Estimating the risk of post-COVID condition (PCC) in deprived communities, migrants and ethnic minorities in England: Findings from Virus Watch - a prospective community cohort study

Authors
Wing Lam Erica Fong[1], Sarah Beale[1], Vincent Grigori Nguyen[1,2,3], Jana Kovar[1], Alexei Yavlinsky[1], Andrew C Hayward[2], Ibrahim Abubakar[4], Sander MJ van Kuijk[5], Robert W Aldridge[1,6]

1. Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, UK
2. Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London, UK
3. Department of Population, Policy and Practice, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK
4. Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, London, UK
5. Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Medical Technology Assessment, Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC), Maastricht, The Netherlands
6. The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle, USA

Corresponding author
Wing Lam Erica Fong
Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, UK
erica.fong.16@ucl.ac.uk

What is already known on this topic:

- Deprived, migrant, and ethnic minority groups experienced disproportionate rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalisation and death due to a range of socioeconomic factors.
- Emerging evidence suggests that individuals living in deprived areas may have a higher risk of developing post COVID condition (PCC), while mixed results were reported in research on PCC risk in ethnic minorities.
- There is limited evidence on the association between migration status and PCC.

What this study adds:

- During the pre-Omicron period, more deprived populations were associated with increased PCC probability, especially among females. Migrant, ethnic minority and migrant-ethnic minority males also had higher PCC probability compared to their counterparts after accounting for potential confounders.
- In the Omicron period, the disparities in the likelihood of PCC were less pronounced, though migrant-ethnic minority females still had higher PCC probability, especially in those with confirmed infections, suggesting post-infection determinants play a role.
- Our study suggests pre- and post-infection determinants of PCC among these populations.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy:

- This study underscores the need to address health inequalities faced by deprived, migrant and ethnic minority populations to reduce their risk of COVID-19 infection and PCC.
- Further research into the intersection of migration, ethnicity, and deprivation, along with other factors such as sex and occupation, is required to guide targeted public health efforts and resource allocation.
- Target policies should address occupational and housing exposure risks, increase vaccine uptake, provide culturally appropriate public health information and ensure equitable access to PCC and primary care services.

Abstract

Background: Deprived communities, migrant and ethnic minorities were disproportionately affected by COVID-19 and may, therefore, be at a higher risk of post-COVID condition (PCC). This analysis, using data from the Virus Watch study, investigates how deprivation, migration status, and ethnic minority status influence PCC risk in both the full cohort (all regardless of infection status) and those with a confirmed COVID-19 infection.

Methods: A subset of participants from Virus Watch, a prospective community cohort study in England, were included. We used logistic regression to compare the predicted probability of developing PCC in both full and infected cohorts among different deprivation levels, migration and ethnic minority status categories by sex-at-birth during pre-Omicron and Omicron periods, adjusting for socio-demographic covariates.

Results: During the pre-Omicron period, PCC probability increased with deprivation levels, especially in females (most deprived: 7.8%, 95% CI 4.6-11.0%; least deprived: 3.5%, 2.5-4.5%). Migrant and ethnic minority males had a higher likelihood of PCC than their respective counterparts, particularly in the full cohort for migrants (6.3%, 1.8-10.8%) and the previously infected cohort for ethnic minorities (38.8%, 21.2-56.4%). However, these disparities were less pronounced in females. In the Omicron period, these differential probabilities were also less evident.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest that greater PCC probability among these populations is driven by increased infection risk and post-infection determinants. This underscores the need for policies and interventions to reduce infection risk and affordable and easily available healthcare services for those with PCC.

Introduction

Migrants, ethnic minorities and individuals in deprived areas have historically experienced health inequalities which were exacerbated by the coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic(1). The pandemic also led to the emergence of post-COVID condition (PCC) or long COVID, a syndrome comprising a wide range of symptoms which emerge within three months of acute infection and persist for at least two months with no other explanation. Globally, 10-30% of non-hospitalised and 50-70% of hospitalised cases reported developing PCC(2).

Known PCC risk factors include increasing age and female sex, and severe COVID-19 illness, but the role of socioeconomic factors remains unclear (2). Deprived communities, migrants and ethnic minorities experienced higher rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalisation and death compared to the general population, particularly during the Wild-type, Alpha and Delta variants waves (3–5). Socio-economic disparities, including household overcrowding, occupational exposures, and limited healthcare and vaccine access, contributed to these increased risks (6–9). These communities also have higher rates of underlying health conditions, such as diabetes and hypertension, which increase their vulnerability to severe COVID-19 (10). As a result, they may be at greater risk of developing PCC.

Emerging evidence suggests that individuals in deprived areas may be at elevated risk of developing PCC. Multiple UK studies have consistently reported greater odds/risk of PCC in the most deprived decile/quintile compared to the least deprived after adjusting for covariates (11). However, studies on PCC risk in ethnic minorities yielded mixed results. Research from the UK, US, Netherlands and Denmark (12–16) observed higher PCC odds/risk among ethnic minorities compared to the majority ethnic population. In contrast, others reported no association (17,18) or lower PCC odds/risk (19,20). Evidence on migration status is limited, but a study in the Netherlands found higher PCC risk in migrant hospitalised patients compared to non-migrants following confounder adjustment (13).

Given these inconsistencies and gaps in research, we aimed to use data from the Virus Watch prospective community cohort study in England (21) to investigate how PCC risk varies by deprivation levels, migration and ethnic minority status during pre-Omicron and Omicron periods. We evaluated this in the full cohort, irrespective of infection status (objective 1), and in individuals with confirmed COVID-19 infection (objective 2). This will provide evidence for policies addressing health inequities related to PCC and future pandemics.

Methods

Ethics Approval and Consent

Virus Watch was approved by the Hampstead NHS Health Research Authority Ethics Committee: 20/HRA/2320, and conformed to the ethical standards set out in the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants provided informed consent for all aspects of the study.

Study design and participants

Virus Watch is a large prospective community cohort study established in June 2020 on the transmission and burden of COVID-19 in England and Wales (n = 58,497 as of March 2022). Participation was self-selected and limited to households with internet access and a lead household member proficient in English (Consent forms and participant information sheets were available in multiple languages). Participants complete weekly online questionnaires regarding COVID-19 symptoms, testing and vaccination, and occasional in-depth surveys on

related topics, such as long-term symptom monitoring. The full study design and methodology have been described elsewhere (22).

Participants in this analysis were a subset of the Virus Watch study cohort. Inclusion criteria were: 1) registered with an English postcode, 2) responded to at least one survey on new persistent symptoms between February 2020 and March 2023, and 3) if infected, able to assign the infection variant based on SARS-CoV-2 test reporting date.

Exposures

We examined three exposures: Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) as a measure of deprivation, migration status, and minority ethnicity status.

IMD was categorised into quintiles (1st quintile = most deprived, 5th = least deprived), and was based on self-reported postcode of residence linked to the May 2020 ONS Postcode Lookup (23). The 5th quintile was used as the reference category.

Migration status was determined by self-reported country of birth. Non-UK-born participants were classified as migrants, while those with missing migration status were analysed as a separate category. Comparisons used the UK-born group as the reference category.

Ethnic minority status was based on self-reported ethnicity. Participants who reported to be white Irish, white Other, mixed, South Asian, other Asian, Black, or other were categorised as ethnic minorities. The white British group acted as the reference category.

Outcome

PCC (yes/no) was phenotypically defined using the World Health Organisation consensus definition as the onset of at least one symptom lasting at least two months within three months of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, unexplained by other diagnoses. SARS-CoV-2 infections before the end of nationally funded COVID-19 testing (31s March 2022) were identified using linked test results from the national testing database, self-reported/study-based COVID-19 and antibody test results (see ‘Sources of SARS-CoV-2 Infection’ in Supplemental materials).

Persistent symptom tracking was based on four occasional surveys on long-term symptoms (February 2021, May 2021, March 2022, and March 2023), where participants reported any symptoms lasting at least four weeks, the onset dates of their three most severe symptoms, and whether they were ongoing or resolved. Data were available from February 2020 to March 2023, with symptom onset dates matched to track symptom episodes across multiple surveys.

PCC cases were defined as individuals with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection within three months of symptom onset with at least one symptom lasting two months. Symptom duration was calculated from symptom onset to survey completion (for ongoing symptoms) or reported resolution date. Only PCC cases reported by 30 June 2022 (three months post nationally-funded testing end) were included to minimise misclassification. Participants who were hospitalised for/with COVID-19 or reported ongoing symptoms lasting less than two months were also excluded. Non-PCC participants completed all four surveys and either reported no persistent symptoms or symptoms without a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection within three months of onset, reducing the risk of undetected or unreported symptoms.

Covariates

The covariates considered were age group (<25, 26-44, 45-64, 65+ years), sex at birth (male and female) and occupation. Occupations were categorised into five categories based on occupation type, exposure risk, and employment status: higher exposure risk occupation, lower exposure risk occupation, not in employment, retired, and unknown/other status (see Supplemental Table 1 and further details elsewhere) (24).

SARS-CoV-2 infection variants were based on regional variant dominance periods (25,26). Study periods were categorised as 'pre-Omicron' (1 February 2020 - 13 December 2021) and 'Omicron' (14 December 2021 - 12 June 2022) (Supplemental Table 2).

Statistical analyses

We summarised baseline sociodemographic and clinical characteristics using descriptive statistics.

Separate analyses were conducted for each exposure using two distinct cohorts. The first included all participants, regardless of SARS-CoV-2 infection history, to assess the association between each exposure and PCC. The second included individuals with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection to estimate the association between each exposure and the risk of PCC within infected populations, providing an estimate of post-infection PCC probability differences among different exposure groups.

Directed acyclic graphs were used to identify minimally sufficient adjustment sets for each exposure (Supplemental Figures 1-3). For IMD quintile, the adjustment set included age, migration status, ethnic minority status, and occupation for objective 1, and age, migration and ethnic minority status for objective 2. For migration status, the set included age and minority ethnicity status for both objectives, while for minority ethnicity status, the adjustment set consisted of age.

We conducted stratified multivariable logistic regression analyses for each exposure and cohort, stratified by sex and variant period. To explore the intersection of minority ethnicity and migration status, we performed an additional analysis using a composite variable that combined these two factors, adjusted for age (27). Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis was conducted by categorising white British participants with missing migration status as UK-born, based on evidence from the 2011 Census that 98% of white British individuals were UK-born (28). Multicollinearity was tested (see 'Multicollinearity' in Supplemental Materials). Results were expressed as predicted probabilities (PP) to allow comparison across all exposures, and odds ratios (OR) to assess the relative odds of developing PCC in each exposure group compared to the reference group in both cohorts.

Results



Figure 1. Flow diagram of participant eligibility.

Figure 1 illustrates participant selection. Table 1 reports the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the analysis cohorts. See Supplemental Tables 6-8 for characteristics by each exposure.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the analysis cohorts.

Characteristic	**All participants regardless of any confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection N = 8,591**	**Participants with a reported confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection N = 2,841**
Age group		
0-24	415 (4.8%)	231 (8.1%)
25-44	477 (5.6%)	267 (9.4%)
45-64	3,185 (37%)	1,141 (40%)
65+	4,514 (52%)	1,202 (42%)
Sex (at birth)		
Male	4,906 (57%)	1,655 (58%)
Female	3,685 (43%)	1,186 (42%)
Ethnic minority status		

White British	7,870 (92%)	2,578 (91%)
Minority ethnic	666 (7.8%)	250 (8.8%)
Missing/Prefer not to say	55 (0.6%)	13 (0.5%)
Migration status		
UK Born	7,299 (85%)	2,355 (83%)
Not UK Born	537 (6.3%)	171 (6.0%)
Missing	755 (8.8%)	315 (11%)
IMD Quintile		
1 (most deprived)	593 (6.9%)	213 (7.5%)
2	1,139 (13%)	406 (14%)
3	1,734 (20%)	573 (20%)
4	2,274 (26%)	714 (25%)
5 (least deprived)	2,778 (32%)	921 (32%)
Missing	73 (0.8%)	14 (0.5%)
Clinical vulnerability		
Not clinically vulnerable	4,856 (57%)	1,679 (59%)
Clinically vulnerable	2,391 (28%)	763 (27%)
Clinically extremely vulnerable	1,262 (15%)	370 (13%)
Missing	82 (1.0%)	29 (1.0%)
Body Mass Index (BMI)		
Underweight	82 (1.0%)	24 (0.8%)
Normal	2,836 (33%)	898 (32%)
Pre-obesity	2,535 (30%)	808 (28%)
Obesity	1,361 (16%)	459 (16%)
Severe obesity	174 (2.0%)	48 (1.7%)
Missing	1,603 (19%)	604 (21%)
Occupation		
Higher Risk Occupation	1,386 (16%)	591 (21%)
Lower Risk Occupation	1,746 (20%)	643 (23%)
Not in Employment	358 (4.2%)	118 (4.2%)
Retired	4,120 (48%)	1,105 (39%)
Unknown or Other Status	981 (11%)	384 (14%)

Across all exposure groups, the likelihood of developing PCC was higher during the pre-Omicron than the Omicron period, regardless of sex and infection status. Overall, the PCC probability was higher in females than males across all exposure groups (Figures 2 and 3; Supplemental Tables 9-12, 29, 30).

PCC Risk by IMD Quintile

Pre-Omicron, increasing PCC probability across deprivation levels was observed for both sexes, regardless of infection status (Figure 2A). Among individuals with confirmed infection, females residing in the most deprived quintile and males in the 2nd most deprived quintile had the highest PCC probabilities (Female: 37.7%, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 25.4-

50.0%; Male: 26.1%, 15.5-36.7%) (Supplemental Table 11). There was strong evidence for an increased odds of PCC in females in the most deprived areas (adjusted OR (aOR): 2.1, 1.1-4.3) and males in the 2nd most deprived areas (2.5, 1.1-5.8) compared to counterparts in the least deprived areas (Figure 3A; Supplemental Tables 13-14).

In the Omicron period, there were no between-quintile differences for either sex in both cohorts (Figure 2B). Females in the most deprived areas had the highest PCC probability (18.1%, 9.6-26.6%), exceeding those in less deprived areas and all males (Supplemental Table 12). However, there was little evidence of increased odds in more deprived groups than those least deprived in both cohorts during this period (Figure 3B; Supplemental Tables 15-16).

PCC Risk by Migration Status

Pre-Omicron, migrant males had a higher PCC probability compared to UK-born males in the full cohort (migrant: 6.3%, 1.8-10.8%; UK-born: 1.9%, 1.4-2.4%) and the confirmed infection cohort (migrant: 33.1%, 11.8-54.5%; UK-born: 14.4%, 10.5-18.3%) (Figure 2A; Supplemental Table 11). There was strong evidence for a 3.6 (1.5-8.5) increased odds of PCC in migrant males compared to UK-born males in the full cohort, but this was attenuated in the infected group (aOR: 3.1, 1.0-9.2) (Figure 3A; Supplemental Tables 17-18). Individuals with missing migration status had the highest PCC probabilities in both cohorts.

During the Omicron period, PCC probabilities were higher for non-UK-born than UK-born individuals in both cohorts, but no differences in PCC risk were identified, as suggested by overlapping 95% CIs were wide (Figure 2B; Supplemental Table 12). There was also little evidence to suggest differential odds between the two groups (Figure 3B). Similar to the pre-Omicron period, individuals with unknown migration status exhibited the highest PCC probability, particularly among females (female: 35.1%, 25.8-44.5%; male: 19.8%, 11.2-28.4%) (Supplemental Tables 19-20).

Reclassifying white British participants with missing migration status as UK-born attenuated the increased PCC probability seen in non-UK-born males in both cohorts during the pre-Omicron period. The increased PCC risk among those with unknown migration status was also lost (Supplemental Figure 4 & Tables 25-28).

PCC Risk by Ethnic Minority Status

Pre-Omicron, ethnic minority males had a higher PCC probability than white British males in the full cohort, with ethnic minority males experiencing a 1.93 (1.01-3.68) higher odds of PCC. A similar trend was seen in the infected cohort (white British: 38.8%, 21.2-56.4%; ethnic minority: 16.2%, 12.5-20.0%), with the association observed being more pronounced (aOR: 3.44, 1.49-7.94). Among females, we found no evidence of an association between ethnic minority status and PCC in both cohorts (Figures 2A & 3A; Supplemental Tables 11, 21-22).

In the Omicron period, PCC probability was generally low across all groups, regardless of infection status. Among infected individuals, the likelihood of PCC was higher in ethnic minority than white British females (white British: 11.0%, 9.0-13.0%; ethnic minority: 15.7%, 7.5-23.8%) but lower in ethnic minority males than white British males (white British: 7.8%, 5.8-9.7%; ethnic minority: 3.9%, 0.0-8.3%), though confidence intervals overlapped (Figure 2B; Supplemental Table 12). Adjusted ORs suggested no differences in the odds of

developing PCC between ethnic groups for either cohort and sex (Figure 3B; Supplemental Tables 23-24).

When including the ‘ethnicity-migration status’ composite variable, among the infected cohort, we found strong evidence for a higher PCC probability in male ethnic minority migrants (49.7%, 26.4-73.1%) compared to white British UK-born males (13.7%, 9.9-17.4%) during the pre-Omicron period, and in female ethnic minority migrants (19.4%, 6.9-31.8%) than their white British UK-born counterparts (8.2%, 6.4-10.1%) during the Omicron period (Figure 4; Supplemental Tables 29-34).



Figure 2. Predicted probabilities of PCC by IMD quintile, migration status and ethnic minority status in the full cohort and individuals with a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, categorised by reported sex-at-birth during A) pre-Omicron and B) Omicron periods.



Figure 3. Conditional adjusted odds ratio of PCC by IMD quintile, migration status and ethnic minority status in the full cohort and individuals with a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, categorised by reported sex-at-birth during A) pre-Omicron and B) Omicron periods.

Predicted Probability



Conditional adjusted Odds Ratio



Figure 4. Predicted probability and conditional adjusted odds ratio of PCC by the 'ethnicity-migration' composite variable in the full cohort and individuals with a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, stratified by reported sex-at-birth during A) pre-Omicron and B) Omicron periods. No PP and OR estimates are available for males in the 'ethnic minority-missing migration status' group from the Omicron period due to the small sample size.

Discussion

Using data from a community cohort in England, we found that deprivation levels were associated with higher PCC probability, particularly among females, during the pre-Omicron period. Migrant and ethnic minority groups had higher PCC probabilities, though these disparities were less pronounced in females - who overall had a higher probability of PCC - and more pronounced in migrant-ethnic minority males. These disparities were also less pronounced in the Omicron period, with some evidence for an association with PCC for migrant-ethnic minority females than their white British-UK-born counterparts.

While our study lacked statistical power to demonstrate an association between deprivation and PCC risk, the point estimates suggested one, which is consistent with broader literature. Shabnam et al. found higher PCC risk in females than males across all IMD deciles and a dose-response relationship with deprivation levels in both sexes (11). Our findings regarding elevated PCC probability among ethnic minority males align with some existing studies, although findings on ethnic disparities have been mixed (12–20). Furthermore, our results corroborate those from the Netherlands, which reported higher PCC risk in migrants (13). It is important to note that our findings are not directly comparable since our analyses were stratified by sex and variant period. Our findings underscore the intersectionality of sex, ethnicity, migration and deprivation as PCC determinants and the need for further comparative research to better understand these intersections.

Our findings suggest that inequalities in the likelihood of PCC were influenced by pre- and post-infection determinants. Migrant and ethnic minority males, often employed in insecure or frontline roles, reliant on public transport, working or residing in overcrowded environments, and experiencing pre-existing health inequalities, likely faced heightened exposure risk (6–9). These findings may reflect intervention-induced inequalities during the pre-Omicron period - where measures including lockdowns, social distancing and work-from-home, while lowering overall infection rates, disproportionately impacted these populations depending on work and housing-related exposure. Differential vaccine access in these populations may also affect their infection risk (29). However, by the Omicron period, as restrictions were lifted, the observed inequality gaps narrowed when infection became more widespread.

Slower vaccine uptake among migrants with non-White ethnicity, along with lower vaccination rates in ethnic minority and deprived groups, as reported by Burns et al. and Curtis et al., likely also contributed to the increased risk of infection and severe illness, particularly by pre-Omicron variants (30–32). These variants were associated with more severe COVID-19 illness, a key infection-related PCC determinant (33). Improved vaccination coverage across different populations and Omicron’s reduced pathogenicity contributed to milder illness and, subsequently, the observed attenuation of PCC risk disparities in the later period (32,34). This underscores the need to improve vaccine access and uptake in deprived and minority groups, particularly in future pandemics, to reduce their infection and PCC risk.

Delayed care for COVID-19, often due to institutional and personal barriers to healthcare access, may lead to more severe illness and increase the risk of PCC (35). The individual and intersecting characteristics of migrants and ethnic minorities also translate to unique challenges related to healthcare access, such as cultural and language differences, fear of stigma, and distrust of healthcare systems (35). Job insecurity and lack of paid sick leave, common among deprived communities and in some migrant and ethnic minority groups, also

delay or prevent timely care, as many cannot afford to miss work or risk losing their jobs (35,36). These challenges are more pronounced for women in these populations as they are more likely to work in low-income, precarious jobs and serve as primary caregivers (37).

Strengths and limitations

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the association between migration status and PCC in England, assess how deprivation, migration and minority ethnicity status influence PCC risk over time during pre-Omicron and Omicron periods, and explore whether PCC determinants of these populations arise before or after a SARS-CoV-2 infection. Virus Watch's longitudinal design and detailed sociodemographic and clinical data collection across multiple pandemic periods, along with linkage to the national testing database, reduced recall and selection bias, strengthening the validity of study findings.

Several limitations should be considered. Using an area-level measure of deprivation limits individual-level conclusions, and categorising migration and ethnic minority status as binary variables, while necessary for adequate sample sizes, restricted a more in-depth analysis of PCC risks across specific migrant groups and ethnicities. Future studies should explore these differences more granularly. Deprived, migrant, and minority groups are likely underrepresented in Virus Watch due to language barriers, limited internet access, and economic circumstances (38). Misclassification of PCC cases may have arisen from limiting community testing, recall bias, and missed asymptomatic infections, particularly during the pre-Omicron (Wild Type and Alpha) periods.

Conclusion

Our findings underscore the critical need to tackle health inequalities to minimise the infection risk and long-term consequences of COVID-19 and future pandemics, especially for deprived, migrant and ethnic minority groups. This includes addressing pre-infection determinants such as mitigating occupational and housing-related exposure risks. Targeted policies and interventions should focus on the specific needs of these groups in vaccination, recovery and rehabilitation efforts. Early efforts to increase vaccine uptake and ensure equitable access to PCC and primary care services in these communities are crucial to reducing their infection and subsequent PCC risk. Providing culturally and linguistically appropriate care and collaborating with trusted community partners is also necessary to disseminate accurate public health information about PCC. Further investigation into the intersectionality of multiple social dimensions, including sex and occupation, on PCC risk is also recommended to guide targeted public health efforts and resource allocation for the most vulnerable populations.

Funding

This work was supported by the Medical Research Council [Grant Ref: MC_PC 19070] awarded to UCL on 30 March 2020 and Medical Research Council [Grant Ref: MR/V028375/1] awarded on 17 August 2020. The study also received $15,000 of advertising credit from Facebook to support a pilot social media recruitment campaign on 18th August 2020.

This study was supported by the Wellcome Trust through a Wellcome Clinical Research Career Development Fellowship to RWA [206602].

From 1 May 2022, Virus Watch received funding from the European Union (Project: 101046314). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do

not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Health and Digital Executive Agency (HaDEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Competing Interests
AH serves on the UK New and Emerging Respiratory Virus Threats Advisory Group. All other authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. J Epidemiol Community Health [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1 [cited 2024 Nov 6];74(11):964–8. Available from: https://jech.bmj.com/content/74/11/964
2. Davis HE, McCorkell L, Vogel JM, Topol EJ. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and recommendations. Nat Rev Microbiol [Internet]. 2023;21(3):133–46. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-022-00846-2
3. Mathur R, Rentsch CT, Morton CE, Hulme WJ, Schultze A, MacKenna B, et al. Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care unit admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an observational cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. The Lancet [Internet]. 2021 May 8;397(10286):1711–24. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00634-6
4. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. London; 2020.
5. Intensive Care National Audit and Research Centre. Case Mix Programme Public Report 2022-23 - Summary Statistics. 2023.
6. Aldridge RW, Pineo H, Fragaszy E, Eyre MT, Kovar J, Nguyen V, et al. Household overcrowding and risk of SARS-CoV-2: analysis of the Virus Watch prospective community cohort study in England and Wales [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. Wellcome Open Res. 2021;6(347).
7. Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J, et al. Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank participants. Occup Environ Med. 2020 Dec;78(5):307–14.
8. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Reducing COVID-19 transmission and strengthening vaccine uptake among migrant populations in the EU/EEA. 2021.
9. Zhang CX, Boukari Y, Pathak N, Mathur R, Katikireddi SV, Patel P, et al. Migrants' primary care utilisation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in England: An interrupted time series analysis. The Lancet Regional Health – Europe [Internet]. 2022 Sep 1;20. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100455
10. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. J Epidemiol Community Health (1978) [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1;74(11):964. Available from: http://jech.bmj.com/content/74/11/964.abstract
11. Shabnam S, Razieh C, Dambha-Miller H, Yates T, Gillies C, Chudasama Y V, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities of Long COVID: a retrospective population-based cohort study in the United Kingdom. J R Soc Med [Internet]. 2023 May 10;116(8):263–73. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/01410768231168377
12. Subramanian A, Nirantharakumar K, Hughes S, Myles P, Williams T, Gokhale KM, et al. Symptoms and risk factors for long COVID in non-hospitalized adults. Nat Med [Internet]. 2022;28(8):1706–14. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01909-w

13. Chilunga FP, Appelman B, van Vugt M, Kalverda K, Smeele P, van Es J, et al. Differences in incidence, nature of symptoms, and duration of long COVID among hospitalised migrant and non-migrant patients in the Netherlands: a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet Regional Health – Europe [Internet]. 2023 Jun 1;29. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2023.100630
14. Khullar D, Zhang Y, Zang C, Xu Z, Wang F, Weiner MG, et al. Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Post-acute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in New York: an EHR-Based Cohort Study from the RECOVER Program. J Gen Intern Med [Internet]. 2023;38(5):1127–36. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07997-1
15. Mkoma GF, Agyemang C, Benfield T, Rostila M, Cederström A, Petersen JH, et al. Risk of long COVID and associated symptoms after acute SARS-COV-2 infection in ethnic minorities: A nationwide register-linked cohort study in Denmark. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2024 Feb 20;21(2):e1004280-. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004280
16. Yomogida K, Zhu S, Rubino F, Figueroa W, Balanji N, Holman E. Post-Acute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Adults Aged ≥18 Years — Long Beach, California, April 1–December 10, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021 Sep 17;70(37):1274–7.
17. Westerlind E, Palstam A, Sunnerhagen KS, Persson HC. Patterns and predictors of sick leave after Covid-19 and long Covid in a national Swedish cohort. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2021;21(1):1023. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11013-2
18. Hirschtick JL, Titus AR, Slocum E, Power LE, Hirschtick RE, Elliott MR, et al. Population-Based Estimates of Post-acute Sequelae of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection (PASC) Prevalence and Characteristics. Clinical Infectious Diseases [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1;73(11):2055–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab408
19. Thompson EJ, Williams DM, Walker AJ, Mitchell RE, Niedzwiedz CL, Yang TC, et al. Long COVID burden and risk factors in 10 UK longitudinal studies and electronic health records. Nat Commun [Internet]. 2022;13(1):3528. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30836-0
20. Whitaker M, Elliott J, Chadeau-Hyam M, Riley S, Darzi A, Cooke G, et al. Persistent COVID-19 symptoms in a community study of 606,434 people in England. Nature Communications 2022 13:1 [Internet]. 2022 Apr 12 [cited 2024 Nov 6];13(1):1–10. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-29521-z
21. Byrne T, Kovar J, Beale S, Braithwaite I, Fragaszy E, Fong WLE, et al. Cohort Profile: Virus Watch—understanding community incidence, symptom profiles and transmission of COVID-19 in relation to population movement and behaviour. Int J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2023 Oct 1;52(5):e263–72. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyad087
22. Hayward A, Fragaszy E, Kovar J, Nguyen V, Beale S, Byrne T, et al. Risk factors, symptom reporting, healthcare-seeking behaviour and adherence to public health guidance: protocol for Virus Watch, a prospective community cohort study. BMJ Open. 2021 Jun;11(6):e048042.
23. Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government. MHCLG English indices of deprivation 2019: File 1: Index of Multiple Deprivation [Internet]. 2019. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019
24. Beale S, Yavlinsky A, Fong WLE, Nguyen VG, Kovar J, Vos T, et al. Long-term outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 variants and other respiratory infections: evidence from the Virus Watch prospective cohort in England. Epidemiol Infect [Internet]. 2024/05/10.

2024;152:e77. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/6844574EB4E337F29F7B60B00A22FC01
25. UK Health Security Agency. Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 variants: Technical briefings [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Nov 6]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/investigation-of-sars-cov-2-variants-technical-briefings
26. UK Health Security Agency. Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 variants: Routine variant data update [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Nov 6]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/investigation-of-sars-cov-2-variants-routine-variant-data-update
27. Viruell-Fuentes EA, Miranda PY, Abdulrahim S. More than culture: Structural racism, intersectionality theory, and immigrant health. Soc Sci Med. 2012 Dec 1;75(12):2099–106.
28. Office for National Statistics. People born outside the UK [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2024 Nov 6]. Available from: https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/people-born-outside-the-uk/latest/#:~:text=This%20data%20shows%20that:%20at%20the%20time,people%20born%20in%20the%20UK%2C%20at%2014.5%
29. Oskrochi Y, Jeraj S, Aldridge R, Butt J, Miller A. Not by choice – the unequal impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on disempowered ethnic minority and migrant communities [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Nov 7]. Available from: https://raceequalityfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Not-by-choice.pdf
30. Burns R, Wyke S, Eyre MT, Boukari Y, Sørensen TB, Tsang C, et al. COVID-19 vaccination coverage for half a million non-EU migrants and refugees in England. Nat Hum Behav [Internet]. 2024 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Nov 6];8(2):288–99. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38049560/
31. Curtis HJ, Inglesby P, Morton CE, MacKenna B, Green A, Hulme W, et al. Trends and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 vaccine recipients: a federated analysis of 57.9 million patients' primary care records in situ using OpenSAFELY. British Journal of General Practice [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1 [cited 2024 Nov 6];72(714):e51–62. Available from: https://bjgp.org/content/72/714/e51
32. Kerr S, Bedston S, Cezard G, Sampri A, Murphy S, Bradley DT, et al. Undervaccination and severe COVID-19 outcomes: meta-analysis of national cohort studies in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The Lancet [Internet]. 2024 Feb 10 [cited 2024 Nov 6];403(10426):554–66. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140673623024674/fulltext
33. Hernández-Aceituno A, García-Hernández A, Larumbe-Zabala E. COVID-19 long-term sequelae: Omicron versus Alpha and Delta variants. Infect Dis Now. 2023 Aug 1;53(5):104688.
34. Wolter N, Jassat W, Walaza S, Welch R, Moultrie H, Groome M, et al. Early assessment of the clinical severity of the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant in South Africa: a data linkage study. The Lancet [Internet]. 2022 Jan 29 [cited 2024 Nov 6];399(10323):437–46. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140673622000174/fulltext
35. Doctors of the World. An Unsafe Distance: The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Excluded People in England. 2020 May.
36. Patel P, Beale S, Nguyen V, Braithwaite I, Byrne TE, Erica Fong WL, et al. Inequalities in access to paid sick leave among workers in England and Wales. Int J Health Plann Manage [Internet]. 2023 Nov 1 [cited 2024 Nov 6];38(6):1864–76. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hpm.3697

37. Yong A, Germain S. Ethnic minority and migrant women's struggles in accessing healthcare during COVID-19: an intersectional analysis. Journal for Cultural Research [Internet]. 2022 Jan 2 [cited 2024 Nov 6];26(1):65–82. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14797585.2021.2012090
38. Shaghaghi A, Bhopal RS, Sheikh A. Approaches to Recruiting "Hard-To-Reach" Populations into Re-search: A Review of the Literature. Health Promot Perspect. 2011;1(2):86–94.