

1 **Gender/Sex Disparities in the COVID-19 Cascade from Testing to Mortality: An** 2 **Intersectional Analysis of Swiss Surveillance Data**

3 Diane Auderset^{*1,2}, Michaël Amiguet³, Carole Clair², Valérie Pittet³, Julien Riou³, Joëlle Schwarz²
4 & Yolanda Mueller¹

5 ***Corresponding author**

6 ¹ Department of Family Medicine, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté),
7 University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

8 ² Gender and Health Unit, Department of Ambulatory Care, Centre for Primary Care and Public
9 Health (Unisanté), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

10 ³ Department of Epidemiology and Health Systems, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health
11 (Unisanté), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

12

13 **ABSTRACT**

14 **Objectives** This study investigates gender and sex disparities in COVID-19 epidemiology in the
15 Canton of Vaud, Switzerland, focusing on the interplay with socioeconomic position (SEP) and
16 age.

17 **Methods** We analyzed COVID-19 surveillance data from March 2020 to June 2021, using an
18 intersectional approach. Negative binomial regression models assessed disparities between
19 women and men, across SEP quintiles and age groups, in testing, positivity, hospitalizations, ICU
20 admissions, and mortality (Incidence Rate Ratios [IRR], with 95% Confidence Intervals [CI]).

21 **Results** Women had higher testing and positivity rates than men, while men experienced more
22 hospitalizations, ICU admissions, and deaths. The higher positivity in women under 50 was
23 mitigated when accounting for their higher testing rates. Within SEP quintiles, gender/sex
24 differences in testing and positivity were not significant. In the lowest quintile, women's mortality
25 risk was 68% lower (Q1: IRR 0.32, CI 0.20-0.52), with decreasing disparities with increasing SEP
26 quintiles (Q5: IRR 0.66, CI 0.41-1.06).

27 **Conclusion** Our findings underscore the complex epidemiological patterns of COVID-19, shaped
28 by the interactions of gender/sex, SEP, and age, highlighting the need for intersectional
29 perspectives in both epidemiological research and public health strategy development.

30 **Keywords (5-8)** *COVID-19 epidemiology; Gender and sex; Social determinants of health;*
31 *Intersectionality; Public health strategy*

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32 INTRODUCTION

33 The COVID-19 pandemic has had heterogeneous impacts, with certain populations being
34 disproportionately affected. The literature on COVID-19 indicates that socioeconomically
35 disadvantaged groups face higher risks of contracting the virus and experiencing severe
36 outcomes such as hospitalization and mortality (1-5). This risk is linked to socioeconomic
37 determinants, where limited income and education create conditions that elevate exposure risk
38 and susceptibility to infection (1). In many countries, studies have highlighted socioeconomic
39 disparities in the COVID-19 cascade, both nationally (5-8) and regionally (4, 9), indicating that
40 neighborhood-level socioeconomic vulnerability shapes these disparities (10). Additionally,
41 substantial gender differences, particularly in labor and family domains, impact individuals
42 throughout their lifespan, contributing to gendered socioeconomic inequalities that affect health
43 (11).

44 Globally, men were more likely to develop severe forms of COVID-19, resulting in higher
45 hospitalizations and mortality rates compared to women (12-18). The origins and pathways of
46 these disparities are rooted in a complex interplay of gender-specific social processes and sex-
47 related biological attributes. Gender, as a major social determinant, shapes life experiences and
48 health outcomes through systematic differences in roles, responsibilities, access to power, and
49 opportunities between women and men (19, 20). Gender inequalities in health arise from the
50 intricate interaction of multiple factors, including differential exposure to health risks, health-
51 related behaviors, access to healthcare, and gender biases in healthcare and research (19, 21).
52 Exploring gender and sex reveals nuanced pathways impacting the COVID-19 progression from
53 testing rates to mortality. Gender affects individuals' health behaviors, access to healthcare,
54 occupational exposures, and adherence to public health measures, thereby potentially affecting
55 COVID-19 exposure, testing rates, positivity, and the burden of disease (15, 22-25). Conversely,
56 sex-related differences, such as immune responses and hormone levels, primarily influence
57 susceptibility, severity, and mortality rates of COVID-19 (13, 26, 27). Studies suggest that
58 hormones like oestrogens and progesterone, typically higher in women, offer protection against
59 viral infections, whereas testosterone, predominant in men, may have the opposite effect (28, 29).
60 Additionally, men often exhibit higher ACE-2 receptor levels, used by SARS-CoV-2 to enter cells,
61 potentially explaining the more severe infection cases (26, 28, 30).

62 The significant variations in the influence of gender and sex across socioeconomic conditions and
63 over the lifespan underscore the importance of intersectional approaches to deepen our
64 understanding of COVID-19 epidemiology (28, 31). Building on Kimberlé Crenshaw's work, the
65 concept of intersectionality emerges as a critical framework that clarifies the complex and
66 multifaceted nature of individual experiences, such as their health, shaped by various forms of

67 oppression, including class and gender inequalities (32). An intersectional perspective highlights
68 the intricate ways in which socially constructed categories—rooted in structural power relations—
69 intersect at multiple levels, often independently or simultaneously, to produce nuanced layers of
70 disadvantage (19, 32, 33). It helps to move beyond the consideration of isolated risk factors (34)
71 and focuses on identifying modifiable cause for health inequalities, offering major insights for
72 formulating equitable public health policies and interventions (35).

73 This study analyzes surveillance data from the canton of Vaud, located in the southwestern part
74 of Switzerland within the French-speaking region. As one of Switzerland's larger cantons by
75 population and area, it encompasses diverse urban and rural settings, representing approximately
76 one-tenth of the national population. The primary objective is to explore gender and sex disparities
77 in the COVID-19 epidemiology cascade, from testing to mortality, including test positivity,
78 hospitalization, and intensive care unit (ICU) admission. We examined these disparities in the
79 context of key social determinants of health, focusing on neighborhood-based socioeconomic
80 position (SEP) and age, through an intersectional analytical approach. We aim to uncover the
81 complex dynamics underlying these disparities and enhance our understanding of COVID-19's
82 broader epidemiology. Such knowledge, by considering gender and sex influences,
83 vulnerabilities, and diverse social determinants of health is essential for developing targeted and
84 effective public health strategies to address COVID-19 and guide responses to future pandemics
85 (28).

86 **METHODS**

87 **Study design and setting**

88 This observational retrospective study analyzed COVID-19 surveillance data from March 2020 to
89 the end of June 2021 of the population residing in the canton of Vaud. The first epidemic wave in
90 Switzerland spanned from February to May 2020, characterized by low testing capacities with
91 RT-PCR tests (4, 5). The tested population primarily included symptomatic individuals, those with
92 known risk factors (e.g., people with comorbidities), and healthcare workers (4). Testing was
93 expanded on June 24, 2020, to include mildly symptomatic individuals and close contacts of
94 infected individuals, with test costs reimbursed (5). Vaccinations began in December 2020,
95 initially for vulnerable groups, and expanded with the opening of vaccination on January 11, 2021
96 (36, 37). By June 2021, 85% of those aged 75 or older, and 53% of those aged 18 to 49 had
97 received at least one vaccine dose (38).

98 **Data**

99 Within the Swiss federal state, the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) oversees the
100 monitoring of transmissible diseases, including COVID-19, in collaboration with cantonal

101 authorities, through mandatory reporting of infectious diseases (36). Entities authorized to
102 conduct SARS-CoV-2 testing (RT-PCR and rapid antigen tests), such as general practitioners,
103 pharmacies, and testing centers, had to notify each test (negative and positive) to the FOPH.
104 Hospitalizations (lasting at least 24 hours) and ICU admissions due to COVID-19 were reported
105 by hospitals. Probable or confirmed COVID-19-related deaths were reported to cantonal health
106 authorities (see Supplementary Table S1 for case definitions). Population data as of December
107 31, 2020, were obtained from the cantonal office of statistics (39). The SEP of notified individuals
108 was determined using the Swiss-SEP, an area-based indicator (40, 41). Detailed information on
109 the geocoding procedures is provided in Supplementary Section 2.

110 The study period spanned 69 weeks from March 2, 2020 (first notified cases in Vaud canton), to
111 June 27, 2021, marking the cessation of the cantonal hospital's surveillance system. Due to
112 inconsistent negative test reporting prior to May 24, 2020, the dataset for the total number of tests
113 was limited to the period from May 27, 2020, to June 27, 2021, covering a span of 57 weeks.
114 Notifications included the date, test result (positive, negative), date of birth or age, and residential
115 address. Additionally, the gender/sex of each individual was recorded. For hospitalization, death,
116 and PCR test notifications, the gender/sex indicator conformed to the administrative sex
117 categories, restricted to female or male in Switzerland. In contrast, rapid antigenic tests included
118 an "other" option alongside "women" and "men", acknowledging non-binary gender identities.
119 Consequently, we refer to this variable as "gender/sex" throughout our analysis. Duplicated
120 notifications, records with invalid residential addresses, and those missing age or gender/sex
121 information were excluded. Additionally, notifications with "other" as gender/sex (0.001% of total
122 tests) were excluded. Age was grouped into eight categories of 10-year age bands and 80 and
123 above. For hospitalizations, ICU admissions, and deaths, ages 0 to 59 years were combined due
124 to low number of events in this age range.

125 **The Swiss socio-economic position (Swiss-SEP)**

126 The Swiss-SEP, an area-based socio-economic position index centered on each residential
127 building and incorporating neighborhood information from the surrounding 50 households, was
128 developed by the Swiss National Cohort (41) (detailed in Supplementary Section 3). The Swiss-
129 SEP index, derived through principal component analysis, aggregates neighborhood-level data
130 from the 2000 census and 2012-2015 annual micro-census. This index utilizes key indicators as
131 proxies for SEP: median rent per square meter (income proxy), proportion of households led by
132 individuals with a primary education or less (education proxy), proportion of households headed
133 by individuals in manual or unskilled jobs (occupation proxy), and the average number of persons
134 per room (crowding proxy). The index scores range from 0 to 100, with higher values indicating

135 higher SEP (40). There are 115 596 SEP neighborhoods within the geographical boundaries of
136 Vaud canton.

137 Residential coordinates of each notification were matched with the nearest SEP neighborhood,
138 and SEP index values were categorized into quintiles from one (lowest) to five (highest). Non-
139 residential addresses, such as schools or nursing homes, and addresses with only ZIP code
140 information, were assigned the average SEP of their ZIP code area. Regarding total and positive
141 test notifications, 94% and 92% respectively, were successfully geocoded, thus assigned an
142 address-based SEP (See Supplementary Table 4). However, notifications for hospitalization and
143 ICU admission, that contained only ZIP code information, did not receive a SEP assignment due
144 to the method of assigning average SEP scores to ZIP code areas, which tends to centralize
145 distribution around mean values, thereby reducing variability at the extremes of the SEP quintiles.
146 Death notifications that could not be geocoded (39%) were likewise excluded from analyses
147 requiring SEP attribution, due to similar concerns regarding the accuracy of SEP assignment.

148 **Statistical analysis**

149 The distribution of notifications stratified by gender/sex, across age groups, and SEP quintiles
150 were described. Incidence rates of tests, positive tests, hospitalizations, ICU admissions, and
151 deaths were calculated weekly per 100 000 persons, stratified by gender/sex categories.
152 Cumulative incidence rates over the study period were similarly computed. Negative binomial
153 regression models were used to examine the incidence rate ratios (IRR) with 95% confidence
154 intervals (CIs) between women and men, with interaction terms between sex/gender and age
155 groups and between SEP quintiles. These models, which can handle overdispersion of residuals,
156 included denominators as offsets, with corresponding age and sex structure of the general
157 population as of December 31, 2020, serving as the base for all outcomes. Specifically for positive
158 tests, an additional negative binomial model using the total number of tests as the denominator
159 was formulated to investigate gender/sex-specific test positivity ratios. A similar methodology was
160 applied for ICU admissions, with hospitalizations serving as the offset. Sensitivity analyses were
161 conducted on death notifications, incorporating notifications from institutional locations, followed
162 by a comprehensive analysis of all death notifications, including those not precisely geocoded.
163 Statistical analyses were conducted using R statistical software (42), and negative binomial
164 models estimated using the MASS package (43).

165 **Data reporting standards**

166 This research aligns with the Sex and Gender Equity in Research (SAGER) guidelines, which
167 advocate for systematic integration of sex and gender considerations into research design,
168 analysis, and reporting (44). Consequently, we will discuss the sex and/or gender-related
169 mechanisms potentially influencing the findings reported within the context of Switzerland. In this

170 paper, the term “gender/sex” is used to acknowledge the complex interplay between these
171 concepts from a theoretical perspective (45). This terminology effectively reflects the varied
172 nature of surveillance data analyzed, where the indicator might represent either administrative
173 sex or gender identity, depending on the notification type. From a methodological standpoint,
174 gender/sex acts as a proxy capturing both gender-related aspects (e.g., behaviors) and sex-
175 related biological factors (e.g., hormonal differences), which may impact the outcomes studied.

176

177 **RESULTS**

178

[Table 1 – descriptive statistics]

179 By the end of 2020, Vaud population was 815 300, comprising 412 599 women (50.6%) and 402
180 701 men (49.4%) (Table 1). From March 2020 to June 2021, a total of 885 925 SARS-CoV-2
181 tests, 96 963 positive tests, 6 356 hospitalizations, 1 134 ICU admissions and 1 175 deaths
182 (before excluding non-geocoded death notifications) were notified and met eligibility criteria (see
183 Supplementary Figure 5). Although women had more tests and positive results, the majority of
184 hospitalizations, ICU admissions, and deaths occurred among men.

185 In the canton of Vaud, 38% of women and 34% of men were aged 50 and above. Among women,
186 this age group accounted for 33% of all tests and 38% of positive tests, but represented 80% of
187 hospitalizations, 89% of ICU admissions, and 99.8% of deaths. Likewise, men aged 50 and older
188 accounted for 32% of tests, 39% of positive tests, 86% of hospitalizations, 91% of ICU
189 admissions, and 99.4% of deaths.

190 For total tests, 17% of women and 18% of men were in the lowest socioeconomic quintile (Q1),
191 while 21% of tests for both women and men occurred in the highest quintile (Q5). Regarding
192 positive tests, 21% for women and 20% for men were recorded in Q1, with 18% in Q5 for both. In
193 terms of mortality, 18% of men who died were in Q1, and 14% in Q5. Among women, 12% of
194 deaths occurred in Q1 and 15% in Q5.

195

[Fig. 1 – Weekly incidence rate overtime]

196 The weekly incidence of outcomes per 100 000 showed distinct patterns between women and
197 men throughout the study period (Figure 1). Women had higher incidence rate of tests and
198 positive tests compared to men, especially during the second wave of the pandemic. In contrast,
199 men had higher incidence rates of hospitalizations and ICU admissions throughout the study
200 period, though the disparity in mortality rates was less pronounced. During the third wave, while
201 testing rates peaked, both severe outcomes and positivity rates were comparatively lower.

202

[Fig. 2 – Cumulative incidence across SEP and age groups]

203 The cumulative incidences of outcomes across age groups, gender/sex categories, and SEP
204 quintiles revealed distinct patterns (Figure 2). Individuals aged 20 to 39 were the most tested
205 group, whereas children under 10 were the least tested. Testing rates were higher for people
206 aged 80 and above compared to those aged 60-69 and 70-79. Similar patterns emerged across
207 age groups concerning positivity. For severe outcomes, prominent age-related trends were
208 observed, with older age groups experiencing higher incidence rates, though ICU admission were
209 less frequent among those aged 80 and above. Men experienced higher incidence rates of
210 hospitalization, ICU admission, and death than women.

211 In terms of SEP quintiles (Figure 2, panel B), the cumulative incidence of testing progressively
212 increased from Q1 to Q5. For the cumulative incidence of positive tests, the three lowest SEP
213 quintiles (Q1-Q3) showed similar rates, with lower rates observed in the two highest quintiles (Q4-
214 Q5). A consistent trend was observed, with women having higher cumulative incidence of both
215 tests and positive tests across all quintiles, except in Q5 where the positivity incidence was
216 comparable between women and men. For death notifications, men's cumulative mortality rate
217 appeared to decrease from Q1 to Q5, whereas for women, the mortality rate was lowest in Q1
218 and Q4. Men displayed higher mortality rates across all SEP quintiles, except in Q2.

219 **[Fig. 3 – IRR of tests and positive tests]**

220 Regression analyses demonstrated distinct testing patterns between women and men across age
221 groups. Notably, women aged 20-29 (IRR 1.14, CI 1.07-1.22) and 30-39 (IRR 1.16, CI 1.09-1.24)
222 displayed a significantly higher likelihood of undergoing testing compared to men in the same age
223 groups (Figure 3, left panel). Conversely, girls under 10 (IRR 0.91, CI 0.85-0.97) and women aged
224 60-69 (IRR 0.92, CI 0.86-0.98) and 70-79 (IRR 0.85, CI 0.80-0.91) were less likely to get tested
225 compared to their male counterparts. For incidence of positive tests per population, similar
226 gender/sex trends were observed across age groups (Figure 3, center panel). However, these
227 trends were not apparent when adjusting for the initial gender/sex differences in testing, as
228 indicated by the regression results of positive tests per test (Figure 3, right panel). An exception
229 was observed among individuals aged 60 and older, where women were less likely to test positive
230 per test compared to men. Specifically, women had an IRR of 0.92 in the 60-69 age group (CI
231 0.86-0.98), 0.89 in the 70-79 age group (CI 0.82-0.95), and 0.83 among those aged 80 and older
232 (CI 0.86-1.00), indicating a lower likelihood of a positive result when tested. Moreover, when
233 comparing women and men in similar SEP quintiles (Figure 3, red coefficients), no statistically
234 significant differences in testing and positive testing rates were found, except for women in Q3
235 who presented a slightly reduced probability of testing positive per test compared to their male
236 counterparts.

237 In regression models without an interaction term for gender/sex categories (Supplementary Table
238 6), individuals in Q5 were notably more likely to undergo testing (IRR 1.25, CI 1.19-1.30)
239 compared to those in Q1. Conversely, individuals in Q5 showed a decreased likelihood of testing
240 positive per person (IRR 0.89, CI 0.85-0.95) and testing positive per test (IRR 0.71, CI 0.68-0.74).

241 **[Fig. 4 – IRR of hospitalisations]**

242 Age was the strongest predictor for hospitalisations, ICU admissions and deaths, increasing age
243 being associated with higher likelihoods of these events, as shown by the regression analysis in
244 models without an interaction term by gender/sex (Supplementary Table 6). Analyzing the
245 interaction of gender/sex with age (Figure 4, Panel A), women exhibited lower probabilities of
246 COVID-19 hospitalization than men across all age cohorts, although the differences were not
247 statistically significant. The IRR for women up to 59 was 0.80 (CI 0.52-1.22), 0.49 (CI 0.18-1.36)
248 for those 60-69, 0.50 (CI 0.18-1.38) for the 70-79 age group, and 0.58 (CI 0.21-1.61) for those 80
249 and above. Statistical significance was achieved for ICU admissions in the under-60 cohort, where
250 women had a 55% decreased risk (IRR 0.45, CI 0.23-0.86). Women consistently showed a lower
251 risk of ICU admissions compared to men when hospitalized (figure 4, Panel B). Women under 60
252 presented an IRR of 0.59 (CI 0.44-0.78), denoting a 41% lower risk. In the 60-69 age group, the
253 IRR was 0.71 (CI 0.49-1.01), with the risk reduction becoming more pronounced with advancing
254 age. Women aged 70-79 had an IRR of 0.62 (CI 0.43-0.88), while those aged 80 and over had
255 an IRR of 0.56 (CI 0.37-0.85), mirroring the risk reduction observed in the youngest age group.

256 **[Fig. 5 – IRR of deaths]**

257 Regarding mortality, individuals in Q5 had a lower likelihood of death (IRR 0.71, CI 0.54-0.95)
258 compared to those in Q1, as indicated by the regression models without a gender/sex interaction
259 term (Supplementary Table 6). This association between SEP and death persisted in the
260 sensitivity analysis that included nursing home residents and remained robust when extended to
261 include non-precisely geocoded death notifications (Supplementary material S7). Lower mortality
262 rates among women were noted across all age groups (figure 5). Women demonstrated a reduced
263 mortality risk compared to men of 55% at ages 60-69 (IRR 0.45, CI 0.23-0.88), 58% at ages 70-
264 79 (IRR 0.42, CI 0.30-0.59), and 45% for those aged 80 and above (IRR 0.55, CI 0.46-0.66).
265 Regarding SEP, the gender/sex disparities in mortality were more pronounced in Q1, with women
266 having a 68% reduction in mortality risk (IRR 0.32, CI 0.20-0.52); and these disparities were not
267 statistically significant in Q2 and Q5. Exploring the combined effects of gender/sex, age, and SEP
268 on mortality among older groups (70-79 and 80+), a triple interaction term was employed
269 (Supplementary Figure S8). Our findings indicate a reduction in gender/sex mortality disparities
270 with increasing SEP, as the IRR tends toward unity from the lowest to highest quintiles.

271 **DISCUSSION**

272 In the resident population of the Canton of Vaud, Switzerland, women contributed to a higher
273 number of COVID-19 tests and positive tests than men, whereas more hospitalizations, ICU
274 admissions, and deaths occurred among men. This finding underscores a pronounced
275 gender/sex disparity in the pandemic's health impact, highlighting the need to explore underlying
276 causes, such as potential biological differences, gender-specific behavioral patterns, and
277 occupational exposures.

278 Individuals residing in the highest SEP neighborhoods underwent more COVID-19 testing than
279 those in the lowest SEP areas, accompanied by a lower likelihood of testing positive and a
280 reduced risk of mortality. These observations suggest significant socio-economic influences on
281 health-related behaviors and resource accessibility and utilization. Notably, our intersectional
282 analysis revealed that these disparities in testing and positivity rates are consistent across women
283 and men within similar SEP quintiles. Moreover, the gender/sex disparities in mortality across
284 SEP quintiles highlight the intricate interplay between socioeconomic factors and gender/sex,
285 reinforcing the value of an intersectional approach in uncovering nuanced aspects of COVID-19
286 epidemiology.

287 Moreover, age-related variations in SARS-CoV-2 testing rates between women and men were
288 evident in our data. Women aged 20-29 and 30-39 had higher testing rates than men in
289 corresponding age groups, whereas this trend reversed in the younger (<20) and older age
290 groups (60-69 and 70-79), echoing trends observed in other European countries (46). These
291 variations illustrate a complex relationship between age, gender/sex, and health-seeking
292 behavior, calling for further investigations.

293 Age is a key factor in understanding COVID-19 gender/sex disparities. The influence of gender
294 norms on health outcomes varies across the life course (19, 28, 31), and the disparities in testing
295 rates between men and women across different age groups likely reflect the evolving societal
296 roles and responsibilities (47). In the 20 to 40 age range, where gender differences in testing were
297 most pronounced, marked distinctions in family and employment domains are generally observed.
298 Women are more likely to work in essential service sectors involving close contacts and limited
299 telecommuting options, such as in service and healthcare jobs (47-50), which may account for
300 their higher testing rates. Yet, this potential increased exposure did not translate into higher
301 positivity rates when accounting for initial differences in testing, possibly attributable to greater
302 adherence to health recommendations and protective measures among women compared to men
303 (23, 26, 29, 49, 51). Additionally, women in this age group often bear a disproportionate burden
304 of unpaid care responsibilities, likely influencing their decisions regarding COVID-19 testing (29,
305 52). The observed higher testing rates in men aged 60 and above may be attributed to the

306 preferential ascertainment of severe cases (53), where individuals who are more likely, or
307 perceived as more likely—due to early widely reported higher mortality rates in men—, to suffer
308 from severe forms of infection tend to get tested more frequently. Although the ratios of positive
309 tests were generally similar, women aged 60 and above were significantly less likely to test
310 positive per test conducted compared to their male counterparts, highlighting possible differences
311 in exposure.

312 Our study corroborates the well-established correlation between age and severe COVID-19
313 outcomes, with older age associated with an increased risk of hospitalization, ICU admissions,
314 and mortality. Additionally, our data confirm that men face a higher risk of severe outcomes
315 compared to women, aligning with previous research (54-56). Notably, women under the age of
316 60 and those aged 70 and above had a reduced risk of ICU admissions when hospitalized,
317 suggesting possible variations in immune system responses, prevalence of comorbidities, health-
318 seeking behaviors, or differences in treatment approaches between women and men.

319 Our findings are consistent with existing literature on the link between SEP and COVID-19
320 outcomes (1-5), highlighting the increased vulnerability of individuals residing in low SEP
321 neighborhoods. This vulnerability stems from a combination of factors, including limited access to
322 healthcare, higher exposure risks due to living and working conditions, occupational hazards, and
323 lifestyle habits, coupled with higher comorbidities rates (57). Previous studies show that those in
324 lower SEP areas experienced lower testing rates—particularly pronounced in the pandemic's early
325 stages—and faced elevated rates of case incidence, hospitalizations, and mortality, a trend
326 reported globally (1-5, 9, 58-60).

327 As extensively documented in the literature and corroborated by our findings, men experienced
328 higher mortality rates related to COVID-19 compared to women (12, 13, 15-17, 23, 29, 61). Our
329 results outlined gender/sex disparities in mortality across SEP quintiles, particularly marked in the
330 lowest SEP neighborhoods. This suggests that men from socioeconomically deprived
331 backgrounds may encounter cumulative disadvantages that amplify their health vulnerabilities
332 throughout their lives (62). Biological sex-related factors are thought to play a significant role in
333 men's increased vulnerability to COVID-19, possibly mediated through hormonal and immune
334 response (29, 50). Mortality is also influenced by gendered practices and societal norms such as
335 expressions of masculinity, which intersect with various social determinants of health (50). These
336 include working in hazardous industries, engagement in risky health behaviors, and maintaining
337 lifestyles that lead to higher prevalences of chronic diseases (26, 28, 29, 63, 64), which are more
338 common in socioeconomically disadvantaged populations (58). Beyond age, pre-existing medical
339 conditions such as obesity, diabetes, or chronic respiratory and cardiovascular diseases have
340 been described as major contributors to COVID-19 severity (65). Comparatively riskier health

341 behaviors among men, such as smoking, excessive alcohol consumption, and unhealthy diets,
342 combined with societal norms that valorize toughness and discourage timely medical care, are
343 thought to contribute to their health vulnerabilities (16, 19, 26). Our findings align with existing
344 studies using an intersectional framework, which are notably concentrated in the US and often
345 emphasize ethnic/racial disparities alongside gender/sex, though not always directly correlating
346 these with socioeconomic class distinctions. Notably, a US study found that Black women
347 experienced higher mortality rates than White men, while Black men had the highest mortality
348 rates (66). Another study exploring the combined effects of gender, SEP, and race/ethnicity
349 revealed that, compared to high SEP White women, low SEP White men experienced a mortality
350 rate 7.4 times higher, and 1.5 times higher compared to women in low SEP. Meanwhile, low SEP
351 Hispanic men faced the most significant disparity, with mortality rates 27 times higher than those
352 of high SEP White women (67).

353 Our study's strengths include the use of a neighborhood-based SEP indicator to capture potential
354 individual and local-level effects on outcomes, and the minimization of selection bias by using
355 comprehensive surveillance data for the entire Canton of Vaud population. Although Vaud was
356 heavily impacted during the early stages of the pandemic, its diverse rural and urban population
357 profiles provide valuable insights that may reflect broader trends in Switzerland, despite some
358 regional variations. However, our analysis is limited by the absence of data on key individual-level
359 factors such as migration background status and ethnicity. Incorporating these factors could
360 greatly enrich our understanding, especially given that approximately one-third of Vaud's
361 population in 2020 held non-Swiss nationality (39), and ethnic minorities faced higher exposure
362 and vulnerability to COVID-19 (60, 66, 68). Furthermore, disentangling the sources of disparities
363 between gender and sex is methodologically challenging when using administrative sex to
364 investigate women's and men's health outcomes. Nevertheless, our intersectional approach
365 facilitated the development of hypotheses about gendered mechanisms, which extend beyond
366 the traditional biological interpretations common in biomedical research. Another limitation
367 concerns hospitalization and ICU admission data, which may be subject to underreporting due to
368 challenges associated with identifying primary causes of hospitalization, especially among older
369 adults with comorbidities (69). Moreover, deaths occurring outside clinical settings frequently
370 remain untested, complicating their classification as COVID-19 related (69, 70). Additionally, the
371 reliance on residence location for the Swiss-SEP indicator may not accurately reflect an
372 individual's lifelong SEP, a common challenge with area-based indicators (71).

373 **Conclusion**

374 Our study within the Canton of Vaud highlighted the significant interplay of gender/sex, age, and
375 SEP in shaping the epidemiology COVID-19. The intersectional analyses have revealed nuanced

376 disparities, notably the increased risk of mortality in men, particularly those from lower SEP
377 neighborhoods. While no substantial gender/sex differences in testing outcomes were observed
378 across SEP quintiles, important age-related variation emerged, with young adult women
379 experiencing higher testing rates. These findings underscore the importance of adopting
380 intersectional approaches in both epidemiological research and public health strategy
381 development. Such approaches are necessary for developing more effective and equitable health
382 responses.

383

384

385

386

387

388 References

- 389 1. Laajaj R, Webb D, Aristizabal D, Behrentz E, Bernal R, Buitrago G, et al. Understanding
390 how socioeconomic inequalities drive inequalities in COVID-19 infections. *Scientific Reports*.
391 (2022);12(1):8269.
- 392 2. Benita F, Rebollar-Ruelas L, Gaytán-Alfaro ED. What have we learned about
393 socioeconomic inequalities in the spread of COVID-19? A systematic review. *Sustainable Cities
394 and Society*. (2022);86:104158.
- 395 3. Vandentorren S, Smaïli S, Chatignoux E, Maurel M, Alleaume C, Neufcourt L, et al. The
396 effect of social deprivation on the dynamic of SARS-CoV-2 infection in France: a population-based
397 analysis. *The Lancet public health*. (2022);7(3):e240-e9.
- 398 4. Mongin D, Cullati S, Kelly-Irving M, Rosselet M, Regard S, Courvoisier DS.
399 Neighbourhood socio-economic vulnerability and access to COVID-19 healthcare during the first
400 two waves of the pandemic in Geneva, Switzerland: A gender perspective. *EClinicalMedicine*.
401 (2022);46:101352.
- 402 5. Riou J, Panczak R, Althaus CL, Junker C, Perisa D, Schneider K, et al. Socioeconomic
403 position and the COVID-19 care cascade from testing to mortality in Switzerland: a population-
404 based analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*. (2021);6(9):e683-e91.
- 405 6. Khazanchi R, Beiter ER, Gondi S, Beckman AL, Bilinski A, Ganguli I. County-Level
406 Association of Social Vulnerability with COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the USA. *J Gen Intern
407 Med*. (2020);35(9):2784-7.
- 408 7. Berchet C, Bijlholt J, Ando M. Socio-economic and ethnic health inequalities in COVID-19
409 outcomes across OECD countries. (2023).
- 410 8. Jassat W, Ozougwu L, Munshi S, Mudara C, Vika C, Arendse T, et al. The intersection of
411 age, sex, race and socio-economic status in COVID-19 hospital admissions and deaths in South
412 Africa (with corrigendum). *South African Journal of Science*. (2022);118(5/6).
- 413 9. Khan MM, Odoi A, Odoi EW. Geographic disparities in COVID-19 testing and outcomes
414 in Florida. *BMC Public Health*. (2023);23(1):79.
- 415 10. Tudor Hart J. THE INVERSE CARE LAW. *The Lancet*. (1971);297(7696):405-12.
- 416 11. Corna LM. A life course perspective on socioeconomic inequalities in health: A critical
417 review of conceptual frameworks. *Advances in Life Course Research*. (2013);18(2):150-9.
- 418 12. Thompson K, Vassallo A, Finfer S, Woodward M. Renewed rationale for sex-and gender-
419 disaggregated research: A COVID-19 commentary review. *Women's Health*.
420 (2022);18:17455065221076738.
- 421 13. Gebhard C, Regitz-Zagrosek V, Neuhauser HK, Morgan R, Klein SL. Impact of sex and
422 gender on COVID-19 outcomes in Europe. *Biology of Sex Differences*. (2020);11(1):29.
- 423 14. Scully EP, Schumock G, Fu M, Massaccesi G, Muschelli J, Betz J, et al. Sex and Gender
424 Differences in Testing, Hospital Admission, Clinical Presentation, and Drivers of Severe
425 Outcomes From COVID-19. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. (2021);8(9).
- 426 15. Peckham H, de Gruijter NM, Raine C, Radziszewska A, Ciurtin C, Wedderburn LR, et al.
427 Male sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ITU
428 admission. *Nature communications*. (2020);11(1):1-10.
- 429 16. Bambra C, Albani V, Franklin P. COVID-19 and the gender health paradox. *Scandinavian
430 Journal of Public Health*. (2021);49(1):17-26.
- 431 17. Sharma G, Volgman AS, Michos ED. Sex Differences in Mortality From COVID-19
432 Pandemic. *JACC: Case Reports*. (2020);2(9):1407-10.
- 433 18. Bauer GR. Sex and Gender Multidimensionality in Epidemiologic Research. *Am J
434 Epidemiol*. (2023);192(1):122-32.
- 435 19. Heise L, Greene ME, Opper N, Stavropoulou M, Harper C, Nascimento M, et al. Gender
436 inequality and restrictive gender norms: framing the challenges to health. *The Lancet*.
437 (2019);393(10189):2440-54.
- 438 20. Kaufman MR, Eschliman EL, Karver TS. Differentiating sex and gender in health research
439 to achieve gender equity. *Bull World Health Organ*. (2023);101(10):666-71.

- 440 21. Shannon G, Jansen M, Williams K, Cáceres C, Motta A, Odhiambo A, et al. Gender
441 equality in science, medicine, and global health: where are we at and why does it matter? *Lancet*.
442 (2019);393(10171):560-9.
- 443 22. Laster Pirtle WN, Wright T. Structural Gendered Racism Revealed in Pandemic Times:
444 Intersectional Approaches to Understanding Race and Gender Health Inequities in COVID-19.
445 *Gender & Society*. (2021);35(2):168-79.
- 446 23. Danielsen AC, Lee KM, Boulicault M, Rushovich T, Gompers A, Tarrant A, et al. Sex
447 disparities in COVID-19 outcomes in the United States: Quantifying and contextualizing variation.
448 *Soc Sci Med*. (2022);294:114716.
- 449 24. Clark C, Davila A, Regis M, Kraus S. Predictors of COVID-19 voluntary compliance
450 behaviors: An international investigation. *Global Transitions*. (2020);2:76-82.
- 451 25. Wenham C, Smith J, Morgan R. COVID-19: the gendered impacts of the outbreak. *The*
452 *lancet*. (2020);395(10227):846-8.
- 453 26. Ya'qoub L, Elgendy IY, Pepine CJ. Sex and gender differences in COVID-19: More to be
454 learned! *American Heart Journal Plus: Cardiology Research and Practice*. (2021);3:100011.
- 455 27. Groban L, Wang H, Sun X, Ahmad S, Ferrario CM. Is Sex a Determinant of COVID-19
456 Infection? Truth or Myth? *Current Hypertension Reports*. (2020);22(9):62.
- 457 28. Taslem Mourosi J, Anwar S, Hosen MJ. The sex and gender dimensions of COVID-19: A
458 narrative review of the potential underlying factors. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*.
459 (2022);103:105338.
- 460 29. Díaz-Rodríguez N, Binkytė R, Bakkali W, Bookseller S, Tubaro P, Bacevičius A, et al.
461 Gender and sex bias in COVID-19 epidemiological data through the lens of causality. *Information*
462 *Processing & Management*. (2023);60(3):103276.
- 463 30. Youth Repeatedly Hospitalized for DKA: Proof of Concept for Novel Interventions in
464 Children's Healthcare (NICH) | *Diabetes Care*.
- 465 31. Notarte KI, de Oliveira MHS, Peligro PJ, Velasco JV, Macaranas I, Ver AT, et al. Age, Sex
466 and Previous Comorbidities as Risk Factors Not Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection for Long
467 COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*.
468 (2022);11(24):7314.
- 469 32. Collins PH. Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*.
470 (2015);41(1):1-20.
- 471 33. Olanlesi-Aliu A, Tulli M, Kemei J, Bonifacio G, Reif LC, Cardo V, et al. A scoping review
472 on the operationalization of intersectional health research methods in studies related to the
473 COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*.
474 (2024);19(1):2302305.
- 475 34. Molenaar J. Using an intersectional lens to understand the unequal impact of the COVID-
476 19 pandemic. Bi-monthly report 5 September 2021. (2021).
- 477 35. Bauer GR. Incorporating intersectionality theory into population health research
478 methodology: Challenges and the potential to advance health equity. *Social Science & Medicine*.
479 (2014);110:10-7.
- 480 36. Giachino M, Valera CBG, Rodriguez Velásquez S, Dohrendorf-Wyss MA, Rozanova L,
481 Flahault A. Understanding the Dynamics of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Real-Time Analysis of
482 Switzerland's First Wave. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
483 (2020);17(23):8825.
- 484 37. Office fédéral de la santé publique, Commission fédérale pour les vaccinations. COVID-
485 19 : stratégie de vaccination (2022) 29.11.2022. Available from:
486 [https://www.bag.admin.ch/dam/bag/fr/dokumente/mt/k-und-i/aktuelle-ausbrueche-](https://www.bag.admin.ch/dam/bag/fr/dokumente/mt/k-und-i/aktuelle-ausbrueche-pandemien/2019-nCoV/impfstrategie-bag-ekif.pdf.download.pdf/strategie-de-vaccination-covid-19-ofsp-ekif.pdf)
487 [pandemien/2019-nCoV/impfstrategie-bag-ekif.pdf.download.pdf/strategie-de-vaccination-covid-](https://www.bag.admin.ch/dam/bag/fr/dokumente/mt/k-und-i/aktuelle-ausbrueche-pandemien/2019-nCoV/impfstrategie-bag-ekif.pdf.download.pdf/strategie-de-vaccination-covid-19-ofsp-ekif.pdf)
488 [19-ofsp-ekif.pdf](https://www.bag.admin.ch/dam/bag/fr/dokumente/mt/k-und-i/aktuelle-ausbrueche-pandemien/2019-nCoV/impfstrategie-bag-ekif.pdf.download.pdf/strategie-de-vaccination-covid-19-ofsp-ekif.pdf).
- 489 38. EPICOVID, Direction Générale de la santé (DGS), Office du médecin cantonal. COVID-
490 19: Point épidémiologique – Situation au 28 juin 2021. Available from:
491 [https://infosan.vd.ch/fileadmin/2-](https://infosan.vd.ch/fileadmin/2-PUBLICATIONS/SANTE_POPULATION/SSP_20210628_COVID_Bulletin_hebdomadaire_epidemiolo.pdf)
492 [PUBLICATIONS/SANTE_POPULATION/SSP_20210628_COVID_Bulletin_hebdomadaire_epid](https://infosan.vd.ch/fileadmin/2-PUBLICATIONS/SANTE_POPULATION/SSP_20210628_COVID_Bulletin_hebdomadaire_epidemiolo.pdf)
493 [emio.pdf](https://infosan.vd.ch/fileadmin/2-PUBLICATIONS/SANTE_POPULATION/SSP_20210628_COVID_Bulletin_hebdomadaire_epidemiolo.pdf).

- 494 39. Statistique Vaud (2020). Population résidante permanente par âge exact_ sexe et origine_
495 Vaud_ 2017-2020 [Available from: [https://www.vd.ch/themes/etat-droit-](https://www.vd.ch/themes/etat-droit-finances/statistique/statistiques-par-domaine/01-population/etat-et-structure-de-la-population)
496 [finances/statistique/statistiques-par-domaine/01-population/etat-et-structure-de-la-population](https://www.vd.ch/themes/etat-droit-finances/statistique/statistiques-par-domaine/01-population/etat-et-structure-de-la-population).
497 40. Panczak R, Berlin C, Voorpostel M, Zwahlen M, Egger M. The Swiss neighbourhood index
498 of socioeconomic position: update and re-validation. *Swiss Medical Weekly*. (2023);153(1):40028.
499 41. Panczak R, Galobardes B, Voorpostel M, Spoerri A, Zwahlen M, Egger M. A Swiss
500 neighbourhood index of socioeconomic position: development and association with mortality. *J*
501 *Epidemiol Community Health*. (2012);66(12):1129-36.
502 42. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In: *Computing*
503 *RFfS*, editor. Vienna, Austria(2022).
504 43. Ripley B, Venables B. *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Fourth ed. New York: Springer;
505 (2022).
506 44. Heidari S, Babor TF, De Castro P, Tort S, Curno M. Sex and Gender Equity in Research:
507 rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. *Res Integr Peer Rev*. (2016);1(1):2.
508 45. Fausto-Sterling A. Gender/Sex, Sexual Orientation, and Identity Are in the Body: How Did
509 They Get There? *J Sex Res*. (2019);56(4-5):529-55.
510 46. Sobotka T, Brzozowska Z, Muttarak R, Zeman K, di Lego V. Age, gender and COVID-19
511 infections. *medRxiv*. (2020):2020.05.24.20111765.
512 47. Yavorsky JE, Qian Y, Sargent AC. The gendered pandemic: The implications of COVID-
513 19 for work and family. *Sociol Compass*. (2021);15(6):e12881.
514 48. Kley S, Reimer T. Exploring the Gender Gap in Teleworking from Home. The Roles of
515 Worker's Characteristics, Occupational Positions and Gender Equality in Europe. *Social*
516 *Indicators Research*. (2023);168(1):185-206.
517 49. Sant Fruchtmann C, Fischer FB, Monzón Llamas L, Tavakkoli M, Cobos Muñoz D, Antillon
518 M. Did COVID-19 Policies Have the Same Effect on COVID-19 Incidence Among Women and
519 Men? Evidence From Spain and Switzerland. *Int J Public Health*. (2022);67:1604994.
520 50. Morgan R, Baker P, Griffith DM, Klein SL, Logie CH, Mwiine AA, et al. Beyond a zero-sum
521 game: how does the impact of COVID-19 vary by gender? *Frontiers in Sociology*. (2021):126.
522 51. Galasso V, Pons V, Profeta P, Becher M, Brouard S, Foucault M. Gender differences in
523 COVID-19 attitudes and behavior: Panel evidence from eight countries. *Proceedings of the*
524 *National Academy of Sciences*. (2020);117(44):27285-91.
525 52. Bühler N, Pralong M, Rawlinson C, Gonseth S, D'Acremont V, Bochud M, et al. Caring
526 during COVID-19: Reconfigurations of gender and family relations during the pandemic in
527 Switzerland. *Frontiers in Sociology*. (2021);6:737619.
528 53. Lipsitch M, Donnelly CA, Fraser C, Blake IM, Cori A, Dorigatti I, et al. Potential Biases in
529 Estimating Absolute and Relative Case-Fatality Risks during Outbreaks. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*.
530 (2015);9(7):e0003846.
531 54. Hawkes S, Pantazis A, Purdie A, Gautam A, Kiuwa-Muyingo S, Buse K, et al. Sex-
532 disaggregated data matters: tracking the impact of COVID-19 on the health of women and men.
533 *Econ Polit (Bologna)*. (2022);39(1):55-73.
534 55. Pivonello R, Auriemma RS, Pivonello C, Isidori AM, Corona G, Colao A, et al. Sex
535 Disparities in COVID-19 Severity and Outcome: Are Men Weaker or Women Stronger?
536 *Neuroendocrinology*. (2021);111(11):1066-85.
537 56. Scully EP, Schumock G, Fu M, Massaccesi G, Muschelli J, Betz J, et al., editors. Sex and
538 gender differences in testing, hospital admission, clinical presentation, and drivers of severe
539 outcomes from COVID-19. *Open forum infectious diseases*; 2021: Oxford University Press US;
540 (2021)Published.
541 57. Acebillo-Baqué M, Maestriperi L. Intersectionality Theory and Its Application in the
542 COVID-19 Pandemics. In: Liamputtong P, editor. *Handbook of Social Sciences and Global Public*
543 *Health*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; (2023). p. 1189-211.
544 58. McGowan VJ, Bamba C. COVID-19 mortality and deprivation: pandemic, syndemic, and
545 endemic health inequalities. *The Lancet Public Health*. (2022);7(11):e966-e75.
546 59. Bamba C. Pandemic inequalities: emerging infectious diseases and health equity.
547 *International Journal for Equity in Health*. (2022);21(1):6.

- 548 60. Khanijahani A, Iezadi S, Gholipour K, Azami-Aghdash S, Naghibi D. A systematic review
549 of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic disparities in COVID-19. *International Journal for Equity in*
550 *Health*. (2021);20(1):248.
- 551 61. Kim H, Fox AM, Kim Y, Kim R, Bae G, Kang M. Is the male disadvantage real? Cross-
552 national variations in sex gaps in COVID-19 incidence and mortality. *Glob Public Health*.
553 (2021);16(12):1793-803.
- 554 62. Turrell G, Lynch JW, Leite C, Raghunathan T, Kaplan GA. Socioeconomic disadvantage
555 in childhood and across the life course and all-cause mortality and physical function in adulthood:
556 evidence from the Alameda County Study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*.
557 (2007);61(8):723-30.
- 558 63. Anderegg N, Panczak R, Egger M, Low N, Riou J. Survival among people hospitalized
559 with COVID-19 in Switzerland: a nationwide population-based analysis. *BMC Med*.
560 (2022);20(1):164.
- 561 64. Nikoloski Z, Alqunaibet AM, Alfawaz RA, Almudarra SS, Herbst CH, El-Saharty S, et al.
562 Covid-19 and non-communicable diseases: evidence from a systematic literature review. *BMC*
563 *Public Health*. (2021);21(1):1068.
- 564 65. Agodi A, Maugeri A, Favara G, Magnano San Lio R, Puglisi M, Sinatra D, et al. Gender
565 differences in comorbidities of patients with COVID-19: An Italian local register-based analysis.
566 *Heliyon*. (2023);9(7):e18109.
- 567 66. Rushovich T, Boulicault M, Chen JT, Danielsen AC, Tarrant A, Richardson SS, et al. Sex
568 Disparities in COVID-19 Mortality Vary Across US Racial Groups. *Journal of General Internal*
569 *Medicine*. (2021);36(6):1696-701.
- 570 67. Pathak EB, Menard JM, Garcia RB, Salemi JL. Joint Effects of Socioeconomic Position,
571 Race/Ethnicity, and Gender on COVID-19 Mortality among Working-Age Adults in the United
572 States. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2022);19(9).
- 573 68. Irizar P, Pan D, Kapadia D, Bécares L, Sze S, Taylor H, et al. Ethnic inequalities in COVID-
574 19 infection, hospitalisation, intensive care admission, and death: a global systematic review and
575 meta-analysis of over 200 million study participants. *eClinicalMedicine*. (2023);57.
- 576 69. Akter S. The gender gap in COVID-19 mortality in the United States. *Feminist Economics*.
577 (2021);27(1-2):30-47.
- 578 70. Riou J, Hauser A, Fesser A, Althaus CL, Egger M, Konstantinoudis G. Direct and indirect
579 effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on mortality in Switzerland. *Nature Communications*.
580 (2023);14(1):90.
- 581 71. Bryere J, Pornet C, Copin N, Launay L, Gusto G, Grosclaude P, et al. Assessment of the
582 ecological bias of seven aggregate social deprivation indices. *BMC Public Health*.
583 (2017);17(1):86.

584

Table 1 Distribution of age and socioeconomic position (SEP), stratified by gender/sex categories, Canton of Vaud surveillance data, from March 2*, 2020 to June 27, 2021, Switzerland

	Population (N=815 300)		Total tests* (N = 885 925)		Positive tests (N = 96 963)		Hospitalisations (N = 6 356)		ICU admissions (N = 1 134)		Deaths (N = 1 175)	
	Women N = 412 599	Men N = 402 701	Women N = 463 105	Men N = 422 820	Women N = 50 296	Men N = 46 667	Women N = 2 720	Men N = 3 636	Women N = 334	Men N = 800	Women N = 558	Men N = 617
Age groups												
0-9	42 502 (10%)	44 319 (11%)	10 675 (2.3%)	12 225 (2.9%)	620 (1.2%)	649 (1.4%)	30 (1.1%)	31 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10-19	44 291 (11%)	47 101 (12%)	47 039 (10%)	47 542 (11%)	4 644 (9.2%)	4 743 (10%)	50 (1.8%)	48 (1.3%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
20-29	52 178 (13%)	54 565 (14%)	84 209 (18%)	76 947 (18%)	8 854 (18%)	7 987 (17%)	128 (4.7%)	69 (1.9%)	8 (2.4%)	5 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
30-39	59 329 (14%)	59 317 (15%)	94 883 (20%)	81 253 (19%)	8 799 (17%)	7 896 (17%)	173 (6.4%)	121 (3.3%)	13 (3.9%)	12 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
40-49	59 869 (14%)	58 157 (15%)	74 146 (16%)	67 652 (16%)	8 410 (17%)	7 387 (16%)	160 (5.9%)	250 (6.9%)	15 (4.5%)	52 (6.5%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)
50-59	57 692 (14%)	56 987 (14%)	62 506 (13%)	59 343 (14%)	7 692 (15%)	7 494 (16%)	299 (11%)	541 (15%)	60 (18%)	147 (18%)	3 (0.9%)	5 (1.3%)
60-69	40 758 (9.8%)	38 247 (9.6%)	36 464 (7.9%)	37 232 (8.8%)	4 260 (8.5%)	4 734 (10%)	384 (14%)	740 (20%)	88 (26%)	238 (30%)	13 (4.1%)	27 (6.8%)
70-79	34 053 (8.2%)	27 488 (6.9%)	25 042 (5.4%)	23 742 (5.6%)	2 967 (5.9%)	3 170 (6.8%)	542 (20%)	873 (24%)	93 (28%)	242 (30%)	54 (17%)	103 (26%)
80+	24 246 (5.8%)	14 201 (3.5%)	28 141 (6.1%)	16 884 (4.0%)	4 050 (8.1%)	2 607 (5.6%)	954 (35%)	963 (26%)	56 (17%)	102 (13%)	246 (78%)	259 (65%)


Quintile of SEP										N = 317	N = 396	
Q1 (lowest)	83 022 (20%)	80 913 (20%)	79 987 (17%)	74 721 (18%)	10 334 (21%)	9 382 (20%)					50 (16%)	92 (23%)
Q2	82 756 (20%)	80 512 (20%)	88 181 (19%)	80 457 (19%)	10 560 (21%)	9 708 (21%)					78 (24 %)	72 (18%)
Q3	82 951 (20%)	80 319 (20%)	95 105 (21%)	83 934 (20%)	10 649 (21%)	9 935 (21%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	69 (22%)	88 (22%)
Q4	83 236 (20%)	79 726 (20%)	101 244 (22%)	92 853 (22%)	9 927 (20%)	9 226 (20%)					56 (18%)	77 (20%)
Q5 (highest)	82 953 (20%)	78 912 (20%)	98 588 (21%)	90 855 (21%)	8 826 (18%)	8 416 (18%)					64 (20%)	67 (17%)

Notes: n (%); SEP = socioeconomic position; NA = Not Applicable. Death's distribution across SEP quantiles only includes geocoded notifications. * For total tests, period goes from May 27, 2020, to June 27, 2021.

Figure

[Fig. 1 – Weekly incidence rate overtime]


Figure 1 – Weekly incidence of COVID-19 outcomes per 100 000, stratified by gender/sex, Canton of Vaud surveillance data 2020-2021, Switzerland



Notes: The boundaries of epidemic periods were defined by identifying the points of lowest positive test counts that occurred between peaks of highest positive test counts.

[Fig. 2 – Cumulative incidence across SEP and age groups]

Figure 2 – Cumulative incidence of outcomes between March 2nd, 2020 and June 27, 2021* per 100 000, stratified by gender/sex, across age groups and quintiles of socio-economic position, Canton of Vaud surveillance data 2020-2021, Switzerland




Notes: **Panel A** indicates the cumulative incidences of outcomes stratified by gender/sex across age groups, while **Panel B** displays incidences across quintiles of socioeconomic position (SEP). The SEP indicator was not derived for hospitalization and ICU admissions, as only the ZIP code was available for these outcomes.

For visual clarity, the highest incidence point within each category have been brought to the foreground.

*The period considered covered 57 weeks for total tests, and 69 weeks for the other outcomes of interest.


[Fig. 3 – IRR of tests and positive tests]

Figure 3– Incidence rate ratios (IRR) of gender/sex (ref.: men) for number of tests and of positive tests, stratified by age groups (upper part), and quintiles of socio-economic position (SEP, lower part), using general population (left and center panel) and total number of tests (right panel) as denominator, Canton of Vaud surveillance data 2020-2021, Switzerland



[Fig. 4 – IRR of hospitalisations]

Figure 4 – Incidence rate ratios (IRR) of gender/sex (ref.: men) for hospitalization (upper panel) and ICU admission (lower panel) stratified by age groups, using general population as offset (panel A), and ICU admission per hospitalisations (panel B), Canton of Vaud surveillance data 2020-2021, Switzerland



[Fig. 5 – IRR of deaths]

Figure 5 – Incidence rate ratios (IRR) of gender/sex (ref.: men) for death, by age groups (blue coefficients), and quintiles of socio-economic position (SEP, red coefficients), using general population as offset, Canton of Vaud surveillance data 2020-2021, Switzerland

