Title: Time-Varying Risk of Death After SARS-CoV-2-Infection in Long-Term Care Facility Residents: A Matched Cohort Study

Short title: Time-Varying Mortality After SARS-CoV-2

Authors: Marcel Ballin, MSc[1]*^, John P.A. Ioannidis, MD, DSc[2,3]^, Jonathan Bergman, PhD[1], Miia Kivipelto, MD, PhD[4,5], Anna Nordström, MD, PhD[1,6,7], Peter Nordström, MD, PhD[1]

^ Indicating shared first authorship and equal contribution.

Affiliations: [1]Department of Community Medicine and Rehabilitation, Unit of Geriatric Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden. [2]Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA. [3]Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA. [4]Division of Clinical Geriatrics, Center for Alzheimer Research, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society (NVS), Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden . [5]Medical Unit Aging, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden. [6]School of Sport Sciences, UiT the Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway. [7]Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Section of Sustainable Health, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

***Correspondence:** Marcel Ballin. Unit of Geriatric Medicine, Department of Community Medicine and Rehabilitation, Umeå University, 90187 Umeå, Sweden. Phone: +46735265380. E-mail: marcel.ballin@umu.se. Twitter: @Marcel_Ballin

Disclosures: The authors received funding used for salaries from Foundation Stockholms Sjukhem (MK), Academy of Finland (MK), Läkarsällskapet (MK), and the Swedish Research Council (MK, AN, PN). The funders had no role in any part of this manuscript or the decision to publish. The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The manuscript has been submitted

25 previously as preprint in medRxiv

26 (https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.03.10.22272097v2).

27 **Word count main text:** 2859

28 **Abstract word count:** 300

29 **Number of figures/tables**: 2 figures, 1 table

30 **Impact statement:** We certify that this work is novel. This research adds to the literature by

31 showing there was no excess mortality observed in long-term care facility residents who

32 survived the acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, and that life expectancy of uninfected residents

33 was much lower than that of the general population of same age and sex. This has major

34 repercussions for estimation of years of life lost in infected long term care facility residents.

35 **Key points**

36 - SARS-CoV-2 infection sharply increased mortality risk among residents of long-term

37 care (LTC) facilities in the first month.

38 - After the first month, the mortality risk in infected residents rapidly returned to

39 baseline and dropped below the mortality risk of uninfected controls, where it

40 remained lower for 8 months of follow-up.

41 - Median survival of uninfected controls was 1.6 years, which was much lower than

42 national life expectancy in Sweden at age 87.

43 **Why does this matter?**

44 - Whereas LTC residents who recover from SARS-CoV-2 infection may be concerned

45 about having residual debilitation caused by the infection, we found no excess

46 mortality was in those who survived the acute infection.

47 - Because life expectancy of uninfected residents was much lower than that of the

48 general population of same age and sex, LTC resident status should be accounted for

49 in estimations of years of life lost.

Abstract

Background: SARS-CoV-2 confers high risk of short-term death in residents of long-term care (LTC) facilities, but longer-term risk among survivors is unclear.

Methods: We extended the follow-up period of a previous, propensity score-matched retrospective cohort study based on the Swedish Senior Alert register. N=3731 LTC residents with documented SARS-CoV-2 until 15 September 2020 were matched to 3731 uninfected controls using time-dependent propensity scores on age, sex, health status, comorbidities, and prescription medications. In a sensitivity analysis, matching included also geographical region and Senior Alert registration time. The outcome was all-cause mortality over 8 months (until October 24, 2020). The absolute risk of death was examined using Kaplan-Meier plots. Hazard ratios (HR) for death over time were estimated using flexible parametric models with restricted cubic splines. Cox regression was used to estimate HRs and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) in 30-day intervals of follow-up until 210 days.

Results: The median age was 87 years and 65% were women. Excess mortality was highest 5 days after documented infection (HR 19.1, 95% CI, 14.6-24.8), after which excess mortality decreased. From the second month onwards, mortality rate became lower in infected residents than controls. The HR for death during days 61-210 of follow-up was 0.41 in the main analysis (95% CI, 0.34-0.50) and 0.76 (95% CI, 0.62-0.93) in the sensitivity analysis. Median survival of uninfected controls was 1.6 years, which was much lower than the national life expectancy in Sweden at age 87 (5.05 years in men, 6.07 years in women).

Conclusions: No excess mortality was observed in LTC residents who survived the acute SARS-CoV-2 infection. Life expectancy of uninfected residents was much lower than that of the general population of the same age and sex. This suggests that LTC resident status should be accounted for in years-of-life-lost estimates for COVID-19 burden of disease calculations.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, death, long-term care facilities, mortality

Introduction

During the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, many of the COVID-19 deaths that occurred in high-income countries were seen in long-term care (LTC) facilities,[1] where case fatality rates were 10-40% or even higher.[2,3] We have previously reported that 30-day mortality in Swedish LTC was 40% in residents infected with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) versus 6% in matched, non-infected controls in the first wave of the pandemic.[4] A natural follow-up question to ask is whether SARS-CoV-2 also increases the risk of death beyond the acute period of 30 days , i.e. whether it has long-term effects on mortality in LTC residents who recover from infection. A major concern is that LTC residents who recover from SARS-CoV-2 infection may have residual debilitation caused by the infection. If so, this may affect also their life expectancy beyond the acute phase of the infection. Moreover, it would be interesting to estimate the loss of life expectancy in LTC residents infected with SARS-CoV-2. We set out to answer these questions by extending the follow-up period in our previous analysis from 30 days to 8 months.

Methods

Study design and population

The present study offers extended follow-up on a propensity score-matched retrospective cohort study.[4] The basic study design and of the selection of exposed (infected) and unexposed (uninfected control) residents has been described in detail previously in the publication presenting 30-days of follow-up.[4] In brief, data on Swedish LTC residents were obtained from Senior Alert, a database of health assessments performed in older adults aged ≥65 years.[5] All residents of LTC facilities in Sweden registered in Senior Alert were eligible to be considered. Senior Alert collects health data on various conditions in adults aged ≥65 years. Senior Alert captures an estimated 73% of all Swedish LTC facility residents. This

100 study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (no. 2020-02552), which
101 waived the informed consent requirement given the retrospective nature of the study. The
102 study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

103 **Cohort construction and matching**

104 We selected LTC residents who had a record in Senior Alert from 2019 or 2020;
105 the latest record during these years was used, whenever there were multiple records. Among
106 these, we identified 3731 LTC residents with a documented SARS-CoV-2 infection until
107 September 15, 2020. We excluded SARS-CoV-2 infected residents that did not have a record
108 in Senior Alert within a year prior to date of testing or confirmed infection (whichever came
109 first or was available) and those where dates of testing and confirmed infection were both
110 unavailable. Data on SARS-CoV-2 infections were obtained from the national SmiNet
111 registry to which reporting is mandatory according to Swedish law.

112 Each infected resident was matched 1:1 to a control resident on age, sex, body
113 mass index, health status, comorbidity, and prescription medication use, using time-dependent
114 propensity scores. This enables matching when the exposure (date of documented SARS-
115 CoV-2 infection) do not coincide with the time of cohort entry (date of Senior Alert record).
116 With time starting at the date of the Senior Alert record, a Cox model calculated a propensity
117 score for the propensity to contract SARS-CoV-2 based on all variables shown in
118 Supplemental Table 1. Each infected resident was matched to the control with the closest
119 propensity score among those who were still alive when the SARS-CoV-2 case occurred
120 (counting time since the Senior Alert date). Matching was done sequentially, starting with the
121 first case (smaller number of days since cohort entry) and proceeding with cases with
122 increasingly larger number of days since cohort entry. Diagnoses and medications were used
123 as time-varying covariates in the Cox regression model. Information on comorbidities was
124 obtained from the Swedish National Patient Register and for cancer from the Swedish Cancer

125 Register. Information on recent use of medications (prescriptions in 2019-2020) came from
126 Senior Alert and the Swedish Prescribed Drug Register. In addition, in order to conduct a
127 sensitivity analysis to examine whether the results were confounded by secular trends and
128 geographic variations in mortality, we performed an additional matching which included also
129 the geographical region (21 categories) and the date (year and month) of Senior Alert
130 registration. Data linkage across registers were performed using pseudo-anonymised Personal
131 Identification Numbers.

132 **Outcome**

133 The study outcome was all-cause mortality (until October 24, 2020). These data
134 were obtained from the national Swedish Cause of Death Register. While in our previous
135 study we only assessed 30-day mortality,[4], the extension to 8 months in the present study
136 allows to get a more complete picture of the mortality risk of this frail population, while at the
137 same time it largely excludes the subsequent waves and also the COVID-19 vaccination
138 period which may have further affected mortality risk in this population.

139 **Statistical analysis**

140 In both the main and sensitivity analyses for death risk, all-cause mortality was
141 considered as the outcome of interest and the starting date for follow-up was the SARS-CoV-
142 2 documentation date in cases and the corresponding date (in days since cohort entry) in
143 controls. Follow-up time in days was calculated as censor date (24 October 2020 or death
144 whichever came first) minus baseline date + 1 day. This was done so that the baseline date
145 could also be included in the follow-up time and analysis (thus, a person would be able to die
146 on the same date as they were documented to be infected). The absolute risk of death was
147 examined using Kaplan-Meier plots. The hazard ratio (HR) for death was plotted over time
148 using flexible parametric models with restricted cubic splines (4 knots in default positions).
149 HRs and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were also estimated using Cox regression for 30-day

150 intervals of follow-up until 210 days. To adjust for matching, we calculated 95% CIs in the
151 Cox models and the flexible parametric models using robust standard errors. All analyses
152 were performed using Stata MP version 16.1 for Mac (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

153 ## Results

154 **Baseline characteristics**

155 Baseline characteristics are shown in Supplemental Table 1. The median age was 87 years,
156 65% were women, and comorbidities were common. In the main analysis, median
157 (interquartile range [IQR] baseline date for infected residents was 27 Apr 2020 (10 Apr to 22
158 May), median (maximum) follow-up was 129 (246) days and there were 1713 deaths. For
159 controls, median (IQR) baseline date was 12 Apr 2020 (16 Dec 2019 to 30 Jun 2020), median
160 (maximum) follow-up was 146 (641) days and there were 899 deaths. In the sensitivity
161 analysis, for infected residents, median (IQR) baseline date was 26 Apr 2020 (IQR 10 Apr to
162 21 May), median (maximum) follow-up was 130 (246) days and there were 1640 deaths. For
163 controls, median (IQR) baseline date was 28 Apr 2020 (9 Apr to 23 May), median
164 (maximum) follow-up was 173 (249) days and there were 536 deaths. The median age was 87
165 years, 65% were women, and comorbidities were common (Supplemental Table 1).

166 **Mortality analyses**

167 As previously reported, SARS-CoV-2 was associated with a sharp, early
168 increased risk of death: 40% versus 6% within 30 days (1487/3731 versus 211/3731).
169 However, extending the follow-up period showed that the risk soon plateaued (Figure 1A).
170 Similar results were seen in the sensitivity analysis (Figure 1B).

171 Survival of controls at 210 days was 74.3% (72.6%-75.9%) in the main analysis
172 and 82.9% (81.3%-84.4%) in the sensitivity analysis. Median survival of controls was 577
173 days. Median survival was also 577 days among the controls who were matched to the 1487
174 infected residents who died in the first month. Survival of these 1487 controls was similar to

175 the survival of the remaining 2242 controls, for example their survival at 210 days was 72.5%
176 versus 75.4%.

177 In the main analysis, peak HR (19.1 (95% CI, 14.6-24.8)) occurred at 5 days
178 after documented infection. HR was high in the first month, decreased below 1.0 early in the
179 second month, and remained below 1.0 for the remaining duration of follow-up (Figure 2a).
180 In the sensitivity analysis, peak HR was 21.5 (95% CI, 15.9-29.2). Again, HR decreased
181 sharply but took a bit longer to drop below 1.0 (after the second month) and remained below
182 1.0 afterwards (Figure 2b).

183 In the main analysis, for 0-30 days, there were 1487 deaths among infected
184 residents (17.57 deaths per 1000 person-days) versus 211 in uninfected controls (1.88 deaths
185 per 1000 person-days), resulting in a HR of 8.81 (7.64-10.15). For 31-60 days, there were 93
186 deaths (1.42 per 1000 person-days) versus 144 (1.42 per 1000 person-days) (HR 1.00 (0.77-
187 1.30)). For 61-90 days the respective numbers were 33 (0.55) versus 121 (1.38) (HR 0.38
188 (0.26-0.55)). For 91-120 days, the respective numbers were 38 (0.63) versus 126 (1.72) (HR
189 0.36 (0.25-0.52)). A similar pattern was seen for 121-150 days (HR, 0.52 (0.36-0.76)), 151-
190 180 days (HR 0.47 (0.28-0.79)), and 181-210 days (HR 0.29 (0.10-0.83)).

191 During the 61-210 days follow-up, there were 133 deaths among infected
192 residents (0.58 per 1000 person-days) versus 420 deaths among the uninfected controls (1.37
193 per 1000 person-days), with the HR being 0.41 (0.34-0.50). In the sensitivity analysis, during
194 61-210 days of follow-up, there were 131 deaths (0.59 per 1000 person-days) in infected
195 versus 278 deaths (0.78 per 1000 person-days) in controls, with the HR being 0.76, 95% CI,
196 0.62-0.93).

197 **Discussion**

198 In this extended follow-up analysis of mortality in SARS-CoV-2-infected versus
199 uninfected control LTC residents, we found that mortality risk peaked during the first week of

200 documented infection, after which it rapidly decreased. Mortality remained elevated for the
201 first month after infection, but then reverted back to baseline levels (i.e., control levels) before
202 it dropped below baseline levels, where it remained at low levels for the remaining duration of
203 follow-up (up to 8 months). These results suggest that SARS-CoV-2 does not reduce the life
204 expectancy of LTC residents who survive the acute period of the disease. Despite concerns
205 that infected residents who survive may have persistent residual debilitation that might
206 enhance their subsequent death risk, we saw the opposite: death risk decreased in longer-term
207 follow-up. This suggests that deaths due to COVID-19 in LTC facilities in Sweden during the
208 first wave probably resulted in average loss of life expectancy of less than 1.6 years on
209 average. This figure is much lower than the life expectancy in the general Swedish
210 population, which in 2019 was 5.05 years for men and 6.07 years for women at the age of 87
211 (the median age in our study).[7]

212 Calculations of burden of disease due to COVID-19 often use age- and sex-
213 adjusted life expectancies to calculate years-of-life-lost; however, without properly
214 accounting for LTC residence and general health. Our findings suggest that such an approach
215 can yield massively inflated estimates.[8] Adjustment for comorbidities has been shown to
216 decrease the number of years-of-life-lost in some studies.[9-11] However, the change is typically
217 modest (e.g. in the range of 1 years) and much smaller than what we observed in the LTC
218 resident population that we evaluated. It is possible that in most studies, information on
219 comorbidities is not available in sufficient granularity and accuracy regarding severity. E.g.
220 "kidney disease" would carry very different risk connotations depending on the stage and
221 severity. LTC resident status is a surrogate for increased frequency and severity of many
222 comorbidities and of overall frailty. Therefore, it should be taken into account as a first
223 correction for any years-of-life-lost estimates for COVID-19 burden of disease calculations.

224 Calculations accounting for LTC status and also properly adjusting for
225 comorbidities and their severity may also lead to much lower estimates than some other
226 increasingly used approaches such as the Global Burden of Disease Reference Life Table[12] -
227 also known as Theoretical Minimum Risk Life Table. This life table is an "aspirational"
228 construct: it assumes an idealized situation with very low risk of death. According to this
229 table, life expectancy is 88.9 years at birth, 9.99 years at age 85, 5.92 years at age 90, and
230 5.92 years at age 95.[13] Using this popular aspirational life table would probably overestimate
231 by 5-10-fold the years-of-life-lost for SARS-CoV-2-deceased residents in LTC facilities.
232 Aspirational life tables have been promoted as a way to standardize burden of disease
233 calculations across different countries. However, in the case of diseases like COVID-19 they
234 could lead to grossly misleading inferences.
235 Estimates of survival in residents of LTC facilities preceding the COVID-19
236 pandemic also agree with very limited median survival of nursing home residents, e.g. 541
237 days in one study in the United Kingdom[14] and 2 years in a study of residential care entrants
238 in New Zealand.[15] In Sweden, previously published data[16] on the survival of elderly people
239 who moved into institutionalized care in an area of Stockholm (N=1103) suggested that, on
240 average, the median survival after moving to institutionalized care declined between 2006 and
241 2012 from 764 to 595 days. For the lower percentiles, the decrease was very large, e.g. for the
242 30th percentile, the length of stay declined from 335 days in 2006 to 119 days in 2012, and in
243 2012 10% died within just 8 days. A widening survival gap (due to shortening survival in
244 nursing home residents) versus community-dwelling elderly has also been documented in a
245 10-year study in England.[17] Another study[18] evaluated all deaths in people >67 years old in
246 November 2015 in Sweden and focused on the 2 years prior to death. Women used LTC for
247 15.6 months and men for 14.1 months out of 24 these months. The length of stay in
248 institutional care was 7.2 and 6.2 months, respectively. These survival data for LTC residents

249 are in line with the estimated median survival of controls in our study, thus further validating
250 the median survival in residents of LTC facilities is very limited.

251 We should acknowledge that there can be large heterogeneity in survival in
252 different LTC facilities. Some LTC facilities admit mostly residents with known limited life-
253 expectancy (mostly for palliative care), while others may be institutions that admit mostly
254 older adults who are quite healthy or have limited health problems with substantial life-
255 expectancy. A systematic review has found that across 6 cohort studies, the mortality rate
256 within 6 months of admission to a nursing home ranged from 0% to 34% (median 20.2%).[19]
257 In our analysis, we could not include data on the features of each LTC facility (e.g. whether it
258 focused on palliative care) and we could not match infected residents with uninfected
259 residents from the same facility. Nevertheless, the control groups both in the main and in the
260 sensitivity analysis seem to have median survival that is entirely compatible with the literature
261 on LTC residents and their overall limited expected survival, on average.

262 Some additional caveats should be discussed. Our data pertain to fatalities
263 during the first wave of COVID-19 and until the fall of 2020. The first wave was the most
264 devastating in most high-income countries, with a few exceptions (e.g. Australia).[20,21] The
265 relatively lower proportion of fatalities in LTC residents in subsequent waves may reflect a
266 combination of multiple factors: high levels of prior infection (seroprevalence studies have
267 found 5-10 times higher infection rates in LTC facilities than in the general population in the
268 first wave),[22-24] better protection of nursing homes, more extensive testing, widespread use of
269 vaccination in 2021,[21] and the possibility that the sickest individuals were the first to
270 succumb.[25] Moreover, the lower risk of death after the first month post-infection versus the
271 uninfected controls should not be interpreted as a sign that SARS-COV-2 infection causally
272 decreases the risk of death during long-term follow-up, as it probably reflects mostly a
273 selection process (residents who died in the first month were probably more sick and

debilitated before infection, while those surviving probably had better life expectancy). Finally, we cannot exclude the possibility that some controls may have been asymptomatically infected but the infection remained unnoticed due to limited testing, especially in the early weeks of the pandemic. With more systematic testing after the end of the first wave and with limited epidemic activity during the late spring and summer of 2020, it is unlikely that infections in controls were missed in that period, let alone that these infections would shorten the survival of the control groups. As above, the observed limited survival of the control groups is entirely in line with data on residents of LTC facilities in the absence of COVID-19 from Sweden and elsewhere. In further support of our findings, excess death calculations for Sweden for 2020 and also for the entire pandemic period to end of 2021 and early 2022 show very limited excess deaths, if at all.[26,27] This pattern is entirely congruent with the possibility that many/most residents who died of SARS-CoV-2 in the first wave had very limited life expectancy. Therefore, they would not contribute to excess death calculations, if excess deaths are assessed over 1-2 years downstream.

Allowing for these caveats, the major strength of our study is that it uses on large databases with nationwide coverage. Even so, similar analyses should also be performed in other countries because the health status of LTC residents may be different and with assessments covering also the vaccination period for a complete picture of the COVID-19 pandemic.[28] This will allow to obtain more solid evidence on both the years-of-life-lost over 2020-2022, as well as insights about the long-term outcomes of SARS-CoV-2-infected residents of various types of LTC facilities who survived and recovered from the acute infection.

Acknowledgments

Conflict of Interest: The authors received funding used for salaries from Foundation Stockholms Sjukhem (MK), Academy of Finland (MK), Läkarsällskapet (MK), and the Swedish Research Council (MK, AN, PN). The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions: Concept and design: MB, JPI, JB, PN, Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors. Drafting of the manuscript: MB, JPI. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors. Statistical analysis: MB and JB. Supervision: PN, JPI.

Sponsor's Role: The funders had no role in any part of this manuscript or the decision to publish.

References

1. Comas-Herrera A, Zalakaín J, Lemmon E, Henderson D, Litwin C, Hsu A, et al. Mortality associated with COVID-19 in care homes: international evidence. Article in LTCcovid.org, International Long-Term Care Policy Network, CPEC-LSE, 14 October2020.
2. Panagiotou OA, Kosar CM, White EM, et al. Risk factors associated with all-cause 30-day mortality in nursing home residents with COVID-19. JAMA Intern Med. 2021; 181: 439-448.
3. Murti M, Goetz M, Saunders A, Sunil V, Guthrie JL, Eshaghi A, Zittermann S, Teatero S, Fittipaldi N, Rilkoff H, Gubbay JB, Garber G, Callery S, Holt AM, Noseworthy AL. Investigation of a severe SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in a long-term care home early in the pandemic. CMAJ. 2021 May 10;193(19):E681-E688.
4. Ballin M, Bergman J, Kivipelto M, Nordström A, Nordström P. Excess Mortality After COVID-19 in Swedish Long-Term Care Facilities. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2021 Aug;22(8):1574-1580.e8.

322 5. Edvinsson J, Rahm M, Trinks A, Hoglund PJ. Senior alert: A quality registry to
323 support a standardized, structured, and systematic preventive care process for older
324 adults. Qual Manag Health Care. 2015;24:96–101.
325 6. Brooke HL, Talbäck M, Hörnblad J. The Swedish cause of death register. Eur J
326 Epidemiol. 2017;32:765–773.
327 7. https://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/en/ssd/START__BE__BE0101__BE010
328 1I/LivslangdEttariga/, last accessed March 3, 2022
329 8. Ioannidis JPA. Over- and under-estimation of COVID-19 deaths. Eur J Epidemiol.
330 2021 Jun;36(6):581-588.
331 9. Ferenci T. Different approaches to quantify years of life lost from COVID-19. Eur J
332 Epidemiol. 2021;36:589–597.
333 10. von der Lippe E, Devleesschauwer B, Gourley M, et al. Reflections on key
334 methodological decisions in national burden of disease assessments. Arch Public
335 Health. 2020;78:137.
336 11. Hanlon P, Chadwick F, Shah A, et al. COVID-19—exploring the implications of long-
337 term condition type and extent of multimorbidity on years of life lost: a modelling
338 study. Wellcome Open Res 2021;5:75.
339 12. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204
340 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of
341 Disease Study 2019. The Lancet. 2020;396:1204–1222.
342 13. Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 Reference Life Table,
343 http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/ihme-data/global-burden-disease-study-2019-gbd-
344 2019-reference-life-table, last accessed March 8, 2022.

14. Rothera IC, Jones R, Harwood R, Avery AJ, Waite J. Survival in a cohort of social services placements in nursing and residential homes: factors associated with life expectancy and mortality. Public Health. 2002 May;116(3):160-5.

15. Broad JB, Lumley T, Ashton T, Davis PB, Boyd M, Connolly MJ. Transitions to and from long-term care facilities and length of completed stay: Reuse of population-based survey data. Australas J Ageing. 2017 Jun;36(2):E1-E7.

16. Schön P, Lagergren M, Kåreholt I. Rapid decrease in length of stay in institutional care for older people in Sweden between 2006 and 2012: results from a population-based study. Health Soc Care Community. 2016 Sep;24(5):631-8.

17. Espuny Pujol F, Hancock R, Morciano M. Trends in survival of older care home residents in England: A 10-year multi-cohort study. Soc Sci Med. 2021 Aug;282:113883.

18. Meinow B, Wastesson JW, Kåreholt I, Kelfve S. Long-term care use during the last 2 years of life in Sweden: implications for policy to address increased population aging. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2020 Jun;21(6):799-805.

19. Ferrah N, Ibrahim JE, Kipsaina C, Bugeja L. Death following recent admission into nursing home from community living: A systematic review into the transition process. J Aging Health. 2018 Apr;30(4):584-604.

20. Ioannidis JPA, Axfors C, Contopoulos-Ioannidis DG. Second versus first wave of COVID-19 deaths: Shifts in age distribution and in nursing home fatalities. Environ Res. 2021 Apr;195:110856.

21. Pastorino R, Pezzullo AM, Villani L, Causio FA, Axfors C, Contopoulos-Ioannidis DG, Boccia S, Ioannidis JPA. Change in age distribution of COVID-19 deaths with the introduction of COVID-19 vaccination. Environ Res. 2022 Mar;204(Pt C):112342.

22. Candel FJ, Barreiro P, San Román J, Del Mar Carretero M, Sanz JC, Pérez-Abeledo M, et al. The demography and characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 seropositive residents and staff of nursing homes for older adults in the Community of Madrid: the SeroSOS study. Age Ageing. 2021;50(4):1038-47.
23. Vena A, Berruti M, Adessi A, Blumetti P, Brignole M, Colognato R, et al. Prevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in Italian Adults and Associated Risk Factors. J Clin Med. 2020;9(9).
24. Krutikov M, Palmer T, Tut G, Fuller C, Shrotri M, Williams H, et al. Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection according to baseline antibody status in staff and residents of 100 long-term care facilities (VIVALDI): a prospective cohort study. Lancet Healthy Longevity. 2021;2(6):e362-e70.
25. Levi M, Cipriani F, Romeo G, Balzi D. Analysis of the excess mortality and factors associated with deaths from COVID-19 versus other causes in Central Tuscany (Italy) in 2020. Epidemiol Prev. 2021 Nov-Dec;45(6):496-503.
26. Kowall B, Standl F, Oesterling F, Brune B, Brinkmann M, Dudda M, Pflaumer P, Jöckel KH, Stang A. Excess mortality due to Covid-19? A comparison of total mortality in 2020 with total mortality in 2016 to 2019 in Germany, Sweden and Spain. PLoS One. 2021 Aug 3;16(8):e0255540.
27. Human Mortality Database, mortality.org, last accessed May 1, 2022.
28. Ioannidis JP. The end of the COVID-19 pandemic. Eur J Clin Invest 2022; Mar 28:e13782.

Figure legends:

Figure 1. Risk of death in residents with SARS-CoV-2 and controls in the main analysis (A) and in the sensitivity analysis (B). The coloured areas show the 95% confidence interval.

394 **Figure 2.** Hazard ratio for death in residents with SARS-CoV-2, as compared with controls in

395 (A) the main analysis and (B) the sensitivity analysis. The coloured areas show the 95%

396 confidence interval


A
Risk of death (%)
0
25
50
75
100
SARS-CoV-2
Control
0 30 60 90 120 150 180 210 240 270 300 330 360 390 420 450 480 510 540 570 600 630
Days
No. at risk
SARS-CoV-2 3731 2135 1973 942 4 0 0 0 0 0 0
Controls 3731 3167 2219 1460 894 574 335 172 82 23 5


B
Risk of death (%)
0
25
50
75
100
SARS-CoV-2
Control
0 30 60 90 120 150 180 210 240
Days
No. at risk
SARS-CoV-2 3604 2196 2080 2012 1919 1539 923 122 4
Controls 3604 3460 3327 3195 3002 2461 1531 332 5


A
25
20
15
10
5
1
0.5
Hazard ratio for death
0
30
60
90
120
150
180
210
240
Days
B
30
25
20
15
10
5
1
0.5
Hazard ratio for death
0
30
60
90
120
150
180
210
Days