

Risk factors for household transmission of SARS-Cov-2: a modelling study in the French national population-based EpiCov cohort

Sophie Novelli¹, Lulla Opatowski^{2,3}, Carmelite Manto¹, Delphine Rahib⁴, Xavier de Lamballerie⁵, Josiane Warszawski^{1,6}, and Laurence Meyer^{1,6}, on behalf of the EpiCov study group

Author information

¹ Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, INSERM, CESP, 94276 Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

² Epidemiology and Modelling of Antibiotic Evasion Unit, Institut Pasteur, Paris, France.

³ Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, INSERM, CESP, 78180 Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France

⁴ Unité santé sexuelle, Direction de la prévention et de la promotion de la santé, Santé publique France

⁵ Unité des Virus Emergents, UVE, Aix Marseille Université, Inserm 1207, IRD 190 France

⁶ AP-HP Epidemiology and Public Health Service, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris-Saclay, Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

Corresponding author:

Sophie Novelli, Inserm U1018, CESP, Hôpital de Bicêtre, 82 rue du Général Leclerc

94276 le Kremlin Bicêtre cedex, France

+ 33 1 45 21 23 34

sophie.novelli@inserm.fr

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, households, seroprevalence, population-based survey

Word count: 3543

1 **ABSTRACT – 250 words**

2

3 **Background**

4 Households are specific transmission settings, as they involve close and repeated contacts
5 between individuals of different generations. Household surveys provide a unique
6 opportunity to better understand SARS-CoV-2 transmission and the role of individual
7 characteristics.

8 Here, we assessed the risk of SARS-CoV-2 acquisition from household and community
9 exposure according to age, family ties, and socioeconomic and living conditions using data
10 from the nationwide population-based EpiCov cohort/ORCHESTRA collaboration in
11 November-December 2020.

12

13 **Methods**

14 A history of SARS-CoV-2 infection was defined by a positive Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2
15 ELISA IgG result in November-December 2020. We applied stochastic chain binomial models
16 fitted to the final distribution of infections in households to data from 17,983 individuals ≥ 5
17 years enrolled from 8,165 households. Models estimated the competing risks of being
18 infected from community and household exposure.

19

20 **Results**

21 Young adults aged 18-24 years had the highest risk of extra-household infection (8.9%, [95%
22 credible interval, CrI]: 7.5 – 10.4), whereas the oldest (>75) and the youngest (6 -10) had the
23 lowest risk, 2.6% (1.8 – 3.5) and 3.4% (1.9 – 5.2), respectively. Extra-household infection was
24 also independently associated with socioeconomic conditions. Within households, the
25 probability of person-to-person transmission increased with age: 10.6% (5.0 – 17.9) among
26 6-10-year-olds to 43.1% (32.6 – 53.2) among 65-74-year-olds. It was higher between
27 partners 29.9% (25.6 - 34.3) and from mother to child 29.1% (21.4 – 37.3) than between
28 individuals related by other family ties.

29

30 **Conclusion**

31 In 2020 in France, the main factors identified for extra-household infection were age and
32 socioeconomic conditions. Intra-household infection mainly depended on age and family
33 ties.

34

35

36 **Key Messages**

37 • Young adults aged 18-24 years had the highest probability of extra-household SARS-Cov-
38 2 acquisition over the year 2020: 8.9%, 95% credible interval (95%CrI) 7.5 – 10.4.

39 • The probability of extra-household infection increased with family income and
40 population density in the municipality of residence and was higher in the French regions
41 most affected by the waves of SARS-CoV-2.

42 • When estimating the probability of person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2, the
43 65-74 year-olds had the highest susceptibility, i.e. the highest probability of SARS-CoV-2
44 acquisition when exposed to an infected household member (22.1%, 16.4 – 28.2)

45 • The probability of transmission was the highest between partners (29.9%, 25.6 – 34.3).
46 The probability of transmission was higher from mother to child than from father to
47 child: 29.1%, (21.4 – 37.3) and 14.0% (5.9 – 22.8), respectively. The probability of
48 transmission from child to parent was higher from children <12 years than for older
49 children: 11.8% (2.5 – 25.1) and 4.1% (0.9 – 9.0), respectively.

50 INTRODUCTION

51 Monitoring households, where individuals of different generations have close and repeated
52 contacts can help us understand the transmission of pathogens. Regarding COVID-19,
53 household studies have provided accumulating evidence that susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2
54 infection is lower for children (<8-10 years of age), relative to adults, and higher among
55 those >60-65 years relative to younger/middle-aged adults ^{1,2}. However, evidence is still
56 lacking regarding risk for newborns, young children, and adolescents, while these age groups
57 are characterized by highly heterogeneous behavior and social contact patterns.

58 Based on a population-based serosurvey in Geneva, Switzerland over April-June 2020, Bi et
59 al. identified a reduced risk of within-household infection among young children (5-8 years
60 of age) and young people (10-19) relative to middle-aged adults (20-49)³. This study was
61 however carried out a time of particularly low prevalence among children across Europe ⁴⁻⁸
62 after a long period of school closure during which children had limited interactions outside
63 of the home. limiting the possibility of studying routes of infection and infectivity among
64 children. From June-December 2020, data from a Canadian pediatric cohort highlighted
65 higher infectivity among children than adolescents ⁹. Importantly despite growing evidence
66 of social disparities in the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection ¹⁰⁻¹⁴ socio-economic factors were
67 rarely evaluated at the household level.

68 The EpiCov cohort is a rich nationwide population-based serosurvey in France, with a
69 household survey performed in November-December 2020, when schools were open and
70 vaccination had not yet been implemented. Serological assays are used to measure antibody
71 responses in blood samples as the sign of a previous SARS-Cov-2 infection, while virological
72 tests detect ongoing infection. While these later may miss mild or asymptomatic infections
73 ¹⁵, serological tests remain sensitive over a longer period ¹⁶ and thus consist in

74 complementary tools to define infection history and study SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Here,
75 we used mathematical modelling to assess, from the Epicov data, the effects of age, family
76 ties, and living and socio-economic conditions on the risk of SARS-CoV-2 acquisition from
77 both household and community exposure.

78

79

80 **METHODS**

81 **The EpiCov cohort**

82 EpiCov is a national random population-based cohort that combines serological testing and
83 longitudinal follow-up. It aims to analyze both the impact of living conditions on the
84 dynamics of the epidemic and the impact of the epidemic on health and living conditions in
85 France. In May 2020, 371,000 individuals aged ≥ 15 years living in mainland France or three
86 of the five French overseas territories were randomly selected from the Fidéli administrative
87 sampling frame. This database is considered to be quasi-exhaustive for the population living
88 in France¹⁷. The survey design was defined to ensure overrepresentation of the less densely
89 populated departments and lower income households, for which lower response rates were
90 expected. Selected individuals were contacted to undergo a web/telephone questionnaire.
91 The survey design, multimodal data collection have been detailed elsewhere¹¹.

92

93 **Household study design**

94 In November 2020, a 20% subsample of EpiCov participants was randomly drawn to be part
95 of a household study. Eligible participants were offered home capillary blood self-sampling
96 for SARS-CoV-2 serology for all household members, i.e., any person living at the same
97 address aged >6 years. Only one household member per household, i.e., the one initially

98 sampled to be part of the EpiCov cohort, completed the questionnaire. He/she was defined
99 as the respondent member. Households for whom the respondent was aged <17 years or
100 living in a household of >9 members were not proposed to participate in the household sub-
101 study.

102

103 **Epidemiological context of the household survey**

104 This household survey aimed to capture infections that had occurred from the start of the
105 pandemic in France (February-March 2020) to November-December 2020. This period
106 covers the first two waves of the COVID-19 pandemic, mostly caused by the wildtype virus
107 before the alpha variant gradually became dominant after its introduction at the end of 2020
108 ¹⁸ and before the start of the vaccination campaign on December 27, 2020 ¹⁹. The
109 epidemiological evolution during the year 2020 in France has been described elsewhere ¹²
110 and is briefly detailed in Supplementary Note 1.

111

112 **Laboratory analyses**

113 Dried-blood spots were collected on 903Whatman paper (DBS) kits sent to each participant
114 who agreed to blood sampling and mailed to one of the three participating biobanks
115 (Bordeaux, Amiens, Montpellier) to be punched using a PantheraTM machine (Perkin Elmer).
116 Eluates were processed in the virology laboratory (Unité des Virus Emergents, Marseille)
117 with a commercial ELISA kit (Euroimmun[®], Lübeck, Germany) for the detection of anti-SARS-
118 CoV-2 antibodies (IgG) against the S1 domain of the viral spike protein (ELISA-S), according
119 to the manufacturer's instructions.

120

121 **Outcome**

122 SARS-Cov-2 seropositivity was defined as an ELISA-S IgG ratio ≥ 1.1 , according to the ratio
123 threshold supplied by the manufacturer, and considered as the main criteria.

124

125 **Exposures**

126 Collected data included the number, age, and gender of all individuals living in the
127 household and the decile income of the household per capita. We also considered the
128 administrative region, the population density in the municipality of residence, whether the
129 housing was overcrowded, defined as housing with $<18 \text{ m}^2$ per inhabitant, and whether the
130 neighborhood was defined as socially deprived according to national definitions for
131 prioritizing targeted socio-economic interventions.

132

133 **Ethics**

134 The survey was approved by the CNIL (the French data protection authority)
135 (MLD/MFI/AR205138) and the local ethics committee (Comité de Protection des Personnes
136 Sud Méditerranée III 2020-A01191-38). The survey was also reviewed by the “Comité du
137 Label de la Statistique Publique”. The serological results were sent to the participants by
138 post with information on how to interpret the individual test results.

139

140 **Statistical analysis**

141 We analyzed all households for which serostatus was available for all members. Because
142 serostatus of young children was not available in EpiCov, households with children ≤ 5 years
143 of age were removed. We applied stochastic chain binomial transmission models to the final
144 distribution of infections in households ^{3,20}. The models accounted for competing risks
145 between community and household infection by considering all possible sequences of SARS-

146 Cov2 introduction and subsequent transmission events within a household. We estimated:
147 1) the probability that a susceptible individual i was infected from extra-household exposure
148 since the beginning of the pandemic to the time of the serosurvey and 2) the probability that
149 a susceptible individual i was infected from a single infectious household member j ; note this
150 was not the overall probability of being infected within the household but a probability of
151 person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2. For the purposes of simplicity, we considered
152 the serological status to be a perfect marker of having been infected and neglected the
153 occurrence of false positives or false negatives. We also neglected the possibility that
154 individuals could have been infected several times.

155 We investigated factors associated with the risk of extra- and within-household SARS-Cov-2
156 acquisition. They included the characteristics of the susceptible individual i and the potential
157 infector j , as well as the living and socioeconomic conditions of the household (see
158 Supplementary Note 2). The variables considered for modeling the probability of extra-
159 household acquisition were: age and gender of the susceptible member, family income,
160 population density in the municipality of residence, and living in a socially deprived
161 neighborhood. We also considered immigration status, this variable being collected for the
162 respondent. We accounted for spatial heterogeneity in the extra-household probability,
163 adjusting for the administrative region. For the probability that an infectious household
164 member j infects a susceptible household member i , we considered the following covariates:
165 age and gender of the susceptible individual i , age and gender of the potential infector j ,
166 family ties between i and j (i.e., whether j was i 's partner, parent, child, sibling, grandparent,
167 grandchild, or other), household size, accommodation type, and number of rooms. We also
168 tested whether demographic and socioeconomic factors (immigration status, family income,
169 population density in the municipality of residence, and living in a socially deprived

170 neighborhood) and administrative region modulated the risk of within-household
171 transmission.

172 We built a series of models including various combinations of these variables. Model
173 parameters were estimated by Bayesian inference via Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)
174 sampling. Model fits were compared using the widely applicable information criterion
175 (WAIC) ²¹. Given the very low percentage of missing data for the considered variables (<4%),
176 we run complete case analysis.

177 We adapted the code written by Bi et al. ³ and available in open access to the EPICOV data.
178 Models were implemented in the Stan probabilistic programming language using the rstan R
179 package (version 2.21.2). We used weakly informative priors on all parameters to be
180 normally distributed on the logit scale, with a mean of 0 and a standard error of 1.5. We ran
181 four chains of 1,500 iterations each with 500 warm-up iterations. We assessed convergence
182 visually and using the Gelman-Rubin Convergence Statistic (R-hat). We report estimates as
183 the medians of the posterior samples with their 95% credible interval (CrI), i.e., the 2.5th and
184 97.5th percentiles of their distribution.

185

186

187 **RESULTS**

188 **Study population**

189 Among the 22,118 households in mainland France drawn from the EpiCov cohort to be part
190 of the household sub-study in November 2020, we analyzed 17,983 individuals belonging to
191 8,165 households for which the serostatus of all members was available ([Figure 1](#)). The
192 median date of blood sampling was November 27th, 2020 (interquartile range, IQR: 23th
193 November–6th December). The median age of the participants was 52 years (IQR, 28–64),

194 and male-female sex-ratio 0.93. The household characteristics are shown in [Table 1](#). Most of
195 the households were one-person (25.9%) or two-person (47.4%), which differed from the
196 general population (36.9% and 32.6% one and two-person households in 2019, respectively
197 ²²). The main family structures were couples without (43.2%) and with children (23.8%).
198 Young people (6-24 years) and middle-aged adults (35-54) mainly lived in households with >2
199 members, whereas 25-34 and >55-year-olds mainly lived in two-person households (Table
200 S1). The proportion of one-person households was the highest among 25-34-year-olds
201 (21.1%) and >75-year-olds (21.0%).

202

203 **Seroprevalence and household final attack rates**

204 At the individual level, overall seroprevalence did not differ by gender but varied with age,
205 increasing from 5.5% among 6-10-year-olds to 7.5% among 11-14-year-olds and 7.7% among
206 15-17-year-olds, before peaking at 10.7% among 18-24-year-olds and then decreasing to
207 3.0% among those aged ≥ 75 ([Figure 2A,B](#)).

208 The proportion of households with at least one seropositive member was 9.6% overall and
209 increased from 5.1% for one-person households to 23.1% for households with ≥ 5 members
210 ([Figure 2C](#), Table S2). Most infected households counted only one or two positive individuals,
211 even in households >3 members ([Figure 2D](#)). Among households with at least one positive
212 individual, the proportion of positive members was 52% overall and decreased with
213 household size, from 66% in two-person households to 47% in three-person households, to
214 40% in 4 and >4-person households.

215

216 **Factors associated with the acquisition of SARS-CoV-2**

217 We estimated the overall cumulative probability of infection from extra-household exposure
218 from the start of the pandemic in France through the time of the survey to be a median of
219 4.5% (95% CrI 4.2–4.9). This probability varied with age: young adults aged 18-24 years had
220 the highest probability of extra-household infection and those aged ≥ 75 had the lowest
221 ([Figure 3A](#)).

222 The estimated median probability of person-to-person transmission between household
223 members was 17.9% (16.0–19.9) overall. It varied with age of the susceptible: susceptibility
224 was the highest among 65-74-year-olds, and the lowest among 6-10-year-old ([Figure 3B](#)).

225 Models allowing for differential risk of transmission by the age of the infector showed the
226 lowest infectivity for the 15-17 and 18-24 age groups ([Figure 3C](#)). The probability of person-

227 to-person transmission between household members was 29.5% (24.3–34.9) in two-person
228 households, and decreased to 15% in larger households. These overall estimates concealed
229 heterogeneous probabilities of transmission according to family ties. The probability of
230 transmission was the highest between partners (29.9%, 25.6–34.3), which was consistent
231 with the estimate in two-person households ([Figure 4A,B](#)). The probability of transmission

232 was higher from mother to child (29.1%, 21.4–37.3) than from father to child (14.0%, 5.9–
233 22.8). From child to parent it was of 11.8% (2.5–25.1) for children < 12 years of age and

234 decreased to 4.1% (0.9–9.0) for children ≥ 12 years of age. The limited number of three-
235 generation families in the sample led to wide credible intervals when estimating the

236 transmission risk between grandchildren and grandparents. Family income, population
237 density in the municipality of residence, immigration status, and region were not associated

238 with the risk of person-to-person transmission between household members ([Table S3](#)).

239 In multivariate analysis, the probability of being infected from extra-household exposure was
240 adjusted for the age of the susceptible individual, family income, population density in the

241 municipality of residence, immigration status of the respondent, and the administrative
242 region of residence. The association with age remained similar: young people (18-24-year-
243 olds) and middle-aged adults (25-34 and 35-44-year-olds) had a higher risk of extra-
244 household SARS-CoV-2 acquisition than that of 55-64-year-olds ([Table 2](#)). The probability of
245 extra-household infection increased with family income (highest for the two highest deciles
246 compared to the central deciles) and population density in the municipality of residence.
247 Individuals in households in which the respondent participant was a first-or second-
248 generation immigrant from outside Europe had a higher risk of extra-household SARS-CoV-2
249 acquisition in univariate analysis. This effect was tempered after adjusting for socioeconomic
250 factors. Finally, as expected, the regions with the highest SARS-CoV-2 incidence at the time
251 of the survey were those with the highest probability of extra-household infection.

252 Concerning intra-household transmission, the probability of person-to-person transmission
253 was adjusted for the age of the susceptible and his/her family link with the potential
254 infector. Those aged 65-74 years had twice the odds of being infected from a single infected
255 household member than 55-64-year-olds (aOR 1.9, 95%CrI 1.0–3.5), whereas 6-10-year-olds
256 appeared to have a lower risk of infection (aOR 0.4, 0.1–1.2), but the 95% credible interval
257 was wide. The risk of transmission from mother to child was similar to that between
258 partners aOR, 1.2 (0.5–2.8), whereas it was lower from father to child than from mother to
259 child (aOR 0.34, 0.06–1.04). The risk of transmission from child to parent decreased with
260 increasing age of the child: aOR, 0.63 (95%CrI, 0.07–2.16) for children <12 years and 0.27
261 (0.09–0.57) for children ≥12 years, using transmission between partners as the reference.

262 When adjusting for family ties, household size was no longer associated with the risk of
263 person-to-person transmission.

264 Interestingly, living condition variables, i.e., the type of accommodation and overcrowded
265 housing, were not associated with the risk of person-to-person transmission in univariate
266 analysis. The introduction of these two variables into the multivariate analysis did not
267 change the odds ratio estimates for age or family ties.

268

269 **Proportion of intra-household infections**

270 Using the posterior distribution of parameters from the final multivariate model, we
271 simulated the predicted sources of infection for all individuals in the study (see
272 [Supplementary Note 1](#)). We estimated that 25.5% (95%CrI, 25.1–25.8) of all infections were
273 caused by another household member. This proportion increased with household size, from
274 22.2% (21.6–22.7) for two-person households to 44.0% (42.5–45.5) for households with ≥ 5
275 members ([Figure 5](#)).

276

277

278 **DISCUSSION**

279 Using serological data from the French nationwide population-based EpiCov cohort, we
280 estimated the risk of SARS-CoV-2 acquisition from the community and the person-to-person
281 transmission risk within households in 2020. Participants of all ages >5 years were included
282 and we particularly investigated the effect of family composition, socioeconomic factors, and
283 living conditions on within-household SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Based on simulations, we
284 found that household transmission represented one quarter of SARS-CoV-2 infections. The
285 main factors for extra-household infection were age and demographic and socioeconomic
286 factors (i.e., family income, population density in the area of residence, and region), whereas

287 intra-household infection mainly depended on the age of individuals and family ties between
288 them.

289 Our results regarding an age pattern of SARS-Cov-2 transmission was consistent with
290 previous household studies^{3,23}. Young adults had the highest probability of extra-household
291 infection, probably reflecting a higher intensity of social interaction in this age group. The
292 highest probability of being infected when exposed to an infectious individual at home was
293 obtained for the 65-74 year-olds, which may be explained by either a higher susceptibility to
294 virus infection or by more time spent at home relative to the younger age groups.
295 Surprisingly, participants >74 did not have a particularly high risk of being infected by an
296 infectious family member at home. This may reflect a potentially higher level of preventive
297 measures in these populations. A higher level of waning antibodies in the oldest individuals
298 may have also led to an underestimation of the infection rates in this age group²⁴.
299 Importantly, individuals leaving in nursing homes were not included in the EpiCov study.

300 Age-specific probabilities of person-to-person transmission result from a combination of
301 biological effects (immune response and viral shedding) and behavioral factors (differences
302 in social exposure and the frequency and intensity of contacts between age groups in the
303 population). In models accounting for family ties, the probability of within-household
304 transmission was the highest between partners and from mother to child. Lower values
305 were obtained from child to parents. This is consistent with the higher secondary infection
306 rates for spouses than for other adult relationships, which were reported previously^{25,26}. We
307 found a higher probability of transmission to parents from the <12 year-old children than
308 from older children, probably reflecting heterogeneity in contact patterns between
309 individuals within families. Overall, our results suggest that, in a context where schools were

310 open, adults rather than children were more likely to be infected outside and introduced the
311 virus to the household, leading to transmission to children.

312 Family income and population density in the municipality of residence were associated with
313 the probability of extra- but not intra-household infection, which allows a better
314 understanding of the association of these factors with the seroprevalence previously
315 described in the EpiCov cohort ^{11,12}. Surprisingly, we did not find an association between
316 within-household person-to-person transmission and overcrowded housing or
317 accommodation type, by opposition to some previous studies which reported associations
318 between housing surface areas and secondary infection rates in households ^{27,28}. This
319 difference may be due to the fact that relatively few dwellings were overcrowded in our
320 sample. Isolation measures taken in households after a member became infected may also
321 explain our results but this information was not available.

322 The probability of person-to-person transmission was inversely related to household size. It
323 was 30% in two-person households, which corresponds to the estimated probability of
324 transmission between partners. It decreased to 15-16% in larger households, which is an
325 average of all the probabilities of transmission between household members that ranged
326 from 4 to 30% according to families ties. When adjusting for family ties, household size was
327 no longer associated with the risk of person-to-person transmission.

328 Interestingly, from our simulations we estimated that household transmission represented
329 one quarter of SARS-CoV-2 infections in 2020. This value depended on the person-to-person
330 probability of transmission within households, as well as the structure of the population: the
331 larger the household size and the number of positive household members, the more likely
332 sequences involving one or more within-household infection events. In France, near 50% of
333 households are two-persons. Our study population mainly consisted of one- and two-person

334 households 73%. The contribution of household transmission would be expected to be far
335 higher in settings where larger households are more frequent, as the estimated risk of
336 household transmission increased from 22.2% in two-person households to 44.0% in
337 households with ≥ 5 members.

338

339 Among the main strengths of our study, in addition to its nationwide dimension, is that it
340 covers a period of interest when schools were no longer closed in France, starting from
341 autumn 2020, and children and young people were therefore more exposed to SARS-CoV-2
342 in the community. In addition, we accounted for competing risks between extra- and intra-
343 household exposure for SARS-CoV-2 acquisition and the possibility of tertiary or longer
344 transmission chains within households by using chain binomial models.

345 Some limitations need to be mentioned. First, despite the size of our study, one of the
346 largest in Europe, its statistical power was limited for the analysis of specific interactions,
347 e.g. between grandparents and grandchildren. Second, antibody responses are generally
348 sustained over the first four months following infection but may wane afterwards. The study
349 taking place in fall 2020, some infections that occurred early in the first wave of the
350 pandemic may have been missed²⁴. Third, the possibility of re-infection was neglected here.
351 Given that the same viral strain circulated at this time of the pandemic, this phenomenon
352 was considered infrequent²⁴. Finally, lack of availability of serological status in children <5
353 years in the EpiCov cohort impeded us from investigating the role of very young children in
354 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. More studies should be carried out in this specific group in the
355 future.

356 In conclusion, our study provides estimates of the risk of acquisition of SARS-CoV-2 within
357 and outside the household over the first two waves in France in 2020. The probability of

358 person-to-person transmission within households was estimated to be 18% overall, and
359 varied highly depending on the age of the individuals and the family ties. Since November
360 2020, the epidemiological context has drastically changed, with both the emergence of
361 variants of concern with increased transmissibility and widespread implementation of
362 vaccination. Our study brings new insights into the understanding of factors associated with
363 the heterogeneity of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. It also illustrates and highlights the strength
364 of population-based serosurveys to assess the relative contribution of household and
365 community transmission, which can be extended to other respiratory viruses.

366

367 **Word count: 3543**

368

369 **Authors contribution**

370 JW and LM conceived and designed the epidemiological study. CM, XL and DR contributed to
371 data collection. SN and LO conceived the modelling analysis. SN performed the analysis,
372 supervised by LO. SN, LM and LO interpreted the results. SN wrote the first draft of the
373 paper. All authors wrote, read and approved the final manuscript.

374

375 **For the EpiCov study group**

376 Josiane Warszawski, Nathalie Bajos (Co-Principal investigator), Guillaume Bagein, François
377 Beck, Emilie Counil, Florence Jusot, Nathalie Lydié, Claude Martin, Laurence Meyer, Philippe
378 Raynaud, Alexandra Rouquette, Ariane Pailhé, Delphine Rahib, Patrick Sillard, Alexis Spire.

379 **Funding**

380 This research was supported by research grants from Inserm (Institut National de la Santé et
381 de la Recherche Médicale), the French Ministry for Research, Drees-Direction de la

382 Recherche, des Etudes, de l'Evaluation et des Statistiques, and the French Ministry for
383 Health and by the Région Ile-de-France.

384 This project has also received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
385 innovation program under grant agreement No 101016167, ORCHESTRA (Connecting
386 European Cohorts to Increase Common and Effective Response to SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic).
387 S.N was funded by ORCHESTRA.

388

389 **Data availability**

390 The second round EpiCov dataset is available for research purpose on CASD
391 (<https://www.casd.eu/>), after submission to approval of French Ethics and Regulatory
392 Committee procedure (Comité du Secret Statistique, CESREES and CNIL). Access to
393 anonymized individual data underlying the findings may be available before the planned
394 period, on request to the corresponding author, to be submitted to approval of ethics and
395 reglementary Committee for researchers who meet the criteria for access to data.

396

397 **Acknowledgments**

398 The views expressed in this paper are the sole responsibility of the author and the
399 Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

400 We sincerely thank all the participants in the EpiCoV study.

401 We warmly thank the INSERM staff, including, in particular, Carmen Calandra, Karim
402 Ammour, Jean-Marc Boivent, Jean-Marie Gagliolo, Frédérique Le Saulnier, and Frédéric
403 Robergeau, who worked with considerable dedication and commitment to make it possible
404 to develop, in record time, and to maintain all regulatory, budgetary, technical, and logistical
405 aspects of the EpiCov study.

406 We warmly thank the staff of Santé publique France, and especially Lucie Duchesne, who
407 played a major role in organisation and quality assurance for the seroprevalence component
408 of the EpiCov study.

409 We thank the CRB biobanks staff, and especially their heads, Dr Isabelle Pellegrin, and Julien
410 Jeanpetit (Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Robert Pellegrin, Bordeaux, France), Pr Edouard
411 Tuaille (Centre de Ressources Biologiques du CHU de Montpellier), Dr Yves-Edouard Herpe
412 (Centre de Ressources Biologiques Biobanque de Picardie), Pr Jacqueline Deloumeaux
413 (Centre biologique du CHU de la Guadeloupe), Dr Rémi Nevier (CeRBiM, Centre de
414 Ressources Biologiques de la Martinique), Julien Eperonnier, Estelle Nobecourt (Centre de
415 Ressources Biologiques de la Réunion) for the quality of DBS sample management of the
416 EpiCov study. We thank the biobank team in Inserm SC10, particularly Sophie Circosta.

417 We also thank the staff of the UVE virology department, for the high-quality management of
418 such a large number of serological assays.

419 We thank the staff of DREES and INSEE, for their collaboration in the implementation of the
420 study, methodological input, sample selection, and the complex development of weights to
421 correct for non-response.

422 We thank the Ipsos staff, including Christophe David and Valérie Blineau in particular, for
423 their major contribution to the quality of data collection.

424

425 **Competing interests**

426 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

427 **REFERENCES**

428 1. Goldstein E, Lipsitch M, Cevik M. On the Effect of Age on the Transmission of SARS-CoV-
429 2 in Households, Schools, and the Community. *J Infect Dis.* 2020 Oct 29;**223**(3):362–
430 369.

- 431 2. Zhu Y, Bloxham CJ, Hulme KD, et al. A meta-analysis on the role of children in SARS-
432 CoV-2 in household transmission clusters. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am.*
433 2020 Dec 6;
- 434 3. Bi Q, Lessler J, Eckerle I, et al. Insights into household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from
435 a population-based serological survey. *Nat Commun.* 2021 Jun 15;**12**(1):3643.
- 436 4. Espenhain L, Tribler S, Sværke Jørgensen C, Holm Hansen C, Wolff Sönksen U, Ethelberg
437 S. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Denmark: nationwide, population-based
438 seroepidemiological study. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2021 Jul;**36**(7):715–725.
- 439 5. Le Vu S, Jones G, Anna F, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in France: results
440 from nationwide serological surveillance. *Nat Commun.* 2021 May 21;**12**(1):3025.
- 441 6. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
442 (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet.*
443 Elsevier; 2020 Aug 22;**396**(10250):535–544.
- 444 7. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
445 antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *Lancet*
446 *Lond Engl.* 2020;**396**(10247):313–319.
- 447 8. Vos AG, Hulzebosch A, Grobbee DE, Barth RE, Klipstein-Grobusch K. Association
448 between Immune Markers and Surrogate Markers of Cardiovascular Disease in HIV
449 Positive Patients: A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2017 Jan 13 [cited 2019
450 Oct 2];**12**(1). Available from:
451 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5234789/>
- 452 9. Paul LA, Daneman N, Schwartz KL, et al. Association of Age and Pediatric Household
453 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA Pediatr* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 16 [cited
454 2021 Oct 6]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.2770>
- 455 10. Bajos N, Jusot F, Pailhé A, et al. When lockdown policies amplify social inequalities in
456 COVID-19 infections: evidence from a cross-sectional population-based survey in
457 France. *BMC Public Health.* BioMed Central; 2021 Dec;**21**(1):1–10.
- 458 11. Warszawski J, Beaumont A-L, Seng R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-Cov-2 antibodies and
459 living conditions: the French national random population-based EPICOV cohort. *BMC*
460 *Infect Dis.* 2022 Jan 9;**22**(1):41.
- 461 12. Warszawski J, Meyer L, Franck J-E, et al. Trends in social exposure to SARS-Cov-2 in
462 France. Evidence from the national socio-epidemiological cohort–EPICOV. *PLoS ONE.*
463 2022 May 25;**17**(5):e0267725.
- 464 13. Ward H, Atchison C, Whitaker M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in England
465 following the first peak of the pandemic. *Nat Commun.* 2021 Feb 10;**12**:905.
- 466 14. Mathur R, Rentsch CT, Morton CE, et al. Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection and
467 COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care unit admission, and death in 17 million


- 468 adults in England: an observational cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. *The*
469 *Lancet*. Elsevier; 2021 May 8;**397**(10286):1711–1724.
- 470 15. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative
471 Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by
472 Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med*. American College of Physicians; 2020 Aug
473 18;**173**(4):262–267.
- 474 16. Kuwelker K, Zhou F, Blomberg B, et al. Attack rates amongst household members of
475 outpatients with confirmed COVID-19 in Bergen, Norway: A case-ascertained study.
476 *Lancet Reg Health – Eur* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2021 Apr 1 [cited 2022 Jul 13];**3**. Available
477 from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762\(20\)30014-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(20)30014-4/fulltext)
478 [4/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(20)30014-4/fulltext)
- 479 17. Fidéli, l’intégration des sources fiscales dans les données sociales – Courrier des
480 statistiques N6 - 2021 | Insee [Internet]. [cited 2022 Sep 14]. Available from:
481 <https://www.insee.fr/fr/information/5398683?sommaire=5398695>
- 482 18. Santé Publique France. Coronavirus: circulation des variants du SARS-CoV-2 [Internet].
483 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 15]. Available from:
484 [https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-circulation-des-variants-du-sars-cov-2)
485 [circulation-des-variants-du-sars-cov-2](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-circulation-des-variants-du-sars-cov-2)
- 486 19. Santé Publique France. Vaccination contre la COVID-19 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jul
487 15]. Available from: [https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/vaccination-contre-la-covid-19)
488 [19/vaccination-contre-la-covid-19](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/dossiers/coronavirus-covid-19/vaccination-contre-la-covid-19)
- 489 20. Longini IM, Koopman JS. Household and Community Transmission Parameters from
490 Final Distributions of Infections in Households. *Biometrics*. 1982 Mar;**38**(1):115.
- 491 21. Watanabe S. Asymptotic Equivalence of Bayes Cross Validation and Widely Applicable
492 Information Criterion in Singular Learning Theory. *J Mach Learn Res*.
493 2010;**11**(116):3571–3594.
- 494 22. INSEE. Couples - Familles - Ménages en 2019 – Recensement de la population –
495 Résultats pour toutes les communes, départements, régions, intercommunalités...
496 –Couples - Familles - Ménages en 2019 | Insee [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 16].
497 Available from:
498 [https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6455805?sommaire=6455840&geo=FE-](https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6455805?sommaire=6455840&geo=FE-1#graphique-FAM_G1)
499 [1#graphique-FAM_G1](https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6455805?sommaire=6455840&geo=FE-1#graphique-FAM_G1)
- 500 23. Li F, Li Y-Y, Liu M-J, et al. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and risk factors for
501 susceptibility and infectivity in Wuhan: a retrospective observational study. *Lancet*
502 *Infect Dis*. 2021 Jan 18;
- 503 24. Helfand M, Fiordalisi C, Wiedrick J, et al. Risk for Reinfection After SARS-CoV-2: A Living,
504 Rapid Review for American College of Physicians Practice Points on the Role of the
505 Antibody Response in Conferring Immunity Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Ann Intern*
506 *Med*. 2022 Apr;**175**(4):547–555.

- 507 25. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of
508 SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020 Dec
509 1;**3**(12):e2031756.
- 510 26. Verberk JDM, Hoog MLA de, Westerhof I, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within
511 households: a remote prospective cohort study in European countries. *Eur J Epidemiol*.
512 2022 May 1;**37**(5):549–561.
- 513 27. Ghosh AK, Venkatraman S, Soroka O, et al. Association between overcrowded
514 households, multigenerational households, and COVID-19: a cohort study. *Public*
515 *Health*. 2021 Sep 1;**198**:273–279.
- 516 28. Cerami C, Popkin-Hall ZR, Rapp T, et al. Household Transmission of Severe Acute
517 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in the United States: Living Density, Viral Load,
518 and Disproportionate Impact on Communities of Color. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis*
519 *Soc Am*. 2021 Aug 12;**74**(10):1776–1785.
- 520 29. Layan M, Gilboa M, Gonen T, et al. Impact of BNT162b2 Vaccination and Isolation on
521 SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Israeli Households: An Observational Study. *Am J*
522 *Epidemiol*. 2022 Jun 27;**191**(7):1224–1234.
- 523 30. Prunas O, Warren JL, Crawford FW, et al. Vaccination with BNT162b2 reduces
524 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts in Israel. *Science*. American
525 Association for the Advancement of Science; 2022 Mar 11;**375**(6585):1151–1154.

526

Figure 1. Flowchart of enrolled participants

Abbreviations: FOD, French Overseas Departments






Figure 2. Study population: (A) Proportion of infected households, i.e., with at least one positive case, according to household size. (B) Among households with a least one positive individual, total number of positive individuals in the household according to the size of the household. Example: Among households with three members with at least one positive individual, 67% had only one positive household member, 25% two positive members, and 8% three positive members. (C) and (D) Seroprevalence (95% CI) according to sex, age and household size.




Figure 3. Estimated probabilities (%) of extra and intra-household infection by age

Median, 95% credible interval




Figure 4. Estimated probabilities (%) of person-to-person transmission according to (A) household size and (B) family ties

Median, 95% credible interval




Figure 5. Estimated proportion of infections that occurred within a household depending on household size

Median, 95% credible interval

Table 1. Household characteristics

Characteristics	Missing data % (n)	Households N = 8,165 % (n)
Household size	0 (0)	
One-person		25.9 (2,116)
Two-person		47.4 (3,870)
Three-person		11.5 (941)
Four-person		11.5 (937)
More than four persons		3.7 (301)
Family structure	0 (0)	
Living alone		25.9 (2,116)
Couple without children		43.2 (3,524)
Single-parent family		4.7 (385)
Couple with one or more children		23.8 (1,941)
3-generation family		0.2 (20)
Other household structure		2.2 (179)
Family income per capita (deciles)	1.9 (153)	
D01		5.7 (458)
D02-D03		9.9 (794)
D04-D05		13.6 (1,093)
D06-D07		20.8 (1,663)
D08-D09		31.5 (2,523)
D10		18.5 (1,481)
Unknown		153
Population density in the municipality of residence	0 (0)	
Low		37.2 (3,038)
Medium		28.9 (2,358)
High		33.9 (2,769)
Living in a socially deprived neighborhood	0 (0)	2.2 (176)
Accommodation type	<0.1 (2)	
An apartment with no balcony, terrace, or community garden		9.4 (764)
An apartment with a balcony or a terrace		18.9 (1,545)
An apartment with a community garden		2.3 (189)
A house with a yard or a garden		0.9 (70)
A house with no yard and no garden		67.9 (5,546)
Other		0.6 (49)
Overcrowded housing	6.5 (528)	
Living alone		21.8 (1,665)
Housing not particularly crowded		74.5 (5,688)
Crowded housing		3.7 (284)
Region	0 (0)	
Occitanie		10.7 (870)
Nouvelle-Aquitaine		9.3 (761)

Characteristics	Missing data % (n)	Households N = 8,165 % (n)
Hauts-de-France		9.0 (731)
Ile-de-France		16.3 (1,327)
Bretagne		5.4 (444)
Auvergne-Rhone-Alpes		12.8 (1,045)
Provence-Alpes-Côte-d’Azur		6.4 (525)
Grand Est		10.1 (828)
Normandie		4.5 (369)
Centre-Val de Loire		4.2 (343)
Bourgogne-Franche-Comte		4.7 (386)
Corse		0.4 (31)
Pays de la Loire		6.2 (505)
Immigration status of the respondent participant¹	3.1 (254)	
Majority population		87.8 (6,946)
1st-generation immigrant from Europe		2.9 (227)
2nd-generation immigrant from Europe		5.2 (409)
1st-generation immigrant from outside Europe		1.8 (145)
2nd-generation immigrant from outside Europe		2.3 (184)

¹ The respondent participant was the household member who was sampled to be part of the EpiCov study and answered the questionnaire

Table 2. Factors associated with a risk of extra-household and intra-household infection

Variables	Infection from extra-household exposures		Infection from one single infected household member	
	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis 1
	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI
Age of the susceptible, years				
06-10	0.9 (0.5 - 1.5)	1.0 (0.5 - 1.6)	0.4 (0.2 - 0.8)	0.4 (0.1 - 1.2)
11-14	1.2 (0.8 - 1.8)	1.1 (0.6 - 1.6)	0.7 (0.4 - 1.3)	0.9 (0.3 - 2.1)
15-17	1.5 (1.0 - 2.2)	1.4 (0.9 - 2.1)	0.7 (0.3 - 1.4)	1.1 (0.4 - 2.8)
18-24	2.5 (2.0 - 3.3)	2.4 (1.8 - 3.1)	0.5 (0.3 - 0.9)	0.9 (0.4 - 2.0)
25-34	1.9 (1.4 - 2.5)	1.6 (1.2 - 2.2)	0.5 (0.2 - 1.0)	0.5 (0.2 - 1.1)
35-44	1.3 (1.0 - 1.8)	1.4 (1.0 - 1.9)	0.5 (0.2 - 0.9)	0.5 (0.2 - 1.1)
45-54	1.1 (0.8 - 1.4)	1.2 (0.9 - 1.6)	0.8 (0.5 - 1.3)	1.0 (0.6 - 1.9)
55-64	ref	ref	ref	ref
65-74	0.8 (0.6 - 1.1)	0.9 (0.7 - 1.2)	2.7 (1.5 - 4.7)	1.9 (1.0 - 3.5)
>74	0.7 (0.5 - 1.0)	0.7 (0.5 - 1.0)	0.8 (0.2 - 2.0)	0.7 (0.2 - 2.1)
Sex of the susceptible				
Female	ref		ref	
Male	0.9 (0.8 - 1.1)		0.7 (0.5 - 1.0)	
Age of the infector, years				
06-10			0.5 (0.2 - 1.1)	
11-14			0.5 (0.2 - 1.1)	
15-17			0.11 (0.02 - 0.34)	
18-24			0.15 (0.05 - 0.31)	
25-34			0.3 (0.1 - 0.7)	
35-44			0.3 (0.1 - 0.6)	
45-54			0.9 (0.5 - 1.4)	
55-64			ref	
65-74			1.5 (0.8 - 2.6)	
>74			0.7 (0.2 - 2.0)	
Sex of the infector				
Female			ref	
Male			0.8 (0.5 - 1.3)	
Family ties				
Between partners			ref	ref
From mother to child			1.0 (0.6 - 1.5)	1.2 (0.5 - 2.8)
From father to child			0.4 (0.1 - 0.7)	0.34 (0.06 - 1.04)
From child <12 years old to parent			0.31 (0.06 - 0.81)	0.63 (0.07 - 2.16)
From child ≥12 years old to parent			0.10 (0.02 - 0.24)	0.27 (0.09 - 0.57)
From grandparent to grandchild			0.53 (0.04 - 4.78)	0.63 (0.04 - 6.67)
From grandchild to grandparent			0.39 (0.04 - 2.59)	0.50 (0.04 - 4.50)
From a sibling <12 years old			0.39 (0.07 - 1.14)	0.8 (0.1 - 3.0)
From a sibling ≥12 years old			0.3 (0.2 - 0.6)	0.4 (0.1 - 1.0)
Between individuals with other family ties			0.4 (0.1 - 1.3)	0.5 (0.1 - 1.5)
Between individuals with no family ties			0.13 (0.02 - 0.66)	0.18 (0.02 - 1.03)
Immigration status				
Majority population	ref		ref	
1st-generation immigrant from Europe	0.8 (0.5 - 1.2)	0.8 (0.5 - 1.2)	1.0 (0.4 - 2.1)	
1st-generation immigrant from outside Europe	1.6 (1.0 - 2.4)	1.3 (0.8 - 2.0)	0.6 (0.2 - 1.2)	

Variables	Infection from extra-household exposures		Infection from one single infected household member	
	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis 1
	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI	OR 95%CrI
2nd-generation immigrant from Europe	1.0 (0.7 - 1.4)	1.0 (0.7 - 1.4)	1.3 (0.7 - 2.3)	
2nd-generation immigrant from outside Europe	1.6 (1.0 - 2.3)	1.4 (0.9 - 2.0)	1.3 (0.7 - 2.4)	
Family income				
D01 (lowest)	1.2 (0.8 - 1.8)	1.0 (0.7 - 1.5)	0.5 (0.2 - 1.2)	
D02-D03	1.0 (0.7 - 1.4)	0.9 (0.7 - 1.3)	1.3 (0.7 - 2.3)	
D04-D05	ref	ref	ref	
D06-D07	1.2 (0.9 - 1.5)	1.2 (0.9 - 1.6)	1.1 (0.7 - 1.9)	
D08-D09	1.3 (1.1 - 1.7)	1.3 (1.0 - 1.7)	1.1 (0.7 - 1.7)	
D10 (highest)	1.7 (1.3 - 2.2)	1.6 (1.2 - 2.1)	1.4 (0.9 - 2.3)	
Population density in the municipality of residence				
Low	ref	ref	ref	
Medium	1.2 (1.0 - 1.4)	1.1 (0.9 - 1.3)	1.0 (0.7 - 1.4)	
High	1.6 (1.4 - 1.9)	1.2 (1.0 - 1.4)	1.0 (0.7 - 1.4)	
Household size				
2			ref	ref
3			0.5 (0.3 - 0.7)	0.8 (0.4 - 1.4)
4			0.4 (0.3 - 0.6)	0.8 (0.4 - 1.3)
>4			0.4 (0.3 - 0.6)	0.9 (0.5 - 1.7)
Accommodation type				
A house with a yard or a garden			ref	
A house with no yard or garden			1.5 (0.4 - 4.0)	
An apartment with a balcony or a terrace			1.3 (0.9 - 1.8)	
An apartment with a community garden			0.8 (0.1 - 2.5)	
An apartment with no balcony, terrace or community garden			1.1 (0.5 - 2.1)	
Other			0.9 (0.2 - 3.1)	
Overcrowded housing				
Housing not particularly crowded			ref	
Crowded housing			1.2 (0.8 - 1.7)	
Region				
Auvergne-Rhone-Alpes	1.9 (1.3 - 2.9)	1.8 (1.2 - 2.7)		
Bourgogne-Franche-Comte	1.1 (0.7 - 1.9)	1.1 (0.7 - 1.9)		
Bretagne	0.6 (0.3 - 1.0)	0.5 (0.3 - 0.9)		
Centre-Val de Loire	ref	ref		
Corse	0.24 (0.02 - 1.22)	0.28 (0.03 - 1.62)		
Grand Est	1.5 (1.0 - 2.3)	1.5 (1.0 - 2.3)		
Hauts-de-France	1.8 (1.2 - 2.7)	1.8 (1.2 - 2.8)		
Ile-de-France	2.3 (1.6 - 3.5)	1.8 (1.2 - 2.6)		
Normandie	1.1 (0.7 - 1.9)	1.1 (0.6 - 1.8)		
Nouvelle-Aquitaine	0.8 (0.5 - 1.3)	0.8 (0.5 - 1.3)		
Occitanie	0.9 (0.6 - 1.4)	0.9 (0.6 - 1.4)		
Pays de la Loire	1.0 (0.6 - 1.6)	1.0 (0.6 - 1.6)		
Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur	0.8 (0.5 - 1.4)	0.8 (0.5 - 1.3)		

Abbreviations: OR odds ratio; 95% CrI, 95% credibility interval; ref, reference