

Socio-economic determinants of SARS-CoV-2 infection: results from a population-based serosurvey in Geneva, Switzerland

Hugo-Alejandro Santa-Ramírez^{†1}, Ania Wisniak^{†1,2}, Nick Pullen¹, María-Eugenia Zaballa¹, Francesco Pennacchio¹, Elsa Lorthe¹, Roxane Dumont¹, Hélène Baysson¹, Idris Guessous^{±1,3}, Silvia Stringhini^{±1,3,4*}, on behalf of the Specchio-COVID19 study group⁵

¹Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

²Institute of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

³Department of Health and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

⁴University Centre for General Medicine and Public Health (UNISANTE), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

⁵The members of this group are acknowledged at the end of the article

[†] These authors share first authorship.

[±]These authors share senior authorship.

* Correspondence:

Silvia Stringhini

Unit of Population Epidemiology, Geneva University Hospitals, Chemin Thury 3B, 1206 Geneva, Switzerland

silvia.stringhini@hcuge.ch

Abstract

Background

SARS-CoV-2 infection and its health consequences have disproportionately affected disadvantaged socio-economic groups globally. This study aimed to analyze the association between socio-economic conditions and having developed anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in a population-based sample in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland.

Methods

Data was obtained from a population-based serosurvey of adults in Geneva and their household members, between November and December, 2020, towards the end of the second pandemic wave in the canton. Participants were tested for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Socio-economic conditions representing different dimensions were self-reported. Mixed effects logistic regressions were conducted for each predictor to test its association with seropositive status as the main outcome.

Results

2,889 adults completed the study questionnaire and were included in the final analysis. Retired participants and those living in suburban areas had lower odds of a seropositive result when compared to employed participants (OR 0.42, 95% CI - 0.20 – 0.87) and those living in urban areas (OR 0.67, 95% CI - 0.46 – 0.97), respectively. People facing financial hardship for less than a year had higher odds of a seropositive result compared to those who had never faced them (OR 2.23, 95% CI - 1.01 – 4.95). Educational level, occupational position and household income were not associated with being seropositive, nor were ethnicity or country of birth.

39 Discussion

40 While traditional measures of socio-economic position did not seem to be related to the risk of being
41 infected in this sample, this study sheds lights on the importance of examining the broader social
42 determinants of health when evaluating the differential impact of the pandemic within the population.

43 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, social determinants of health, socio-economic status, serological
44 survey

45 1 Introduction

46 Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, studies have shown that SARS-COV-2 infection and
47 its health-related consequences have disproportionately affected disadvantaged socio-economic groups
48 (1–3). Disadvantaged populations accumulate several vulnerabilities to infection, such as poor living
49 conditions, higher job instability, fewer job opportunities, poorer social benefits and lower financial
50 security (4,5), household crowding and possible impairments of their immune status due, among others,
51 to work-related and financial stress (6). This may lead to a higher need of continued work outside the
52 home, particularly for essential workers. Socioeconomically disadvantaged populations are also known
53 to have a higher burden of chronic diseases and reduced access to healthcare (7), both risk factors for
54 COVID-19 severity (8). In New York City, underprivileged neighborhoods, neighborhoods with higher
55 household density, and those with higher proportions of black and immigrant populations were more
56 likely to have a positive COVID-19 test result (9). An analysis of data reported to the Swiss Federal
57 Office of Public Health (SFOPH) during the first year of the pandemic revealed that people living in
58 neighborhoods with a low socioeconomic position index were less likely to get tested, but had a higher
59 proportion of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and antigen test results and were more likely to be
60 hospitalized or die compared to people living in socioeconomically advantaged areas (10). Another
61 study has also shown persistence of SARS-CoV-2 clusters in more disadvantaged neighborhoods,
62 when analyzing RT-PCR positive test results (11). Several studies revealing social inequalities related
63 to COVID-19 have been based on confirmed RT-PCR test results, therefore missing a large part of the
64 population who did not undergo testing (12,13). Socio-economic conditions may also influence the
65 probability of getting tested when presenting with symptoms of COVID-19. A better picture of the
66 distribution of the infection in the population is achieved with serological surveys as they yield more
67 accurate estimations of the real number of infections including mild and asymptomatic cases (14).
68 Further, most studies rely on area-based indicators of socioeconomic status, thereby not allowing a
69 more precise characterization of factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection.

70 Previous work by our research team showed associations between employment status and
71 seropositivity during the first wave of the epidemic in the canton of Geneva, with retirees having lower
72 odds of a seropositive result, and found no association with education, occupational status and
73 neighborhood median income (15). A serological survey conducted among essential workers in Geneva
74 after the first epidemic wave showed significant variation in seroprevalence across occupations (16).
75 Nevertheless, other features that might influence serological status could not be assessed in those
76 studies, such as ethnicity, individual income, country of birth and living and residential conditions.
77 Although the canton of Geneva never followed a strict lockdown, there were some differences between
78 the first and second waves, with the relaxation of certain measures such as re-opening of primary
79 schools, as well as shops and establishments, and allowing larger social gatherings. During the second
80 wave, a more strict use of facemasks was mandated and tests were made available free of charge to
81 any person with symptoms.

82 Understanding the influence of socioeconomic conditions on the probability of being infected with
83 SARS-CoV-2 is crucial for the implementation of equity-driven public health measures both to contain
84 the spread of the virus during the pandemic phase and to structure the public health response in the
85 post-pandemic phase. This study aimed to analyze the association between socioeconomic conditions
86 and having developed anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies during the second COVID-19 wave (October-
87 December 2020) in a representative sample of the population in the canton of Geneva.

88 **2 Methods**

89 The study sample included adults aged 18 years and older, who were randomly selected from a previous
90 population-based serosurvey conducted in the canton of Geneva in spring 2020, and from population
91 registries of the canton. Household members of recruited participants were also invited to take part in
92 the study. Details of the selection process have been described previously (17). Recruitment occurred
93 between November 23 and December 23, 2020. Participants were required to fill in a questionnaire
94 (online or in paper format) and had their blood drawn to determine their SARS-CoV-2 serological
95 status. The study was approved by the Geneva Cantonal Commission for Research Ethics (Project N°
96 2020-00881). All participants provided informed written consent.

97 Socio-economic conditions were assessed through conventional indicators of socio-economic status,
98 such as self-reported occupational position, education, family income, and other social determinants,
99 including ethnicity, country of birth, household residential area, household density and the experience
100 of financial hardship. Detailed information on the variables used is available in the supplementary
101 material (Annex I). Serological status was determined using the Elecsys anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay
102 (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) detecting total immunoglobulins (IgM/A/G) targeting the
103 spike protein, following manufacturer's recommendations (≥ 0.8 U/mL considered seropositive). Of
104 note, the vaccination campaign in Switzerland started on December 23th, 2020. Thus, antibodies
105 detected during this study could only have been produced in response to a SARS-CoV-2 infection.

106 Mixed effects logistic regressions were conducted for each individual predictor with seropositive status
107 as the main outcome and the household as the second level random effect variable. Four types of
108 models were developed: one model adjusted for age and sex only, another model additionally adjusted
109 for education, occupational position and family income; a third model adjusted for health-related
110 variables (weight status classified through categories of BMI, having a chronic disease, smoking status
111 and blood group); and a final model adjusted for all of the variables used in the previous models (Annex
112 II. Supplementary material). Reference categories were set to the most socially advantaged groups.
113 Multicollinearity was assessed for each of the adjusted models with no variables showing noticeable
114 collinearity. Analyses were conducted in the overall population and stratified by sex, as a differential
115 risk for COVID-19 outcomes and SARS-CoV-2 infection have been documented between men and
116 women (19) (Annex III and IV. Supplementary material). Results have not been adjusted for multiple
117 comparisons. Statistical analyses were conducted using STATA version 14.0 (StataCorp, College
118 Station, TX, USA).

119 **3 Results**

120 A total of 2,986 adults participated in the study and had a blood sample taken, of which 2,889
121 completed the study questionnaire and were included in the final analysis. The mean (SD) age of
122 participants was 47.8 (15.4) years, and 55% were women. Education, occupation and income were not
123 associated with being seropositive in the overall sample (Table 1 and Annex II. Supplementary
124 material). Looking at other socioeconomic indicators, associations were found with employment status,

125 financial hardship and the residential area in the overall sample, with retired people and those living in
126 a suburban area exhibiting lower odds of a seropositive result when compared with those employed
127 and those living in an urban area, respectively. People facing financial hardship for less than a year had
128 twice the odds of a seropositive result when compared to those that had never faced financial
129 difficulties, all other variables remaining constant. This association did not hold for participants having
130 faced financial difficulties for several years. People living in households with higher density also
131 tended to have higher odds of a seropositive result. Ethnicity and country of birth were not associated
132 with seropositivity in our sample. When stratifying by sex, men in the lower occupational position
133 tended to have higher odds of a seropositive result when compared to those with a higher occupational
134 position (OR 1.79, 95% CI - 0.97, 3.32) (Annex IV. Supplementary material). Higher odds of a
135 seropositive result were found for unemployed women compared to employed women (OR 2.01, 95%
136 CI - 1.01, 4.03) (Annex III. Supplementary material).

137 **4 Discussion**

138 In this population-based serological study, we found associations between financial hardship,
139 employment status, residential area and the odds of having developed anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. A
140 higher household density tended to be associated with increased odds of a seropositive result. However,
141 other socioeconomic conditions such as educational level, occupational position and income were not
142 associated with serological status, nor were ethnicity and country of birth.

143 Our study shows lower odds of a SARS-CoV-2 seropositive result for the retired population when
144 compared with the employed one, possibly due to the fact of being considered at higher risk of severe
145 forms of COVID-19, potentially leading them to reduce social contact and increase the use of
146 preventive measures. This result is consistent with previous findings from the first seroprevalence study
147 in Geneva (15) and findings from a report in the UK for the age group comprising the retired population
148 (20).

149 We also found a protective effect of the residential area for people living in suburban areas compared
150 to urban areas, which could be explained by increased use of private transportation and lower
151 population density. While this may also be the case in rural areas, higher commuting times and a
152 potentially lower sense of danger posed by the infection in these areas may explain the lack of
153 significant difference in seropositivity between rural and urban areas. It has been suggested that a lower
154 population density outside the urban areas might have contributed to lower incidence at the beginning
155 of the pandemic in some regions in Europe (21) and some studies have shown lower seroprevalence in
156 municipalities of less than 100.000 inhabitants (22). Further work is needed to uncover the potential
157 mechanisms explaining the association of the residential area with a seropositive result in the
158 population of Geneva, as considering the small size of the canton, the difference between urban and
159 suburban areas is not clearly established and the distribution of SARS-CoV-2 infections might not
160 follow a similar pattern as the one found in other places.

161 There seemed to be a trend in the association between duration of financial difficulties and the odds of
162 seropositivity, with people facing financial hardship for less than one year having the highest odds of
163 a seropositive result compared to those who reported never facing financial hardship. This could
164 potentially be explained by the development of coping mechanisms in individuals being used to
165 financial difficulties, while those with unexpected economic hardship may need more time to adapt to
166 their new circumstances, putting them at higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 exposure as they cannot afford
167 to miss work or need to look for economic alternatives. A consistent association of financial hardship
168 due to COVID-19 with health behavior risk changes has been shown in a sample of women in the U.S.,

169 although the health behaviors assessed were based on lifestyle factors rather than on the risk of getting
170 infected with SARS-CoV-2 (23); this may support a hypothesis of higher risky behaviors when facing
171 economic stress. On the other hand, reverse causation cannot be excluded, with people affected by
172 COVID-19 being more likely to reduce their work time due to symptomatic disease leading to financial
173 instability.

174 Consistent with our previous findings (15), we did not find associations between educational level,
175 occupational position, income, ethnicity or country of birth and the seropositive status. Other studies
176 conducted in European countries have found similar results for education (20,24). However, there is
177 divergence when looking at the role of occupation, income, nationality and ethnicity, with studies
178 showing conflicting results (20,25–27). This may be due to differences in survey design and
179 measurement across studies. The association between education and seropositivity may be confounded
180 by increased SARS-CoV-2 exposure in certain professions requiring tertiary education, such as in the
181 health-related field. Future analyses should take into account professional exposure to SARS-CoV-2.
182 Heterogeneity in the socioeconomic circumstances in different countries, as well as diverging policies
183 for pandemic management, may also explain some of the conflicting results.

184 Strengths of this study include the relatively large sample size and comprehensive information related
185 to different social and economic circumstances at the individual level as well as objective information
186 about individual health such as the serological status. Our study also has some limitations. A selection
187 bias should not be disregarded, with people with higher health concerns being more prone to
188 participate, and those most socioeconomically disadvantaged less likely to be included, limiting the
189 generalizability of our results. In addition, the population that was hospitalized at the time of the study
190 or that died because of COVID-19 could not be included in the study, therefore potentially masking
191 the association between socio-economic conditions and SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity for severe cases.
192 As other studies have documented, the severity of the disease might be higher in socioeconomically
193 disadvantaged groups (4,28).

194 The COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately affected socially vulnerable populations globally.
195 However the impact of socio-economic determinants can vary widely depending on geographical,
196 political and cultural contexts (29–31). In our study we have found associations of employment status,
197 financial hardship and residential area with the natural development of anti SARS-CoV-2 antibodies
198 during the second wave of the pandemic (before the roll-out of the vaccination campaign in
199 Switzerland); but not with other socioeconomic conditions. Our results highlight the importance of
200 examining the broader social determinants of health when evaluating the differential impact of the
201 pandemic within the population. A better understanding of the structural determinants shaping the
202 inequitable distribution of COVID-19 among the population is imperative for tailoring public health
203 interventions, such as vaccine prioritization and public health campaigns, and for setting up supportive
204 mechanisms for vulnerable population groups.

205 **5 Conflict of Interest**

206 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
207 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

208 **6 Author Contributions**

209 SS and IG conceived the study. AW, NP, HB, MZ, FP, RD and SS contributed to the scientific
210 coordination and data management during the study. HS and AW drafted the first version of the

211 manuscript. HS and NP did data analyses. NP, EL, HB, MZ, FP, IG and SS contributed to draft the
212 manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

213 **For the Specchio-COVID19 study group:**

214 Deborah Amrein, Isabelle Arm-Vernez, Andrew S Azman, Fatim Ba, , Delphine Bachmann, Antoine Bal, Jean-
215 François Balavoine, Michael Balavoine, Rémy P Barbe, H  l  ne Baysson, Lison Beigbeder, Julie Berthelot,
216 Patrick Bleich, Livia Boehm, Ga  lle Bryand, Viola Bucolli, Fran  ois Chappuis, Prune Collombet, Delphine
217 Courvoisier, Alain Cudet, Vladimir Davidovic, Carlos de Mestral Vargas, Paola D'ippolito, Richard Dubos,
218 Roxane Dumont, Isabella Eckerle, Nacira El Merjani, Antoine Flahault, Natalie Francioli, Marion Frangville,
219 Cl  ment Graindorge , Idris Guessous, S  verine Harnal, Samia Hurst, Laurent Kaiser, Omar Kherad, Julien
220 Lamour, Pierre Lescuyer, Fran  ois L'Huissier, Fanny-Blanche Lombard, Andrea Jutta Loizeau, Elsa Lorthe,
221 Chantal Martinez, Lucie M  nard, Lakshmi Menon, Ludovic Metral-Boffod, Benjamin Meyer, Alexandre
222 Moulin, Mayssam Nehme, Natacha No  l, Francesco Pennacchio, Javier Perez-Saez, Didier Pittet, Jane Portier,
223 Klara M Posfay-Barbe, G  raldine Poulain, Caroline Pugin, Nick Pullen, Zo Francia Randrianandrasana, ,
224 Viviane Richard, Frederic Rinaldi, Jessica Rizzo, Deborah Rochat, Irine Sakvarelidze, Khadija Samir, Santa
225 Ramirez Hugo Alejandro, Stephanie Schrempt, Claire Semaani, Silvia Stringhini, St  phanie Testini, Deborah
226 Urrutia Rivas, Charlotte Verolet, Jennifer Villers, Guillemette Violot, Nicolas Vuilleumier, Ania Wisniak,
227 Sabine Yerly, Mar  a-Eugenia Zaballa

228 **7 Data Availability Statement**

229 **8 Funding**

230 This study was funded by the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, the General Directorate of Health
231 of the Department of Safety, Employment and Health of the canton of Geneva, the Private Foundation
232 of the Geneva University Hospitals, the Swiss School of Public Health (Corona Immunitas Research
233 Program), the Fondation des Grangettes, and the Center for Emerging Viral Diseases. Hugo Santa is
234 funded by the SSPH+ Global PhD Fellowship Programme in Public Health Sciences (GlobalP3HS) of
235 the Swiss School of Public Health and by the Centre for Global Health Inequalities Research (CHAIN),
236 Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

237 **9 Acknowledgments**

238 We thank all the participants, without whom this study would not have been possible

239 **10 References**

- 240 1. S   F. Socioeconomic Determinants of Covid-19 Infections and Mortality: Evidence from
241 England and Wales [Internet]. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020 May
242 [cited 2021 Sep 22]. Report No.: ID 3612850. Available from:
243 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3612850>
- 244 2. Rozenfeld Y, Beam J, Maier H, Haggerson W, Boudreau K, Carlson J, et al. A model of
245 disparities: risk factors associated with COVID-19 infection. *Int J Equity Health*. 2020 Jul
246 29;19(1):126.
- 247 3. Finch WH, Hern  ndez Finch ME. Poverty and Covid-19: Rates of Incidence and Deaths in the
248 United States During the First 10 Weeks of the Pandemic. *Front Sociol* [Internet]. 2020 [cited

- 249 2021 Nov 30];0. Available from:
250 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2020.00047/full>
- 251 4. Little C, Alsen M, Barlow J, Naymagon L, Tremblay D, Genden E, et al. The Impact of
252 Socioeconomic Status on the Clinical Outcomes of COVID-19; a Retrospective Cohort Study. *J*
253 *Community Health*. 2021 Jan 2;1–9.
- 254 5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Health Equity Considerations and Racial
255 and Ethnic Minority Groups [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020 [cited
256 2021 Sep 22]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html)
257 [equity/race-ethnicity.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html)
- 258 6. Khalatbari-Soltani S, Cumming RC, Delpierre C, Kelly-Irving M. Importance of collecting data
259 on socioeconomic determinants from the early stage of the COVID-19 outbreak onwards. *J*
260 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020 Aug;74(8):620–3.
- 261 7. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *J*
262 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020 Nov 1;74(11):964–8.
- 263 8. Semenzato L, Botton J, Drouin J, Cuenot F, Dray-Spira R, Weill A, et al. Chronic diseases,
264 health conditions and risk of COVID-19-related hospitalization and in-hospital mortality during
265 the first wave of the epidemic in France: a cohort study of 66 million people. *Lancet Reg Health*
266 *– Eur* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Sep 22];8. Available from:
267 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762\(21\)00135-6/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(21)00135-6/fulltext)
- 268 9. Borjas GJ. Demographic Determinants of Testing Incidence and COVID-19 Infections in New
269 York City Neighborhoods [Internet]. *IZA Discussion Papers*; 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 22]. Report
270 No.: 13115. Available from: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/216427>
- 271 10. Riou J, Panczak R, Althaus CL, Junker C, Perisa D, Schneider K, et al. Socioeconomic position
272 and the COVID-19 care cascade from testing to mortality in Switzerland: a population-based
273 analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021 Sep 1;6(9):e683–91.
- 274 11. De Ridder D, Sandoval J, Vuilleumier N, Azman AS, Stringhini S, Kaiser L, et al.
275 Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Face Increased Persistence of SARS-CoV-2
276 Clusters. *Front Public Health*. 2021 Jan 27;8:626090.
- 277 12. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate
278 of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since
279 Exposure. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020 May 13;M20-1495.
- 280 13. Hendricks B, Paul R, Smith C, Wen S, Kimble W, Amjad A, et al. Coronavirus testing
281 disparities associated with community level deprivation, racial inequalities, and food insecurity
282 in West Virginia. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2021 Jul 1;59:44–9.
- 283 14. Kritsotakis EI. On the importance of population-based serological surveys of SARS-CoV-2
284 without overlooking their inherent uncertainties. *Public Health Pract*. 2020 Nov;1:100013.
- 285 15. Richard A, Wisniak A, Perez-Saez J, Garrison-Desany H, Petrovic D, Piumatti G, et al.
286 Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, risk factors for infection and associated

- 287 symptoms in Geneva, Switzerland: a population-based study: *Scand J Public Health* [Internet].
288 2021 Oct 19 [cited 2021 Nov 17]; Available from:
289 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/14034948211048050>
- 290 16. Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Pullen N, de Mestral C, Perez-Saez J, Dumont R, et al. Large
291 variation in anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence among essential workers in Geneva,
292 Switzerland. *Nat Commun*. 2021 Jun 8;12(1):1–7.
- 293 17. Stringhini S, Zaballa M-E, Perez-Saez J, Pullen N, de Mestral C, Picazio A, et al.
294 Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies after the second pandemic peak. *Lancet Infect
295 Dis*. 2021 May;21(5):600–1.
- 296 19. Peckham H, de Gruijter NM, Raine C, Radziszewska A, Ciurtin C, Wedderburn LR, et al. Male
297 sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ICU admission.
298 *Nat Commun*. 2020 Dec 9;11(1):6317.
- 299 20. Ward H, Atchison C, Whitaker M, Ainslie KEC, Elliott J, Okell L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody
300 prevalence in England following the first peak of the pandemic. *Nat Commun*. 2021 Feb
301 10;12(1):905.
- 302 21. Goujon A, Natale F, Ghio D, Conte A. Demographic and territorial characteristics of COVID-
303 19 cases and excess mortality in the European Union during the first wave. *J Popul Res
304 Canberra Act*. 2021 May 29;1–24.
- 305 22. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al.
306 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based
307 seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet*. 2020 Aug 22;396(10250):535–44.
- 308 23. Sampson L, Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Colyer E, Dukes K, Lane KJ, et al. Financial hardship
309 and health risk behavior during COVID-19 in a large US national sample of women. *SSM -
310 Popul Health*. 2021 Jan 12;13:100734.
- 311 24. Aziz NA, Corman VM, Echterhoff AKC, Müller MA, Richter A, Schmandke A, et al.
312 Seroprevalence and correlates of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies from a population-based
313 study in Bonn, Germany. *Nat Commun*. 2021 Apr 9;12(1):2117.
- 314 25. Wagner R, Peterhoff D, Beileke S, Günther F, Berr M, Einhauser S, et al. Estimates and
315 Determinants of SARS-Cov-2 Seroprevalence and Infection Fatality Ratio Using Latent Class
316 Analysis: The Population-Based Tirschenreuth Study in the Hardest-Hit German County in
317 Spring 2020. *Viruses*. 2021 Jun 10;13(6):1118.
- 318 26. Wachtler B, Müters S, Michalski N, Koschollek C, Albrecht S, Haller S, et al. Socioeconomic
319 inequalities in the prevalence and perceived dangerousness of SARS-CoV-2 infections in two
320 early German hotspots: findings from a seroepidemiological study. *BMC Res Notes*. 2021 Sep
321 26;14(1):375.
- 322 27. Bobrovitz N, Arora RK, Cao C, Boucher E, Liu M, Donnici C, et al. Global seroprevalence of
323 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE*. 2021 Jun
324 23;16(6):e0252617.

- 325 28. Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. Hospitalization and Mortality among Black
326 Patients and White Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jun 25;382(26):2534–43.
- 327 29. Hawkins RB, Charles EJ, Mehaffey JH. Socio-economic status and COVID-19–related cases
328 and fatalities. *Public Health*. 2020 Dec;189:129–34.
- 329 30. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the Unequal Burden of COVID-19 by Income, Race/Ethnicity,
330 and Household Crowding: US County Versus Zip Code Analyses. *J Public Health Manag Pract*.
331 2021 Feb;27:S43.
- 332 31. Muñoz-Price LS, Nattinger AB, Rivera F, Hanson R, Gmehlin CG, Perez A, et al. Racial
333 Disparities in Incidence and Outcomes Among Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open*.
334 2020 Sep 25;3(9):e2021892.

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354
355

Table 1. Association between socio-economic predictors and seropositive status to SARS-CoV-2 in the overall population

	Age-and sex-adjusted model			Fully adjusted model ⁺		
	OR	(95% CI)	p	OR	(95% CI)	p
Education						
Tertiary	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Secondary	0.88	[0.58,1.35]	0.569	0.82	[0.50,1.32]	0.411
Apprenticeship	0.92	[0.60,1.41]	0.692	0.77	[0.47,1.25]	0.284
Compulsory - None	0.83	[0.44,1.57]	0.573	0.75	[0.37,1.53]	0.432
Occupational position						
Higher	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Lower	1.16	[0.84,1.61]	0.360	1.26	[0.86,1.87]	0.240
Other ¹	0.79	[0.45,1.37]	0.397	0.82	[0.43,1.57]	0.556
Family income						
High	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Medium	0.93	[0.58,1.51]	0.781	0.91	[0.55,1.50]	0.720
Low	1.07	[0.61,1.88]	0.821	1.05	[0.58,1.91]	0.863
Don't know/Don't want to answer	0.99	[0.58,1.69]	0.962	1.04	[0.59,1.84]	0.896
Ethnicity						
Caucasian	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Other	0.69	[0.42,1.15]	0.154	0.66	[0.39,1.12]	0.123
Country of birth						
Switzerland	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Other HICs	0.99	[0.70,1.40]	0.962	0.93	[0.65,1.34]	0.693
LMICs	0.81	[0.49,1.34]	0.419	0.72	[0.43,1.23]	0.230
Employment status						
Employed	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Independent	1.21	[0.68,2.18]	0.515	1.26	[0.70,2.28]	0.444
Retired	0.46 [*]	[0.23,0.93]	0.030	0.42 [*]	[0.20,0.87]	0.020
Student	0.85	[0.44,1.65]	0.635	0.81	[0.34,1.95]	0.645
Unemployed	1.78	[0.85,3.76]	0.128	1.76	[0.82,3.77]	0.147
Other	0.54	[0.28,1.05]	0.070	0.46 [*]	[0.22,0.93]	0.031
Facing financial hardship						
Never	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Yes, not currently but have happened in the past	1.30	[0.92,1.85]	0.138	1.26	[0.88,1.82]	0.196
Yes, for several years	1.62	[0.70,3.70]	0.257	1.65	[0.69,3.93]	0.260
Yes, for less than a year	2.19 [*]	[1.01,4.72]	0.046	2.23 [*]	[1.01,4.95]	0.049
Don't want to answer	0.94	[0.55,1.61]	0.818	0.89	[0.50,1.61]	0.712
Residential area²						
Urban	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
Suburban	0.65 [*]	[0.45,0.94]	0.021	0.67 [*]	[0.46,0.97]	0.036
Rural	0.93	[0.58,1.47]	0.745	0.95	[0.59,1.52]	0.810
Household density³						
<2	Ref.	Ref.	.	Ref.	Ref.	.
≥2	1.55	[0.96,2.51]	0.073	1.55	[0.95,2.54]	0.082

^{*} $p < 0.05$

⁺ Adjusted for age, sex, traditional measures of socio-economic status (education, occupation and family income) and health related variables (having a chronic disease, weight status, smoking status and blood group).

OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval, HICs: High income countries, LMICs: Low and middle income countries

¹ Other include students, unemployed and others not concerned

² Self-reported by participants

³ Defined as the ratio between the number of household members and the number of bedrooms

356
357
358
359
360
361
362

363

364 11 Supplementary Material

365 The supplementary material for this article can be found in the additional document