

1 Sex-specific differences in physiological parameters related to 2 SARS-CoV-2 infections among a national cohort (COVI-GAPP 3 study)

4 Kirsten Grossmann^{1,2¶}, Martin Risch^{2,3,4¶}, Andjela Markovic^{5,6,7¶}, Stefanie Aeschbacher⁸, Ornella C
5 Weideli^{2,9}, Laura Velez², Marc Kovac⁴, Fiona Pereira¹⁰, Nadia Wohlwend⁴, Corina Risch⁴, Dorothea
6 Hillmann⁴, Thomas Lung⁴, Harald Renz¹¹, Raphael Twerenbold^{8,12}, Martina Rothenbühler⁵, Daniel
7 Leibovitz⁵, Vladimir Kovacevic⁵, Paul Klaver¹³, Timo B Brakenhoff¹³, Billy Franks¹³, Marianna
8 Mitratza^{14,15}, George S Downward^{14,15}, Ariel Dowling¹⁶, Santiago Montes¹⁷, Duco Veen^{18,19}, Diederick
9 E Grobbee^{14,15&}, Maureen Cronin^{5&}, David Conen^{20&}, Brianna M Goodale^{5,12&}, Lorenz Risch^{1,2,4,21&*}, on
10 behalf of the COVID-19 remote early detection (COVID-RED) consortium[^]

11 †Full list of group members is provided in the Appendix

12

13 ¹Private University in the Principality of Liechtenstein (UFL), Triesen, Principality of Liechtenstein

14 ²Dr Risch Medical Laboratory, Vaduz, Liechtenstein

15 ³Central Laboratory, Kantonsspital Graubünden, Chur, Switzerland

16 ⁴Dr Risch Medical Laboratory, Buchs, Switzerland

17 ⁵Ava AG, Zürich, Switzerland

18 ⁶Department of Psychology, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland

19 ⁷Department of Pulmonology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

20 ⁸Cardiovascular Research Institute Basel (CRIB), University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

21 ⁹Soneva Fushi, Boduthakurufaanu Magu, Male, Maldives

22 ¹⁰Department of Metabolism, Digestive Diseases and Reproduction, Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, London,
23 UK

24 ¹¹Institute of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiochemistry, Molecular Diagnostics, Philipps University Marburg, Marburg, Germany

25 ¹²Department of Cardiology and University Center of Cardiovascular Science, University Heart and Vascular Center Hamburg,
26 Hamburg, Germany

27 ¹³Julius Clinical, Zeist, The Netherlands

28 ¹⁴UMC Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

29 ¹⁵Julius Global Health, the Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center, Utrecht, The
30 Netherlands

31 ¹⁶Takeda Pharmaceuticals, Digital Clinical Devices, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

32 ¹⁷Roche Diagnostics Nederland B.V., Almere, The Netherlands

33 ¹⁸Department of Methodology and Statistics, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

34 ¹⁹Optentia Research Programme, North-West University, South Africa

35 ²⁰Population Health Research Institute, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

36 ²¹Center of Laboratory Medicine, University Institute of Clinical Chemistry, University of Bern, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland

37

38 ¶NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

&These authors also contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author

Email: lorenz.risch@ufli.li (LR)

^Membership of the COVID-RED consortium is provided in the Appendix.

62 Abstract

63

64 Considering sex as a biological variable in modern digital health solutions, we investigated sex-specific
65 differences in the trajectory of four physiological parameters across a COVID-19 infection.

66 A wearable medical device measured breathing rate, heart rate, heart rate variability, and wrist skin
67 temperature in 1163 participants (mean age = 44.1 years, standard deviation [SD]=5.6; 667 [57%]
68 females). Participants reported daily symptoms and confounders in a complementary app. A machine
69 learning algorithm retrospectively ingested daily biophysical parameters to detect COVID-19
70 infections. COVID-19 serology samples were collected from all participants at baseline and follow-up.
71 We analysed potential sex-specific differences in physiology and antibody titres using multilevel
72 modelling and t-tests.

73 Over 1.5 million hours of physiological data were recorded. During the symptomatic period of
74 infection, men demonstrated larger increases in skin temperature, breathing rate and heart rate as
75 well as larger decreases in heart rate variability than women. The COVID-19 infection detection
76 algorithm performed similarly well for men and women.

77 Our study belongs to the first research to provide evidence for differential physiological responses to
78 COVID-19 between females and males, highlighting the potential of wearable technology to inform
79 future precision medicine approaches.

80 This work has received support from the Princely House of the Principality of Liechtenstein, the
81 government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, the Hanela Foundation in Switzerland, and the
82 Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) 2 Joint Undertaking under grant agreement No 101005177. This
83 Joint Undertaking receives support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
84 programme and EFPIA.

85 Introduction

86

87 On March 11, 2020, the WHO declared the fast spreading coronavirus disease (COVID-19) a global
88 pandemic [1]. This novel viral disease was first detected in Wuhan, China in December 2019 and is
89 caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) [2]. Increasing knowledge
90 about risk factors and symptoms, as well as the implementation of mass reverse transcription
91 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), serological tests, vaccines and social restrictions have helped
92 control its spread [3,4]. However, asymptomatic virus transmissions and emerging virus mutations
93 pose ongoing challenges in dealing with the pandemic. Today, more than two years after the first case
94 was detected, many countries worldwide continue to experience waves of rising infections, with
95 numerous unknowns remaining in our understanding of SARS-CoV-2. In particular, consistent data
96 about the role of sex in relation to COVID-19 are lacking [5,6]. Significant changes in physiological
97 parameters as breathing rate, heart rate, heart rate variability, and wrist skin temperature during a
98 COVID-19 infection [7] raise the question about sex-specific differences within the trajectory of these
99 parameters. A better understanding of sex-specific trajectories in physiological responses to the
100 infection may support early detection and treatment of COVID-19.

101

102 A meta-analysis found that men with COVID-19 were globally almost three times more likely than
103 women to be admitted to an intensive treatment unit [8]. Furthermore, the disease's mortality rates
104 were higher in men [9], potentially due to sex-specific differences in angiotensin converting enzyme 2
105 (ACE2) expression [10,11]. On the other hand, women were found to more frequently experience
106 persistent symptoms such as dyspnoea and fatigue several months after the acute phase of the illness
107 [12]. The infection rates were similar between the sexes [8], although this observation may differ
108 between countries [13]. Moreover, initial analyses of eumenorrhic women's susceptibility to SARS-
109 CoV-2 among a real-world sample are in line with previously shown immune function fluctuations
110 across the menstrual cycle [14] and suggest increased susceptibility during the luteal phase [15].
111 Research on sex-specific differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes

112 showed higher plasma levels of innate immune cytokines such as IL-8 and IL-18 along with more robust
113 induction of non-classical monocytes in male patients, whereas female patients showed higher T cell
114 activation during SARS-CoV-2 infection [16]. Also, higher levels of innate immune cytokines were
115 associated with worse disease progression in female patients [16].

116

117 To the best of our knowledge, our work represents the first investigation of sex-specific differences in
118 SARS-CoV-2 affected physiological parameters as measured by a medical device. Previous studies have
119 shown that direct-to-consumer and easy to use products with wide market availability such as Fitbit
120 [17], smartwatches [18], the Ava bracelet [7,19], and other wearable devices [20] could be used for
121 surveillance of changes in physiological parameters to give the user an early warning before COVID-
122 19 symptom occurrence [21] or during asymptomatic infection [22]. The COVI-GAPP study
123 investigated the applicability of the Ava bracelet for pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 [23].
124 Developed as a fertility tracker, the bracelet measures physiological parameters including wrist skin
125 temperature, breathing rate, heart rate, heart rate variability and skin perfusion [24]. The previously
126 published interim analysis of the COVI-GAPP dataset demonstrated significant changes in skin
127 temperature, breathing rate, heart rate and heart rate variability during a COVID-19 infection [7].
128 These parameters were used to develop a machine learning (ML) algorithm for detection of pre-
129 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection which successfully detected 68% of COVID-19 cases up to two days
130 before symptom onset. The algorithm is currently being tested and validated in a larger population
131 with real-time access to the algorithm's predictions [19].

132

133 The current work analyzed the same physiological parameters collected in the COVI-GAPP study to
134 quantify sex-specific differences before, during and after a COVID-19 infection. We examined
135 differences in trajectories of physiological parameters over five defined phases (baseline, incubation,
136 pre-symptomatic, symptomatic, recovery) between female and male participants. Furthermore, we
137 evaluated the performance of our ML algorithm for female and male participants separately with the

138 goal to assess and correct a potential sex bias in its functionality.

139 Materials and Methods

140 Study design and participants

141
142 Since 2010, the observational population-based Genetic and Phenotypic Determinants of Blood
143 Pressure and Other Cardiovascular Risk Factors (GAPP) study aims to better understand the
144 development of cardiovascular risk factors in the general population of healthy adults aged 25 to 41
145 years [25]. From 2170 GAPP participants, 1163 individuals were enrolled in the COVI-GAPP study with
146 inclusion and exclusion criteria published previously [23]. Data were collected from April 14, 2020,
147 until January 31, 2022. The local ethics committee (KEK, Zürich, Switzerland) approved the study
148 protocol, and written informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to enrolment (BASEC
149 2020-00786).

150 Data collection

151
152 Physiological parameters of interest for this analysis were breathing rate, heart rate, heart rate
153 variability, and wrist skin temperature, measured every 10 seconds by a wrist-worn bracelet while the
154 user slept. The CE-certified and FDA-cleared Ava Fertility Tracker (version 2.0; Ava AG, Switzerland)
155 was originally built to detect ovulating women's fertile days in real time with 90% accuracy [26–28].
156 The bracelet's three sensors can track biophysical changes regardless of the wearer's sex [7] and was
157 used in this study for detecting infection-based deviations from baseline parameters in both men and
158 women (regardless of their menstruating status). Participants synchronized their bracelet each
159 morning upon waking to a complementary smartphone app.

160 In addition to automatically collected physiological data, participants also provided information in the
161 complementary app about their daily alcohol, medication, and drug intake (Fig 1A), as these
162 substances can alter central nervous system functioning [29]. Furthermore, the app included a
163 customized user functionality where participants reported COVID-19 symptoms in a daily diary (Fig

164 1B). Participants were also able to see and monitor changes in their physiological parameters in the
165 app.

166 **This is the Fig 1A and Fig 1B Title. Participants wore a wrist-based medical device at night.**

167 This is the Fig 1A and Fig 1B legend. Upon waking, participants synchronized the device with a
168 complementary smartphone application and reported alcohol, medication, and drug intake (A) as well
169 as potential COVID-19 symptoms (B) in the app.

170 SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing and RT-PCR testing

171
172 SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests were performed by the medical laboratory Dr Risch Ostschweiz AG (Buchs
173 SG, Switzerland) with an orthogonal test algorithm employing electrochemiluminescence (ECLIA)
174 assays testing for pan-immunoglobulins directed against the N antigen and the receptor binding
175 domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, as described by Risch et al [30]. The enacted procedure
176 ensures testing for actual SARS-CoV-2 infection independent of vaccine status. Baseline data were
177 collected starting in April 2020 onwards (run 1; R1). Three follow-up blood samples (run 2, R2; run 3,
178 R3; and run 4, R4) were collected within the scope of the study (Fig 2). The cut-off levels used for
179 positive and negative values were ≥ 1.0 and ≤ 0.1 , respectively. Values between 0.2 – 0.9 were
180 considered as gray zone. Seroconversion was assumed if the first blood sample was negative for SARS-
181 CoV-2 antibodies, but a subsequent sample was positive. Follow-up calls with participants who tested
182 positive were performed to discuss their symptoms and duration.

183 **This is the Fig 2 Titel. Study flow chart of the 1,163 participants that are enrolled in the COVI-GAPP**
184 **study.**

185 This is the Fig 2 legend. The cut-off levels used for positive and negative values were ≥ 1.0 and ≤ 0.1 ,
186 respectively. Values between 0.2 – 0.9 were considered as gray zone * Successful bracelet
187 synchronization on more than 50% of days around symptom onset.

188
189

190 Questionnaires

191
192 When visiting the study centre for SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests, participants were asked to answer a
193 questionnaire about their personal information (age, sex), smoking status (current, past, never), as
194 well as symptoms and hospitalizations during COVID-19 infection. Body mass index (BMI) based on
195 height and weights were calculated with data from the GAPP database.

196 Statistical Analysis

197
198 Our primary objective was to examine sex differences in the trajectory of breathing rate, heart rate,
199 heart rate variability, and wrist skin temperature across a SARS-CoV-2 infection. Secondly, we
200 evaluated a machine learning algorithm designed for early detection of COVID-19 separately in male
201 and female participants to examine potential sex biases in algorithm performance. Furthermore, we
202 assessed sex-specific differences in antibody titres after SARS-CoV-2 infections. We processed and
203 analysed all data using R (version 4.1.1) [31] and Python (version 3.6) [32].

204 1. Sex-specific differences in COVID-19 related physiological parameters

205 To examine the association between sex and physiological parameters during baseline, incubation,
206 pre-symptomatic, symptomatic and recovery phases of a COVID-19 infection, we applied multilevel
207 linear mixed models with random intercepts and slopes including residual maximum likelihood
208 estimation (REML) and Satterthwaite degrees of freedom. A multiplicative interaction term tested the
209 association between sex and infection phase. All signals measured more than 10 days before symptom
210 onset via phone call confirmation with a study team member were categorized as occurring during
211 the baseline period. The incubation period was defined as the time interval from 10 days up to 3 days
212 before symptom onset. The pre-symptomatic period was defined as the two days before symptom
213 onset, while the symptomatic period lasted from the day of symptom onset until the day symptoms
214 ended. All signals measured after symptom end were categorized as occurring during the recovery
215 period. We dummy coded four variables to indicate the period within which the signal occurred, with

216 baseline serving as the reference period. Each of the four multilevel models was compared to the
217 corresponding null model (i.e., an intercept-only model) by means of an ANOVA.

218

219 As a sensitivity analysis, we also tested potentially confounding variables as single terms in additional
220 models to determine whether changes in physiological parameters occurred due to COVID-19
221 infection over and above changes associated with participant age, BMI, hypertension, medication,
222 alcohol, and recreational drugs.

223 2. Sex-specific differences in algorithm's performance

224 The retrospective ML algorithm, developed as described in previous papers, [7,19] aimed to detect a
225 COVID-19 infection prior to symptom onset. The algorithm was designed to ingest trends in
226 physiological signals across sets of days to detect deviations in these signals and predict a potential
227 infection. The model was trained to predict infection two days and one day prior to symptom onset,
228 as well as on the day of symptom onset. Here, we assessed the algorithm's performance metrics
229 separately for male and female COVI-GAPP participants to identify any potential sex bias in the model.
230 Performance metrics were calculated per day in participants who tested positive where days from -40
231 to -2 relative to the onset of the first symptoms were considered negative and days -2 to day 0 as
232 positive. In other words, positive predictions of the algorithm prior to 2 days before symptom onset,
233 these predictions were interpreted as false positives. The set of metrics selected for the evaluation of
234 the algorithm included precision (number of true positives divided by sum of true positives and false

235 positives), recall (number of true positives divided by the sum of true positives and false negatives),
236 and F-score (the harmonic mean of precision and recall).

237 3. Sex-specific differences in antibody titres of SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid 238 after COVID-19 infection

239 To enable a reliable comparison of antibody titres after a COVID-19 infection, antibody titres (values
240 > 1.0) against the SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid were compared between sex. Blood was collected four
241 times over the course of the study with varying sample sizes (Fig 2). Normally distributed continuous
242 variables were compared using unpaired t-tests, and non-parametric continuous variables were
243 compared using Mann-Whitney U tests.

244

245 Results

246

247 Participants

248

249 A total of 1163 participants (mean age = 44.1 years, standard deviation [SD] = 5.6; 667 [57%] females)
250 were enrolled in the study. During the study period, 127 participants (10.9%; [9.3,12.8]) contracted
251 COVID-19. Eighty-two participants (mean age = 42.6 ± 5.3 years; 56 [68%] females) testing positive for
252 SARS-CoV-2 had worn and synchronized their bracelet successfully on more than 50% of days around
253 symptom onset (i.e., at least 20 days before and 20 days after symptom onset), thereby ensuring
254 sufficient quality of data to be included in analyses. The number of days with successfully synchronized
255 bracelet data did not differ ($p = 0.967$) between females (range 67 to 511 days; mean = 239.6 ± 71.8
256 days) and males (range 45 to 508 days; mean = 238.8 ± 86.4 days). With regards to the reported
257 symptom duration, values for four participants (2 females) were missing and imputed based on the
258 median across the sample.

259 Blood samples and questionnaire data were available from 1,144 participants. Mean age and BMI of
260 these participants were 45 (± 5.5) and 24.7 (± 3.9), respectively. At baseline, male participants had
261 significantly higher BMIs (26.17 ± 3.41) than female participants (23.70 ± 3.96; $t(1079) = 10.71$,
262 $p < 0.001$). They also reported significantly higher rates of hypertension (7.74%) than female
263 participants (3.15%; $\chi^2(1) = 11.23$, $p < 0.001$). Analyses did not reveal any significant sex-based
264 differences in smoking status, age, or hospitalization rate (Table 1).

265 **Table 1. This is the Table 1 Title. Baseline characteristics stratified according to sex were collected**
 266 **by questionnaires completed within the GAPP study.**

Variables	Total n = 1,144	Male n = 478	Female n = 666	Test statistics	Significance (p value)
Smoking status, N (never: current: past smoker)	658: 167: 319	265: 68: 145	393: 99: 174	X2 (2) = 2.46	0.292
Hypertension, N (yes: no)	58: 1086	37: 441	21: 645	X2 (1) = 11.23	<0.001
Age, years (\pm SD)	43.99 (\pm 5.51)	44.3 (\pm 5.35)	43.77 (\pm 5.61)	t (1057) = 1.53	0.1449
BMI, kg/m2 (\pm SD)	24.72 (\pm 3.94)	26.17 (\pm 3.41)	23.7 (\pm 3.96)	t (1079) = 10.71	<0.001
Hospitalization 01, N (yes: no)	0:10	0:4	0:6	Fisher's exact test	1
Hospitalization 02, N (yes: no)	11:113	7:44	4:69	X2 (1) = 2.52	0.2047
Hospitalization 03, N (yes: no)	2:23	0:12	2:11	X2 (1) = 0.46	0.4973
Hospitalization 04, N (yes: no)	3:47	0:24	3:23	X2 (1) = 1.25	0.2625

267

268 This is the Table 1 legend. Information about hospitalization were collected 4 times (01 – 04) as part
 269 of a questionnaire for SARS-CoV-2 positive participants within the COVI-GAPP study. Data are
 270 presented as mean \pm SD, or number.

271 Sex-specific differences in COVID-19 related physiological parameters

272 We show the trajectory each of the four analysed physiological parameters during a SARS-CoV-2
 273 infection separated by sex (Fig 3). The multilevel models revealed significant differences between male
 274 and female participants in all parameters during the symptomatic period (Table 2). We observed a
 275 larger increase in skin temperature, breathing rate and heart rate as well as a larger decrease in heart
 276 rate variability in males compared to females during this period. Moreover, male participants'
 277 breathing rate and heart rate remained at significantly higher levels during the recovery period as
 278 compared to their female peers (Table 2). Each of the four models provided a significantly better fit
 279 to the data than the corresponding null model ($p < 0.0001$).

280

281 **This is the Fig 3 Title. Trajectory of the four analysed physiological parameters across the course of**
 282 **a confirmed COVID-19 infection, centred around participant-reported symptom onset.**

283 This is the Fig 3 legend. The values of each physiological parameter (with 95% CIs) were normalized
 284 according to each individual's baseline measurements and collapsed across females (n=56) and males
 285 (n=26).

286

287 **Table 2. This is the Table 2 Title. Results from multilevel linear mixed models showing the main**
 288 **effects of infection phase and sex as well as the interactions between the two with regards to**
 289 **changes in physiological signals.**

	Skin temperature	Breathing rate	Heart rate	Heart rate variability
Intercept	35.01 (<0.0001)	13.51 (<0.0001)	46.98 (<0.0001)	4.3 (<0.0001)
Infection phase				
Baseline	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Incubation	0.18 (0.15)	0.33 (0.13)	1.49 (0.12)	-0.25 (0.12)
Pre-symptomatic	0.23 (0.26)	0.71 (0.17)	1.26 (0.41)	-0.18 (0.42)
Symptomatic	0.74 (<0.0001)	2.93 (<0.0001)	6.88 (<0.0001)	-0.93 (<0.0001)
Recovery	0.22 (0.0006)	0.38 (0.004)	2.17 (0.003)	-0.28 (0.09)
Sex, female	0.45 (<0.0001)	0.91 (0.06)	4.96 (0.001)	-1.35 (<0.0001)
Interaction				
Sex*Incubation	-0.02 (0.74)	-0.2 (0.11)	-0.36 (0.5)	0.09 (0.34)
Sex*Pre-symptomatic	-0.01 (0.92)	-0.26 (0.38)	0.07 (0.93)	0.04 (0.78)
Sex*Symptomatic	-0.28 (<0.0001)	-1.31 (<0.0001)	-3.09 (0.0001)	0.43 (<0.0001)
Sex*Recovery	-0.04 (0.23)	-0.25 (0.001)	-0.96 (0.02)	0.11 (0.25)

290

291 This is the Table 2 legend. Unstandardized beta coefficients are presented, with *p*-values in
 292 parentheses and in bold if lower than 0.05. Sex was coded such that positive coefficients represent
 293 larger values in females.

294

295 When including age, BMI, hypertension diagnosis, medication, alcohol and drug intake, the
 296 interactions between sex and phase of infection remained unchanged indicating that they cannot be
 297 explained by the influence of these confounding variables (S1 Table).

298

299 Sex-specific differences in algorithm's performance

300 Table 3 provides a by-sex breakdown for the algorithm's performance. Sensitivity score can be found
301 as the recall of the positive class (days with an existent SARS-CoV2 infection), while specificity is the
302 recall of the negative class (days without a SARS-CoV2 infection). The algorithm showed the same
303 precision (i.e., 92) when giving a SARS-CoV2 positive alert, across participant sex. Cross-class recall
304 was more balanced among females than males in our sample. Detecting 53% of SARS-CoV-2 positive
305 days in females, the algorithm performed less well in males (26% of SARS-CoV2 positive cases
306 detected).

307

308

309 **This is the Table 3 Title. Performance metrics of the machine learning algorithm for female and male**
310 **participants.**

311

Participant Sex	Class	Precision	Recall	F-score
All	0	12.36	68.421	19.048
	1	91.599	41.509	78.331
Female	0	12.977	60.69	20.859
	1	92.147	53.125	73.181
Male	0	10.811	80.0	15.385
	1	92.308	26.667	85.714

312

313 This is the Table 3 legend. Sensitivity score can be found as the recall of the positive class (i.e., days
314 with an existent SARS-CoV2 infection), while specificity is the recall of the negative class (i.e., days
315 without a SARS-CoV2 infection).

316

317 Sex-specific differences in antibody titres of SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid 318 after COVID-19 infection

319 Antibody titres of the female and male sub-groups were not significantly different across runs.

320 Nucleocapsid antibody values in run 1 trended higher in male participants (Table 4).

321

322 **This is the Table 4 Title. SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid (N) antibody (AB) values stratified according to**

323 **sex.**

324

Variables	Male (n = 7)	Female (n = 7)	Test statistics	Significance (p value)
SARS-CoV-2 N AB run1	32.66 (± 34.74)a	75.66 (± 46.87)a	W = 13	0.14
	Male (n = 51)	Female (n = 68)		
SARS-CoV-2 N AB run2	34.1 (1 – 183.7)b	33.4 (1.7 – 212.2)b	W = 1753	0.92
	Male (n = 62)	Female (n = 85)		
SARS-CoV-2 N AB run3	40.05 (1 - 274)	29.7 (1.4 – 234.3)	W = 2772	0.59
	Male (n = 76)	Female (n = 102)		
SARS-CoV-2 N AB run4	17.95 (1.2 - 221)	36.59 (1 – 266.4)	W = 4280	0.235

325

326 This is the Table 4 legend. data are presented as mean ± SD, or median (interquartile range).

327 Discussion

328
329 The presented study examined sex-specific differences in physiological parameters among 82
330 individuals with a documented SARS-CoV-2 infection. We found that male participants experienced
331 significantly larger increases in wrist skin temperature, breathing rate and heart rate as well as larger
332 decreases in heart rate variability during the symptomatic period compared to females. In one of the
333 first prospective cohort studies relying on wearable sensor technology to collect real-time continuous
334 physiological signals, we provide evidence for sex-based differential physiological responses to COVID-
335 19.

336
337 Considering the higher mortality and hospitalization rates observed in male COVID-19 patients [9], our
338 findings may reflect sex-specific biological responses to the infection. In line with previous work [16],
339 we did not observe any differences between the sexes with regards to antibody titers. However,
340 Takahashi et al. [16] observed a stronger acute T-cell response in female as compared to male COVID-
341 19 patients. The poorer T-cell response in men was associated with their worse disease progression.
342 On the other hand, the authors measured higher levels of several pro-inflammatory innate immunity
343 chemokines and cytokines in men as compared to women. They thus concluded that the early phase
344 of COVID-19 is associated with key sex differences in immunological mechanisms potentially
345 accounting for the differential disease progression between women and men.

346
347 Given that the sex differences in physiological signals in our study are most pronounced during the
348 symptomatic phase, we propose that they reflect the above mentioned sex-specific immunological
349 mechanisms [33]. Inflammatory markers (e.g., cytokines) have been shown to reflect disease severity
350 in COVID-19 [34]. As the autonomic nervous system is known to modulate inflammation [35] and the

351 examined physiological signals reflect the function of the autonomic nervous system [36], our findings
352 suggest support for differential immunological responses to COVID-19 between the sexes.

353

354 Importantly, altered physiological signals such as decreased heart rate variability and increased skin
355 temperature have been proposed as prognostic markers for several disorders including cardiovascular
356 disease [37] as well as infectious diseases like COVID-19 [18,38–40]. Modern wearable technology
357 represents a unique and powerful framework to collect continuous real-time physiological data. The
358 predictive value of physiological signals combined with the reliable history of measurements provided
359 by wearables opens up new avenues to inform clinical actions and support future precision medicine
360 approaches incorporating a variety of individual factors into clinical decisions (reviewed in Mitratza et
361 al. [41]).

362

363 An important step towards precision medicine can be made by considering sex differences in modern
364 digital health solutions. Historically, women have been underrepresented in clinical trials leading to
365 medical solutions focusing on men at the risk to women’s health [42]. Many diseases differ between
366 female and male patients with regards to the prevalence, progression or response to treatment [43].
367 For example, minor stroke is more often missed in female than male [44] patients, possibly due to
368 definitions in clinical diagnosis reflecting typical manifestations in males [43]. More recently, a sex bias
369 has been recognized in modern ML solutions that are often developed and trained on male data and
370 thus result in better performance in men [45]. Therefore, in the presented work, we examined sex
371 differences in the performance of our ML algorithm for early detection of COVID-19. The algorithm
372 reached a higher sensitivity for female participants. We postulate this difference may be due to the

373 larger sample size in the female group. However, the algorithm's precision was the same in both
374 groups indicating that it is suitable for use in both men and women, as intended.

375 Limitations

376 While our study belongs to the first research to consider sex-based differences in COVID-19
377 detection using digital health, future work could continue to build upon our findings by examining
378 the casual mechanism underlying differences between SARS-Cov-2 infected men and women. In
379 particular, inability to disentangle immunological versus menstrual-driven changes in physiological
380 parameters among female participants limits our research's generalizability. In menstruating
381 women, a specific pattern has been recognized in the trajectory of physiological signals across the
382 menstrual cycle. Goodale et al. have demonstrated increased skin temperature, heart rate and
383 breathing rate in the postovulatory phase of the cycle, mirroring cycle-based shifts in sex hormones
384 [26]. Sex differences in physiological signals measured in the current study may thus partly be due to
385 hormonal impact. We cannot exclude such influence as we had limited information about female
386 participants' menstrual cycle or reproductive health (e.g., usage of hormonal birth control,
387 menopausal status). Future researchers may wish to record participants' menstrual status and
388 measure hormone levels directly, to probe the relationship between sex hormones and physiological
389 differences.

390
391 Nevertheless, we believe that menses-driven changes in physiology do not adequately explain the sex
392 differences in our results, as the dynamics of the observed physiological signals are in line with
393 previous reports regarding COVID-19 and include increased skin temperature, heart rate and
394 breathing rate as well as decreased heart rate variability during infection [20]. Furthermore, the most
395 pronounced sex differences in our study occurred during the symptomatic period, suggesting a
396 disease-triggered disparity among males and females. Moreover, we do not expect that the
397 distribution of menstrual cycle phases follows a specific pattern for our participants. We rather expect
398 it to be random, and thus the hormonal effects to be cancelled out. Finally, 30% (n=17) of females in

399 the sample were older than 45 years; peri- or post-menopausal, they were beyond reproductive age
400 and thus unlikely to experience menses-modulating effects on their physiological parameters.

401

402 Another limitation important to note is the potential effect of recall bias on our findings. The COVID-
403 19 symptom onset date was determined based on the participants' retrospective reports, and the
404 classification of the relevant infection periods (i.e., incubation, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic
405 period) was based on this date. Therefore, an unreliable report would be associated with an inaccurate
406 definition of the infection periods leading to shifts in trajectories of physiological signals. Furthermore,
407 in the effort to smooth the data in the model, the abrupt changes in physiological signals after
408 infection generated gradual alterations in the estimated trajectory. The deviations from the baseline
409 during the first and last days may be reflective of such model artifacts (Fig 3). Finally, it is important to
410 note that we did not adjust any parameters from our statistical tests to account for multiple testing.
411 Therefore, we acknowledge chances for type 1 error in our findings. Nevertheless, we believe that our
412 research provides important initial insights to be confirmed in future investigations.

413

414 Conclusion

415 For the first time, we show sex differences in physiological responses to COVID-19. Our results
416 highlight the importance of taking sex into account in medical treatment and care of COVID-19
417 patients, as well as when validating infection detection algorithms in digital health. Moreover, we
418 reveal the potential of continuous real-time physiological signals as a clinical tool to inform future
419 precision medicine approaches.

420

421

422

423

424 Acknowledgements

425 We thank the GAPP participants who enrolled in this study. Additionally, the authors thank the
426 following for their contributions to the study: The local study team in Vaduz, FL, the different teams
427 at the Dr Risch medical laboratories in Vaduz and Buchs, CH. We would also like to thank the Coobx
428 AG in Balzers, FL, for the provision of 3D printed bracelet extensions for persons with large wrists.
429 Addressing data protection issues, we acknowledge the substantial collaborative support of the Elleta
430 AG as well as the national data protection agency in Liechtenstein. We thank the government of the
431 Principality of Liechtenstein, the health ministers, and the Liechtenstein Office of Public Health for
432 their support. Finally, our thanks are especially due to the Princely House of Liechtenstein, which gave
433 decisive support that enabled the initiation of this project.

434

436 References

- 437 1. WHO. WHO. Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19.
438 Available: [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/whodirector-general-s-opening-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/whodirector-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
439 [remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19--- 11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/whodirector-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
- 440 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
441 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382: 727–733. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2001017
- 442 3. WHO. WHO_weekly-operational-update-on-covid-19---29-march-2021. 2021 [cited 30 Mar
443 2021] p. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-ope>. Available:
444 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-operational-update-on-covid-19---29-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-operational-update-on-covid-19---29-march-2021)
445 [march-2021](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-operational-update-on-covid-19---29-march-2021)
- 446 4. Lake MA. What we know so far: COVID-19 current clinical knowledge and research. *Clin Med J*
447 *R Coll Physicians London.* 2020;20: 124–127. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2019-coron
- 448 5. Bhopal R. Covid-19 worldwide: We need precise data by age group and sex urgently. *BMJ.*
449 2020;369: 32188598. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1366
- 450 6. Health E for public, Sanità IS di. Gender differences in COVID-19: the importance of sex-
451 disaggregated data. Available: [https://www.epicentro.iss.it/en/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-](https://www.epicentro.iss.it/en/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-gender-differences-importance-sex-disaggregated-data)
452 [gender-differences-importance-sex-disaggregated-data](https://www.epicentro.iss.it/en/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-gender-differences-importance-sex-disaggregated-data)
- 453 7. Risch M, Grossmann K, Aeschbacher S, Weideli OC, Kovac M, Pereira F, et al. Investigation of
454 the use of a sensor bracelet for the presymptomatic detection of changes in physiological
455 parameters related to COVID-19: an interim analysis of a prospective cohort study (COVI-
456 GAPP). *BMJ Open.* 2022;12: e058274. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-058274
- 457 8. Peckham H, de Gruijter NM, Raine C, Radziszewska A, Ciurtin C, Wedderburn LR, et al. Male
458 sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ITU admission.
459 *Nat Commun.* 2020;11: 1–10. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19741-6
- 460 9. Williamson EJ, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, Bacon S, Bates C, Morton CE, et al. Factors associated

- 461 with COVID-19-related death using OpenSAFELY. *Nature*. 2020;584: 430–436.
462 doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2521-4
- 463 10. Vikse J, Lippi G, Henry BM. Do sex-specific immunobiological factors and differences in
464 angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) expression explain increased severity and mortality
465 of COVID-19 in males? *Diagnosis (Berlin, Ger)*. 2020;7: 385–386. doi:10.1515/dx-2020-0054
- 466 11. Gebhard C, Regitz-Zagrosek V, Neuhauser HK, Morgan R, Klein SL. Impact of sex and gender
467 on COVID-19 outcomes in Europe. *Biol Sex Differ*. 2020;11: 29. doi:10.1186/s13293-020-
468 00304-9
- 469 12. Aggarwal NR, Patel HN, Mehta LS, Sanghani RM, Lundberg GP, Lewis SJ, et al. Sex Differences
470 in Ischemic Heart Disease: Advances, Obstacles, and Next Steps. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual
471 Outcomes*. 2018;11: 1–14. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.117.004437
- 472 13. Jacobsen H, Klein SL. Sex Differences in Immunity to Viral Infections . *Frontiers in
473 Immunology* . 2021. p. 3483. Available:
474 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fimmu.2021.720952>
- 475 14. Oertelt-Prigione S. Immunology and the menstrual cycle. *Autoimmun Rev*. 2012;11: A486-92.
476 doi:10.1016/j.autrev.2011.11.023
- 477 15. Kovacevic V, Markovic A, Veen D, Brakenhoff TB, Mitratza M, Goodale BM. Menstrual Cycle
478 Influence on COVID-19 Detection Using Machine Learning and a Wearable Medical Device
479 [A120]. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;139. Available:
480 [https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2022/05001/Menstrual_Cycle_Influence_on
481 _COVID_19_Detection.118.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2022/05001/Menstrual_Cycle_Influence_on_COVID_19_Detection.118.aspx)
- 482 16. Takahashi T, Ellingson MK, Wong P, Israelow B, Lucas C, Klein J, et al. Sex differences in
483 immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes. *Nature*. 2020;588: 315–320.
484 doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2700-3
- 485 17. Bogu GK, Snyder MP. Deep learning-based detection of COVID-19 using wearables data.
486 medRxiv. 2021; 2021.01.08.21249474. Available:

- 487 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/01/09/2021.01.08.21249474.abstract>
- 488 18. Mishra T, Wang M, Metwally AA, Bogu GK, Brooks AW, Bahmani A, et al. Pre-symptomatic
489 detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data. *Nat Biomed Eng.* 2020;4: 1208–1220.
490 doi:10.1038/s41551-020-00640-6
- 491 19. Brakenhoff TB, Franks B, Goodale BM, van de Wijgert J, Montes S, Veen D, et al. A
492 prospective, randomized, single-blinded, crossover trial to investigate the effect of a
493 wearable device in addition to a daily symptom diary for the remote early detection of SARS-
494 CoV-2 infections (COVID-RED): a structured summary of a study protocol fo. *Trials.* 2021;22:
495 1–5. doi:10.1186/s13063-021-05241-5
- 496 20. Quer G, Radin JM, Gadaleta M, Baca-Motes K, Ariniello L, Ramos E, et al. Wearable sensor
497 data and self-reported symptoms for COVID-19 detection. *Nat Med.* 2021;27: 73–77.
498 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1123-x
- 499 21. Ates HC, Yetisen AK, Güder F, Dincer C. Wearable devices for the detection of COVID-19. *Nat*
500 *Electron.* 2021;4: 13–14. doi:10.1038/s41928-020-00533-1
- 501 22. Cosoli G, Scalise L, Poli A, Spinsante S. Wearable devices as a valid support for diagnostic
502 excellence: lessons from a pandemic going forward. *Health Technol (Berl).* 2021;11: 673–675.
503 doi:10.1007/s12553-021-00540-y
- 504 23. Risch L, Conen D, Aeschbacher S, Grossmann K RM. Defining the role of a fertility bracelet for
505 early recognition and monitoring of COVID-19 in Liechtenstein: an observational study (COVI-
506 GAPP). In: 10. April 2020. p. <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN51255782>.
- 507 24. Hamvas G, Hofmann A, Sakalidis V, Goodale B, Shilaih M, Leeners B. Innovative Trial Design
508 Using Digital Approaches: An Example From Reproductive Medicine [21]. *Obstet Gynecol.*
509 2020;135. Available:
510 [https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2020/05001/Innovative_Trial_Design_Using_](https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2020/05001/Innovative_Trial_Design_Using_Digital_Approaches_.338.aspx)
511 [Digital_Approaches_.338.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/Fulltext/2020/05001/Innovative_Trial_Design_Using_Digital_Approaches_.338.aspx)
- 512 25. Conen D, Schön T, Aeschbacher S, Paré G, Frehner W, Risch M, et al. Genetic and phenotypic

- 513 determinants of blood pressure and other cardiovascular risk factors: Methodology of a
514 prospective, population-based cohort study. *Swiss Med Wkly.* 2013;143: 1–9.
515 doi:10.4414/smw.2013.13728
- 516 26. Goodale BM, Shilaih M, Falco L, Dammeier F, Hamvas G, Leeners B. Wearable sensors reveal
517 menses-driven changes in physiology and enable prediction of the fertile window:
518 Observational study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2019;21. doi:10.2196/13404
- 519 27. French-Mowat E, Burnett J. How are medical devices regulated in the European Union? *J R*
520 *Soc Med.* 2012;105 Suppl: 22–28. doi:10.1258/jrsm.2012.120036
- 521 28. Muehlematter UJ, Daniore P, Vokinger KN. Approval of artificial intelligence and machine
522 learning-based medical devices in the USA and Europe (2015–20): a comparative analysis.
523 *Lancet Digit Heal.* 2021;3: e195–e203. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30292-2
- 524 29. Degenhardt L, Charlson F, Ferrari A, Santomauro D, Erskine H, Mantilla-Herrara A, et al. The
525 global burden of disease attributable to alcohol and drug use in 195 countries and territories,
526 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet*
527 *Psychiatry.* 2018;5: 987–1012. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30337-7
- 528 30. Risch M, Weber M, Thiel S, Grossmann K, Wohlwend N, Lung T, et al. Temporal course of
529 SARS-CoV-2 antibody positivity in patients with COVID-19 following the first clinical
530 presentation. *medRxiv.* 2020;2020. doi:10.1101/2020.10.17.20214445
- 531 31. R Core Team (2021). *The R Project for Statistical Computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation
532 for Statistical Computing.; Available: <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 533 32. Van Rossum, G., & Drake FL. *Python 3 Reference Manual.* Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace.;
534 2009.
- 535 33. Shi Y, Wang Y, Shao C, Huang J, Gan J, Huang X, et al. COVID-19 infection: the perspectives on
536 immune responses. *Cell Death Differ.* 2020;27: 1451–1454. doi:10.1038/s41418-020-0530-3
- 537 34. Junqueira C, Crespo Â, Ranjbar S, de Lacerda LB, Lewandrowski M, Ingber J, et al. FcγR-
538 mediated SARS-CoV-2 infection of monocytes activates inflammation. *Nature.* 2022;606:

- 539 576–584. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04702-4
- 540 35. Webster JI, Tonelli L, Sternberg EM. Neuroendocrine regulation of immunity. *Annu Rev*
541 *Immunol.* 2002;20: 125–163. doi:10.1146/annurev.immunol.20.082401.104914
- 542 36. Ernst G. Heart-Rate Variability-More than Heart Beats? *Front public Heal.* 2017;5: 240.
543 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2017.00240
- 544 37. Papaioannou V, Pneumatikos I, Maglaveras N. Association of heart rate variability and
545 inflammatory response in patients with cardiovascular diseases: current strengths and
546 limitations. *Front Physiol.* 2013;4: 174. doi:10.3389/fphys.2013.00174
- 547 38. Natarajan A, Su HW, Heneghan C, Blunt L, O’Connor C, Niehaus L. Measurement of
548 respiratory rate using wearable devices and applications to COVID-19 detection. *npj Digit*
549 *Med.* 2021;4. doi:10.1038/s41746-021-00493-6
- 550 39. Robert P Hirten, MD, Matteo Danieletto, PhD, [...], and Zahi A Fayad P. Use of Physiological
551 Data From a Wearable Device to Identify SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Symptoms and Predict
552 COVID-19 Diagnosis: Observational Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2021;
553 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC79015>.
- 554 40. Conroy B, Silva I, Mehraei G, Damiano R, Gross B, Salvati E, et al. Real-time infection
555 prediction with wearable physiological monitoring and AI to aid military workforce readiness
556 during COVID-19. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12: 3797. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-07764-6
- 557 41. Marianna Mitratza, MD, PhD Ms, Brianna Mae Goodale P, Aizhan Shagadatova Ms, Vladimir
558 Kovacevic P, Janneke van de Wijgert, MD, PhD M, Timo B. Brakenhoff P, et al. The
559 Performance of Wearable Sensors in the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection: A Systematic
560 Review. *Lancet Digit Heal.* 2022.
- 561 42. Shaw LJ, Pepine CJ, Xie J, Mehta PK, Morris AA, Dickert NW, et al. Quality and Equitable
562 Health Care Gaps for Women: Attributions to Sex Differences in Cardiovascular Medicine. *J*
563 *Am Coll Cardiol.* 2017;70: 373–388. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2017.05.051
- 564 43. Schumacher Dimech A, Ferretti MT, Sandset EC, Santuccione Chadha A. The role of sex and

565 gender differences in precision medicine: the work of the Women’s Brain Project. Eur Heart J.
566 2021;42: 3215–3217. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehab297

567 44. Yu AYX, Hill MD, Asdaghi N, Boulanger J-M, Camden M-C, Campbell BC V, et al. Sex
568 Differences in Diagnosis and Diagnostic Revision of Suspected Minor Cerebral Ischemic
569 Events. Neurology. 2021;96: e732–e739. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000011212

570 45. Cirillo D, Catuara-Solarz S, Morey C, Guney E, Subirats L, Mellino S, et al. Sex and gender
571 differences and biases in artificial intelligence for biomedicine and healthcare. npj Digit Med.
572 2020;3: 81. doi:10.1038/s41746-020-0288-5

573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590

591 Supporting information

592 **S1 Table. This is the S1 Table Title. Results from multilevel linear mixed models showing the main**
593 **effects of infection phase, sex, age, medication, drug and alcohol intake, BMI and hypertension as**
594 **well as interactions between sex and infection phase with regards to changes in physiological**
595 **signals.**

596 This is the S1 Table legend. Unstandardized beta coefficients are presented, with p-values in
597 parentheses and in bold if lower than 0.05. Sex was coded such that positive coefficients represent
598 larger values in females. Hypertension was a binary variable representing diagnosed hypertension. In
599 addition to significant effects of infection phase and sex described in the main text, we observed a
600 significant main effect of medication and alcohol intake on physiological signals. Nevertheless, these
601 effects did not alter any of the multilevel model results reported in the main text.

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616 CRediT Statement for Authorship

617 All authors critically reviewed and approved the final version of this manuscript and had final
618 responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

619 Conceptualization: MRi, HR, RT, PK, TB, BF, MM, GD, AD, SM, MC, DEG, DC and BMG, LR; Data curation:
620 KG, SA, MRo., VK, AM, and BMG; Formal analysis: MRi, KG, NW, OCW, MRo, DL, VK, AM, and BMG;
621 Funding acquisition: MRi, MC, DEG, DC and LR; Investigation: KG, SA, OCW and MM; Methodology:
622 MRi, AM, VK, KG, PK, TB, BF, GD, SM, MC, DEG, DC, BMG, and LR; Project administration: KG, OCW,
623 SM, MC and DEG; Resources: MRi, KG, SA, OCW, MK, NW, CR, DH and TL; Supervision: MRi, SA, HR,
624 RT, MC, DEG, DC, BMG, LR; Validation: KG, AM, NW, OCW, CR, DH, MRo, DL, VK and BMG;
625 Visualization: KG, AM and FP; Writing – original draft: MRi, KG, AM, FP, MC, DC, BMG, LR; Writing -
626 review & editing: MRi, KG, AM, SA, OCW, LV, MK, FP, NW, CR, DH, TL, HR, RT, MRo, DL, PK, TB, BF,
627 MM, GD, AD, SM, MC, DEG, DC, BMG, LR

628

629 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

630 Lorenz Risch, and Martin Risch are key shareholders of the Dr Risch Medical Laboratory. David Conen
631 has received consulting fees from Roche Diagnostics, outside of the current work. Andjela Markovic,
632 Vladimir Kovacevic and Brianna Goodale are past employees of Ava AG. Billy Franks is a former
633 employee of the Julius Clinic and now employee of Haleon. The other authors have no financial or
634 personal conflicts of interest to declare.

635

636 Data Sharing Statement

637 Anonymized data that underlie the results reported in this article are available upon justified request
638 to the corresponding author.

A

Today		FRI, JUL 31					Done
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
26	27	28	29	30	31	1	

Period/Spotting

Alcohol

No alcohol 1-2 drinks 3-4 drinks 5+ drinks

Recreational Drugs

Medication

Oral temperature

COVID-19 Symptoms

PCR Test for COVID-19

COVID-19 Antibody Test

Custom Log

B

Today		FRI, JUL 31					Done
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
26	27	28	29	30	31	1	

Medication

Oral temperature

COVID-19 Symptoms

Chills

Diarrhea

Dry cough

Fatigue

Fever

Loss of smell

Loss of taste

Muscle or body aches


Nasal congestion or runny nose

Shortness of breath or difficulty breathing


Sore throat

Vomiting

Fig_1



Fig_2



Fig_3