

1 Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on food safety inspection outcomes in Toronto, Canada: a  
2 Bayesian interrupted time series analysis

3

4 Ian Young\*, Binyam Negussie Desta, Fatih Sekercioglu

5

6 School of Occupational and Public Health, Toronto Metropolitan University, 350 Victoria St.,

7 Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 2K3

8

9 \* Corresponding author: [iyoung@torontomu.ca](mailto:iyoung@torontomu.ca)

10

11 Word count = 3403

12 **Summary:**

13 The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic resulted in major disruptions to the food service  
14 industry and regulatory food inspections. The objective of this study was to conduct an  
15 interrupted time series analysis to investigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on food  
16 safety inspection trends in Toronto, Canada. Inspection data for restaurants and take-out  
17 establishments were obtained from 2017 to 2022 and ordered as a weekly time series. Bayesian  
18 segmented regression was conducted to evaluate the impact of the pandemic on weekly  
19 infraction and inspection pass rates. On average, a 0.31-point lower weekly infraction rate (95%  
20 credible interval [CI]: 0.23, 0.40) and a 2.0% higher probability of passing inspections (95% CI:  
21 1.1%, 3.0%) were predicted in the pandemic period compared to pre-pandemic. Models  
22 predicted lower infraction rates and higher pass rates immediately following the pandemic that  
23 were regressing back toward pre-pandemic levels in 2022. Seasonal effects were also identified,  
24 with infraction rates highest in April and pass rates lowest in August. The COVID-19 pandemic  
25 resulted in an initial positive effect on food safety outcomes in restaurants and take-out food  
26 establishments in Toronto, but this effect appears to be temporary. Additional research is needed  
27 on seasonal and long-term inspection trends post-pandemic.

28

29 **Keywords:** food hygiene; food inspection; COVID-19 pandemic; time series; Bayesian

30

31

32 **Introduction:**

33 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic caused major disruptions to society  
34 when declared by the World Health Organization in March 2020. Jurisdictions across the world  
35 instituted lockdowns, physical distancing requirements, and temporary closures of public  
36 businesses and other facilities to control the spread of the virus [1]. During this time, the  
37 incidence of food-borne illness reported to the United States' Foodborne Diseases Active  
38 Surveillance Network was 26% lower than in the prior three years (2017-2019) [2]. Similarly, in  
39 Colorado, a 52% decrease in the rate of persons seeking medical care for acute gastroenteritis  
40 was observed in 2020 vs. 2017-2019 [3]. It is not clear to what extent these decreases were due  
41 to actual declines in food-borne illness exposures or to decreased illness reporting, detection, or  
42 diagnosis.

43 Restaurants and food service settings were intermittently closed to indoor dining during the  
44 initial and subsequent waves of the COVID-19 pandemic, and as a result, they shifted their food  
45 service operations primarily to take-out and delivery, curbside pickup, and drive-thru options  
46 during pandemic waves [4]. The pandemic also led to enhanced hygiene, cleaning, disinfection,  
47 and other infection control practices and policies at these establishments as they aimed to control  
48 the spread of the virus (e.g., increased hand hygiene, cleaning and disinfection of high-touch  
49 surfaces, contactless menus and payment options, physical distancing of staff and patrons,  
50 suspending of self-serve buffets and salad bars) [5]. These enhanced practices and policies could  
51 also have influenced a reduction in food contamination and the spread of foodborne pathogens  
52 via these settings, which are common sources of food-borne illness outbreaks [6]. However, little  
53 research has been conducted to investigate food safety practices at restaurants and other food  
54 service establishments during the COVID-19 pandemic.

55 In Toronto, Canada, the city’s public health inspectors are responsible for conducting routine  
56 food safety inspections of restaurants and other retail food establishments according to provincial  
57 guidelines [7]. Food establishments are inspected once, twice, or three times per year depending  
58 on their risk level (low, moderate, or high, respectively) as determined via a risk categorization  
59 process and in accordance with the provincial food safety regulation [7]. In Toronto, food  
60 establishments then receive a pass, conditional pass, or fail rating based on the inspection results  
61 as part of a public disclosure system called DineSafe [8]. The inspection rating must be visible  
62 from the establishments entrance and results are posted publicly online [8]. Routine food safety  
63 inspections are important to promote and encourage food safety practices, and they can serve as  
64 an early warning indicator of the potential for food-borne illness outbreaks [9–11]. The pandemic  
65 led to an initial pause in food safety inspections in Toronto immediately following the provincial  
66 emergency declaration in March 2020, but its impacts on inspection outcomes have not been  
67 investigated. We conducted an interrupted time series analysis to investigate the impact of the  
68 COVID-19 pandemic on DineSafe inspection trends in Toronto. Results can inform public health  
69 policy and planning related to food inspections in the post-pandemic era and in future pandemic  
70 preparedness.

71

## 72 **Materials and Methods:**

73 **Dataset access and description.** We obtained DineSafe inspection data from the City of  
74 Toronto’s Open Data Portal [12]. As the open data repository only provides the most recent two  
75 years of inspection data, we made a special request to access data dating back to 2017. Our  
76 dataset timeframe ranged from 1 January 2017 to 31 December 2022. The dataset contained  
77 information on the establishment ID number, name, business type, address, geolocation, and

78 inspections results. Inspection results included a separate row for each infraction identified,  
79 including its severity (minor, significant, crucial, or other) and description, as well as the overall  
80 inspection rating (pass, conditional pass, or fail). The full dataset contained information on  
81 218,607 total inspection outcomes.

82 **Dataset preparation.** Data were obtained as comma separated value files and imported into  
83 RStudio (version 2022.12.0 running R 4.2.2) for formatting, preparation, and analysis [13,14].  
84 For the purposes of this analysis, we restricted the dataset to establishments classified as  
85 restaurants and food take-aways. We then reformatted the dataset to one row per inspection by  
86 summing the number of infractions per inspection. As conditional pass and fail inspections  
87 usually resulted in a re-inspection within 48 hours, we removed such re-inspections from the  
88 dataset to focus only on the routine inspections. The dataset was then converted to a time series  
89 for analysis. We created a weekly time variable and summarized the total number of inspections  
90 conducted, pass ratings, and infractions identified each week.

91 In Ontario, the province declared a state of emergency for COVID-19 on 17 March 2020,  
92 resulting in the first provincial lockdown. Starting on this date, the DineSafe program was  
93 essentially paused for several weeks. The dataset contained zero to three inspections per week  
94 from week 13 to week 25 in 2020 (23 March to 21 June), which likely reflected only complaint-  
95 based inspections. Given the low and inconsistent numbers of inspections during these weeks,  
96 we decided to remove these weeks from the dataset. Therefore, the final dataset for analysis  
97 contained 297 weeks of data: 168 weeks prior to the pandemic, and 129 weeks during the  
98 pandemic.

99 **Interrupted time series analysis.** We conducted an interrupted time series analysis using  
100 segmented regression to evaluate the impact of the pandemic on infraction and pass rate

101 outcomes [15,16]. Analysis was conducted under a Bayesian framework [17]. Bayesian analysis  
102 incorporates uncertainty via estimation of posterior distributions of model parameters, and direct  
103 probability statements can be made based on model results [17,18]. Two models were  
104 constructed to assess each of two outcomes of interest: 1) a negative binomial regression model  
105 for weekly infraction counts, with an offset term to account for the number of inspections  
106 conducted; and 2) an aggregated logistic regression model for the number of weekly pass ratings  
107 (vs. conditional pass or fail ratings) per number of inspections conducted [17].

108 The following variables were included as fixed effects in each model: time elapsed  
109 (continuous), pandemic period (yes/no indicator variable), and an interaction term between these  
110 two variables [15,16]. The pandemic period was defined to start the week following the first  
111 lockdown and emergency declaration in Ontario (Mar. 23, 2020). To account for seasonal  
112 effects, we included month as a varying effect via a multi-level structure. For each outcome, we  
113 compared this model structure to a model with month as a fixed-effect indicator variable. We  
114 also compared both models to models that included a first-order autoregressive term to account  
115 for any residual autocorrelation in weekly observations. These model comparisons were  
116 conducted using leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation [19].

117 Weekly informative priors (prior distributions) were specified for all model beta coefficient  
118 parameters [18,20]. Priors were specified to have normal distributions with a mean of 0 and  
119 standard deviation (SD) of 1. Priors for varying effects (month) and residual SD parameters used  
120 half Student- $t$  priors with 3 degrees of freedom and a SD of 2.5 [20]. The appropriateness of  
121 these priors was assessed via prior predictive checking to ensure the prior distributions captured  
122 a reasonable range of plausible values. Sensitivity analysis was also conducted to assess the

123 impact of specifying alternative weakly informative priors for beta coefficient parameters of  
124  $N(0,0.5)$  and  $N(0,2)$ .

125 Models were constructed using the “brms” package in RStudio, which fits models via the  
126 probabilistic programming software Stan [20,21]. We used the “CmdStanR” interface to fit the  
127 Stan models [22]. Stan estimates model parameters using Hamiltonian Monte Carlo and its  
128 extension, the no-U-turn sampler [20,21]. We estimated models using 4000 iterations across each  
129 of four chains via four cores, of which the first 1000 were warmup iterations. Model  
130 convergence was assessed via examination of trace plots, effective sample sizes, and r-hat values  
131 [17,20,23]. We also conducted posterior predictive checks to evaluate the suitability of the  
132 models to simulate new data in relation to the observed data, and evaluated residual  
133 autocorrelation for model parameters [24].

134 To facilitate and visualize interpretation of the model parameters, we calculated posterior  
135 predictions of the expected value of model parameters using the “marginaleffects” package [25].  
136 Average marginal effects (i.e., contrasts) were calculated to assess the effect of the pandemic on  
137 both outcomes. Long-term time trends and the conditional seasonal effect of month were also  
138 visualized in the pre-pandemic and pandemic periods. All figures show the parameter  
139 distribution densities along with the median value and 66% and 95% credible intervals (CI). A  
140 copy of the dataset used in this analysis along with R script files used for all formatting and  
141 analysis in this study are available from the following GitHub page:  
142 <https://github.com/iany33/dinesafepandemic>.

143

144 **Results:**

145       **Descriptive results.** The time series dataset contained data on a total of 81,435 inspections.  
146       The overall inspection pass rate was 91.4% (74,408 / 81,435). A total of 103,118 infractions  
147       were identified. Figure 1 shows weekly infraction and pass rates across the study time period,  
148       while Figure 2 shows the total number of infractions identified and inspections conducted per  
149       week. Raw summary comparisons for all outcomes identified before and during the pandemic are  
150       shown in Table 1. Weekly infraction rates appeared to be lower during compared to prior to the  
151       pandemic, while pass rates appeared similar (Figure 1 and Table 1). Additional variability was  
152       also noted for both outcomes during the pandemic period. The number of weekly inspections  
153       conducted was much lower during the pandemic period and started to increase back toward pre-  
154       pandemic levels in the latter part of 2022 (Figure 2 and Table 1).

155       **Interrupted time series results.** Both the infraction rate and pass rate models showed no  
156       issues with convergence or residual autocorrelation (see Supplementary Material). Additionally,  
157       for both outcomes, the LOO comparisons found that multi-level models with month as a varying  
158       effect, and no auto-regressive term, had the best fit (see Supplementary Material). The sensitivity  
159       analysis of alternative prior distributions suggested minimal impact on the model results (see  
160       Supplementary Material).

161       Results of the multi-level negative binomial regression model for weekly infraction rates are  
162       shown in Table 2, with model coefficients exponentiated as incidence rate ratios (IRR).  
163       However, the effects are most intuitively illustrated in Figures 3-5. Figure 3 shows posterior  
164       predictions for the average expected value of the infraction rate in pre-pandemic and pandemic  
165       periods on the left, with the average marginal effect (i.e., contrast) of the pandemic shown on the  
166       right. On average, the pandemic resulted in a 0.31-point lower food safety infraction rate (95%  
167       CI: 0.23, 0.40) compared to the pre-pandemic period (Figure 3). This effect was primarily noted



168 in the first 2 years of the pandemic until the week of 26 April 2022 (-0.40, 95% CI: -0.32, -0.48),  
169 when weekly inspection numbers were still consistently <200, compared to the most recent  
170 period from 22 April to 31 December 2022 (-0.09, 95% CI: -0.01, -0.19). Figure 4 shows  
171 posterior predictions for the infraction rate over time in both periods. A slightly decreasing trend  
172 in weekly infraction rates was noted pre-pandemic. A level change was noted post-pandemic,  
173 with much lower infraction rates that are predicted to be increasing back toward pre-pandemic  
174 levels (Figure 4). Figure 5 shows the monthly, or seasonal, effects of the pandemic on posterior  
175 predictions for the weekly infraction rate. In both pre-pandemic and pandemic periods, predicted  
176 infraction rates were highest in April, and lowest in January and September (Figure 5).

177 Results of the multi-level aggregated logistic regression model for weekly pass rates are  
178 shown in Table 2, with model coefficients exponentiated as odds ratios (OR). As above, these  
179 effects are most intuitively illustrated in Figures 6-8. Figure 6 shows posterior predictions for the  
180 average expected value of the weekly inspection pass rate in pre-pandemic and pandemic periods  
181 on the left, with the average marginal effect of the pandemic shown on the right. On average, the  
182 pandemic resulted in a 2.0% higher probability of passing food safety inspections (95% CI:  
183 1.1%, 3.0%) compared to the pre-pandemic period (Figure 6). As above, this effect was strongest  
184 in the first 2 years of the pandemic (2.3%, 95% CI: 1.4%, 3.2%) compared to the most recent  
185 period from 22 April to 31 December 2022 (1.4%, 95% CI: 0.3%, 2.6%). Figure 7 shows  
186 posterior predictions for the pass rate over time in both periods. A slightly decreasing trend in  
187 weekly infraction rates was noted pre-pandemic, but it is not clear if this is practically  
188 meaningful. A level change was noted after inspections were resumed during the pandemic, with  
189 much higher predicted pass rates that are regressing back toward pre-pandemic levels (Figure 7).  
190 Figure 8 shows the monthly, or seasonal, effects of the pandemic on posterior predictions for the

191 weekly pass rate. In both pre-pandemic and pandemic periods, predicted pass rates were highest  
192 in January and December, and lowest in August (Figure 8).

193

#### 194 **Discussion:**

195 The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in major disruptions to society starting in March 2020,  
196 including routine public health services such as food safety inspections of restaurants and take-  
197 out facilities. This was reflected in the DineSafe program in Toronto, where inspections were not  
198 conducted for several weeks following the initial provincial declaration of emergency and  
199 lockdown. Additionally, the number of inspections conducted each week following resumption  
200 of routine inspections in 2020 was substantially reduced compared to pre-pandemic levels until  
201 approximately mid-2022. This reduction in DineSafe inspections is due to COVID-19 closures  
202 and restrictions, as well as the reallocation and secondment of many public health inspectors to  
203 assist with COVID-19 case and contact management and other pandemic-related duties during  
204 the initial and subsequent waves [26].

205 After controlling for long-term time trends and seasonality, our interrupted time series  
206 analysis found that there was a substantial average effect of the pandemic on lowering food  
207 safety infraction rates, and increasing inspection pass rates, particularly in the initial 1-2 years of  
208 the pandemic. This increase in food safety outcomes is likely due to the enhanced hygiene,  
209 cleaning, sanitation, and other precautions implemented in restaurants and take-out facilities to  
210 prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Surveys and focus groups conducted with the general  
211 public in the initial months of the pandemic found an overall increased adoption of hand hygiene  
212 (e.g., handwashing, sanitizer use) and other cleaning and sanitation practices [27,28]. It is likely  
213 that these practices were also enhanced among restaurant and take-out facility management and

214 staff due to personal concerns about COVID-19 and government requirements for infection  
215 control [29]. Additionally, food establishments were also likely responding to customer concerns  
216 about hygiene and COVID-19 control measures, which have been shown to be predictors of their  
217 dining behaviours at restaurants and other food service facilities during the pandemic [30].

218 Despite the average effects of the pandemic, when examining time trends during the  
219 pandemic period, we identified a regression of infraction and pass rates back toward pre-  
220 pandemic levels. The initial step change in rates following the pandemic and regression back  
221 toward the mean is common in interrupted time series analyses for temporary effects of major  
222 events or interventions [16]. It is unclear whether these rates will stabilize at or near pre-  
223 pandemic levels or whether they will worsen over time in the coming years. For example, the  
224 pandemic and other ongoing global events (e.g., inflation) have led to numerous operational  
225 challenges for restaurant and food service operators, including stress, financial losses, labour  
226 shortages, and supply chain difficulties that may persist in the future and lead to potential food  
227 safety lapses [31]. We also noted slightly decreasing trends for both rates during the pre-  
228 pandemic period, and it is unclear what was driving those trends or if they would have continued  
229 had the pandemic not occurred.

230 When examining infraction and pass rate trends by month, we identified some seasonal  
231 effects. The pre-pandemic and pandemic period monthly effects were similar, except there was  
232 much more variability noted in the pandemic period likely due to the lower number of  
233 inspections conducted and time trends noted above. Interestingly, weekly infraction rates were  
234 highest in the spring (April) and lowest in the fall to early winter (September to January), while  
235 inspection pass rates were lowest in the summer (August) and highest in winter (December and  
236 January). Conditional pass and fail outcomes for an inspection are assigned when one or more

237 significant or critical infractions are identified that correspond to potential health hazards (e.g.,  
238 time-temperature abuse, pest infestation) and cannot be immediately corrected [8]. In contrast,  
239 total infractions also include minor infractions that present minimal health risks directly (e.g.,  
240 sanitary condition of food handling room) [8]. Lower pass rates in August could be related to  
241 higher average air temperatures in summer months. For example, prior research in New York has  
242 found that higher ambient air temperatures were associated with increased temperature-control  
243 related infractions in restaurants [32]. Foodborne illness rates also show a seasonal trend with  
244 many infections being highest in summer months [33,34]. It is unclear why total infractions  
245 differed seasonally. Future research would be beneficial in this area, including types of  
246 infractions identified and differences in their frequency by month or season, as well as primary  
247 research with public health inspectors and restaurant operators to determine barriers, facilitators,  
248 and other factors affecting food safety practices in these settings post-pandemic.

249 We examined total infraction rates as an outcome rather than specific categories (e.g., minor,  
250 significant, critical), as preliminary evaluation found little difference in trends when these rates  
251 were stratified by type, and the pass rate outcome reflects information on more severe infractions  
252 identified. The publicly available DineSafe dataset did not contain any information about the  
253 characteristics of included food establishments, such as inspection frequency, cuisine or food  
254 type, number of employees, or chain vs. independent status, which are known to be related to  
255 inspection outcomes but could not be investigated in this study [35–37]. Future research could  
256 aim to investigate how the pandemic affected food safety outcomes in food service  
257 establishments with different characteristics. The dataset contained geolocation data for each  
258 establishment, but these were not considered in this study as we focused on the overall time  
259 series of inspection outcomes across the city. Future research could also examine pandemic-

260 related and post-pandemic inspection outcome trends in different geographical areas, as prior  
261 research has shown a relationship between infractions and neighbourhood socioeconomic status  
262 indicators [36,38].

263 We used a Bayesian approach to estimate the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on food  
264 safety inspection outcomes in restaurants and take-out facilities in Toronto. This analytical  
265 approach allowed us to determine probability distributions of modelled outcomes and to account  
266 for uncertainty in the model parameters and predicted expected effects. We found that the  
267 pandemic had an initial positive effect on lowering total infraction rates and increasing  
268 inspection pass rates, but this effect appears to be temporary with outcomes regressing back  
269 toward pre-pandemic levels in 2022. This finding suggests that enhanced COVID-19 infection  
270 control measures could have temporarily improved food safety outcomes in restaurants and food  
271 service settings. However, further research is needed to examine longer-term trends in these  
272 outcomes as COVID-19 control measures and requirements are reduced and removed from such  
273 settings and as operators cope with additional post-pandemic stressors. We also identified  
274 seasonal trends in inspection outcomes that warrant future research and investigation.

275

## 276 **Acknowledgements**

277 The authors acknowledge the Open Data initiative at the City of Toronto for providing access to  
278 the DineSafe dataset for research and analysis purposes.

279

## 280 **Financial support**

281 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit  
282 sectors.

283

284 **Conflicts of interest**

285 None to declare.

286 **References**

- 287 1. **Escandón K, et al.** (2021) COVID-19 false dichotomies and a comprehensive review of the  
288 evidence regarding public health, COVID-19 symptomatology, SARS-CoV-2 transmission,  
289 mask wearing, and reinfection. *BMC Infectious Diseases*; **21**: 710.
- 290 2. **Ray LC, et al.** (2021) Decreased incidence of infections caused by pathogens transmitted  
291 commonly through food during the COVID-19 pandemic — Foodborne Diseases Active  
292 Surveillance Network, 10 U.S. sites, 2017–2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*;  
293 **70**: 1332–1336.
- 294 3. **Armistead I, et al.** (2022) Trends in outpatient medical-care seeking for acute gastroenteritis  
295 during the COVID-19 pandemic, 2020. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease*; **19**: 290–292.
- 296 4. **Abebe GK, Charlebois S, Music J.** (2022) Canadian consumers’ dining behaviors during  
297 the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for channel decisions in the foodservice industry.  
298 *Sustainability*; **14**: 4893.
- 299 5. **Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.** (2022) Coronavirus (COVID-19) -  
300 tips: restaurants, bars, and food services (<https://www.ccohs.ca/covid19/restaurants/>).  
301 Accessed 3 January 2023.
- 302 6. **Angelo KM, et al.** (2017) Epidemiology of restaurant-associated foodborne disease  
303 outbreaks, United States, 1998–2013. *Epidemiology and Infection*; **145**: 523–534.
- 304 7. **Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.** (2019) Operational approaches for food  
305 safety guideline  
306 ([https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/oph\\_standards/docs/protocols\\_g  
307 uidelines/Operational\\_Approaches\\_For\\_Food\\_Safety\\_Guideline\\_2019\\_en.pdf](https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/publichealth/oph_standards/docs/protocols_guidelines/Operational_Approaches_For_Food_Safety_Guideline_2019_en.pdf)). Accessed 3  
308 January 2023.
- 309 8. **City of Toronto.** (2022) About DineSafe ([https://www.toronto.ca/community-people/health-  
310 wellness-care/health-programs-advice/food-safety/dinesafe/about-dinesafe/](https://www.toronto.ca/community-people/health-wellness-care/health-programs-advice/food-safety/dinesafe/about-dinesafe/)). Accessed 3  
311 January 2023.
- 312 9. **Firestone MJ, et al.** (2020) Can aggregated restaurant inspection data help us understand  
313 why individual foodborne illness outbreaks occur? *Journal of Food Protection*; **83**: 788–793.
- 314 10. **Fleetwood J, et al.** (2019) As clean as they look? Food hygiene inspection scores,  
315 microbiological contamination, and foodborne illness. *Food Control*; **96**: 76–86.
- 316 11. **Petran RL, White BW, Hedberg CW.** (2012) Health department inspection criteria more  
317 likely to be associated with outbreak restaurants in Minnesota. *Journal of Food Protection*;  
318 **75**: 2007–2015.
- 319 12. **City of Toronto.** (2022) DineSafe (<https://open.toronto.ca/dataset/dinesafe/>). Accessed 3  
320 January 2023.

- 321 13. **R Core Team.** (2022) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
322 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 323 14. **RStudio Team.** (2020) RStudio: integrated development for R. Boston, MA: RStudio, PBC.
- 324 15. **Bhaskaran K, et al.** (2013) Time series regression studies in environmental epidemiology.  
325 *International Journal of Epidemiology*; **42**: 1187–1195.
- 326 16. **Lopez Bernal J, et al.** (2017) Interrupted time series regression for the evaluation of public  
327 health interventions: a tutorial. *International Journal of Epidemiology*; **46**: 348–355.
- 328 17. **McElreath R.** (2020) *Statistical Rethinking*, 2nd ed. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and  
329 Hall/CRC.
- 330 18. **van de Schoot R, et al.** (2021) Bayesian statistics and modelling. *Nature Reviews Methods*  
331 *Primers*; **1**: 1–26.
- 332 19. **Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J.** (2017) Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-  
333 one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing*; **27**: 1413--1432.
- 334 20. **Bürkner PC.** (2017) brms: an R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan.  
335 *Journal of Statistical Software*; **80**: 1–28.
- 336 21. **Carpenter B, et al.** (2017) Stan: a probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical*  
337 *Software*; **76**: 1–32.
- 338 22. **Gabry J, Češnovar R.** (2022) cmdStanR (<https://mc-stan.org/cmdstanr/index.html>).  
339 Accessed 3 January 2023.
- 340 23. **Gabry J, et al.** (2019) Visualization in Bayesian workflow. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*  
341 *Society: Series A*; **182**: 389–402.
- 342 24. **Depaoli S, van de Schoot R.** (2017) Improving transparency and replication in Bayesian  
343 statistics: the WAMBS-Checklist. *Psychological Methods*; **22**: 240–261.
- 344 25. **Arel-Bundock V.** (2022) marginaleffects: marginal effects, marginal means, predictions,  
345 and contrasts (<https://vincentarelbundock.github.io/marginaleffects/>). Accessed 3 January  
346 2023.
- 347 26. **Sekercioglu F, et al.** (2020) Experiences of environmental public health professionals during  
348 the COVID-19 pandemic response in Canada. *Environmental Health Review*; **63**: 70–76.
- 349 27. **Haas R, et al.** (2021) ‘I walk around like my hands are covered in mud’: food safety and  
350 hand hygiene behaviors of Canadians during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Food Protection*  
351 *Trends*; **41**: 454–463.



- 352 28. **Thomas MS, Feng Y.** (2021) Food handling practices in the era of COVID-19: a mixed-  
353 method longitudinal needs assessment of consumers in the United States. *Journal of Food*  
354 *Protection*; **84**: 1176–1187.
- 355 29. **Government of Ontario.** (2022) Report on amendments, extensions, and revocations of  
356 orders under the Reopening Ontario (A Flexible Response to COVID-19) Act, 2020 from  
357 December 2, 2021, to March 28, 2022 ([http://www.ontario.ca/document/report-amendments-](http://www.ontario.ca/document/report-amendments-extensions-and-revocations-orders-under-reopening-ontario-flexible-3)  
358 [extensions-and-revocations-orders-under-reopening-ontario-flexible-3](http://www.ontario.ca/document/report-amendments-extensions-and-revocations-orders-under-reopening-ontario-flexible-3)). Accessed 3 January  
359 2023.
- 360 30. **Jeong M, et al.** (2022) Key factors driving customers' restaurant dining behavior during the  
361 COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*; **34**:  
362 836–858.
- 363 31. **Messabia N, Fomi P-R, Kooli C.** (2022) Managing restaurants during the COVID-19 crisis:  
364 innovating to survive and prosper. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*; **7**: 100234.
- 365 32. **Dominianni C, et al.** (2018) Hot weather impacts on New York City restaurant food safety  
366 violations and operations. *Journal of Food Protection*; **81**: 1048–1054.
- 367 33. **Powell MR, et al.** (2018) Temporal patterns in principal *Salmonella* serotypes in the USA;  
368 1996–2014. *Epidemiology and Infection*; **146**: 437–441.
- 369 34. **Simpson RB, Zhou B, Naumova EN.** (2020) Seasonal synchronization of foodborne  
370 outbreaks in the United States, 1996–2017. *Scientific Reports*; **10**: 17500.
- 371 35. **Harris KJ, et al.** (2015) Food safety inspections results: a comparison of ethnic-operated  
372 restaurants to non-ethnic-operated restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality*  
373 *Management*; **46**: 190–199.
- 374 36. **Leinwand SE, et al.** (2017) Inspection frequency, sociodemographic factors, and food safety  
375 violations in chain and nonchain restaurants, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2013-2014. *Public*  
376 *Health Reports*; **132**: 180–187.
- 377 37. **Menachemi N, et al.** (2012) Characteristics of restaurants associated with critical food safety  
378 violations. *Food Protection Trends*; **32**: 73–80.
- 379 38. **Ng DLT, et al.** (2020) Spatial distribution and characteristics of restaurant inspection results  
380 in Toronto, Ontario, 2017–2018. *Food Protection Trends*; **40**: 232–240.

381

382 Table 1. Summary statistics of weekly restaurant and take-away establishment food safety  
383 inspection trends, Toronto, 2017–2022.

Outcome	Pre-Pandemic Period (n = 168 weeks)			Pandemic Period (n = 129 weeks)		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range
Inspections	364.6	79.0	32, 624	156.5	87.1	23, 470
Infractions	486.0	108.0	34, 713	166.4	125.6	28, 502
Infraction rate	1.34	0.17	0.88, 1.83	0.99	0.28	0.52, 1.74
Pass rate	0.91	0.02	0.87, 0.97	0.92	0.04	0.74, 1.00

384  
385  
386

387 Table 2. Bayesian segmented regression model results for two weekly inspection outcomes,  
 388 Toronto, 2017–2022.

Outcome / parameter	Estimate <sup>a</sup>	95% credible interval	R-hat <sup>b</sup>	Bulk ESS <sup>b</sup>	Tail ESS <sup>b</sup>
<b>Infraction rate</b>					
(negative binomial model)					
Intercept	IRR = 1.38	1.31, 1.46	1.00	4170	5139
Time elapsed	IRR = 0.999	0.999, 1.00	1.00	14,302	9084
Pandemic period (yes vs. no)	IRR = 0.233	0.188, 0.291	1.00	12,088	8853
Time*pandemic interaction term	IRR = 1.005	1.004, 1.006	1.00	11,754	8183
Group-level effects for month	SD = 0.058	0.030, 0.103	1.00	3381	5029
<b>Pass rate (logistic regression model)</b>					
Intercept	OR = 11.21	10.22, 12.29	1.00	2944	3803
Time elapsed	OR = 0.999	0.999, 1.00	1.00	15,308	9994
Pandemic period (yes vs. no)	OR = 2.08	1.48, 2.92	1.00	8230	7522
Time*pandemic interaction term	OR = 0.998	0.997, 0.999	1.00	8450	8548

Group-level effects    SD = 0.111    0.063, 0.191    1.00    2315    3853

for month

---

389    <sup>a</sup> Intercept and fixed-effect parameter estimates and credible intervals are shown here as odds  
390    ratios (OR) for the logistic model and incidence rate ratios (IRR) for the negative binomial  
391    model. Group-level effect estimates for month are shown as SD estimates.

392    <sup>b</sup> R-hat values are an indicator of model convergence, with values closer to 1 indicating  
393    convergence. Bulk and tail effective sample size (ESS) are indicators of Marko Chain sampling  
394    efficiency, with numbers greater than 100 indicating reliable results.

395

396

397

398 **Figure legends**

399 Figure 1. A) Weekly infraction rate (number of total infractions identified per number of  
400 inspections conducted) at restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto, 2017–2022. B)  
401 Weekly pass rate (number of passes per number of inspections conducted) at restaurants and  
402 take-out establishments in Toronto, 2017–2022.

403

404 Figure 2. Number of total infractions identified and inspections conducted per week at  
405 restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto, 2017–2022.

406

407 Figure 3. A) Posterior predictions of the average expected value of the weekly infraction rate at  
408 restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto in the pre-pandemic (January 2017 to March  
409 2020) and pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022). B) Average marginal effect of the  
410 COVID-19 pandemic on the expected value of the weekly infraction rate.

411

412 Figure 4. Predicted expected value of the weekly infraction rate at restaurants and take-out  
413 establishments in Toronto over time during the pre-pandemic (January 2017 to March 2020) and  
414 pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022).

415



416 Figure 5. Posterior predictions of the month-specific average expected value of the weekly  
417 infraction rate at restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto in the pre-pandemic (January  
418 2017 to March 2020) and pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022).

419

420 Figure 6. A) Posterior predictions of the average expected value of the weekly pass rate at  
421 restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto in the pre-pandemic (January 2017 to March  
422 2020) and pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022). B) Average marginal effect of the  
423 COVID-19 pandemic on the expected value of the weekly pass rate across the study time period.


424  
425 Figure 7. Predicted expected value of the weekly pass rate at restaurants and take-out  
426 establishments in Toronto over time during the pre-pandemic (January 2017 to March 2020) and  
427 pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022).

428  
429 Figure 8. Posterior predictions of the month-specific average expected value of the weekly pass  
430 rate at restaurants and take-out establishments in Toronto in the pre-pandemic (January 2017 to  
431 March 2020) and pandemic periods (June 2020 to December 2022).






Outcome    ●    Infractions    ●    Inspections

Number of infractions and inspections














Credible Interval 0.95 0.8 0.5 Time Period Pre-Pandemic Pandemic Period



Time Period ■ Pre-Pandemic ■ Pandemic Period







Time Period ■ Pre-Pandemic ■ Pandemic Period