiello, D, et al. A random population sample and 10 follow-ups: one year of COVID-19 pandemic seen through the CHRIS COVID-19 study. 1th SISMEC congress, online; 2021 Sep 15.

29. Tao R, Downs J, Beckie TM, Chen Y, McNelley W. Examining spatial accessibility to COVID-19 testing sites in Florida. Annals of GIS. 2020 Oct 1;26(4):319–27.

30. Ward S, Lindsley A, Courter J, Assa'ad A. Clinical testing for COVID-19. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2020 Jul;146(1):23–34.

31. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in suspected human cases. Interim guidance. [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 23]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331329/WHO-COVID-19-laboratory-2020.4-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

32. ECDC: COVID-19 testing strategies and objectives [Internet]. [cited 2021 Nov 23]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/covid-19-testing-strategies-and-objectives

33. Bergman J, Ballin M, Nordström A, Nordström P. Risk factors for COVID-19 diagnosis, hospitalization, and subsequent all-cause mortality in Sweden: a nationwide study. Eur J Epidemiol. 2021 Mar 1;36(3):287–98.

34. Allen WE, Altae-Tran H, Briggs J, Jin X, McGee G, Shi A, et al. Population-scale longitudinal mapping of COVID-19 symptoms, behaviour and testing. Nat Hum Behav. 2020 Sep;4(9):972–82.

35. Lan F-Y, Filler R, Mathew S, Buley J, Iliaki E, Bruno-Murtha LA, et al. COVID-19 symptoms predictive of healthcare workers' SARS-CoV-2 PCR results. PLOS ONE. 2020 Jun 26;15(6):e0235460.

36. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Public Health. 2020 Sep;5(9):e475–83.

37. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Collins GS, Riley RD, Heinze G, Schuit E, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. BMJ. 2020 Apr 7;369:m1328.

38. Jehi L, Ji X, Milinovich A, Erzurum S, Rubin BP, Gordon S, et al. Individualizing Risk Prediction for Positive Coronavirus Disease 2019 Testing. Chest. 2020 Oct;158(4):1364–75.

39. Binnicker MJ. Challenges and Controversies to Testing for COVID-19. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 58(11):e01695-20.

40. Manabe YC, Sharfstein JS, Armstrong K. The Need for More and Better Testing for COVID-19. JAMA. 2020 Dec 1;324(21):2153–4.