medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Cohort Profile: Prospective Cohort to Study the COVID-19 Immune Response in Retail Workers in Québec, Canada (CISACOV)

Authors: Kim Santerre[1*], Mathieu Thériault[1*], Nicholas Brousseau[2], Samuel Rochette[3], Joelle N. Pelletier,[4,5,6] Caroline Gilbert,[1] Jean-François Masson,[4,7,8,9] Mariana Baz,[1] Denis Boudreau,[10] Sylvie Trottier[1]

1. Département de microbiologie-infectiologie et d'immunologie, Centre de recherche du centre hospitalier universitaire de Québec, Université Laval, Québec, QC G1V 4G2, Canada
2. Biological Risks Department, Institut national de santé publique du Québec, Québec, QC G1V 5B3, Canada
3. SR Scientific Writing Services, Brossard, QC J4Z 3C7, Canada
4. Department of Chemistry, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H2V 0B3, Canada
5. Department of Biochemistry, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H2V 0B3, Canada
6. PROTEO — The Québec Network for Research on Protein Function, Engineering, and Applications, Québec, QC G1V 0A6, Canada
7. Quebec center for advanced materials, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada
8. Regroupement québécois sur les matériaux de pointe, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9. Centre interdisciplinaire de recherche sur le cerveau et l'apprentissage, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada

10. Département de chimie et Centre d'optique, photonique et laser (COPL), Université Laval, Québec, QC G1V 0A6, Canada

*Co-first authors

Corresponding author:

Mariana Baz, PhD

E-mail : mariana.baz@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca

Tel: 418-525-4444 ext 48281

Mathieu Thériault, PhD

E-mail : mathieu.theriault@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca

Tel: 418-525-4444 ext 47992

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Retail workers are an understudied occupational group that may have been at increased risk of contracting SARS-CoV-2 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, we set up a longitudinal cohort of participants working in this sector to better document the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection and the immune response to infection and/or vaccination in this group.

Participants: A total of 304 participants were recruited between April 20, 2021 and October 22, 2021. They were invited to attend three visits (each separated by ~12 weeks) during which they provided blood samples and information on participant characteristics, COVID-19 symptoms, and vaccination. An extension phase of two additional visits was carried out between March 15th, 2022 and October 3rd, 2022 to document the impact of the Omicron variant among the 198 participants who were still eligible for recruitment. Participants were aged 18 to 75 and worked in grocery stores, hardware stores, bars or restaurants within the Québec City metropolitan area (Canada). *Findings to date:* This article describes participants' demographic, socioeconomic, behavioral, clinical and occupational characteristics, and their COVID-19 symptoms (where applicable). It also describes SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status and any SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test (i.e., PCR or rapid antigen) performed from the beginning of the pandemic until the last visit.

Future plans: The incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections will be assessed. The immune response (innate and acquired) to SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination will be studied

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

using a variety of techniques, including reference and experimental enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays, microneutralization assays with live viruses, experimental pseudoneutralization with an angiotensin-converting enzyme 2-spike assay, peripheral blood mononuclear cells and neutrophil stimulation, and a proliferation assay based on carboxyfluorescein diacetate succinimidyl ester.

Registration: Not applicable.

Strengths and limitations

- This cohort offers a comprehensive dataset to study the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination (alone), or hybrid immunity, as participants provided information on a wide range of demographic, socioeconomic, behavioral, clinical, and occupational variables. However, the low proportion of racial minorities (i.e., 3.0%) limits the use of this cohort to study racial determinants of immunity to SARS-CoV-2.
- This cohort focuses on workers in the food and retail service sector, an understudied population at high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents.
- This study covered seven pandemic waves and thus captured a large number of confirmed infections from different variants.
- Sample collection was initiated immediately prior to COVID-19 vaccine availability for this population and thus captured successive vaccination campaigns over 17 months.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- In keeping with the study design, none of the participants had severe COVID-19 disease requiring hospitalization at baseline, and none of the COVID-19 illnesses that occurred during the study required hospitalization; this cohort may not, therefore, be used to study the immune response leading to severe health outcomes, but is appropriate to study the immune response to mild SARS-CoV-2 infections.
- Nearly 1300 blood samples were collected; furthermore, only 13 out of 304 (4.3%) participants withdrew before attending all three initial visits, and 4 out of 198 (2.0%) participants who remained eligible in the extension phase withdrew before attending the fifth visit. A series of at least 5 blood samples drawn over 48 weeks is therefore available for most participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, workers with client-facing duties were considered to be at greater risk of infection than those who worked remotely.[1-3] Although most studies have focused on healthcare workers (HCW),[4 5] many non-HCWs were also considered to be at risk due to their occupational exposure.[6 7]

Workers in the food and retail industry are an understudied occupational group that may have been at greater risk of contracting SARS-CoV-2. These workers often have below-average incomes, face precarious employment conditions and lack benefit packages to cover health-related absenteeism. At the beginning of the pandemic, these workers often lacked the training and the access to protective equipment used by HCWs to reduce exposure.[8] However, risk is likely to vary from one sector to another. For example, grocery stores were considered an essential service and therefore remained open throughout the pandemic, with public health measures (e.g., mask wearing) being enforced and generally well respected. In contrast, restaurants and bars were intermittently opened and closed by health authorities over the same period, and public health measures were more difficult to enforce due to the intrinsically social nature of these businesses and their main purpose — the consumption of food and drink — that precluded continuous mask wearing.

Compelling evidence now confirms that the risk of occupational exposure is high for these workers. In a serological survey conducted in New York City prior to the approval of the first COVID-19 vaccine, the seroprevalence of anti-spike antibodies was higher among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

grocery store and restaurant workers than in most subgroups of HCWs.[1] In another serosurvey conducted in Switzerland, kitchen staff and grocery store workers exhibited an above-average seroprevalence compared to other essential workers.[9] In the Netherlands, individuals working in the hospitality sector were more likely to have a positive PCR test result than those working in non-close-contact occupations.[10] In Japan, restaurants and bars were the second most common setting of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks after healthcare facilities.[7 11]

To date, no thorough investigation of SARS-CoV-2 exposure has been conducted among Canadian workers in grocery stores, hardware stores, bars or restaurants.[12 13] Such an investigation could help better prepare health authorities when implementing future measures, including the designation of priority groups for vaccination, and mandatory lockdowns in these sectors. Accordingly, we set up a longitudinal cohort that investigated the incidence of COVID-19 and the humoral and cellular immunity (innate and acquired) to SARS-CoV-2 in these workers. This article describes the experimental design of the project and the cohort of participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

COHORT DESCRIPTION

Participants and setting

Eligibility criteria included the following: (1) providing informed consent; (2) age ≥18 years; (3) working either on a full-time or part-time basis in a grocery store, hardware store, bar or restaurant located in the administrative regions of Capitale-Nationale and Chaudière-Appalaches that include and surround the area of Québec City, Canada; (4) having a public-facing role in daily work-related activities; (5) having worked ≥20 full days between February 1st, 2020 and the first visit; and (6) having no history of hospitalization due to COVID-19.

Participants were recruited using a variety of strategies: 1) an online recruitment campaign conducted by a student-run communication agency; 2) email invitations to members of partner union organizations - *Confédération des syndicats nationaux* (CSN) and to sectoral organizations of hardware store workers - *Association Québécoise de la quincaillerie et des matériaux de construction* (AQMAT); and 3) email information to all students and employees at *Université Laval* and the *Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Québec* in order to publicize the study.

Design and procedures

The study was initially designed as a prospective cohort study with three sampling visits, each separated by 12±2 weeks, between April 20th, 2021 and October 3rd, 2022. In response to the emergence of Omicron, an extension of two additional visits was proposed to the participants who were still eligible for recruitment. An additional COVID-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

19 visit (VCoV) was also planned shortly after the occurrence of any SARS-CoV-2 infection during the study period (Figure 1).

At the first visit ("V1"), participants signed an informed consent form and were then interviewed by trained nurses to obtain information on demographic, socioeconomic, behavioral, clinical and occupational variables (Table 1). The questionnaires were adapted from those suggested by our funding body, the COVID Immunity Task Force (CITF).[14] At or after the third visit ("V3"), eligible participants received information about the extension of the study and signed a new informed consent if they were interested in participating.

At the second ("V2"), third ("V3"), fourth ("V4") and fifth visits ("V5"), participants completed an abridged version of the V1 questionnaire that focused the COVID-19 vaccines that they received and SARS-CoV-2 symptoms, diagnosis, exposure and associated risk factors (Table 1). Blood was drawn to study humoral immunity (i.e., at V1 to V5) and cellular immunity (i.e., at V1, V3, and V5) to SARS-CoV-2. Additional PCR tests were carried out at V4 and V5 to detect asymptomatic carriers.

The VCoV visits took place at a median time of 15 days (10 to 42 days) after the onset of symptoms. Blood was drawn to study humoral and cellular immunity and a questionnaire focusing exclusively on SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis and symptoms was completed at that visit.

Study exposures and follow-up

The two main exposures of the study were SARS-CoV-2 infection, defined as a positive test result for SARS-CoV-2 (PCR or antigen detection), and participants'

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

vaccination status. Participants were asked about possible or confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (i.e., symptoms, diagnostic test, test date and test result) and their SARS-CoV-2 vaccination history (i.e., number of doses, date of vaccination, type of vaccine) since the beginning of the pandemic at V1, and since the last visit (at V2 to V5). Positive SARS-CoV-2 test results were therefore captured from the beginning of the pandemic until the earliest among the last visit, withdrawal from the study, or loss of eligibility.

Study outcome

The primary outcomes were vaccine- and infection-induced immunity. We also explored the humoral immunity, using different techniques and antigens, and the cellular immunity (innate and acquired).

Confidentiality and data storage

This study was approved by the « *Comité d'éthique de la recherche du CHU de Québec – Université Laval* » (registration number 2021-5744). A unique, anonymized identifier was assigned to each participant and used to store the data and the samples. The samples will be stored for up to 10 years, and the data for at least 15 years.

Patient and public involvement statement

No public stakeholders were involved in establishing and designing this cohort.

Participant characteristics

Overall, 304 individuals were initially recruited to attend the three first visits from April 20th, 2021 to May 9th, 2022. The cohort included 149 (49.0%) restaurant/bar

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

workers, 112 (36.8%) grocery store workers, and 43 (14.1%) hardware store workers. With the emergence of Omicron, 198 participants who at the time of ethic approval were still within the recruiting window, were included for two additional visits (12±4 weeks apart) between March 15th, 2022 and October 3rd, 2022. Only 13 out of 304 (4.3%) withdrew before V3, and only 4 more out of 198 (2.0%) withdrew at V5, resulting in a series of at least 5 blood samples drawn over 48 weeks for most participants.

On average, participants were aged 41.3 years in the overall cohort (Table 2). Specifically, restaurants/bar workers were on average 37.2 years old, grocery store workers 44.2 and hardware store workers 48.2. Female participants represented 57.9% of the cohort. Overall, 96.7% self-identified as White, 1.6% as Asian, 1.0% as Latino American, and 0.7% as Black. The low proportion of racial minorities (i.e., 3.3%) is consistent with the size of the visible minority population in the Québec City metropolitan area (i.e., 4.9% according to census).[15] Levels of education varied: 39.4% reported having a high school diploma or vocational certificate, 33.2% a higher education certificate and 22.7% at least a university degree. In total, 76.0% of participants resided in the Capitale-Nationale administrative region, the remainder residing in the Chaudière-Appalaches administrative region (Table 3). Most (i.e., 62.2%) lived alone or with one other person, 23.0% lived with children (<18 years), 15.5% with HCWs and 7.6% with teachers or kindergarten workers. These distributions were similar within each occupational group.

According to body mass index (BMI), 41.1% of the participants had a healthy weight (i.e., BMI=18.5 to 24.9 kg/m^2), 27.0% were overweight (BMI=25.0 to 29.9 kg/m^2) and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

30.6% were obese (BMI ≥30 kg/m^2) (Table 4). Only 1.3% were considered underweight (BMI <18.5 kg/m^2). Cigarette (i.e., tobacco) use was reported by 17.4% of the participants and e-cigarette use by 7.9%. About half (i.e., 47.7%) of participants reported having at least one comorbidity. Hardware store workers had more comorbidities, probably because they were slightly older (on average). Overall, 17.1% reported usually receiving an annual influenza vaccine (13.8% in the year prior to the first visit).

Approximately half (i.e., 53.6%) of the participants reported working on average more than 30 hours per week (Table 5). Most (88.8%) had attended at least one gathering of 10 or more persons during the study period, and 40.8% reported attending more than 10 such gatherings. The predominant mode of transportation was by car (88%), followed by bus (12.8%) and walking (9.2%). Traveling outside the province of Québec was reported by 47.0% of the participants, with 25.7% travelling within Canada, 14.8% to the United States, and 27.6% elsewhere. The distribution of participants in each occupational group was similar for the workplace region, mode of transportation and travelling, but differed for the weekly hours worked and the number of gatherings attended.

Overall, 98.7% of the participants reported wearing a mask at work, indicating excellent adherence to this measure (Table 6). Other measures, such as handwashing (98.4%), distancing (70.1%) and the use of Plexiglas dividers (77.3%) were also frequent. The use of gloves (6.9%) and face-shields (10.5%), which were not extensively promoted by the regional public health authorities, were less frequent. Outside work, all participants reported wearing a mask in public (100.0%); most avoided usual salutations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(85.2%), practiced social distancing (84.2%) and avoided contact with vulnerable persons (83.6%) and crowded places (76.6%). Most participants reported washing their hands when dirty (96.7%), after using the bathroom (97.7%), when arriving at (92.1%) and leaving the workplace (71.7%), before eating (87.8%) and after handling trash (79.6%). In general, adherence to these measures was consistently lower among restaurant and bar workers, possibly because of the nature of their work or their younger age (on average).

FINDINGS TO DATE

SARS-CoV-2 infection

Overall, 168 positive tests were reported in 121 participants throughout the study period (Table 7). Of these tests, 117 were the first to yield a positive result as reported by the participants; 40 (performed by 37 participants) were additional tests with 32 considered follow-up tests (<90 days since previous test) and 8 detecting a second or third infection (>90 days since previous test). The remaining 11 (including four first-ever positives) were PCR tests performed as per protocol at V4 and V5 among asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals. In addition, 29 participants reported 31 suspected COVID-19 infections based on their symptoms, although not confirmed by a PCR or antigen detection test.

SARS-CoV-2-related symptoms

Among the 117 participants with a first confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, 94.9% reported ≥1 symptom at the time of testing (Table 8). Each individual symptom was experienced by ≥47.9% of participants, except for diarrhea (13.7%) and loss of smell or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

taste (22.2%), a pattern consistent with prior studies.[16-18] These distributions were similar within each occupational group.

Vaccination for SARS-CoV-2

The participants were vaccinated according to local government recommendations with the vaccines approved by Canadian health authorities. The COVID-19 vaccines available were monovalent Comirnaty (Pfizer-BioNTech), Spikevax (Moderna) and Vaxzevria (AstraZeneca), which each required two doses to complete the primary series. Hardware store workers were the most highly vaccinated occupational group, 100% of them having received two doses by February 2022 (Figure 2). By the end of the study (i.e., last visit between May 10th, 2022 and October 3rd, 2022), nearly 70% of all participants had received at least one booster dose.

At the time of testing positive, 17.9% of the participants had received no vaccine dose, 0.9% had received a single dose of vaccine, 38.4% had received two, 39.3% had received three, and 3.4% had received four (Table 9). In participants who tested positive and had received at least two vaccine doses, all infections occurred after the 4th wave, when the Omicron variant was predominant.

Blood sample bank to study infection-induced, vaccine-induced, and hybrid immunity

Overall, 1299 blood samples were collected, including 304 (23.4%) at V1, 297 (22.9%) at V2, 291 (22.4%) at V3, 198 (15.2%) at V4, 194 (15.0%) at V5, and 15 (1.2%) at additional visits (i.e., VCoV). In total, 69.2% of the blood samples were drawn from vaccinated participants with no known history of SARS-CoV-2 infection, 23.1% from vaccinated and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

previously infected participants, 6.9% from unvaccinated participants with no known history of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and 11 (0.8%) from previously infected and unvaccinated participants (Table 10).

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

We set up a cohort of 304 participants to conduct a longitudinal study of COVID-19 immunity among food and retail workers who lived and worked within the greater Québec City metropolitan region. The participants provided information on a wide range of demographic, socioeconomic, behavioral, clinical and occupational variables. The study covered seven waves of COVID-19 infection, including those dominated by the Alpha, Delta, and Omicron variants, thus capturing a relatively large number of epidemiological periods and infections. In addition, the blood samples were collected at each scheduled visit regardless of participants' infection or vaccination history, thus enabling the study of infection-induced, vaccine-induced and hybrid immunity in this extensively characterized cohort. Moreover, few participants withdrew from the study before the end of the initial (i.e., V1-V3) and extension phases (i.e., V4-V5), resulting in complete series of at least 5 samples for most participants.

A total of 117 first (ever) COVID-19 infections were reported, and most occurred between December 5th, 2021 and October 3rd, 2022, consistent with the emergence of the highly contagious Omicron variant. In the present study, vaccine coverage was high: by the time Omicron had emerged, nearly 95% of the participants had already received two vaccine doses (primary series). This high rate of vaccination may be because retail

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

workers considered themselves at higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 exposure than the general population and were thus more willing to get vaccinated and reduce their risk of infection.

Some limitations must be considered when interpreting our results. Per the study design, none of the participants had previously experienced a severe COVID-19 illness that required hospitalization. Therefore, the cohort may not be used to study the immune response that leads to severe health outcomes, but is appropriate to study the immune response to mild COVID-19 illness. Furthermore, our study was not designed to infer a causal relationship between a worker's occupational sector and the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, such that confounders probably explain part of the differences among occupational groups. For example, relative to hardware store workers, grocery store workers were younger (i.e., mean age: 44.2 vs. 48.2 years), included more overweight or obese participants (i.e., 72.3% vs. 46.5%), and lived in more crowded households (i.e., proportion with ≥3 residents: 49.1% vs. 25.6%), which may have predisposed them to infection. Another limitation is that the cohort may have been subject to a sampling bias as there may be less vaccine hesitancy among people willing to participate in a scientific study. Hence, the study participants may not be representative of the overall population of workers in these sectors. This is suggested by the 5% to 7% higher vaccination coverage for the second dose as of fall 2021 compared to the general population of the province of Québec.

The low proportion of racial minorities (i.e., 3.0%) also limits the use of this cohort to study racial determinants of immunity to SARS-CoV-2. In addition, participant responses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

may have been affected by a memory bias, particularly for those whose last infection occurred months before V1. Moreover, few samples were drawn from unvaccinated and previously infected participants, so that the cohort may be of limited use to study immunity induced by infection alone. The high vaccination coverage also made it impossible to assess the impact of vaccination on the risk of infection, since, at any given time, most participants had been vaccinated. Lastly, our study may have underestimated the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection since most infections occurred during the Omicron wave, when access to PCR-based screening was limited in Québec (and only less sensitive antigen detection tests were available). The serology data of these samples will shed light on this question.

COLLABORATION

More detailed, participant-level information is publicly available on an online platform developed by Maelstrom Research.[19] Researchers with other enquiries or collaboration proposals may contact Sylvie Trottier — the principal investigator in charge of setting up the cohort — at sylvie.trottier@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca. Data on participants' immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination will be shared through peer-reviewed publications.

Funding: This project is being supported by funding from the Public Health Agency of Canada, through the Vaccine Surveillance Reference group and the COVID-19 Immunity Task Force (grant number: 2021-HQ-000134).

Competing interests statement: Nothing to declare.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data sharing statement: All participant-level information is publicly available on an online platform developed by Maelstrom Research.

Author contributions: The co-principal investigators of the study were DB and ST, who conceived the study and led the proposal. Protocol design and development team: J.N.P., C.G., J.-F.M., M.B., D.B., and S.T. K.S. constructed the data base, coordinated the study and contributed to the data analysis. M.T. did the maintenance and the development of the data base, the cleaning of the data and contributed to data analysis. N.B. oversaw the data analysis. S.R. participated to data analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the participants and all the staff involved in planning and preparation of this study. David Simonyan helped with statistical analysis. A special thank you to our partners: CSN Federation of Commerce and AQMAT.

ORCID iDs

Sylvie Trottier https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3986-5146

Denis Boudreau https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-5152-2464

Caroline Gilbert https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2722-1180

Jean-Francois Masson https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0101-0468

Mariana Baz https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1230-0735

Joelle Pelletier https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2934-6940

Mathieu Thériault https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7293-7623

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Pathela P, Crawley A, Weiss D, et al. Seroprevalence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Following the Largest Initial Epidemic Wave in the United States: Findings From New York City, 13 May to 21 July 2020. *J Infect Dis* 2021;224(2):196-206. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiab200
2. Feehan AK, Velasco C, Fort D, et al. Racial and Workplace Disparities in Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;27(1) doi: 10.3201/eid2701.203808 [published Online First: 20201110]
3. Sim MR. The COVID-19 pandemic: major risks to healthcare and other workers on the front line. *Occup Environ Med* 2020;77(5):281-82. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2020-106567 [published Online First: 20200401]
4. Gomez-Ochoa SA, Franco OH, Rojas LZ, et al. COVID-19 in Health-Care Workers: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prevalence, Risk Factors, Clinical Characteristics, and Outcomes. *Am J Epidemiol* 2021;190(1):161-75. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwaa191
5. Gholami M, Fawad I, Shadan S, et al. COVID-19 and healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021;104:335-46. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.01.013 [published Online First: 20210111]
6. Boucher E, Cao C, D'Mello S, et al. Occupation and SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence studies: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2023;13(2):e063771. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-063771 [published Online First: 20230228]
7. Vachon MS, Demmer RT, Yendell S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Survey in Grocery Store Workers-Minnesota, 2020-2021. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;19(6) doi: 10.3390/ijerph19063501 [published Online First: 20220316]
8. Parks CA, Nugent NB, Fleischhacker SE, et al. Food System Workers are the Unexpected but Under Protected COVID Heroes. *J Nutr* 2020;150(8):2006-08. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxaa173
9. Stringhini S, Zaballa ME, Pullen N, et al. Large variation in anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence among essential workers in Geneva, Switzerland. *Nat Commun* 2021;12(1):3455. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-23796-4 [published Online First: 20210608]
10. de Gier B, de Oliveira Bressane Lima P, van Gaalen RD, et al. Occupation- and age-associated risk of SARS-CoV-2 test positivity, the Netherlands, June to October 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25(50) doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.50.2001884
11. Furuse Y, Sando E, Tsuchiya N, et al. Clusters of Coronavirus Disease in Communities, Japan, January-April 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020;26(9) doi: 10.3201/eid2609.202272 [published Online First: 20200610]
12. Decarie Y, Michaud PC. Counting the Dead: COVID-19 and Mortality in Quebec and British Columbia During the First Wave. *Can Stud Popul* 2021;48(2-3):139-64. doi: 10.1007/s42650-021-00053-z [published Online First: 20210917]
13. Shim E. Regional Variability in COVID-19 Case Fatality Rate in Canada, February-December 2020. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;18(4) doi: 10.3390/ijerph18041839 [published Online First: 20210214]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

14. COVID-19 Immunity Task Force standardized core survey data elements [Available from: https://www.covid19immunitytaskforce.ca/covid-19-immunity-task-force-releases-standardized-core-survey-data-elements/ accessed February 15th, 2023 2023.
15. Census profile, 2016 census, Québec City [Available from: https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=2423027&Geo2=CD&Code2=2423&Data=Count&SearchText=quebec&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&TABID=1 accessed February 16th, 2023.
16. Zhu J, Ji P, Pang J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 3062 COVID-19 patients: A meta-analysis. *J Med Virol* 2020;92(10):1902-14. doi: 10.1002/jmv.25884 [published Online First: 20200624]
17. Burke RM, Killerby ME, Newton S, et al. Symptom Profiles of a Convenience Sample of Patients with COVID-19 - United States, January-April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69(28):904-08. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6928a2 [published Online First: 20200717]
18. Government C. COVID-19 signs, symptoms and severity of disease: A clinician guide. [Available from: https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/signs-symptoms-severity.html.
19. Boudreau DT, Sylvie; Masson, Jean-François; Baz Etchebarne, Mariana; Gilbert, Caroline; Pelletier, Joëlle;. CISACOV investigators. Cellular Immunity and Seroprevalence of Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2: Characterisation of Three Populations of Food Workers. , 2021-2022.
20. Canada Go. COVID-19 vaccination in Canada: Government of Canada; 2023 [updated 2023-03-03. Available from: https://health-infobase.canada.ca/covid-19/vaccination-coverage/.

421 **TABLES AND FIGURES**

422 **Table 1. Participant visits**

	Visit 1 N=304	Visit 2 N=297	Visit N=291	Visit 4 N=198	Visit 5 N=194	COVID-19 visit (VCoV) N=15
Retention	**100%**	**98%**	**96%**	**100%**	**98%**	**-**
Eligibility assessment	X			X		
Consent form	X			X		
Participant characteristics						
Demographic data	X					
Household data	X					
Clinical data	X					
Occupational data	X	X	X	X	X	X
Retrospective questionnaire form						
COVID-19 positive tests & symptoms	X	X	X	X	X	X
Vaccine status	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cross-section interventions						
Humoral immunity blood samples	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cellular immunity blood samples	X		X		X	X
COVID-19 PCR test at visit				X	X	

423

424 **Table 2. Detailed demographics of study participants at the first visit**

	Overall study population		Restaurant/bar workers		Grocery store workers		Hardware store workers	
	Total (N=304)	COVID-19[1] (N=117)	Total (N=149)	COVID-19[1] (N=62)	Total (N=112)	COVID-19[1] (N=42)	Total (N=43)	COVID-19[1] (N=13)
Age (years), Mean±SD	41.3 ± 15.9	39.6 ± 14.6	37.2 ± 14.8	36.2 ± 14.3	44.2 ± 15.3	42.4 ± 14.1	48.2 ± 17.3	46.5 ± 14.6
Age groups, N (%)								
18-59	257 (84.5%)	106 (90.6%)	135 (90.6%)	57 (91.9%)	93 (83.0%)	37 (88.1%)	29 (67.4%)	12 (92.3%)
60-75	47 (15.5%)	11 (9.4%)	14 (9.4%)	5 (8.1%)	19 (17.0%)	5 (11.9%)	14 (32.6%)	1 (7.7%)
Sex, N (%)								
Female	176 (57.9%)	72 (61.5%)	95 (63.8%)	39 (62.9%)	57 (50.9%)	25 (59.5%)	24 (55.8%)	8 (61.5%)
Male	128 (42.1%)	45 (38.5%)	54 (36.2%)	23 (37.1%)	55 (49.1%)	17 (40.5%)	19 (44.2%)	5 (38.5%)
Race/ethnicity,[2] N (%)								
White	294 (96.7%)	114 (97.4%)	142 (95.3%)	61 (98.4%)	109 (97.3%)	40 (95.2%)	43 (100.0%)	13 (100.0%)
Asian	5 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Black	2 (0.7%)	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Latino American	3 (1.0%)	1 (0.9%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Educational attainment, N (%)								
Less than high school	14 (4.6%)	3 (2.6%)	4 (2.7%)	2 (3.2%)	9 (8.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (7.7%)
High school	79 (26.0%)	27 (23.1%)	42 (28.2%)	14 (22.6%)	23 (20.5%)	7 (16.7%)	14 (32.6%)	6 (46.2%)
Professional certificate	41 (13.5%)	13 (11.1%)	19 (12.8%)	6 (9.7%)	16 (14.3%)	6 (14.3%)	6 (14.0%)	1 (7.7%)
CEGEP and college certificate	101 (33.2%)	45 (38.5%)	51 (34.2%)	26 (41.9%)	35 (31.3%)	14 (33.3%)	15 (34.9%)	5 (38.5%)
University baccalaureate	54 (17.8%)	22 (18.8%)	28 (18.8%)	12 (19.4%)	21 (18.8%)	10 (23.8%)	5 (11.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Graduate studies	15 (4.9%)	7 (6.0%)	5 (3.4%)	2 (3.2%)	8 (7.1%)	5 (11.9%)	2 (4.7%)	0 (0.0%)

425 Abbreviations: CEGEP = General and professional teaching college

426 Notes:

427 1. Subset of participants who contracted COVID-19 at least once during the study period.

428 2. Self-reported by study participants

429 **Table 3. Household characteristics of the participants at the first visit**

	Overall study population		Restaurant/bar workers		Grocery store workers		Hardware store workers	
	Total (N=304)	COVID-19[1] (N=117)	Total (N=149)	COVID-19[1] (N=62)	Total (N=112)	COVID-19[1] (N=42)	Total (N=43)	COVID-19[1] (N=13)
Region, N (%)								
Capitale-Nationale	231 (76,0%)	91 (77,8%)	112 (75,2%)	45 (72,6%)	86 (76,8%)	35 (83,3%)	33 (76,7%)	11 (84,6%)
Chaudière-Appalaches	73 (24,0%)	26 (22,2%)	37 (24,8%)	17 (27,4%)	26 (23,2%)	7 (16,7%)	10 (23,3%)	2 (15,4%)
Household size, N (%)								
1-2 residents	189 (62,2%)	76 (65,0%)	100 (67,1%)	48 (77,4%)	57 (50,9%)	19 (45,2%)	32 (74,4%)	9 (69,2%)
3-4 residents	93 (30,6%)	32 (27,4%)	36 (24,2%)	10 (16,1%)	48 (42,9%)	19 (45,2%)	9 (20,9%)	3 (23,1%)
≥5 residents	22 (7,2%)	9 (7,7%)	13 (8,7%)	4 (6,5%)	7 (6,3%)	4 (9,5%)	2 (4,7%)	1 (7,7%)
Co-residents, N (%)								
Underage (<18)	70 (23,0%)	29 (24,8%)	35 (23,5%)	12 (19,4%)	29 (25,9%)	14 (33,3%)	6 (14,0%)	3 (23,1%)
Healthcare worker	47 (15,5%)	17 (14,5%)	23 (15,4%)	9 (14,5%)	18 (16,1%)	5 (11,9%)	6 (14,0%)	3 (23,1%)
Kindergarden worker	10 (3,3%)	3 (2,6%)	5 (3,4%)	1 (1,6%)	5 (4,5%)	2 (4,8%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
Teacher	13 (4,3%)	7 (6,0%)	9 (6,0%)	4 (6,5%)	4 (3,6%)	3 (7,1%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
Household bedroom, N (%)								
0-2	158 (52,0%)	66 (56,4%)	90 (60,4%)	41 (66,1%)	49 (43,8%)	19 (45,2%)	19 (44,2%)	6 (46,2%)
≥3	146 (48,0%)	51 (43,6%)	59 (39,6%)	21 (33,9%)	63 (56,3%)	23 (54,8%)	24 (55,8%)	7 (53,8%)

430 Notes:

431 1. Subset of participants who contracted COVID-19 had least once during the study period.

432

433

434 **Table 4. Clinical characteristics of study participants at the first visit**

	Overall study population		Restaurant/bar workers		Grocery store workers		Hardware store workers	
	Total (N=304)	COVID-19[1] (N=117)	Total (N=149)	COVID-19[1] (N=62)	Total (N=112)	COVID-19[1] (N=42)	Total (N=43)	COVID-19[1] (N=13)
BMI scores, Mean±SD	27,3 ± 6,1	27,5 ± 6,4	27,0 ± 6,9	26,83 ± 6,7	28,1 ± 5,3	27,94 ± 5,2	26,3 ± 5,3	27,51 ± 6,6
BMI categories, N (%)								
<18.5 (underweight)	4 (1,3%)	1 (0,9%)	2 (1,3%)	1 (1,6%)	2 (1,8%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
18.5-24.9 (healthy weight)	125 (41,1%)	49 (41,9%)	73 (49,0%)	30 (48,4%)	29 (25,9%)	13 (31,0%)	23 (53,5%)	6 (46,2%)
25.0-29.9 (overweight)	82 (27,0%)	23 (19,7%)	31 (20,8%)	10 (16,1%)	39 (34,8%)	9 (21,4%)	12 (27,9%)	4 (30,8%)
≥30 (obesity)	93 (30,6%)	44 (37,6%)	43 (28,9%)	21 (33,9%)	42 (37,5%)	20 (47,6%)	8 (18,6%)	3 (23,1%)
Smoking, N (%)								
Cigarette user	53 (17,4%)	22 (18,8%)	33 (22,1%)	14 (22,6%)	16 (14,3%)	6 (14,3%)	4 (9,3%)	2 (15,4%)
E-cigarette user	24 (7,9%)	8 (6,8%)	20 (13,4%)	6 (9,7%)	3 (2,7%)	2 (4,8%)	1 (2,3%)	0 (0,0%)
Comorbidities,[2] N (%)								
Hypertension	39 (12,8%)	11 (9,4%)	13 (8,7%)	4 (6,5%)	18 (16,1%)	6 (14,3%)	8 (18,6%)	1 (7,7%)
Chronic pulmonary disease	33 (10,9%)	17 (14,5%)	13 (8,7%)	6 (9,7%)	14 (12,5%)	10 (23,8%)	6 (14,0%)	1 (7,7%)
Diabetes mellitus	18 (5,9%)	5 (4,3%)	4 (2,7%)	1 (1,6%)	11 (9,8%)	3 (7,1%)	3 (7,0%)	1 (7,7%)
Hypothyroidism	16 (5,3%)	4 (3,4%)	6 (4,0%)	2 (3,2%)	6 (5,4%)	1 (2,4%)	5 (11,6%)	1 (7,7%)
Cancer	10 (3,3%)	3 (2,6%)	4 (2,7%)	1 (1,6%)	5 (4,5%)	2 (4,8%)	1 (2,3%)	0 (0,0%)
Cardiovascular disease	8 (2,6%)	2 (1,7%)	2 (1,3%)	0 (0,0%)	3 (2,7%)	1 (2,4%)	3 (7,0%)	1 (7,7%)
Immune deficiency	7 (2,3%)	5 (4,3%)	3 (2,0%)	3 (4,8%)	1 (0,9%)	0 (0,0%)	3 (7,0%)	2 (15,4%)
Chronic neurological disorder	6 (2,0%)	1 (0,9%)	2 (1,3%)	1 (1,6%)	3 (2,7%)	0 (0,0%)	1 (2,3%)	0 (0,0%)
Liver disease	2 (0,7%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	1 (0,9%)	0 (0,0%)	1 (2,3%)	0 (0,0%)
Blood disorder	1 (0,3%)	1 (0,9%)	1 (0,7%)	1 (1,6%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
Obesity[3]	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Kidney disease	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
Influenza vaccination, N (%)								
Usually received	52 (17,1%)	21 (17,9%)	23 (15,4%)	12 (19,4%)	18 (16,1%)	7 (16,7%)	11 (25,6%)	2 (15,4%)
Received in the last year	42 (13,8%)	12 (10,3%)	17 (11,4%)	5 (8,1%)	15 (13,4%)	5 (11,9%)	10 (23,3%)	2 (15,4%)

435 Notes:

436 1. Subset of participants who contracted COVID-19 had least once during the study period.

437 2. Comorbidities related to an increased risk of hospitalisation at the first visit.

438 3. 30.6% of participants had a BMI in the range of obesity, but only one reported to be obese.

439 **Table 5. Occupational and behavioral characteristic of study participants**

	Overall study population		Restaurant/bar workers		Grocery store workers		Hardware store workers	
	Total (N=304)	COVID-19[1] (N=117)	Total (N=149)	COVID-19[1] (N=62)	Total (N=112)	COVID-19[1] (N=42)	Total (N=43)	COVID-19[1] (N=13)
Workplace region,[2] N (%)								
Capitale-Nationale	240 (78,9%)	96 (82,1%)	123 (82,6%)	49 (79,0%)	85 (75,9%)	36 (85,7%)	32 (74,4%)	11 (84,6%)
Chaudière-Appalaches	64 (21,1%)	19 (16,2%)	26 (17,4%)	12 (19,4%)	27 (24,1%)	6 (14,3%)	11 (25,6%)	1 (7,7%)
Weekly hours worked,[3] Mean±SD	27,9 ± 11,5	28,9 ± 11,4	24,7 ± 11,0	24,5 ± 11,0	32,6 ± 10,4	34,2 ± 9,8	26,6 ± 11,9	32,3 ± 10,4
Participants working								
Full time (≥30)	141 (46,4%)	64 (54,7%)	49 (32,9%)	23 (37,1%)	73 (65,2%)	32 (76,2%)	19 (44,2%)	9 (69,2%)
Part time (<30)	163 (53,6%)	53 (45,3%)	100 (67,1%)	39 (62,9%)	39 (34,8%)	10 (23,8%)	24 (55,8%)	4 (30,8%)
Gathering of 10+ persons,[3] Mean±SD	17,1 ± 27,5	22,5 ± 31,4	23,2 ± 33,9	31,5 ± 38,9	10,4 ± 15,8	13,1 ± 15,9	13,7 ± 22,1	9,9 ± 10,4
Per group, N (%)								
None	34 (11,2%)	6 (5,1%)	16 (10,7%)	2 (3,2%)	15 (13,4%)	4 (9,5%)	3 (7,0%)	0 (0,0%)
1 to 10 gatherings	146 (48,0%)	47 (40,2%)	57 (38,3%)	16 (25,8%)	62 (55,4%)	22 (52,4%)	27 (62,8%)	9 (69,2%)
11 to 50 gatherings	101 (33,2%)	51 (43,6%)	58 (38,9%)	33 (53,2%)	32 (28,6%)	14 (33,3%)	11 (25,6%)	4 (30,8%)
>50 gatherings	23 (7,6%)	13 (11,1%)	18 (12,1%)	11 (17,7%)	3 (2,7%)	2 (4,8%)	2 (4,7%)	0 (0,0%)
Transportation,[2] N (%)								
Car	266 (87,5%)	103 (88,0%)	127 (85,2%)	54 (87,1%)	98 (87,5%)	37 (88,1%)	41 (95,3%)	12 (92,3%)
Carpooling	2 (0,7%)	2 (1,7%)	1 (0,7%)	1 (1,6%)	1 (0,9%)	1 (2,4%)	0 (0,0%)	0 (0,0%)
Bus	39 (12,8%)	16 (13,7%)	23 (15,4%)	9 (14,5%)	10 (8,9%)	5 (11,9%)	6 (14,0%)	2 (15,4%)
Bicycle	13 (4,3%)	6 (5,1%)	7 (4,7%)	3 (4,8%)	4 (3,6%)	2 (4,8%)	2 (4,7%)	1 (7,7%)
Walking	28 (9,2%)	11 (9,4%)	13 (8,7%)	6 (9,7%)	14 (12,5%)	5 (11,9%)	1 (2,3%)	0 (0,0%)
Travel,[3] N (%)								
Any destination	143 (47,0%)	70 (59,8%)	79 (53,0%)	40 (64,5%)	48 (42,9%)	25 (59,5%)	16 (37,2%)	5 (38,5%)
In Canada	78 (25,7%)	39 (33,3%)	45 (30,2%)	24 (38,7%)	23 (20,5%)	13 (31,0%)	10 (23,3%)	2 (15,4%)
To USA	45 (14,8%)	20 (17,1%)	25 (16,8%)	11 (17,7%)	16 (14,3%)	8 (19,0%)	4 (9,3%)	1 (7,7%)
Other destination[4]	84 (27,6%)	45 (38,5%)	47 (31,5%)	25 (40,3%)	28 (25,0%)	16 (38,1%)	9 (20,9%)	4 (30,8%)

440 Notes:

441 1. Subset of participants who contracted COVID-19 had least once during the study period.

2. At the time of the first visit (i.e., week 0).

3. During the entire study period.

4. Includes travel to Cuba, Ireland, Great-Britain, Luxembourg, Dominican Republic, South Africa, Bahamas, Morocco, Guadeloupe, Panama, Costa Rica, Greece.

447 **Table 6. Protective measures taken at work and elsewhere by study participants at first visit**

	Overall study population		Restaurant/bar workers		Grocery store workers		Hardware store workers	
	Total (N=304)	COVID-19[1] (N=117)	Total (N=149)	COVID-19[1] (N=62)	Total (N=112)	COVID-19[1] (N=42)	Total (N=43)	COVID-19[1] (N=13)
Protection measures at work,[2] N (%)								
Mask	300 (98,7%)	116 (99,1%)	147 (98,7%)	61 (98,4%)	111 (99,1%)	42 (100,0%)	41 (95,3%)	13 (100,0%)
Handwashing	299 (98,4%)	114 (97,4%)	145 (97,3%)	59 (95,2%)	111 (99,1%)	42 (100,0%)	43 (100,0%)	13 (100,0%)
Plexiglas	235 (77,3%)	88 (75,2%)	96 (64,4%)	39 (62,9%)	98 (87,5%)	37 (88,1%)	41 (95,3%)	12 (92,3%)
Social distancing	213 (70,1%)	86 (73,5%)	111 (74,5%)	48 (77,4%)	74 (66,1%)	29 (69,0%)	28 (65,1%)	9 (69,2%)
Protective glasses	77 (25,3%)	12 (10,3%)	30 (20,1%)	4 (6,5%)	35 (31,3%)	5 (11,9%)	12 (27,9%)	3 (23,1%)
Faceshield	32 (10,5%)	4 (3,4%)	16 (10,7%)	1 (1,6%)	13 (11,6%)	2 (4,8%)	3 (7,0%)	1 (7,7%)
Gloves	21 (6,9%)	3 (2,6%)	10 (6,7%)	0 (0,0%)	9 (8,0%)	3 (7,1%)	2 (4,7%)	0 (0,0%)
Face Cover	7 (2,3%)	1 (0,9%)	3 (2,0%)	0 (0,0%)	4 (3,6%)	1 (2,4%)	0 -	0 (0,0%)
Other[3]	135 (44,4%)	59 (50,4%)	85 (57,0%)	41 (66,1%)	43 (38,4%)	16 (38,1%)	7 (16,3%)	2 (15,4%)
Behavioral protection measures,[2] N (%)								
Mask wearing in public spaces	304 (100,0%)	117 (100,0%)	149 (100,0%)	62 (100,0%)	112 (100,0%)	42 (100,0%)	43 (100,0%)	12 (92,3%)
Avoid usual salutations	259 (85,2%)	99 (84,6%)	119 (79,9%)	48 (77,4%)	103 (92,0%)	39 (92,9%)	37 (86,0%)	12 (92,3%)
Social distancing	256 (84,2%)	93 (79,5%)	115 (77,2%)	41 (66,1%)	102 (91,1%)	40 (95,2%)	39 (90,7%)	12 (92,3%)
Avoid contacts with vulnerable persons	254 (83,6%)	93 (79,5%)	114 (76,5%)	42 (67,7%)	100 (89,3%)	38 (90,5%)	40 (93,0%)	13 (100,0%)
Avoid crowded places	233 (76,6%)	81 (69,2%)	102 (68,5%)	35 (56,5%)	94 (83,9%)	34 (81,0%)	37 (86,0%)	12 (92,3%)
Quarantine if exposed to COVID-19	126 (41,4%)	70 (59,8%)	65 (43,6%)	36 (58,1%)	46 (41,1%)	25 (59,5%)	15 (34,9%)	9 (69,2%)
Pre-emptive isolation	36 (11,8%)	23 (19,7%)	21 (14,1%)	13 (21,0%)	12 (10,7%)	9 (21,4%)	3 (7,0%)	1 (7,7%)
Handwashing habits,[2] N (%)								
After using the toilet	297 (97,7%)	115 (98,3%)	147 (98,7%)	60 (96,8%)	109 (97,3%)	42 (100,0%)	41 (95,3%)	13 (100,0%)
When dirty	294 (96,7%)	113 (96,6%)	140 (94,0%)	58 (93,5%)	112 (100,0%)	42 (100,0%)	42 (97,7%)	13 (100,0%)
When entering workspace	280 (92,1%)	106 (90,6%)	136 (91,3%)	55 (88,7%)	107 (95,5%)	37 (88,1%)	37 (86,0%)	13 (100,0%)
Before eating	267 (87,8%)	104 (88,9%)	124 (83,2%)	51 (82,3%)	105 (93,8%)	41 (97,6%)	38 (88,4%)	12 (92,3%)
Before & after handling food	246 (80,9%)	96 (82,1%)	127 (85,2%)	55 (88,7%)	93 (83,0%)	32 (76,2%)	26 (60,5%)	9 (69,2%)
After handling trash	242 (79,6%)	97 (82,9%)	119 (79,9%)	51 (82,3%)	95 (84,8%)	38 (90,5%)	28 (65,1%)	8 (61,5%)
When exiting workspace	218 (71,7%)	81 (69,2%)	104 (69,8%)	41 (66,1%)	87 (77,7%)	32 (76,2%)	27 (62,8%)	8 (61,5%)
Other[4]	50 (16,4%)	11 (9,4%)	29 (19,5%)	4 (6,5%)	12 (10,7%)	2 (4,8%)	9 (20,9%)	5 (38,5%)

448 Notes:

449 1. Subset of participants who contracted COVID-19 had least once during the study period

2. Includes customer registry, QR code, customer limit in store, thorough cleaning of workplace, worker temperature surveillance.

3. Includes after touching the cash register, handling money, in between clients.

452 **Table 7. Number of COVID-19 positive tests**

	Overall cohort	Bar/ Restaurant	Grocery store	Hardware store
Reported positive COVID-19 tests				
First occurrence	**117**	**62**	**42**	**13**
PCR	40	24	13	3
Antigen detection	77	38	29	10
Additional test[1]	**8**	**5**	**2**	**1**
PCR	1	1	0	0
Antigen detection	7	4	2	1
Positive PCR test for COVID-19 at V4 or V5	**11**	**6**	**5**	**0**
First occurrence	4	1	3	0
Additional test				
<90 days from previous test	4	3	1	0
≥90 days from previous test	3	2	1	0
Reported symptoms (no positive test)	**31**	**17**	**12**	**2**

453 Notes:

454 1. All 90 days or more since a previously positive test.

455

456 **Table 8. COVID-19 symptoms at the first COVID-19 positive test reported by the participant**

	Overall cohort (N=117)	Bar/ Restaurant (N=62)	Grocery store (N=42)	Hardware store (N=13)
Asymptomatic infection, N (%)	**6 (5,1%)**	**2 (3,2%)**	**4 (9,5%)**	**0 (0,0%)**
Symptomatic infection, N (%)	**111 (94,9%)**	**60 (96,8%)**	**38 (90,5%)**	**13 (100,0%)**
Runny nose or nasal congestion	76 (65,0%)	39 (62,9%)	26 (61,9%)	11 (84,6%)
Cough	74 (63,2%)	41 (66,1%)	25 (59,5%)	8 (61,5%)
Headache	71 (60,7%)	36 (58,1%)	26 (61,9%)	9 (69,2%)
Sore throat	70 (59,8%)	41 (66,1%)	23 (54,8%)	6 (46,2%)
Fever	68 (58,1%)	39 (62,9%)	19 (45,2%)	9 (69,2%)
Muscle pain	65 (55,6%)	35 (56,5%)	22 (52,4%)	8 (61,5%)
Shortness of breath	56 (47,9%)	27 (43,5%)	21 (50,0%)	8 (61,5%)
Loss of sense of smell or taste	26 (22,2%)	11 (17,7%)	10 (23,8%)	5 (38,5%)
Diarrhea	16 (13,7%)	7 (11,3%)	8 (19,0%)	1 (7,7%)

457

458 **Table 9. COVID-19 vaccination status at the first reported COVID-19 positive test**

	Overall cohort (N=117)	Bar/ Restaurant (N=62)	Grocery store (N=42)	Hardware store (N=13)
Vaccination status, N (%)				
No vaccine	21 (17.9%)	11 (17.7%)	10 (23.8%)	0 (0.0%)
One dose	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Two doses	45 (38.5%)	24 (38.7%)	15 (35.7%)	6 (46.2%)
Three doses	46 (39.3%)	26 (41.9%)	14 (33.3%)	6 (46.2%)
Four doses	4 (3.4%)	1 (1.6%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (7.7%)

459

460 **Table 10. Blood samples collected by vaccination status**

	Overall cohort Blood samples (N = 1299)	
	Infected	**Not infected**
No Vaccine, N (%)	**11 (0.8%)**	**89 (6.9%)**
Vaccinated, N (%)	**300 (23.1%)**	**899 (69.2%)**
1 dose	14 (1.1%)	61 (4.7%)
2 doses	145 (11.2%)	584 (45.0%)
3 doses	122 (9.4%)	231 (17.8%)
4 doses	20 (1.5%)	22 (1.7%)

461

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Timeline of the study illustrating the visits (colored dash lines) and the first occurrences of COVID-19-positive tests (grey bars)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.18.23294172; this version posted August 21, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Evolution of the vaccination coverage (Comirnaty [Pfizer-BioNTech], SpikeVax [Moderna] or Vaxzevria [AstraZeneca] vaccine) during the study period (A) in the overall cohort stratified by the number of doses received, and (B) stratified by occupational group. The study data are compared to those of the Public Health Agency of Canada (Qc population) for the whole province.[20]



.