

Social deprivation and SARS-CoV-2 testing: a population-based analysis in a highly contrasted Southern France region

Jordi Landier¹, Léa Bassez¹, Marc-Karim Bendiane¹, Pascal Chaud², Florian Franke², Steve Nauleau³, Fabrice Danjou³, Philippe Malfait², Stanislas Rebaudet^{1,4}, Jean Gaudart⁵

1. Aix Marseille Univ, IRD, INSERM, SESSTIM, Aix Marseille Institute of Public Health, ISSPAM, Marseille, France
2. Santé Publique France Cellule régionale Paca-Corse, Marseille, France
3. Agence Régionale de la Santé Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur, Marseille, France
4. Hôpital Européen Marseille, Marseille, France
5. Aix Marseille Univ, APHM, Inserm, IRD, SESSTIM, ISSPAM, Hop Timone, BioSTIC, Marseille, France

Correspondence: Jordi Landier, jordi.landier@ird.fr

16 **Abstract**

17 **Background**

18 Testing was the cornerstone of the COVID-19 epidemic response in most countries until vaccination
19 became available for the general population. Social inequalities generally affect access to healthcare
20 and health behaviours, and COVID-19 was rapidly shown to impact deprived population more
21 drastically. In support of the regional health agency in Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur (PACA) in South-
22 Eastern France, we analysed the relationship between testing rate and socio-demographic
23 characteristics of the population, to identify gaps in testing coverage and improve targeting of
24 response strategies.

25 **Methods**

26 We conducted an ecological analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 testing rate in the PACA region, based
27 on data aggregated at the finest spatial resolution available in France (IRIS) and by periods defined by
28 public health implemented measures and major epidemiological changes. Using general census data,
29 population density, and specific deprivation indices, we used principal component analysis followed
30 by hierarchical clustering to define profiles describing local socio-demographic characteristics. We
31 analysed the association between these profiles and testing rates in a generalized additive multilevel
32 model, adjusting for access to healthcare, presence of a retirement home, and the age profile of the
33 population.

34 **Results**

35 We identified 6 socio-demographic profiles across the 2,306 analysed IRIS spatial units: privileged,
36 remote, intermediate, downtown, deprived and very deprived (ordered by increasing social
37 deprivation index). Profiles also ranged from rural (remote) to high density urban areas (downtown,
38 very deprived). From July 2020 to December 2021, we analysed SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 testing rate
39 over 10 periods. Testing rates fluctuated strongly but were highest in privileged and downtown areas,
40 and lowest in very deprived ones. The lowest adjusted testing rate ratios (aTRR) between privileged
41 (reference) and other profiles occurred after implementation of a mandatory healthpass for many
42 leisure activities in July 2021. Periods of contextual testing near Christmas displayed the largest aTRR,
43 especially during the last periods of 2021 after the end of free convenience testing for unvaccinated
44 individuals.

45 **Conclusions**

46 We characterized in-depth local heterogeneity and temporal trends in testing rates and identified
47 areas and circumstances associated with low testing rates, which the regional health agency targeted
48 specifically for the deployment of health mediation activities.

49 Introduction

50 In recent years, social epidemiology has made a significant contribution to showing and explaining
51 health inequalities. Some authors are now advocating an integrative approach based on
52 interdisciplinarity and integrating social science theory more deeply [1]. The role played by socio-
53 economic status (SES) in access to care, use of care and health behaviors [2] must thus be taken into
54 account to study the disparities observed within the population in the recent COVID-19 pandemic,
55 especially in access and use of diagnostic tests. From the first months of the pandemic, COVID-19 was
56 rapidly shown to impact more dramatically populations who were already affected by socio-economic
57 deprivation in European countries [3, 4].

58
59 During the 18 months after the first hard lockdown in France, mass testing, tracking and isolating was
60 the only way to attempt controlling the spread until generalized vaccination became available. Testing
61 also provided knowledge on transmission dynamics and variant detection, as well as anticipating
62 surges in hospitalized cases. Testing was even more crucial in countries aiming for zero-COVID
63 strategies. In such contexts, ensuring access to testing for the population is paramount. However, the
64 distribution of tests can largely be heterogeneous in terms of time, space, but also population groups.

65 Recent studies analysed the link between deprivation and COVID-19 testing, incidence or morbidity-
66 mortality at the national scale [5, 6]. These studies highlighted the combined role of deprivation and
67 population density to increase COVID-19 burden. Deprivation was also associated with lower testing
68 rates. However, these studies relied on deciles or quintiles of the national distribution of deprivation
69 indices. These categories may not reflect accurately local disparities, due to different standards of
70 living between regions (e.g. housing costs between Paris and Marseille, the two largest cities in France).
71 Limits inherent to building indices may also bias results when applied at large scale, when specific
72 situations are difficult to capture accurately. For example, well-off urban population may live without
73 a car, and conversely rural populations across a wide range of socio-economic conditions likely own at
74 least one car and live in a personal house. In addition, these studies only accounted for population
75 density and did not adjust for access to healthcare, nor for the age structure of the population.

76 Our objective was therefore to analyse the relationship between socio-economic profile and SARS-
77 CoV-2 testing and incidence rates during the different phases of the epidemic. We also aimed to
78 support intervention allocation by the regional public health agency of the Provence Alpes Côtes d'Azur
79 (PACA), a geographically heterogeneous region combining dense urban coastal regions and rural
80 mountainous areas in South-Eastern France.

81

82 Material and methods

83 Study design

84 We conducted an ecological analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 testing rate in the Provence-Alpes-Côte
85 d'Azur (PACA) region in south-eastern France, at the highest spatial resolution available for aggregated
86 epidemiological data in France: "regrouped islets for statistical information" (French acronym: IRIS
87 used hereafter). IRIS correspond to contiguous geographical areas regrouping between 1000 and 5000
88 inhabitants. Municipalities (lowest local authority level) with a population <5000 inhabitants typically
89 correspond to a single IRIS, while municipalities >5000 are divided into several IRIS. The PACA region
90 counts 946 municipalities and 2,446 IRIS, corresponding to 5.04 million inhabitants.

91 Study period

92 We analysed COVID-19 testing rate from the start of the second wave in the PACA region on 21 July
93 2020 to the regional upsurge in incidence corresponding to the onset of the omicron wave on 23
94 December 2021. We combined dates of implementation of public health measures and local incidence
95 minima to account for the multiple distinct testing incentives or constraints faced by the population.
96 We distinguished 10 epidemic periods (Figure S1, Table S1). The delimitations were: the two
97 nationwide lockdowns starting dates (30 October 2020 and 24 March 2021) and first easing up dates
98 (28 November 2020 and 3 May 2021); the end of Christmas holidays (4 January 21); the lowest regional
99 incidence in June before delta-variant wave 4 (23 June 2021); the decree establishing a mandatory
100 health pass for recreational and cultural events >50 participants (16 July 2021), which required a
101 complete vaccination or a negative test result of less than three days, or evidence of a COVID-19
102 infection for >10 days and ≤6 months; end of convenience test gratuity for unvaccinated individuals
103 (15 October 2021); the regional onset of the delta variant-associated fifth wave (8 November 2021).

104 COVID-19 tests and cases data

105 COVID-19 tests and confirmed cases were available as 7-day cumulative counts aggregated by IRIS
106 from the French National Public Health Agency (Santé Publique France) SI-DEP information system,
107 which aggregates results of all SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and antigenic tests performed in France. People
108 presenting for a test provided their home address systematically and a pre-processing algorithm
109 mapped them to the corresponding IRIS.

110 IRIS (spatial unit) selection

111 We excluded IRIS with ≤30 inhabitants because of incomplete covariate data due to non-disclosure of
112 local income statistics when the number of inhabitants is insufficient to preserve anonymity. In
113 addition, we excluded “activity” IRIS hosting >1000 workers during the day with twice as many workers
114 as inhabitants, as well as “diverse” IRIS corresponding to low population areas (e.g. a protected natural
115 area in the periphery of a city), because the resident population profile could be very different from
116 the actual population frequenting and influencing the transmission. We also excluded IRIS where the
117 average monthly number of tests exceeded three times the actual population over multiple periods,
118 due to likely address errors in laboratories.

119 IRIS (spatial unit) descriptive data

120 Sources

121 We obtained data describing the population of each IRIS from the French National Institute of Statistics
122 and Economic Studies (INSEE). We used the national census database, which provides descriptive data
123 on the population by IRIS and the equipment public database, which provides an exhaustive list of
124 equipment located in each unit, with geographical coordinates (Table S2).

125 Socio-demographic variables

126 We characterized the population inhabiting each IRIS using the following variables: (i) percentage of
127 the population ≥15 years old in each social and professional categories (8-category job classification:
128 agriculture, business owners/independent, white-collar, intermediate, employees, blue-collar,
129 pensioned/retired, unemployed/other-including students); (ii) percentage of total IRIS population of
130 foreign origin; (iii) percentage of immigrants in total IRIS population; (iv) four variables used to
131 calculate the French deprivation index (percentage of high-school graduates in population ≥15 years
132 old not studying; percentage of unemployed in the active 15-64 years old population; percentage

133 holding a blue-collar job in the active 15-64 years old population; median income) [7]; (v) proportion
134 of overcrowded main residences; (vi) European deprivation index (EDI), which combines ten census-
135 based variables aggregated at the IRIS-level, and deprivation variables at the individual level
136 (proportion of individuals of foreign nationality, of households without a car, of individuals employed
137 as managers or intermediate professionals, of single-parent families, of households with at least two
138 individuals, of non-owner-occupied households, of unemployed individuals, of individuals without
139 post-secondary school education, of overcrowded dwellings, and of non-married individuals) [8]; (vii)
140 population density; and (viii) percentage of inhabitants belonging to 4 age groups: <18, 18-39, 40-64,
141 ≥ 65 .

142 *Access to healthcare variables*

143 We separately considered the general access to healthcare and the specific access to SAR-CoV-2 tests.

144 We characterized the general access to healthcare at IRIS level as the number of primary healthcare
145 practitioners (medical doctor (MD), nurse, physiotherapist...) present in the IRIS. We also used localized
146 potential accessibility (LPA), an indicator defined at municipal level corresponding to the number of
147 MD consultations available per year for each person based on their residence (Table S2). This
148 composite indicator takes into account the number of MDs relative to the population in the
149 corresponding catchment area, population expected needs and the travel time to the nearest MD.

150 We considered the specific access to SAR-CoV-2 tests following two main options available for general
151 population testing: medical laboratories, which conducted RT-PCR-based tests throughout all periods;
152 and pharmacies, which deployed antigenic testing from period 3 onwards. We considered distance
153 from a IRIS to the nearest facility and the number of facilities in the IRIS. Preliminary analysis showed
154 a strong correlation between distance to pharmacies and distance to laboratories (Spearman
155 correlation coefficient=0.6); and the minimal distance to either facility corresponded to the distance
156 to a pharmacy (Spearman correlation coefficient=1) (Figure S2). Numbers of pharmacies and
157 laboratories were also correlated (Spearman correlation coefficient=0.4).

158 Exploratory analysis of all variables by Spearman correlation confirmed by principal component
159 analysis (PCA) indicated strong positive correlations between general access to healthcare and specific
160 access to testing: a negative correlation between distance to testing facilities and LPA, and strong
161 correlations between the numbers of primary healthcare practitioners and laboratories or pharmacies
162 in IRIS. There was only limited correlation between number of equipment and LPA or distances to
163 testing facilities (Figure S2). As a result, we used LPA and number of primary healthcare practitioners
164 in our main analyses, and replaced LPA with distance to pharmacy in the sensitivity analysis.

165 *Statistical analysis*

166 Statistical analyses were performed using R software (version 4.0.5., R Core Team 2020. R Foundation
167 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) and packages {mgcv}, {factominer} and {sf}.

168 *Socio-demographic and age profiles*

169 In order to evaluate socio-demographic characteristics of, we grouped IRIS into one age- and one socio-
170 demographic profile using an unsupervised clustering method based on PCA followed by hierarchical
171 clustering on principal components (HCPC) [9, 10]. We defined socio-demographic profile using all
172 socio-demographic variables except age variables, and we generated age profiles separately using the
173 4 age variables. We studied direct effects of EDI, proportion of inhabitants older than 65 years and
174 population density in a sensitivity analysis.

175 *Variable selection*

176 Variable selection in the multivariable model was done based on prior assumptions using a directed
177 acyclic graph (Dagitty v3.0, Figure S3) [11]. For testing rate, we considered that two main factors could
178 explain the testing rate in a IRIS in the different periods: first, characteristics of general accessibility to
179 tests in the IRIS, due to its geographical location and pre-epidemic access to healthcare and second,
180 elements related to individual testing behaviour of IRIS population, such as age, presence of a
181 retirement home, and socio-demographic characteristics.

182 *Statistical model*

183 We used a generalized additive multilevel model (GAMM, [12]) with a random-effect at municipality
184 level to account for similarities in IRIS of the same municipality and for the LPA variable definition
185 available at municipality-level only. As appropriate for count variables, we used a negative binomial
186 distribution to take into account overdispersion, with a log link and included IRIS census-defined log
187 population as an offset. We also included a Gaussian kriging smoother based on the geographical
188 coordinates of each IRIS to account for spatial autocorrelation. Continuous variables were first tested
189 without linear assumption (as splines) in univariate analysis. Sensitivity analyses were conducted by
190 substituting distance to the nearest pharmacy to LPA, as these indicators were too correlated for all to
191 be included in the same model (see supplement). In a second sensitivity analysis, we adjusted for
192 population density and proportion of population above 65 years as spline individual predictors (not
193 requiring linear approximation), and studied the effect of the social deprivation directly including EDI
194 as a linear predictor or as a spline.

195 *Ethics*

196 Access to information was controlled and SI-DEP data were obtained in accordance with privacy laws
197 (General Data Protection Regulation [EU] 2016/679). Clearance was obtained through a specific
198 convention (number 22DIRA41-0) between Aix-Marseille University and Santé Publique France, from
199 the Aix-Marseille University Ethic committee (number 2022-10-20-006), and from the Aix-Marseille
200 University Data Protection Officer (number 513087).


201 *Role of the funding source*

202 The funding source had no role in the design, analysis, result interpretation and reporting for this study.

203 *Results*

204 *Spatial unit selection*

205 Out of the 2,446 IRIS in the Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur region, we analysed 2,306 after excluding 74
206 activity IRIS, 40 diverse IRIS, 25 residential IRIS with population <30 inhabitants, and one single unit
207 corresponding to a rural municipality with 36 inhabitants with monthly test rates >3 times larger than
208 the IRIS population (Figure 1).



209


210 **Figure 1: IRIS (spatial units) selection flow chart.**

211

212 IRIS (spatial unit) profiles

213 IRIS classification for socio-demographic variables identified 6 profiles ordered by increasing
214 deprivation and exhibiting strong contrasts in terms of population density (Figure 2A, 2B). An
215 intermediate-density profile corresponded to the lowest EDI, high income, high proportion of white
216 collar and densities ranging from peri-urban to urban (profile 1, “privileged”). A very low-density profile
217 included an important proportion of agriculture workers (profile 2, “remote”) and a second
218 intermediate-density profile ranged from rural to peri-urban IRIS (profile 3, “intermediate”). A high-
219 density urban profile corresponding to young adults, intermediate income with a high proportion of
220 white collars (profile 4, “downtown”). Another high-density urban profile corresponded to areas with
221 a high proportion of blue collar, lower income and intermediate density (profile 5, “deprived”). The
222 third and last urban profile corresponded to very deprived urban areas with highest EDI, highest
223 densities i.e. neighbourhoods of large social housing projects (profile 6, “very deprived”). IRIS profiles
224 presented less heterogeneity in terms of age, with only two profiles displaying higher (remote) or lower
225 proportion (very deprived) of population ≥ 65 (Figure 2F). Access to healthcare variables by profiles
226 generally reflected the urban vs rural accessibility issue, access to healthcare being highly variable for
227 rural IRIS (“remote” + “intermediate”) profiles (Figure 2G).

228 IRIS classification in age profiles identified 4 profiles. The three profiles “families”, “young adults”, and
229 “elderly” were characterized respectively by a higher proportion of <18 years old; 18-39 years old, and
230 ≥ 65 years old. The fourth profile, “balanced” exhibited similar proportions of inhabitants for each age
231 category.



232

233 **Figure 2: Characteristics of the socio-demographic profiles of the spatial units (IRIS). (A) population**
 234 **density (log scale); (B) European Deprivation Index (EDI); (C) proportion of white collars among aged**
 235 **≥ 15 years; (D) proportion of blue collar among the ≥ 15 -year old population; (E) median income; (F)**
 236 **proportion of population aged ≥ 65 years; (G) localized potential accessibility (LPA) to healthcare**
 237 **indicator based on the average number of potential medical doctor visits available per inhabitant**
 238 **(defined at municipality level); and (H) number of primary healthcare professionals active in the**


239 **census unit. Socio-demographic profiles:** (1) “privileged” (red); (2) “remote” (green); (3) “intermediate”
240 (yellow); (4) “downtown” (cyan); (5) “deprived” (light purple); (6) “very deprived” (dark purple).
241 Corresponding histograms are presented in Figure S4.

242

243 The geographical distribution of IRIS profiles matched expected patterns based on descriptive
244 variables. “Remote” IRIS were mostly located in the mountainous areas of the region. “Privileged” IRIS
245 mostly clustered in a vast area comprising and around Aix-en-Provence city, in the south and east of
246 Marseille city, in along the coast between Marseille and Toulon city, along the coast between Cannes
247 and Nice city. Lastly, “deprived” and “very deprived” IRIS concentrated in the northern part of
248 Marseille city, or particular neighbourhoods of Toulon and Nice (Figure 3).

249

250



251

252 **Figure 3: Spatial distribution of the socio-demographic profiles. (A) Provence Alpes Côte d’Azur**
253 **(PACA) region; (B to E) main cities. Socio-demographic profiles:** (1) privileged (red); (2) remote (green);
254 (3) intermediate (yellow); (4) downtown (cyan); (5) deprived (light purple); (6) very deprived (dark
255 purple).


256

257 SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 testing and incidence rates from July 2020 to December 2021 258 by socio-demographic profile

259 From July 2020 to December 2021, 5 peaks of SARS-CoV-2 testing rate were observed, in parallel with
260 4 waves of incidence (Figure 4). Testing peaks generally responded to increasing transmission periods,
261 except for the 5th testing rate peak that occurred during Christmas 2020. “Privileged” and “downtown”
262 IRIS exhibited the highest testing rate overall, whereas the “very deprived” IRIS exhibited the lowest
263 test rate, except during summer 2021 (after the health pass establishment) (Figure 4A). During that
264 period, urban profiles (“downtown”, “deprived” and “very deprived”) displayed a general increase and
265 “remote” or “intermediate” profiles showed the lowest testing rates.

266 In comparison, COVID-19 incidence rates were highest in the “very deprived”, “downtown” and
 267 “privileged” units, despite contrasted testing rates (Figure 4B). The dynamics in these profiles were
 268 also different. In 2020, the “privileged” and “downtown” IRIS reached their maximum incidence rate
 269 one week before the October lockdown (period 1), while “very deprived” IRIS reached their peak
 270 during the week after the lockdown (period 2). Likewise, in July 2021 (period 8), “privileged” and
 271 “downtown” IRIS reached a maximum incidence rate at the end of July, compared to early August for
 272 “deprived” and mid-August for “very deprived” profiles, in a context of general high testing rates in
 273 these largely urban IRIS.

274



275

276 **Figure 4: Evolution of daily SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 (A) testing and (B) incidence rates, by**
 277 **sociodemographic profile in PACA region, from July 2020 to December 2021.**

278

279 [Factors associated with COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 testing rates during period 1](#)


280 We analysed each period separately to identify factors associated with testing rate at IRIS level.

281 During period 1 (wave 2 rising), “privileged” IRIS showed a higher testing rate than all others and were
 282 chosen as a reference class. The adjusted testing rate ratio (aTRR) ranged from a 5% difference for
 283 “downtown” IRIS (aTRR=0.95, 95% confidence interval=[0.91-0.97]) to a 21% difference for “very
 284 deprived” IRIS (aTRR=0.79 [0.79-0.74]) (Table 1). The presence of elderly population also played a role,
 285 with an independent effect of the presence of a retirement home (aTRR=1.07 [1.04-1.09]) and of the
 286 elderly age profile (aTRR=1.11 [1.06 to 1.15]), with “families” age profile as the reference class (Table
 287 1). LPA and number of primary healthcare professionals showed non-linear relationships with testing

288 rate ratio (Table 1). For lower values of both variables, an increase was associate with a strong increase
 289 in aTRR. For LPA above 3 general practitioner consultations per inhabitant and per year, no additional
 290 effect on the aTRR was observed, while for IRIS with >10 primary healthcare practitioners, the increase
 291 of aTRR associated with supplementary practitioners was limited.

292 **Table 1: Adjusted factors associated with SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 cumulative testing rate between 22**
 293 **July and 29 October 2020: multivariate model results for period 1. See Table S3 for univariate results.**

Variable	Adjusted testing rate ratio (aTRR)	95% confidence interval	p-value
Retirement home presence	1.07	1.04-1.09	<10 ⁻⁶
IRIS sociodemographic profile			
Privileged	1	reference	
Remote	0.92	0.87-0.96	0.00035
Intermediate	0.94	0.91-0.97	0.000145
Downtown	0.95	0.91-1	0.044
Deprived	0.9	0.87-0.93	<10 ⁻⁶
Very deprived	0.79	0.74-0.83	<10 ⁻⁶
IRIS age profile			
Families	1	reference	
Young adults	1.03	0.99-1.07	0.151
Balanced	1.06	1.03-1.1	5.10 ⁻⁵
Elderly	1.11	1.06-1.15	<10 ⁻⁶
LPA (municipality level)	Log (aTRR)		6.10 ⁻⁶
Number of primary healthcare professionals (IRIS level)			<10 ⁻⁶



294

295


296 Comparison of COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2 testing rates across socio-demographic profiles 297 and periods

298 After adjusting for structural indicators of access to healthcare (LPA and number of primary healthcare
299 practitioners) and spatial autocorrelation, “remote” and “intermediate” IRIS exhibited only limited
300 gaps in SARS-CoV-2 testing rates compared to “privileged” IRIS (Figure 5A). “Intermediate” IRIS had
301 higher testing rates compared to “remote” IRIS, with a parallel dynamic.

302 Likewise, “downtown” IRIS did not have significantly lower aTRR except during period 3 and 10,
303 corresponding to Christmas 2020 and 2021 periods (Figure 5A). On the other hand, aTRR were
304 consistently lower for “deprived” IRIS (except during lockdown period 2) and for “very deprived” Sus
305 (during all periods). The lowest differences (approximately 15%) between “privileged” and “very
306 deprived” profiles were observed for periods 7 and 8 after health pass implementation. But in spite of
307 massively available tests, periods 9 and 10 exhibited a sharp drop of testing in “deprived” and “very
308 deprived” as compared to the “privileged” IRIS (Figure 5A).

309 The effect of the presence of a retirement home waned over the different periods (Figure 5B). The
310 effect of age profile also changed gradually from early periods: elderly profile IRIS had higher testing
311 than the family IRIS reference during early periods, and young adults profile IRIS had lower testing rate
312 in the last two periods (Figure 5C).

313 The effect of LPA remained similar across periods, reaching a plateau around 2.5-3 available consults
314 per inhabitant and per year (Figure S5). The effects associated to the number of primary healthcare
315 professionals were more heterogeneous, with strongly non-linear shapes during the three “rising
316 wave” periods 1, 7, 10 (Figure S6).



317
 318 **Figure 5: Forest plots of adjusted testing rate ratios (aTRR) across all 10 periods: (A) changing**
 319 **patterns between socio-demographic profiles (reference class, “privileged” profile); (B) decreasing**
 320 **effect of retirement homes over time; and (C) changing patterns according to age profiles (reference**
 321 **class, “family” profile).**

322 We conducted a sensitivity analysis replacing municipality-level LPA by IRIS-level distance to nearest
 323 pharmacy, which did not change the results (Figure S7). The direct analysis of EDI indicated that
 324 increasing deprivation was consistently associated with lower testing rates, but that this relationship
 325 was not linear for all periods. It also confirmed the periods of highest disparity between privileged
 326 and deprived profiles (Figures S8 and S9).

327 Discussion

328 This geo-epidemiological study analysed factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 testing rates at the finest
 329 spatial scale available in the south-eastern French region across 10 periods spanning 18 months and
 330 corresponding to political measures (lockdowns, health pass), contextual events (Christmas) and
 331 epidemic waves. Our analysis showed strong contrasts in terms of socio-demographic profiles, access
 332 to healthcare, and population structure across the different periods analysed. It suggests that
 333 individuals living in “privileged” and “downtown” spatial units (IRIS) of the main regional cities
 334 sustained high testing rates. In contrast, individuals living in “remote” and “intermediate” IRIS
 335 displayed stable, slightly lower testing levels, after taking into account their more limited access to
 336 healthcare.

337 Looking away from large metropolitan areas, “remote” and “intermediate” IRIS presented parallel
 338 dynamics. While they exhibited only marginal differences in terms of income or EDI, and largely
 339 corresponded to rural areas, “intermediate” IRIS extended from rural to suburban areas with a higher
 340 population density and a better access to care (LPA and basic care professionals), whereas “remote”
 341 IRIS corresponded to smaller villages with low density, aging population, far from health services.

342 IRIS in “deprived” and “very deprived” profiles exhibited lower testing rates compared to “privileged”
343 IRIS. Contextual testing periods (Christmas, periods 3 and 10) led to increasingly large testing gaps.
344 Requirement of a health pass to access specific activities led to drastic testing increases in urban
345 populations. However, the following period ending convenience test gratuity for unvaccinated
346 asymptomatic individuals was associated with a dramatic drop in testing rates, mainly within
347 “deprived” and “very deprived” areas, aggravating the underestimation of incidence rates.

348 Indeed, our results underline how testing disparities could affect the local monitoring of the epidemic:
349 the highest incidence rates were recorded in “deprived”, “very deprived” and “privileged” profiles,
350 however the epidemic situation could only be interpreted in the light of the much larger
351 underestimation of cases in IRIS with higher levels of deprivation.

352 We studied drivers of SARS-CoV-2 testing at the finest spatial scale available in France, IRIS (or “IRIS”
353 in French). We benefited from a wealth of contextual data provided by the French national census.
354 Combining multiple data sources to characterize IRIS beyond population density, we could adjust for
355 the general access to healthcare using different variables, and for the presence of elderly populations
356 most likely to receive tests in the first periods before generalized vaccination. Presence of elderly
357 populations was associated with a specific risk increase until the vaccination campaign reached
358 sufficient coverage (period 5, ending in April 2021).

359 Access to healthcare is difficult to estimate at the IRIS level. Using a municipality-level localized
360 potential accessibility (LPA) indicator may overestimate access in “very deprived” areas of
361 metropolitan cities, where gaps in public transportation may isolate specific
362 populations/neighbourhoods. On the other hand, many rural areas usually rely on the primary
363 healthcare practitioners of the nearest town. Our strategy was thus to combine a distance-driven
364 indicator (LPA or distance to pharmacy) and a presence-driven indicator (number of primary healthcare
365 practitioners). This approach also allowed us to differentiate “remote” IRIS and “intermediate” IRIS,
366 the latter showing a better access to care.

367 The IRIS-level vaccine coverage data was not available for our study, which precluded the analysis of
368 factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 incidence rate after the onset of the vaccination campaign during
369 the first quarter 2021. As a result, we could only show distinct incidence dynamics according to the
370 IRIS profile, without quantifying the contribution of respective factors. We hypothesize that higher
371 testing rates, better isolation abilities in more spacious housing, and enhanced ability to work remotely
372 could explain the earlier incidence peak in “privileged” versus “very deprived” IRIS during period 2 and
373 5. In period 8, the different dynamics for the august peak are probably linked to differential vaccine
374 coverage matching deprivation.

375 Based on our ecological approach, results excluded all individual components involved in population
376 health behaviours. The decision whether or not to get screened stems from a particular psychological
377 mechanism whose theoretical models are numerous [13] and whose determinants are not only
378 associated with social characteristics, even if they play a certain role [14]. The simple economic
379 dimension cannot by itself account for the complexity of health behaviours in the multiple dimensions
380 in which they are deployed [15]; other elements must be considered in order to better understand
381 them [16]. For example, some international studies have shown the influence of socio-cultural factors
382 on health behaviours, and argue for further exploration of these [17]. Identified barriers to COVID-19
383 testing thus also include low health literacy, low trust in the healthcare system, or stigma and
384 consequences of testing positive [18].

385 Our analysis displays stronger contrasts between most deprived and privileged areas compared to the
386 analysis conducted at national level in France during comparable periods or in Switzerland [5, 6]. It also

387 highlights the important contribution of elderly testing until April 2021. Our regional scale analysis
388 based on socio-demographic profiles rather than national quintiles (France) or deciles (Switzerland) of
389 deprivation indices allowed a precise characterization of local specific aspects : indeed, in our study
390 region >30% of IRIS belonged to the highest deprivation quintile defined at French national level,
391 respectively only 10% to the lowest quintile (Figure S10).

392 Conclusion

393 We initiated this study in support of the regional public health agency of the PACA region (South-
394 Eastern France) during the fourth quarter of 2020 to document the main drivers and inequalities in
395 testing rate in the region and to identify areas with structurally low testing rates. Specific interventions
396 (community engagement, home-visits for testing and supporting isolation efforts...) targeted these
397 areas specifically. The “very deprived” IRIS profile was included as a contextual indicator in addition to
398 weekly epidemic trends to prioritize health mediation interventions deployed by the regional health
399 agency from October 2020 to June 2022 [19]. This fine spatial scale local profiling (infra-
400 neighbourhood) is now included for general health mediation intervention projects in the city of
401 Marseille.

402 Author's contributions

403 JL and JG designed the study with contributions of SR. LB and JL collected and analysed the data with
404 support of PC, FF and SN. All authors interpreted the results. JL, SR, MKBD, and JG drafted the first
405 version of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the manuscript and reviewed the final version.

406

407 Funding source

408 This publication was supported by the grant n°22DIRA41-0 on 28 october 2022 from 2. Santé
409 Publique France (the French National Public Health agency).

410 References

- 411 1. Diez Roux A V. Social Epidemiology: Past, Present, and Future. *Annu Rev Public Health*.
412 2022;43:79–98.
- 413 2. Phelan JC, Link BG, Tehranifar P. Social Conditions as Fundamental Causes of Health Inequalities :
414 Theory , Evidence , and Policy Implications. 2010.
- 415 3. Warszawski J, Beaumont AL, Seng R, Lamballerie X De, Rahib D, Lydié N, et al. Prevalence of SARS -
416 Cov - 2 antibodies and living conditions : the French national random population - based EPICOV
417 cohort. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2022;22:1–13.
- 418 4. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al.
419 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological
420 study. *Lancet*. 2020;396:535–44.
- 421 5. Riou J, Panczak R, Althaus CL, Junker C, Perisa D, Schneider K, et al. Articles Socioeconomic position
422 and the COVID-19 care cascade from testing to mortality in Switzerland : a population-based analysis.
423 *Lancet Public Heal*. 2021;6:e683–91.
- 424 6. Vandentorren S, Smaïli S, Chatignoux E, Maurel M, Alleaume C, Neufcourt L, et al. Articles The
425 effect of social deprivation on the dynamic of SARS-CoV-2 infection in France : a population-based
426 analysis.
- 427 7. Rey G, Jouglu E, Fouillet A, Hémon D. Ecological association between a deprivation index and
428 mortality in France over the period 1997 – 2001 : variations with spatial scale , degree of urbanicity ,
429 age , gender and cause of death. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:1–12.
- 430 8. Pernet C, Delpierre C, Dejardin O, Grosclaude P, Launay L, Guittet L, et al. Construction of an
431 adaptable European transnational ecological deprivation index : the French version. *J Epidemiol*
432 *Community Heal*. 2012;;982–9.
- 433 9. Gaudart J, Landier J, Huiart L, Legendre E, Lehot L, Bendiane MK, et al. Factors associated with the
434 spatial heterogeneity of the first wave of COVID-19 in France: a nationwide geo-epidemiological
435 study. *Lancet Public Heal*. 2021;6:e222–31.
- 436 10. Lê S, Josse J, Husson F. FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis. *J Stat Softw*.
437 2008;25:1–18.
- 438 11. Textor J, van der Zander B, Gilthorpe MS, Liškiewicz M, Ellison GT. Robust causal inference using
439 directed acyclic graphs: The R package “dagitty.” *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016;45:1887–94.
- 440 12. Wood SN. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*, Second Edition. CRC Press.
441 Chapman & Hall; 2017.
- 442 13. Saulle R, Sinopoli A, De Paula Baer A, Mannocci A, Marino M, de Belvis AG, et al. The precede-
443 proceed model as a tool in public health screening: A systematic review. *Clin Ter*. 2020;171:E167–77.
- 444 14. Chorley AJ, Marlow LAV, Forster AS, Haddrell JB, Waller J. Experiences of cervical screening and
445 barriers to participation in the context of an organised programme: a systematic review and thematic
446 synthesis. *Psychooncology*. 2017;26:161–72.
- 447 15. Travert AS, Annerstedt K, Daivadanam M. Built environment and health behaviors:
448 Deconstructing the black box of interactions—a review of reviews. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
449 2019;16.
- 450 16. Assari S, Khoshpouri P, Chalian H. Combined effects of race and socioeconomic status on cancer
451 beliefs, cognitions, and emotions. *Healthc*. 2019;7:30–6.

- 452 17. Milstein G, Palitsky R, Cuevas A. The religion variable in community health promotion and illness
453 prevention. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1085235220191617519>. 2019;48:1–6.
- 454 18. Embrett M, Sim SM, Caldwell HAT, Boulos L, Yu Z, Agarwal G, et al. Barriers to and strategies to
455 address COVID-19 testing hesitancy: a rapid scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22:1–10.
- 456 19. Franke F, Nauleau S, Landier J, Chaud P, Ramdani A, Gravier R, et al. [COVID-19 hotspots project:
457 designing epidemiological surveillance for targeted intervention](french). *Rev Epidemiol Sante*
458 *Publique*. 2022;70:S168.