

Type of article: Research article

1 First and second waves of coronavirus disease-19: A comparative study in
2 hospitalized patients in Reus, Spain

3
4 **Simona Iftimie**¹, **Ana F. López-Azcona**¹, **Immaculada Vallverdú**², **Salvador Hernández-Flix**
5 **³**, **Gabriel de Febrer**⁴, **Sandra Parra**¹, **Anna Hernández-Aguilera**^{5,6}, **Francesc Riu**⁵, **Jorge**
6 **Joven**⁶, **Jordi Camps**^{6,*}, **Antoni Castro**¹, and the **REUSCOVID Study Group**

7 ¹ Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació
8 Sanitària Pere Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

9 ² Intensive Care Unit, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació Sanitària Pere
10 Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

11 ³ Section of Pneumology, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació Sanitària Pere
12 Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

13 ⁴ Intermediate Care Unit, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació Sanitària Pere
14 Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

15 ⁵ Department of Pathology, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació Sanitària Pere
16 Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

17 ⁶ Unitat de Recerca Biomèdica, Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan, Institut d'Investigació Sanitària
18 Pere Virgili, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain

19

20

21 **Short title:** Comparison between the first and the second waves of COVID-19

22 **Collaborators of the REUSCOVID Study Group:**

23 (In alphabetical order)

24 Natàlia Andreychuk, Gerard Baiges-Gaya, Frederic Ballester, Marc Benavent, José Burdeos, Alba
25 Català, Èric Castañé, Helena Castañé, Josep Colom, Mireia Feliu, Xavier Gabaldó, Diana Garrido,
26 Pedro Garrido, Joan Gil, Paloma Guelbenzu, Carolina Lozano, Francesc Marimon, Pedro Pardo,
27 Isabel Pujol, Antoni Rabassa, Laia Revuelta , Marta Rios, Neus Rius-Gordillo, Elisabet Rodríguez-
28 Tomàs, Wojciech Rojewski, Esther Roquer-Fanlo, Noèlia Sabaté, Anna Texidó, Carlos Vasco.

29

30
31
32

32 Abstract

33 Many countries have seen a two-wave pattern in reported cases of coronavirus disease-19
34 during the 2020 pandemic, with a first wave during spring followed by the current second wave in
35 late summer and autumn. Empirical data show that the characteristics of the effects of the virus do
36 vary between the two periods. Differences in age range and severity of the disease have been
37 reported, although the comparative characteristics of the two waves still remain largely unknown.
38 Those characteristics are compared in this study using data from two equal periods of 3 and a half
39 months. The first period, between 15th March and 30th June, corresponding to the entire first wave,
40 and the second, between 1st July and 15th October, corresponding to part of the second wave, still
41 present at the time of writing this article. Two hundred and four patients were hospitalized during
42 the first period, and 264 during the second period. Patients in the second wave were younger and
43 the duration of hospitalization and case fatality rate were lower than those in the first wave. In the
44 second wave, there were more children, and pregnant and post-partum women. The most frequent
45 signs and symptoms in both waves were fever, dyspnea, pneumonia, and cough, and the most
46 relevant comorbidities were cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and chronic
47 neurological diseases. Patients from the second wave more frequently presented renal and
48 gastrointestinal symptoms, were more often treated with non-invasive mechanical ventilation and
49 corticoids, and less often with invasive mechanical ventilation, conventional oxygen therapy and
50 anticoagulants. Several differences in mortality risk factors were also observed. These results might
51 help to understand the characteristics of the second wave and the behaviour and danger of SARS-
52 CoV-2 in the Mediterranean area and in Western Europe. Further studies are needed to confirm our
53 findings.

54

55 **Keywords:** COVID-19; Epidemiology; Mortality; Pandemic; SARS-CoV-2.

56 Introduction

57 Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19), produced by the severe acute respiratory syndrome
58 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has become a global pandemic, giving rise to a serious health threat
59 globally. Several countries have seen a two-wave pattern of reported cases, with a first wave in
60 spring and a second in late summer and autumn [1-6]. In Spain, the first wave of COVID-19 began
61 in early March 2020, although some isolated cases had been reported in February [7]. As a
62 consequence of the first outbreak, the Spanish Government introduced a series of strict prevention
63 measures, including home confinement, which lasted from 13th March to 4th May, followed by a
64 three-month period of progressively increasing social interaction, work and commercial activity. As
65 of July, life in the country had returned to relative normality, except for the mandatory wearing of a
66 face mask and maintaining a safe social distance. Unfortunately, the number of cases of patients
67 with COVID-19 began to increase towards the end of August and a month later it once again
68 presented numbers similar to those in April. This forced the Government to reintroduce serious
69 restrictive measures, including local and regional lockdowns, closures of bars, restaurants, cultural
70 and sports activities, and a general curfew after 10 pm. The second wave of COVID-19 had been
71 predicted months earlier and had already occurred in other countries [4]. The vast majority of
72 Western European countries are currently suffering the consequences of this second wave and are
73 taking similar restrictive measures. However, empirical data would suggest that this second wave
74 differs from the first in such factors as age range and severity of the disease [8]. Indeed, it has been
75 suggested that this second wave in Europe might be linked to the appearance of a new variant of the
76 SARS-CoV-2, termed 20A.EU1, which appears to have originated in Spain, from where it then
77 spread to the rest of Europe through tourists who had spent their summer holidays in that area [9].
78 The similarities and differences between the characteristics of the two waves remain largely
79 unknown. Population comparison is difficult because the technological and logistical capacity of the
80 countries in detection and diagnosis of asymptomatic patients and those with mild symptoms has

81 improved greatly in the six months since spring, and it is assumed that the incidence of infection in
82 the early months of the pandemic was much higher than had been reported [10]. However, a more
83 accurate comparison of the two waves is feasible through the study of the hospitalized patients for
84 whom disease was confirmed by reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and
85 severe symptoms.

86 This study investigated the severity and characteristics of the two waves in hospitalized
87 patients in Reus, Spain. We evaluated age, gender, symptoms, comorbidities, mortality, supportive
88 care, medication, and the outcome for the patient.

89 **Materials and Methods**

90 **Study design**

91 We conducted a prospective study of all hospitalized cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
92 *Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan*, in Reus, Spain, admitted between 15th March and 15th October
93 2020. All patients admitted up to 30th June were considered to be in the first wave and all those
94 admitted from 1st July in the second wave, which divided the study period into two equal parts of
95 three and a half months. The only inclusion criterion was to be a hospitalized patient with an
96 analytical diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2. We excluded those with suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection but
97 had no laboratory confirmation and those who came to the hospital with symptoms compatible with
98 COVID-19 but did not require hospitalization. SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by RT-PCR
99 using swab samples from the upper respiratory tract (nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal exudate), from
100 the lower respiratory tract (sputum/endotracheal aspirate/bronchoalveolar lavage/bronchial aspirate)
101 or from the lower digestive tract (rectal smear). Tests were carried out with the VIASURE *SARS-*
102 *CoV-2* Real Time PCR Detection Kit (CerTest Biotec, Zaragoza, Spain), or with the Procleix®
103 method in a Panther automated extractor and amplifier (Grifols Laboratories, Barcelona, Spain).
104 This study was approved by the *Comitè d'Ètica i Investigació en Medicaments* (Institutional

105 Review Board) of *Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan* (Resolution CEIM 040/2018, amended on 16
106 April 2020).

107 **Calculation of sample size**

108 Accepting an alpha risk of 0.05 and a beta risk of less than 0.2 in a bilateral contrast, it takes
109 137 subjects in the first wave and 105 in the second wave to detect a difference equal to or greater
110 than 8 years in the variable age. The common standard deviation is assumed to be 22. A follow-up
111 loss rate of 0% was estimated.

112 **Statistical analyses**

113 Data is given as numbers and percentages or means and standard deviations. Statistical
114 comparisons between two groups were made using the χ^2 test (categorical variables) or the
115 Student's *t* test. Logistic regression models were fitted to investigate the combined effect of selected
116 variables on mortality. Statistical significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$. All calculations were made using
117 the SPSS 25.0 statistical package (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

118 **Results**

119 The raw data of this study are as Supporting Information. During the study period, 468
120 patients with SARS-Co-V2 infection, confirmed by RT-PCR, were admitted to the hospital. The
121 seasonal distribution of hospital admissions is shown in Figure 1. The first wave peaked at the end
122 of March and was followed by a progressive decrease with very few patients being admitted in May
123 and June. The number of cases fluctuated upward from mid-July until a sharp increase in mid-
124 October. The number of patients admitted was 204 in the first wave and 264 in the second one.
125 Those in the second wave were significantly younger (58 ± 26 vs. 67 ± 18 years; $p < 0.001$). A
126 noteworthy feature of the second wave was the high number of children between 0 and 9 years of
127 age ($n = 21$), 12 of them being babies under 1 year (Figure 2). The department to which the patients
128 were admitted is shown in Table 1. The second wave caused a significantly higher number of
129 admissions to Gynecology, Pediatrics and Emergency Departments and fewer to Internal Medicine

130 and ICU. The duration of hospitalization was significantly shorter in the second wave (14 ± 19 vs.
131 22 ± 25 days; $p < 0.001$). A total of 49 deaths occurred during the first wave and 35 during the
132 second wave, so the case fatality rate decreased from 24.0% to 13.2%. The patients who died were
133 significantly older than the survivors and those who died in the second wave were older than those
134 in the first wave (83 ± 10 vs. 78 ± 13 years; $p = 0.042$).

135

136 **Figure 1.- Number of patients with COVID-19 admitted per day over the entire study period.**

137 **Figure 2.- Distribution by age intervals of the patients admitted for COVID-19 during the first**
138 **and second waves.** The p values were calculated using the χ^2 test.

139 **Table 1. Distribution of the hospitalized patients in the first and second waves.**

140

Department	First wave (n = 204)	Second wave (n = 264)	p-value
Internal Medicine	124 (60.8)	123 (46.6)	0.004
Intermediate Care Unit	42 (20.6)	47 (17.8)	0.596
Intensive Care Unit	35 (17.1)	19 (7.2)	0.029
Emergency Unit	0 (0.0)	33 (12.5)	N.A.
Pediatrics	0 (0.0)	22 (8.3)	N.A.
Gynecology	0 (0.0)	10 (3.8)	N.A.
Surgery	1 (0.5)	5 (1.9)	0.102
Oncology	1 (0.5)	3 (1.1)	0.317
Traumatology	1 (0.5)	2 (0.8)	0.564

141

142 Statistical analysis was performed by the χ^2 test. Results are shown as number of cases and percentages (in parenthesis).
143 N.A.: Not applicable. The statistical test cannot be performed when one of the variables is equal to 0.

144

145 The relationships between COVID-19 and the clinical and epidemiological variables are
146 shown in Figure 3 and Table 2. The most frequent signs and symptoms in both waves were fever,
147 dyspnea, pneumonia, and cough (Figure 3A). The most relevant comorbidities were cardiovascular
148 diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and chronic neurological diseases (Figure 3B). Patients from the
149 second wave differed from those of the first wave in that they more frequently presented a higher
150 frequency of vomiting, asthenia, abdominal pain, rhinorrhea, or acute kidney failure, and less
151 frequently a cough or chills. There was no significant difference in the frequency of concomitant
152 chronic diseases. One result that we consider noteworthy is the considerably higher frequency in the
153 second wave of pregnant women who went to the hospital to give birth and post-partum women.

154 **Figure 3.- Distribution of symptoms and diseases associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection (A)**
 155 **and comorbidities and gestational variables (B) in patients admitted for COVID-19 during the**
 156 **first and second waves.** The p values were calculated using the χ^2 test. AKF, acute kidney failure;
 157 ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CLD, chronic liver
 158 disease; CLUD, chronic lung disease; CND, chronic neurological disease; CVD, cardiovascular
 159 disease; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus.

160 **Table 2. Clinical and epidemiological characteristics of patients with COVID-19 infection.**
 161

Feature	First wave (n = 204)	Second wave (n = 264)	p-value
Epidemiological characteristics			
Age	67 ± 18	58 ± 26	< 0.001
Gender, male	114 (55.9)	144 (54.5)	0.423
Smoking habit	10 (4.9)	27 (13.2)	< 0.001
Alcohol consumption	10 (4.9)	15 (7.3)	0.421
Signs and symptoms			
Fever	134 (65.6)	170 (64.3)	0.845
Dyspnea	122 (59.8)	134 (50.7)	0.061
Pneumonia	119 (58.3)	140 (53.8)	0.262
Cough	103 (50.5)	107 (40.5)	0.039
Diarrhea	44 (21.5)	46 (17.4)	0.288
Chills	42 (20.5)	7 (2.6)	< 0.001
Acute kidney failure	22 (10.2)	46 (17.4)	0.048
Odynophagia	14 (6.8)	15 (5.6)	0.700
Acute respiratory distress syndrome	10 (4.9)	17 (6.4)	0.552
Vomiting	9 (4.4)	39 (14.7)	< 0.001
Other symptoms ¹	12 (5.8)	69 (26.1)	< 0.001
Comorbidities and gestational variables			
Cardiovascular disease (including hypertension)	108 (52.9)	144 (54.5)	0.502
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	56 (27.4)	64 (24.2)	0.456
Chronic neurological disease	45 (22.0)	52 (19.7)	0.429
Chronic kidney disease	32 (15.6)	34 (12.9)	0.359
Chronic lung disease	31 (15.2)	47 (17.8)	0.401
Cancer	29 (14.2)	43 (16.3)	0.816
Other infectious diseases	6 (2.9)	10 (3.8)	0.464
Chronic liver disease	5 (2.4)	17 (6.4)	0.069
Postpartum (< 6 weeks)	2 (0.9)	15 (5.7)	0.024
Pregnancy	1 (0.4)	12 (4.5)	0.016

162 Statistical analysis was performed by the χ^2 test (categorical variables) or the Student's t test (quantitative variables).
 163 Results are shown as number of cases and percentages (in parenthesis) or as means ± standard deviations.
 164

165 ¹ Asthenia, rhinorrhea or abdominal pain.

166 We also evaluated the differences in treatments between the two groups of patients. Subjects
 167 from the second wave were treated more often with non-invasive mechanical ventilation and
 168 corticoids, and less often with invasive mechanical ventilation, conventional oxygen therapy and
 169 anticoagulants (Table 3). Regarding other treatments, patients in the first wave received lopinavir,
 170 ritonavir and hydroxychloroquine, while those in the second wave received remdesivir and
 171 tocilizumab.

172 **Table 3. Main treatments of patients with COVID-19 infection.**
 173

Treatment	First wave (n = 204)	Second wave (n = 264)	p-value
Noninvasive mechanical ventilation	7 (3.4)	25 (9.5)	0.007
Invasive mechanical ventilation	27 (13.2)	11 (4.2)	< 0.001
High-flow oxygen therapy	18 (8.8)	28 (10.6)	0.315
Conventional oxygen therapy	155 (76.0)	156 (59.1)	< 0.001
Anticoagulants	184 (90.2)	188 (71.2)	< 0.001
Corticosteroids	86 (42.2)	156 (59.1)	< 0.001

174 Statistical analysis was performed by the χ^2 test. Results are shown as number of cases and percentages (in parenthesis).
 175
 176

177 Finally, we wanted to identify which factors were the most important determinants of death
 178 in the two groups of patients. Logistic regression analyses highlighted the importance of age, fever,
 179 dyspnea, acute respiratory distress syndrome, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and cancer in the first wave
 180 (Table 4), and of age, gender, smoking habit, acute respiratory distress syndrome, and chronic
 181 neurological diseases in the second wave (Table 5).

182 **Table 4. Logistic regression analysis on the relationships of comorbidities with deaths for patients from the first**
 183 **wave of COVID-19.**
 184

Variable	B	SE	Exp (B)	p-value
Age	0.096	0.024	1.101	< 0.001
Gender	0.365	0.517	1.441	0.480
Smoking habit	0.060	0.352	1.062	0.865
Alcohol consumption	-0.570	0.468	0.565	0.223
Fever	2.138	0.658	8.481	0.001
Cough	0.238	0.581	1.269	0.682
Pneumonia	-1.139	0.651	0.320	0.080

Odynophagia	-2.107	1.148	0.122	0.067
Chills	-1.288	0.760	0.276	0.090
Dyspnea	1.365	0.628	3.915	0.030
Vomiting	-1.132	1.481	0.322	0.445
Diarrhea	-0.846	0.657	0.429	0.198
Acute respiratory distress syndrome	3.606	1.185	36.828	0.002
Acute kidney failure	0.442	0.769	1.556	0.565
Other symptoms ¹	0.192	0.964	1.211	0.843
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	1.298	0.505	3.662	0.010
Cardiovascular diseases	0.114	0.559	1.121	0.839
Chronic liver diseases	0.122	1.371	1.130	0.929
Chronic lung diseases	-0.458	0.682	0.632	0.502
Chronic kidney diseases	-0.256	0.665	0.774	0.701
Chronic neurological diseases	-0.547	0.598	0.579	0.360
Other infectious diseases	0.476	1.705	1.610	0.780
Cancer	1.518	0.595	4.565	0.011
Pregnancy	-31.735	42695.071	0.000	0.999
Postpartum	20.726	40192.969	0.1 x 10 ⁹	1.000
Constant	-10.394	2.044	0.000	< 0.001

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

Model summary: log-likelihood(-2) = 136.623; r^2 Cox & Snell = 0.343; r^2 Nagelkerke = 0.515; $p < 0.001$. B: Non-standardized β coefficient. SE: Standard error of B.

¹ Asthenia, rinorrhea or abdominal pain.

Table 5. Logistic regression analysis on the relationships of comorbidities with deaths for patients from the second wave of COVID-19.

Variable	B	SE	Exp (B)	p-value
Age	0.094	0.030	1.098	0.002
Gender	1.755	0.716	5.782	0.014
Smoking habit	-2.874	1.446	0.056	0.047
Alcohol consumption	0.558	0.789	1.747	0.479
Fever	-0.583	0.756	0.558	0.441
Cough	-0.173	0.641	0.841	0.787
Pneumonia	0.186	0.744	1.204	0.803
Odynophagia	-16.683	8820.456	0.000	0.998
Chills	-18.312	12533.763	0.000	0.999
Dyspnea	-0.305	0.708	0.737	0.666
Vomiting	-1.544	1.335	0.214	0.247
Diarrhea	-1.329	1.319	0.265	0.313
Acute respiratory distress syndrome	2.242	0.988	9.410	0.023

Acute kidney failure	0.195	0.765	1.216	0.799
Other symptoms ¹	0.485	0.605	1.624	0.423
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	0.183	0.599	1.201	0.759
Cardiovascular diseases	0.276	0.832	1.318	0.740
Chronic liver diseases	2.419	1.249	11.234	0.053
Chronic lung diseases	0.178	0.697	1.195	0.799
Chronic kidney diseases	0.234	0.835	1.264	0.779
Chronic neurological diseases	1.945	0.723	6.993	0.007
Other infectious diseases	2.042	1.451	7.704	0.160
Cancer	0.289	0.626	1.335	0.644
Pregnancy	-11.766	10235.783	0.000	0.999
Postpartum	-0.555	0.542	0.574	0.306
Constant	-10.590	2.789	0.000	< 0.001

193

194 Model summary: log-likelihood(-2) = 98.286; r^2 Cox & Snell = 0.318; r^2 Nagelkerke = 0.597; $p < 0.001$. B: Non-
195 standardized β coefficient. SE: Standard error of B.

196 ¹ Asthenia, rinorrhea or abdominal pain.

197

198 Discussion

199 We have previously reported the main epidemiological and clinical characteristics and the
200 mortality risk factors of the first wave patients during a month and a half between March and April
201 [11]. In the present investigation we extended the study to mid-October to cover two equal periods
202 of three and a half months. More patients were admitted during the second wave, they were younger
203 and there were fewer deaths, in agreement with results reported by previous research in several
204 countries [2,3,12]. The reasons for the clear differences between the two periods are not yet known
205 although it has been suggested that a new variant of SARS-CoV-2 emerged in early summer 2020 in
206 Spain [9], a variant that was linked to outbreaks among young agricultural workers in the north-east
207 of the country. Transmission to the general population in that area was then replicated across the
208 country. Furthermore, poor compliance with social distancing guidelines by young people might
209 have facilitated contagion in young, healthy adults and children [2,13]. The decrease in the age of
210 the patients then resulted in a decrease in the case fatality rate in that those patients who died were

211 on average 5 years older than the victims of the first wave. Moreover, fewer patients required
212 respiratory assistance via invasive mechanical ventilation methods. This improvement in the results
213 of admitted patients might be linked to the fact that the health system in our country, as in many
214 others, has since become better prepared. We have more experience and better treatment regimens,
215 and we carry out more diagnostic tests, allowing serious cases to be detected early and to receive
216 more effective treatments. In this regard, during the second period, patients were treated more
217 frequently with dexamethasone, as suggested by the RECOVERY study [14], and
218 hydroxychloroquine and loponavir-ritonavir were substituted by remdesivir and tocilizumab, which
219 several studies have reported to be more effective than in preventing death and shortening the
220 duration of hospital stays [15-17]. Another factor that might have contributed to the decrease in the
221 case fatality rate is the improvement in environmental conditions. For example, warm weather and
222 improved air quality following the city lockdown have been reported to correlate negatively with
223 SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility [18-20].

224 A new and remarkable characteristic of the incidence of COVID-19 in this second wave in
225 our population is the higher incidence in babies, children and pregnant women who went to the
226 hospital to give birth or in post-partum women. The vast majority of these patients did not present
227 serious symptoms and so did not require hospitalization for more than 4 days. There were no deaths
228 among children up to 9 years of age, pregnant or post-partum women. The predominant symptom
229 presented by the children was fever (19 out of 21 cases, 90.5%), while pregnant and post-partum
230 women (13 and 17 cases, respectively) were asymptomatic and promptly discharged. These results
231 highlight the role of family contact in the transmission of the virus and agree with previous reports
232 that have indicated the generally low severity of the disease in these patients [21-24].

233 The predominant symptoms of infection (fever, dyspnea, pneumonia cough) were similar in
234 both waves, although the patients in the second wave presented renal (acute kidney failure) and
235 gastrointestinal symptoms (vomiting, abdominal pain) more frequently. Indeed, the Spanish
236 Ministry of Health has already highlighted, in a document updated on 2nd October, the higher

237 incidence of the latter in the second wave [25]. The present study did not find any differences
238 between the frequency of concomitant diseases in the two waves, similar findings to those of our
239 preliminary study [9]. In this respect, we differ from a previous study conducted in Japan that has
240 reported a lower incidence of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases [3].

241 Lastly, regarding the risk factors associated with mortality, we also found differences
242 between the first and second waves. Multiple regression analysis showed that older age and the
243 presence of fever, dyspnea, acute respiratory distress syndrome, diabetes, and cancer were
244 independently associated with higher mortality in the first wave, while age, gender, and the
245 presence of acute respiratory distress syndrome and chronic neurological diseases were associated
246 with mortality in the second. This might be a reflection of a better management of cancer or
247 diabetes patients. On the other hand, the association of neurological diseases with mortality might
248 be due to the higher mean age of those who died in this second wave.

249 **Conclusion**

250 The results of the present study show that hospitalized patients in the second wave were
251 younger, required fewer days of hospitalization, had lower mortality rates and treatments were more
252 effective and less intensive. Although the majority of symptoms were similar in both periods, the
253 higher incidence of gastrointestinal symptoms in the second wave stands out as a difference.
254 Comorbidities were similar, but there were differences between those associated with mortality,
255 highlighting the importance of chronic neurological diseases in this second wave. An important
256 difference was the high incidence of babies, children and pregnant and post-partum women
257 admitted but, in general, these cases were not serious and were resolved promptly and successfully.
258 These results might help to understand the characteristics of this second wave and the behaviour
259 and danger of SARS-CoV-2 in the Mediterranean area and in Western Europe generally. Further
260 studies are needed to confirm our findings.

261 **Acknowledgments**

262 The authors are indebted to all the staff of the *Hospital Universitari de Sant Joan*, doctors,
263 nurses, assistants, cleaning and security personnel, and all the volunteer students, who with their
264 enormous effort are managing to overcome this dramatic situation. Editorial assistance was
265 provided by Phil Hoddy at the Service of Linguistic Resources of the *Universitat Rovira i Virgili*.

266 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

267 **Simona Iftimie:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology,
268 Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Funding acquisition, Writing-original
269 draft, Writing-review & editing. **Ana F. López-Azcona:** Data curation, Investigation, Methodology,
270 Writing-review & editing. **Immaculada Vallverdú:** Investigation, Resources. **Salvador**
271 **Hernández-Flix:** Investigation, Resources. **Gabriel de Febrer:** Investigation, Resources. **Sandra**
272 **Parra:** Investigation, Resources. **Anna Hernández-Aguilera:** Data curation, Investigation,
273 Methodology, Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing. **Francesc Riu:** Investigation,
274 Resources. **Jorge Joven:** Investigation, Resources. **Jordi Camps:** Conceptualization, Data
275 curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources,
276 Supervision, Validation, Funding acquisition, Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing,
277 Supervision. **Antoni Castro:** Investigation, Resources, Funding acquisition, Writing-review &
278 editing.

279 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

280 The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

281 **Data availability**

282 All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.

283 **References**

- 284 1. Vahidy FS, Drews AL, Masud FN, Schwartz RL, Boom ML, Phillips RA, et al. Characteristics
285 and outcomes of COVID-19 patients during initial peak and resurgence in the Houston
286 metropolitan area. *JAMA*. 2020; 324: 998-1000. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.15301>.
- 287 2. Fan G, Yang Z, Lin Q, Zhao S, Yang L, He D. Decreased case fatality rate of COVID-19 in the
288 second wave: a study in 53 countries or regions. *Transbound Emerg Dis*. 2020;
289 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13819>. Epub ahead of print.
- 290 3. Saito S, Asai Y, Matsunaga N, Hayakawa K, Terada M, Ohtsu H, et al. First and second
291 COVID-19 waves in Japan: A comparison of disease severity and characteristics: Comparison of
292 the two COVID-19 waves in Japan. *J Infect*. 2020: S0163-4453(20)30693-9.
293 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.10.033>.
- 294 4. Renardy M, Eisenberg M, Kirschner D. Predicting the second wave of COVID-19 in
295 Washtenaw County, MI. *J Theor Biol*. 2020; 507: 110461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2020.110461>.
- 296 5. Looi MK. Covid-19: Is a second wave hitting Europe? *BMJ*. 2020 ; 371: m4113. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m4113>.
- 297 6. Win A. Rapid Rise of COVID-19 second wave in Myanmar and implications for the Western
298 Pacific Region. *QJM*. 2020; hcaa290. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcaa290>.
- 301 7. Ballester-Arnal R, Gil-Llario MD. The virus that changed Spain: Impact of COVID-19 on
302 people with HIV. *AIDS Behav*. 2020; 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-020-02877-3>.
- 303 8. Long SW, Olsen RJ, Christensen PA, Bernard DW, Davis JJ, Shukla M, et al. Molecular
304 architecture of early dissemination and massive second wave of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in a
305 major metropolitan area. *mBio*. 2020; 11: e02707-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02707-20>.
- 306 9. Hodcroft EB, Zuber M, Nadeau S, Comas I, González Candelas F, et al. Emergence and spread
307 of a SARS-CoV-2 variant through Europe in the summer of 2020. *medRxiv*.

- 308 2020.10.25.20219063 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 November 18]. Available from:
309 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.25.20219063>.
- 310 10. Yang J, Chen X, Deng X, Chen Z, Gong H, Yan H, et al. Disease burden and clinical severity of
311 the first pandemic wave of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Nat Commun.* 2020; 11: 5411.
312 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19238-2>.
- 313 11. Iftimie S, López-Azcona AF, Vicente-Miralles M, Descarrega-Reina R, Hernández-Aguilera A,
314 Riu F, et al. Risk factors associated with mortality in hospitalized patients with SARS-CoV-2
315 infection. A prospective, longitudinal, unicenter study in Reus, Spain. *PLoS One.* 2020; 15:
316 e0234452. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234452>.
- 317 12. Buonanno P, Galletta S, Puca M. Spatial dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 and reduced risk of
318 contagion: evidence from the second Italian epidemic wave. *medRxiv* 2020.11.08.20227934
319 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited 2020 November 18]. Available from:
320 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.08.20227934>.
- 321 13. Aleta A, Moreno Y. Age differential analysis of COVID-19 second wave in Europe reveals
322 highest incidence among young adults. *medRxiv* 2020.11.11.20230177 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited
323 2020 November 18]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.11.20230177>.
- 324 14. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, Mafham M, Bell JL,
325 Linsell L. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19—preliminary report. *N Engl J*
326 *Med.* 2020; July 17 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436>. [Epub ahead of print].
- 327 15. Costanzo M, De Giglio MAR, Roviello GN. SARS-CoV-2: Recent reports on antiviral
328 therapies based on lopinavir/ritonavir, darunavir/umifenovir, hydroxychloroquine, remdesivir,
329 favipiravir and other drugs for the treatment of the new coronavirus. *Curr Med Chem.* 2020; 27:
330 4536-4541. <https://doi.org/10.2174/0929867327666200416131117>.
- 331 16. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Lopinavir-ritonavir in patients admitted to hospital with
332 COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet.* 2020;
333 396: 1345-1352. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)32013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32013-4).

- 334 17. Lam S, Lombardi A, Ouanounou A. COVID-19: A review of the proposed pharmacological
335 treatments. *Eur J Pharmacol.* 2020; 886: 173451. [https://doi: 10.1016/j.ejphar.2020.173451](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejphar.2020.173451).
- 336 18. Ran J, Zhao S, Han L, Liao G, Wang K, Wang MH, et al. A re-analysis in exploring the
337 association between temperature and COVID-19 transmissibility: an ecological study with 154
338 Chinese cities. *Eur Respir J.* 2020; 56: 2001253. [https://doi: 10.1183/13993003.01253-2020](https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01253-2020).
- 339 19. Ran J, Zhao S, Han L, Chen D, Yang Z, Yang L, et al. The ambient ozone and COVID-19
340 transmissibility in China: A data-driven ecological study of 154 cities. *J Infect.* 2020; 81: e9-e11.
341 [https://doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.011).
- 342 20. Ran J, Zhao S, Han L, Qiu Y, Cao P, Yang Z, et al. Effects of particulate matter exposure on the
343 transmissibility and case fatality rate of COVID-19: A Nationwide Ecological Study in China. *J*
344 *Travel Med.* 2020; 27: taaa133. [https:// doi: 10.1093/jtm/taaa133](https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa133).
- 345 21. Dong Y, Mo X, Hu Y, Qi X, Jiang F, Jiang Z, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19 among children
346 in China. *Pediatrics.* 2020; 145: e20200702. [https://doi: 10.1542/peds.2020-0702](https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-0702).
- 347 22. Shen KL, Yang YH, Jiang RM, Wang TY, Zhao DC, Jiang Y, et al. Updated diagnosis, treatment
348 and prevention of COVID-19 in children: experts' consensus statement (condensed version of
349 the second edition). *World J Pediatr.* 2020;16: 232-239. [https://doi: 10.1007/s12519-020-00362-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12519-020-00362-4)
350 4.
- 351 23. Schwartz DA. An analysis of 38 pregnant women with COVID-19, their newborn infants, and
352 maternal-fetal transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Maternal coronavirus infections and pregnancy
353 outcomes. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2020 Mar 17. [https://doi: 10.5858/arpa.2020-0901-SA](https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2020-0901-SA). Epub
354 ahead of print.
- 355 24. Qiao J. What are the risks of COVID-19 infection in pregnant women? *Lancet.* 2020; 395: 760-
356 762. [https://doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30365-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30365-2).
- 357 25. Spanish Ministry of Health. Questions and answers about the new coronavirus (COVID-19).
358 Updated October 2, 2020. 2020; 1-4. Available from:

359 <https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/2>
360 [020_10_05_Preguntas_respuestas_2019-nCoV-2.pdf](#).
361
362