

1 **Context matters: Contrasting behavioral and residential risk factors for Lyme disease**
2 **between two high-incidence regions in the Northeastern and Midwestern U.S.**

3

4 **Authors:** Bron ^{a,b,†}, Gebbiena M., Fernandez ^{c,d,e} †, Maria del P., Larson ^{a,b,1}, Scott R., Maus
5 ^f, Adam, Gustafson ^f, Dave, Tsao ^{b,g}, Jean I., Diuk-Wasser ^{d,e}, Maria A., Bartholomay ^{b,h},
6 Lyric C., Paskewitz* ^{a,b}, Susan, M.

7 ^aDepartment of Entomology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1630 Linden Drive,
8 Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA. gbron@wisc.edu, adam.maus@wisc.edu,
9 dgustafson@wisc.edu, lyric.bartholomay@wisc.edu, smpaskew@wisc.edu

10 ^bMidwest Center of Excellence for Vector-Borne Diseases, 1656 Linden Drive, Madison,
11 WI, USA.

12 ^cEarth Institute, Columbia University, New York, USA. Mpf2131@columbia.edu

13 ^dDepartment of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, Columbia University, New
14 York, USA. Mad2256@columbia.edu

15 ^eNortheast Regional Center for Excellence for Vector-Borne Diseases, USA.

16 ^fCenter for Health Enhancement System Studies (CHESS), Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

17 ^gDepartment of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan,
18 USA. tsao@msu.edu

19 ^hDepartment of Pathobiological Sciences, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1656 Linden
20 Drive, Madison, Wisconsin, 53706, USA.

21 ¹Present address: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, 2099 University Avenue West,
22 Saint Paul, Minnesota, 55104, USA. Slarson@mmcd.org

23

24 * Corresponding author: smpaskew@wisc.edu

25 † Both authors contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 **Highlights**

27 - Use of personal tick prevention was associated with more frequent outdoor activity

28 - Personal protective measure use was higher in the Midwest than Northeast

29 - Interventions reducing peridomestic deer and ticks more common in the Northeast

30

31 **Abstract.** The dynamics of zoonotic vector-borne diseases are determined by a complex set
32 of parameters including human behavior that may vary with socio-ecological contexts. Lyme
33 disease is the most common vector-borne disease in the United States and the Northeast and
34 upper Midwest are the regions most affected - two areas with differing levels of urbanization
35 and sociocultural settings. The probability of being diagnosed with Lyme disease is related to
36 the risk of encounters with an infected blacklegged tick, which reflects both the
37 environmental tick hazard and human behaviors. Herein, we compare behavioral and
38 peridomestic risk factors associated with human-tick encounters between high-incidence
39 states in the Northeast (New York and New Jersey) and Midwest (Wisconsin) of the United
40 States. We used a smartphone application, The Tick App, as a novel survey tool, during
41 spring and summer of 2018. Adaptive human behavior was identified in the relationship
42 between outdoor activities and the use of preventive methods. More frequent recreational
43 outdoor activities and gardening (a peridomestic activity) were associated with an increased
44 likelihood of using personal protective measures. Weekly participation in non-seasonal
45 recreational and peridomestic outdoor activities in spring and summer was associated with an
46 increased likelihood of finding a tick in the fall or winter. Most outdoor activities were more
47 frequently reported by participants from the Midwest than the Northeast. Participants in the
48 Northeast reported less use of personal protective measures, but they reported more
49 interventions to reduce the presence of peridomestic deer and ticks (i.e. pesticide applications
50 on their property) than participants in the Midwest. Participants from the Midwest were more
51 likely to kill rodents on their property. Context mattered, and our study illustrates the need for
52 the assessment of personal behavior and tick exposure in these two Lyme disease-endemic
53 regions to aid in targeted public health messaging to reduce tick-borne diseases.
54 **Keywords:** *Borrelia burgdorferi*, mHealth, self-efficacy, prevention, ticks, Lyme disease

55 **Introduction**

56 Lyme disease is the most common vector-borne disease in the United States and represents
57 over 80% of reported tick-borne disease cases (Rosenberg et al., 2018). The causative agent,
58 *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu stricto (Burgdorfer et al., 1982), is transmitted by two tick
59 species, *Ixodes scapularis* (Say) and *I. pacificus* (Cooley and Kohls) in the United States. The
60 geographic range of *I. scapularis* has been expanding (Eisen et al., 2016) with predicted
61 establishment of the enzootic transmission of the pathogen and Lyme disease cases
62 approximately three to five years later (Ogden et al., 2013). Humans are incidental hosts of *B.*
63 *burgdorferi*, and infection occurs after exposure to an infectious tick (typically a nymph
64 which are small and active in late spring and early summer), normally encountered outdoors,
65 in proximity to wooded environments and during recreational, work-related or peridomestic
66 activities (Porter et al., 2019; Stafford and Magnarelli, 1993).

67 Spatial patterns of Lyme disease risk (i.e. the likelihood of acquiring the disease) in
68 the United States are geographically clustered and dynamic, with high incidence states
69 located in the Northeast and Midwest (Kugeler et al., 2015). These high-risk clusters correlate
70 with increased hazard ('the source of harm'), measured as the density of host-seeking *I.*
71 *scapularis* nymphs (Diuk-Wasser et al., 2006; Eisen et al., 2016). However, while tick
72 density is a predictor of disease risk at a national scale, this relationship varies in strength at
73 the county level (Pepin et al., 2012). These variations have been, in part, attributed to
74 potential differences in human behaviors that play a critical role in determining human
75 exposure to the hazard, or in mitigating its negative effects by engaging in risk reduction
76 practices (Eisen and Eisen, 2016). Studies assessing human behavioral risk factors have
77 mostly been local (among others: Connally et al., 2009; Orloski et al., 1998; Smith et al.,
78 2001; Vázquez et al., 2008), precluding regional comparisons. To overcome this limitation,
79 we developed a smartphone application, The Tick App, to conduct standardized surveys on

80 human exposure and behavior across regions in a cost-efficient manner (Fernandez et al.,
81 2019). Study participants self-administered a survey on the behavioral and environmental risk
82 factors of contracting tick-borne diseases, thus providing new insights into drivers of human
83 risk that are superimposed on or interact with the hazard.

84 Without a human vaccine or community-based interventions, Lyme disease
85 prevention relies on personal protective behaviors during outdoor activities and interventions
86 in peridomestic settings targeting the enzootic cycle to reduce ticks or pathogen transmission
87 (Schiffman et al., 2016). Personal protective behaviors include preventive practices that
88 reduce tick exposure (e.g., avoiding risky habitats and using repellents), and practices that
89 reduce the risk of Lyme disease after tick exposure (e.g., checking for ticks and showering
90 after being outdoors) (Connally et al., 2009; Eisen and Dolan, 2016; Gould et al., 2008; Jones
91 et al., 2018). Peridomestic interventions aiming at reducing the tick hazard include the
92 applying area-wide acaricides, treating wild animal (rodents) host to kill attached ticks, and
93 performing landscape modifications to reduce deer visitations (e.g. by using tall fencing and
94 limit resource provisioning) and limit rodent habitat (Connally et al., 2009; Hinckley et al.,
95 2016; Orloski et al., 1998).

96 According to the health belief model (Rosenstock, 1974), actions to prevent Lyme
97 disease would be taken when individuals are knowledgeable, perceive the risk and its
98 severity, understand the benefits of and have the self-efficacy to carry out interventions, and
99 receive external cues to act. Thus, the ecological (e.g. landscape structure, tick hazard) and
100 social context (e.g. experiences of friends and family, public health messaging) can influence
101 the uptake of risk reduction practices, as humans adapt their behavior in response to tick
102 densities and perceived risk (Berry et al., 2018). For example, implementation of personal
103 protective behaviors by park visitors varied across an urban-to-rural gradient in Missouri
104 (Bayles et al., 2013). Visitors to rural and exurban parks (beyond the urban fringe) were more

105 likely to implement tick checks and utilize tick repellent compared to visitors to suburban
106 parks while the latter were more likely to avoid tick habitat; this variation was linked to
107 differences in the intended recreational activity of park visitors (Bayles et al., 2013). Regional
108 differences in the socio-ecological context, such as the higher urbanization levels, population
109 densities and median household income in the Northeast compared to the Midwest (U.S.
110 Census Bureau 2013) may simultaneously affect residential (i.e., peridomestic features
111 associated with tick hazard) and behavioral risk factors for Lyme disease (i.e. activity
112 patterns, the use of personal protective behaviors and the implementation of peridomestic
113 interventions).

114 In this study, we used information derived from self-administered surveys completed
115 by users of The Tick App to compare the use of personal protection measures, the frequency
116 of different types of outdoor activities, the implementation of peridomestic interventions, and
117 residential risk factors associated with peridomestic tick hazard between two high-incidence
118 regions for Lyme disease in the United States: Wisconsin (Midwest), and New Jersey and
119 southern New York (Northeast). Additionally, to better understand the drivers behind the use
120 of personal protective behaviors, we evaluated the association between the adoption of these
121 behaviors and the frequency of outdoor activities, considering both recreational and
122 peridomestic exposure scenarios and adjusting for regional differences, demographic factors,
123 and previous Lyme disease diagnoses (e.g. previous personal experience). In the peridomestic
124 exposure scenario, we also assessed whether hazard reduction practices (i.e., the
125 implementation of peridomestic interventions) affected the use of personal protective
126 behaviors.

127

128 **Material and methods**

129 *The Tick App project*

130 The Tick App was developed by the Midwest and Northeast Centers of Excellence
131 for Vector-borne Diseases in collaboration with the University of Wisconsin – Madison
132 Center for Health Enhancement System Studies (CHESS) to serve as a research tool to better
133 understand human behaviors affecting tick exposure and engage the general public in active
134 tick prevention across the United States (Fernandez et al., 2019). As a research tool, it
135 includes epidemiological surveys and allows for real-time assessment of people’s locations
136 and activities (Fernandez et al., 2019). The Tick App included a one-time enrollment survey
137 which was designed to take less than 10 min to fill out, and aimed to retrospectively
138 document the users’ demographic data, past experiences with ticks and tick-borne diseases,
139 and residential and behavioral risk factors (Fernandez et al., 2019). This app was freely
140 available through Google Play and the App Store. Participants also had the options of
141 enrolling and completing the survey online through The Tick App website
142 (www.thetickapp.org), completing the survey in person, or downloading the survey from the
143 website and mailing . The enrollment survey was accessed by users upon completion of the
144 consent form in The Tick App, online (UW-Madison Qualtrics Survey Hosting Service,
145 Qualtrics XM, Provo, UT) or on paper. This work was conducted in accordance with
146 Institutional Review Board approved protocols (2018-84 University of Wisconsin – Madison
147 and AAA3750-M00Y01 Columbia University) and HIPAA regulations.

148 Participants

149 Participants in the Northeast and upper Midwest of the United States were recruited
150 using passive recruitment efforts through social media (Facebook, Twitter), by posting flyers
151 and posters in public spaces, and through newspaper, television and radio interviews. Efforts
152 were focused particularly in Wisconsin and southern New York. Active recruitment was also
153 conducted during house visits coupled with ongoing field research involving tick sampling in
154 yards at selected study sites (Eau Claire, WI and Staten Island, NY). During these visits, the

155 researchers explained the objective of the app and invited residents to participate as users.
156 Any adult over 18 years old residing in the selected regions was eligible to participate in the
157 study. The app was available in Google Play on May 8th and in App Store on May 9th, 2018,
158 respectively. The Tick App promotional activities were launched during Memorial Day
159 weekend (May 25th to 28th), and recruitment of participants continued throughout the duration
160 of the spring and summer of 2018 (Fernandez et al 2019).

161 Survey

162 The enrollment survey consisted of five sections: 1) User profile, 2) Tick exposure, 3)
163 Outdoor activities, 4) Property features, and 5) Pets. The sections captured the following
164 information: 1) The user profile queried demographic information including gender, age, and
165 address (Supp. Text A, questions 1-4). 2) The tick exposure section assessed the use of
166 personal protective behaviors (wear permethrin-treated clothing, shower or bathe to remove
167 ticks, adjust clothing or wear light-colored clothing, use tick repellent, check for ticks, or
168 other to-be-specified measures), tick exposure during the previous fall and winter, and
169 previous diagnosis with Lyme disease or another tick-borne disease by a physician (Supp.
170 Text A, questions 5-7). 3) This section captured occupational, peridomestic, and recreational
171 outdoor activities. Questions were designed to identify whether people worked or volunteered
172 outdoors and for what duration, and to document the frequency of recreational activities
173 (hunting, fishing, bird watching, hiking/walking/biking/running on nature trails, camping, and
174 visiting the beach of an ocean, lake or river) and peridomestic outdoor activities (mowing the
175 lawn and gardening) (Supp. Text A, question 8 and 9). The frequency of recreational and
176 peridomestic outdoor activity was reported as never, about once in the summer, at least once
177 a month, or at least once a week. 4) This section captured property features: including
178 residential risk factors for Lyme disease, ranging from property characteristics to the
179 presence of deer, as well as interventions to modify deer or rodent activity, and interventions

180 to reduce tick hazard by host-targeted or environmental pesticide applications (Supp. Text A,
181 questions 10-15). 5) The final section pets, identified the number of cats and dogs and use of
182 pet-related tick protection (Supp. Text A, questions 16-25).

183 Responses were formatted as binary (Yes or No), five-point frequency scales, select
184 the applicable answer (i.e. drop-down menu), check all that apply, or free answer forms when
185 appropriate (name, address, text detail for an “other” response). A few exceptions were made
186 to reduce the complexity of choice tables and to make frequencies appropriate to the
187 question; most notably, a 4-point scale (never, about once a summer, at least once a month, at
188 least once a week) was used to assess outdoor activity options. This study followed the
189 recommended guidelines for reporting results of internet e-surveys (Eysenbach, 2004), the
190 checklist for reporting results of internet e-surveys (CHERRIES) is available in Supp. Text B.

191 Data analysis

192 We included enrollment surveys submitted between May 8th and rd, 2018 in our
193 analyses (Fernandez et al., 2019). This period captured three major holiday weekends in the
194 United States, included our peak enrollment period and high risk season for acquiring
195 pathogens that cause Lyme disease in the US. We compared southern New York, New
196 Jersey, and Wisconsin as the majority of Tick App participants lived in these areas
197 (Fernandez et al., 2019): within the Midwest, 82.3% of participants lived in Wisconsin,
198 whereas within the Northeast 76.9% of participants lived in southern New York and New
199 Jersey, consistent with the area of influence of our study and recruitment efforts. When
200 comparing both areas, we kept the regional reference (Midwest and Northeast) for simplicity
201 throughout the text but we do not intend to extrapolate to the entire region. Survey responses
202 that did not include state or residence, use of personal protective measures, outdoor activity,
203 and property related questions were removed. In addition, those who reported an age between
204 7 and 18 years old were removed. A reported age of 6 or younger was assumed to be

205 incorrect; these surveys were retained but we manually replaced the age with 'not answered'.
206 We checked for congruence between state and reported zipcodes (and address, if needed) to
207 confirm that the selected state was the actual state of residence. Personal identifiable
208 information was removed and working files for data analysis were created to preserve
209 confidentiality of the dataset. Peridomestic host-targeted interventions were re-coded to
210 binary variables; a 'yes' was assigned if any intervention method was used and 'no' if all
211 responses to the intervention methods were not used (Supp. Text A question 13 and 15).

212 Data analysis was completed in R Statistical Computing Software (R Core Team,
213 2018). Responses were summarized, and a comparison between the regions of interest was
214 made using Pearson's Chi-squared tests without continuity correction after missing values
215 were removed. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated for the likelihood of
216 having found a tick in the prior fall or winter for each outdoor activity frequency with 'never'
217 as the reference level using *oddsratio.wald* from package *Epitools* (Aragon, 2017).

218 Modeling personal protective behaviors

219 Multinomial logistic models were used to assess the likelihood of reporting each of
220 the four most commonly reported personal protective behaviors against not using personal
221 protective behaviors ('None') as the reference level, depending on the frequency of a given
222 recreational activity, the region (Midwest and Northeast), previous self-reported Lyme
223 diagnosis (Yes or No), gender, age category, and the interaction between region and activity.
224 The ordinal indices for frequency of each outdoor activity were transformed into numeric
225 variables (never = 0, at least once a week = 3) for use in the multinomial logistic models
226 allowing us to assess direct proportional association between the use of prevention strategies
227 and the frequency of activities. We conducted a separate model for each of the recreational
228 activities.

229 For those participants living in houses with yards, we also assessed the likelihood of
230 using personal protective behaviors depending on the frequency of peridomestic outdoor
231 activities, peridomestic tick interventions (insecticide use, interventions reducing deer
232 activity and interventions reducing rodent activity), and accounting for frequent recreational
233 outdoor activities with the outdoor index (Fernandez et al. 2019), the region (Midwest and
234 Northeast), self-reported Lyme diagnosis (Yes or No), gender, and age category. Participants
235 who worked and/or volunteered outdoors also reported frequent (monthly and weekly)
236 outdoor activities (Fernandez et al., 2019); because these parameters were highly correlated
237 working / volunteering outdoors was not included in the models. Tick exposure in fall and
238 winter was not included as a co-variate as this was strongly correlated with participation in
239 outdoor activities (see results).

240 For these analyses, we used the function *multinom* from R package *nnet* (Venables &
241 Ripley, 2002). Multi-model selection was used to assess all possible model combinations and
242 account for model selection uncertainty, by using the function *dredge* from package *MuMIn*
243 (Barton, 2018). The odds ratios for each explanatory variable were calculated by averaging
244 model estimates weighted by AICc using function *model.avg* from package *MuMIn*.

245

246 **Results**

247 Participants

248 A total of 1,093 enrollment surveys were included in the analysis, including 396 from
249 New York and New Jersey and 697 from Wisconsin (Table 1). The Tick App was most
250 commonly used to complete the survey (n=999). The gender distribution was similar in the
251 Midwest and Northeast, and male and females were nearly equally represented (Table 1). The
252 age distribution was bimodal (Fernandez et al. 2019), and the representation in age categories
253 varied between the two study populations: 35-44 year-olds were most represented in the

254 Northeast (28%) whereas older than 55-64 year-olds were most represented in Wisconsin
255 (24.3%, Table 1). Although in both regions most of the participants lived in a house with yard
256 (n=899), the proportion of participants living in an apartment was higher in the Northeast
257 than in the Midwest (Table 1). By contrast, participants from the Midwest were more likely
258 to have an outdoor occupation and own at least one dog (Table 1). For those who worked
259 outdoors, the time committed to outdoor work was similar between the two regions (Table 1).

260 The proportion of participants who reported a previous diagnosis of tick-borne disease
261 was 13.6% (148 of 1089) and this was similar between participants from the Midwest (12.2%
262 of 696) and the Northeast (16.0% of 393) (χ^2 test, df=1, $\chi^2=3.119$, p=0.08). Lyme disease was
263 most frequently reported (12.0% of 1,086, Table 1) and both babesiosis (1.8% of 1,052
264 respondents) and anaplasmosis (0.95% of 1,050) were rarely reported. Other diseases
265 reported (2.0% of 1,026) included ehrlichiosis (n=6), Rocky Mountain spotted fever (n=2)
266 and Colorado tick fever (n=1). About a third of participants (31.7%, n=1,089) found a tick on
267 themselves during the previous fall or winter and this was significantly higher in the Midwest
268 than the Northeast (37.3% versus 21.8%, respectively; χ^2 test, df=1, $\chi^2=27.164$, p<0.001).

269 Personal protective measures

270 The four most commonly reported personal protective behaviors were ‘Check myself
271 for ticks’ (the most common behavior), ‘Tick repellent (e.g. DEET, picaridin)’, ‘Wear
272 protective clothing (e.g. light colored, long-sleeved, tucking pants in socks, boots, not
273 including permethrin-treated clothing)’, and ‘Shower or bathe to remove ticks’ (Figure 1).
274 Midwest respondents were more likely to report that they checked for ticks, used repellent, or
275 showered and bathed (Figure 1). Less than 15% of the study participants reported use of
276 permethrin-treated clothing, and 4.1% reported other strategies to protect against tick bites
277 including the use of essential oils (n=10) or staying away from grass, trees, and woods
278 (n=10).

279 Recreational outdoor activities

280 Nearly all participants engaged in at least one of the recreational outdoor activities
281 during the spring and summer (98.4%); only 16 of 1,060 participants responded “never” to all
282 six recreational activities. Participation in recreational outdoor activities was greater in
283 participants from the Midwest than the Northeast, except for visiting the beach on a lake,
284 river, or ocean (Table 2). The odds of self-reported tick encounter during the previous fall or
285 winter were higher if any of the recreational outdoor activities were reported to be done at
286 least monthly or weekly in the spring and summer compared to never or once (Table 3).

287 Peridomestic risk factors

288 Of all houses with a yard, nearly all had a manicured lawn and outdoor seating, and
289 approximately 25% had children’s play equipment (Figure 2A). Properties in Wisconsin had
290 more birdfeeders (χ^2 test, $n=892$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=524.46$, $p<0.001$) and log or brush piles (χ^2 test,
291 $n=891$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=36.106$, $p<0.001$), whereas fences were more common in the Northeast (χ^2
292 test, $n=890$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=42.368$, $p < 0.001$) (Figure 2A). Self-reported deer sightings (never or
293 rarely versus more frequent sightings) on properties with a yard were not significantly
294 different between respondents from the Midwest and the Northeast (χ^2 test, $n=893$, $df=1$,
295 $\chi^2=0.159$, $p=0.69$). Daily sightings happened at 16.3% (100 of 615 Midwest participants) and
296 14.0% of homes (39 of 278 Northeast participants), while deer were never or rarely observed
297 at 47.5% (Midwest) and 48.9% (Northeast) of homes. Deer proof fences (χ^2 test, $n=892$,
298 $df=1$, $\chi^2=30.593$, $p<0.001$) and deer resistant plants (χ^2 test, $n=888$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=17.867$,
299 $p<0.001$) were more commonly used among participants from the Northeast. By contrast,
300 baiting to attract deer to yards was more common among participants from the Midwest (χ^2
301 test, $n=890$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=8.140$, $p=0.004$) although still infrequent (5.7% of 615 versus 1.5% of
302 275, Figure 2B).

303 Rodent-targeted interventions to control ticks were rarely used; less than 5% of
304 participants used tick tubes or bait boxes (Figure 2B). Killing rodents (i.e. chipmunks and
305 mice) on the property was much more common among respondents from the Midwest (χ^2
306 test, $n=889$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=21.772$, $p<0.001$) (Figure 2B); of the Midwesterners who killed
307 nuisance rodents, 18.9% reported doing this at least weekly ($n=32$). Use of pesticides
308 targeting ticks, mosquitoes, or other insects on the property was more common among
309 Northeasterners (χ^2 test, $n=895$, $df=1$, $\chi^2=15.205$, $p<0.001$) (Figure 2B). However, among
310 those who applied pesticides, the frequency of application did not differ between the two
311 study areas (χ^2 test, $n=228$, $df=2$, $\chi^2=2.185$, $p=0.3$). Seasonal (45.2%) and monthly (48.2%)
312 applications were most commonly reported and weekly application was rare (6.6%).

313 Participation in peridomestic activities was common among participants residing on
314 properties with a yard; 49.9% of 888 participants reported mowing the lawn weekly and
315 61.7% of 888 gardened at least weekly. The frequency of mowing the lawn and gardening
316 was higher among respondents from the Midwest than the Northeast (Table 2). Participants
317 who reported weekly gardening or lawn mowing in spring and summer were at least twice as
318 likely to report that they had found a tick on themselves the previous fall and winter
319 compared to participants who never gardened or mowed the lawn (Table 3).

320 Modeling personal protective behaviors

321 For each of the recreational outdoor activities, the likelihood of using the four most
322 common personal protective behaviors (check themselves for ticks, adjust their clothing, use
323 repellent, or shower and bathe to remove ticks) increased with the reported frequency of the
324 activity during the spring and summer, after adjusting for the region, gender, age category,
325 and previous Lyme disease diagnosis (Figure 3A). There was strong evidence for the
326 relationship between personal protective behaviors and going to the beach, birding, camping,
327 fishing, and hiking (Figure 3A, $p<0.001$, Supp. Table 1) and moderate evidence for the

328 relationship with hunting (Figure 3A, p-value range: 0.01 – 0.02, Supp. Table 1). Participants
329 who reported doing more frequent peridomestic outdoor activities were more likely to use
330 any of the four common prevention strategies if they gardened (Figure 3B, p-value range:
331 0.015-0.026, Supp. Table 2), after accounting for region, previous Lyme disease diagnosis,
332 age, gender, frequent participation in recreational outdoor activities (outdoor index), and the
333 use of deer, rodent, and/or environmental control measures. However, mowing the lawn was
334 not associated with use of personal protective behaviors (Figure 3B, p-value range: 0.74-0.98,
335 Supp. Table 2). In this peridomestic scenario, participants who reported any type of deer
336 control, also reported using three of the four most common personal protective behaviors
337 (check for ticks, adjust clothing, and shower and bathe to remove ticks) more frequently
338 (Supp. Table 2). The use of rodent and environmental control measures was not associated
339 with use of personal protective behaviors.

340 The likelihood of use of personal protective behaviors among respondents from the
341 Northeast was about half compared to Midwesterners for those who went birding (cOR
342 range: 0.51-0.57, p-range: 0.003-0.01, Supp. Table 1), visited the beach (cOR range: 0.43-
343 0.51, p-range: <0.001-0.007, Supp. Table 1), went hunting (cOR range: 0.49-0.56, p-range:
344 0.002-0.012, Supp. Table 1), or went camping (cOR range: 0.54-0.62, p-range: 0.01-0.05,
345 Supp. Table 1) after accounting for region, previous Lyme disease diagnosis, age and gender.
346 That is, people with the same risk of exposure reported using fewer personal protective
347 behaviors in the Northeast except for those that fished, hiked, gardened or mowed the lawn.
348 In the outdoor activity models, there is marginal evidence of increased reporting of personal
349 protective behaviors with a previous Lyme disease diagnosis after we accounted for the
350 aforementioned covariates (cOR 1.296-2.475, p-range: 0.054-0.492, Supp. Table 1 and 2).

351

352 **Discussion**

353 Behavioral and residential risk factors for exposure to ticks and tick-borne diseases
354 were different for study participants from the Northeast and Midwest. Midwesterners
355 participated at a greater rate and more frequently in recreational outdoor activities (81.9% vs
356 63.1%). Similarly, Midwesterners were more likely to engage in the peridomestic activities of
357 weekly lawn mowing (60.5% vs 26.4%) and gardening (65.8% vs 52.7%) compared to
358 Northeasterners. These observations suggest that exposure to ticks and tick-borne diseases
359 could be higher for Midwestern study participants compared to Northeastern participants.
360 Indeed, the frequency of tick encounters in the prior fall and winter was higher for
361 Midwestern participants (37.3%) than Northeastern participants (22.0%). Midwesterners also
362 utilized personal protective behaviors more frequently (Figure 1), perhaps as an adaptive
363 behavior in response to higher risk of encountering a tick or other biting insects due to more
364 frequent outdoor activities. In contrast, Northeasterners were more likely to use peridomestic
365 interventions that could reduce tick and deer activity in their yards.

366 Overall, the use of personal protective behaviors was associated with more frequent
367 participation in outdoor activities. Nonetheless, Northeasterners were less likely to use
368 personal protective behaviors even when they were engaged in similar outdoor activities.
369 This difference is opposite to the trend observed in the national HealthStyles survey, where
370 participants from the Mid-Atlantic region, including New York, New Jersey and
371 Pennsylvania, reported slightly higher use of personal prevention measures than respondents
372 from East-North Central US, including Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio
373 (Hook et al., 2015). Although the two regions in the HealthStyles survey had similar reports
374 of tick exposure (24% in Mid Atlantic to 22.8% in East-North Central), the East-North
375 Central region included four states-Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio-where Lyme disease
376 incidence rates are much lower and blacklegged ticks less common than in Wisconsin (Eisen
377 et al., 2016). This lower risk of Lyme disease in most of the region may have resulted in the

378 slightly reduced use of personal protective behaviors observed in the East North Central US
379 survey responses.

380 Use of prevention measures generally increases if they are perceived as effective and
381 not burdensome (Butler et al., 2016). The proportion of participants that reported checking
382 themselves for ticks (74.3 and 86.7%) was high compared to reports from other high-
383 incidence states, for example 30.7% in the Mid Atlantic (Hook et al., 2015) and 57-67% in
384 Connecticut, (Connally et al., 2009; Niesobecki et al., 2019). The high percentage of
385 checking for ticks in our study could be due to the profile of our study participants, who were
386 more likely to be active outdoors and to have been diagnosed with tick-borne disease
387 compared to the general public (Fernandez et al., 2019). Alternatively, this high percentage
388 may have been an artifact of the structure of the survey question, because checking for ticks
389 was the first option in the response list. While “checking for ticks” was reported more
390 frequently than expected based on prior studies, the use of adjusting clothing (50 and 57.6%),
391 wearing repellent (50.4 and 62.4%), or showering to remove ticks (38.8 and 52%) in our two
392 study areas fell within the wide range of reported use percentages in high Lyme disease
393 incidence states (Connally et al., 2009; Herrington, 2004; Niesobecki et al., 2019). Similar to
394 Connally et al. (2009) and Niesobecki et al. (2019), the use of permethrin-treated clothing
395 was least reported. However, there appears to be an increasing trend in the sales of
396 permethrin-treated clothing (Online access Market Research Engine), which aligns with the
397 increase in positive responses seen in surveys asking about the use of permethrin-treated
398 clothing, from 0.7% in 2005-2007 (Connally et al., 2009), to 7% in 2015 (Niesobecki et al.,
399 2019) and 14% in our study. Greater awareness and increased belief in the effectiveness
400 together with increased availability of these products could explain this increase.

401 The observed differences in peridomestic risk factors and intervention strategies
402 between the Northeastern and Midwestern participants might be due to differences in socio-

403 ecological contexts and possibly influenced by differing urbanization levels between the
404 regions compared. Southern New York and New Jersey are metropolitan areas whereas
405 nearly two-third of Wisconsin counties (46 of 72) are nonmetropolitan (less than 50,000
406 inhabitants per urban cluster, (Ingram and Franco, 2014). Midwest participants represented a
407 social group that is more active outdoors and also actively recruited wildlife like birds and
408 deer into their yards. Birdfeeders, known to attract deer, squirrels, and other rodents, and log
409 and brush piles, known to provide nesting space for rodents, were more common in the
410 Midwest. These features might increase rodent activity on the property, which could explain
411 why killing of rodents on properties was also more common in the Midwest than in the
412 Northeast. In addition, while Midwest participants were more likely to provide forage for
413 deer, deer proof fencing and deer resistant plants were more common in the Northeast.
414 Despite the difference in the use of deer-targeted interventions, deer sightings on the
415 properties were not significantly different between study regions.

416 Interestingly, the largest difference in outdoor activity frequency was related to
417 mowing the lawn. Only 26.4% of Northeasterners with a yard did this weekly compared to
418 60.5% of Midwesterners. We posit that the difference in weekly lawn mowing participation is
419 because lawn care companies do the work in the Northeast (unpublished data Fernandez &
420 Diuk-Wasser). The use of a lawn care company could also explain the higher proportion of
421 study participants who reported pesticide use on Northeastern properties compared to
422 Midwestern properties. Taken together, the higher use of peridomestic interventions of
423 Northeastern participants (i.e. reducing adult blacklegged tick hosts, deer, in the yard and
424 using pesticides to kill ticks to reduce the environmental hazard) might suggest that they are
425 more prone to invest in protecting their landscaping or have greater awareness of Lyme
426 disease ecology compared to Midwestern participants. Further studies are needed to dissect

427 these associations and their relationship to the socio-ecological contexts (e.g., risk perception,
428 income).

429 Our study was a retrospective survey, with voluntary participation and mostly passive
430 recruitment. This strategy resulted in a biased study population with participants who likely
431 had an above average interest in preventing tick-borne diseases. In this study, we did not
432 explicitly address differences in urbanization levels that could be driving the observed
433 differences in behavioral and residential risk factors. This uneven representation of the
434 population living in more urban areas in the Northeast *versus* the Midwest, warrants further
435 exploration as more data becomes available from exurban and rural areas in the Northeast. In
436 addition, any retrospective survey is subject to recall bias (Groves et al., 2011); increasing the
437 frequency of reporting can reduce this bias with information recalled for a shorter period of
438 time (Clarke et al., 2008). In The Tick App, participants can share their daily outdoor
439 activities, personal prevention methods used, and tick encounters in less than a minute using
440 the Daily Log functionality. This feature, called Tick diary in 2018, was sparingly used by
441 Tick App users (Fernandez et al. 2019), but we anticipate that these daily assessments can
442 provide more accurate estimates of prevention method use in relation to outdoor activities
443 when a more robust sample is acquired. Lastly, although we tried to avoid “check all that
444 apply” question structures where participants are more likely to select the first options
445 (Rasinski et al., 1994), the personal preventative behavior question was structured this way.
446 Possible over reporting of the first option (i.e. checking for ticks) and under reporting of later
447 options could have been reduced by a forced reply structure (yes/no) or randomizing the
448 order of responses, but randomizing was not possible in our smartphone application. In the
449 2019 Tick App enrollment survey, the “check all that apply” structure was replaced with a
450 yes/no response structure.

451 Human behavior converts enzootic hazard into Lyme disease risk. The results of this
452 study illustrate how personal prevention measures were more likely to be employed by
453 participants in different socio-ecological contexts. To be able to include the human
454 behavioral component into predictions of Lyme disease risk, researchers will need to
455 determine how specific behaviors (activities and prevention strategies) relate to tick
456 encounters and disease risk, across regions. The use of a smartphone application to deliver
457 standardized surveys proved to be a cost-efficient tool to collect data regarding risk factors
458 for Lyme disease and offers the opportunity of expanding the geographic scope of these
459 studies. Ultimately, this information will be valuable to adapt risk reduction interventions and
460 for generating tailored public health messages for different populations across regions in the
461 United States.

462

463 **Acknowledgements:**

464 We thank all participants for taking time to share their experiences and we thank everybody
465 who promoted The Tick App. We extend our gratitude to our colleagues, beta-testers, UW-
466 Madison Survey Center, Becky Eisen and Alison Hinckley for constructive feedback on the
467 survey. Funding: This work was Supported by Center for Disease Control and Prevention
468 [Cooperative Agreements #U01 CK000505 and #U01 CK000509-01]. Its contents are solely
469 the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of CDC or
470 the Department of Health and Human Services.

471

472

473 References

- 474 Aragon T.J., 2017. Epitools: Epidemiology Tools. R package version 0.5-10.
475 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=epitools>
- 476 Bartoń, K., 2018. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.42.1.
477 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- 478 Bayles, B.R., Evans, G., Allan, B.F., 2013. Knowledge and prevention of tick-borne diseases
479 vary across an urban-to-rural human land-use gradient. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*
480 4, 352–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2013.01.001>
- 481 Berry, K., Bayham, J., Meyer, S.R., Fenichel, E.P., 2018. The Allocation of Time and Risk of
482 Lyme: A Case of Ecosystem Service Income and Substitution Effects. *Environ*
483 *Resource Econ* 70, 631–650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0142-7>
- 484 Burgdorfer, W., Barbour, A.G., Hayes, S.F., Benach, J.L., Grunwaldt, E., Davis, J.P., 1982.
485 Lyme Disease--A Tick-Borne Spirochetosis? *Science, New Series* 216, 1317–1319.
- 486 Butler, A.D., Sedghi, T., Petrini, J.R., Ahmadi, R., 2016. Tick-borne disease preventive
487 practices and perceptions in an endemic area. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases* 7, 331–
488 337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.12.003>
- 489 Clarke, P.M., Fiebig, D.G., Gerdtham, U.-G., 2008. Optimal recall length in survey design.
490 *Journal of Health Economics* 27, 1275–1284.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2008.05.012>
- 492 Connally, N.P., Durante, A.J., Yousey-Hindes, K.M., Meek, J.I., Nelson, R.S., Heimer, R.,
493 2009. Peridomestic Lyme Disease Prevention: results of a population-based case-
494 control study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 37, 201–206.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.04.026>
- 496 Diuk-Wasser, M.A., Gatewood, A.G., Cortinas, M.R., Yaremych-Hamer, S., Tsao, J., Kitron,
497 U., Hickling, G., Brownstein, J.S., Walker, E., Piesman, J., Fish, D., 2006.
498 Spatiotemporal Patterns of Host-Seeking *Ixodes scapularis* Nymphs (Acari: Ixodidae)
499 in the United States. *J. Med. Entomol* 43, 166–176. [https://doi.org/10.1603/0022-
500 2585\(2006\)043](https://doi.org/10.1603/0022-2585(2006)043)
- 501 Eisen, L., Dolan, M.C., 2016. Evidence for Personal Protective Measures to Reduce Human
502 Contact with Blacklegged Ticks and for Environmentally Based Control Methods to
503 Suppress Host-Seeking Blacklegged Ticks and Reduce Infection with Lyme Disease
504 Spirochetes in Tick Vectors and Rodent. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 53, 1063–
505 1092. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjw103>
- 506 Eisen, L., Eisen, R.J., 2016. Critical Evaluation of the Linkage Between Tick-Based Risk
507 Measures and the Occurrence of Lyme Disease Cases: Table 1. *Journal of Medical*
508 *Entomology* 53, 1050–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjw092>
- 509 Eisen, R.J., Eisen, L., Beard, C.B., 2016. County-Scale Distribution of *Ixodes scapularis* and
510 *Ixodes pacificus* (Acari: Ixodidae) in the Continental United States. *J Med Entomol*
511 53, 349–386. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjv237>
- 512 Eysenbach, G., 2004. Improving the Quality of Web Surveys: The Checklist for Reporting
513 Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *J Med Internet Res* 6.
514 <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34>
- 515 Fernandez, M.P., Bron, G.M., Kache, P.A., Larson, S.R., Maus, A., Gustafson Jr, D., Tsao,
516 J.I., Bartholomay, L.C., Paskewitz, S.M., Diuk-Wasser, M.A., 2019. Usability and
517 Feasibility of a Smartphone App to Assess Human Behavioral Factors Associated
518 with Tick Exposure (The Tick App): Quantitative and Qualitative Study. *JMIR*
519 *Mhealth Uhealth* 7, e14769. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14769>
- 520 Gould, L.H., Nelson, R.S., Griffith, K.S., Hayes, E.B., Piesman, J., Mead, P.S., Cartter, M.L.,
521 2008. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviors Regarding Lyme Disease Prevention

- 522 Among Connecticut Residents, 1999–2004. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases* 8,
523 769–776. <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2007.0221>
- 524 Groves, R.M., Fowler, F.J., Couper, M.P., Lepkowski, J.M., Singer, E., Tourangeau, R.,
525 2011. Survey methodology. John Wiley & Sons.
- 526 Herrington, J.E., 2004. Risk perceptions regarding ticks and Lyme disease. *American Journal*
527 *of Preventive Medicine* 26, 135–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2003.10.010>
- 528 Hinckley, A.F., Meek, J.I., Ray, J.A.E., Niesobecki, S.A., Connally, N.P., Feldman, K.A.,
529 Jones, E.H., Backenson, P.B., White, J.L., Lukacik, G., Kay, A.B., Miranda, W.P.,
530 Mead, P.S., 2016. Effectiveness of Residential Acaricides to Prevent Lyme and Other
531 Tick-borne Diseases in Humans. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 214, 182–188.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv775>
- 533 Hook, S.A., Nelson, C.A., Mead, P.S., 2015. U.S. public’s experience with ticks and tick-
534 borne diseases: Results from national HealthStyles surveys. *Ticks and Tick-borne*
535 *Diseases* 6, 483–488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.03.017>
- 536 Ingram, D., Franco, S., 2014. 2013 NCHS Urban-Rural Classification Scheme for Counties.
537 *Vital Health Stat, National Center for Health Statistics* 2, 81.
- 538 Jones, E.H., Hinckley, A.F., Hook, S.A., Meek, J.I., Backenson, B., Kugeler, K.J., Feldman,
539 K.A., 2018. Pet ownership increases human risk of encountering ticks. *Zoonoses*
540 *Public Health* 65, 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12369>
- 541 Kugeler, K.J., Farley, G.M., Forrester, J.D., Mead, P.S., 2015. Geographic Distribution and
542 Expansion of Human Lyme Disease, United States. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 21,
543 1455–1457. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2108.141878>
- 544 Niesobecki, S., Hansen, A., Rutz, H., Mehta, S., Feldman, K., Meek, J., Niccolai, L., Hook,
545 S., Hinckley, A., 2019. Knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding tick-borne
546 disease prevention in endemic areas. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases* 10, 101264.
547 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2019.07.008>
- 548 Ogden, N.H., Lindsay, L.R., Leighton, P.A., 2013. Predicting the rate of invasion of the agent
549 of Lyme disease *Borrelia burgdorferi*. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50, 510–518.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12050>
- 551 Orloski, K.A., Campbell, G.L., Genese, C.A., Beckley, J.W., Schriefer, M.E., Spitalny, K.C.,
552 Dennis, D.T., 1998. Emergence of Lyme Disease in Hunterdon County, New Jersey,
553 1993: A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors and Evaluation of Reporting Patterns.
554 *American Journal of Epidemiology* 147, 391–397.
555 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009462>
- 556 Pepin, K.M., Eisen, R.J., Mead, P.S., Piesman, J., Fish, D., Hoen, A.G., Barbour, A.G.,
557 Hamer, S., Diuk-Wasser, M.A., 2012. Geographic variation in the relationship
558 between human Lyme disease incidence and density of infected host-seeking *Ixodes*
559 *scapularis* nymphs in the Eastern United States. *American Journal of Tropical*
560 *Medicine and Hygiene* 86, 1062–1071. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2012.11-0630>
- 561 Porter, W.T., Motyka, P.J., Wachara, J., Barrand, Z.A., Hmood, Z., McLaughlin, M.,
562 Pemberton, K., Nieto, N.C., 2019. Citizen science informs human-tick exposure in the
563 Northeastern United States. *Int J Health Geogr* 18, 9. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-019-0173-0)
564 [019-0173-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-019-0173-0)
- 565 R Core Team, 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
566 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 567 Rasinski, K.A., Mingay, D., Bradburn, N.M., 1994. Do Respondents Really “Mark All That
568 Apply” On Self-Administered Questions? *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58, 400.
569 <https://doi.org/10.1086/269434>
- 570 Rosenberg, R., Lindsey, N.P., Fischer, M., Gregory, C.J., Hinckley, A.F., Mead, P.S., Paz-
571 Bailey, G., Waterman, S.H., Drexler, N.A., Kersh, G.J., Hooks, H., Partridge, S.K.,

- 572 Visser, S.N., Beard, C.B., Petersen, L.R., 2018. Vital Signs: Trends in Reported
573 Vectorborne Disease Cases — United States and Territories, 2004–2016. *MMWR*
574 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 67, 496–501. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6717e1>
575 Rosenstock, I.M., 1974. Historical Origins of the Health Belief Model. *Health Education*
576 *Monographs* 2, 328–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019817400200403>
577 Schiffman, E.K., Neitzel, D.F., Lynfield, R., 2016. Tick-borne Disease Prevention: Still No
578 Silver Bullet. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 214, 171–172.
579 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv776>
580 Smith, G., Wileyto, E.P., Hopkins, R.B., Cherry, B.R., Maher, J.P., 2001. Risk factors for
581 lyme disease in Chester County, Pennsylvania. *Public Health Rep* 116, 146–156.
582 Stafford, K.C., Magnarelli, L.A., 1993. Spatial and Temporal Patterns of *Ixodes scapularis*
583 (Acari: Ixodidae) in Southeastern Connecticut. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 30,
584 762–771. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmedent/30.4.762>
585 Vázquez, M., Muehlenbein, C., Cartter, M., Hayes, E.B., Ertel, S., Shapiro, E.D., 2008.
586 Effectiveness of Personal Protective Measures to Prevent Lyme Disease. *Emerging*
587 *Infectious Diseases* 14, 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1402.070725>
588 Venables, W.N., Ripley, B.D., 2002. *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Fourth Edition.
589 Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0
590

		Midwest		Northeast		χ^2	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	p-value	
Device	"The Tick App"	663	(95.1)	366	(92.4)	0.068	
	Not App	34	(4.9)	30	(7.6)		
Age (years)	18-24	40	(5.8)	11	(2.8)	0.001	
	25-34	111	(16.0)	70	(17.8)		
	35-44	137	(19.7)	109	(27.7)		
	45-54	120	(17.3)	83	(21.1)		
	55-64	169	(24.3)	73	(18.5)		
	65 or older	118	(17.0)	48	(12.2)		
Gender	Female	340	(48.8)	211	(53.3)	0.258	
	Male	348	(49.9)	178	(45.0)		
	Other	9	(1.3)	7	(1.8)		
Previous Lyme diagnosis	No	618	(89.2)	338	(86.0)	0.122	
	Yes	75	(10.8)	55	(14.0)		
Property	Apartment	79	(11.3)	112	(28.5)	<0.001	
	House with yard	618	(88.7)	281	(71.5)		
Outdoor recreation	Infrequent	126	(18.1)	146	(36.9)	<0.001	
	Frequent	571	(81.9)	250	(63.1)		
Work / volunteer outdoors	No	363	(52.4)	266	(67.5)	<0.001	
	Yes	330	(47.6)	128	(32.5)		
	<8 hr	209	(63.7)	86	(67.2)		0.486
	>8 hr	119	(36.3)	42	(32.8)		
Tick previous fall / winter	No	435	(62.7)	308	(78.0)	<0.001	
	Yes	259	(37.3)	87	(22.0)		
Dog	No	306	(44.2)	212	(54.5)	0.001	
	Yes	386	(55.8)	177	(45.5)		

Table 1: Summary of study participants. The Midwest represents participants from Wisconsin and the Northeast represents participants from New Jersey and New York.

Activity	Frequency	Midwest		Northeast		χ^2
		n	(%)	n	(%)	p-value
<i>Recreational</i>						
Bird watching	Never	363	(53.0)	254	(65.5)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	82	(12.0)	51	(13.1)	
	At least once a month	91	(13.3)	40	(10.3)	
	At least once a week	149	(21.8)	43	(11.1)	
Camping	Never	262	(38.2)	233	(59.9)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	217	(31.7)	115	(29.6)	
	At least once a month	176	(25.7)	34	(8.7)	
	At least once a week	30	(4.4)	7	(1.8)	
Fishing	Never	296	(43.0)	299	(76.7)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	149	(21.6)	47	(12.1)	
	At least once a month	173	(25.1)	30	(7.7)	
	At least once a week	71	(10.3)	14	(3.6)	
Hiking	Never	37	(5.4)	45	(11.4)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	62	(9.0)	71	(18.0)	
	At least once a month	230	(33.4)	119	(30.1)	
	At least once a week	360	(52.2)	160	(40.5)	
Hunting	Never	539	(79.1)	373	(95.4)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	43	(6.3)	5	(1.3)	
	At least once a month	63	(9.3)	8	(2.0)	
	At least once a week	36	(5.3)	5	(1.3)	
Visiting the beach	Never	49	(7.1)	24	(6.2)	0.911
	About once in the summer	156	(22.7)	90	(23.1)	
	At least once a month	293	(42.6)	163	(41.9)	
	At least once a week	189	(27.5)	112	(28.8)	

<i>Peridomestic</i>						
Gardening	Never	72	(11.8)	60	(21.5)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	38	(6.2)	20	(7.2)	
	At least once a month	98	(16.1)	52	(18.6)	
	At least once a week	401	(65.8)	147	(52.7)	
Mowing the lawn	Never	120	(19.6)	147	(53.3)	<0.001
	About once in the summer	23	(3.8)	11	(4.0)	
	At least once a month	99	(16.2)	45	(16.3)	
	At least once a week	370	(60.5)	73	(26.4)	

Table 2. Midwesterners do more frequent recreational and peridomestic activity than Northeasterners. The number of respondents (n) and percentage (%) in each frequency per recreational and peridomestic outdoor activity. A comparison between the Midwest and Northeast was made for the participants in each activity frequency, the p-value of the Chi-squared test (χ^2) is included.

Activity	Frequency	Midwest		OR (95% CI)	Northeast		OR (95% CI)	χ^2 p-value
		n / N	(%)		n / N	(%)		
Recreational								
Bird watching	Never	112 / 363	(30.9)	1	38 / 254	(15.0)	1	0.877
	About once in the summer	33 / 82	(40.2)	1.51 (0.92, 2.47)	13 / 51	(25.5)	1.95 (0.95, 3.99)	
	At least once a month	44 / 91	(48.4)	2.10 (1.31, 3.35)	15 / 40	(37.5)	3.41 (1.65, 7.06)	
	At least once a week	64 / 149	(43.0)	1.69 (1.14, 2.50)	18 / 43	(41.9)	4.09 (2.04, 8.29)	
Camping	Never	79 / 262	(30.2)	1	34 / 233	(14.6)	1	0.024
	About once in the summer	81 / 217	(37.3)	1.38 (0.94, 2.02)	34 / 115	(29.6)	2.46 (1.43, 4.22)	
	At least once a month	81 / 176	(46.0)	1.98 (1.33, 2.94)	13 / 34	(38.2)	3.62 (1.66, 7.92)	
	At least once a week	13 / 30	(43.3)	1.77 (0.82, 3.82)	3 / 7	(42.9)	4.39 (0.94, 20.49)	
Fishing	Never	86 / 296	(29.1)	1	57 / 299	(19.1)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	61 / 149	(40.9)	1.69 (1.12, 2.56)	10 / 47	(21.3)	1.15 (0.54, 2.44)	
	At least once a month	76 / 173	(43.9)	1.91 (1.29, 2.83)	13 / 30	(43.3)	3.25 (1.49, 7.07)	
	At least once a week	33 / 71	(46.5)	2.12 (1.25, 3.60)	3 / 14	(35.7)	2.36 (0.76, 7.31)	
Hiking	Never	8 / 37	(21.6)	1	3 / 45	(6.7)	1	0.032
	About once in the summer	9 / 62	(14.5)	0.62 (0.21, 1.77)	10 / 71	(14.1)	2.30 (0.60, 8.84)	
	At least once a month	69 / 230	(30.0)	1.55 (0.68, 3.57)	25 / 119	(21.0)	3.72 (1.07, 13.02)	
	At least once a week	172 / 360	(47.8)	3.32 (1.48, 7.45)	49 / 160	(30.6)	6.18 (1.83, 20.90)	
Hunting	Never	170 / 539	(31.5)	1	79 / 373	(21.2)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	19 / 43	(44.2)	1.72 (0.92, 3.22)	0 / 5	(0)	NA	
	At least once a month	38 / 63	(60.3)	3.30 (1.93, 5.64)	4 / 8	(50.0)	3.72 (0.91, 15.21)	
	At least once a week	25 / 36	(69.4)	4.93 (2.37, 10.26)	2 / 5	(40.0)	2.48 (0.41, 15.11)	
Visiting the beach	Never	20 / 49	(40.8)	1	2 / 24	(8.3)	1	0.059

	About once in the summer	42 / 156	(26.9)	0.53 (0.27, 1.06)	20 / 90	(22.2)	3.14 (0.68, 14.52)	
	At least once a month	106 / 293	(36.2)	0.82 (0.44, 1.52)	26 / 163	(16.0)	2.09 (0.46, 9.42)	
	At least once a week	89 / 189	(47.1)	1.29 (0.68, 2.44)	35 / 112	(31.2)	5.00 (1.11, 22.45)	
<i>Peridomestic</i>								
Gardening	Never	17 / 72	(23.6)	1	7 / 60	(11.7)	1	0.681
	About once in the summer	10 / 38	(26.3)	1.16 (0.47, 2.85)	3 / 20	(15.0)	1.34 (0.31, 5.75)	
	At least once a month	30 / 98	(30.6)	1.43 (0.71, 2.85)	11 / 52	(21.2)	2.03 (0.72, 5.70)	
	At least once a week	177 / 401	(44.1)	2.56 (1.43, 4.56)	46 / 147	(31.3)	3.45 (1.46, 8.16)	
Mowing the lawn	Never	27 / 120	(22.5)	1	27 / 147	(18.4)	1	<0.001
	About once in the summer	8 / 23	(34.8)	1.84 (0.70, 4.79)	3 / 11	(27.3)	1.67 (0.42, 6.70)	
	At least once a month	34 / 99	(34.3)	1.80 (0.99, 3.27)	12 / 45	(26.7)	1.62 (0.74, 3.53)	
	At least once a week	168 / 370	(45.4)	2.87 (1.78, 4.61)	23 / 73	(31.5)	2.04 (1.07, 3.90)	

Table 3 Participants who reported more frequent outdoor activity in spring and summer were more likely to have found a tick in the previous fall and winter. The number of respondents that found a tick (n) and the total in each frequency per recreational outdoor activity are included (N), followed by the percentage (%). The odds of finding a tick when doing an activity about once a summer, monthly or weekly compared to never doing the activity was calculated, the odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) are included. A comparison between the Midwest and Northeast was made for participants that reported finding a tick versus those who did not, the p-value of the Chi-squared test (χ^2) is included.




Figure 1: Use of personal protective measures vary between the Midwest and the Northeast. The proportion of participants who used personal protective measures the previous spring and summer. Personal protective measures included: Check one-self for ticks, use of tick repellent use (e.g. DEET, picaridin), wear protective clothing (e.g. light colored, long-sleeved, tucking pants in socks, boots), shower or bathe to remove ticks, permethrin-treated clothing, no personal protective measures and other methods. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 2: Peridomestic risk factors for tick exposure were more prevalent in the Midwest and peridomestic tick interventions were more common in the Northeast. A)

The proportion of homes (excluding apartments or condominiums) from participants from the Midwest (grey) and Northeast (black) with each property characteristic. B) Peridomestic interventions employed in the Midwest and Northeast targeting deer, rodents and the environment. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 3: More frequent recreational and peri-domestic activities, except mowing the lawn, were associated with the use of personal protective measures. The conditional odds ratios represent the conditional estimate for increased outdoor activity and the likelihood of use of a preventative measure. A) Estimates for recreational outdoor activities, after accounting for age category, gender, the interaction between activity frequency and region, and previous Lyme diagnosis. B) Estimates for peridomestic activities. In addition to the previously mentioned model parameters, the model also accounted for peridomestic

interventions for deer, rodents and insecticide treatment, and if participants did frequent recreational outdoor activities. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval.