Time-varying death risk after SARS-CoV-2-infection in Swedish long-term care facilities

Word count: 2771; 2 figures; 1 table; 28 references; abstract: 249 words.

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

Marcel Ballin (1)*, John P.A. Ioannidis (2,3)*, Jonathan Bergman (1), Miia Kivipelto (4,5), Anna Nordström (1,6,7), Peter Nordström (1)

* Indicating shared first authorship and equal contribution.

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

Abstract

Background: The case fatality rate of SARS-CoV-2 has been high among residents of long-term care (LTC) facilities. It is unknown whether there is also higher mortality after the first month from documented infection.

Methods: We extended the follow-up period to 8 months of a previous, retrospective cohort study based on the Swedish Senior Alert register. 3731 LTC residents infected with SARS-CoV-2 were matched to 3731 uninfected controls using time-dependent propensity scores on age, sex, body mass index, health status, comorbidities, and prescription medication use. In a sensitivity analysis, residents were also matched on geographical region and time of Senior Alert registration.

Results: Median age was 87 years (65% women). Excess mortality was highest 5 days after documented infection (hazard ratio 19.1; 95% confidence interval [CI], 14.6-24.8); subsequently excess mortality decreased rapidly. After the second month, mortality rate became lower in infected residents than in controls. Median survival of uninfected controls was 577 days (1.6 years), much lower than national life expectancy in Sweden at age 87 (5.05 years in men, 6.07 years in women). During days 61-210 of follow-up, hazard ratio for death was 0.41 (95% CI, 0.34-0.50) (0.76 (95% CI, 0.62-0.93) in the sensitivity analysis).

Conclusions: No excess mortality was observed in LTC residents who survived acute SARS-CoV-2 infection (the first month). Life expectancy of uninfected residents was much lower than that of the general population of same age and sex. This difference should be taken into account in calculations of years of life lost among LTC residents.

Key messages:

- SARS-CoV-2 infection sharply increased mortality risk among residents of long-term care (LTC) facilities in the first month.
- The mortality risk in infected residents of LTC facilities rapidly returned to baseline and dropped below the mortality risk of uninfected controls after the first month.
- The mortality rate remained lower in infected residents than in uninfected controls for 8 months of follow-up.
- No excess mortality was observed in LTC residents who survived the acute SARS-CoV-2 infection.
- Loss of life-years in infected residents of LTC facilities is much lower than suggested for age- and sex- general population life tables.

Introduction

During the 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 SARS-CoV-2 versus 6% in matched, non-infected controls in the first wave of COVID-19.[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

The study offers extended follow-up on a retrospective cohort study. The basic study design of the retrospective cohort and of selection of exposed (infected) and unexposed (uninfected control) residents was 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. We selected LTC residents who had a record in Senior Alert from 2019 or 2020; the latest record during

these years was used, whenever there were multiple records. Linkage used pseudo-anonymised Personal Identification Numbers. Among these, we identified 3731 LTC residents with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 until September 15, 2020. Each infected resident was matched to a control resident on age, sex, body mass index, health status, comorbidity, and prescription medication use. Data on SARS-CoV-2 infections were obtained from the SmiNet national registry where SARS-CoV-2 infections must be reported by law. The study outcome was all-cause mortality (until October 24, 2020). These data were obtained from the national Swedish Cause of Death Registry. The extension to 8 months (up to October 2020) allows to get a more complete picture of the mortality risk of this frail population, while at the same time it largely excludes the subsequent waves and also the COVID-19 vaccination period which may have further affected mortality risk in this population.

Information on comorbidities was obtained from the Swedish National Patient Register and for cancer outcomes from the Swedish Cancer Registry. Information on recent use of medications (prescriptions in 2019-2020) came from Senior Alert and the Swedish Prescribed Drug Register.

We excluded SARS-CoV-2 infected residents that did not have a record in Senior Alert within a year prior to date of testing or confirmed infection (whichever came first or was available) and those where dates of testing and confirmed infection were both unavailable.

Infected residents and uninfected controls were 1:1 matched with time-dependent propensity scores, so as to allow for the fact that exposure (date of documented SARS-CoV-2 infection) did not coincide with the time of cohort entry (date of Senior Alert record). With time starting at the date of the Senior Alert record, a Cox model calculated a propensity score for the propensity to contract SARS-CoV-2. Each infected resident was matched to the control with the closest propensity score among those who were still alive

when the SARS-CoV-2 case occurred (counting time since the Senior Alert date). Matching was done sequentially, starting with the first case (smaller number of days since cohort entry) and proceeding with cases with increasingly larger number of days since cohort entry. Diagnoses and medications were used as time-varying covariates in the Cox regression model.

We conducted a sensitivity analysis to examine whether the results were confounded by secular trends and geographic variations in mortality. To do this, matching included also the geographical region (21 categories) and the date (year and month) of Senior Alert registration.

In both the main and sensitivity analyses for death risk, all-cause mortality was considered as the outcome of interest and the starting date for follow-up was the SARS-CoV-2 documentation date in cases and the corresponding date (in days since cohort entry) in controls. Follow-up time in days was calculated as censor date (24 October 2020 or death whichever came first) minus baseline date + 1 day. This was done so that the baseline date could also be included in the follow-up time and analysis (thus, a person would be able to die on the same date as they were documented to be infected).

The absolute risk of death was examined using Kaplan-Meier plots. The hazard ratio (HR) for death was plotted over time using flexible parametric models with restricted cubic splines (4 knots in default positions). HRs and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were also estimated using Cox regression for 30-day intervals of follow-up until 210 days. To adjust for matching, we calculated 95% CIs in the Cox models and the flexible parametric models using robust standard errors.

Analyses were performed using Stata MP version 16.1 for Mac (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

The study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority, which waived the informed consent requirement (no. 2020-02552). No patients were consulted in the study.

Results

In the main analysis, median baseline date for infected residents was 27 Apr 2020 (IQR 10 Apr to 22 May), median (maximum) follow-up was 129 (246) days and there were 1713 deaths. For controls, median baseline date was 12 Apr 2020 (IQR 16 Dec 2019 to 30 Jun 2020), median (maximum) follow-up was 146 (641) days and there were 899 deaths. In the sensitivity analysis, for infected residents, median baseline date was 26 Apr 2020 (IQR 10 Apr to 21 May), median (maximum) follow-up was 130 (246) days and there were 1640 deaths. For controls, median baseline date was 28 Apr 2020 (IQR 9 Apr to 23 May), median (maximum) follow-up was 173 (249) days and there were 536 deaths. The median age was 87 years, 65% were women, and comorbidities were common (Table 1).

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

Survival of controls at 210 days was 74.3% (72.6%-75.9%) in the main analysis and 82.9% (81.3%-84.4%) in the sensitivity analysis. Median survival of controls was 577 days. Median survival was also 577 days among the controls who were matched to the 1487 infected residents who died in the first month. Survival of these 1487 controls was similar to the survival of the remaining 2242 controls, for example their survival at 210 days was 72.5% versus 75.4%.

Peak HR (19.1 (95% CI, 14.6-24.8)) occurred at 5 days after documented infection. HR was high in the first month, decreased below 1.0 early in the second month, and

remained below 1.0 for the remaining duration of follow-up (Figure 2). In the sensitivity analysis, peak HR was 21.5 (95% CI, 15.9-29.2). Again, HR decreased sharply but took a bit longer to drop below 1.0 (after the second month) and remained below 1.0 afterwards.

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

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

Discussion

In this extended follow-up analysis of mortality in SARS-CoV-2-infected versus uninfected control LTC residents, we found that mortality risk peaked during the first week of documented infection, after which it rapidly decreased. Mortality remained elevated for the first month after infection, but then reverted back to baseline levels (i.e., control levels) before it dropped below baseline levels, where it remained at low levels for the remaining duration of follow-up (up to 8 months). These results suggest that SARS-CoV-2 does not reduce the life expectancy of LTC residents who survive the acute period of the disease. Despite concerns

that infected residents who survive may have persistent residual debilitation that might enhance their subsequent death risk, we saw the opposite: death risk decreased in longer-term follow-up. This suggests that deaths due to COVID-19 in LTC facilities in Sweden during the first wave probably resulted in average loss of life expectancy of less than 1.6 years on average. This figure is much lower than the life expectancy in the general Swedish population, which in 2019 was 5.05 years for men and 6.07 years for women at the age of 87 (the median age in our study).[7]

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

Calculations accounting for LTC status and also properly adjusting for comorbidities and their severity may also lead to much lower estimates than some other increasingly used approaches such as the Global Burden of Disease Reference Life Table[12] - also known as Theoretical Minimum Risk Life Table. This life table is an "aspirational" construct: it assumes an idealized situation with very low risk of death. According to this table, life expectancy is 88.9 years at birth, 9.99 years at age 85, 5.92 years at age 90, and

5.92 years at age 95.[13] Using this popular aspirational life table would probably overestimate by 5-10-fold the years-of-life-lost for SARS-CoV-2-deceased residents in LTC facilities. Aspirational life tables have been promoted as a way to standardize burden of disease calculations across different countries. However, in the case of diseases like COVID-19 they could lead to grossly misleading inferences.

Estimates of survival in residents of LTC facilities preceding the COVID-19 pandemic also agree with very limited median survival of nursing home residents, e.g. 541 days in one study in the United Kingdom[14] and 2 years in a study of residential care entrants in New Zealand.[15] In Sweden, previously published data[16] on the survival of elderly people who moved into institutionalized care in an area of Stockholm (N=1103) suggested that, on average, the median survival after moving to institutionalized care declined between 2006 and 2012 from 764 to 595 days. For the lower percentiles, the decrease was very large, e.g. for the 30th percentile, the length of stay declined from 335 days in 2006 to 119 days in 2012, and in 2012 10% died within just 8 days. A widening survival gap (due to shortening survival in nursing home residents) versus community-dwelling elderly has also been documented in a 10-year study in England.[17] Another study[18] evaluated all deaths in people >67 years old in November 2015 in Sweden and focused on the 2 years prior to death. Women used LTC for 15.6 months and men for 14.1 months out of 24 these months. The length of stay in institutional care was 7.2 and 6.2 months, respectively. These survival data for LTC residents are in line with the estimated median survival of controls in our study, thus further validating the median survival in residents of LTC facilities is very limited.

We should acknowledge that there can be large heterogeneity in survival in different LTC facilities. Some LTC facilities admit mostly residents with known limited life-expectancy (mostly for palliative care), while others may be institutions that admit mostly older adults who are quite healthy or have limited health problems with substantial life-

expectancy. A systematic review has found that across 6 cohort studies, the mortality rate within 6 months of admission to a nursing home ranged from 0% to 34% (median 20.2%).[19] In our analysis, we could not include data on the features of each LTC facility (e.g. whether it focused on palliative care) and we could not match infected residents with uninfected residents from the same facility. Nevertheless, the control groups both in the main and in the sensitivity analysis seem to have median survival that is entirely compatible with the literature on LTC residents and their overall limited expected survival, on average.

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

Declarations

Ethics approval: The study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority, which waived the informed consent requirement (no. 2020-02552). No patients were consulted in the study.

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. Supervision: PN, JPI.

Data availability: The data files used for the present study is publicly unavailable according to regulations under Swedish law, but can be applied for at each of the respective registry holders.

Funding: 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.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

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.
5. Edvinsson J, Rahm M, Trinks A, Hoglund PJ. Senior alert: A quality registry to support a standardized, structured, and systematic preventive care process for older adults. Qual Manag Health Care. 2015;24:96–101.
6. Brooke HL, Talbäck M, Hörnblad J. The Swedish cause of death register. Eur J Epidemiol. 2017;32:765–773.
7. https://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/en/ssd/START__BE__BE0101__BE0101I/LivslangdEttariga/, last accessed March 3, 2022
8. Ioannidis JPA. Over- and under-estimation of COVID-19 deaths. Eur J Epidemiol. 2021 Jun;36(6):581-588.

9. Ferenci T. Different approaches to quantify years of life lost from COVID-19. Eur J Epidemiol. 2021;36:589–597.
10. von der Lippe E, Devleesschauwer B, Gourley M, et al. Reflections on key methodological decisions in national burden of disease assessments. Arch Public Health. 2020;78:137.
11. Hanlon P, Chadwick F, Shah A, et al. COVID-19—exploring the implications of long-term condition type and extent of multimorbidity on years of life lost: a modelling study. Wellcome Open Res 2021;5:75.
12. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet. 2020;396:1204–1222.
13. Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 Reference Life Table, http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/ihme-data/global-burden-disease-study-2019-gbd-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 1. Risk of death in residents with SARS-CoV-2 and controls in the main analysis (panel A) and in the sensitivity analysis (panel B). The colored areas show the 95% CI.

A



B



Figure 2. Hazard ratio for death in residents with SARS-CoV-2, as compared with controls in (A) the main analysis and (B) the sensitivity analysis.

A



B



Table 1. Baseline characteristics*

Variables	SARS-CoV-2 infected residents (main analysis) (n=3731)	Uninfected controls (main analysis) (n=3731)	SARS-CoV-2 infected residents (sensitivity) (n=3604)	Uninfected controls (sensitivity) (n=3604)
Days, Senior Alert registration to baseline†, median (IQR)	120 (60-188)	120 (60-188)	118 (59-184)	118 (59-184)
Male sex	1325 (35.5)	1318 (35.3)	1278 (35.5)	1233 (34.2)
Age, median (IQR), yrs	87 (81-92)	87 (81-92)	86 (80-91)	87 (81-92)
Age group, yrs				
<70	140 (3.8)	164 (4.4)	152 (4.2)	166 (4.6)
70-74	249 (6.7)	238 (6.4)	251 (7.0)	302 (8.4)
75-79	456 (12.2)	431 (11.6)	465 (12.9)	438 (12.2)
80-84	706 (18.9)	693 (18.6)	965 (19.3)	688 (19.1)
85-89	938 (25.1)	927 (24.9)	911 (25.3)	829 (23.0)
≥90	1,242 (33.3)	1,278 (34.3)	1130 (31.4)	1181 (32.8)
BMI, kg/m^2, mean (SD)	25.4 (5.0)	25.6 (5.3)	25.4 (5.1)	25.0 (5.0)
BMI categories				
Underweight (<18.5 kg/m^2)	240 (6.4)	258 (6.9)	233 (6.5)	264 (7.3)
Normal weight (18.5-24.99 kg/m^2)	1,672 (44.8)	1,604 (43.0)	1614 (44.8)	1701 (47.2)
Overweight (25.0-29.99 kg/m^2)	1,196 (32.1)	1,182 (31.7)	1108 (30.7)	1160 (32.2)
Obesity (≥30 kg/m^2)	623 (16.7)	687 (18.4)	597 (14.7)	531 (16.6)
Neuropsychological conditions				
None	886 (23.8)	884 (23.7)	858 (23.8)	906 (25.1)
Mild dementia or depression	1,822 (48.8)	1,805 (48.4)	1755 (48.7)	1724 (47.8)
Severe dementia or depression	1,023 (27.4)	1,042 (27.9)	991 (27.5)	974 (27.0)
Known previous falls	1,970 (52.8)	1,950 (52.3)	1893 (52.5)	1884 (52.3)
Walking ability				
Safe with or without walking aids	1,513 (40.6)	1,492 (40.0)	1467 (40.7)	1458 (40.5)
Unsafe walk	1,367 (36.6)	1,379 (37.0)	1309 (36.3)	1306 (36.2)
Unable to walk	851 (22.8)	860 (23.1)	828 (23.0)	840 (23.3)
Fluid intake, ml/day				
>1000	2,191 (58.7)	2,182 (58.5)	2118 (58.8)	2189 (60.7)
700-1000	1,327 (35.6)	1,312 (35.2)	1292 (35.9)	1237 (34.3)
500-700	196 (5.3)	210 (5.6)	180 (5.0)	161 (4.5)
<500	17 (0.5)	27 (0.7)	14 (0.4)	17 (0.5)
Food intake				
Normal serving	2,597 (69.6)	2.587 (69.3)	2523 (70.0)	2486 (69.0)
3/4 serving	686 (18.4)	699 (18.7)	654 (18.2)	686 (19.9)
½ serving	350 (9.4)	341 (9.1)	334 (9.3)	339 (9.4)
<½ serving	98 (2.6)	104 (2.8)	93 (2.6)	93 (2.6)
General physical condition				
Good	2,077 (55.7)	2,034 (54.5)	2020 (56.1)	2002 (55.6)
Fair	1,524 (40.9)	1,545 (41.4)	1463 (40.6)	1471 (40.8)
Poor	121 (3.2)	142 (3.8)	113 (3.1)	128 (3.6)
Very bad	9 (0.2)	10 (0.3)	8 (0.2)	3 (0.1)
Incontinence				
No	986 (26.4)	989 (26.5)	952 (26.4)	962 (26.7)
Temporarily but unusual	565 (15.1)	556 (14.9)	542 (15.0)	482 (13.4)
Urinary or bowel	906 (24.3)	890 (23.9)	881 (24.5)	940 (26.1)
Urinary and bowel	1,274 (34.2)	1,296 (34.7)	1229 (34.1)	1220 (33.9)
Comorbidities				
Stroke	942 (25.3)	940 (25.2)	911 (25.3)	940 (26.1)
Myocardial infarction	446 (12.0)	431 (11.6)	428 (11.9)	408 (11.3)

Angina pectoris	576 (15.4)	574 (14.4)	553 (15.3)	550 (15.3)
Heart failure	771 (20.7)	776 (20.8)	733 (20.3)	721 (20.0)
Atrial fibrillation	997 (26.7)	971 (26.0)	963 (26.7)	936 (26.0)
Autoimmune disease	487 (13.1)	491 (13.2)	454 (12.6)	446 (12.4)
Diabetes	825 (22.1)	845 (22.7)	791 (22.0)	765 (21.2)
COPD	483 (13.0)	486 (13.0)	454 (12.6)	459 (12.7)
Asthma	275 (7.4)	242 (6.5)	258 (7.2)	247 (6.9)
Cancer	1,687 (45.2)	1,661 (44.5)	1630 (45.2)	1623 (45.0)
Renal failure/CKD	521 (14.0)	536 (14.4)	479 (13.3)	505 (14.0)
Liver disease	72 (1.9)	75 (2.0)	65 (1.8)	62 (1.7)
Sepsis	316 (8.5)	309 (8.3)	298 (8.3)	296 (8.2)
Influenza	184 (4.9)	193 (5.2)	172 (4.8)	174 (4.8)
Pneumonia	915 (24.5)	923 (24.7)	870 (24.1)	895 (24.8)
Alcohol intoxication	233 (6.2)	221 (5.9)	226 (6.3)	250 (6.9)
Medications				
Antithrombotics	2,205 (59.1)	2,253 (60.4)	2122 (58.9)	2102 (58.3)
Antihypertensives (non-diuretic)	2,257 (60.5)	2,271 (60.9)	2174 (60.3)	2150 (59.7)
Diuretics	1,611 (43.2)	1,608 (43.1)	1537 (42.7)	1453 (40.3)
Antidepressants	2,178 (58.4)	2,140 (57.4)	2100 (58.3)	2078 (57.7)
Psycholeptics	2,649 (71.0)	2,648 (71.0)	2556 (70.9)	2553 (70.8)

Abbreviations: BMI, Body mass index; CKD, chronic kidney disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation.

* The data are displayed as number (percent) unless stated otherwise. The data in the first two columns are the same as those presented in of our previous publication (reference 4).

†Baseline was the date of SARS-CoV-2 test/date of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 and the corresponding date in matched controls.