

1 **TITLE: The SARS-CoV-2 infection among students in the University of Porto: a cross-sectional**  
2 **study**

3 Paula Meireles<sup>1\*</sup>, Joana Pinto Costa<sup>1\*</sup>, Maria João Novais<sup>1</sup>, Daniela Miranda<sup>1</sup>, Mariana Mendes  
4 Lopes<sup>1</sup>, Milton Severo<sup>1</sup>, Henrique Barros<sup>1,2</sup>

5 \* equally contributing first authors

6 <sup>1</sup> EPIUnit–Instituto de Saúde Pública, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, nº 135, 4050-600  
7 Porto, Portugal

8 <sup>2</sup> Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Alameda Prof. Hernâni Monteiro, 4200-319  
9 Porto, Portugal

10

11 **ABSTRACT**

12 Introduction

13 Incidence based on notified cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection underestimates the real extension  
14 of the infection. We aimed to quantify SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies' seroprevalence among  
15 University students in Porto.

16 Methods

17 A rapid point of care testing for SARS-CoV-2 specific immunoglobulin (Ig) M and IgG antibodies  
18 was performed, and a questionnaire was applied to the 6512 voluntary students from  
19 September to December 2020. We computed the apparent IgM, IgG and IgM or IgG  
20 prevalence, and the true prevalence and 95% credible intervals (95% CI) using Bayesian  
21 inference.

22 Results

23 We found an apparent prevalence (IgM or IgG) of 9.7%, the true prevalence being 7.9% (95%

24 CI 4.9–11.1). Prevalence was significantly higher among males (10.9% vs 9.2%), international

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 students (18.1% vs 10.4% local vs 8.8% nationally displaced) and increased with age. Those  
26 with a known risk contact, that experienced quarantine, had symptoms, or a previous negative  
27 molecular test had a higher seroprevalence. Of the 91 (1.4%) students who reported a  
28 molecular diagnosis, 86.7% were reactive for IgM or IgG.

29 Conclusion

30 Based on immunological evidence infection was 5.6 times more frequent than if based on a  
31 molecular diagnosis. The higher seroprevalence among male, older, and international students  
32 emphasizes the importance of identifying particular groups.

33

34 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; seroprevalence; antibodies; University students

35

## 36 INTRODUCTION

37 The infection with the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) can  
38 follow many distinct courses, with ominous outcomes mostly in the elderly population and no  
39 or few unspecific symptoms mainly among young and healthy individuals [1-3]. Real-time  
40 Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) is the diagnostic “reference standard”, but testing  
41 strategies changed over the course of the epidemic and varied according to local logistic  
42 capacity. Thus, confirmed cases are a suboptimal indicator of the extent of SARS-CoV-2  
43 infection, and the magnitude of undiagnosed infections can vary widely [4]. SARS-CoV-2  
44 seroprevalence studies are critical to monitor the epidemic evolution in a population and to  
45 inform public health measures, such as vaccine allocation [5]. Those studies estimate the  
46 number of past infections higher than the number of RT-PCR confirmed cases [6, 7]. In the case  
47 of an emergent agent, it is assumed that all population is initially susceptible; therefore, the  
48 presence of specific antibodies provides good estimates of the cumulative incidence  
49 particularly if the infection provides long-term serological immunity.

50 In Portugal, the first case of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was diagnosed on March 2,  
51 2020 and on March 16 a nationwide schools closure was decreed affecting all education levels  
52 [8] – around 2 million students, more than 346 thousand from higher education [9]. Schools  
53 and universities fully reopened in mid-September 2020, providing an excellent opportunity to  
54 obtain data on the serum status of a large sample of university young adults exposed to highly  
55 varied risk contexts.

56 This study aimed to estimate SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies’ seroprevalence and its  
57 determinants among students at the University of Porto (U.Porto), assessed between  
58 September and December of 2020.

## 59    **METHODS AND PARTICIPANTS**

60    All undergraduate and postgraduate students from the U.Porto were sent an email by the  
61    University communication office to invite them to perform a rapid serological test for SARS-  
62    CoV-2 specific immunoglobulin (Ig) M and IgG antibodies. Along with this email, an information  
63    leaflet was sent. Participation was voluntary, and students scheduled their appointment  
64    according to their convenience. They were invited to answer a face-to-face questionnaire  
65    conducted by the trained researcher who performed the test, while waiting for the result.

66    The questionnaire included the following demographic and social questions: sex, age, living in  
67    usual residence (yes; no, usual residence in the country; no, usual residence abroad), faculty,  
68    history of contacts with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 case since January 2020, history of being  
69    quarantined since January 2020, symptoms (then categorized as asymptomatic;  
70    paucisymptomatic: defined as having or having had one or two of the following symptoms:  
71    cough, dyspnea, odynophagia, headache, vomiting or nausea, diarrhea, fever, arthralgias,  
72    myalgia, asthenia; and symptomatic defined as having or having had at least three symptoms  
73    listed before, or dysgeusia or anosmia), ever being tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection, previous  
74    SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis, dates of diagnosis and recovery, self-perception of the  
75    probability of having been infected.

76    Data reported in this study refer to the period between September 24 to December 15, 2020,  
77    during which 6512 students (approximately 20% of the 32,443 students of U.Porto) self-  
78    selected to have a point of care serological test. The participants' characteristics are presented  
79    in Table 1.

80    The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the Institute of Public Health of  
81    the University of Porto (ID 20154). Verbal informed consent was obtained prior to the  
82    interview. Questionnaires were anonymous, and the results were only communicated to the

83 students. The identifying information needed to schedule testing was kept only at the U.Porto  
84 information systems' department. The linkage between datasets is impossible.

#### 85 *SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM and IgG antibodies determination*

86 Three point-of-care tests were used according to the manufacturer instructions – the  
87 STANDARD Q COVID-19 IgM/IgG Combo (manufacturer reported sensitivity of 94.5% seven or  
88 more days after symptom onset and specificity of 95.7% for both IgG and IgM), the HIGHTOP -  
89 SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG Test Combo (manufacturer reported sensitivity of 82.0% and 93.0% and  
90 specificity of 96.0% and 97.5% for IgM and IgG, respectively), and the *Teste Rápido Pantest de*  
91 *Coronavirus 2019-nCoV IgG/IgM* (manufacturer reported sensitivity of 85.0% and 100% and  
92 specificity of 96.0% and 98.0% for IgM and IgG, respectively). The three manufacturers used  
93 RT-PCR as the gold standard. The first was used from September 24 to October 19 (n=2263),  
94 the second from October 19 to 26 (n=1059), and the third from October 27 onwards (n=3190).  
95 All participants presenting with symptoms or reporting high-risk contacts in the previous 14  
96 days were recommended to contact the National Health Service Contact Center. All  
97 participants were communicated their results orally and also in the form of a written leaflet  
98 with the information that the serological test only indicates whether there is evidence of  
99 previous contact with the SARS-CoV-2 and that it cannot be used to diagnose or rollout SARS-  
100 CoV-2 infection. It also recommended that all SARS-CoV-2 preventive measures were to be  
101 adopted and to call the National Health Service Contact Center in case of symptoms.

#### 102 *Statistical analysis*

103 We estimated seroprevalence as the proportion of individuals who had a reactive result in the  
104 IgM or IgG band of the point-of-care test. We estimated the true prevalence and 95% credible  
105 intervals (95% CI) using Bayesian inference. We used a uniform prior distribution for sensitivity  
106 ranging from 0.82 to 1 and specificity between 0.94 and 1. Estimates were obtained using the  
107 'rjags' package in R.

108 Groups were compared using the Pearson Chi-Square, or the Fisher-exact test when the chi-  
109 square test's assumptions did not hold.

## 110 **RESULTS**

111 Table 1 presents the IgM, IgG and IgM or IgG apparent seroprevalence and reported SARS-CoV-  
112 2 infection prior diagnosis by a molecular test according to the characteristics of the U.Porto  
113 students. Among the 6512 students evaluated, 558 (8.6%) had a reactive test for IgM, 380  
114 (5.8%) for IgG and 634 (9.7%) for IgM or IgG. The estimated true prevalence was 6.6 (95% CI  
115 3.6-9.6) for IgM, 3.5 (95% CI 0.5-6.5) for IgG and 7.9 (95% CI 4.9-11.1) for IgM or IgG.

116 The prevalence of IgG was higher among males (7.1% vs 5.3% among females,  $p=0.006$ ). The  
117 prevalence of IgM or IgG antibodies was higher among the 30-34 years old and the 40 and  
118 more years old, 13.5% and 16.1%, respectively (vs 7.9 % in students under 20, 9.7% in 20-24  
119 years, 10.9% in 25-29 years and 8.7% in 35-39 years,  $p=0.001$ ). A history of prior diagnosis was  
120 also higher in those age groups, 2.5% among the 30-34 years old and 2.2% in those aged 40  
121 years or over (vs 0.7% in students under 20, 1.5% in 20-24 years, 1.6% in 25-29 years and 1.6%  
122 in 35-39 years,  $p=0.028$ ).

123 The prevalence of antibodies was higher among international students (18.1% for IgM or IgG vs  
124 10.4% among those living in their usual family home and 8.8% among nationally displaced,  
125  $p<0.001$ ). The proportion of those who report a previous infection diagnosis was also higher  
126 among international students (3.8% vs 1.2% among those living in their usual family home and  
127 1.0% among nationally displaced,  $p<0.001$ ).

128 Students who had contact with confirmed cases showed a prevalence of IgM or IgG of 20.5%,  
129 higher than the prevalence of 8.0% among those without ( $p<0.001$ ). Similar results were found  
130 among those who were quarantined (21.3% vs 8.3%,  $p<0.001$ ). IgM or IgG prevalence was also  
131 higher whenever there was a history of symptoms since the beginning of 2020, being 7.5%

132 among asymptomatic, 10.3% among paucisymptomatic and 20.1% among ever symptomatic  
133 students ( $p < 0.001$ ).

134 SARS-CoV-2 infection had been previously diagnosed by a molecular test in 91 (1.4%) students.  
135 They had a prevalence of IgM or IgG antibodies of 86.8%; this was 10.7% in those tested  
136 negative and 8.1% in those never tested ( $p < 0.001$ ).

137 Of the 91 (1.4%) students who had been previously diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection, 48  
138 (52.7%) had a diagnosis in October 2020. The distribution by month of diagnosis showed an  
139 increase in cases starting in August 2020. The prevalence of antibodies decreased with the  
140 increasing time since diagnosis, 76.9% among those diagnosed between two and five months  
141 and 68.4% among those diagnosed six or more months before the serological test.

142 Among students without an infection diagnosis, the prevalence of antibodies increased with  
143 the increased perception of having been infected; it varied from 39.3% among those who  
144 considered this probability to be very high to 7.0% among those who thought it was low or  
145 very low.

## 146 **DISCUSSION**

147 The 6512 students had a 9.7% prevalence of IgM or IgG antibodies. However, only 1.4%  
148 reported a prior diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on an RT-PCR result. The burden of  
149 infection in this group was 6.9 times higher than the reported cases considering the point  
150 estimate or 5.6 times higher if compared with the estimated true prevalence of 7.9%, as  
151 observed in previously published surveys [4, 6, 7, 10]. The lower true prevalence was expected.  
152 Even using high specificity and sensitivity tests there is a high number of false positives due to  
153 the relatively low frequency of infection in this population [11].

154 Students had a higher prevalence of infection than observed in the Portuguese serological  
155 survey (ISNCOVID-19), conducted between May and July 2020 (2.9%) [12]. Considering the  
156 participants in the age group 20-39 years both in the ISNCOVID-19 and the U.Porto students,

157 the prevalence was 2.9% and 10.1%, respectively. However, the studies were conducted in  
158 different periods of the epidemic in Portugal. The cumulative incidence of notified SARS-CoV-2  
159 infection at the end of the national survey was 0.4% while at the end of this study, it was 3.5%  
160 [13]. These, along with differences in the recruitment of participants and the population's  
161 characteristics, explain the difference in results.

162 Male and female students reported the same proportion of molecular diagnosis (1.4%).  
163 However, we found a higher seroprevalence among males, as reported in American university  
164 students [14], the Portuguese population [12] but not in other population-based surveys [4, 6,  
165 7] and a meta-analysis [15]. We have no information on the study level (undergraduate or  
166 graduate) and therefore could not measure seroprevalence according to this variable, but  
167 older students had a higher seroprevalence. A previous study showed no difference in the  
168 prevalence of IgG antibodies in undergraduates and graduates suggesting they may have not  
169 had different lifestyles that would make them more or less susceptible [14] but considering  
170 age this may not have been the case in U.Porto. Students whose usual residence was abroad  
171 had a higher seroprevalence of infection. This might reflect a higher risk experience in their  
172 own countries or sharing a more vulnerable context during their stay in U.Porto.

173 We found higher seroprevalence among students who reported previous negative molecular  
174 test compared with those never tested, suggesting that some RT-PCR results might have been  
175 false negatives [16]. In accordance with previous studies, the self-reported belief of having had  
176 SARS-CoV-2 infection, prior contact with confirmed cases, and having had symptoms were  
177 positively associated with a higher seroprevalence [7, 12, 14].

178 Despite a previous RT-PCR positive test, 17.6% showed no IgM and 13.2% IgG antibodies.  
179 These may be false negative results, evidence of no immune response, or more likely waning  
180 of antibodies over time. The observed decreasing seroprevalence with increasing time after  
181 the diagnosis also support this explanation, as previously described [17, 18]. However, it is



182 important to note that more than two-thirds of RT-PCR positive students had detectable  
183 immunological evidence of infection more than six months after diagnosis, indicating that  
184 antibodies may last long in a substantial proportion of individuals, as previously reported [19].  
185 The national cumulative incidence of notified COVID-19 cases was 3.5% by the end of our data  
186 collection. However, only 1.4% of students reported a positive RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2.  
187 This lower incidence may be partially explained by the higher proportion of young people with  
188 few or no symptoms and, therefore, unnoticed infections, students' higher socioeconomic  
189 status, and an increased commitment to non-pharmacological preventive measures [1, 2]. It is  
190 worth mentioning that the number of reported cases among U.Porto students from September  
191 16, 2020, to December 16, 2020, was 879, corresponding to 26 per 1000 students. This is  
192 almost double the observed in our sample and can have several explanations: 1. from an  
193 individual point of view those with previous infection may have less interest in doing the  
194 serological test because they know already they had contact with the virus; 2. they may be  
195 enrolled in care or having already an antibody test provided by the clinical services, and 3.  
196 some of those infections were recent and therefore students may have not yet had the  
197 opportunity to perform the test. We observed an increasing number of reported infection  
198 diagnosis in our study since August, as observed nationwide, but only one case in November,  
199 which might indicate that those diagnosed more recently did not yet have the chance to  
200 perform the test.

201 We used three different point-of-care tests over three different periods. This was unintended  
202 and was due to manufacturer delay on delivery which are constraints of real-world research in  
203 a time of high demand. However, all tests presented similar manufacturer's reported  
204 characteristics, were used by the same trained researchers, and had similar performance in an  
205 in-house pilot test (data not shown). We cannot infer from this large sample to the U.Porto  
206 students' population due to the lack of representativeness and the relatively low participation,

207 probably explained by the voluntary nature of this testing program and the fact that many  
208 students remained on virtual learning. It is even possible that those who have had symptoms,  
209 high-risk contacts, or a self-perception of a higher probability of having been infected might be  
210 overrepresented. However, the dimension of infection in an educated, probably relatively low-  
211 risk community, is strong evidence of the increasing burden of COVID-19 in Portugal.

## 212 *Conclusion*

213 In the University of Porto, students had a 7.9% seroprevalence, which was five times higher  
214 than the prevalence based on the reported molecular diagnoses and two times higher than the  
215 notified national cumulative incidence by the end of the study. Being an international student,  
216 reporting symptoms, self-perceiving high probability of infection, having had contact with a  
217 case, experiencing quarantine, and having had a diagnostic test performed though negative  
218 was associated with higher seroprevalence. Antibodies were present in 87% of those  
219 previously diagnosed with a molecular test, though reactivity decreased with increased time  
220 since the diagnosis.

221 **Funding:** This study was funded by University of Porto and supported by national funds of  
222 Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT), under the scope of the project UIDB/04750/2020 -  
223 Research Unit of Epidemiology–Institute of Public Health of the University of Porto (EPIUnit).  
224 Joana Costa was the recipient of PhD grant 2020.08562.BD co-funded by the national funds of  
225 FCT and the Fundo Social Europeu (FSE). The funding source had no role in the work.

226 **Acknowledgements:** We wish to acknowledge the team of researchers in the field namely Ana  
227 Margarida Lopes, Daniela Soares, Ema Fortunato, Flávia Mouta, Inês Roque, Inês Teixeira,  
228 Jacinta Mendonça, Janessa Oliveira, Laís Vieira, Mafalda Alves, Marta Costa, and Suellen Brito.  
229 The IT support from Paulo Oliveira, Celeste Pinto and Elisabete Neves. The U.Porto  
230 communication team led by Raul Santos. The U.Porto vice-rector Pedro Rodrigues.

231 **Competing interests:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to  
232 the content of this article.

233 **Availability of data and material:** The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the  
234 current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

235 **Ethics approval:** This study was performed in line with the principles of the Declaration of  
236 Helsinki. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the Institute of Public  
237 Health of the University of Porto (ID 20154).

238 **Consent to participate:** Verbal informed consent was obtained prior to the interview.

239

## 240 REFERENCES

241 [1] Felsenstein S, Hedrich CM (2020) SARS-CoV-2 infections in children and young people.  
242 *Clinical Immunology* 220:108588

243 [2] Oran DP, Topol EJ (2020) Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Annals of*  
244 *Internal Medicine* 173 (5):362-367

245 [3] Li X, Xu S, Yu M, Wang K, Tao Y, Zhou Y, et al. (2020) Risk factors for severity and mortality  
246 in adult COVID-19 inpatients in Wuhan. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 146 (1):110-  
247 118

248 [4] Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ, et al. (2020) Seroprevalence  
249 of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA*  
250 *Internal Medicine* 180 (12):1576-1586

251 [5] World Health Organization (WHO). Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological  
252 investigation protocol for coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19)infection (version 2.0). World Health  
253 Organization, Geneva

254 [6] Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al. (2020)  
255 Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a  
256 population-based study. *The Lancet* 396 (10247):313-319

257 [7] Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al.  
258 (2020) Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based  
259 seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet* 396 (10250):535-544

- 260 [8] Presidência do Conselho de Ministros (2020) Decreto-Lei n.º 10-A/2020: Diário da  
261 República n.º 52/2020, 1º Suplemento, Série I de 2020-03-13.
- 262 [9] UNESCO (2020) COVID-19 Impact on Education: Global monitoring of school closures  
263 caused by COVID-19, <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>. Cited 27 december  
264 2020
- 265 [10] Rogawski McQuade ET, Guertin KA, Becker L, Operario D, Gratz J, Guan D, et al. (2021)  
266 Assessment of Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and Risk Factors Associated With COVID-19  
267 Infection Among Outpatients in Virginia. JAMA Network Open 4 (2):e2035234-e2035234
- 268 [11] Kumleben N, Bhopal R, Czypionka T, Gruer L, Kock R, Stebbing J, et al. (2020) Test, test,  
269 test for COVID-19 antibodies: the importance of sensitivity, specificity and predictive powers.  
270 Public Health 185:88-90
- 271 [12] Kislaya I, Gonçalves P, Barreto M, de Sousa R, Garcia AC, Matos R, et al. (2021)  
272 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Portugal in May-July 2020: Results of the First  
273 National Serological Survey (ISNCOVID-19). 2021 34 (2):8
- 274 [13] (2020) Direção Geral da Saúde (DGS). COVID-19 | Relatório de Situação nº 289 | 16  
275 dezembro 2020.
- 276 [14] Tilley K, Ayzvazyan V, Martinez L, Nanda N, Kawaguchi ES, O'Gorman M, et al. (2020) A  
277 Cross-Sectional Study Examining the Seroprevalence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
278 Coronavirus 2 Antibodies in a University Student Population. J Adolesc Health 67 (6):763-768
- 279 [15] Rostami A, Sepidarkish M, Leeflang MMG, Riahi SM, Nourollahpour Shiadeh M,  
280 Esfandyari S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence worldwide: a systematic review and meta-  
281 analysis. Clinical Microbiology and Infection
- 282 [16] Arevalo-Rodriguez I, Buitrago-Garcia D, Simancas-Racines D, Zambrano-Achig P, Del  
283 Campo R, Ciapponi A, et al. (2020) False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19:  
284 A systematic review. PLoS One 15 (12):e0242958
- 285 [17] Post N, Eddy D, Huntley C, van Schalkwyk MCI, Shrotri M, Leeman D, et al. (2021)  
286 Antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans: A systematic review. PLOS ONE 15  
287 (12):e0244126
- 288 [18] Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A (2020) Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2.  
289 JAMA 323 (22):2249-2251
- 290 [19] Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, Hastie KM, Yu ED, Faliti CE, et al. (2021) Immunological  
291 memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. Science:eabf4063
- 292

Table 1: Characteristics of participants, IgM, IgG and IgM or IgG apparent seroprevalence and reported SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis by a molecular test according to those characteristics among U.Porto students from September to December 2020, Porto, Portugal

	Total of participants		IgM seroprevalence	IgG seroprevalence	IgM or IgG seroprevalence	Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis
	N	%	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
<b>Overall</b>	6512	100	558 (8.6)	380 (5.8)	634 (9.7)	91 (1.4)
<b>SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS</b>						
<b>Sex</b>						
Female	4554	69.9	8.1	5.3	9.2	1.4
Male	1951	30.0	9.6	7.1	10.9	1.4
Missing	7	0.1				
	<i>p-value</i>		<i>0.060</i>	<i>0.006</i>	<i>0.048</i>	<i>0.907</i>
<b>Age strata (years)</b>						
< 20	1600	24.6	6.8	4.3	7.9	0.7
20-24	3548	54.5	8.7	5.7	9.7	1.5
25-29	735	11.3	10.1	7.2	10.9	1.6
30-34	319	4.9	10.7	10.0	13.5	2.5
35-39	127	2.0	7.1	5.5	8.7	1.6
>= 40	180	2.8	14.4	10.6	16.1	2.2
Missing	3	0.0				
	<i>p-value</i>		<i>0.002</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>0.028</i>
<b>Living in usual residency</b>						
Yes	3689	56.6	7.7	5.1	10.4	1.2
No, but usual residence in the country	2192	33.7	7.9	4.7	8.8	1.0
No, usual residence abroad	626	9.6	15.8	14.4	18.1	3.8
Missing	5	0.1				
	<i>p-value</i>		<i>&lt;0.001</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>
<b>INFECTION-RELATED CHARACTERISTICS</b>						
<b>Previous RT-PCR test and diagnosis</b>						
Never tested	5062	77.7	7.0	4.2	8.1	
Tested, not diagnosed	1358	20.9	9.6	6.8	10.7	
Tested, diagnosed	91	1.4	82.4	84.6	86.8	

Missing	1	0.0					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	
<b>Confirmed case contact</b>							
No	5624	86.4	7.1	4.0	8.0	0.5	
Yes	878	13.5	17.8	17.3	20.5	7.3	
Missing	10	0.2					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Quarantined</b>							
No	5757	88.4	7.2	4.3	8.3	0.4	
Yes	748	11.5	19.0	17.4	21.3	9.0	
Missing	7	0.1					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Symptoms since January 2020</b>							
Asymptomatic	4871	74.8	6.6	3.7	7.5	0.4	
Paucissymptomatic <sup>1</sup>	689	10.6	9.9	6.5	10.4	1.5	
Symptomatic <sup>1</sup>	947	14.5	17.5	16.4	20.5	6.3	
Missing	5	0.1					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
<b>Self-perception of the probability of having already been infected * (excluding those with diagnosis n= 6421)</b>							
Very low	860	13.2	6.2	3.5	7.0		
Low	3134	48.1	6.3	3.1	7.0		
Moderate	1954	30.0	7.8	4.9	8.9		
High	351	5.4	14.0	12.0	16.2		
Very high	117	1.8	28.2	33.3	39.3		
Missing	5	0.1					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	
<b>Previous RT-PCR test and diagnosis</b>							
Never tested	5062	77.7	7.0	4.2	8.1		
Tested, not diagnosed	1358	20.9	9.6	6.8	10.7		
Tested, diagnosed	91	1.4	82.4	84.6	86.8		
Missing	1	0.0					
	<i>p-value</i>			<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	

**Time since the diagnosis (among those previously diagnosed n= 91)**

< 14 days	2	2.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
14-29 days	24	26.4%	87.5%	83.3%	87.5%
30 days-2months	33	36.3%	100.0%	97.0%	100.0%
2-5 months	13	14.3%	61.5%	76.9%	76.9%
>= 6 months	19	20.9%	57.9%	68.4%	68.4%
Missing	0	0.0%			
		<i>p-value</i>	<0.001*	0.044*	0.005

**Month of diagnosis (among those previously diagnosed n= 91)**

March	9	9.9%	55.6%	66.7%	66.7%
April	9	9.9%	66.7%	77.8%	77.8%
May	3	3.3%	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%
June	0	0.0%	-	-	-
July	1	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
August	8	8.8%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
September	12	13.2%	83.3%	83.3%	100.0%
October	48	52.7%	93.8%	93.8%	93.8%
November	1	1.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Missing	9	9.9%			
		<i>p-value</i>	0.008*	0.033*	0.012*

<sup>1</sup> Paucisymptomatic: having or having had one or two of the following symptoms: cough, dyspnea, odynophagia, headache, vomiting or nausea, diarrhea, fever, arthralgias, myalgia, asthenia; Symptomatic defined as having or having had at least three symptoms listed before, or dysgeusia or anosmia.

\*P-value for the Fisher exact-test