

1                    **Socioeconomic inequalities of Long COVID: findings from a**  
2                    **population-based survey in the United Kingdom**  
3

4 Sharmin Shabnam<sup>1</sup>, Cameron Razieh<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, Hajira Dambha-Miller<sup>5</sup>, Tom Yates<sup>2,3</sup>, Clare  
5 Gillies<sup>1</sup>, Yogini V Chudasama<sup>1</sup>, Manish Pareek<sup>6</sup>, Amitava Banerjee<sup>7</sup>, Ichiro Kawachi<sup>8</sup>, Ben  
6 Lacey<sup>9</sup>, Eva JA Morris<sup>9</sup>, Martin White<sup>10</sup>, Francesco Zaccardi<sup>1</sup>, Kamlesh Khunti<sup>1</sup>, Nazrul  
7 Islam<sup>9,11</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup> Leicester Real World Evidence Unit, Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, Leicester,  
9 LE5 4PW, UK

10 <sup>2</sup> Diabetes Research Centre, Leicester General Hospital, University of Leicester, Leicester, LE5 4PW,  
11 UK

12 <sup>3</sup> NIHR Leicester Biomedical Research Centre (BRC), University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust and  
13 University of Leicester, Leicester, LE5 4PW, UK

14 <sup>4</sup> Office for National Statistics, Newport, NP10 8XG, UK

15 <sup>5</sup> Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, SO16 5ST, UK

16 <sup>6</sup> Department of Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, LE1 9HN, UK

17 <sup>7</sup> Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, NW1 2DA, UK

18 <sup>8</sup> Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, MA, 02115, USA

19 <sup>9</sup> Oxford Population Health, Big Data Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX3 7LF, UK

20 <sup>10</sup> MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 0SL, UK

21 <sup>11</sup> Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK

22

23 **Corresponding author**

24 **Nazrul Islam, M.B.B.S, M.Sc, M.P.H, Ph.D**

25 Associate Professor of Epidemiology and Medical Statistics

26 Faculty of Medicine

27 University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

28 Email: nazrul.islam@soton.ac.uk

## 29 **Abstract**

30

### 31 **Objective**

32 To estimate the risk of Long COVID by socioeconomic deprivation and to further examine  
33 the socioeconomic inequalities in Long COVID by sex and occupational groups.

### 34 **Design**

35 We analysed data from the COVID-19 Infection Survey conducted by the Office for National  
36 Statistics between 26/04/2020 and 31/01/2022. This is the largest and nationally  
37 representative survey of COVID-19 in the UK and provides uniquely rich, contemporaneous,  
38 and longitudinal data on occupation, health status, COVID-19 exposure, and Long COVID  
39 symptoms.

### 40 **Setting**

41 Community-based longitudinal survey of COVID-19 in the UK.

### 42 **Participants**

43 We included 201,799 participants in our analysis who were aged between 16 and 64 years  
44 and had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection.

### 45 **Main outcome measures**

46 We used multivariable logistic regression models to estimate the risk of Long COVID at least  
47 4 weeks after acute SARS-CoV-2 infection by deciles of index of multiple deprivation (IMD)  
48 and adjusted for a range of demographic and spatiotemporal factors. We further examined  
49 the modifying effects of socioeconomic deprivation by sex and occupational groups.

### 50 **Results**

51 A total of 19,315 (9.6%) participants reported having Long COVID symptoms. Compared to  
52 the least deprived IMD decile, participants in the most deprived decile had a higher adjusted  
53 risk of Long COVID (11.4% vs 8.2%; adjusted OR: 1.45; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.33,  
54 1.57). There were particularly significantly higher inequalities (most vs least deprived decile)  
55 of Long COVID in healthcare and patient facing roles (aOR: 1.76; 1.27, 2.44), and in the  
56 education sector (aOR: 1.62; 1.26, 2.08). The inequality of Long COVID was higher in  
57 females (aOR: 1.54; 1.38, 1.71) than males (OR: 1.32; 1.15, 1.51).

### 58 **Conclusions**

59 Participants living in the most socioeconomically deprived areas had a higher risk of Long  
60 COVID. The inequality gap was wider in females and certain public facing occupations (e.g.,  
61 healthcare and education). These findings will help inform public health policies and  
62 interventions in adopting a social justice and health inequality lens.

### 63 **Keywords**

64 Long COVID, socioeconomic inequality, index of multiple deprivation, sex, occupation.

## 65 Introduction

66 The COVID-19 (Coronavirus Disease 2019) pandemic has led to an unprecedented public  
67 health crisis. Extensive research efforts have outlined the severe impact of COVID-related  
68 morbidity and mortality burden.<sup>1-4</sup> A growing body of evidence also suggests that COVID-19  
69 is a complex systemic disease that can leave a long-term impact to those affected.<sup>5</sup> The  
70 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines in the UK have included  
71 these ongoing symptoms under the umbrella term of “Long COVID”, comprising both  
72 “ongoing symptomatic COVID-19” (symptoms persisting for 4-12 weeks after the onset of  
73 acute infection) and “post COVID syndrome” (≥12 weeks after acute infection).<sup>6</sup> These  
74 lingering symptoms are diverse in range and include both physical and psychological  
75 manifestations.<sup>7,8</sup>

76 According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS), an estimated 2 million people in the UK  
77 (3.1% of the population) are currently experiencing COVID-related symptoms persisting for  
78 more than four weeks, with 67% (1.2 million people) reporting that their daily activities had  
79 been adversely affected by prolonged symptoms, while 19% (376,000) of this group first had  
80 COVID-19 at least two years previously.<sup>9</sup> The underlying mechanisms of Long COVID are  
81 still unclear;<sup>8</sup> however studies report that these symptoms can occur even after having mild  
82 or asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Given the extent of the long-term health risk, Long  
83 COVID has been identified as one of the priority areas for further research.<sup>10</sup>

84 Previous studies have found significantly higher risk of COVID-19 exposure, hospitalization,  
85 and mortality in the elderly, in ethnic minority populations, in people living in areas of lower  
86 socioeconomic status, and in those working in certain employment sectors (e.g., healthcare  
87 and frontline workers).<sup>11-17</sup> The disproportionate impact of pandemic on people living in  
88 deprived areas may partly be due to having greater concentration of minority ethnic groups,  
89 higher prevalence of chronic medical conditions, occupational exposure, heavy reliance on  
90 public transport, crowded or multigenerational households, and limited access to  
91 healthcare.<sup>18,19</sup> Occupation is particularly important because workplace setting can modify  
92 exposure risk (e.g., a higher exposure risk for public or client facing roles) as well as the  
93 effect of the exposure on various COVID-19 related outcomes.<sup>20,21</sup>

94 Such findings of differential exposure and consequently higher SARS-CoV-2 infection rates  
95 in certain vulnerable groups warrant the need to investigate whether such associations also  
96 exist in cases of Long COVID. Although sociodemographic and occupational inequality in  
97 Long COVID is currently largely unexplored, understanding this complex relationship is  
98 highly relevant in terms of assessing any unequal impact of the pandemic and adopting  
99 targeted and proportionate public health measures.<sup>22</sup>

100 Therefore, we undertook a study to estimate the risk of Long COVID by socioeconomic  
101 deprivation, independently of other potentially important predictors of Long COVID. We  
102 further examined the socioeconomic differentials in Long COVID by sex and occupational  
103 groups.

## 104 **Methods**

### 105 **Data source**

106 The study uses data from the COVID-19 infection survey (CIS). The CIS, conducted by the  
107 ONS and the University of Oxford, was approved by the South-Central Berkshire B  
108 Research Ethics Committee (20/SC/0195). It is a nation-wide longitudinal survey monitoring  
109 SARS-CoV-2 infection and immunity response in the UK.<sup>23</sup> Private households were  
110 randomly selected from databases of addresses to ensure they reflect the UK population.  
111 Nose and throat swabs for Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) testing and blood samples for  
112 antibody testing were collected at regular intervals from individuals agreeing to participate.  
113 Participants also reported results of swab or blood tests that were collected and analysed  
114 elsewhere (for example, at general practices or home lateral flow tests). Participants also  
115 provided information about their demographic characteristics (age, sex, and ethnicity),  
116 occupation, and presence of long-term health conditions at each survey visit. Since February  
117 3, 2021, the ONS included a section in the survey questionnaire pertaining to Long COVID  
118 symptoms and their severity.

119 The detailed protocol, survey design, and questionnaires of CIS are available online.<sup>24–26</sup>

### 120 **Study population**

121 The data for this analysis were collected by the ONS CIS from April 26, 2020 to January 31,  
122 2022. Participants were eligible for analysis if they were aged between 16 and 64 years at  
123 the first survey visit to reflect the working age population in UK.<sup>27</sup>

124 To assess the risk of Long COVID, we first restricted the analysis to survey participants with  
125 a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection and a corresponding date of first infection (see definitions  
126 below). Participants were excluded if they did not participate in the survey after February 3,  
127 2021 (date when Long COVID questions were introduced in the survey) or if they did not  
128 participate at least 4 weeks of after their date of first infection.

### 129 **Definition of infection date and Long COVID**

130 Participants were regarded as having Long COVID if they answered “yes” to: (1) having  
131 symptoms persisting for more than 4 weeks after their first SARS-CoV-2 infection which  
132 could not be explained by something else; or (2) having Long COVID symptoms that  
133 affected their day-to-day activities; or (3) having any specific Long COVID symptoms  
134 including pre-existing symptoms which were aggravated by a subsequent COVID-19  
135 infection ([Supplementary Figure S1](#)).

136 COVID-19 cases were defined using both self-reported and ONS-conducted test results. In  
137 addition to the swab and blood test results (CIS or non-CIS) recorded at each visit,  
138 participants were also asked to report whether they suspected they had COVID-19 before  
139 the survey visit and the date of first suspected infection. We defined the first SARS-CoV-2  
140 infection date (index date) as the earliest of the following: (1) date of first positive CIS PCR  
141 swab result; (2) date of first positive CIS blood sample result; (3) date of first positive non-  
142 CIS swab; (4) date of first positive non-CIS blood sample result; or (5) the self-reported date  
143 when the participant thought they had COVID-19.

144 Participants were followed from the first visit date occurring at least 4 weeks after the index  
145 date. The end of follow-up was defined as either: (1) the first visit date when the participant

146 reported having Long COVID; or (2) the date of last follow-up visit by the end of the study  
147 period of the participant, if they did not report having Long COVID.

#### 148 **Exposure**

149 The primary exposure of interest was area-level socioeconomic deprivation measured using  
150 the area-based indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).<sup>28</sup> The indices were developed using a  
151 combined relative measures of seven domains such as income, employment, health,  
152 education, crime, housing, and living environment. IMD is the official measure of deprivation  
153 in the UK. IMD scores and deciles were linked to the CIS data for each participant matched  
154 to their address and postcode. For our analysis, we have used IMD deciles where decile 1  
155 represents the most deprived 10% of small areas and decile 10 represents the least  
156 deprived 10%.

#### 157 **Covariates**

158 Age was estimated from participants' response during the first survey visit. Self-reported  
159 ethnicity was categorized as White or non-White due to small strata after further stratification  
160 (e.g., by IMD deciles, sex, regions). Ongoing long-term conditions (if the participants  
161 reported having any physical or mental health conditions excluding any long-lasting COVID-  
162 19 symptoms that lasted or expected to last for  $\geq 1$  year),<sup>29</sup> household size,<sup>30,31</sup> urban or rural  
163 residence, country of the respondents, and calendar time period of the index date  
164 (expressed as quarter of the year) were also included as covariates in the analysis.  
165 Household size of the participants was grouped into three categories: households of one  
166 person, two persons, and three persons or more.

167 We categorized participants' occupations into four groups based on responses from each  
168 individual concerning whether their current job regularly involves in-person contact with  
169 patients or clients: (1) patient-facing healthcare workers; (2) non-patient facing healthcare  
170 workers; (3) patient or client-facing non-healthcare workers; (4) others (including workers in  
171 non-patient or client facing role, unemployed, unknown etc.). We adjusted for this variable in  
172 our main analysis.

173 We had complete data on all variables except self-reported on-going long-term conditions  
174 and occupation. Since participants' data were collected at each survey visit, any missing  
175 records were imputed with the most recent valid data. We also excluded four occupational  
176 groups because of insufficient event counts by IMD deciles (fewer than 50) ([Supplementary  
177 Table S1](#)).

#### 178 **Statistical Analysis**

179 We generated descriptive statistics of demographic characteristics at the index date for the  
180 overall cohort, and for IMD decile 1 (most deprived) and decile 10 (least deprived).

181 We used multivariable logistic regression models to estimate the unadjusted and adjusted  
182 odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) of experiencing Long  
183 COVID symptoms by IMD deciles (using the least deprived group as the reference). We  
184 adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, urban or rural location, comorbid conditions, household size,  
185 quarter of the year and country. We also included the logarithm of the follow-up time as an  
186 offset term. Confidence intervals were estimated using robust variance estimator.

187 Since the odds ratio only provides a relative risk for the group of interest compared to the  
188 reference group, we also estimated the absolute adjusted marginal risk from the regression

189 models. We also conducted stratified analysis by sex and occupational groups to investigate  
190 whether there were any differences in risks within these categories.

### 191 **Sensitivity analysis**

192 As a sensitivity analysis, we used multilevel logistic regression models, fitting random effects  
193 at country level to allow for the clustering of the data, adjusting for the same covariates.  
194 Since each of the four countries in the UK have used slightly different methods for  
195 measuring deprivation, we conducted another sensitivity analysis using only participants  
196 residing in England. We also carried out an additional sensitivity analysis using only the  
197 positive test results from PCR swab or blood sample (excluding self-reported data) to define  
198 the COVID-19 infection date.

199 All data management and statistical analyses were performed using Python version 3.6 and  
200 Stata MP Version 16.

## 201 **Results**

202 During the study period, data were collected from a total of 535,634 participants, of whom  
203 332,931 were between 16-64 years. Among them, 201,799 participants were eligible for our  
204 analysis (study flow chart available in [Supplementary Figure S2](#)).

205 Participants had a median follow-up duration of 214 days (interquartile range [IQR]: 187-331  
206 days) and median number of follow-up visits (at least 4 weeks after the index date) of 6  
207 (IQR: 3-9).

208 **Table 1** reports the baseline (at the index date) demographic characteristics of the  
209 participants analysed, as well as a comparison between the most and the least deprived IMD  
210 deciles. Overall, the mean age of the participants was 45.1 (SD 12.9) years. Of them, 55.8%  
211 were female (n=112,683), 92.4% were White (n=186,547), and 79.6% were from urban  
212 areas (n=160,623). Most of the participants lived in a household of at least three persons  
213 (n=100,996, 50.0%), whereas 36.8% (n=74,264) and 13.2% (n=26,539) in two and one  
214 person households, respectively; 145,886 (72.3%) participants had a concurrent comorbidity  
215 and 12,934 (6.4%) were engaged in a healthcare occupation with a patient facing role.

216 Compared to the least deprived, participants in the most deprived decile had a lower mean  
217 age (43.8 vs 46.3 years), lower proportion of males (42.7% vs 45.1%) and lower proportion  
218 from White ethnic group (90.7% vs 94.7%), and had a higher proportion of participants from  
219 urban areas (97.1% vs 82.8%) and one person households (21.9% vs 8.5%). Participants  
220 residing in the least deprived areas had a substantially lower prevalence of any on-going  
221 health conditions (23.1%) compared to those in the most deprived (42.2%). The distribution  
222 of country of residence and occupational roles were comparable between the most and the  
223 least deprived areas ([Table 1](#)).

224 One in ten (9.6%; n=19,315) participants reported having Long COVID symptoms that  
225 persisted 4 or more weeks after the acute infection. The prevalence of Long COVID varied  
226 by sex and IMD decile: it was higher in females (n= 11,875, 11.8%) than males (n=7,440,  
227 9.1%) and in participants residing in the most deprived tenth of areas (n=1,229, 13.0%)  
228 versus those who resided in the least deprived tenth of areas (n=2,188, 8.1%)  
229 ([Supplementary Table S2](#)). The prevalence of Long COVID by IMD and occupational  
230 groups showed similar trends ([Supplementary Table S3](#)).

### 231 **Adjusted odds ratio of Long COVID by IMD deciles**

232 The adjusted odds of having Long COVID was greater in more deprived neighbourhoods  
233 (**Supplementary Figure S3**). After adjusting for potential covariates, the odds of Long  
234 COVID were 46% higher (OR: 1.46; 1.34, 1.59) in the most deprived decile (compared to the  
235 least). The odds of long COVID were similar to those of the main analysis when the  
236 participants residing in England were analysed separately (OR: 1.41; 1.29, 1.54) in a  
237 sensitivity analysis. The trend was also consistent (OR: 1.46; 1.31, 1.63) in a sensitivity  
238 analysis using random effects at country level. Results from an additional sensitivity analysis  
239 excluding the participants who only self-reported having COVID-19 also showed comparable  
240 results (OR: 1.52; 1.37, 1.69) (**Supplementary Tables S4-S6**).

241 When stratified by sex, the results were generally consistent in terms of deprivation-specific  
242 trends, with a higher level of inequality among females (OR: 1.56; 1.40, 1.73) than males  
243 (OR: 1.32; 1.15, 1.51) in the most deprived decile compared to the least deprived decile  
244 (**Figure 1**).

245 We also investigated whether the risk of Long COVID was modified by the occupation of  
246 participants and found large variations in different occupational groups. For example,  
247 compared to the least deprived decile, the adjusted odds ratio of having Long COVID was  
248 significantly higher in participants from the most deprived decile for those working in health  
249 care and patient facing role (OR: 1.76; 1.27, 2.44), teaching and education roles (OR: 1.68;  
250 1.31, 2.16), overall health care role (OR: 1.65; 1.27, 2.14), hospitality sector (OR: 1.58; 1.01,  
251 2.46), and civil service (OR: 1.44; 1.01, 2.05) (**Figure 2**). Our analysis showed no statistically  
252 significant association in the relative risk of Long COVID for those working in other  
253 employment sectors such as social care, retail, and manufacturing or construction sector.

### 254 **Adjusted absolute risks of Long COVID by IMD deciles**

255 Overall, the adjusted prevalence of people reporting any Long COVID symptoms at least 4  
256 weeks after having COVID-19 was higher in the most deprived decile (11.4%; 10.8, 12.1)  
257 than the least deprived decile (8.2%; 7.9, 8.6) (**Table 2**). The adjusted prevalence also  
258 increased with increasing levels of deprivation.

259 In males, the adjusted prevalence of participants reporting any Long COVID symptoms  
260 ranged from 7.3% (6.8, 7.8) in the least deprived to 9.4% (8.4, 10.3) in the most deprived  
261 decile. In females, the range was from 8.9% (8.5, 9.4) to 13.0% (12.1, 13.9) in the least and  
262 the most deprived deciles, respectively. The risk in females in the least deprived decile was  
263 comparable to that in males living the most deprived decile (**Table 2**).

264 When stratified by occupational groups, the absolute risk was always higher in participants  
265 residing in the most deprived areas than those in the least deprived areas. However, the  
266 adjusted prevalence varied substantially even when the deprivation level was the same. For  
267 example, in the most deprived decile, the prevalence ranged from 10.0% (7.7, 12.3) in the  
268 manufacturing or construction sector to 14.6% (12.1, 17.2) in teaching and education sector.  
269 In contrast, the variability within the least deprived decile was relatively smaller, and ranged  
270 from 8.3% (6.1, 10.5) in the hospitality sector to 9.5% (8.5, 10.5) in teaching and education  
271 sector (**Table 3**).

272

## 273 Discussion

274 In this study, we investigated the risk of Long COVID in a large nationally representative  
275 community-based survey of over 200,000 working-age adults in successive waves of the  
276 COVID-19 pandemic and report that the risk of experiencing such symptoms is strongly  
277 associated with the area level of deprivation of the participants. Results from our analysis  
278 show that the odds of experiencing Long COVID are 45% higher on average for participants  
279 from the most deprived areas (IMD decile 1) compared to those in the least deprived areas  
280 (IMD decile 10). Our findings are robust after controlling for baseline demographic factors,  
281 household size, time of the year, comorbidity, and follow-up duration. The probability of  
282 persistent symptoms after at least 4 weeks was also the lowest in the least deprived  
283 population and increased in an almost dose-response fashion with increasing levels of  
284 deprivation, both in males and females. Females also exhibited an elevated risk of  
285 developing Long COVID after SARS-CoV-2 infection, compared to males across all the IMD  
286 deciles.

287 We also found that these associations varied widely by the occupational groups of the  
288 participants. Stratified analysis showed that those living in the most deprived areas and  
289 working in healthcare (both patient facing and non-patient facing roles) and in the  
290 teaching/education sectors had the highest likelihoods (76%, 64%, and 62%, respectively) of  
291 reporting Long COVID symptoms compared to the least deprived group, while no significant  
292 association was observed in other occupational groups. This indicates that socioeconomic  
293 disparities in risk of Long COVID are wider in certain occupational groups, and that these  
294 disparities cannot be explained by differential exposure to SARS-CoV-2 infection.

### 295 Findings in context

296 To our knowledge, this is the first study to quantify the association between Long COVID  
297 symptoms by socioeconomic status and occupational groups. Previous research reported  
298 that people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds had worse COVID-19 outcomes in terms  
299 of infection severity, hospitalisation, and mortality. Our results suggest that the unequal  
300 effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the most socioeconomically vulnerable population  
301 extends beyond recovery from acute illness. Only a few studies have examined the risk  
302 factors of Long COVID, and found that female sex, age, smoking, body mass index, and  
303 comorbidities are strong predictors.<sup>32-38</sup> A cohort study of 4,182 COVID-19 patients showed  
304 that those who had more than five symptoms during the initial phase of acute illness were  
305 3.5 times more likely to develop Long COVID.<sup>33</sup> Another observational study reported a  
306 significant association between severe COVID-19 and persistent symptoms suggesting that  
307 the disease severity might lead to higher likelihood of Long COVID.<sup>39</sup> One study<sup>33</sup> found no  
308 significant variation within different socioeconomic groups while another<sup>34</sup> reported that  
309 deprivation was associated with having Long COVID-19. However, none of the prior studies  
310 explored the intersectional inequalities (sex, deprivation, and occupation) of Long COVID  
311 risk as we did in our study.

312 Occupational groups such as healthcare, transport, retail, and social care workers have also  
313 been unequally affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>13,14</sup> The heightened risk could be due  
314 to more frequent exposure to infections, lack of personal protective equipment, lack of  
315 provision to work from home, higher usage of public transport, not being able to take time off  
316 from work, lack of proper ventilation, mask wearing and physical distancing at work.<sup>40</sup> The  
317 occupational inequalities resulted in higher SARS-CoV-2 exposure, infection, and mortality  
318 of frontline and essential workers compared to general population. However, studies  
319 regarding Long COVID and occupation are sparse. A recent study reported that participants  
320 working in healthcare had a higher probability of having long-term sequelae of COVID-19.<sup>34</sup>



321 The adverse effect of the pandemic on the occupational health of doctors have led the  
322 British Medical Association to insist on recognising Long COVID as an occupationally  
323 acquired disease.<sup>41</sup> However, to our knowledge, no previous studies have investigated Long  
324 COVID among a wide range of occupational groups.

325 We have demonstrated that the risk of prolonged symptoms and illness related to COVID-19  
326 is not homogenous across the intersections of work sectors and deprivation levels. We have  
327 found that the socioeconomic inequality, i.e., the difference between the most and the least  
328 deprived populations, was particularly higher among females and those employed in  
329 healthcare or teaching/education sector. Our findings are not directly comparable in the  
330 context of COVID-19 because no previous study has conducted such detailed analysis.  
331 However, our results are consistent with pre-pandemic research on other health conditions  
332 suggesting that workers with lower socioeconomic status have poorer health outcomes and  
333 higher premature mortality than those with higher socioeconomic position but a similar  
334 occupation.<sup>42-46</sup> Poor working and housing conditions (including living in dense, poorly  
335 ventilated multigenerational households) and unhealthier lifestyle behaviour (poor nutrition,  
336 heavy alcohol consumption, smoking etc.) are among the well-established factors associated  
337 with the overall burden of ill health among socioeconomically deprived workers.<sup>43</sup> Previous  
338 evidence, together with the results from this study, suggest that inequalities in Long COVID  
339 cannot be viewed in isolation without considering the role of occupation in a gender-blind  
340 manner.

#### 341 **Implications for policy and practice**

342 This study provides insights into the heterogeneous degree of inequality by deprivation, sex  
343 and occupation with regards to Long COVID. This indicates the need for a diverse range of  
344 public health interventions after recovery from COVID (treatment and/or rehabilitation)  
345 across multiple intersecting social dimensions as well as data for reducing disproportionate  
346 impact on these populations in any future waves of the pandemic. Hence, our findings  
347 highlight the necessity of managing post-recovery of COVID-19 with a health equity lens.  
348 These include assessing the differentials in Long COVID diagnosis, health-seeking  
349 behaviour, and follow-up after recovery across the intersections of sex, occupation, and  
350 socioeconomic circumstances of people. The assessment will help inform health policy in  
351 identifying the most vulnerable sub-groups of populations so that more focused efforts are  
352 given, and proportional allocation of resources are implemented to facilitate the reduction of  
353 health inequalities.

354 Most studies on health inequality have predominantly taken unitary approaches (focusing on  
355 sex, ethnicity or socioeconomic status separately) and rarely explored the impact of  
356 intersectional inequality on population health.<sup>47-49</sup> However, the inequalities shown in this  
357 study shows that such approach can provide more precise identification of risks and be  
358 relevant to other diseases and beyond the pandemic.

#### 359 **Strengths and limitations**

360 The study has several key strengths. We have used the COVID-19 Infection Survey for our  
361 analysis which is the largest community-based longitudinal survey of COVID-19 in the UK.  
362 The survey provides rich, contemporaneous, and longitudinal data on socio-economic  
363 factors, occupation, health status, COVID-19 exposure, and Long COVID symptoms. The  
364 survey design ensures participation from representative households across the UK through  
365 random sampling to obtain direct population-level estimates of Long COVID.

366 Another strength of this study is that we have examined Long COVID in both asymptomatic  
367 and symptomatic COVID-19 patients. The participants in this study had their nose and throat

368 swab collected at each visit. Consequently, the survey captured Long COVID data among  
369 the subgroup of the population who would not have been tested due to lack of COVID-19  
370 symptoms. Our study is also strengthened by the usage of a consistent definition of Long  
371 COVID thought out the survey period.

372 We have also adjusted for a range of covariates in the model to estimate the independent  
373 effects of the IMD on the respective outcomes. We further examined intersectional inequality  
374 by estimating the differential risks of Long COVID within sex and occupational groups.  
375 However, our study has some limitations. First, IMD is an ecological measure; therefore,  
376 these findings may not be interpreted at individual participant level. Second, Long COVID  
377 symptoms are diverse in nature<sup>7</sup> and our study may not have captured the full range of  
378 symptoms experienced by the participants. However, the 21 specific symptoms of Long  
379 COVID included in the survey questionnaire are selected based on a comprehensive review  
380 of the existing body of evidence and encompasses the most common types of neurological,  
381 psychological, and physiological symptoms reported by patients.<sup>37,50</sup> Furthermore, the survey  
382 questionnaire allows participants to self-classify themselves as having Long Covid without  
383 the need to be experiencing the 21 specific symptoms listed on the questionnaire.

384 Third, Long COVID symptoms and existence of any chronic conditions were self-reported.  
385 Therefore, we could not rule out the possibility that some of the reported symptoms may not  
386 be directly caused by COVID-19. Furthermore, to address the possibility of a differential  
387 attribution of long COVID symptoms depending on the time from acute infection to the  
388 survey visit date, we controlled for follow-up time in our analyses.

389 Fourth, as this is an observational analysis, a causal relationship between socioeconomic  
390 deprivation and the risks of Long COVID cannot be established. Our results focus on the  
391 unequal long-term burden of COVID across the deprived communities in the UK and  
392 therefore the results we found only measure the association of the two in the aggregated  
393 area level.

394 Our research also could not examine the time to remission of Long COVID symptoms due to  
395 lack of granular longer term follow-up data. Future studies should fill this gap in the literature,  
396 especially if the time to remission varies by occupation and deprivation. Future research  
397 could also explore additional set of symptoms that are yet to be reported and recognised as  
398 Long COVID symptoms.

## 399 **Conclusion**

400 Our study demonstrates that people from the most socioeconomically deprived populations  
401 have the highest risk of long COVID symptoms, and this inequality is independent of  
402 differences in the risk of initial infection. The trend was consistent within different sex and  
403 occupational groups, but the disparity gap was heterogeneous, with a particularly higher  
404 level of inequality in participants who are female, working in health care, and in teaching and  
405 education sector. Future health policy recommendations should incorporate the multiple  
406 dimensions of inequality, such as sex, deprivation, and occupational groups when  
407 considering the treatment and management of Long COVID.

408

## 409 **Declarations**

410

411 **Competing Interests:** KK is chair of the ethnicity subgroup of the UK Scientific  
412 Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) and is a member of SAGE. KK, SS, TY,  
413 FZ, CG, YC, CR, MP are supported by the National Institute for Health Research  
414 (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration East Midlands (ARC EM) and the NIHR  
415 Leicester Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). MW is supported by Medical  
416 Research Council funding for the MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge  
417 [grant number MC/UU/00006/7]. Other authors declare no relevant conflicts of  
418 interest.

419 **Funding:** The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the  
420 research, authorship, and/or publication of this article:

421 This project was funded by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). Project number:  
422 2002569, Ref: PU-22-0205(a). <https://www.ons.gov.uk/>.

423 **Disclaimer:** The opinions expressed within this report are solely the authors' and do  
424 not necessarily reflect the opinions of the organisations/entities the authors are  
425 employed by and/or affiliated with.

426 “This work was produced using statistical data from the Office for National Statistics  
427 (ONS). The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the  
428 endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the statistical  
429 data. This work uses research datasets which may not exactly reproduce National  
430 Statistics aggregates.”

431 **Ethics Approval:** The ONS COVID-19 Infection Survey (CIS) was approved by the  
432 South-Central Berkshire B Research Ethics Committee (Ethics Ref: 20/SC/0195).  
433 The study was assessed using the National Statistician's Data Ethics Advisory  
434 Committee (NSDEC) ethics self-assessment tool, and the committee confirmed that  
435 no further ethical consideration was required.

436 **Data availability statement:** The data from the Office of National Statistics COVID-19  
437 Infection Survey (CIS) can be accessed only by ONS accredited researchers (AR)  
438 through the Secure Research Service (SRS). Researchers can apply for  
439 accreditation through the Research Accreditation Service and will need approval to  
440 access CIS data. For further details see:  
441 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/statistics/requestingstatistics/secureresearchservice>.  
442

443 **Guarantor:** NI.

444 **Contributorship:** NI and KK conceived and designed the study, obtained the funding,  
445 developed the statistical methodology, and managed and coordinated research  
446 activity. SS carried out the data preparation, analyses and data visualization. SS  
447 drafted the first version of the manuscript. NI contributed significant edits and input

448 for the draft manuscript. All authors contributed to reviewing the manuscript and  
449 interpreting the findings. All authors have approved the final published version.

450 **Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Dr. Vahé Nafilyan and Daniel Ayoubkhani  
451 from the Office for National Statistics for their contributions to the analysis and very  
452 helpful feedback on earlier versions of the manuscript.

453

454 **Tables**

455

456 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the cohort.**

Characteristics	IMD 1 (most deprived) (N=9,483)	IMD 10 (least deprived) (N= 27,113)	Overall (N=201,799)
<b>Age, mean (SD)</b>	43.8 (13.0)	46.3 (12.7)	45.1 (12.9)
<b>Age, (median (IQR))</b>	45.0 (33.0-55.0)	48.0 (39.0-57.0)	47.0 (36.0-56.0)
<b>Sex, n (%)</b>			
Male	4,048 (42.7)	12,234 (45.1)	89,116 (44.2)
Female	5,435 (57.3)	14,879 (54.9)	112,683 (55.8)
<b>Ethnicity, n (%)</b>			
White	8,600 (90.7)	25,679 (94.7)	186,547 (92.4)
Non-White	883 (9.3)	1,434 (5.3)	15,252 (7.6)
<b>Rural/urban, n (%)</b>			
Urban	9,211 (97.1)	22,462 (82.8)	160,623 (79.6)
Rural	272 (2.9)	4,651 (17.2)	41,176 (20.4)
<b>Household size in persons, n (%)</b>			
1	2,081 (21.9)	2,299 (8.5)	26,539 (13.2)
2	3,252 (34.3)	89,68 (33.1)	74,264 (36.8)
>=3	4,150 (43.8)	15,846 (58.4)	100,996 (50.0)
<b>Any comorbid conditions, n (%)</b>			
No	5,484 (57.8)	20,855 (76.9)	145,886 (72.3)
Yes	3,999 (42.2)	6,258 (23.1)	55,913 (27.7)
<b>Country, n (%)</b>			
England	7,989 (84.2)	22,668 (83.6)	171,602 (85.0)
Scotland	777 (8.2)	2,272 (8.4)	15,253 (7.6)
Wales	498 (5.3)	1,233 (4.5)	9,232 (4.6)
Northern Ireland	219 (2.3)	940 (3.5)	5,712 (2.8)
<b>Occupational role</b>			
Non-healthcare patient/client facing	1,943 (20.5)	5,324 (19.6)	42,013 (20.8)
Healthcare non-patient/client facing	326 (3.4)	1,081 (4.0)	7,417 (3.7)
Healthcare patient/client facing	624 (6.6)	1,675 (6.2)	12,934 (6.4)
Other or Unknown	6,590 (69.5)	19,033 (70.2)	139,435 (69.1)

457 IMD: Index of Multiple Deprivation; SD: standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range.

458 **Table 2: Proportion of participants experiencing Long COVID at least 4 weeks after having**  
459 **COVID-19, by IMD deciles**

IMD, deciles	Unadjusted % (95% CI)	Adjusted* % (95% CI)	Sex Stratified**	
			Male % (95% CI)	Female % (95% CI)
<b>1 (most deprived)</b>	12.71 (12.00, 13.42)	11.40 (10.75, 12.06)	9.35 (8.44, 10.26)	13.00 (12.07, 13.92)
<b>2</b>	11.28 (10.72, 11.84)	10.68 (10.14, 11.22)	9.24 (8.47, 10.01)	11.81 (11.06, 12.56)
<b>3</b>	10.49 (9.99, 10.98)	10.27 (9.79, 10.76)	9.47 (8.76, 10.18)	10.91 (10.24, 11.59)
<b>4</b>	10.00 (9.54, 10.45)	9.93 (9.48, 10.38)	8.72 (8.08, 9.36)	10.89 (10.26, 11.51)
<b>5</b>	9.89 (9.46, 10.33)	9.87 (9.44, 10.30)	8.80 (8.18, 9.42)	10.72 (10.12, 11.32)
<b>6</b>	9.55 (9.14, 9.95)	9.74 (9.32, 10.15)	8.36 (7.79, 8.94)	10.82 (10.24, 11.41)
<b>7</b>	8.83 (8.45, 9.21)	9.01 (8.62, 9.40)	7.97 (7.42, 8.52)	9.84 (9.29, 10.38)
<b>8</b>	9.21 (8.83, 9.58)	9.41 (9.02, 9.79)	7.66 (7.14, 8.17)	10.80 (10.25, 11.35)
<b>9</b>	8.99 (8.63, 9.35)	9.18 (8.81, 9.54)	8.23 (7.71, 8.75)	9.92 (9.41, 10.43)
<b>10 (least deprived)</b>	8.07 (7.74, 8.41)	8.23 (7.89, 8.57)	7.33 (6.84, 7.81)	8.94 (8.46, 9.42)

460

461 \*Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, urban/rural, comorbid conditions, household size, healthcare and  
462 patient/client facing nature of the job, and country in the logistic regression model using logarithm of  
463 the follow-up time as an offset term.

464 \*\*Adjusted for age, ethnicity, urban/rural, comorbid conditions, household size, healthcare and  
465 patient/client-facing nature of the job, and country in the logistic regression model using logarithm of  
466 the follow-up time as an offset term.

467 **Table 3: Adjusted proportions of participants experiencing Long COVID at least 4 weeks**  
468 **after having COVID-19, by occupational groups and IMD deciles**

<b>Occupational groups</b>	<b>IMD 1 (most deprived); adjusted proportions (95% CI)</b>	<b>IMD 10 (least deprived); adjusted proportions (95% CI)</b>
Teaching and education	14.64 (12.11, 17.18)	9.48 (8.47, 10.48)
Health care and patient/client facing	13.94 (11.04, 16.83)	8.75 (7.32, 10.18)
Health care	13.14 (10.89, 15.39)	8.66 (7.56, 9.76)
Civil service or local government	12.32 (9.32, 15.32)	9.05 (7.56, 10.53)
Social care	12.31 (8.80, 15.83)	8.36 (5.84, 10.87)
Hospitality	12.24 (8.91, 15.58)	8.28 (6.06, 10.50)
Retail sector	12.04 (9.71, 14.38)	9.36 (7.67, 11.06)
Manufacturing or construction	10.02 (7.70, 12.34)	9.27 (7.95, 10.58)


469

470 Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, urban/rural, comorbid conditions, household size, and country in the  
471 logistic regression model using logarithm of the follow-up time as an offset term.

472 **Figures**

473

474 **Figure 1. Association between deprivation and experiencing Long COVID at least 4 weeks**  
 475 **after having COVID-19, stratified by sex.**




476

477

478 Estimates adjusted for age, ethnicity, urban/rural, comorbid conditions, household size, country,  
 479 quarter of the year, healthcare and patient/client-facing nature of the job in the multivariable logistic  
 480 regression model using the logarithm of the follow-up time as an offset term.



481 **Figure 2. Association between deprivation and experiencing Long COVID at least 4 weeks**  
 482 **after having COVID-19, stratified by occupational groups.**



483 \*Overall sample size in the occupational group

484

485 Estimates adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, urban/rural, comorbid conditions, household size, country  
 486 and quarter of the year in the multivariable logistic regression model using the logarithm of the follow-  
 487 up time as an offset term.

## 488 References

- 489 1. Miller IF, Becker AD, Grenfell BT, et al. Disease and healthcare burden of COVID-19  
490 in the United States. *Nature Medicine* 2020 26:8 2020; 26: 1212–1217.
- 491 2. Hessami A, Shamshirian A, Heydari K, et al. Cardiovascular diseases burden in  
492 COVID-19: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Emerg Med* 2021; 46: 382–  
493 391.
- 494 3. Norgaard SK, Vestergaard LS, Nielsen J, et al. Real-time monitoring shows  
495 substantial excess all-cause mortality during second wave of COVID-19 in Europe,  
496 October to December 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 2021; 26: 2002023.
- 497 4. Islam N, Shkolnikov VM, Acosta RJ, et al. Excess deaths associated with covid-19  
498 pandemic in 2020: age and sex disaggregated time series analysis in 29 high income  
499 countries. *BMJ*; 373. Epub ahead of print 19 May 2021. DOI: 10.1136/BMJ.N1137.
- 500 5. Ramos-Casals M, Brito-Zerón P, Mariette X. Systemic and organ-specific immune-  
501 related manifestations of COVID-19. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology* 2021 17:6 2021;  
502 17: 315–332.
- 503 6. Venkatesan P. NICE guideline on long COVID. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; 9: 129.
- 504 7. Lopez-Leon S, Wegman-Ostrosky T, Perelman C, et al. More than 50 long-term  
505 effects of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports* 2021  
506 11:1 2021; 11: 1–12.
- 507 8. Desai AD, Lavelle M, Boursiquot BC, et al. Long-term complications of COVID-19. *Am*  
508 *J Physiol Cell Physiol* 2022; 322: C1–C11.
- 509 9. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in the  
510 UK - Office for National Statistics,  
511 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditio](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1june2022)  
512 [nsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19in](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1june2022)  
513 [fectionintheuk/1june2022](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1june2022) (accessed 9 June 2022).
- 514 10. Zeng N, Zhao Y-M, Yan W, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of long term  
515 physical and mental sequelae of COVID-19 pandemic: call for research priority and  
516 action. *Molecular Psychiatry* 2022 2022; 1–11.
- 517 11. Kontopantelis E, Mamas MA, Webb RT, et al. Excess years of life lost to COVID-19  
518 and other causes of death by sex, neighbourhood deprivation, and region in England  
519 and Wales during 2020: A registry-based study. *PLoS Med* 2022; 19: e1003904.
- 520 12. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-  
521 care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Public*  
522 *Health* 2020; 5: e475–e483.
- 523 13. Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, et al. Occupation and risk of severe  
524 COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank participants. *Occup*  
525 *Environ Med* 2021; 78: 307–314.
- 526 14. Nafilyan V, Pawelek P, Ayoubkhani D, et al. Occupation and COVID-19 mortality in  
527 England: a national linked data study of 14.3 million adults. *Occup Environ Med* 2021;  
528 0: oemed-2021-107818.

- 529 15. Razieh C, Zaccardi F, Gillies CL, et al. Ethnic minorities and COVID-19: examining  
530 whether excess risk is mediated through deprivation. *Eur J Public Health* 2021; 31:  
531 630–634.
- 532 16. Matz M, Allemani C, Tongeren M van, et al. Excess mortality among essential  
533 workers in England and Wales during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Epidemiol  
534 Community Health* 2022; 76: 660–666.
- 535 17. Islam N, Khunti K, Dambha-Miller H, et al. COVID-19 mortality: a complex interplay of  
536 sex, gender and ethnicity. *Eur J Public Health* 2020; 30: 847–848.
- 537 18. Yates T, Summerfield A, Razieh C, et al. A population-based cohort study of obesity,  
538 ethnicity and COVID-19 mortality in 12.6 million adults in England. *Nature  
539 Communications* 2022 13:1 2022; 13: 1–9.
- 540 19. Islam N, Lacey B, Shabnam S, et al. Social inequality and the syndemic of chronic  
541 disease and COVID-19: county-level analysis in the USA. *J Epidemiol Community  
542 Health* 2021; 75: 496–500.
- 543 20. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-  
544 care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Public  
545 Health* 2020; 5: e475–e483.
- 546 21. Rowlands A v., Gillies C, Chudasama Y, et al. Association of working shifts, inside  
547 and outside of healthcare, with severe COVID–19: an observational study. *BMC  
548 Public Health* 2021; 21: 1–7.
- 549 22. Marmot M. Health equity in England: the Marmot review 10 years on. *BMJ*; 368. Epub  
550 ahead of print 25 February 2020. DOI: 10.1136/BMJ.M693.
- 551 23. COVID-19 Infection Survey - Office for National Statistics,  
552 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/surveys/informationforhouseholdsandindividuals/householdand](https://www.ons.gov.uk/surveys/informationforhouseholdsandindividuals/householdandindividualsurveys/covid19infectionsurvey)  
553 [dindividualsurveys/covid19infectionsurvey](https://www.ons.gov.uk/surveys/informationforhouseholdsandindividuals/householdandindividualsurveys/covid19infectionsurvey) (accessed 28 June 2022).
- 554 24. Protocol and information sheets — Nuffield Department of Medicine,  
555 [https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-survey/protocol-and-](https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-survey/protocol-and-information-sheets)  
556 [information-sheets](https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-survey/protocol-and-information-sheets) (accessed 9 June 2022).
- 557 25. Pouwels KB, House T, Pritchard E, et al. Community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in  
558 England from April to November, 2020: results from the ONS Coronavirus Infection  
559 Survey. *Lancet Public Health* 2021; 6: e30–e38.
- 560 26. Ayoubkhani D, Bermingham C, Pouwels KB, et al. Trajectory of long covid symptoms  
561 after covid-19 vaccination: community based cohort study. *BMJ* 2022; 377: e069676.
- 562 27. Working age population - GOV.UK Ethnicity facts and figures, [https://www.ethnicity-](https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/working-age-population/latest)  
563 [facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/working-age-](https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/working-age-population/latest)  
564 [population/latest](https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/working-age-population/latest) (accessed 28 June 2022).
- 565 28. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey, characteristics of people testing positive for  
566 COVID-19, UK - Office for National Statistics,  
567 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditio](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveycharacteristicsofpeopletestingpositiveforcovid19uk/20july2022)  
568 [nsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveycharacteristicsofpeoplelest](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveycharacteristicsofpeopletestingpositiveforcovid19uk/20july2022)  
569 [ingpositiveforcovid19uk/20july2022](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveycharacteristicsofpeopletestingpositiveforcovid19uk/20july2022) (accessed 19 August 2022).

- 570 29. Atkins JL, Masoli JAH, Delgado J, et al. Preexisting Comorbidities Predicting COVID-  
571 19 and Mortality in the UK Biobank Community Cohort. *The Journals of Gerontology:*  
572 *Series A* 2020; 75: 2224–2230.
- 573 30. Nafilyan V, Islam N, Ayoubkhani D, et al. Ethnicity, household composition and  
574 COVID-19 mortality: a national linked data study. *J R Soc Med* 2021; 114: 182–211.
- 575 31. Gillies CL, Rowlands A v., Razieh C, et al. Association between household size and  
576 COVID-19: A UK Biobank observational study. *J R Soc Med* 2022; 115: 138–144.
- 577 32. Bai F, Tomasoni D, Falcinella C, et al. Female gender is associated with long COVID  
578 syndrome: a prospective cohort study. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2022; 28:  
579 611.e9-611.e16.
- 580 33. Sudre CH, Murray B, Varsavsky T, et al. Attributes and predictors of long COVID.  
581 *Nature Medicine* 2021 27:4 2021; 27: 626–631.
- 582 34. Whitaker M, Elliott J, Chadeau-Hyam M, et al. Persistent COVID-19 symptoms in a  
583 community study of 606,434 people in England. *Nature Communications* 2022 13:1  
584 2022; 13: 1–10.
- 585 35. Sykes DL, Holdsworth L, Jawad N, et al. Post-COVID-19 Symptom Burden: What is  
586 Long-COVID and How Should We Manage It? *Lung* 2021; 199: 113–119.
- 587 36. Michelen M, Manoharan L, Elkheir N, et al. Characterising long COVID: a living  
588 systematic review. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021; 6: e005427.
- 589 37. Ziauddeen N, Gurdasani D, O'Hara ME, et al. Characteristics and impact of Long  
590 Covid: Findings from an online survey. *PLoS One* 2022; 17: e0264331.
- 591 38. Thompson EJ, Williams DM, Walker AJ, et al. Long COVID burden and risk factors in  
592 10 UK longitudinal studies and electronic health records. *Nature Communications*  
593 2022 13:1 2022; 13: 1–11.
- 594 39. Kamal M, Abo Omirah M, Hussein A, et al. Assessment and characterisation of post-  
595 COVID-19 manifestations. *Int J Clin Pract*; 75. Epub ahead of print 1 March 2021.  
596 DOI: 10.1111/IJCP.13746.
- 597 40. Carlsten C, Gulati M, Hines S, et al. COVID-19 as an occupational disease. *Am J Ind*  
598 *Med* 2021; 64: 227–237.
- 599 41. Mahase E. Covid-19: Long covid must be recognised as occupational disease, says  
600 BMA. *BMJ* 2021; 374: n2258.
- 601 42. Schaap R, Schaafsma FG, Bosma AR, et al. Improving the health of workers with a  
602 low socioeconomic position: Intervention Mapping as a useful method for adaptation  
603 of the Participatory Approach. *BMC Public Health* 2020; 20: 1–13.
- 604 43. Harris JR, Huang Y, Hannon PA, et al. Low-socioeconomic status workers: Their  
605 health risks and how to reach them. *J Occup Environ Med* 2011; 53: 132–138.
- 606 44. Mackenbach JP, Stirbu I, Roskam A-JR, et al. Socioeconomic Inequalities in Health in  
607 22 European Countries. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2008; 358: 2468–2481.
- 608 45. Socioeconomic inequalities in use of NHS outpatient care emerged after 2010 -  
609 Institute For Fiscal Studies - IFS, <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/15059> (accessed 18  
610 June 2022).

- 611 46. Lewer D, Jayatunga W, Aldridge RW, et al. Premature mortality attributable to  
612 socioeconomic inequality in England between 2003 and 2018: an observational study.  
613 *Lancet Public Health* 2020; 5: e33–e41.
- 614 47. Holman D, Salway S, Bell A. Mapping intersectional inequalities in biomarkers of  
615 healthy ageing and chronic disease in older English adults. *Scientific Reports* 2020  
616 *10:1* 2020; 10: 1–12.
- 617 48. Bauer GR. Incorporating intersectionality theory into population health research  
618 methodology: Challenges and the potential to advance health equity. *Soc Sci Med*  
619 2014; 110: 10–17.
- 620 49. Kapilashrami A, Hankivsky O. Intersectionality and why it matters to global health.  
621 *The Lancet* 2018; 391: 2589–2591.
- 622 50. Davis HE, Assaf GS, McCorkell L, et al. Characterizing long COVID in an international  
623 cohort: 7 months of symptoms and their impact. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; 38: 101019.
- 624